



TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
RESPONSE PACKET

REQUEST FOR PROPSAL

Bid Number:
18163

CAUTION TO VENDOR

Vendor's failure to submit required items and/or information as specified in the *Bid Solicitation Document* **may** result in disqualification.



CITY OF LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS

SIGNATURE PAGE

Type or Print the following information.

VENDOR INFORMATION				
Company:				
Address:				
City		State:		Zip Code:
Business Designation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual	<input type="checkbox"/> Sole Proprietorship	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Service Corp	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Profit
	<input type="checkbox"/> Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Corporation		
<p>The City of Little Rock encourages participation of small, minority-owned, disadvantaged, and woman-owned business enterprises in the procurement of goods, services, professional services, and construction, either as a general contractor or sub-contractor. It is further requested that whenever possible, majority contractors that require sub-contractors, seek qualified small, minority, and woman businesses to partner with them.</p> <p>Minority is defined by Arkansas Code Annotated § 15-4-303. The Arkansas Economic Development Commission or the Arkansas Department of Transportation conduct a certification process for these businesses. Check if any of the following apply to your company:</p>				
<input type="checkbox"/> African American <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic American <input type="checkbox"/> American Indian <input type="checkbox"/> Women-Owned				
<input type="checkbox"/> Asian American <input type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islander American <input type="checkbox"/> Service Disabled Veteran <input type="checkbox"/> Disadvantage Business Enterprise				
Provide your certification number (if applicable):				

CONTACT INFORMATION			
Provide contact information to be used for bid solicitation related matters.			
Contact Person:		Title:	
Phone:		Alternate #:	
Email:			

Upon signing this document, the vendor certifies that they have read and agree to the requirements set forth in this solicitation including specifications, conditions and pertinent information regarding the articles being bid upon. The vendor agrees that any additional terms or conditions submitted by the vendor that conflict with requirements in this solicitation, whether submitted intentionally or inadvertently, may cause the vendor's proposal to be rejected. If the City, in the City's sole discretion, determines that such a conflict applies to a material term of this solicitation, then the vendor's proposal shall be disqualified.

Authorized Signature: _____ Title: _____

Printed/Typed Name: _____ Date: _____



PROPOSED SUBCONTRACTORS FORM

- **Do not** include additional information relating to subcontractors on this form or as an attachment to this form.

VENDOR PROPOSES TO USE THE FOLLOWING SUBCONTRACTOR(S) TO PROVIDE SERVICES.

Type or Print the following information

Subcontractor's Company Name	Street Address	City, State, ZIP

VENDOR DOES NOT PROPOSE TO USE SUBCONTRACTORS TO PERFORM SERVICES.

By signature below, vendor agrees to and **shall** fully comply with all Requirements related to subcontractors as shown in the bid solicitation.

Authorized Signature: _____

Use Ink Only.

Printed/Typed Name: _____ **Date:** _____

INFORMATION FOR EVALUATION

- Provide a response to each item/question in this section. Vendor may expand the space under each item/question to provide a complete response or include in proposal as attachment.
- **Do not** include additional information if not pertinent to the itemized request.

Category 1.	<u>Cover Letter</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	5
	Please compose a cover letter summarizing the proposal. The letter must be signed by an officer of the proposer or a designated agent empowered to bind the firm in the contract offer.		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>High scoring proposals will summarize the key elements the proposal, and affix the proper signature.</i> 		
Category 2.	<u>Experience and Past Performance</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	25
2.1	Please provide a brief synopsis of BSSP experience, qualifications, and success in providing bikeshare services.		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>High scoring proposals will describe an experienced BSSP capable of delivering a high-quality, dependable bikeshare system to the City of Little Rock (CLR). BSSP <u>must</u> have experience in the bikeshare industry and establishing bikeshare systems and with a minimum of two (2) years in business specifically for bikeshare.</i> 		
2.2	Please list all of the markets (municipality, university, business campus, etc.) that the BSSP has ever launched a bikeshare program. Please include the date of launch and the approximate number of bikes at launch. Note markets similar to Little Rock in geography (Southeastern United States) or size (~200,000 population). In the same table, indicate for which markets the BSSP has elected or been asked to leave. For these markets, list the approximate date of termination, who initiated termination (BSSP or locality), and a brief explanation of why the program was terminated. In what market(s) similar to Little Rock has the BSSP operated? What other markets in the Southeastern United States? What other markets in mid-sized cities (~200,000 people)?		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>High scoring proposals will have launched in many markets. High scoring proposals will demonstrate experience with markets similar to Little Rock. CLR is looking for evidence of quality, stability, and resiliency in our BSSP. High scoring proposals will have few markets in which a bikeshare program was terminated and, when programs were terminated, will succinctly but clearly explain the circumstances that resulted in program termination. Failure to disclose terminated contracts may result in disqualification.</i> 		
2.3	What experience does the BSSP have in offering an equity program in other markets? Provide evidence that the BSSP's equity program(s) achieved the goal of inclusion.		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>High scoring proposals will describe a reasonably convenient process through which a user without a smart phone can access the System. An equity program that includes access for users without smartphones is a minimum requirement.</i> 		
2.4	CLR seeks diversity and to be a place of opportunity for traditionally disadvantaged demographics, such as minorities, women, service-disabled veterans or DBEs. Such status may also be advantageous for the BSSP to secure grant funding for the System. Please provide any certification.		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>High scoring proposals will demonstrates minority, woman, service-disabled veteran, or Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) ownership. Such ownership shall be certified through an Arkansas recognized certification program such as the Arkansas Economic Development Commission (AEDC) or the Arkansas Department of Transportation (ArDOT).</i> 		
2.5	Please provide up to three references from past and/or present clients for contracts similar in scope to this contract and in communities similar to CLR (in population, demographics, and number of bicycle facilities in within the initial launch focal area) including the agency's name and complete mailing address, the name of the contact person, title, email address and phone number of each reference.		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>High scoring proposals will have references who enthusiastically support the work the BSSP has done in their communities and believe the BSSP could create a high-performing bikeshare system in CLR. Note to reviewers: You will evaluate the feedback we get from references, which will be collected between the date of proposal submission and the date of evaluation, not any information provided directly in the proposal.</i> 		
Category 3.	<u>BSSP Staffing</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	15

