

1 [Opposing California State Assembly Bill 2989 (Flora) - Standup Electric Scooters]

2 **Resolution opposing California State Assembly Bill 2989, authored by Assembly**
3 **Member Heath Flora, which would increase the speed limit, triple the wattage, repeal**
4 **the helmet requirement, and permit use of standup electric scooters on sidewalks.**
5

6 WHEREAS, On February 16, 2018, California State Assembly Member Heath Flora (R-
7 12) introduced Assembly Bill 1989 (“AB-2989”) which would, if passed, deregulate standup
8 electric scooters to triple the permitted wattage from 250 to 750 watts, to increase their speed
9 from 15 to 20 miles per hour, and to repeal the helmet requirement for non-minors; and

10 WHEREAS, AB-2989 would also allow standup electric scooters to be operated on
11 sidewalks, shifting the burden to local authorities to adopt rules and regulations prohibiting or
12 restricting persons from riding or propelling a standup electric scooter on sidewalks or other
13 public rights of way; and

14 WHEREAS, These proposed amendments to the California Vehicle Code are being
15 proposed at the same time as multiple proprietors of standup electric scooters are deploying
16 their products in major urban areas across the state of California; and

17 WHEREAS, Since the arrival of standup electric scooters in San Diego in February
18 2018, police have indicated that they are cracking down on user behavior deemed illegal by
19 the California Vehicle Code, including rampant use on sidewalks and without helmets; and

20 WHEREAS, In Santa Monica, the launch of standup electric scooters in defiance of
21 local ordinance caused prosecutors in the Santa Monica City Attorney’s Office to file a
22 criminal complaint against one of those proprietors seeking administrative citation fines
23 totaling over six million dollars; and
24
25

1 WHEREAS, Anticipating the potentially imminent launch of standup electric scooters in
2 San Francisco, the Board of Supervisors in early March initiated legislation to create a permit
3 requirement for any standup electric scooter company seeking to deploy its product in public
4 rights of way; and

5 WHEREAS, In spite of the introduction of that legislation, standup electric scooter
6 proprietors nevertheless launched their product in San Francisco the following week; and

7 WHEREAS, While San Francisco policymakers pursue common sense regulation of
8 standup electronic scooters to enhance the public benefit of this new shared mobility
9 technology and to reduce potential harm to the public, state legislators seek to eliminate
10 elements of the Vehicle Code that exist to protect the health and safety of members of the
11 public including users of standup electric scooters; and

12 WHEREAS, Private shared mobility services may certainly provide a benefit to the
13 public to the extent they fill gaps in our public transportation network and provide incentive for
14 users to minimize or discontinue automobile usage, thereby reducing greenhouse gas
15 emissions; now, therefore be it

16 RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco
17 finds that AB-2989 directly contradicts San Francisco’s current efforts to responsibly regulate
18 standup electric scooters in order to enhance public benefit while mitigating risk of harm to the
19 public realm; and, be it

20 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San
21 Francisco opposes AB-2989 for the reasons stated herein; and, be it

22 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San
23 Francisco directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit copies of this Resolution to the State
24 Legislature and the City Lobbyist upon passage.

25