



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #:	21-356	Name:	
Type:	Agendas	Status:	Agenda Ready
File created:	11/2/2021	In control:	Board of Aldermen
On agenda:	11/9/2021	Final action:	
Title:	Update on Draft Bike Share RFP PURPOSE: The purpose of this item is to provide the Town Council an update on the development of an RFP (Request for Proposals) to select a bike share service provider to create a unified system for Carrboro, Chapel Hill, and UNC-Chapel Hill and to seek guidance on specifics of the system.		
Indexes:			
Code sections:			
Attachments:	1. Attachment A - Resolution, 2. Attachment B - Draft Bike Share RFP, 3. Attachment C - Bike Share Interest Areas		

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
------	------	-----------	--------	--------

TITLE:

Update on Draft Bike Share RFP

PURPOSE: The purpose of this item is to provide the Town Council an update on the development of an RFP (Request for Proposals) to select a bike share service provider to create a unified system for Carrboro, Chapel Hill, and UNC-Chapel Hill and to seek guidance on specifics of the system.

DEPARTMENT: Planning

CONTACT INFORMATION: Zachary Hallock, Transportation Planner, 919-918-7329, zhallock@townofcarrboro.org <<mailto:zhallock@townofcarrboro.org>>; Tina Moon, Planning Administrator, 919-918-7325, cmoon@townofcarrboro.org <<mailto:cmoon@townofcarrboro.org>>

INFORMATION: At the October 12, 2021 Town Council meeting, staff presented a draft RFP that is being developed in conjunction with staff from Chapel Hill and UNC ([Town of Carrboro - File #: 21-320 \(legistar.com\)](https://carrboro.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5164557&GUID=C236AD30-00BD-4B27-9F04-0099CC460D6F) <<https://carrboro.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5164557&GUID=C236AD30-00BD-4B27-9F04-0099CC460D6F>>). While the work group is still refining the RFP, Town staff wanted to provide the Council with an additional opportunity to review and provide input on the elements of the bike share system and criteria for selecting a potential vendor. As staff are aiming to complete the final RFP in December, with the target advertisement date in January, this item provides one final opportunity to review and discuss key features of a bike share system.

To date, discussions on potential bike share programs have focused on three particular features:

1. Geographic equity-the system should be available for all residents, with particular attention to historically disadvantaged neighborhoods;
2. Financial equity-the system should provide for different types of payment options;
3. Participation regardless of ability-the system should have accessible/adaptive vehicles which do not require balancing.

In preparation for the final revisions to the Bike Share RFP (*Attachment B*), staff is seeking guidance from the Council on the following:

Hub Definition - There are two ways a bike share hub can be defined:

- Fixed - A hub where the bike share vehicle must be returned to a specific location, which generally has a docking station or other physical infrastructure associated with it. The use of fixed hubs helps minimize the need for rebalancing.
- Floating - A hub, which has basic paint or signage to identify the center of the hub. Bike share vehicles, can be parked in the general vicinity of the hub without penalty. During rebalancing, bikes will be located at the center of the hub. The use of floating hubs may provide more accessibility by allowing users to end their trip closer to their destination. There may higher user fees associated with this method due to increased need for rebalancing.
 - Question: Is there a preference for one type of hub versus another?

Geographic Equity & Coverage - Staff has prepared an Interest Areas map (*Attachment C*) to identify areas of special interest for consideration when determining hub locations with a focus on providing system access to affordable housing developments or historically African American neighborhoods. Staff anticipates working with selected vendor to determine the appropriate number of vehicles and hubs to ensure that the system is well used. Depending on the success of the system, more vehicles and hubs can be added to the system over time as ridership grows.

- Question: How should the identification and selection of hubs be prioritized?

RFP Evaluation Criteria - The RFP includes a set of evaluation criteria to guide the selection of a respondent. This process will be a joint effort between Carrboro, Chapel Hill, and UNC.

- Question: Are there any priorities, changes, or additions, which should be made to the evaluation criteria? Are there other key features that should be added?

In addition, the following changes have been made following the meeting in October:

- Language was added to request that respondents provide information about all of the types of vehicles that they provide (including scooters). This information would help inform the possible inclusion of scooters or other types of vehicles to the fleet, should UNC policy on scooters change in the future.
- Language was added to request that respondents describe their experience providing vehicles for riders of different ages and abilities, including past coordination with organizations such as the Orange County Department on Aging.
- Language was added to request that respondents describe their fleet recharging process and provide data on their electricity usage.

Staff expect to work to incorporate the priorities expressed by Council into the final version of the RFP. Additional coordination with legal teams from the three organizations will review the final draft and discuss remaining considerations related to how the RFP will be issued.

FISCAL & STAFF IMPACT: There is no impact associated with receiving this update.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that Council consider the resolution (*Attachment A*) and

provide direction with regard to hub types, geographic coverage, and evaluation criteria.