Call to Order

Council Standing Committee Meeting
Open to the public to attend. Note: there is generally no public comment period for Committee sessions. Standing Committee Members receive reports and information, ask questions and, when appropriate, vote on a recommended action for consideration by the full Council at the Regular Meeting. The notice of Committee Meetings identified below also serves as notice of Special Meetings of the City Council at the times identified as Council Members who are not members of the committee routinely attend and participate in the Committee Meetings. Committee Chairs give a report of the Committee Meeting at the Regular Meeting in the evening prior to deliberation and formal vote in the order shown below:

Public Works and Natural Resources
Gene Knutson, Chair
Terry Bornemann, April Barker

22398  1.  Washington Conservation Corps End-of-Term Presentation  p. 3

22399  2.  Bid Award for Cornwall Avenue Outfall, EV-0160, Bid #31B-2019  p. 5

22400  3.  Chestnut Bridge Bicycle Lane  p. 9

22401  4.  Active Transportation Devices  p. 11

Adjournment

Agenda Information:
Council Committee and Regular Meeting agendas and agenda packets, which contain the supporting documentation for agenda items, are available to the public Wednesday afternoon prior to the meeting. They are posted at https://meetings.cob.org/. Meetings are streamed live on the internet as they occur.

Accessibility:
The Council Chambers is fully accessible. Elevator access to the second floor is available at City Hall’s west entrance. Hearing assistance is available and a receiver may be checked out through
the clerk prior to the evening session. For additional accommodations, contact the Legislative Assistant at 778-8200 in advance of the meeting. Thank you.

Next City Council Committee Meetings
Monday, September 9, 2019

Deadline to submit material for any public hearing for inclusion in the published agenda packet is 8:00 a.m. on Wednesday prior to the meeting.
City Council Agenda Bill

Bill Number 22398

Subject: Washington Conservation Corps End-of-Term Presentation

Summary Statement: Over the past 18 years, Bellingham citizens have benefitted from the City's relationship with the Washington Conservation Corps (WCC). The Public Works Department currently sponsors two crews through a joint funding agreement with the Washington State Department of Ecology and the federal AmeriCorps Program. The crews have been crucial to the success of the City's habitat restoration efforts. This presentation, given by the WCC crew members, will showcase select restoration projects, monitoring activities, and community service.

Previous Council Action: AB #22029 Approving Inter-Agency Agreement for 2018-2019

Fiscal Impact: $426,400, in adopted 2019-2020 Budget

Funding Source: Water Fund (410)
Attachments: 1. WCC PRESENTATION STAFF MEMO

Meeting Activity | Meeting Date | Recommendation | Presented By | Time
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Committee Briefing - Information Only | 8/26/2019 | Information/Discussion | Eric Johnston, Interim Public Works Director | 15 minutes

Recommended Motion:

Council Committee:
Public Works and Natural Resources Committee

Agenda Bill Contact:
Analiese Burns, Habitat and Restoration Manager, 778-7968

Reviewed By | Department | Date
--- | --- | ---
Eric C. Johnston | Public Works | 8/19/2019
Matthew T. Stamps | Legal | 8/20/2019
Kelli J. Linville | Executive | 8/20/2019
MEMORANDUM

TO: BELLINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
FROM: ANALIESE BURNS, HABITAT AND RESTORATION MANAGER
CC: MAYOR KELLI LINVILLE; RENEE LACROIX, ASSISTANT PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: WASHINGTON CONSERVATION CORPS END-OF-TERM PRESENTATION
DATE: 8/26/2019

The City of Bellingham’s Washington Conservation Corps (WCC) crews are completing their 2018-2019 term. They work with Public Works Natural Resources staff to continue the City’s long-term commitment to improving and protecting the community’s water quality, salmon habitat, and open space. The City’s WCC crews serve the City though an inter-agency agreement with the Department of Ecology. The WCC program is a partnership between the City of Bellingham, the Washington State Department of Ecology and the federal AmeriCorps program. It provides meaningful service and training opportunities to young adults (ages 18-25) and military veterans.

