

CONSENT CALENDAR

September 30, 2025

To: Honorable Members of the City Council

From: Councilmember Lunaparra (Author), Councilmember Blackaby (Co-Sponsor), Councilmember Humbert (Co-Sponsor), Councilmember Tregub (Co-Sponsor)

Subject: Refer to the City Manager in Collaboration with the City Attorney's Office to Develop Proposed Increases to the Shared Micromobility Program Fees

RECOMMENDATION

Refer to the City Manager in collaboration with the City Attorney's Office to develop proposed increases to the shared micromobility program fees and return to Council within 120 days. The proposed amendments should evaluate adjustments to the following fee categories:

- Application fee
- Operating fee
- Fee per vehicle
- Fee per ride

POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

On September 3, 2025, the Facilities, Infrastructure, Transportation, Environment & Sustainability Committee adopted the following action: M/S/C (Taplin/Lunaparra) to send item to Council with a positive recommendation. Vote: Ayes – Taplin, Lunaparra; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Humbert

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

Berkeley started its shared micromobility program in April 2022, with the goal of addressing gas-vehicle's exacerbation of climate change, offering convenient transportation options throughout the city, and creating safer streets for all. While the program has been extremely effective, there has been a persistent issue related to improperly parked scooters, largely due to insufficient scooter and bike parking infrastructure. The City Council frequently receives complaints regarding this problem.

To sustain this essential program that aligns with Berkeley values and policy commitments, it is important to adjust the shared micromobility program fees to meet the needs of all residents who use our sidewalks and streets. These fees have remained static since the program's launch, while cost of living, construction costs, and the City's budget deficit have increased. In 2024, Portland State University's Transportation Research and Education Center published a study explaining that, "now might be a logical time to re-evaluate fee structures, particularly those cities that have

made minimal changes to the program terms since the beginning of the shared micromobility industry.”¹ With the quickly shifting landscape of the industry and an uncertain budget, Berkeley should amend fees to become more consistent with similarly effective programs.

With additional revenue, the City could meet evolving needs and support the development and installation of necessary scooter and bike parking, racks, and infrastructure to ensure the program’s continued success.

The request that staff return to Council with an amended contract within 120 days is to ensure the process is finalized before the Spring Request For Proposal timeline.

BACKGROUND

Since the start of Berkeley’s shared micromobility program in 2022, the most common complaint amongst community members has been improper parking of shared vehicles. Many complaints cite scooters blocking the public right-of-way, making it difficult to safely use streets and sidewalks. As the program provides significant benefits to residents citywide—demonstrated by one of the highest ridership rates in the Bay Area—and plays a vital role in advancing our climate and transit goals, it’s critical to creatively address these issues while remaining committed to the long-term viability of the program.

District 7 has one of the lowest rates of car ownership in Berkeley and the shared micromobility program has fundamentally and critically changed the way residents get around. This is evident in the fact that District 7 accounts for 37% of all shared micromobility rides across the entire City. With a high rate of ridership and UC Berkeley’s restriction of shared micromobility devices on campus, the district experiences a large share of improper parking incidents, creating hazardous conditions for people with disabilities, seniors, pedestrians, and cyclists. A study by the University of Oregon’s Urbanism Next Center found that 13% of improper parking is due to insufficient parking, 9% is because people parked how others did, and 7% of incidents were because people were in a hurry.² To address these three pertinent issues and reduce right-of-way obstructions, the City, along with our shared micromobility vendors, must invest in more dedicated scooter and bike parking facilities.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

Berkeley’s shared micromobility program charges vendors less than those in other jurisdictions with comparable ridership levels. When Berkeley’s program started, public-private shared micromobility initiatives were still relatively new and still in the process of refining oversight mechanisms, best practices, and sustainable fee structures. Berkeley’s fees do not reflect the evolving challenges of the program or the high demand it sustains. The current fee structure fails to generate sufficient revenue to offset the cost of administering and sustaining the program while also supporting the development and construction of scooter and bike parking. This is a necessary part of effectively maintaining Berkeley’s high level of ridership while keeping sidewalks and streets safe and accessible.

¹ John MacArthur, Kevin Fang, and Calvin Thigpen, *Taxing Shared Micromobility: Assessing the Global Landscape of Fees and Taxes and Their Implications for Cities, Riders, and Operators*, research report (Portland, OR: Transportation Research and Education Center, Portland State University, June 2024), https://ppms.trec.pdx.edu/media/project_files/PSU_SSU_micromobility_fees_and_taxes_report.pdf.

