



London Breed, Mayor

Cheryl Brinkman, Chairman
Malcolm Heinicke, Vice Chairman
Gwyneth Borden, Director
Lee Hsu, Director

Cristina Rubke, Director
Art Torres, Director

Edward D. Reiskin, Director of Transportation

Marlo Sandler
Bird Rides Inc.
406 Broadway #369
Santa Monica CA 90401

August 30, 2018

Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program Application – Notice of Permit Denial

Dear Marlo Sandler,

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has reviewed the permit application submitted by Bird Rides Inc. for the 2018-2019 Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program. For the reasons set forth below, the SFMTA has denied your permit application.

In accordance with San Francisco Transportation Code Sec. 916, SFMTA scooter share program staff were directed to conduct a thorough review of all permit applications and evaluate their adherence to the application requirements and their merits as compared to other applicants in order to ensure that any permitted program promotes the public interest and safety of the transportation system. The SFMTA's evaluation process is discussed in further detail in the August 30, 2018 memorandum from Director of Transportation Edward D. Reiskin to interested parties regarding the Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program (Scooter Share Memorandum).

In addition to the reasons set forth in the Scooter Share Memorandum, Bird Rides Inc.'s ("Bird") permit application was denied for the following reasons:

- Although helmet use is required by law when riding a motorized scooter, Bird's application met only baseline strategies proposed by most or all other applicants. Based on the SFMTA's observations during the scooter roll out in spring 2018, these baseline strategies taken alone did not result in high levels of helmet use. Bird's proposal to have field staff approaching users regarding helmet use is unlikely to improve usage if staff or riders do not have a helmet on hand.
- While Bird proposes preventing users who are habitually noncompliant from continuing to use Bird's service, the level of detail Bird has provided regarding penalties is insufficient for the SFMTA to evaluate whether they would be effective at improving user behavior.
- Despite proposing significantly discounted rates for low income users, the SFMTA concludes that these users would face barriers to accessing Bird's services based on the lack of detail about how users would access/qualify for these benefits.

- The SFMTA concludes that Bird's proposed small service area and lack of specific rebalancing plans are insufficient to ensure availability in underserved communities.
- Bird mentions outreach to Communities of Concern during the second half of the pilot to determine where to expand service, among other approaches to ensure the low income residents are aware of service and how to participate. This demonstrates some understanding of the SFMTA's goals to promote low income programs but does not provide sufficient detail as to how that would be accomplished. The SFMTA negatively evaluates this lack of detail as unlikely to ensure that low income residents are aware of services and how to participate.
- Bird's application provided insufficient detail for staff to evaluate the company's commitment to listen to and address community feedback. While Bird proposed to participate in events to be available to answer questions and build community partnerships, it does not articulate plans to address feedback. Attending events and meeting with stakeholders is a baseline strategy proposed by most applicants; without specific goals or plans to address feedback, the SFMTA negatively evaluates the application's lack of detail as unlikely to result in applicant successfully listening to and addressing community feedback.
- Bird's application lacks detail regarding its operations and rebalancing plan beyond nightly retrieval and recharging and hiring a Fleet Coordinator and Community Manager. The SFMTA negatively evaluates applicant's lack of detailed strategy for operations and rebalancing as insufficient to ensure safe and reliable operational practices.
- All field staff beyond the Fleet Coordinator and Community manager would be independent contractors, including maintenance staff. Independent contractors would be trained by video, are "expected to already have knowledge relevant to the services provided", and would charge scooters on their own, including in private homes. The SFMTA negatively evaluates Bird's reliance on minimally trained independent contractors for charging and in particular for maintenance activities, which could compromise safety and reliability of system.
- Bird demonstrates experience operating shared scooter service, but the SFMTA negatively evaluates applicant's history of violations, which indicates that past strategies have been insufficient to ensure user compliance with laws. San Francisco Public Works impounded 169 improperly parked Bird scooters and issued 5 violations while Bird was operating in the city.
- Bird's application includes no mention of recycling, including battery recycling. The SFMTA negatively evaluates Bird's response, which fails to address critical requirements of San Francisco's Zero Waste Policy.
- For the above factors, Bird's responses either met only the bare minimum requirements established in the terms and conditions for holding a permit, or lacked important details, or were unlikely to result in a stated standard. Bird's application also did not include strategies highly likely to result in success on its own or as compared to other applicants in the following areas: education and training around safe operations and ensuring proper parking of scooters.

These factors demonstrate insufficient commitment to ensuring that Bird's approach would result in a well-functioning and sustainable scooter share system that serves the public interest and maintains public safety when compared to the successful applicants.

In addition to these factors, in denying this application, the SFMTA evaluated the issues outlined in the Scooter Share Memorandum, the full applications of all applicants as received by June 7, 2018, and the experience and qualifications of all applicants.

Please be aware that this denial is for the Pilot program only and, as described in more detail in the Scooter Share Memorandum, SFMTA will be using the results of the Pilot to consider the development of a permanent program.

Accordingly, Bird Rides Inc.'s application for a scooter share permit is denied. As set forth in Section 916(e)(1) of the Transportation Code, Bird may request review of SFMTA's decision to deny this permit. Applicants seeking review of a permit denial will have 15 business days from the date of notice of denial to request review of the decision by a hearing officer. The procedures for such review are available on the SFMTA's website at <http://www.sfmta.com/sharedscooters>.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tom Maguire". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Tom Maguire

Director of Sustainable Streets, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency



London Breed, Mayor

Cheryl Brinkman, Chairman

Malcolm Heinicke, Vice Chairman

Gwyneth Borden, Director

Lee Hsu, Director

Cristina Rubke, Director

Art Torres, Director

Edward D. Reiskin, Director of Transportation

Josh Squire
CycleHop
350 Lincoln Rd
Miami Beach, FL 33139

August 30, 2018

Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program Application – Notice of Permit Denial

Dear Josh Squire,

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has reviewed the permit application submitted by CycleHop for the 2018-2019 Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program. For the reasons set forth below, the SFMTA has denied your permit application.