The City has sponsored two crews each year for 18 consecutive years, starting in the wake of the 1999 Olympic Pipeline Explosion in Whatcom Creek. Their work helped restore this important habitat corridor and has now expanded to include over 200 acres on 81 properties throughout the City and Lake Whatcom Watershed. During the 2018-2019 term, they planted 14,673 native plants, removed invasive species from 16 acres, and contributed approximately 19,000 hours.

The WCC crews worked with City staff to help fulfill the City’s adopted Legacies and Strategic Commitments. This term, they contributed to Healthy Environment by completing planting along the Final Phase of the Willow Spring restoration site. Their work completed the restoration project that opens new salmon habitat in lower Squalicum Creek in Squalicum Creek Park. They contributed to Clean Safe Drinking Water, through their forest management practices on Galbraith Mountain in the Lake Whatcom Watershed. They helped thin trees in areas that would optimize growth for young conifers and support a fully functioning forest habitat. In addition, they improved the Agate Bay Preserve and Uy properties in the Lake Whatcom Watershed by removing invasive plants impacting native forest canopy. They also protected Bellingham’s waterbodies through monitoring fish accessibility, forage fish spawning, stream macroinvertebrates, and stream temperature. The results help us plan and improve our stewardship efforts. Finally, the crews contributed to Sense of Place by hosting three community work parties along our City streams to build community understanding and participation. Each crew member has contributed to our quality of life and in return, they leave with the skills necessary to continue their career of service.
Subject: Bid Award for Cornwall Avenue Outfall, EV-0160, Bid #31B-2019

Summary Statement: The Cornwall Avenue Outfall project involves relocation of an existing stormwater outfall that frequently gets blocked by sediment. The project will move the outfall approximately 300 feet west to deeper water. The City received two bids, which were publicly opened on August 14, 2019. Strider Construction was the responsible bidder who submitted the lowest responsive bid of $240,316.13, including any applicable Washington State Sales or Use Tax. The engineer's estimate was $225,737.29.

Previous Council Action: ILA with Port of Bellingham for Cornwall Stormwater Outfall - June 3, 2019

Fiscal Impact: $240,316.13

Funding Source: Stormwater Fund, Street Fund

Attachments:
1. FINAL BID REPORT
2. MANDATORY BIDDER RESPONSIBILITY CHECKLIST
3. CORNWALL OUTFALL RELOCATION VICINITY MAP

Meeting Activity: Committee Briefing - Vote Requested
Meeting Date: 8/26/2019
Recommendation: Award Bid
Presented By: Eric Johnston, P.E. - Interim Public Works Director
Time: 5 minutes

Recommended Motion:

Council Committee:
Public Works and Natural Resources Committee

Agenda Bill Contact:
Craig Mueller, PE - 360-778-7922

Reviewed By Department Date
Eric C. Johnston Public Works 8/19/2019
Connie C. Allen Purchasing 8/19/2019
Andrew D. Askjornsen Finance 8/19/2019
Matthew T. Stamps Legal 8/20/2019
Kelli J. Ljungvall Executive 8/20/2019
### CITY OF BELLINGHAM
#### FINAL BID REPORT
- **CONTRACTOR NAME**: STRIDER
  - **CITY/STATE**: BELLINGHAM, WA
  - **BID NUMBER**: 31B-2019
  - **DATE OPENED**: 7/25/2018
  - **TOTAL BID AMOUNT**: $240,316.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BID NAME</th>
<th>BID NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE OPENED</th>
<th>TOTAL BID AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORNWALL AVENUE OUTFALL</td>
<td>31B-2019</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>$221,082.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT No. EV-0160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,234.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8.7% sales tax</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$221,082.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL BID AMOUNT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$240,316.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEANSIDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$280,973.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8.7% sales tax</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$280,973.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL BID AMOUNT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$280,973.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# MANDATORY BIDDER RESPONSIBILITY CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bid Number:</th>
<th>3IB-2019</th>
<th>Bid Submittal Deadline:</th>
<th>8/14/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name:</td>
<td>Cornwall Avenue Outfall</td>
<td>Project Number:</td>
<td>3IB-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidder's Business Name:</td>
<td>Strider Construction Co., Inc.</td>
<td>City Business Registration Number:</td>
<td>011355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTRACTOR REGISTRATION**

