POLICY STATEMENT

ASSOCIATION OF PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PROFESSIONALS

Expertise for Active Transportation

POLICY STATEMENT: SHARED MICROMOBILITY PROGRAMS

Overview of APBP Policy Statements

The Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals (APBP) supports the community of professionals working to create more walkable, bikeable places through facilitating the exchange of professional and technical knowledge and by promoting fundamental positions that are broadly acknowledged and acted upon by APBP members.

APBP Policy Principles:

- APBP represents the professional expertise and practical experience of its members in transportation policy discussions to advance active, healthy, and sustainable communities.
- APBP recognizes the impacts of systemic and institutionalized racism, and we recognize our responsibility to identify and address inequities.
- APBP endorses active transportation as an integral part of transportation systems through all stages of planning, design, funding, and implementation.
- APBP supports connected, convenient, accessible, and safe streets and pathways in every community and planning with the input of every member of a community.
- APBP advances a safe system approach that leverages active transportation to create equitable access for everyone in every place.

Position:

APBP supports the development of shared micromobility programs and supporting policies as key elements of a community's comprehensive transportation system. APBP believes that shared micromobility programs have the potential to improve access and reduce barriers to destinations; increase transportation options; reduce congestion on city streets; act as a catalyst for infrastructure that increases safety for all road users; improve air quality; and support local economic development. To ensure an effective, equitable, and sustainable program, communities must be actively involved with the implementation and governance of shared micromobility.

Definition:

Shared micromobility programs are established by municipalities, universities, hospital campuses, multi-family communities, corporate campuses, transit agencies, state transportation departments, and others to create a framework and regulatory environment for one or more shared micromobility systems. Shared micromobility systems include bikeshare (traditional human-powered bikes, electric-assist bikes or e-bikes, and adaptive bikes/trikes); shared electric scooter systems (e-scooters); and other systems based on small, lightweight, low-speed transportation devices. By definition, shared micromobility programs are on-demand, open to the public, and accessed through a membership or per-trip rental fee. While some devices are electric-assist, shared micromobility devices all require some type of physical engagement by the user in the form of balancing and/or propulsion. With the range of shared micromobility modes, geographic availability, and limited-duration access options, these systems offer a low barrier to entry, engaging a broad range of people and encouraging more community members to participate in active transportation.

This policy statement does not consider all forms of electric transportation devices and vehicles as shared micromobility systems. Vehicles such as mopeds, small cars, neighborhood electric vehicles (NEVs), and minibuses are not considered under the umbrella of micromobility. Individually owned bikes, e-bikes, e-scooters, and other small transportation devices are not considered in this policy statement because they are not part of shared systems.

This policy recognizes but does not pertain to private systems that are not available to the public, such as a system for employees on a corporate campus. APBP encourages these private systems to integrate with and support adjacent publicly accessible micromobility systems.

Background:

Traditional bikeshare systems (defined as systems requiring stations, docks, and payment kiosks) required significant capital investment and utilized public-private partnerships and funding from grants (federal, state, and local), sponsorships, and user revenues to launch and maintain operations. In 2017, private companies backed by venture capital began operating bike- and scooter-share systems in several U.S. cities. Between 2017 and 2022, private and venture capital firms invested more than US$8.4 billion in micromobility worldwide, including in many cities in the United States and Canada. The long-term funding and profitability of these systems is still largely unknown.[1]

Shared micromobility programs have successfully increased transportation options for communities across North America and have grown in size and popularity. Since 2010, traditional bikeshare systems have been implemented using the technologies and resources available at the time. Traditional bikeshare systems were designed so that bikes could be checked out and returned to designated stations.

Due to technological advancements, it is also possible to have “dockless” systems, where users can find and unlock bikes using smartphones, and bikes do not need to be parked at stations to be tracked, serviced, and rebalanced. While technology has allowed for dockless operation, some systems operate in a hybrid manner, with designated space on the sidewalk or street for micromobility device parking,

---

[1] https://mobility-innovators.com/beyond-the-hype-navigating-the-evolving-landscape-of-micromobility/

while allowing parking outside of a designated area for an additional fee. Some systems retain a docked-only system, which allows for the greatest control and oversight

Other changes since 2017 include subscription-based models that make renting micromobility devices more convenient and less expensive for users who regularly rely on them for transportation options. This is a way to provide access to these options for using e-scooters, e-bikes, and other micromobility devices. In addition to subscriptions, micromobility companies are collaborating with public transit operators to integrate app technologies. This allows the user to trip chain different types of transportation modes. Examples of integrated apps include the Cities of Pittsburgh[2] and Las Vegas[3].