In accordance with San Francisco Transportation Code Sec. 916, SFMTA scooter share program staff were directed to conduct a thorough review of all permit applications and evaluate their adherence to the application requirements and their merits as compared to other applicants in order to ensure that any permitted program promotes the public interest and safety of the transportation system. The SFMTA's evaluation process is discussed in further detail in the August 30, 2018 memorandum from Director of Transportation Edward D. Reiskin to interested parties regarding the Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program (Scooter Share Memorandum).

In addition to the reasons set forth in the Scooter Share Memorandum, CycleHop's ("HOPR") permit application was denied for the following reasons:

- While HOPR proposes preventing users who are habitually noncompliant from continuing to use your service, the lack of detail in HOPR's response underscored lack of commitment to leveraging penalties and incentives.
- Despite proposing significantly discounted rates for low income users, the SFMTA concludes that these users would face barriers to accessing HOPR's services based on the lack of detail about how users would access/qualify for these benefits.
- HOPR mentions but does not describe presence at community events and does not provide details of proposed inclusive, diverse marketing campaigns, as well as collaboration with community organizations to promote low-cost scooter share programs. The SFMTA negatively evaluates this lack of detail as unlikely to ensure that low income residents are aware of services and how to participate.

- HOPR's application did not mention attempts to engage members of the public generally. Failure to include strategies to engage members of the public who do not choose to use scooter services is a flaw in application.
- The SFMTA negatively evaluates applicant's lack of detailed strategy and low level of staffing for operations and rebalancing as insufficient to ensure safe and reliable operational practices. Furthermore, required locking racks (HOPR Pods) would significantly delay program launch based on required coordination with the City; the SFMTA evaluates this as incompatible with current pilot permit program.
- HOPR's application contained very limited detail regarding hiring and training employees and/or contractors to ensure that staff have the knowledge and skills to ensure safe operational practices and knowledge of the communities in which they operate. The application mentions but does not describe continued training opportunities for employees. The SFMTA negatively evaluates lack of detail regarding training programs as unlikely to result in safe operational practices compared to other applicants.
- HOPR's application includes no mention of recycling, including battery recycling. The SFMTA negatively evaluates HOPR's response, which fails to address critical requirements of San Francisco's Zero Waste Policy.
- For the above factors, HOPR's responses either met only the bare minimum requirements established in the terms and conditions for holding a permit, or lacked important details, or were unlikely to result in a stated standard. HOPR's application also did not include strategies highly likely to result in success on its own or as compared to other applicants in the following areas: education and training around safe operations; ensuring availability of scooters in underserved areas; and demonstrating capacity to comply with city regulations through experience operating and maintaining shared mobility systems.

These factors demonstrate insufficient commitment to ensuring that HOPR's approach would result in a well-functioning and sustainable scooter share system that serves the public interest and maintains public safety when compared to the successful applicants.

In addition to these factors, in denying this application, the SFMTA evaluated the issues outlined in the Scooter Share Memorandum, the full applications of all applicants as received by June 7, 2018, and the experience and qualifications of all applicants.

Please be aware that this denial is for the Pilot program only and, as described in more detail in the Scooter Share Memorandum, SFMTA will be using the results of the Pilot to consider the development of a permanent program.

Accordingly, CycleHop's application for a scooter share permit is denied. As set forth in Section 916(e)(1) of the Transportation Code, CycleHop may request review of SFMTA's decision to deny this permit. Applicants seeking review of a permit denial will have 15 business days from the date of notice of denial to request review of the decision by a hearing officer. The procedures for such review are available on the SFMTA's website at <http://www.sfmta.com/sharedscooters>.

Sincerely,

Tom Maguire

Tom Maguire

Director of Sustainable Streets, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency



London Breed, Mayor

Cheryl Brinkman, Chairman

Malcolm Heinicke, Vice Chairman

Gwyneth Borden, Director

Lee Hsu, Director

Cristina Rubke, Director

Art Torres, Director

Edward D. Reiskin, Director of Transportation

Mark Miretsky
Social Scooters LLC (JUMP Bikes)
2200 Jerrold Ave. Unit R
San Francisco, CA 94124

August 30, 2018

Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program Application – Notice of Permit Denial

Dear Mark Miretsky,

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has reviewed the permit application submitted by JUMP for the 2018-2019 Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program. For the reasons set forth below, the SFMTA has denied your permit application.

In accordance with San Francisco Transportation Code Sec. 916, SFMTA scooter share program staff were directed to conduct a thorough review of all permit applications and evaluate their adherence to the application requirements and their merits as compared to other applicants in order to ensure that any permitted program promotes the public interest and safety of the transportation system. The SFMTA's evaluation process is discussed in further detail in the August 30, 2018 memorandum from Director of Transportation Edward D. Reiskin to interested parties regarding the Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program (Scooter Share Memorandum).

In addition to the reasons set forth in the Scooter Share Memorandum, JUMP's permit application was denied for the following reasons:

- JUMP's proposed strategies to educate and train users met only baseline strategies proposed by most or all other applicants. Based on staff's observations during the scooter roll out in spring 2018, these baseline strategies taken alone were not effective in addressing safe user behavior and operation.
- Although helmet use is required by law when riding a motorized scooter, JUMP's application met only baseline strategies to promote and distribute helmets proposed by most or all other applicants. Based on the SFMTA's observations during the scooter roll out in spring 2018, these baseline strategies taken alone did not result in high levels of helmet use.
- The SFMTA finds that the lack of specificity throughout JUMP's discussion of parking, locking, and tethering is inadequate to ensure safe parking behavior despite listing some potentially effective strategies.