- License Number: STRIDCC1210Z
- License Active?: Yes ☑ No ☐
- Effective Date: 9/9/88
- Expiration Date: 6/23/21

**UBI/TAX REGISTRATION NUMBER**

https://secure.dor.wa.gov/authorize/ (go to Business Lookup)

- UBI/TAX Registration Number: 601 100 050
- Account: Open ☑ Closed ☐

**INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE COVERAGE**

https://fortress.wa.gov/lni/crpsI/MainMenu.aspx

- Account Number: 548,463-00
- Account Current?: Yes ☑ No ☐

**EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DEPARTMENT**

- Employment Security Department Number: 000-655099-00-1
- Has bidder provided account number on the Bid Form?: Yes ☑ No ☐

**NOT DISQUALIFIED FROM BIDDING**

https://secure.lni.wa.gov/debarandstrike/ContractorDebarList.aspx

- Is the Bidder listed on the "Debarred Contractors List" list of the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries Website?: Yes ☑ No ☐
- Attach printout from website.

https://www.SAM.gov/ (go to Search Records)

- Is the bidder listed on the current debarred or suspended bidder list available on the U.S. General Services Administration's System for Award Management ("SAM") website?: Yes ☑ No ☐
- Attach printout from website.

**BIDDER CERTIFICATIONS**

1. The bidder hereby certifies under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that, within the 3-year period immediately preceding the bid solicitation date, the bidder is not a "willful" violator, as defined in RCW 49.48.082, of any provision of RCW 49.46, 49.48, or 49.52, as determined by a final and binding citation and notice of assessment issued by the Department of Labor and Industries or through a civil judgment entered by a court of limited or general jurisdiction.

2. The undersigned further certifies that bidder (check one):
   - ☐ Has received training on the requirements related to public works and prevailing wage as mandated in RCW 39.04.350(1)(f); or
   - ☑ Is exempt from such training because it has completed three or more public works projects and has had a valid business license in Washington for three or more years.

3. The undersigned further certifies that all other information provided by or on behalf of bidder on this form is true and correct.

   Signature of Authorized Official: [Signature]
   Date: 8/14/19
   Kyle J. Gehhardt, P.E., Vice-President
   Bellingham, WA

**CITY VERIFICATION**

- City Purchasing Manager or Designee: [Signature]
- Date: 8/15/19
- Has bidder satisfied applicable supplemental responsibility criteria?: Yes ☑ No ☐

Documentation on file.
The City of Bellingham has compiled this information for its own use and is not responsible for any use of this information by others. The information found herein is provided simply as a courtesy to the public and is not intended for any third party use in any official, professional or other authoritative capacity. Persons using this information do so at their own risk and by such use agree to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City of Bellingham as to any claims, damages, liability, losses or suits arising out of such use. Contact the Whatcom County Assessors office (360-778-5050) for the most up to date parcel information.
Summary Statement: A traffic signal was designed and constructed at Granary/Chestnut by the City pursuant to Waterfront Development project agreements with the Port of Bellingham. The signalized intersection required a left turn lane thereby necessitating removal of approximately 200-ft of marked bike lane. The 200-ft was remarked with sharrows. Removing this length of bike lane has raised questions from some residents and members of Council. Public Works informed Council on the reasons behind the re-channelization in May of 2019. Council requested a committee discussion of this topic.


Fiscal Impact: Further modifications to the Chestnut Bridge will require either cancelling planned TBD projects or new General Fund revenue

Funding Source: Street Fund and Transportation Benefit District (TBD)

Attachments: 1. CHESTNUT BRIDGE SITE PLAN
1. Remove existing conflicting white line as necessary to accommodate new striping.

GENERAL NOTES

1. The Contractor is responsible for installing all channelization for City of Bellmawr, Woodbury, and Waterford standards, as specified.
2. W Chestnut St/Roeder Ave posted speed limit = 35 MPH
3. Granary Ave posted speed limit = 25 MPH
4. See sheet C100 for sign legend and schedule.