	Please list BSSP staff positions that will launch and operate the System (including, but not limited to, lawyer(s), marketer(s), local manager, and mechanics/redistributors). What role (if any) will each staff position have in System launch? What role (if any) will each staff position have in ongoing System operations following launch? What proportion of each staff position's time will be physically spent in Little Rock (and how will this change prior to and following launch)? For each position type, how many FTEs will be directed toward the Little Rock System? Referencing the proposed timeline (Category 26), at what point between the contracts being signed and the launch will each be hired or turn their attention toward the Little Rock System? If actual staff members are known for any of these positions, feel free to discuss them and their qualifications, but this is not expected.		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will have a bikeshare launch staffing plan that is robust, sufficiently focused on the Little Rock, and capable of creating a successful launch by Spring 2019. High scoring proposals will also include staffing sufficient to operate a quality bikeshare system, likely a full-time, local System Manager and at least two full time equivalent System Mechanics/Redistributors (or three if petal-assist batteries must be regularly swapped), with a strong national operational support. BSSP <u>must</u> hire full-time, local managerial and maintenance staff sufficient for the day-to-day operations of the System. Operations must not rely on CLR Staff in theory or in practice. 		
Category 4.	<u>System Bicycles</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	15
	Provide a detailed description of the bicycles used in the system (e.g. suspension, seat adjustment, expected lifespan, branding, onboard technology, cargo space, bell, lights, kickstand, and lock). Photographs, diagrams, and/or link(s) to online video. What is the weight of the bike and how many gears does it have? CLR wishes to for the System bike to have a built-in GPS tracker (not reliant on smartphone GPS tracking) capable of locating bikes in real-time for security purposes, geofencing small (2x2 meter) bikeshare stations, determining where bikes are checked out and checked backed in, and determining on which streets and paths System bikes are ridden.		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will describe System bicycles that have ample cargo space, a bell, a lock(s) that allow the bicycle to be secured in locations other than a bikeshare station, a kickstand, and bright lights, Phase One bike <u>must</u>: a) lock to and a physical structure when not in use, b) have front and rear lights (AR 27-36-220), c) have an easily adjustable seat, and d) have cargo space. A long expected bicycle lifespan is high scoring if the financial model for CLR is lease-to-own, but otherwise unimportant. High scoring proposals will describe a bike that is relatively light, pleasant, and manageable to ride. A "light", non-pedal-assist bike might be ~34 lbs. and a "heavy", non-pedal-assist bikeshare bike might be ~48 lbs. Pedal-assist (a.k.a. ebike) technology makes bikes heavier but easier to ride; weight is not an important review consideration when the proposal describes a pedal-assist bike. High scoring proposals will describe an internal GPS tracking mechanism accurate enough to perform all of these functions and that transfers location information frequently enough to track individual streets and paths on which the bikes are ridden. Phase one bike <u>must</u> have internal GPS tracking capacity. 		
Category 5.	<u>Pedal-Assist Bicycles</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	10
5.1	CLR wishes to reduce any barriers to System use. Pedal-assist bikeshare systems are popular because they offer a more comfortable transportation alternative in warm climates, in hilly environments, and for physically inactive/obese users. These are important barriers in Little Rock. Is a petal-assist bike available for Phase One (Spring 2019 launch)? Please clarify that the BSSP pedal-assist bike qualifies as Class 1 or Class 2 of Arkansas House Bill 2185 (ftp://www.arkleg.state.ar.us/Bills/2017R/Public/HB2185.pdf).		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will provide a pedal-assist option in Phase One. Pedal-assist bike <u>must</u> be Class 1 or Class 2 as defined by the Arkansas House Bill 2185 		
5.2	Is a pedal assist bike available for 2020?		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will provide a pedal-assist option in Phase Two. Pedal-assist bike <u>must</u> be Class 1 or Class 2 as defined by the Arkansas House Bill 2185 		
Category 6.	<u>Stations</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	25