- While JUMP's application mentions exploring a tiered penalty system, the applicant did not clearly define when penalties would be levied. The lack of detail in the applicant's response underscored a lack of commitment to leveraging penalties and incentives.
- JUMP's application provided insufficient detail for staff to evaluate the company's commitment to listen to and address community feedback. JUMP mentions but does not describe plans to attend community events to gather feedback and answer questions. Attending events is a baseline strategy proposed by most applicants; without specific goals or plans to address feedback, the SFMTA negatively evaluates lack of detail as unlikely to result in applicant successfully listening to and addressing community feedback.
- JUMP's labor plan does not include specific details in approach to hiring and training employees and or contractors, and it mentions but does not describe proposed training operations. The SFMTA negatively evaluates JUMP's lack of detail regarding employment and training programs as unlikely to result in safe operational practices compared to other applicants.
- For the above factors, JUMP's responses either met only the bare minimum requirements established in the terms and conditions for holding a permit, or lacked important details, or were unlikely to result in a stated standard. JUMP's application also did not include strategies highly likely to result in success on its own or as compared to other applicants in the following areas: demonstrating commitment to environmental sustainability and demonstrating capacity to comply with city regulations through experience operating and maintaining shared mobility systems.

These factors demonstrate insufficient commitment to ensuring that JUMP's approach would result in a well-functioning and sustainable scooter share system that serves the public interest and maintains public safety when compared to the successful applicants.

In addition to these factors, in denying this application, the SFMTA evaluated the issues outlined in the Scooter Share Memorandum, the full applications of all applicants as received by June 7, 2018, and the experience and qualifications of all applicants.

Please be aware that this denial is for the Pilot program only and, as described in more detail in the Scooter Share Memorandum, SFMTA will be using the results of the Pilot to consider the development of a permanent program.

Accordingly JUMP's application for a scooter share permit is denied. As set forth in Section 916(e)(1) of the Transportation Code, JUMP may request review of SFMTA's decision to deny this permit. Applicants seeking review of a permit denial will have 15 business days from the date of notice of denial to request review of the decision by a hearing officer. The procedures for such review are available on the SFMTA's website at <http://www.sfmta.com/sharedscooters>.

Sincerely,

Tom Maguire

Tom Maguire

Director of Sustainable Streets, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency



London Breed, Mayor

Cheryl Brinkman, Chairman

Malcolm Heinicke, Vice Chairman

Gwyneth Borden, Director

Lee Hsu, Director

Cristina Rubke, Director

Art Torres, Director

Edward D. Reiskin, Director of Transportation

Sam Dreiman
Neutron Holdings, Inc.
dba Lime
1 Sansome St, Suite 2100
San Francisco, CA 94104

August 30, 2018

Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program Application – Notice of Permit Denial

Dear Sam Dreiman,

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has reviewed the permit application submitted by Neutron Holdings, Inc., dba Lime for the 2018-2019 Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program. For the reasons set forth below, the SFMTA has denied your permit application.

In accordance with San Francisco Transportation Code Sec. 916, SFMTA scooter share program staff were directed to conduct a thorough review of all permit applications and evaluate their adherence to the application requirements and their merits as compared to other applicants in order to ensure that any permitted program promotes the public interest and safety of the transportation system. The SFMTA's evaluation process is discussed in further detail in the August 30, 2018 memorandum from Director of Transportation Edward D. Reiskin to interested parties regarding the Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program (Scooter Share Memorandum).

In addition to the reasons set forth in the Scooter Share Memorandum, Neutron Holdings, Inc., dba Lime's ("Lime") permit application was denied for the following reasons:

- Lime's decision not to require drivers' license is likely to result in rentals by underage and untrained users; this was negatively evaluated by the SFMTA.
- Although helmet use is required by law when riding a motorized scooter, Lime's application met only baseline strategies to promote and distribute helmets proposed by most or all other applicants. Based on the SFMTA's observations during the scooter roll out in spring 2018, these baseline strategies taken alone did not result in high levels of helmet use.
- While Lime's application provided examples of rewards and penalty options, it did not provide details about when penalties would be levied. The lack of detail in the applicant's response underscored a lack of commitment to leveraging penalties and incentives.
- Despite proposing significantly discounted rates for low income users, the SFMTA concludes that these users would face barriers to accessing Lime's services based on the lack of detail about how users would access/qualify for these benefits.

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

1 South Van Ness Avenue, 7th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94103

SFMTA.com

311 Free language assistance / 免費語言協助 / Ayuda gratis con el idioma / Бесплатная помощь переводчиков / Trợ giúp Thông dịch Miễn phí / Assistance linguistique gratuite / 無料の言語支援 / Libreng tulong para sa wikang Filipino / 무료 언어 지원 / การช่วยเหลือทางด้านภาษาโดยไม่เสียค่าใช้จ่าย / خط المساعدة المجاني على الرقم

- The small service area and lack of commitment to redistributing for geographic equity in Lime's application are insufficient to ensure scooter availability in underserved communities.
- While Lime demonstrates experience operating shared scooter service, the SFMTA negatively evaluates Lime's history of violations while operating within San Francisco, which indicates that past strategies have been insufficient to ensure user compliance with laws.
- For the above factors, Lime's responses either met only the bare minimum requirements established in the terms and conditions for holding a permit, or lacked important details, or were unlikely to result in a stated standard. Lime's application also did not include strategies highly likely to result in success on its own or as compared to other applicants in the following areas: ensuring proper parking of scooters; ensuring qualifying residents are aware of low-income options; meaningfully engaging with members of the public including those that choose not to use scooter services; and ensuring staff and contractors have necessary knowledge and skills.

These factors demonstrate insufficient commitment to ensuring that Lime's approach would result in a well-functioning and sustainable scooter share system that serves the public interest and maintains public safety when compared to the successful applicants.

In addition to these factors, in denying this application, the SFMTA evaluated the issues outlined in the Scooter Share Memorandum, the full applications of all applicants as received by June 7, 2018, and the experience and qualifications of all applicants.

Please be aware that this denial is for the Pilot program only and, as described in more detail in the Scooter Share Memorandum, SFMTA will be using the results of the Pilot to consider the development of a permanent program.