² Calvin Thigpen, Nicholas Klein, and Anne Brown, *Dedicated Parking for Micromobility: A Practical Guide for Implementation* (Portland, OR: Urbanism Next Center, 2025), accessed July 17, 2025, <https://www.urbanismnext.org/resources/dedicated-parking-for-micromobility>

The following data provides a direct comparative analysis of shared micromobility fee structures across a sample of California cities, including regional neighbors and other cities with a large university presence.

	Application fee	Annual operating fee	Number of operators	Per vehicle	Permitted vehicles	Other fees	Total revenue/yr
Berkeley ³ (2025)	\$1,500	\$15,000	2	\$64	825	-	\$85,800
Oakland ⁴ (2025)	\$2,500	\$30,000	2	\$64	2,000	-	\$193,000
San Francisco ⁵ (2025)	\$6,173	\$44,041	2	see other fees	total: 5,500, added: 2,872	One time \$100/ device, for bike racks	\$381,455
San Jose ⁶ (2025)	\$4,000	-	1	\$139	1,000	\$10,000 deposit	\$143,000
Emeryville ⁷ (2025)	\$1,000	\$2,500	1	-	-	-	\$3,500
Santa Monica ⁸ (2025)	-	\$20,000	4	\$104	2,200	\$.2/trip for PROW	\$451,225
Sacramento ⁹ (2025)	\$4,400.00	-	2	\$104	1,500	\$.1 per trip, for infrastructure	\$221,375
West Sacramento ¹⁰ (2025)	1st yr: \$2,500 Renew: \$1,500	-	2	-	500	\$.1 per trip, for monitoring	\$9,387

³ https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/SEMPP%20Application_2024.pdf Iris Kwok, "Berkeley Approves Fleet of Lime Rental E-Scooters," *Berkeleyside*, July 5, 2024, accessed July 10, 2025, <https://www.berkeleyside.org/2024/07/05/berkeley-fleet-of-lime-rental-e-scooters>.

⁴ City of Oakland. 2025. *2025–2026 Scooter-Sharing Terms and Conditions (Redlined)*. *Dockless Vehicle Share Program*. Last updated April 16, 2025. Oakland, CA: Oakland Department of Transportation. <https://www.oaklandca.gov/files/assets/city/v/1/transportation/documents/car-share-bike-share-amp-scooter-share/bike-share/redlined-2025-2026-scooter-sharing-terms-and-conditions.pdf>

⁵ City of San Francisco, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, *FY25-FY26 Powered Scooter Share Permit Program* (memorandum from Jeffrey Tumlin, Director of Transportation, and Kate Toran, Taxis, Access & Mobility Services Director, May 30, 2024), San Francisco, CA: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, <https://www.sfmta.com/media/39651/download?inline>.

⁶ City of San José, *Resolution No. RES2024-230: Amending Resolution No. 72737 to Amend and Establish Various Fees and Charges, Effective July 1, 2024*, adopted June 11, 2024, City Council agenda item 3.5(b), accessed July 10, 2025, <https://records.sanjoseca.gov/Resolutions/RES2024-230.pdf>.

⁷ City of Emeryville, *Master Fee Schedule* (approved April 15, 2025; effective July 1, 2025; Emeryville, CA: City of Emeryville), <https://www.emeryville.org/files/assets/city/v/1/public-works/documents/environmental-programs/waste/coe-master-fee-schedule.pdf>.

⁸ City of Santa Monica, *Second Shared Mobility Device Program Administrative Regulations*, December 2024 (Santa Monica, CA: Santa Monica Mobility Division, City of Santa Monica), https://www.santamonica.gov/media/Mobility/Shared_Mobility/Second%20Shared%20Mobility%20Device%20Program%20Admin%20Regs_Dec2024.pdf.

⁹ City of Sacramento, *Resolution No. 2021-0260, Approving Shared-Rideable Permit Fees*, adopted by the City Council on August 17, 2021, accessed July 10, 2025, <https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/content/dam/portal/pw/Transportation/Transportation-Planning/Shared-Rideables/R2021-0260-Approving-Shared-Rideable-Permit-Fees.pdf>.

¹⁰ <https://www.cityofwestsacramento.org/home/showpublisheddocument/19751/638711634834530000>

Davis ¹¹ (2025)	-	\$10,000	1	-	600+	→ \$46,400 UCD → \$.2 per ride	\$16,400
Long Beach ¹² (2025)	-	\$25,000	2	\$75	3,000	→ \$75 inspection → \$.25 per trip	\$430,425
Culver City ¹³ (2025)	-	\$20,000	1	\$100	200+	\$.2 per ride	\$66,000

*Data from July 1, 2024 - June 30, 2025

**2024/2025 Long Beach ride data was not publicly available, data is based on 2023 statistics

***These numbers do not include fines or penalties

This data shows some fee areas where Berkeley charges a similar amount to other jurisdictions and others where Berkeley is undercharging. Certainly, this data only presents half of the larger market picture. There are other critical factors when calculating if Berkeley is charging market rate for permits. Many of the referenced municipalities that charge higher fees are larger or deploy more scooters than Berkeley, so to better understand how Berkeley’s ridership data proportionally compares to other jurisdictions with higher fees, we used two key indicators: per capita use, which shows the proportional rate of shared mobility users relative to population size and utilization rate, measuring how often each device is used in a day. Utilization rate is commonly used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. Together, these metrics highlight the demand of the devices and their function within the transportation system.

City ¹⁴	Population	Avg # of deployed vehicles	Total rides per yr	Avg rides/day	Rides per capita	Rides per device per day
Berkeley	124,000	710	313,000	879	2.52	1.24
San Francisco	815,000	3,900	1,840,000	5,169	2.26	1.33
Davis	66,850	269	65,800	180.00	0.98	0.67
Sacramento	528,000	1,525	545,000	1,531	1.03	1.00
West Sacramento	54,000	465	67,800	190	1.26	0.41
Santa Monica	93,000	1,660	711,000	1,997	7.65	1.20

*Data from July 1, 2024 - June 30, 2025

**Data includes dock and dockless shared micromobility

¹¹ City of Davis, *Shared Micromobility Agreement* (City Council staff report, July 18, 2023), accessed July 17, 2025, <https://documents.cityofdavis.org/Media/Default/Documents/PDF/CityCouncil/CouncilMeetings/Agendas/2023/2023-07-18/04-Shared-Micromobility-Agreement.pdf>.

¹² City of Long Beach, *Micro-Mobility Program (E-Scooters/E-Bikes)* (Long Beach, CA: City of Long Beach, updated May 24, 2025), accessed July 9, 2025, <https://www.longbeach.gov/goactive/b/programs/micro-mobility-program/>, City of Long Beach, *Beach Bike Path E-Scooter Pilot and Data Analysis*, memorandum from Eric Lopez, Director of Public Works, to Mayor and City Council, June 4, 2024, City of Long Beach, accessed July 9, 2025, <https://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/city-manager/media-library/documents/memos-to-the-mayor-tabbed-file-list-folders/2024/june-4--2024---beach-bike-path-e-scooter-pilot-and-data-analysis>

¹³ City of Culver City, *Standard Operating Agreement for Culver City Dockless Shared Micromobility* (Culver City, CA: City of Culver City, revised September 2021), accessed July 17, 2025, <https://www.culvercity.gov/files/assets/public/v/1/documents/transportation/standard-operating-agreement-for-culver-city-dockless-shared-micromobility.pdf>.

¹⁴ Santa Cruz, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo were contemplated as cities to analyze, but do not have comparable dockless scooter programs

The table indicates that Berkeley's shared micromobility program has strong shared mobility use relative to its population, high demand for vehicles, and fleet efficiency comparable to Santa Monica and San Francisco. Berkeley demonstrates proportionally concentrated and consistent scooter use, ultimately indicating high demand and suggesting potential financial feasibility for increasing fees.

With the City's considerable investment in daylighting intersections, there is a significant opportunity to leverage the available space and city funding to install new scooter racks or corrals. With additional revenue from scooter companies, the City could have more capacity to build creative infrastructure at these zones. In fact, the aforementioned study out of the University of Oregon explains that the near side of intersections are ideal locations for shared micromobility corrals.¹⁵ Corrals placed at the near side of intersections create physical barriers to prevent illegal car parking, avoid conflicts with metered or loading zones, reduce accidents, and activate previously unused space.

The goal of this referral is to provide the information, guidance, and flexibility to the City Manager, in partnership with our dedicated shared micromobility vendors, to identify the most feasible and effective avenue for maintaining a successful program that meets the needs of all Berkeley residents. Parking infrastructure that accommodates high use of these vehicles is a critical component of ensuring that success.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

The Public Works Department has been working with shared micromobility vendors to address the issue of improper parking. This referral is intended to provide clarified direction in those conversations. The Public Works Department will already be engaging in the process of raising other municipal fees as part of an annual process and is able to include this without much additional staff time.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

No anticipated impacts.

CONTACT PERSON

Councilmember Cecilia Lunaparra, 510-981-7170
Sara Cerami, Chief of Staff

¹⁵ Urbanism Next, *Dedicated Parking for Micromobility*, by Calvin Thigpen, Nicholas Klein, and Anne Brown (Portland, OR: Urbanism Next, 2025), https://cdn.prod.website-files.com/5d9f83b8b237fa6c07d5d69d/680ff7d0cc63c8bcd753ec7_Dedicated%20Parking%20for%20Micromobility-compressed.pdf (accessed July 10, 2025).