6.1	Please give an overview of the proposed bikeshare stations, including requirements for the area, mounting surface, power, and any other requirements. Describe the BSSP's approach to station permitting and installation on public right-of-way and private property. Pictures/diagrams including area measurements a plus.	5	
•	<i>High scoring proposals will describe an aesthetically pleasing bikeshare station that has as a small footprint (reducing disruption to public spaces) can be mounted to a variety of surfaces (allowing greater flexibility in station locations) and minimal additional requirements. High scoring proposal will have a site planning and permitting strategy that has worked in similar markets. High scoring proposal will require minimal CLR participation in site planning.</i>		
6.2	Are racks specific to System bikes mechanically (i.e. would physically serve as poor racks for non-bikeshare bikes)? Is the BSSP willing to allow System stations to also serve as parking for non-System bikes (with the understanding that station capacities relative to the number of bikes in the System would have to increase).	5	
•	<i>High scoring proposals will describe stations mechanically compatible with non-System bikes with at least two points of contact with the bike. High scoring proposal will allow System stations to also serve as racks for non-System bikes to address an existing bike parking need in the Phase One focal area and throughout Little Rock and propose to have at least 1.7 times as many docking sites as bikes in the System.</i>		
6.3	CLR prefers stations that can respond to consumer demand on different timescales. Are stations modular and easily expandable to allow station location to change based on usage patterns (e.g. after annual review)? Does System hardware allow for temporary "Pop-Up" stations for special events/festivals?	5	
•	<i>High scoring proposals will describe stations with high modularity and expansion capability and with hardware that allows the possibility of short-term "Pop Up" stations for special events.</i>		
6.4	What flexibility is there in station function and focal area demarcation? Does System hardware/software allow any area to be geofenced, as large as the entire focal area (so that bikes could be checked back into the System anywhere within the focal area) or as small as an individual bike rack (to make the System function like a dock-based system)? What is the smallest area that can be reliably geofenced with the GPS technology on the bike? If a station rack is 100% filled, could a user successfully check a bike back into the system immediately adjacent to the station?	5	
•	<i>High scoring proposals will discuss System hardware and software that is flexible in its operations so that the way the System functions initially could be changed without dramatic changes in System hardware or software.</i>		
6.5	Does the BSSP intend to fund all System stations and site planning?	5	
•	<i>High scoring proposals will include all System racks and site planning within the launch and operational expenses of the BSSP. This is a minimum requirement.</i>		
Category 7.	<u>System Data</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	40
7.1	System data is important to demonstrate use. What usage data will be reported to CLR?	5	
•	<i>High scoring proposals will report System use and break down System use by user type (one-time user, annual subscriber, etc.) and demographic (gender, race, income, etc.) in monthly and annual reports and for different spans of time by CLR request.</i>		
7.2	System data is important to consider checkout location, check-in location, and where rebalancing was required. These data will help determine what stations are performing well and poorly and where there is organic demand (or lack of demand) for new stations or increased station capacity. In partnership with the BSSP, these data will help inform future system adjustments. What check-in, checkout, rebalancing data will be reported to CLR and considered by the BSSP?	5	
•	<i>High scoring proposals will report these data by user type (one-time user, annual subscriber, etc.) and demographic (gender, race, income, etc.) in annual reports and for different spans of time by CLR request.</i>		
7.3	System data showing in what zones and on what streets/paths System bicycles are being ridden is important. This will help inform on what streets there is usage and therefore demand for bicycle-	5	

	specific infrastructure or how that infrastructure in turn affects use. Beyond check-in and check-out locations, what georeferenced usage data will be collected and provided to CLR? In what forms will those data be reported? Do these data depend on a smartphone for collection, or does a bicycle-integrated GPS collect these data? Are these data collected at a rate (i.e. pings per minute) that will allow unambiguous tracking of a rider's route?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will describe a system that collects georeferenced trip data by user type and demographic (1 point). High scoring proposals will describe a bicycle-integrated GPS system to collect these data rather than reliance on a smartphone (1 point). High scoring proposals will describe a System that collects data in such a way that street or path routes are unambiguously determinable (2 points). High scoring proposals will discuss user-friendly reporting methods of these data, e.g. heat maps and propose reporting these to CLR in an annual report and for different spans of time by CLR request. 		
8.4	What consumer feedback data is collected by the BSSP?	5	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will describe mechanisms to assess consumer feedback regarding overall satisfaction with the System and more specific areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. High scoring proposals will report all of these metrics, unabridged, in monthly and annual report and for different spans of time by CLR request. Abnormally urgent consumer feedback should be reported to CLR immediately. 		
8.5	Is there any cost to CLR to obtain System data?	5	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will offer System data to CLR free of charge. 		
8.6	Will the BSSP provide assistance to CLR in interpreting data or using available data to answer questions as they arise?	5	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will express the desire to be a good partner with CLR in working with and interpreting all available System metrics without additional consultation costs. 		
8.7	Will the BSSP provide only aggregated data to CLR so that it is impossible to determine System use for individual users?	5	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will only provide CLR only aggregated data so that, in the event of a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, CLR will not be obligated to compromise user anonymity. 		
8.8	A funding stream used by some bikeshare service providers has been to sell user data to third parties. What user data has the BSSP sold in other bikeshare systems? What user data does the BSSP intend to sell to third parties in our System? Is the BSSP willing to be contractually required to directly ask users their permission before selling their data?	5	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will not have sold user data to third parties, especially without user permission, in the past. High scoring proposals will not plan to sell user data to third parties in our System. Proposal <u>must</u> ask System users their permission before selling their data. This must be a stand-alone ask in plain language, not an item buried in contractual language. This is a minimum requirement. 		
Category 8.	<u>Membership, User Fees, and Equity</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	35
8.1	Provide a description of different full-priced and equity program membership categories (including benefits) and a tiered pricing structure for the annual costs and per-use cost of each category. In the System's equity program, what individual or household income corresponds to what membership price? Provide any evidence available that the proposed discounted price points are successful in promoting system use for low-income residents in similar markets. For the System's equity program, how does the BSSP verify individual or household income to determine if the user qualifies for a reduced membership price?	5	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will provide different membership categories that will be attractive to regular and intermittent users of all income levels. High scoring proposals will propose discounts sufficient to be inclusive to low-income residents and provide evidence that proposed price points will achieve the objective of inclusion. An equity program that includes subsidized memberships is a minimum requirement. High scoring proposals will have a plan to verify income that is reasonably convenient for all parties and has been shown to be effective in other BSSP system(s) (ideally) or other bikeshare systems of which the BSSP is aware. 		