Accordingly, Lime's application for a scooter share permit is denied. As set forth in Section 916(e)(1) of the Transportation Code, Lime may request review of SFMTA's decision to deny this permit. Applicants seeking review of a permit denial will have 15 business days from the date of notice of denial to request review of the decision by a hearing officer. The procedures for such review are available on the SFMTA's website at <http://www.sfmta.com/sharedscooters>.

Sincerely,



Tom Maguire

Director of Sustainable Streets, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency



London Breed, Mayor

Cheryl Brinkman, Chairman
Malcolm Heinicke, Vice Chairman
Gwyneth Borden, Director
Lee Hsu, Director

Cristina Rubke, Director
Art Torres, Director

Edward D. Reiskin, Director of Transportation

Lucas Van Houten
Lyft
12723 166th Street
Cerritos, CA 90703

August 30, 2018

Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program Application – Notice of Permit Denial

Dear Lucas Van Houten,

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has reviewed the permit application submitted by Lyft for the 2018-2019 Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program. For the reasons set forth below, the SFMTA has denied your permit application.

In accordance with San Francisco Transportation Code Sec. 916, SFMTA scooter share program staff were directed to conduct a thorough review of all permit applications and evaluate their adherence to the application requirements and their merits as compared to other applicants in order to ensure that any permitted program promotes the public interest and safety of the transportation system. The SFMTA's evaluation process is discussed in further detail in the August 30, 2018 memorandum from Director of Transportation Edward D. Reiskin to interested parties regarding the Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program (Scooter Share Memorandum).

In addition to the reasons set forth in the Scooter Share Memorandum, Lyft's permit application was denied for the following reasons:

- Lyft's proposed strategies to educate and train users regarding safe vehicle operations met only baseline strategies proposed by most or all other applicants. Based on staff's observations during the scooter roll out in spring 2018, these baseline strategies taken alone were not effective in addressing safe user behavior and operation.
- Although helmet use is required by law when riding a motorized scooter, Lyft's application met only baseline strategies to promote and distribute helmets proposed by most or all other applicants. Based on the SFMTA's observations during the scooter roll out in spring 2018, these baseline strategies taken alone did not result in high levels of helmet use.
- While Lyft reserves the right in its application to suspend use of platform/service to users who demonstrate poor compliance with laws governing scooter operation, the applicant does not define when such a penalty would be levied. The lack of detail in the applicant's response underscored a lack of commitment to leveraging penalties and incentives.

- Despite the fact that somewhat extended hours of operations would serve users when transit service is more limited, the SFMTA concludes that Lyft's proposed small service area and lack of specific rebalancing plan are insufficient to ensure availability of scooters in underserved communities.
- While experience operating ridehail services lends credibility to various business aspects of Lyft's proposal, the applicant has no experience to date owning or operating shared mobility equipment in the public right-of-way. Furthermore, the history of violation of traffic laws by ride-hail contractors, including Lyft's, creates some concern about applicant's ability to comply with local regulations.
- For the above factors, Lyft's responses either met only the bare minimum requirements established in the terms and conditions for holding a permit, or lacked important details, or were unlikely to result in a stated standard. Lyft's application also did not include strategies highly likely to result in success on its own or as compared to other applicants in the following areas: ensuring proper parking of scooters; ensuring qualifying residents are aware of low-income options; meaningfully engaging with members of the public including those that choose not to use scooter services; and ensuring staff and contractors have necessary knowledge and skills.

These factors demonstrate insufficient commitment to ensuring that Lyft's approach would result in a well-functioning and sustainable scooter share system that serves the public interest and maintains public safety when compared to the successful applicants.

In addition to these factors, in denying this application, the SFMTA evaluated the issues outlined in the Scooter Share Memorandum, the full applications of all applicants as received by June 7, 2018, and the experience and qualifications of all applicants.

Please be aware that this denial is for the Pilot program only and, as described in more detail in the Scooter Share Memorandum, SFMTA will be using the results of the Pilot to consider the development of a permanent program.

Accordingly, Lyft's application for a scooter share permit is denied. As set forth in Section 916(e)(1) of the Transportation Code, Lyft may request review of SFMTA's decision to deny this permit. Applicants seeking review of a permit denial will have 15 business days from the date of notice of denial to request review of the decision by a hearing officer. The procedures for such review are available on the SFMTA's website at <http://www.sfmta.com/sharedscooters>.

Sincerely,

Tom Maguire

Tom Maguire

Director of Sustainable Streets, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency



London Breed, Mayor

Cheryl Brinkman, Chairman

Malcolm Heinicke, Vice Chairman

Gwyneth Borden, Director

Lee Hsu, Director

Cristina Rubke, Director

Art Torres, Director

Edward D. Reiskin, Director of Transportation

James Moore
ofo US Limited
995 Market St.
San Francisco, CA 94103

August 30, 2018

Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program Application – Notice of Permit Denial

Dear James Moore,

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has reviewed the permit application submitted by ofo US Limited for the 2018-2019 Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program. For the reasons set forth below, the SFMTA has denied your permit application.

In accordance with San Francisco Transportation Code Sec. 916, SFMTA scooter share program staff were directed to conduct a thorough review of all permit applications and evaluate their adherence to the application requirements and their merits as compared to other applicants in order to ensure that any permitted program promotes the public interest and safety of the transportation system. The SFMTA's evaluation process is discussed in further detail in the August 30, 2018 memorandum from Director of Transportation Edward D. Reiskin to interested parties regarding the Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program (Scooter Share Memorandum).

In addition to the reasons set forth in the Scooter Share Memorandum, ofo US Limited's ("ofo") permit application was denied for the following reasons:

- ofo's strategy to educate and train users about safe scooter operation through swipe-through screens met only baseline strategies proposed by most or all other applicants. Based on staff's observations during the scooter roll out in spring 2018, these baseline strategies taken alone were not effective in addressing safe user behavior and operation.
- ofo's offer to provide free helmets upon request met only baseline strategies proposed by most or all other applicants. Based on the SFMTA's observations during the scooter roll out in spring 2018, these baseline strategies taken alone did not result in high levels of helmet use.
- ofo's proposed penalties for parking improperly are likely to result in improved parking behavior, but other penalties were not discussed. Furthermore, the SFMTA finds that ofo's disavowal of responsibility for enforcing safe riding demonstrates insufficient commitment to safety compared to successful applicants.