SIGNING NOTES

1. New signs and sign supports shall be installed at locations shown on sign schedules on sheet C100. In accordance with City of Bellmawr Standard Drawing TC-320 and Woodbridge Standard Plan 0-20-10-02.
2. New signs mounted to luminaire poles shall be installed in accordance with WSDOT standard plan G-30-10-04.
Subject: Active Transportation Devices

Summary Statement: It is the policy of the City of Bellingham to encourage and facilitate the use of non-motorized transportation options, as stated in the City’s Climate Action Plan and Comprehensive Plan, which encompasses the Multimodal Transportation element, Bicycle Master Plan and the Pedestrian Master Plan. Staff will present several policy topics for discussion related to bicycles, e-bicycles, e-scooters and other personal active transportation devices. Staff will also present information related to shared mobility devices, with a particular emphasis on e-scooters. The recommended action is discussion and input on policy issues and direction to proceed with a 2020 e-scooter pilot program.

Previous Council Action: June 2019: Council request for briefing on e-scooter, Adoption of Climate Action Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, Pedestrian Master Plan and Comprehensive Plan

Fiscal Impact: A pilot program will result in minimal direct costs for staffing. Revenue from permits paid by shared mobility providers may partially offset costs, however additional analysis is needed.

Funding Source: General Fund and Permit Fees Revenue

Attachments: 1. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION DEVICES STAFF MEMO 8.26.19
2. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION DEVICES - DRAFT WWU ENTERPRISE RISK MEMO

Recommended Motion:
MEMORANDUM

TO:        MAYOR KELLI LINVILLE
FROM:      ERIC JOHNSTON, INTERIM PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR
CC:        
SUBJECT:   ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION DEVICES
DATE:      August 20, 2019

Background and Definitions

The City of Bellingham Bicycle and Pedestrian Master plans and the Climate Action Plan specifically identify measures and goals to foster increased use of active transportation devices and reducing reliance on single occupant motor vehicles.

Active Transportation is walking, biking or rolling to get from one place to another. Active transportation devices include a wide range of devices including human powered bicycles, bicycles, skateboards, scooters, Segways, OneWheels as well electric and gas powered versions of the same.

RCW 46.04.1695 includes the following definition for electric devices:

“Electric personal assistive mobility device” (EPAMD) means (1) a self-balancing device with two wheels not in tandem, designed to transport only one person by an electric propulsion system with an average power of seven hundred fifty watts (one horsepower) having a maximum speed on a paved level surface, when powered solely by such a propulsion system while ridden by an operator weighing one hundred seventy pounds, of less than twenty miles per hour or (2) a self-balancing device with one wheel designed to transport only one person by an electric propulsion system with an average power of two thousand watts (two and two-thirds horsepower) having a maximum speed on a paved level surface, when powered solely by such a propulsion system, of less than twenty miles per hour.”

Electric bicycles are further classified in RCW 46.04.169 according to the maximum speed, method and level of power assist provided. Class 1 & 2 are electric assist with Class 3 being a fully powered and throttle controlled electric bicycle.

Share micro mobility is active transportation encompassing all shared-use fleets of small, fully or partially human-powered vehicles such as bicycles, e-bicycles and e-scooters.

In 2019, the legislature updated RCW 46.61.710 providing for general requirements for the use and operation of mopeds, EPAMDS, e-scooter and e-bicycles.

Policy Issues

---

1 WSDOT https://www.wsdot.wa.gov/travel/commute-choices/bike/plan
2 Shared Micromobility in the U.S.: 2018, Nation Association of City Transportation Officials
Increased use of non-motorized transportation is an unambiguous City goal and policy established in the Climate Action plan and Comprehensive plan (which also encompasses the Multimodal Transportation Chapter, Bicycle Master Plan and the Pedestrian Master Plan). While clear in intent the implementation of broad policy goals requires additional consideration of some questions.