8.2	Compare membership and user fees to similar markets in the southeastern United States. Please make the case that the proposed user fees have not been a significant barrier to System use in similar markets.	5		
•	<i>High scoring proposals will demonstrate that proposed user fees are similar or less than user fees in similar markets with the understanding that a pedal-assist bike is a superior user experience that may require a slightly higher user price point (but not so high as to discourage use in our market).</i>			
8.3	In the System's equity program, how will an unbanked resident access the system?			
•	<i>High scoring proposals will describe a reasonably convenient process through which an unbanked resident can access the System. An equity program that includes access for unbanked residents is a minimum requirement.</i>	5		
8.4	In the System's equity program, how will users without a smart phone access the system?			
•	<i>High scoring proposals will describe a reasonably convenient process through which a user without a smart phone can access the System. An equity program that includes access for users without smartphones is a minimum requirement.</i>			
Category 9.		<u>User Experience: One-Time User</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	30
9.1	Describe the process for a one time user to check out and check in a bike. Do users need to manually enter their credit card number or is there some other way to provide payment information? If possible, include photos, illustrations, and/or a link to a video(s).	10		
•	<i>High scoring proposals will detail a process that is as fast and convenient as possible so that the steps necessary to access a bike are not so onerous for a one-time user that they discourage use.</i>			
9.2	How does the user physically interact with the bike during this process? Is there more than one locking mechanism? How complex is the locking mechanism? A diagram or link to a video may be helpful.	10		
•	<i>High scoring proposals will describe a locking mechanism that is quick and simple to use, requiring few steps to unlock and to secure the bicycle.</i>			
9.3	How many educational/contractual screens must the user process on the app? Is the user presented with advertisement during this process?	10		
•	<i>High scoring proposals will balance the need for users to agree to contractual terms and to educate users how to use the system with a streamlined checkout process. While in-app advertisement may be necessary to fund the System, high scoring proposals will propose NO advertisement during a first-time check in process that will already include many steps and a learning curve.</i>			
Category 10.		<u>User Experience: Member</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	25
10.1	Describe the process for a member to check out and check in a bike. Rather than repeat information in Category 10.1, feel free to reference, compare, and contrast this process with the process for a non-member.	5		
•	<i>High scoring proposals will describe a process that is fast and convenient for regular users.</i>			
10.2	Is there an RFID reader or other technology available to streamline the process for members?	5		
•	<i>High scoring proposals will include the option for members to have an RFID card, key fob, or similar technology that will allow rapid bike check out.</i>			
10.3	Does RFID or other member rapid check out technology have the potential to be linked to driver's licenses, student IDs, or transit cards?	5		
•	<i>High scoring proposals will include option of using compatible Student IDs or Public Transportation IDs as an RFID Card or another way(s) to integrate accessibility to declutter a user's wallet/pocket/handbag.</i>			
10.4	Does the System allow the possibility for the user to "reserve" a bike for a certain time so that she can see the bike available at a station and prevent the bike from being seen or checked out by another user for a certain amount of time (e.g. 10 minutes) while she walks to the station? Is this an	5		