According to the North American Bikeshare & Scootershare Association's (NABSA) 2025 Shared Micromobility State of the Industry Report,[4] micromobility trips reached pre-pandemic levels in 2022 and increased by 43% between 2022 and 2024. In 2024 there were 225 million shared micromobility trips taken in North America using 333,000 devices.

Application:

In 2024, most major metropolitan areas in the U.S. and Canada have micromobility programs in place, proving programs can be successful in a wide range of demographic, economic, climate, and topographical conditions. Systems are now expanding into smaller and more suburban and rural communities,[5] indicating that shared micromobility programs can be developed in cities and towns of various sizes. Communities can use a combination of public and private bicycle- and scooter-based systems to meet their specific needs.

Key factors and principles:

- ***Policy or Ordinance****:* The foundation of a shared micromobility program is typically a policy or ordinance that applies to publicly and privately owned shared micromobility systems. The policy or ordinance can include regulations on fleet size, service area, pricing, safety education and in-person or in-app training, equity programs, data sharing, parking requirements, and maintenance. Some places also have policies or ordinances that disallow private companies to operate and only allow publicly owned shared micromobility systems. Where possible, policies and ordinances should be consistent across nearby communities so that user experience and expectations are consistent.
- ***Type of Program Ownership and Management****:* One of the key decisions in the development of a shared micromobility program is to determine whether it will include a publicly owned system,

[2] https://blog.transitapp.com/pittsburghers-can-now-combine-bikeshare-and-public-transit-in-one-app/
[3] https://statescoop.com/las-vegas-transit-bike-share-app/
[4] https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/g8bs0ivbntntfpod6hxyp/2022-State-of-the-Industry-Report.pdf?rlkey=n4k2t53u0itcowqv6dauctxmt&e=3&submissionGuid=f2e8b538-5199-41e8-98ef-d4015dc31e2e&dl=0
[5] https://www.nlc.org/article/2022/06/03/bikeshare-solutions-for-small-cities-towns/

one or more privately owned systems, or both. Many traditional bikeshare systems are owned by a government agency or a local nonprofit; it is also possible for shared micromobility systems within a local program to be owned and/or operated by one or more private companies. Bluebikes in the Boston Metro region is publicly owned with a private operator under contract. Some communities, such as Washington, D.C. have both types of systems. Many communities with programs that include privately owned and operated shared micromobility systems have a contract or a permit system to regulate these systems. Most of these cities charge the operator a permit fee and other operating fees to cover the use of the right-of-way and any agency expenses incurred as a result of the system, which can include staff time to oversee or evaluate the program, enforcement and impoundment of devices not parked properly, and other costs associated with program administration. The decision about which type(s) of system(s) to provide becomes the cornerstone of the program and can result in different outcomes depending on the goals of the community. Agencies may have less control and less ability to achieve the principles outlined below when systems are privately owned.

- ***Equity***: A shared micromobility program should include equity as a key driver of program goals and decision-making. Designing an equitable program means making systems accessible and encouraging participation—both in the initial planning process as well as eventual use of the system(s)—by historically underserved communities, low-income populations, communities of color, and individuals with disabilities. Steps to increase access to shared micromobility systems include requiring options for under- and unbanked individuals and check-out options that do not require a smartphone, and developing fee schedules with discounted fares and flexible pricing options for underserved groups. For income-based user fee reductions, municipalities may consider partnering with an existing service provider, such as the local transit agency, for income verification to reduce the burden on the end user and micromobility operator. Service areas should include historically underserved areas and provide a sufficient density of micromobility devices in these areas. System operations must also be equitable in how and when micromobility devices are collected, redistributed, and repaired, and in where stations are placed and how well they are maintained. Systems may also require inclusion of devices that are easier for people of all ages and abilities to use. Devices with greater stability and fewer physical requirements, like those including seats and/or three wheels, can be more inclusive for a broader range of abilities. It is not enough to plan for equity; systems also need to foster and maintain it. Regular feedback from historically underserved communities, low-income populations, communities of color, and individuals with a range of disabilities is necessary for consistent maintenance.
- ***Access for Communities with Disabilities:*** It is important to consider and mitigate any negative impacts that shared mobility systems may have on other transportation system users, especially those with disabilities. Regulations should require operators to park in locations that preserve clear access to sidewalks, curb ramps, and transit stops. Undocked systems may consider inclusion of marked parking locations, education for correct parking behavior, requirements for the user to submit a photo of the device parked correctly, and/or parking enforcement to support clear zones. Acoustic vehicle alert systems (AVAS), like those required in electric vehicles, can alert people, including those with sight loss, about the presence of a shared

micromobility device. Finally, prohibiting sidewalk riding in areas with high pedestrian volumes and instead providing dedicated comfortable space (e.g. bike or micromobility lanes) for shared mobility users to travel will reduce conflicts due to sidewalk riding.

