

**OPTIMIZING BIKE SHARING SYSTEM STATIONS FOR
IMPROVING USAGE EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMIC
VIABILITY: A CASE STUDY IN NEW YORK CITY.**

Sri Wijesundara Yapa Bandaralage Pavithra Kumare Baddewela

248043L

Master of Science (Major Component Research)

Department of Transport Management and Logistics Engineering

Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

August 2025

**OPTIMIZING BIKE SHARING SYSTEM STATIONS FOR
IMPROVING USAGE EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMIC
VIABILITY: A CASE STUDY IN NEW YORK CITY.**

Sri Wijesundara Yapa Bandaralage Pavithra Kumare Baddewela

248043L

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

Master of Science (Major Component Research)

Department of Transport Management and Logistics Engineering

Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

August 2025

DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis/dissertation does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to the University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis/dissertation, in whole or in part in print, electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

20.08.2025

Signature of the Candidate:

Date:

The above candidate has conducted research for the master's dissertation under my supervision. I confirm that the declaration made above by the student is true and correct.

Name of the supervisor: Dr. T. Sivakumar

22.08.2025

Signature of the supervisor:

Date:

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my beloved family.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by the university of Moratuwa through its short-term research grant (SRC/ST/2024/43). I thank the government, the university, and the country's taxpayers for their vital contribution to the research and development sectors, recognizing its long-term significance. I am deeply grateful to my supervisor Dr. T. Sivakumar and Mr. M. De Silva, for their unwavering guidance, encouragement, and valuable insights throughout this journey. My heartfelt appreciation goes to my beloved father, my brother and family, as well as my husband and his family, for their unconditional love and motivation. I also wish to acknowledge my lectures, schoolteachers, coaches, and friends, each of whom, in their own way, has played a part in shaping the person I am today.

Abstract

The global population has increased from 7.4 billion to 8.2 billion during the last decade, and 55% of people live in cities, this ratio expected to rise to 68% by 2050. This has left cities with the difficult burden of controlling traffic congestion and pollution while meeting the high demand for city infrastructure. Bike sharing systems (BSS) have quickly gained popularity as an appealing and long-term solution to these issues yet their distribution is often criticized as unequal, with stations clustered in wealthier neighborhoods, and rigorous evidence on local economic impacts remains limited. This study estimates the causal economic effect of BSS station openings on visits to nearby points of interest (POIs) and derives siting guidance to enhance both usage efficiency and inclusivity. The difference-in-differences design was applied along with propensity score matching for pairing treated POIs with comparable control POIs.

The results highlight a significant average treatment effect of $\approx +17\%$ increase in POI visits during the first 3 months after opening a bike station nearby. However, the effects are heterogeneous. By distance from POI to station, gains are largest very close to the station, 0–100 m: $\sim +26\%$; 100–200 m: $\sim +17\%$. These patterns suggest practical siting rules: prioritize locations within ≤ 300 –400 m of target POIs, aiming for ≤ 100 m in high-potential areas, and tailor placement to local urban form to improve access and equity. Future work should extend the panel back to initial rollout (e.g., 2013), examine time-of-day/weekday variation, and explore broader built-environment and equity metrics across cities. The findings provide actionable evidence for policymakers, planners, operators, and local businesses on where BSS stations can most effectively stimulate nearby economic activity while supporting a more inclusive and sustainable mobility network.

Keywords: Bike sharing systems; Causal impact; Difference in Different methods;
Economic viability; Inclusion; Optimizing; Point of interest

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	v
LIST OF FIGURES	x
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Study background	1
1.1.1. Global evolution of bike sharing systems (BSS)	1
1.1.2. Categories of bike sharing models	3
1.1.3. Emerging trend of e-bikes	4
1.1.4. Bike sharing in United States of America and New York City	5
1.1.5. Usage of BSS	6
1.1.6. Economic and social impact of BSS	7
1.1.7. Difference in Difference (DiD)	7
1.1.7.1. Treatment	8
1.1.7.2. Endogeneity.....	8
1.1.7.3. Heterogeneity	9
1.2. Problem statement.....	9
1.3. Research gap and rationale.....	9
1.4. Research aims and objectives.....	9
1.5. Research questions	10
1.6. Methodology overview	10

