

# Metro



## Board Report

---

**File #:** 2019-0520, **File Type:** Motion / Motion Response

**Agenda Number:** 47.

---

**REGULAR BOARD MEETING  
JUNE 27, 2019**

**Motion by:**

**Garcia, Hahn, Solis, and Dupont-Walker**

Los Angeles County Micro-Mobility Review

Bike Share first came to LA County in 2015. Today, several cities across the county offer public bike share systems. The Metro Bike Share system is currently in the City of Los Angeles. The Cities of Santa Monica and Long Beach launched their own bike share systems separate from Metro Bike Share. Many cities now host private bike and scooter share programs, with varying strategies for regulation. Together, these micro-mobility services provide important first-/last-mile connectivity, mobility access to low income and historically disinvested communities, and access for visitors who otherwise might rent a car.

These micro-mobility services use different technology, different vehicles, different methods of payment, and different fare structures. Each program is funded through different means, especially in the case of private fleets. They also offer different service areas and discount programs for low income access.

To better understand how all of these micro-mobility services are working, and what new approaches may be necessary to build upon past successes and improve access to these important resources throughout LA County, Metro should assess all of LA County's micro-mobility programs.

**SUBJECT: LOS ANGELES COUNTY MICRO-MOBILITY REVIEW**

APPROVE Motion by Directors Garcia, Hahn, Solis and Dupont-Walker to direct the CEO to report back to the Board in 120 days on LA County's micro-mobility services, with the following information for each of the programs operating in LA County:

1. Program locations, as well as locations no longer being served, including demographics of populations served;
2. Discount programs and percentage of riders using each such program;
3. Methods of payment (credit card, cash, etc.);
4. How these programs are integrated into each other and into TAP;

5. Rider safety statistics (reported minor and severe injuries or fatal crashes);
6. System size (numbers of vehicles and coverage) and characteristics of the sponsoring agency (size of city or value of parent company, etc.);
7. Equipment lifecycle (lifespan of vehicles, rates of equipment loss through theft or vandalism, waste disposal practices, etc.);
8. For public systems: federal, state, and local funding sources available and their utilization;
9. Connectivity to bus and rail transit services; and,
10. Efforts by public agencies and private operators to launch public safety campaigns and encourage safe riding practices as it relates to bike and scooter share.