

SDOT Free-Floating Bike Share Program

Application Review Materials

August 17, 2018

Thank you for your willingness to serve on the application review committee for Seattle's free-floating bike share program. This document provides the information and materials you will need to score the vendors' permit applications.

General Review Notes

- Before we sent these materials to you, the bike share team screened the applications. We received three applications, and we are asking the review committee to score all three.
- You will score seven elements of the vendors' applications: five required elements and two optional elements.
- You will assign each element an integer score between 0 (poor) and 10 (excellent).
- Please read the entire application before scoring. You may find responsive information anywhere in the vendor's application packet. Some information may be responsive to more than one scored element.
- The vendor may include references or hyperlinks to additional information not contained in the application packet; you may read and consider this information at your discretion.
- Though we set minimum requirements for acceptable applications, the vendors are free to exceed our expectations and produce innovative or creative proposals. You may score their proposals accordingly.
- The committee will meet to discuss the results on August 23, 2018.
- If you have any questions, please contact Joel Miller or Brian Camozzi.

Program Goals

In addition to the goals described in SDOT's mission, vision, and values, Seattle's RSJI and Transportation Equity Program, and the New Mobility Playbook, we have adopted the following goals for the free-floating bike share program:

1. support an active, healthy, people-first use of Seattle's streets;
2. ensure affordable and equitable service—particularly for cost-burdened communities of color—while expanding access to opportunities;
3. fill mobility gaps and improve connections to transit;
4. be safe and advance our Vision Zero objectives;
5. provide a low-carbon mobility option as part of Seattle's efforts to reduce carbon emissions;
6. manage public space to ensure sidewalks are organized and free from obstructions;
7. derive insights into how people use the system, compliance issues, and targeted bike infrastructure investments with robust data partnerships; and
8. make Seattle a world leader in diverse cycling by increasing access to adaptive cycles as a recreation and mobility option.

Scoring Criteria

Adapted from Appendix F to the Free-Floating Bike Share Requirements v.2.0

Poor: A rating of **0 to 2 points** may be appropriate if the applicant's response:

1. does not address all elements or shows several weaknesses;
2. does not demonstrate an understanding of or alignment with SDOT's program goals;
3. does not address the racial and social equity aspects of its proposal;
4. proposes inadequate or impractical goals and strategies and provides an incomplete or infeasible implementation plan and timeline;
5. fails to make connections with other appropriate elements of the applicant's proposal; or
6. fails to acknowledge limitations or potential adverse impacts of its proposal.

Fair: A rating of **3 to 5 points** may be appropriate if the applicant's response:

1. addresses all elements but shows few strengths;
2. demonstrates an inconsistent understanding of and alignment with SDOT's program goals;
3. addresses limited racial and social equity aspects of its proposal;
4. proposes some goals and strategies and provides a basic implementation plan and timeline;
5. recognizes connections with other elements of the applicant's proposal but does not address them in depth; or
6. acknowledges some limitations or potential adverse impacts of its proposal but does not commit to adequate mitigation strategies.

Good: A rating of **6 to 8 points** may be appropriate if the applicant's response:

1. addresses all elements and shows some strengths;
2. demonstrates a good understanding of and alignment with SDOT's program goals;
3. addresses racial and social equity issues in key areas of its proposal;
4. commits to specific goals and strategies and provides a feasible implementation plan and timeline for implementation of required elements;
5. integrates some appropriate elements of the applicant's proposal;
6. acknowledges the potential limitations and adverse impacts of its proposal and commits to adequate mitigation strategies; or
7. has some experience operating large fleets in cities with more than 500,000 people.

Excellent: A rating of **9 to 10 points** may be appropriate if the applicant's response:

1. addresses all issues in depth and shows strengths in key areas;
2. demonstrates a thorough understanding of and alignment with SDOT's program goals;
3. carefully addresses racial and social equity issues throughout its proposal;
4. commits to specific goals and strategies with a strong implementation plan and detailed timeline;
5. resourcefully integrates other appropriate elements of the applicant's proposal;
6. frankly discusses the potential limitations and adverse impacts of its proposal and commits to adequate mitigation strategies;
7. proposes distinctive, innovative, or particularly compelling products, features, or strategies; or
8. has strong experience operating large fleets in cities with more than 500,000 people.