	option that the CLR and the BSSP can together decide whether they would like to include and the maximum amount of reservation time?	
•	<i>High scoring proposals will describe the option for the BSSP/CLR to consider the use of this functionality in the System, but will not require this functionality.</i>	
10.5	Does the System allow the possibility for the user to put a bike “on hold” during their use, meaning the user is able to lock and leave the bike but not check it back into the System? The bike is still checked out to the user and she is still being charged for the hold time, but the bike will be where she left it when she completes an errand. Is this an option that the CLR and the BSSP can together decide whether they would like to include?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will describe the option for the BSSP/CLR to consider the use of this functionality in the System, but will not require this functionality.</i>	
Category 11.	<u>User Experience: Mobile App</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible 60
11.1	Describe the mobile application. What features does it have not discussed in other Category 12 sub-categories? If possible, include photos, illustrations, and/or a link to a video(s). If the app is currently available, please provide directions for committee members to load and review it on their smartphones	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will describe a mobile application that is simple and pleasant but also with features that are useful.</i>	
11.2	On what platforms is the mobile application available?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will have an app available on iPhone OS and Android OS. Availability on Bada (Samsung), BlackBerry OS (Research in Motion), MeeGo OS (Nokia and Intel), Palm OS, Symbian OS (Nokia), and web OS (Palm/HP) a plus as well.</i>	
11.3	Who is responsible for the maintenance and upgrades to the mobile application?	5
•	<i>As part of a turn-key bikeshare service, maintenance of the app is a minimum requirement for the BSSP.</i>	
11.4	Does the app include an interactive map showing user their current location and station locations?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will include an interactive map to guide users to stations.</i>	
11.5	Does the app and System hardware allow the possibility of guiding users not only to stations but available bikes not docked at a station if CLR elects to move more toward dockless system functionality in the future?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will provide flexibility in System operations, such that we might launch a System that requires bikes be returned to designated stations, but we could later use the same hardware and software to allow the System to function in a way that allowed bikes to be locked to structures and checked back into the System when not at a designated bikeshare station.</i>	
11.6	Does the app indicate the number of bikes available at bikeshare stations updated in real-time?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will discuss an app that will indicate number of bikes at a station in real-time.</i>	
11.7	If the System will contain a mixture of pedal-assist and non-pedal-assist bikes, or some other meaningful difference between System bikes, will the app allow the user to identify which types of bikes are at each station (i.e. allowing the user to seek a certain type of bike within the System)?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will allow users to determine the type of bike on the app map if applicable.</i>	
11.8	Does the app allow push notifications to encourage System use? If so, can those push notifications easily be controlled (i.e. turned off) by the user?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will provide the option for users to get push notifications to encourage System use but allow users to turn off this feature.</i>	
11.9	Does the app allow the possibility for users to return bikes to secure locations within the focal area other than a designated bikeshare station? If so, would CLR have control about whether or not this was allowed and would we be able to change that decision based on feedback from the community?	5

	<i>High scoring proposals will discuss System software and hardware that offers operational flexibility so that the System can benefit from evolving industry best practices and on-the-ground experiences in Little Rock.</i>			
11.10	Does the app report statistics to the user to encourage System use, such as miles ridden per trip and/or per time period, calories burned, etc.?		5	
•	<i>High scoring proposals will provide users these encouraging statistics.</i>			
11.11	Does the app contain advertisements? If so, at what point in the user experience does she see advertisements? How do these advertisements affect the user experience? Is there the potential for the number and intrusiveness of advertisements to increase over time? To what degree is CLR able to control the amount and content of advertising on the app?		5	
•	<i>While app advertisement may be one mechanism through which the System is funded, high scoring proposals will show a sensitivity to how advertisements may affect user experience (particularly during the already onerous task of one-time users accessing the System), and will express a willingness to allow CLR some degree of oversight in the amount, placement, and content of advertisement within the app.</i>			
11.12	Does the app allow the possibility of advertisement/promotion/special offers that are push notifications based on location (i.e. the rider rides within a certain distance of a business, and then is alerted to a special offer from that business)? If users find this type of advertisement distracting or a safety concern, does CLR have any oversight to be able to phase out that functionality over time?			
•	<i>High scoring proposals will describe an app with the possibility for innovative and interactive advertisement such as this, but also a willingness to allow CLR to have a degree of oversight based on user feedback or safety incidents. CLR understands that a contract with a sponsor that includes a provision such as this may have a long term (e.g. annual), we only ask that CLR can request that provision not be a part of the next contract.</i>			
Category 12.		<u>User Experience: Website</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	15
12.1	Describe the System website. Provide any information that will be helpful to visualize the website and its functionality, possibly including a video or a link to another BSSP bikeshare system website with access.		5	
•	<i>High scoring proposals will describe a website that has high functionality and ease-of-use and is aesthetically pleasing. Functions may include membership sign-ups, System use education, relevant safety education, a System map, System news/blog, member portal, etc.</i>			
12.2	What services will the website provide that overlap with the functionality of the app? For each of these services, does the BSSP expect those functions will be more convenient and more frequently done on the app or on the website based on past experience?		5	
•	<i>High scoring proposals will discuss the functions that are able to be completed on both the app and the website, and the benefits and drawbacks of both interfaces for performing those functions.</i>			
12.3	What services will the website provide that are unique to the website?		5	
•	<i>High scoring proposals will have fewer functions that are unique to the website vs. able to be done on both the app and the website, but for those that are, will explain why this function is only available on the website.</i>			
Category 13.		<u>User Experience: Customer Service</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	15
13.1	Describe the customer service support that will be provided to users		5	
•	<i>High scoring proposals will provide a high level of customer support during peak usage hours and some level of customer support 24/7. High scoring proposal will propose the BSSP interacts with customers directly to promptly address their questions and concerns.</i>			
13.2	Describe how customer feedback will be reported to CLR.		5	
•	<i>High scoring proposals will provide CLR access to all communications between BSSP and customers in real-time by request and (more typically) in regular summary reports. The BSSP should be directly responsible for all customer service.</i>			

