



# The economic and social efficiency of bike sharing systems in French Cities

#### Haingotiana RAJAONAH



#### **INTRODUCTION** Heavy involvement of French urban areas

38 schemes 48,000 bikes



# **INTRODUCTION** Bike sharing systems (BSS): a matter of size

Figure 1: BSS by size of French urban area (number of inhabitant)



Source: Survey of Cycling Cities and Territories in France, 2016

2017

INTERNATIONAL CYCLING CONFERENCE

#### **INTRODUCTION** Fairly substantial financial involvement

Overall annual cost of a BSS : €1,300 to €3,400 per bicycle per year (Certu, 2012)

Local authority bears a significant share of the cost: 85%

What do French urban areas aim to achieve?

Change travel behaviour: increase the modal share of cycling

Reduce car and public transport congestion Reduce greenhouse gas emissions Improve the health of inhabitants



#### **OBJECTIVES**

- 1. How does travel behaviour change once bike sharing systems have been made avalaible?
- 2. How can be explained the gap between realities and expectactions?

### METHODOLOGY

Literature rewiew

Analyzing bike sharing uses and French cities mobility surveys



#### 1. IMPACT OF BSS IN TRAVEL BEHAVIOUR 1.1. Marginal change in travel behaviour

Table 1: Use of BSS in French cities in 2016

	Number of			
	bicycles per		Hire per	Hire per
Number of	1,000	Hire per	inhabitant per	inhabitant per
inhabitants	inhabitants	bicycle per day	year	day
More than 1,000,000	4.7	6.3	10.9	0.03
500,000-1,000,000	2.96	4.33	4.68	0.01
250,000-500,000	4.87	1	1.8	0.00
Less than 250,000	1.84	0.97	0.65	0.00

Source: Enquête des villes et territoires cyclables, 2015/2016

→Low penetration among population

→Contrast between use of BSS in large and medium-sized areas,

between use of BSS in city centre and outlying areas



#### 1. IMPACT OF BSS IN TRAVEL BEHAVIOUR 1.2. Stable and low modal share of cycling

Table 2: Bicycle mobility in several French cities according to recent mobility surveys

	Total number of journeys per inhabitant per day	Number of bicycle journeys per inhabitant per day
Lille 2016	3.71	0.06
Lyon 2015	3.18	0.05
Dunkerque 2015	4.06	0.07
Nantes 2014	3.81	0.11
Douai 2013	3.39	0.08
Toulouse 2013	3.59	0.08
Valenciennes 2011	3.21	0.06

Source: Mobility surveys, Cerema Nord-Picardie



#### 1.2. Stable and low modal share of cycling

Table 3: Change in modal share in the Lyon urban area since 2006

			Public		Other
	Bicycle	Car	transport	Walking	modes
2006	2%	48%	16%	33%	1%
2015	2%	42%	20%	35%	1%

Source: Mobility surveys, Cerema Nord-Picardie

Table 4: Change in modal share in the Lille urban area since 2006

			Public		Other
	Bicycle	Car	transport	Walking	modes
2006	1.6%	55.40%	9%	31.80%	2%
2016	1.5%	57%	9.90%	29.60%	2%

Source: Mobility surveys, Cerema Nord-Picardie



2. Why does the introduction of BSS not change French travel behaviour?

#### ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF MODAL CHOICE

- 2.1. Cost of time and cost of using BSS (F. Papon, 2002)
- Table 5: Cost of using and time per kilomètre according to travel mode for journeys of under 5 km

	Bike sharing	Regular Cyclist	Occasional Cyclist	Urban public transport	Car	Walking
Cost of using (€)	0	0.4	0.15	0.1	0.21	0
Speeds (km/h)	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.16	18.5	3.7
Cost of time (€)	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.94	0.46	2.23

Source: author's calculation based on the French Comptes des Transports 2013



#### 2.2 Cost of insecurity and discomfort





# Widespread of BSS→ increase in cycling → « safety in numbers » effect (Jacobsen, 2003)



# **CONCLUSION AND PROSPECTS**

- BSS does not increase the modal share of cycling. Why?
- BSS is not unbeatably the best travel solution for individuals.
- How to optimize BSS' impact and change travel behaviour ?
- Severe restrictions on care use (Mathon, 2012)
  Reduce traffic speeds and restrict the parking of cars.

Is this a socially acceptable solution?







## Thank very much you for listening

Especial thanks to: -Cerema -Club des Villes et Territoires Cyclables