**Trails and Parks:**
Policy related to active transportation devices and in particular electric assisted devices (e-bicycles, e-scooters) on trails, greenways or in City parks should reflect needs and uses by the community. Rules for use on roadways will differ from rules for parks, trails and shared use paths. Evaluation of a wide range of options including speed limits, types of devices, strict prohibition, enforcement, user conflict as well as maintenance and operations needs is necessary. Without a specific local prohibition, state law allows for motorized scooters and Class 1 and Class 2 e-bicycles to operate on shared use paths. State law requires action to allow for Class 3 e-bicycles to be used on any highway but are barred from use on shared use paths unless specific allowed by the local agency. The Parks Department is currently working on this issue.

**Helmets:**
Proper use of helmets can reduce the risk of serious injury to a user of active transportation devices. However, enforcement of the requirement to wear a helmet while using an active transportation device may prove difficult. Further, some jurisdictions worry that a helmet requirement may reduce the interest and use of an active transportation device.

Cities allowing shared micro mobility operations struggle with the question of whether to require helmets or not. Requiring providers to provide helmets to each user is logistically difficult. Some cities require a helmet but consciously have limited to no enforcement. Spokane for example requires users to wear a helmet while using a scooter but removed a code section requiring rental companies to provide helmets. Further, Spokane is not actively enforcing the helmet requirement. Portland requires helmet use but noted that a significant number of complaints about e-scooters were from non-users concerned about the lack of helmet use. Portland does not actively enforce the requirement for helmet use.

Helmet use is not required under the bicycle section, BMC 11.48, or the skateboard section, BMC 11.50. Helmet use is required when operating a motorized scooter by BMC 11.52. From a policy perspective, if a helmet is required for one type of device for the potential safety benefits than logically the requirement should apply to all types of similar devices. On the other hand, imposing requirements to have and use a helmet may inhibit use, prove difficult to enforce and be a source of conflict. Choosing a helmet policy balancing various interests may prove challenging.

**State Policies**
Several changes in the RCW were made in the 2019 session to reflect changes in the industry. In particular, definitions of e-bicycles and provisions for e-scooters were modified and expanded. As cities, recreation managers, industry representative and users continue to look for changes in legislation we can expect that the industry will continue to be ahead of legislative efforts. On the positive side the State Department of Transportation is supporting continued development of

---

3 RCW 46.61.710 (7)
4 RCW 46.61.710(8)
6 Spokane Wheelshare program [https://my.spokanecity.org/projects/wheelshare/](https://my.spokanecity.org/projects/wheelshare/)
Active Transportation modes. Development of their plans and policies may help inform and guide consistency across the State. As WSDOT Active Transportation Plan is under development and may be released by the end of this year.  

Potential Code Revisions:
To help align regulations with policy it is recommended to consolidate and update the Bellingham Municipal Code sections 11.48, 11.52, and 11.57 into a single section covering Active Transportation Devices. Changes would include at least the following:

- Remove outdated sections related to bicycles such as reporting sales of bicycles by dealers and registering for bicycle races.
- Add new sections to reflect changes in the RCW and WAC for electric bicycles and electric personal assisted mobility devices.
- Clarity on requirements for devices used in the roadway or in dedicated bikeways (eg lights, brakes) as well as use on shared use paths and trails and in Parks.
- Clarify the definition of a business district and allow for use of active transportation devices on the sidewalk where appropriate. Currently, BMC section 11.48.140 prohibits use of a bicycle on a sidewalk in a business district. The relevant definition of a business district includes any street within 300-ft of any business.  BMC 11.52.210 prohibits use of a skateboard in the downtown and Fairhaven business districts and defines by a map the relevant streets.

E-Scooter Pilot Program
Staff from Planning and Community and Public Works are gathering information to develop a pilot program for shared mobility providers to offer e-scooters in Bellingham. If approved by the Council, the pilot program could start in early spring of 2020. Staff recommend making the aforementioned code changes prior to implementation of a pilot program. Currently staff are coordinating with WWU and Port of Bellingham, engaging with vendors and gathering information and best practices from other cities, including Spokane, Everett, Tacoma, Portland, Seattle, Austin, TX and Ogden, UT. WWU has provided valuable input and will continue to be a key partner in developing a program benefiting the community. Staff will also be reaching out to both Whatcom Transit Authority and the Port of Bellingham in developing a permit for use during an e-scooter pilot program.