- The outreach approaches ofo proposes, including its strategy for community outreach with various groups focusing on Communities of Concern and numerous language options for customers, demonstrates some understanding of the SFMTA's goals to promote low income programs but does not provide sufficient detail as to how that would be accomplished. The SFMTA negatively evaluates this lack of detail as unlikely to ensure that low income residents are aware of services and how to participate.
- ofo's approach to outreach makes no mention of attempts to engage members of the public generally, including those that choose not to use scooter services. Failure to include strategies to engage members of the public who do not choose to use scooter services is a flaw in this application.
- ofo's approach to operations and disposal mentions general recycling of "of mobility devices" but contains no mention of battery recycling. The SFMTA negatively evaluates this response, which fails to address critical requirements of San Francisco's Zero Waste Policy.
- For the above factors, ofo's responses either met only the bare minimum requirements established in the terms and conditions for holding a permit, or lacked important details, or were unlikely to result in a stated standard. ofo's application also did not include strategies highly likely to result in success on its own or as compared to other applicants in the following areas: ensuring proper parking of scooters; reducing barriers to access for low-income residents and ensuring availability of scooters in underserved areas.

These factors demonstrate insufficient commitment to ensuring that ofo's approach would result in a well-functioning and sustainable scooter share system that serves the public interest and maintains public safety when compared to the successful applicants.

In addition to these factors, in denying this application, the SFMTA evaluated the issues outlined in the Scooter Share Memorandum, the full applications of all applicants as received by June 7, 2018, and the experience and qualifications of all applicants.

Please be aware that this denial is for the Pilot program only and, as described in more detail in the Scooter Share Memorandum, SFMTA will be using the results of the Pilot to consider the development of a permanent program.

Accordingly ofo US Limited's application for a scooter share permit is denied. As set forth in Section 916(e)(1) of the Transportation Code, ofo may request review of SFMTA's decision to deny this permit. Applicants seeking review of a permit denial will have 15 business days from the date of notice of denial to request review of the decision by a hearing officer. The procedures for such review are available on the SFMTA's website at <http://www.sfmta.com/sharedscooters>.

Sincerely,

Tom Maguire

Tom Maguire

Director of Sustainable Streets, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency



London Breed, Mayor

Cheryl Brinkman, Chairman
Malcolm Heinicke, Vice Chairman
Gwyneth Borden, Director
Lee Hsu, Director

Cristina Rubke, Director
Art Torres, Director

Edward D. Reiskin, Director of Transportation

Danny Simon
Razor USA
12723 166th Street
Cerritos, CA 90703

August 30, 2018

Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program Application – Notice of Permit Denial

Dear Danny Simon,

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has reviewed the permit application submitted by Razor USA for the 2018-2019 Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program. For the reasons set forth below, the SFMTA has denied your permit application.

In accordance with San Francisco Transportation Code Sec. 916, SFMTA scooter share program staff were directed to conduct a thorough review of all permit applications and evaluate their adherence to the application requirements and their merits as compared to other applicants in order to ensure that any permitted program promotes the public interest and safety of the transportation system. The SFMTA's evaluation process is discussed in further detail in the August 30, 2018 memorandum from Director of Transportation Edward D. Reiskin to interested parties regarding the Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program (Scooter Share Memorandum).

In addition to the reasons set forth in the Scooter Share Memorandum, Razor USA's ("Razor") permit application was denied for the following reasons:

- Razor's proposed strategies to educate and train users met only baseline strategies proposed by most or all other applicants. Based on staff's observations during the scooter roll out in spring 2018, these baseline strategies taken alone were not effective in addressing safe user behavior and operation.
- Although helmet use is required by law when riding a motorized scooter, Razor's application does not propose a mechanism for providing or encouraging helmet use, which is a significant flaw in this application.
- While Razor proposes preventing users who are habitually noncompliant from continuing to use the service, the lack of detail in Razor's response underscored lack of commitment to leveraging penalties and incentives.
- Despite proposing significantly discounted rates for low income users, the SFMTA concludes that these users would face barriers to accessing Razor's services based on the lack of detail about how users would access/qualify for these benefits.

- The small service area and lack of specific rebalancing plans in Razor’s application are insufficient to ensure availability in underserved communities.
- Razor’s plan for providing a low income option does not explain the mechanism that would be used to approve participation, nor does it address key issues for low income users such as how a potential user would access the service if they do not have access to a credit card or smart phone. Additionally, Razor’s failure to include strategies to ensure awareness of low income programs is a significant flaw in the application.
- While Razor proposed to provide program information and contact information to “CBDs” to provide feedback and complaints, the SFMTA considers this a baseline strategy that will be required of all permittees. The SFMTA negatively evaluates the lack of any proposals to proactively seek feedback from the community. The SFMTA negatively evaluates the lack of any proposals to proactively seek feedback from the community.
- While Razor’s experience manufacturing scooters lends credibility to certain aspects of the proposal, the company’s lack of experience owning or operating shared mobility infrastructure in the public right-of-way reduces the credibility of Razor’s qualifications in most areas.
- Razor’s application provides very limited detail regarding labor and operations, and mentions but does not describe training for maintenance staff. The SFMTA negatively evaluates lack of detail regarding training programs as unlikely to result in safe operational practices compared to other applicants.
- For the above factors, Razor’s responses either met only the bare minimum requirements established in the terms and conditions for holding a permit, or lacked important details, or were unlikely to result in a stated standard. Razor’s application also did not include strategies highly likely to result in success on its own or as compared to other applicants in the following areas: ensuring proper parking of scooters and demonstrating commitment to environmental sustainability.

These factors demonstrate insufficient commitment to ensuring that your approach would result in a well-functioning and sustainable scooter share system that serves the public interest and maintains public safety when compared to the successful applicants.

