



2022 Scooter Sharing License Selection

In October 2021, the City Council passed an ordinance creating a new license administered by the Department of Business Affairs and Consumer Protection (BACP) in partnership with the Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) for a limited number of private companies to operate scooter sharing services in Chicago. The City solicited applications in February 2022, and six companies applied for the new license. License applications were reviewed by CDOT and BACP and awarded based on a competitive application process. In May 2022, 3 companies were awarded two-year licenses to operate scooter sharing service in the City of Chicago: Company and Company.

License Application Process

Per the Scooter Sharing License Ordinance, the Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) and BACP developed license rules, including a process for companies to apply for a license. The application process was designed to help determine which companies were best capable of meeting license requirements and helping the City meet its [goals for scooter sharing service](#). The application required companies to provide data on past performance in other municipalities, operational examples in other municipalities and plans for operation in Chicago. It was organized into 33 unique criteria that were evaluated and scored by the City (see [License Rules & Regulations](#) for scoring details). Scores were then weighted per the Rules & Regulations and combined for a possible of 100 total points. The highest-scoring applicants were awarded licenses to operate.

Reputation Survey

The application scoring process included a reputation survey sent out to jurisdictions in which applicants had previously operated. Each company submitted at least 13 references, including references for each of the cities in which they have operated their 10 largest fleets in the past two years. A brief survey (see appendix) was then sent to each reference—surveys were sent to a total of 181 different jurisdictions around the world (with some jurisdictions receiving surveys for multiple companies). A total of 130 responses were received. Results were as follows:

Question	Bird	Lime	Helbiz	Spin	Superpedestrian	Veo
Level of Compliance with Rules	2.4	2.37	2.73	2.65	2.67	2.67
Responsiveness to Fixing Issues in Timely Manner	2.58	2.67	2.91	2.76	2.83	2.67
Honesty, Transparency, Ability to Follow Through on Commitments	2.58	2.52	2.82	2.88	2.75	2.89
Easy/Difficult to Work With + Poor/Great Partner	2.6	2.63	2.64	2.82	2.83	2.78
Total Reputation Score	10.16	10.19	11.1	11.11	11.08	11.01

Final Application Scoring:

Rule	Item	Evaluation	Scoring	Bird	Helbiz	Lime	Spin	Superpedestrian	Veo
		<i>Minimum Requirements (Pass/Fail)</i>							
17.5	1	Provide images/specifications of devices to be deployed	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
17.5	1	Provide documentation that devices meet City code	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
17.5	2	Outline device safety measures	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
17.5	3	Provide references	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
17.8	6	Provide details from past accessible scooter deployments	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
17.9	4	Provide maximum potential fleet size at start of license and overall	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
17.9	5	Provide standard pricing for 5 largest municipalities	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
17.9	5	Provide fees and fare rates for Chicago	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
17.9	11	Provide details outlining staffing plan in Chicago	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
		Pass?		Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
		<i>Character and Reputation (20%)</i>							
17.6	1	Reputation Survey	0-12	10.16	11.1	10.19	11.11	11.08	11.01
17.6	2	Suspensions and Penalties	0, 2 or 4	0	4	0	2	4	2
		Total Score		10.16	15.1	10.19	13.11	15.08	13.01
		Weighted Score		12.70	18.88	12.74	16.39	18.85	16.26
		<i>Safety (15%)</i>							
17.7	1	Underage Riding	1-4	3	3	3	3	3	3
17.7	2	Sidewalk Riding	1-4	3	3	2	4	4	3
17.7	2	Sidewalk Detection Technology	0-8	8	8	8	8	8	8
17.7	3	Helmet Use	1-4	4	2	3	4	2	2
		Total Score		18	16	16	19	17	16
		Weighted Score		13.50	12.00	12.00	14.25	12.75	12.00
		<i>Access (25%)</i>							
17.8	1	Low-Income and Equity Program Access	1-4	4	3	4	3	3	3
17.8	2	Technology Barriers	1-4	4	4	4	4	3	3
17.8	3	Banking Barriers	1-4	3	3	3	3	3	3
17.8	4	Payment	1-4	4	4	4	4	4	3
17.8	5	Education and Outreach	1-4	4	2	3	4	2	2
17.8	6	Sound Emission for Alert	0 or 1	1	0	1	1	0	1
17.8	7	Driver's License	0 or -2	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Total Score		20	16	19	19	15	15
		Weighted Score		23.81	19.05	22.62	22.62	17.86	17.86
		<i>Operations and Relevant Experience (40%)</i>							
17.9	1	Large Fleet Deployments	1-4	4	4	4	4	4	4
17.9	2	Minimum Deployment Zones	1-4	4	4	4	4	4	4
17.9	3	Dense Commercial Operations and Geofencing	1-4	3	3	4	4	4	3
17.9	6	Parking	1-4	3	3	3	4	4	3
17.9	7	Fleet Rebalancing	1-4	3	3	4	3	4	3
17.9	8	Improper Device Parking Remedy	1-4	3	3	3	4	4	3
17.9	9	Stale Devices	1-4	3	2	3	4	4	3
17.9	10	Maintenance	1-4	2	1	4	3	2	1
17.9	12	Hiring Plan	1-4	1	4	3	4	4	4
17.9	13	Environmental Impact	1-4	3	3	3	4	3	3
17.9	14	MDS Compliance	1-4	1	2	2	3	3	2
		Total Score		30	32	37	41	40	33
		Weighted Score		27.27	29.09	33.64	37.27	36.36	30.00
		FINAL SCORE		77.28	79.01	80.99	90.53	85.82	76.12

Appendix:

Reputation Survey Questions:

Q: Please rate COMPANY'S level of compliance with your operating rules:

- 1 = Many compliance issues
- 2 = Some compliance issues
- 3 = Consistently good compliance

Q: Please rate COMPANY'S responsiveness to fixing issues correctly and in a timely manner:

- 1 = Poor responsiveness
- 2 = Somewhat responsive
- 3 = Consistently responsive

Q: Please rate COMPANY'S honesty and transparency, including ability to follow through on commitments made for operations, safety, infrastructure and/or outreach:

- 1 = Low level of honesty and transparency
- 2 = Moderate level of honesty and transparency
- 3 = High level of honesty and transparency

Q: Please select the statement that best describes your experience working with COMPANY:

- 1 = They were/have been difficult to work with and/or a poor partner in helping us reach our goals
- 2 = They were/have been okay to work with—Neither a frequent hassle nor a great partner
- 3 = They were/have been easy to work with and a great partner