Issues and technical requirements for a permit include: the number of devices, social equity and accessibility, locations for parking, areas of approved use or exclusion, speed limits, device specific speed controls, helmet use, age limits, private property rights, device safety, data reporting, maintenance, and best practices to maximize greenhouse gas reductions. The start and end date for a the pilot program will also need to be determined.

Using a pilot program and a permit for operators allows the City to set an objective and experiment with options without the long-term commitment of a contract or permanent program. For example, many other cities have issued one or more permits to shared mobility providers—and then have revisited the permits after a set amount of time to evaluate measures of success. Objective measures of success will include direct local economic activity and the number of trips. These measures directly connect the pilot program to goals of the Council.

---

9 Washington State Model Traffic Ordinance and specifically WAC 308-330-555 and RCW 46.04.080
10 E-scooter companies hire local residents as contractors to charge the scooters; compensation for charging a scooter ranges from $4 - $20 per scooter per charge.
Strategic Commitments and Legacies (economic development) and the Climate Action Plan. Subjective feedback from citizen surveys, health and law enforcement, and input from ADA organizations will also be used in assessing the pilot program and inform revisions to mitigate undesired outcomes.

Community Development staff recently completed the 2019 Downtown survey. The survey asked whether respondents would be in favor of a bike or scooter-share service coming to Bellingham. Of the 2,600 respondents, about 50% said yes, 35% said no, and 16% said they were unsure. Those who were unsure typically said they needed more information, were uncertain whether this type of product would be used in Bellingham or questioned the potential impacts (such as safety concerns, visual clutter, or blocking of sidewalks).¹¹

Christine Grant and Alice Clark from the Downtown Bellingham Partnership conducted business outreach to roughly 34 businesses and business organizations related to the possibility of e-scooters in Bellingham. The results of the outreach suggest broad support and interest from a wide range of business groups. Businesses expressing support include Faithlife, Barkley Corporation, Chrysalis Inn, Hotel Bellwether, Squalicum Harbor Marina, Pickford Theater, Village Books, Trek, Backcountry Essentials, and several other downtown retail and food service establishments. The Downtown Bellingham Partnership is hosting an event on September 26th to allow the business and downtown community to test ride an e-scooter and ask questions to e-scooter operators directly.

**Next steps**
Staff from multiple departments will coordinate and develop proposed code changes covering active transportation devices. Staff will develop, in conjunction with WWU, a permit for shared mobility device operators in the City of Bellingham starting Spring of 2020. Proposed code revisions and a draft permit will be prepared and discussed with the Transportation Commission prior to additional consideration by the City Council. The Port of Bellingham, Bellingham Technical College, Whatcom Community and other community agencies will be invited to participate in the development of the permit as well.

**Recommended Council Actions**
Discussion and input on policy issues and direction to proceed with a 2020 E-scooter pilot program.

¹¹ [https://www.cob.org/gov/dept/pcd/Pages/2019-Downtown-Survey.aspx](https://www.cob.org/gov/dept/pcd/Pages/2019-Downtown-Survey.aspx)
ERM – E-SCOOTERS ON CAMPUS (Draft 8-1-19)

= Key Risk?

RISKS

Injuries – Reputable studies (e.g. CDC) indicate that riders are at risk of injury while riding e-scooters. Riding without a helmet may increase the risk of head injuries. Riding while distracted (e.g. using a smartphone) and/or while under the influence of alcohol and/or illicit substances may also increase the risk of injury. Traumas may include head, orthopedic and facial injuries. In particular, concussions in students lead to difficulties with cognition, and have a lasting impact on academic performance, affect social engagement and result in mental health complications. Solutions may include requiring that the scooter companies provide training on how to ride an e-scooter safely and information about wearing helmets. Implement helmet laws. Some vendors have given helmets away as part of their e-scooter promotions. The CDC report found that almost a third of scooter accidents happen on the first use of an e-scooter. A lower maximum speed for the first couple of rides may help reduce the number of injuries.