- ***Partnerships****:* Communities with successful micromobility programs that serve all members of the community focus on building partnerships. Potential partners include government agencies, private system providers, community organizations, public health entities, advocacy groups, transit agencies, visitor and tourism bureaus, local employers, colleges and universities, school districts, academic organizations, and transportation consultants.
- ***A Sustainable Business Model****:* Although technology may bring about changes in shared micromobility systems, users desire continuity of service and a reasonable level of consistency. For publicly owned systems, balancing long-term operational and capital expenses with a robust and diversified set of revenue streams will support the system's longevity. Revenue can be generated through a variety of sources, including sponsorships, permit fees, advertising, grants, corporate memberships, and individual rider memberships and usage fees. The long-term financial sustainability of privately owned systems is yet unknown, so communities should develop contingency plans in case all privately owned systems end operations. For example, Denver's bikeshare ended when its grant funding ended. Conversely, nearby Boulder, Colorado, decided to continue its program once outside funding ended by supplementing a grant-funded operations budget with City funds.
- ***System Density and Coverage Area****:* Stations and/or micromobility devices should be conveniently available. Docking stations or replacement of devices (for undocked programs) should ideally be within an eighth of a mile or a fifth of a kilometer (maximum a quarter mile or four tenths of a kilometer) or less than a five-minute walk of each other. Agencies have much greater control over this aspect when systems are publicly owned. Check-out locations are fixed stations in traditional bikeshare systems (see the NACTO Bike Share Station Siting Guide in the Resources section). For dockless systems, shared micromobility devices can be left anywhere, and a smartphone application is typically available for users to locate devices. Some systems offer a hybrid approach, with devices that are occasionally collected and redistributed to "hubs." Even with completely dockless systems, redistribution is still a key factor in making micromobility devices available—particularly in lower-demand and/or underserved areas—and should be written into the requirements for privately owned systems. Micromobility device placement is also key to developing a seamless modal network. Mobility hubs should provide for distribution at transit centers and other key points in the transportation network. Geofencing and/or additional fees can be used in some dockless programs to encourage users to return shared micromobility devices to designated locations where they may be most desirable.
- ***Fleet Size:*** Micromobility programs should specify the minimum and maximum number of devices that can be in operation in specific areas, and criteria for when and how systems can be expanded. These standards can be used to prevent an oversaturation or a scarcity of devices, especially if more than one privately owned system is present.
- ***Flexible and Integrated Pricing Options****:* Monthly (rather than only annual) membership, single-ride pricing similar to transit rides, corporate membership programs, and discounts focused on low-income and other price-sensitive riders can increase system use. Visible pricing schemes

and clear communication regarding price changes, as well as up-front estimates of ride cost, would increase transparency of the system. Integrated platforms for finding, reserving, paying, and transferring to complementary modes such as transportation network companies (TNCs), taxis, transit, parking, etc., improve the flexibility and reliability of the system for users.

- ***Supportive Infrastructure Network****:* Low-stress infrastructure, including separated bikeways and traffic-calmed streets, maximizes comfort and safety for shared micromobility users and reduces conflicts with motor vehicle traffic and pedestrians. Many communities had to quickly react to increase the amount of low-stress infrastructure after privately owned micromobility systems arrived. Agencies should proactively plan and budget for the expansion of interconnected low-stress networks in shared micromobility system service areas before launch. Providing adequate facility width for passing is a key consideration when designing new active transportation infrastructure where electric micromobility devices are expected to mix with lower-speed bikes, scooters, and mobility devices.
- ***Operational Regulation****:* Depending on local context and preferences, communities can regulate the operation of shared micromobility devices based on location. For example, communities may choose to limit speeds, prohibit operation on sidewalks, and regulate where dockless devices can be parked. In addition to legal regulation, geofencing technology can be used to control the operation of shared micromobility devices. Geofencing can be used to allow devices to be parked only in designated areas in the right-of-way, which can help reduce clutter and barriers for people with disabilities to comply with ADA requirements in public spaces. Such technology can also be used to force devices to operate at lower speeds or outright prohibit their operation in sensitive areas, such as pedestrian-heavy paths.
- ***Data Collection****:* All shared micromobility systems can be made to generate data pertaining to where devices are checked out and checked in, while many can also track the route that users take. This data is incredibly valuable to transportation agencies that analyze safety, plan and provide infrastructure for bicycle and micromobility users, and measure equity. All shared micromobility systems should be equipped to collect data on origins/destinations, route selection, and demographics, and vendors should be required to provide this data in aggregated and anonymized format to municipalities and other agencies.