13.3	What is CLR's recourse if it continues to receive an unacceptable number of complaints regarding stranded customers, bikes in the System in disrepair, empty stations, other customer complaints, or is otherwise unsatisfied with the services provided by the BSSP? Describe the costs should bicycle hardware be stolen or lost.	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will articulate the ways in which CLR can address a dysfunctional System, ideally in an escalating, stepwise fashion. High scoring proposal will not allocate any of the financial risk of lost or stolen equipment to CLR or sponsors and will articulate how the BSSP or its insurance policy will absorb those costs.</i>	
Category 14.	<u>Maintenance and Redistribution</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible 50
14.1	Provide an overview of the maintenance done for the System.	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will include an aggressive maintenance schedule to ensure a safe, enjoyable user experience. CLR has experienced dramatically different proposed bikeshare maintenance schedules; a justification for the proposed maintenance schedule that includes field experience with the reliability of the proposed bikeshare bike model is a plus.</i>	
14.2	In the absence of a customer complaint or other red flag, how often are bicycles inspected and maintained in the field? For proactive field inspections, what parts are inspected?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will include an aggressive, proactive maintenance schedule to ensure a safe, enjoyable user experience. A justification for the proposed maintenance schedule is a plus.</i>	
14.3	In the absence of a customer complaint or other red flag, how often are bicycles brought into the shop for a more comprehensive inspection? What is inspected, adjusted, etc. when the bike is brought into the shop for proactive service?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will include an aggressive, proactive maintenance schedule to ensure a safe, enjoyable user experience. A justification for the proposed maintenance schedule is a plus.</i>	
14.4	Describe the process after which a customer reports a broken bicycle within the System. Can the bike be locked out of the System remotely so that another user cannot check it out?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will describe the ability to lock a bike out of the System remotely to prevent another user from checking out a bicycle that may have a dangerous safety issue or would simply result in a poor user experience.</i>	
14.5	If a System bike breaks down, how are the customer's immediate transportation needs met? Under some circumstances, is the BSSP willing to meet the customer with transport or a working bike?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will emphasize customer service.</i>	
14.6	An abundance of out-of-service bikes on the street in the System can leave a bad impression. How quickly after a bike is remotely locked out of the System will the BSSP make a field repair or bring the bike into the shop for service?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will rapidly fix bikes in the field or bring them back into the shop after they have been locked out of the System. High scoring proposals will provide a goal for average time between a bike being locked out of service and it either being repaired in the field or brought into the shop and a contractually obligated maximum time. To clarify, this is not the time to it requires to repair a bike, but the time to physically remove an out-of-service bike from the field. High scoring proposals will also voluntarily provide these data in monthly and annual reports.</i>	
14.7	What is the typical turnaround time for retrieving a broken bicycle, repairing it, and getting it back into the System? What assurances does CLR have for a minimum number of bicycles working within the System at any one time?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will articulate a contractually-obligated percentage of the bikeshare fleet be operational and deployed at any given time. High scoring proposals will also voluntarily provide these data in monthly and annual reports.</i>	
14.8	Are there any bicycle mechanical status red flags that are automatically reported to the BSSP local central office (including battery charge for pedal-assist bikes)? For a pedal-assist system, can the batteries be charged in the field? Are there user incentives to congregate those bikes or bring them to the BSSP?	5

