SANDAG Regional Micromobility Coordination Meeting #2
11/29/18 - Data Sharing and Regulations

Introductions to regional micromobility coordination (SANDAG)
• Marisa Mangan (SANDAG) reminds the group how SANDAG defines micromobility - low-speed, low-weight, zero-emission mobility options (bikeshare, scootershare, hover boards, neighborhood electric vehicles (NEVs), mopeds, electric pods, and more).

Micromobility industry updates (SANDAG)
• Marisa summarized micromobility industry updates across a variety of topics - new business models, safe riding campaigns, new market fleet changes. See Meeting 2 PowerPoint for details.

Peer city updates (SANDAG)
• SANDAG provided program updates on peer cities discussed in Meeting 1 - Santa Monica bike and scootershare drop zones; Scoot kick scooter cable locks to be deployed in San Francisco.
• Staff reviewed the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) Shared Electric Scooter Pilot and provided an overview of their regulations and permit requirements including permit fees, fleet caps, data sharing requirements, and more. See Meeting 2 PowerPoint for more PBOT details.

Local program updates (All)
• City of Encinitas – Leading the North County Coastal bikeshare pilot. In process of negotiation with preferred vendor.
• Solana Beach – Staff introduced Ordinance 495 to establish guidelines for the Shared Mobility Pilot Program.
• Cal State San Marcos – Currently looking at micromobility services for the campus. They are mainly looking at electric assist bikes and/or scooters but haven’t decided on a vendor.
• San Diego State University – Gathered all the bikes off campus due to ofo’s departure. Determining whether they want to establish another partnership but evaluating different outcomes of the program, like increase in injuries. Exploring idea of implementing parking zones on the campus perimeter for students to park their vehicle before entering campus. Trips may be replacing walking rather than driving. Looking to develop requirements to regulate vehicles on campus.
• City of La Mesa – City Council passed direction to implement a non-exclusive agreement with any scooter/dockless bike company that will be interested.
• Naval Base San Diego – Working with Navy Exchange to further the pilot with Lime and rebrand the program. Users are riding bikes to outside communities. Users prefer to walk if the route is within a ½ mile distance. Most bikes are used a couple times a week to commute to southern portion of base (3-mile ride), which is why they deployed the program in the first place. The average ride is 8 minutes, and there are many repeat riders.
• UCSD – One year since Spin pilot launch. Fleet now 300-400 bikes and a few dozen e-bikes. Achieved over 200,000 rides on campus, assessing other mobility device options.
• MTS – Scooters are blocking bus stops and staff spends time relocating vehicles. Looking for ways that the operator can keep more bus stops clear of scooters.
• City of Chula Vista – Launching a 1-year shared mobility device pilot permit program. Taking to City Council in early January. Developed draft regulations and talking to 3rd party data analytic providers to analyze and monitor the program.
Micromobility Data Sharing: MDS v. GBFS
- SANDAG compared two sets of micromobility data sharing specifications; Mobility Data Specifications (MDS) and General Bikeshare Feed Association (GBFS).
- Overall, MDS provides more robust data regarding micromobility trips.
- MDS requires minimum of 2 geographic points to be uploaded every 30 seconds, only 2 points are required to be shared by the vendor (start/end). SANDAG aims to request data that goes beyond the start/end points.
- City of Chula Vista – Received feedback from operators and they prefer MDS. Operators require a license agreement when sharing data with a 3rd party. (Chula Vista to share)

Regional Data Sharing Clearinghouse
- SANDAG discusses role in establishing the regional micromobility data clearinghouse. (See Regional Micromobility Coordination Meeting 2 PowerPoint for details).

Discussion: Draft regional micromobility data sharing requirements
- City of San Diego - Met with vendors operating in San Diego, and they prefer to share data with a private 3rd vendor, to avoid being subject to the Public Records Act.
- NCTD – Is there any way to make the trip routes less specific, to avoid concerns with privacy?
- City of Encinitas – Concerned that requirements are too specific to a specific set of vendors. Are the requirements generic enough so that they aren’t proprietary to other vendors?
  - City of San Diego – Smaller scooter operators (e.g., Wind) may not have the capability of meeting the data sharing requirements.
- City of Encinitas - Start/stop issue of each individual route could be a concern. Is there any merit in obtaining use data that is not directional but just show the frequency of any point in travel?
  - SANDAG – Could create a zone to zone trip. Not all firms have the capability.
- City of Chula Vista – Not necessarily interested in every detail of the route; interested in the number of trips in a particular street segment or block.
- MTS – Is there a way to link trip/parking data with GTFS bus stop layer? Recommends geo-fencing requests to stay out of specific areas.
  - SANDAG – If there’s access to this type of data, SANDAG can publish services using GTFS snapshots that can be used as an overlay for analytics.

Discussion: Regulating Micromobility Services
- City of Carlsbad - The County’s Attorney Association put together a working group to develop universal regulations for micromobility devices.
  - Cross-jurisdictional lines, easier to implement procedures if they are consistent especially for licensing purposes.
- City of Carlsbad – Carlsbad received a business license application from a micromobility provider. Discovered their municipal code prohibits scooters from operating in the City. Looking to put together a program like Santa Monica’s program.
- City of San Diego – Direction from Council is to develop draft regulations for scooters. Avoiding bicycles because of their exclusive agreement with Discover Bike. Two-parts: regulations in the municipal code and permit requirements.
 Permit requirements to provide more detail (e.g., insurance, indemnity, cost of recovery fees, ROW fee). Permit requirements allow for flexibility to update. Per unit fees. No fleet caps.

- City of San Diego – Some jurisdictions are moving forward so coordination timing may not be ideal, but there will be opportunities to learn from one-year pilots to inform future updates.
- City of Encinitas - Transitioning from the license model to ordinance model. Ordinance model provides more tools to deal with violations and enforcement issues.
- City of Oceanside – No ordinance in place to preclude scooters and received a business license application from a scooter operator. How do they prevent scooters from operating in their City?
  - City of Encinitas – Received the same requests and they don’t explicitly allow scooters in their municipal code, which is the approach they use when denying operators.
- City of Oceanside – City management is concerned with parking. How do we regulate parking?
  - City of Encinitas – The City’s preferred vendor offers a flexible model (docked, dockless, or hybrid). The app will notify the users of the requirements when crossing jurisdictions.
  - City of San Diego – Vendors can disincentivize to encourage responsible parking.

**Next Steps**

- The City of San Diego is anticipating sharing draft ordinance content with Public Safety Committee and City Council in late January/early February. A public document will be available to share approximately one week before City Council meeting.
- SANDAG plans to invite operators to future meetings to discuss other topics regarding responsible parking strategies, education/outreach, and equity.