In addition to these factors, in denying this application, the SFMTA evaluated the issues outlined in the Scooter Share Memorandum, the full applications of all applicants as received by June 7, 2018, and the experience and qualifications of all applicants.

Please be aware that this denial is for the Pilot program only and, as described in more detail in the Scooter Share Memorandum, SFMTA will be using the results of the Pilot to consider the development of a permanent program.

Accordingly, Razor USA’s application for a scooter share permit is denied. As set forth in Section 916(e)(1) of the Transportation Code, Razor may request review of SFMTA’s decision to deny this permit. Applicants seeking review of a permit denial will have 15 business days from the date of

notice of denial to request review of the decision by a hearing officer. The procedures for such review are available on the SFMTA's website at <http://www.sfmta.com/sharedscooters>.

Sincerely,

Tom Maguire

Tom Maguire

Director of Sustainable Streets, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency



London Breed, Mayor

Cheryl Brinkman, Chairman

Malcolm Heinicke, Vice Chairman

Gwyneth Borden, Director

Lee Hsu, Director

Cristina Rubke, Director

Art Torres, Director

Edward D. Reiskin, Director of Transportation

JD Higginbotham
Ridecell Inc.
514 Bryan Street
San Francisco, CA 94107

August 30, 2018

Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program Application – Notice of Permit Denial

Dear JD Higginbotham,

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has reviewed the permit application submitted by Ridecell Inc. for the 2018-2019 Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program. For the reasons set forth below, the SFMTA has denied your permit application.

In accordance with San Francisco Transportation Code Sec. 916, SFMTA scooter share program staff were directed to conduct a thorough review of all permit applications and evaluate their adherence to the application requirements and their merits as compared to other applicants in order to ensure that any permitted program promotes the public interest and safety of the transportation system. The SFMTA's evaluation process is discussed in further detail in the August 30, 2018 memorandum from Director of Transportation Edward D. Reiskin to interested parties regarding the Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program (Scooter Share Memorandum).

In addition to the reasons set forth in the Scooter Share Memorandum, Ridecell Inc.'s ("Ridecell") permit application was denied for the following reasons:

- Although helmet use is required by law when riding a motorized scooter, Ridecell failed to include a strategy to distribute helmets. All but one other applicant met this minimum requirement by providing free helmets upon request or organized helmet giveaways.
- Ridecell's application contained no mention of locking or tethering scooters. Failure to address locking/tethering and minimal alternate strategies demonstrates lack of commitment to ensuring safe parking behavior. The SFMTA negatively evaluates this response as being unlikely to result in positive parking outcomes.
- While Ridecell proposes preventing users who are habitually noncompliant from continuing to use the service, lack of further detail in response underscored lack of commitment to leveraging penalties and incentives.

- Despite significantly discounted rates, the SFMTA concludes that low income users would face barriers to accessing Ridecell's services based on the lack of detail about how users would access/qualify for these benefits.
- Ridecell's plans to distribute flyers and promotions in low income communities and intent to highlight discounts to low income residents demonstrates some understanding of the SFMTA's goals to promote low income programs, but does not provide sufficient detail as to how these would be accomplished. The SFMTA negatively evaluates this lack of detail as unlikely to ensure that low income residents are aware of services and how to participate.
- Ridecell mentions but does not describe strategies to attend community events and meetings to capture feedback on issues and how to improve the service. The SFMTA considers these to be baseline strategies proposed by most applicants; without specific goals or plans to address feedback, the SFMTA negatively evaluates lack of detail as unlikely to result in applicant successfully listening to and addressing community feedback.
- Ridecell's proposed operations and labor plan cite use of independent contractors to charge, deploy and redistribute scooters, including at private homes or small businesses. Plans also mention, but do not describe, plans to provide robust training on a continuing basis and a focus on employment for low-income residents. The SFMTA negatively evaluates lack of detail regarding training programs as well as reliance on minimally trained independent contractors for charging and some maintenance activities as unlikely to result in safe operational practices compared to other applicants.
- Although Ridecell has developed software used in operating ridehail and carshare systems, the SFMTA negatively evaluates Ridecell's lack of experience to date owning/operating shared mobility infrastructure in the public right-of-way.
- For the above factors, Ridecell's responses either met only the bare minimum requirements established in the terms and conditions for holding a permit, or lacked important details, or were unlikely to result in a stated standard. Ridecell's application also did not include strategies highly likely to result in success on its own or as compared to other applicants in the following areas: education and training around safe operations and demonstrating commitment to environmental sustainability.

These factors demonstrate insufficient commitment to ensuring that Ridecell's approach would result in a well-functioning and sustainable scooter share system that serves the public interest and maintains public safety when compared to the successful applicants.

In addition to these factors, in denying this application, the SFMTA evaluated the issues outlined in the Scooter Share Memorandum, the full applications of all applicants as received by June 7, 2018, and the experience and qualifications of all applicants.

Please be aware that this denial is for the Pilot program only and, as described in more detail in the Scooter Share Memorandum, SFMTA will be using the results of the Pilot to consider the development of a permanent program.

Accordingly, Ridecell Inc.'s application for a scooter share permit is denied. As set forth in Section 916(e)(1) of the Transportation Code, Ridecell may request review of SFMTA's decision to deny this permit. Applicants seeking review of a permit denial will have 15 business days from the date of notice of denial to request review of the decision by a hearing officer. The procedures for such review are available on the SFMTA's website at <http://www.sfmta.com/sharedscooters>.

Sincerely,

Tom Maguire

Tom Maguire

Director of Sustainable Streets, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency



London Breed, Mayor

Cheryl Brinkman, Chairman
Malcolm Heinicke, Vice Chairman
Gwyneth Borden, Director
Lee Hsu, Director

Cristina Rubke, Director
Art Torres, Director

Edward D. Reiskin, Director of Transportation

Michael Keating
Scoot Networks Inc.
1255 Howard St.
San Francisco, CA 94103

August 30, 2018

Invitation to Participate in Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program

Dear Michael Keating,

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has reviewed Scoot Networks Inc.'s completed permit application materials for participation in the SFMTA's 2018 - 2019 Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program. The SFMTA has approved Scoot's permit application and has selected Scoot to be one of the operators in the one-year pilot program.