Scored Element 1 of 7: Data Collection and Integrity Plan

We required the vendors to provide us with information on their data collection, sharing, and integrity plans. In the table below, please assign each vendor an integer score between 0 (poor) and 10 (excellent) based on your assessment of the vendor's response.

Plan Components

We asked the vendors to include all of the following information in their data collection and integrity plans:

1. a description of the technology and procedures the applicant will use to collect, process, and submit the following:
 - a. real-time data on the status and location of each device that is deployed in the City of Seattle or within 1000 feet of City boundaries and is not being rented ("deployed-device data");
 - b. data on each trip that begins or ends in the City of Seattle or within 1000 feet of city boundaries, including the time and location of trip start, waypoints, and trip end ("trip data");
 - c. data on reports the vendor receives about improperly parked, broken, and idle devices, and the vendor's response to those reports; and
 - d. data on all incidents in which the vendor's devices or personnel were involved in a collision, accident, injury, or property damage;
2. a description of the data integrity or accuracy limitations of the applicant's data collection, processing, and sharing technology and procedures;
3. a description of how the applicant will notify each rider at least once during the permit term about the types of data it collects from riders and devices and the types of data the vendor reports to others; and
4. a copy of any user agreements the rider must accept in order to use the applicant's service.

Scoring Table

In the table below, please assign each vendor an integer score between 0 (poor) and 10 (excellent) based on your assessment of the vendor's response.

		Vendor/Applicant		
		<i>Jump</i>	<i>Lime</i>	<i>Lyft</i>
Score (0-10):				

Scored Element 2 of 7: Parking and Fleet Management Plan

We required the vendors to provide us with information on their parking and fleet management plans. In the table below, please assign each vendor an integer score between 0 (poor) and 10 (excellent) based on your assessment of the vendor's response.

Plan Components

We asked the vendors to provide a parking and fleet management plan describing how the vendor will do all of the following:

1. ensure its staff park the devices correctly;
2. employ geofencing capabilities;
3. detect and repark improperly parked devices;
4. inspect devices to ensure they are in good working order and remove devices that are not in good working order;
5. encourage riders to park safely and conscientiously; and
6. encourage people to report safety, parking, and maintenance concerns.

Scoring Table

In the table below, please assign each vendor an integer score between 0 (poor) and 10 (excellent) based on your assessment of the vendor's response.

	Vendor/Applicant		
	<i>Jump</i>	<i>Lime</i>	<i>Lyft</i>
Score (0-10):			

Scored Element 3 of 7: Equity Plan

We required the vendors to provide us with information on their equity plans. In the table below, please assign each vendor an integer score between 0 (poor) and 10 (excellent) based on your assessment of the vendor's response.

Plan Components

We asked the vendors to include the following information in their equity plans:

1. generally, a description of how the vendor will ensure its services are affordable, accessible, equitably distributed, equitably managed, and engaged with Seattle's diverse communities;
2. a description of how the applicant's services, operations, and marketing will reach all people in the City of Seattle, with a focus on communities of color, low-income communities, immigrant and refugee communities, people with disabilities, people experiencing homelessness or housing insecurity, people with limited English-language proficiency, LGBTQ people, women and girls, youth, and seniors;
3. a description of how the applicant will inform prospective riders and non-riders in the focus communities about:
 - i. the concept and basics of device sharing;
 - ii. the applicant's own service model;
 - iii. the types of devices the applicant offers for rental;
 - iv. the pricing policies the applicant proposes, including any reduced-fare programs; and
 - v. the applicant's proposed rental methods, including any low-barrier rental method the applicant offers for people who have access to neither a smartphone or a credit card;
4. the applicant's plan to provide a translated version or translation support for all City of Seattle Tier I languages (Cantonese, Korean, Mandarin, Somali, Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese) by January 1, 2019 for the following:
 - i. the vendor's required public contact methods (phone, text, and email);
 - ii. disclosure of the vendor's pricing structure; and
 - iii. disclosures of the vendor's data collection and sharing practices;
5. the applicant's plan to provide a one-page marketing document in all Tier I languages for the City's use; and
6. any other appropriate equity-related goals, strategies, or actions the applicant proposes with respect to the following:
 - i. the applicant's fleet composition, including the types of devices and their equipment;
 - ii. any proposal to deploy adaptive cycles;
 - iii. any participation in an emergency unlocking program;
 - iv. the geographic distribution of the applicant's fleet across neighborhoods and focus communities, including the choice of service area and the proportion of the applicant's fleet to be deployed in equity focus areas;
 - v. the pricing policies the applicant offers, including reduced-fare programs;

- vi. the use of rider incentives, disincentives, rewards, or penalties to shape rider behavior;
- vii. the applicant's rental methods, including low-barrier rental methods;
- viii. the applicant's public contact methods and practices;
- ix. the applicant's proposed programming and events during the permit year;
- x. the applicant's fleet management, operations, and staffing structure and policies;
- xi. the availability of helmets;
- xii. equity in knowledge of the applicant's device sharing services and how to find, rent, and ride them;
- xiii. equity of economic and technological access to the applicant's services;
- xiv. racial and social equity generally; and
- xv. any other equity issues the applicant proposes to address.

Scoring Table

In the table below, please assign each vendor an integer score between 0 (poor) and 10 (excellent) based on your assessment of the vendor's response.

		Vendor/Applicant		
		<i>Jump</i>	<i>Lime</i>	<i>Lyft</i>
Score (0-10):				

Scored Element 4 of 7: Rider Education Plan

We required the vendors to provide us with information on their rider education plans. In the table below, please assign each vendor an integer score between 0 (poor) and 10 (excellent) based on your assessment of the vendor's response.

Plan Components

We asked the vendors to include the following information in their rider education plans:

1. a description of how the applicant will educate its riders about
 - i. traffic and riding rules;
 - ii. King County's helmet law;
 - iii. rules for parking the device safely and conscientiously; and
 - iv. any other appropriate instructions; and
2. the applicant's plan to affix required rider education information to its devices addressing the following topics:
 - i. King County's helmet law;
 - ii. yield to pedestrians;
 - iii. follow traffic rules;
 - iv. report maintenance problems to vendor; and
 - v. park responsibly; and
3. a description of how the applicant will tailor its rider education message to address knowledge equity barriers in a manner consistent with the vendor's equity plan.

Scoring Table

In the table below, please assign each vendor an integer score between 0 (poor) and 10 (excellent) based on your assessment of the vendor's response.

	Vendor/Applicant		
	<i>Jump</i>	<i>Lime</i>	<i>Lyft</i>
Score (0-10):			

Scored Element 5 of 7: Experience and Expertise

We required the vendors to provide us with information on any experience and expertise they have operating device sharing services in cities with more than 500,000 people (including Seattle).

In the table below, please assign each vendor an integer score between 0 (poor) and 10 (excellent) based on your assessment of the vendor's response.

	Vendor/Applicant		
	<i>Jump</i>	<i>Lime</i>	<i>Lyft</i>
Score (0-10):			

Scored Element 6 of 7: Adaptive Cycling Plan (Optional)

We asked (but did not require) the vendors to provide us with information on any plans to deploy adaptive cycles as part of their free-floating, shareable fleets. Here, the term "adaptive cycle" includes a wide range of devices with two, three, or more wheels other than a conventional bicycle or electric bicycle, including tricycles, hand-pedaled cycles, recumbent cycles where the rider leans back in a seat, tandem cycles that carry more than one rider, and others.

In the table below, please assign each vendor an integer score between 0 (poor/no plan) and 10 (excellent) based on your assessment of the vendor's response.

	Vendor/Applicant		
	<i>Jump</i>	<i>Lime</i>	<i>Lyft</i>
Score (0-10):			

Scored Element 7 of 7: Emergency Unlocking Plan (Optional)

We asked (but did not require) the vendors to provide us with information on their willingness to participate in an emergency-unlocking program and their plan for implementing emergency unlocking. Here, "emergency unlocking" refers to the vendor making all of its deployed devices available for free if the Mayor issues an emergency unlocking order to participating vendors.

In the table below, please assign each vendor an integer score between 0 (poor/no plan) and 10 (excellent) based on your assessment of the vendor's response.

	Vendor/Applicant		
	<i>Jump</i>	<i>Lime</i>	<i>Lyft</i>
Score (0-10):			