Recommendations:

1. If not already in place, proactively develop a shared micromobility policy that may involve specific regulations or ordinances to be in place in order to plan for the kind of shared micromobility system desired. This will involve operations on public property (e.g., permits for use on the public right of way), but also may involve modifications to the zoning code (considerations include, but are not limited to, what kinds of businesses may operate on private property and whether rentals from open space are an allowed use).
2. Evaluate your community’s access needs and establish program requirements (including appropriate number of operators to avoid oversaturation of market, business licenses, operation agreements, and uniform data-sharing requirements) that meet the community’s needs.

3. Weigh the pros and cons of different business models and vendors to determine what best suits your community, e.g., nonprofit, for-profit, or a public entity.
4. Seek the experience of other communities as your community considers a program; share your experiences with other communities to support better outcomes.
5. Regularly study and evaluate the safety, management, and equity of your shared micromobility system post-launch, and adjust operations and infrastructure as necessary.
6. Helmets should be encouraged, but not mandatory unless required by law.
7. Shared micromobility programs should also be considered and included in municipal transportation plans and policies. A city considering a shared micromobility program could begin with a feasibility study, pilot program, or implementation plan and weigh the benefits of various program design parameters, including ownership model, funding mechanisms, operational guidelines, and program needs such as staffing, infrastructure, and community outreach.
8. Before or concurrent with program launch, cities should implement the rules, regulations, and policies needed to facilitate the arrival of the system(s). A proactive approach can limit the amount of uncertainty and public pushback that micromobility systems can generate as well as prepare for the possibility of statewide regulations.
9. While each community will differ from the next, these recommendations and the key factors and principles discussed previously are broadly applicable to most shared micromobility programs and can be tailored to meet each community's needs.
10. There have been numerous studies demonstrating the high relative safety of bike share systems. It is noted that because electrically powered shared micromobility devices are relatively new technologies, continued research on their safety is needed. While broad research on the overall safety of these new devices is needed, it is also important for agencies to study the safety of their own shared micromobility system post-launch and adjust operations and infrastructure as necessary.

Benefits of Micromobility:

- Health
- Environmental
- Economic
- Resiliency- shut down of public transit systems, natural disasters
- Equity

APBP supports the use of public funding from local and regional governments, state, and federal dollars to support the operations and capital expenses of micromobility systems. As evidence shows, this form of transportation has continually grown over the past decade and is on par with public transportation[6].

[6] https://nabsa.net/2024/03/28/public-funds/

Resources:

APBP recommends the following resources to help local agencies plan and implement micromobility:

- Better Bike Share Partnership (focuses on equity issues): http://betterbikeshare.org/
- North American Bikeshare and Scootershare Association: https://nabsa.net/resources/
- The Shared Micromobility Playbook (2019): http://playbook.t4america.org/
- The Micromobility Revolution (2018): https://www.populus.ai/micro-mobility-2018-july
- The Bike-Share Planning Guide (2013): https://www.itdp.org/the-bike-share-planning-guide-2/
- NACTO Shared Micromobility Publications https://nacto.org/program/bike-share-initiative/
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center- Bike Share topics: https://www.pedbikeinfo.org/topics/bikeshare.cfm
- Bike sharing: Research on health effects, helmet use and equitable access (2018): https://journalistsresource.org/environment/bikeshare-research-health-helmet-transit/
- Portland Bureau of Transportation 2018 E-Scooter Findings Report (2018): https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/709719

APBP's policy statement development
The Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals (APBP) relied on the professional experience of its members and widely available information and tools to draft its policy statement on Shared Micromobility Programs. This policy statement was developed by the APBP Policy Committee in conjunction with APBP member volunteers and was originally approved by the Board of Directors on November 21, 2019, and this most recent revision on October 23, 2025. APBP members can suggest changes to any policy statement by contacting the association's executive director, Policy Committee chair, or a board member. For more information, contact: Lauren Santangelo, Executive Director, at lsantangelo@amrms.com.