Further detail on the SFMTA's application evaluation process is detailed in the accompanied memorandum from SFMTA Director of Transportation, Edward D. Reiskin, to interested parties regarding the Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program.

The SFMTA intends to issue permits to pilot program operators by no later than October 15, 2018.

As such, the agency requests the availability of key Scoot representatives in the next two weeks to review, with the SFMTA staff, the permit terms and conditions, and any other materials required to ensure timely permit issuance.

Please promptly confirm receipt of this letter and advise as to the availability of key company representatives to discuss next steps.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tom Maguire".

Tom Maguire

Director of Sustainable Streets, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 7th Floor San Francisco, CA 94103 SFMTA.com

311 Free language assistance / 免費語言協助 / Ayuda gratis con el idioma / Бесплатная помощь переводчиков / Trợ giúp Thông dịch Miễn phí / Assistance linguistique gratuite / 無料の言語支援 / Libreng tulong para sa wikang Filipino / 무료 언어 지원 / การช่วยเหลือทางด้านภาษาโดยไม่เสียค่าใช้จ่าย / خط المساعدة المجاني على الرقم



London Breed, Mayor

Cheryl Brinkman, Chairman
Malcolm Heinicke, Vice Chairman
Gwyneth Borden, Director
Lee Hsu, Director

Cristina Rubke, Director
Art Torres, Director

Edward D. Reiskin, Director of Transportation

Darren Weingard
Waybots Inc., dba Skip
1161 Mission Street, Ste 510
San Francisco, CA 94103

August 30, 2018

Invitation to Participate in Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program

Dear Darren Weingard,

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has reviewed Skip's completed permit application materials for participation in the SFMTA's 2018 - 2019 Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program. The SFMTA has approved Skip's permit application and has selected Skip to be one of the operators in the one-year pilot program.

Further detail on the SFMTA's application evaluation process is detailed in the accompanied memorandum from SFMTA Director of Transportation, Edward D. Reiskin, to interested parties regarding the Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program.

The SFMTA intends to issue permits to pilot program operators by no later than October 15, 2018.

As such, the agency requests the availability of key Skip representatives in the next two weeks to review, with the SFMTA staff, the permit terms and conditions, and any other materials required to ensure timely permit issuance.

Please promptly confirm receipt of this letter and advise as to the availability of key company representatives to discuss next steps.

Sincerely,

Tom Maguire

Tom Maguire

Director of Sustainable Streets, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

1 South Van Ness Avenue, 7th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94103

SFMTA.com

311 Free language assistance / 免費語言協助 / Ayuda gratis con el idioma / Бесплатная помощь переводчиков / Trợ giúp Thông dịch Miễn phí / Assistance linguistique gratuite / 無料の言語支援 / Libreng tulong para sa wikang Filipino / 무료 언어 지원 / การช่วยเหลือทางด้านภาษาโดยไม่เสียค่าใช้จ่าย / خط المساعدة المجاني على الرقم



London Breed, Mayor

Cheryl Brinkman, Chairman
Malcolm Heinicke, Vice Chairman
Gwyneth Borden, Director
Lee Hsu, Director

Cristina Rubke, Director
Art Torres, Director

Edward D. Reiskin, Director of Transportation

Derrick Ko
Skinny Labs Inc.
188 King St. #203
San Francisco, CA 94107

August 30, 2018

Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program Application – Notice of Permit Denial

Dear Derrick Ko,

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has reviewed the permit application submitted by Spin for the 2018-2019 Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program. For the reasons set forth below, the SFMTA has denied your permit application.

In accordance with San Francisco Transportation Code Sec. 916, SFMTA scooter share program staff were directed to conduct a thorough review of all permit applications and evaluate their adherence to the application requirements and their merits as compared to other applicants in order to ensure that any permitted program promotes the public interest and safety of the transportation system. The SFMTA's evaluation process is discussed in further detail in the August 30, 2018 memorandum from Director of Transportation Edward D. Reiskin to interested parties regarding the Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program (Scooter Share Memorandum).

In addition to the reasons set forth in the Scooter Share Memorandum, Spin's permit application was denied for the following reasons:

- Although helmet use is required by law when riding a motorized scooter, Spin's application met only baseline strategies proposed by most or all other applicants. Based on the SFMTA's observations during the scooter roll out in spring 2018, these baseline strategies taken alone did not result in high levels of helmet use.
- While Spin proposes escalating action for noncompliant users—including fines, temporary suspensions, and bans—the application does not describe the circumstances when penalties would be levied, except for one example. The lack of detail in Spin's response underscored the applicant's lack of commitment to leveraging penalties and incentives.
- The SFMTA concludes that Spin's proposed small service area and lack of specific rebalancing plans are insufficient to ensure availability in underserved communities. Spin's intent to work with the SFMTA to determine priority distribution areas is insufficiently detailed to be considered in the Agency's evaluation of Spin's rebalancing plan.

- Spin’s application provided insufficient detail for staff to evaluate the company’s commitment to listen to and address community feedback. Spin mentions but does not describe meetings with stakeholders and attendance at community events, which is a baseline strategy proposed by most applicants; without specific goals or plans to address feedback, the SFMTA negatively evaluates lack of detail as unlikely to result in applicant successfully listening to and addressing community feedback.
- The SFMTA negatively evaluates Spin’s reliance on independent contractors using their own tools and equipment for charging and in particular for maintenance activities, which could compromise the safety and reliability of Spin’s system.
- While Spin demonstrates experience operating shared scooter service, the SFMTA negatively evaluates Spin’s history of violations while operating within San Francisco, which indicates that past strategies have been insufficient to ensure user compliance with laws.
- For the above factors, Spin’s responses either met only the bare minimum requirements established in the terms and conditions for holding a permit, or lacked important details, or were unlikely to result in a stated standard. Spin’s application also did not include strategies highly likely to result in success on its own or as compared to other applicants in the following areas: education and training around safe operations; reducing barriers to access for low-income residents; and demonstrating commitment to environmental sustainability.