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will describe an automatic reporting of bike condition and problems so that they can (ideally) be addressed before a customer has a bad experience. If the proposed System is a pedal-assist system, high scoring proposals will describe batteries that are easily swapped in the field and an operations strategy that minimizes the effort to maintain a fleet of pedal-assist bikes with adequately charged batteries. NOTE: If the proposed system is NOT a pedal-assist system, it should not count against the scoring of this sub-category. Simply put all of the scoring weight of this sub-category onto the first question. 		
14.9	Describe bicycle redistribution protocols. How are bikes physically moved within the System? Are there user incentives to redistribute bikes?		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will describe an aggressive strategy to maximize the likelihood that bikes are where customers demand them within the System at all times. High scoring proposals will describe BSSP staff who will physically move bikes as necessary but also incentives for users to do this redistribution to reduce the burden on BSSP staff, reduce the overall carbon footprint of the System, and provide a gaming/deal element for users. 		
14.10	Does redistribution happen on a regular cycle and/or when the system is in a defined degree of spatial imbalance?		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will discuss a regular (perhaps daily) redistribution as well as a threshold that would trigger BSSP staff to physically move bikes and/or user incentives for redistribution. 		
Category 15.	<u>Education</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	15
15.1	In what ways/through what platforms will users be taught to use the System?		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will have a developed educational outreach strategy. 		
15.2	What System usage messaging will be communicated?		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A barrier of entry for System use may be simply not knowing how to use the System. High scoring proposals will discuss pithy System use messaging. 		
15.3	What safety messaging will be communicated and by what means?		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will discuss what safety messaging is essential to communicate to the user and when and by what means that messaging is communicated. 		
Category 16.	<u>User Marketing Phases</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	15
16.1	From the time the contract(s) is signed to the time the system is launched, what marketing strategies does the BSSP have to increase visibility and enthusiasm about the System to potential users?		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will articulate specific pre-launch marketing strategies that consider the realities of the Little Rock market and the proposed size and location of the System in Phase One. High scoring proposal will discuss their experience in implementing each specific marketing strategy or whether a strategy is a new concept for our market. 		
16.2	How will the BSSP promote the System at the time of the launch? Will there be any launch/roll out events? If so, what are they?		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will articulate specific launch marketing strategies that consider the realities of the Little Rock market and the proposed size and location of the System in Phase One. High scoring proposal will discuss their experience in implementing each specific marketing strategy or whether a strategy is a new concept for our market. 		
16.3	How will the BSSP promote the System following the launch? Does the BSSP have the local capacity to attend events/festivals to showcase the program? Does the BSSP have a target for the number of events/festivals it will attend per year or specific Little Rock events they would like to target? Is the System and its local operations capable of creating "Pop-Up" bikeshare stations for specific events? Will the BSSP allow/encourage/incentivize users to post System use on social media (usage stats, pictures, etc.)? Feel free to provide examples of promotions the BSSP has done in other markets.		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High scoring proposals will articulate specific post-launch marketing strategies that consider the realities of the Little Rock market and the proposed size and location of the System in Phase One. High scoring proposal will discuss their experience in implementing each specific marketing strategy or whether a strategy is a new concept for our market. 		

Category 17.		<u>Marketing to Different Users</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	15
17.1	What is the expected ratio of usage one-time users vs. System members based on similar markets? How will marketing differ between one-time users and members? What, if any, strategies does the BSSP have to target one-time users to become members?			5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will have distinct marketing strategies for one-time users, members, and possibly other usage groups. High scoring proposal will have a marketing strategy to get one-time users to become members.</i>			
17.2	Bikeshare programs often launch with the intention of providing a transportation option for minorities, low-income residents, and other disadvantaged groups, but fail to fully meet those objectives. Our System should serve the transportation needs of these communities. Based on the experience of the BSSP, for our market, what are appropriate targets of usage for these groups? How will data collected by the BSSP allow us to evaluate our success of meeting these targets? What marketing strategies does the BSSP have to reach these groups?			5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will articulate usages goals for underserved groups based on BSSP experience and the Little Rock market. High scoring proposals will propose that the BSSP collect, compile, and share with CLR the data necessary to evaluate the success of the goals. High scoring proposals will have specific marketing and other strategies to promote System use by underserved groups.</i>			
17.3	CLR would like to expand the System (increase the number of bikes and the focal area the System serves) with a Phase Two, ideally within a year of Phase One launch. Given the initial focal area (Rivermarket/Downtown), local land use patterns, and BSSP expertise, what area(s) would be the best target for System expansion? What marketing strategies targeted the Phase Two expansion area would the BSSP employ prior to Phase Two launch?			5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will outline a plan for Phase Two expansion, including how to create buy-in in the expansion focal area through marketing.</i>			
17.4	Some BSSPs have found marketing to communities by BSSP staff who have no experience or affiliation with those communities challenging, but have found greater success when employing marketing staff from those communities. How will the BSSP marketing staff reflect the residencies, demographics, and organizational affiliations of Little Rock?			
•	<i>High scoring proposals will propose aggressive marketing staffing targeted to individual communities to promote System use within those communities.</i>			
Category 18.		<u>Coexisting with Bike Rental</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	25
18.1	Describe how the BSSP differentiates its services from an existing bike rental company in the community.			5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will discuss strategies including marketing, placement, and pricing that will separate its service from a bike rental service.</i>			
18.2	How often has the BSSP launched in areas with a pre-existing bike rental company?			5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will have experience launching in communities with an existing bike rental company.</i>			
18.3	How has the BSSP's entrance into past markets affected pre-existing bike rental companies in those communities?			5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will be aware of their impacts on bike rental companies in other markets.</i>			
18.4	Has the BSSP purposefully avoided competition with bike rental companies in other communities? What specific measures has the BSSP taken to avoid competition? How have the BSSP and bike rental companies worked together to minimize competition and maximize synergy?			5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will have considered ways in which the System and an existing bike rental company can co-exist and thrive in the same community. High scoring proposal will discuss BSSP experience working with local bike rental companies to carve out separate, successful niches.</i>			

18.5	Provide up to three references from bike rental companies within past and/or present BSSP systems that existed in their market before bikeshare system launch including their business name and complete mailing address, the name of the contact person, title, email address, and phone number of each reference.		
	<i>High scoring proposals will have references who enthusiastically support the relationships the BSSP has created with bike rental companies and believe the BSSP could create a high-performing bikeshare system in CLR while not causing harm to our local bike rental company, Rock Town River Outfitters.</i>		
Category 19.	<u>Other Personal Mobility Solutions</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	10
19.1	CLR seeks only a bikeshare system at this time and all other Categories should reflect only the BSSP's bikeshare offering. However new personal mobility solutions are being launched in communities rapidly. While CLR does not wish to be a proving ground for these new systems, CLR may wish to consider other mobility solutions during the term of the BSSP contract period that have proven successful in other communities. What other personal mobility solutions, if any, does the BSSP offer now? What additional solutions are planned in the next five years? Photos, diagrams, or links to videos a plus.		5
	<i>High scoring proposals will offer a suite of personal mobility solutions that will not be considered for Phase One, are not required to ever be launched in Little Rock, but could be considered based on their success in other communities and evolving Little Rock needs.</i>		
19.2	Please discuss the advantages (and disadvantages) of contracting all personal mobility solutions launched in Little Rock with the BSSP instead of contracting different service providers for different mobility solutions.		5
	<i>High scoring proposals will make the case that one personal mobility provider will be better than a separate provider for each technology.</i>		
Category 20.	<u>North Little Rock's Bikeshare</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	15
20.1	North Little Rock (NLR) has taken steps to find their own BSSP. Our System's focal area will extend to the Arkansas River, where there are several bicycle bridges to NLR (Clinton, Junction, and Broadway). Our System's bikes will likely cross into NLR and NLR's bikeshare bikes will likely cross into our System's focal area. What concerns does the BSSP have to launching and operating immediately adjacent to NLR's bikeshare system? What passive and active measures, if any, will the BSSP take to reduce NLR's bikeshare bikes in our System's focal area and our System's bikes in NLR's focal area?		5
	<i>High scoring proposals will articulate the challenges of having two bikeshare systems operating immediately adjacent to one another and discuss strategies for meeting those challenges but also provide assurances that they will be able to operate successfully next to NLR's bikeshare system.</i>		
20.2	What role, if any, will CLR be asked to take to facilitate Little Rock's and NLR's bikeshare systems working next to one another? Will CLR be asked to participate in impounding bicycles or any other punitive measures?		5
	<i>High scoring proposals will ask for minimal CLR staff time for successful System operations and refrain from asking CLR to regularly participate in interactions that may strain relationships between our two municipalities.</i>		
20.3	Users will want to cross the Arkansas River on bikeshare bikes. Instead of discouraging or preventing these trips, is there any way to work with NLR's BSSP to allow them?		5
	<i>High scoring proposals will consider solutions to allow System users (one-time users and members) to ride into NLR and for NLR users to operate within our focal area.</i>		
Category 21.	<u>Meeting CLR's Bikeshare Goals</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible	10
21.1	CLR's goals for the System may differ from the goals of other communities (see "3.4 Outcomes Desired"). How will the BSSP tailor the System to meet CLR's goals?		5
	<i>High scoring proposals will consider how the System can be customized to Little Rock to meet CLR's goals.</i>		

21.2	CLR would like to assess the System's success in achieving our goals ("3.4 Outcomes Desired"). What metrics can the System collect to quantify the effect of the System on the goals we've set for it? What is the BSSP's goal for the number of rides per bike per day? Can the BSSP report this by demographic and user type in an effort to understand how the System is or is not meeting the Outcomes Desired?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will propose metrics the BSSP and CLR can collect to assess the progress on the goals stated in "3.4 Outcomes Desired".</i>	
Category 22.	<u>Bikeshare and Bike Infrastructure</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible 10
22.1	CLR currently has few on-street and off-street bicycle facilities (i.e. shared use paths and bike lanes) in the Phase One focal area. In other communities with few bicycle facilities, what measures did the BSSP take (or have been more generally been taken by bikeshare providers) to facilitate bikeshare success?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will discuss their successful operation of bikeshare in communities with few bicycle facilities and instill confidence that the BSSP can operate a successful System with existing infrastructure.</i>	
22.2	How has bikeshare and the BSSP provided catalysts for more bicycle infrastructure and other bike-friendly changes in BSSP communities?	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will show how BSSP presence have made other communities more bike-friendly.</i>	
Category 23.	<u>Timeline</u>	Maximum Raw Points Possible 10
23.1	Please provide a timeline of critical milestones that will allow System launch in 2019 assuming a BSSP selection date of December 15, 2018, including (but not limited to): 1) date contracts provided to CLR, 2) date contracts signed by all parties, 3) date CLR payment received, 4) date(s) local hire(s) made, 5) date(s) equipment ordered, 6) date Phase One sponsorships secured, 7) dates site planning complete, 8) date launch date announced, 9) date(s) equipment arrives in Little Rock, 10) launch date, 11) Phase Two expansion date, 12) Phase Three expansion date.	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will establish an aggressive but achievable schedule that will allow System launch in 2019. The System <u>must</u> launch in 2019, preferably in Spring 2019.</i>	
23.2	As necessary, discuss the challenges for meeting any of the milestone dates and how those challenges may be overcome. For all items above, clearly articulate responsible party(s) for meeting proposed deadlines.	5
•	<i>High scoring proposals will facilitate the success of the proposed timeline by clearly articulating challenges and parties responsible for meeting each milestone date.</i>	