

**Regional Bikeshare RFP
Meeting #1
Wednesday, March 20, 2019**

DRAFT Meeting Notes

Meeting Attendees:

Sandy Fry (Hartford); Mark Moriarty, CJ Gandza (New Britain); Gary Anderson (Manchester); Todd Sealy (Windsor); Peter Gillespie (Wethersfield), Bruce Cyr (Farmington); John Mehr (Rocky Hill); Andrew Armstrong (Newington); Ken Sek, Ray Favreau (South Windsor); Marty Sitler (Vernon); Jeff Cormier (East Hartford); Jose Giner (Bloomfield); Rob Phillips (Southington); Neil Pade (Canton); Matt Tyksinski (East Windsor); Wendy Mis (Glastonbury); Jen Rodriguez (Windsor Locks); Tim Malone, Emily Hultquist, Caitlin Palmer (CRCOG)

Meeting Notes:

Emily from CRCOG welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions.

Emily asked for a show of hands from towns to gauge interest in participating in a regional bikeshare RFP, definitely interested or might be interested.

Emily stated that the goal of the meeting is to leave having started the discussion around regional bikeshare and to have representatives go back to their towns and identify what questions their town needs answered in order for them to determine whether or not they will decide to formally participate in the RFP as a “participating community.”

Caitlin Palmer (CRCOG) and Sandy Fry (City of Hartford) gave a presentation on bikeshare including general information and benefits about bikeshare (and bikes) and evolution of bikeshare, the 2014 regional bikeshare report, case studies from various cities and types of bikeshare (most focused on smart-bike systems with dock or “lock-to”), potential obstacles to bikeshare, case studies about other regional bikeshare RFPs, some of CRCOG’s preliminary thoughts on what a regional RFP might include (or not include), some prompt questions for cities/town to begin thinking about, and next steps.

During the case study conversation, discussion of costs came up since Rochester, NY and Louisville, KY both received CMAQ funds (\$350,000 and \$1 million, respectively) to fund initial start up costs. Discussion included conversation about possible funding sources other than CMAQ, since that may or may not be an option in CT.

CRCOG staff suggested that they would look into potential funding options between now and the next meeting.

Additionally, regarding costs, Sandy explained that so far, based on her research and what she is hearing from other communities and vendors that unless towns are going to allow scooters (many vendors pushing for this right now), that we would be hard-pressed to get a free, no-cost to the community system. Likely need to explore startup cost funding options such as lump fees/contributions from towns, grants, advertising on bikes and/or at dock station locations. CMAQ and similar one-time contributions pay for the installation of stations.

Sandy also provided information on Lime pilot in Hartford – demonstrated and need and excitement for bikeshare; no complaints received about the dockless nature of bicycles; vendor stated that they would need 2 rides per bike per day to break even but Hartford never saw those numbers and this is likely why their fee structure changed shortly after the pilot started.

Following the presentation, discussion continued around some of the questions raised by the presentation and additional questions that representatives had as well as comments.

What we heard:

Q: Who assumes the liability?

- One town discussed how they had looked into doing micro-rental type of bikeshare around their multi-use trail but were informed by the town that they wouldn't be able to do on town land because there was no way to do it without incurring liability
- This issue was raised in this town due to the experience had in *another* town, so likely others might share this issue
- **Q: How do others handle this?** Potential “dead in the water” issue for towns
- Likely handled as additional insured, but check RFP for additional language

Q: What about local contributions (to fund start up costs)?

Q: Can language be included in the RFP that allows the vendor to propose what a realistic start up contribution cost might be to get the system they have proposed?

Suggest that the vendor should be able to propose their concept of a workable system (rather than dictate the system) – general agreement here

Q: What about scooters, are these a deal-breaker for communities? (didn't necessarily seem to be a deal-breaker but definitely additional questions about them):

- **Q: Durability of scooters? Lifespan?**
- No electric vehicles of any kind allowed on multi-use trails
- At least in New Haven, scooters coming in this year will require proof of Drivers License
- **Q: Can speeds be set?** (typical top speed is ~20mph but seemingly technology allows vendors to set lower top speeds at the communities request)

Q: What are accident rates of bicycles versus scooters? Is there information on this?

No matter what we decide, need to make sure we clarify very specifically any scooter and/or e-bike language

Q: What about more rural communities?

Possibly pose to vendor for a solution

Q: Particularly with presence of popular trails, is there still an opportunity for some sort of bikeshare?

Q: Is it a different model? Are there other trail-based bikeshare models out there?

Coordination between communities here, if not part of bikeshare system

CRCOG staff reiterated to attendees to send any questions to staff ahead of the meeting so research could be done if needed.

Scheduling another meeting was discussed and anticipated to be approximately one month out, CRCOG staff would send out an email with meeting time/date confirmation.

Meeting concluded.