These factors demonstrate insufficient commitment to ensuring that Spin’s approach would result in a well-functioning and sustainable scooter share system that serves the public interest and maintains public safety when compared to the successful applicants.

In addition to these factors, in denying this application, the SFMTA evaluated the issues outlined in the Scooter Share Memorandum, the full applications of all applicants as received by June 7, 2018, and the experience and qualifications of all applicants.

Please be aware that this denial is for the Pilot program only and, as described in more detail in the Scooter Share Memorandum, SFMTA will be using the results of the Pilot to consider the development of a permanent program.

Accordingly, Spin’s application for a scooter share permit is denied. As set forth in Section 916(e)(1) of the Transportation Code, Spin may request review of SFMTA’s decision to deny this permit. Applicants seeking review of a permit denial will have 15 business days from the date of notice of denial to request review of the decision by a hearing officer. The procedures for such review are available on the SFMTA’s website at <http://www.sfmta.com/sharedscooters>.

Sincerely,

Tom Maguire

Tom Maguire

Director of Sustainable Streets, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency



London Breed, Mayor

Cheryl Brinkman, Chairman
Malcolm Heinicke, Vice Chairman
Gwyneth Borden, Director
Lee Hsu, Director

Cristina Rubke, Director
Art Torres, Director

Edward D. Reiskin, Director of Transportation

Dawn Thompson
Uscooters LLC
8737 Venice Blvd. Suite 102
Los Angeles, CA 90034

August 30, 2018

Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program Application – Notice of Permit Denial

Dear Dawn Thompson,

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has reviewed the permit application submitted by UScooter LLC for the 2018-2019 Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program. For the reasons set forth below, the SFMTA has denied your permit application.

In accordance with San Francisco Transportation Code Sec. 916, SFMTA scooter share program staff were directed to conduct a thorough review of all permit applications and evaluate their adherence to the application requirements and their merits as compared to other applicants in order to ensure that any permitted program promotes the public interest and safety of the transportation system. The SFMTA's evaluation process is discussed in further detail in the August 30, 2018 memorandum from Director of Transportation Edward D. Reiskin to interested parties regarding the Pilot Powered Scooter Share Permit Program (Scooter Share Memorandum).

In addition to the reasons set forth in the Scooter Share Memorandum, UScooter LLC's ("UScooter") permit application was denied for the following reasons:

- Although helmet use is required by law when riding a motorized scooter, UScooter's application does not propose a mechanism for providing or encouraging helmet use, which is a significant flaw in this application.
- While UScooter proposes preventing users who are habitually noncompliant from continuing to use your service, the lack of detail in your response underscored UScooter's lack of commitment to leveraging penalties and incentives to support appropriate operation and parking by users.
- While UScooter proposes low income memberships, the application does not mention the rate low income users would be charged to use UScooter's service, nor does it describe the mechanism for participation. The application therefore provides insufficient detail for the SFMTA to evaluate whether low income users will be able to access system at affordable rates.
- UScooter's application mentions but does not describe a plan to develop collaborative partnerships and to understand diverse communities, and no specific strategies are given to

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

1 South Van Ness Avenue, 7th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94103

SFMTA.com

☎ 311 Free language assistance / 免費語言協助 / Ayuda gratis con el idioma / Бесплатная помощь переводчиков / Trợ giúp Thông dịch Miễn phí / Assistance linguistique gratuite / 無料の言語支援 / Libreng tulong para sa wikang Filipino / 무료 언어 지원 / การช่วยเหลือทางด้านภาษาโดยไม่เสียค่าใช้จ่าย / خط المساعدة المجاني على الرقم

ensure that low income residents are aware of the service and how to participate. The SFMTA negatively evaluates this lack of detail as unlikely to ensure that low income residents are aware of services and how to participate.

- The application does not mention attempts to engage members of the public generally. The failure to include strategies to engage members of the public who do not choose to use scooter services is a flaw in UScooter's application.
- While UScooter's experience manufacturing electric scooters lends credibility to certain aspects of the proposal, the company's lack of experience owning or operating shared mobility infrastructure in the public right-of-way reduces the credibility of UScooter's qualifications in most areas.
- UScooter's application provides very limited detail regarding sustainability, particularly with respect to San Francisco's Zero Waste Policy. The SFMTA negatively evaluates the response, which fails to address critical requirements of the Zero Waste Policy.
- For the above factors, UScooter's responses either met only the bare minimum requirements established in the terms and conditions for holding a permit, or lacked important details, or were unlikely to result in a stated standard. UScooter's application also did not include strategies highly likely to result in success on its own or as compared to other applicants in the following areas: education and training around safe operations; ensuring proper parking of scooters; ensuring availability of scooters in underserved areas; demonstrating understanding of operational needs; and ensuring staff and contractors have necessary knowledge and skills.

These factors demonstrate insufficient commitment to ensuring that Uscooter's approach would result in a well-functioning and sustainable scooter share system that serves the public interest and maintains public safety when compared to the successful applicants.

In addition to these factors, in denying this application, the SFMTA evaluated the issues outlined in the Scooter Share Memorandum, the full applications of all applicants as received by June 7, 2018, and the experience and qualifications of all applicants.

Please be aware that this denial is for the Pilot program only and, as described in more detail in the Scooter Share Memorandum, SFMTA will be using the results of the Pilot to consider the development of a permanent program.

Accordingly, UScooter LLC's application for a scooter share permit is denied. As set forth in Section 916(e)(1) of the Transportation Code, UScooter may request review of SFMTA's decision to deny this permit. Applicants seeking review of a permit denial will have 15 business days from the date of notice of denial to request review of the decision by a hearing officer. The procedures for such review are available on the SFMTA's website at <http://www.sfmta.com/sharedscooters>.

Sincerely,

Tom Maguire

Tom Maguire

Director of Sustainable Streets, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency