

Micromobility Committee Meeting Notes December 5, 2018

In Attendance: Kayla Coleman, Scott Trudeau, Molly Kleinman, Lisa Solomon, Eli Cooper, Raymond Hess.

Member of the Public: Jim Ovinson

1) Committee membership: one person had to drop out due to availability. Molly will see if there are any Ford School students who might be interested in participating, starting in January.

2) Approved notes from last meeting.

3) Question list for staff: Scott drafted, group reviewed and approved.

Discussed questions about data management, will be good to see what other cities are doing. Would be great for a norm or industry standard emerges, what can we do to help influence that? Los Angeles seems to be a good model but there is more to learn. Police department would be able to answer questions about who is doing issue tracking. Community standards as well.

4) Discussion of existing laws: State vehicle code says these are legal to be operated on streets w/ posted speed limits 25mph or below. Regarding bike lanes, state definition of bicycle is "human powered", certain e-assist bikes have been allowed into bike lanes by the state. The ones without pedals by regulatory definition permitted in bike lanes because the state says so. Up to local gov't if they want to allow for that, but hasn't come up in A2. Scooters are not human powered. Would need to be an amendment to the city code to allow them to be in the bike lanes. We don't allow motorized equipment on sidewalks, with the exception of assistive devices.

Opportunity for policy delineation that keeps scooters off the sidewalks downtown, permits them on sidewalks elsewhere. Can use maps. Do you differentiate between wider side paths like on Huron Parkway vs. narrow sidewalks?

There is room in the city rules and regulations governing bike lanes, that are not overruled by the state, to redefine what is allowed in bike lanes. To revisit in future meeting.

5) Micro-Mobility Statement of Values:

Established process: Committee will create draft, get feedback from staff, create near-final draft, get more feedback, share w/ Transportation Commission. Once commission signs off, share w/ Council as an informational item. Not for approval.

Possible ways for us to approach value statement:

Hierarchy of needs in terms of values - Safety as number one, but others, such as congestion, climate change mitigation.

Can also do hierarchy of needs in terms of users: e.g. Pedestrians as #1.

Discussed ideas for a city web page about micro mobility, a resource that talks about rules, existing contracts, best practices.

Public comment:

- 1) People w/ disabilities who have mobility problems already have scooters. When you start putting parameters around e-scooters, be careful not to incorporate assistive scooters. Use of wheelchairs brings about different safety concerns, have low visibility.
- 2) A lot of unsafe operation happening w/ the scooters.
- 3) Lack of clarity w/ the crosswalk law: if someone is on a bicycle or scooter and they are at a non-signalized crosswalk, do you need to yield to them?