Lack of Accessibility – E-scooters are a mode of transportation that is inaccessible to students, faculty and staff with disabilities. Lack of dedicated parking in some jurisdictions has led to e-scooters being parked indiscriminately on sidewalks, pathways and trails, which creates accessibility challenges for persons with disabilities. Solutions may include providing ADA compliant transportation alternatives in conjunction with this opportunity and required, dedicated parking that is removed from sidewalks, pathways, trails and other pedestrian routes.

Need for Transportation Infrastructure (INTRA-CAMPUS) – A safe intra-campus transportation infrastructure that accommodates the intermingling of pedestrians, e-scooters and other popular micro-mobility devices like bicycles and skateboards within the campus core is necessary for safe and efficient circulation around campus. Solutions may include dedicated lanes and wayfinding signs to separate pedestrians from e-scooters and other micro-mobility devices in order to reduce the risk of accidents and injuries.

Need for Transportation Infrastructure (COMMUTER) – A safe commuter transportation infrastructure allows pedestrians and e-scooters and other popular micro-mobility devices like bicycles and skateboards to move more safely around a city. Forcing riders to use city sidewalks is an unsafe and unsustainable solution for both riders and pedestrians. Solutions may include redesigning streets, dedicated lanes (e.g. micro-mobility lanes), safely sharing roadways, and suitable riding surfaces.

Ambiguous Regulations – State laws and municipal codes, and University policies and WAC, are ambiguous with regard to defining various micro-mobility devices, like e-scooters, and the operating (e.g. speed limits) and parking responsibilities that go with those definitions. This lack of clarity leads to operator confusion, lack of compliance, reduced safety and enforcement challenges. Solutions include updating the University policies and WAC in coordination with the City of Bellingham so that the policies and WAC of the two entities are aligned as much as possible.

Enforcement Challenges – The increased use of e-scooters on campus, on top of the growth of other micro-mobility devices like bicycles and skateboards, is likely to overwhelm already stretched University
Police enforcement resources. Solutions may include a well thought out transportation system on
campus with clear and easy to follow rules, and additional University Police enforcement
resources to keep pace with the growth.

**Dedicated Parking** – Lack of dedicated parking (e.g. corrals or docks) may result in e-scooters being
parked indiscriminately on sidewalks, pathways and trails on campus and in the adjacent
neighborhoods. This would reduce accessibility, create tripping hazards, diminish aesthetics and impact
the University’s reputation. Using existing bicycle racks for e-scooter parking may displace bike parking.
Municipalities have found that e-scooters are being parked indiscriminately on sidewalks and in some
cases vendor response to such problems has been inadequate. Solutions include providing clearly
marked places for e-scooters to park and setting up a system with the vendor(s) in which scooter riders
are fined if they do not park an e-scooter correctly, and ensuring that permit or contract language
clearly defines the expectations around vendor response times.

**Abandoned E-Scooters** – Abused, broken or vandalized e-scooters have been haphazardly discarded
or abandoned in waterways, parks, greenbelts and other inappropriate places. In some cases Vendor
response to this problem has been inadequate. Solutions may include ensuring that permit or contract
language clearly defines the vendor expectations around this issue, with financial penalties.

**Vendor Responsibility** – Vendors are rushing to capitalize on the “scootermania” movement and
their profit margins are tight. Their business model leaves the costly and time-consuming burden of
creating safe and effective operating environments to the jurisdictions that have permitted their use.
Jurisdictions are left to create operating and parking infrastructures, develop regulations, provide
enforcement, store impounded e-scooters, dispose of e-scooters, accommodate recharging, assume
liability, promote safety, etc. Solutions may include ensuring that permit or contract language clearly
defines the expectations around this issue and sharing the revenue that the e-scooters generate.

**Permits and Contracts** – Any permit or contract executed between the City of Bellingham and e-
scooter vendor should include Western’s requirements, which will likely include provisions related to
geofencing (limiting operating areas and speed), accommodating juicers, docks, parking, disposal,
privacy, etc. Solutions may include ensuring that permit or contract language clearly defines the
expectations around this issue and sharing the revenue that the e-scooters generate.

