

## 10-28-2020 Town Council Meeting Responses to Council Questions #1

### **ITEM #7: Amend Chapters 12, 17, and 21 of the Code of Ordinances that Regulate Parks and Greenways, Sidewalk Sales, and Bicycling**

**Council Question:**

Back in 2016, why did the Town not continue a collaboration with UNC on RFI for bikeshare services?

**Staff Response:**

*At the time, UNC elected to move forward with a bikeshare program that included constructing bikeshare docks which was and is subsidized by student fees. The Town decided that it was not in a financial situation to commit to building docks. Now, the program that Gotcha is proposing in Chapel Hill and Carrboro would be at no cost to the Towns as Gotcha would finance their hubs through ridership fees.*

**Council Question:**

Where it reads in the agenda materials that “Gotcha” is a bikeshare provider on campus, does this mean it manages Tar Heel Bikes on-campus, or is there a separate bikeshare provider on campus? If so, what is the bikeshare provider on campus?

**Staff Response:**

*Gotcha is the bikeshare provider behind Tar Heel Bikes on campus.*

**Council Question:**

If the bike-share program is with the same company, why can't the bikes be docked on campus from the municipalities?

**Staff Response:**

*The UNC bikes are pedal-only bikes and the potential pilot bikes are electric assist bike (e-bikes). If UNC went to e-bikes or the Town elected to try pedal-only bikes, the same bikes could be used interchangeably.*

**Council Question:**

What KPI's will we be using to measure success of the pilot?

**Staff Response:**

*For performance indicators, the Town will be monitoring the number of rides, miles traveled on the bikes, and feedback from residents (from direct communications or general surveys) to determine whether there is demand for more hubs and/or how the program is received.*

## 10-28-2020 Town Council Meeting Responses to Council Questions #1

**Council Question:**

The introduction to paragraph 17-89.a omits the word “dining” to talk about use permits – need to omit “dining” throughout the following paragraph as well?

**Staff Response:**

*The word “dining” was intentionally left in section 17-89(a) because it is specific to sidewalk dining. The rest of 17-89 has been amended to reflect any kind of use permit.*