

Re: Item No. 15.1.7

# HALIFAX

## **Regulation of Electric Kick- Scooters and Shared Micromobility Services**

**Presentation to Regional Council  
June 20, 2023**

# HALIFAX

# Background

- Bike share systems emerged in 1990s and 2000s
- IMP direction for a bikeshare feasibility study (2017)
- Shared e-scooters grew in popularity in 2018
- First shared e-scooter fleet in Halifax (2019)
- TSC Information Report: *Third Party Docked and Dockless Bike and Scooter Share* (2020)
- HRM Shared Micromobility Readiness Study (2021)
- Motor Vehicle Act (MVA) amended to authorize use of electric kick scooters (2022)



# Recommended Approach for HRM

- New By-law M-300 (Part A) to enable e-scooter use and establish “rules of the road”
- Two-year shared micromobility pilot project

NOTE: Pilot project can only be considered following Second Reading and approval of M-300



# By-law M-300 Part A: Rules of the Road

- Operation of electric kick-scooters in HRM only permitted on:
  - roadways with speed limit of 50 km/hr or less
  - bicycle lanes on any roadway
  - multi-use pathways within streets
- Operators of e-scooters are not permitted to ride:
  - in excess of 25 km/hr on a roadway or bicycle lane
  - in excess of 15 km/hr on a multi-use pathway
  - on a sidewalk
  - in a park (unless designated by the Executive Director of Parks & Recreation)
- Parking of e-scooters in a manner that obstructs the flow of pedestrian, cyclist, or vehicular traffic is prohibited



# By-law M-300 Part A: Enforcement

- Most operational and enforcement responsibilities would be assumed by businesses licensed to operate
- Up to two new enforcement officers to support enforcement, especially for the pilot
- By-law officers would have the authority to enforce the proposed M-300 regulations
- RCMP and HRP have the authority to enforce all regulations under the MVA
- Parking Enforcement staff prepared to enforce proper storage of shared bikes and e-scooters

# Shared Micromobility Pilot: Approach

- Key distinction in municipal approaches is public ownership vs. licensing private operators
- Recommended approach (licensing private operators) chosen due to:
  - Shared Micromobility Readiness Study
  - Sector trends and comparable jurisdiction practices
  - Help advance HRM goals such as IMP, HaliFACT, Economic Strategy, Social Policy, Diversity and Inclusion Framework
  - Launch service more quickly
  - Manages risks (e.g., ridership impacts due to helmet law, costs to HRM)

# Shared Micromobility Pilot: Key Features

- Regulate licensees via proposed Part B of By-law M-300
  - Would establish system-wide rules for the pilot
- Select one or two operators to receive licenses through a competitive process (e.g., RFP)
- Licensees selected based on HRM priorities for factors such as accessibility, enforcement, equity, coverage, fleet size, pricing, etc.
- Micromobility vehicle parking
  - “Lock-to” bikes: bike racks and corrals
  - E-scooters: emphasis on designated parking hubs



# Shared Micromobility Pilot: Costs/Revenue

- Additional Compliance Officers if needed (1-2 FTEs) beginning in 2024/25
- Pilot project management (1-2 FTE's) beginning in 2023/24
- Potential equipment to support enforcement
- Additional bicycle parking and e-scooter parking hubs
- Estimated capital costs:
  - **\$150,000 to \$261,000** (2024/25)
  - **\$15,000** (2025/26)
- Estimated annual operating costs:
  - **\$70,000 - \$76,000** (2023/24)
  - **\$210,000 - \$402,500** (2024/25 to 2025/26)
- Revenues from licenses, per-vehicle and per-ride fees, and fines would offset these costs

# Shared Micromobility Pilot

## Key Implementation Considerations

- Address Accessibility concerns via:
  - On-vehicle and in-app features
  - Education and various parking strategies
  - Enforcement of M-300 rules, including no sidewalk riding
- Helmet requirement
- Equity goals
- Evaluation of pilot



# Thank you

Questions / Comments