**Juicers** - Dockless e-scooter operators require a system of “juicers” to collect e-scooters with low
batteries and recharge them overnight. Juicers are paid per e-scooter charged and delivered (e.g. $20)
and commonly use a large vehicle like a truck or SUV to in order to collect enough e-scooters to make a
profit. Juicers will need access to campus, creating additional vehicle congestion and carbon emissions.
Students may be motivated to bring e-scooters back to the residence halls for recharging for a little
extra cash. Solutions may include permit or contract language that address campus policies about
charging e-scooter in dorm rooms.

**Geo-Fencing** – Geo-Fencing is a technology that can be applied to the entire (or most of the) campus
to limit or control e-scooter operations. It can limit operations in certain areas (e.g. Viking Union and
Red Square), impose speed limits, and establish drop zones (which require that riders end their session
in an authorized drop zone, otherwise a fine is charged to their credit card through the vendor).
As a solution, while the actual capabilities are still unknown, Geo-Fencing the campus with a tightly controlled environment may a good option for Western initially. It would allow the City to get started quickly with the e-scooter pilot and allow Western to build its structure to accommodate them. Such an approach will provide time for planning and preparation and help Western avoid the problems that have plagued other communities and universities. Another solution would for the vendor to program the e-scooters so that they are only able to operate at low speeds (5mph) on campus.

**Privacy** – Vendors collect and use data generated from the rental transaction and use of the e-scooter. Such data use should be disclosed by the vendor and consent sought and provided by the rider beforehand. Solutions may include permit or contract language that addresses this issue. Also, see Rich Source of Data opportunity.

**Competing Resources** - If students are spending money on scooter-share, bicycle-share or rideshare (e.g. Uber and Lyft) for their transportation needs, they may be less likely to support the Alternative Transportation Fee which provides students with a universal bus pass and the AS Late Night Shuttle service. This may create a social equity issue.

**Anticipated v. Actual Environmental Impact** – If e-scooters are replacing cars, then the use of e-scooters is likely having a favorable impact on the environment. If they are replacing bicycling, skateboarding, walking or public transportation, it may be unfavorable. There is waste caused by damaged and unrepairable e-scooters. Juicers’ use of large vehicles like a truck or SUV may offset the benefits of reduced carbon emissions.

**OPPORTUNITIES**

**Promotes Equity** – E-scooters may provide an affordable transportation option for underserved communities and people who cannot afford cars, and may allow students and employees to live further away from public transportation where housing is less expensive.

**Rich Source of Data** – When data sharing is required in the permitting process, universities benefit from having more information about how people are using the transportation infrastructure. The data can inform transportation planning decisions on campus. The data is scrubbed of identifying fields. Also, see Privacy risk.

**First Mile/Last Mile (FM/LM)** - Cars traveling less than 3 miles cause 46% of car emissions. Everybody cannot possibly live or work within easy walking distance of public transportation, which results in traveling short distances with cars. Such use creates traffic congestion, the need for more parking and more emissions. E-scooters may help alleviate a portion of this problem.

**Reduces Carbon Emissions and Congestion** - 30% of riders report using e-scooters to replace car rides on their most recent trip, signaling the positive impact micro-mobility solutions can have on reducing carbon emissions, traffic and parking congestion. If people traveling to and from campus choose to do that using an e-scooter instead of a private vehicle, less tailpipe emissions will be released into the atmosphere and there will be less cars on the road which has the potential to reduce traffic congestion.

**Catalyst for Improvement** – The introduction of e-scooters may be a catalyst for improving available resources for the intra-campus and commuter transportation infrastructures for pedestrians and all micro-mobility devices, including e-scooters, bicycles and skateboards.
Reduce Overcrowding - Use of e-scooters may reduce overcrowding on buses used for short, shuttle trips between places that are within walking distance. E-scooters may be a substitute for cars for students who live on campus thus reducing parking lot overcrowding.