1.7.	Scope and limitations	11
1.8.	Significance of the study	11
1.9.	Thesis structure	11
2.	LITERATURE REVIEW	13
2.1.	Overview of BSS	13
2.2.	BSS history and evaluation	18
2.3.	Global bike-sharing systems, current trends, and drawbacks	20
2.4.	Determinants of bike-sharing usage.....	22
2.5.	Station- level optimization in BSS.....	24
2.6.	Economic analysis of BSS	25
2.7.	New York specific studies	26
2.8.	Research Gap	27
3.	MATERIAL & METHODS	29
3.1.	Research design and approach.	29
3.2.	Study area.....	30
3.2.1.	New York City (NYC)	30
3.3.	Casual inference	31
3.4.	Methods to evaluate casual inference.	31
3.5.	Difference in Difference (DiD) method	33
3.5.1.	One event and canonical DiD	33
3.5.2.	Issues in the TWFE with multiple treatment events (Heterogenous)	34
3.5.3.	Solutions to address the limitations of TWFE.	36
3.5.3.1.	Non-parallel trends.....	36
3.5.3.2.	Substitute sampling assumptions.	36
3.5.4.	Available extension of DiD method.....	37

3.6.	Research methodology applied in this study.....	37
3.6.1.	Data preparation and preprocessing	39
3.6.1.1.	Utilized data types and sources.	39
3.6.2.	Data processing – selection of comparison pairs	43
3.7.	Data analysis.	50
3.8.	Validation	50
3.9.	Ethical consideration and limitations	50
4.	RESULTS & DISCUSSION	52
4.1.	Identifying factors affecting bike-sharing system (BSS) usage focusing on built environment and human perception characteristics.....	52
4.2.	Drivers of BSS establishment and adoption in NYC: The role of socio- demographic and built-environment factors	53
4.3.	Causal economic impact on the nearby POIs.....	56
4.3.1.	Event study – average treatment effect	56
4.3.2.	Overall treatment effect (ATT).....	59
4.3.3.	Heterogeneity study	59
4.4.	Limitations	62
5.	CONCLUSIONS	63
	REFERENCES.....	64

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 , Meddin Bike-Sharing World Map, Source: (Https://Lyfturbansolutions.Com)	2
Figure 2 , BSS Growth Worldwide (Number of Systems Per Year)	3
Figure 3 , Top 15 Countries with New Systems Opened During August 2021- August 2022 Per Type	6
Figure 4 , Data Screening Process Flow Chart	14
Figure 5 , Co-Occurrence of Key World in Studies of Bike-Sharing Systems	15
Figure 6 , BSS Publications Distribution Worldwide (2015-2025)	17
Figure 7 , Overall Research Process	29
Figure 8 , a - North America, b -NYC, c - Borough in NYC, d - Bike station distribution in NYC.	30
Figure 9 , Staggered Treatment Event	35
Figure 10 , Applied Methodology Process	38
Figure 11 , NYC Citi Bike Real-time System Data	40
Figure 12 , Prepared Bike Station details of NYC.	40
Figure 13 , Extracting the Socio-Economic Data from Open-Source Site	42
Figure 14 , Spearman Correlation Checks for Covariates	47
Figure 15 , Standard Mean Difference Before and After Pair Selection	48
Figure 16 , Propensity Score Balance Before and After Pair Selection	48
Figure 17 , Distribution of Selected Treated and Controls POIs	50
Figure 18 , Causal Relationship between factors influencing BSS usage.	52
Figure 19 , Causal Loop Diagram for NYC BSS Usage	53
Figure 20 , Covariates Balance Results	55
Figure 21 , Average Treatment Effect Event Study in 3 months windows.	58
Figure 22 , ATT variation when there are two control candidates for treated POIs.	58
Figure 23 , % ATT by distance bin	62

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1, Active Bike-Sharing Systems in August 2022 by Type	4
Table 2, BSS Generations Over the Years	19
Table 3, Factors Influencing BSS usage.	23
Table 4, Possible Methodologies	32
Table 5, Initial Borough - Group Classification Details	44
Table 6, Results of Hypothesis Testing between the Group of CBGs with and without E-Bike Station,	54
Table 7, ATT by dock capacity of Bike stations	59
Table 8, ATT by borough	60
Table 9, ATT by POI group	61

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AI – Artificial Intelligence

ATT – Average treatment effect on the treated entity

BS – Bike sharing

BSS- Bike Sharing Systems

CI – Confidence Interval

DiD- Difference in Difference

EBSS – Electric Bikes Sharing Systems

E-Scooter – Electric Scooters

FMC – Fifteen Minutes City

MaaS – Mobility as a Service

MKD – Mapping Knowledge Domain

NYC – New York City

POI – Point of Interest

SBBS - Station-based bike-sharing

TWFE – Two Way Fixed Effect

USA – United States of America

U.S – United States