City of Santa Monica®

Administrative Decision

Date: May 10, 2021

By: Francie Stefan, Chief Mobility Officer/Assistant Director of Transportation

Subject: Shared Mobility Device Pilot Program Operator Selection and Device Allocation Pursuant to Santa Monica Municipal Code ("SMMC") Chapter 3.22

Introduction

In March 2021, the City Council (Council) directed staff to implement a second shared mobility device pilot program, including the selection of up to four shared mobility device operators. Council also extended the second pilot program term from July 1, 2021 to March 30, 2023. Since that time, staff from various city departments have worked expeditiously to conduct a competitive request for applications (RFA) and selection process that will facilitate the launch of the second shared mobility device pilot program by July 1, 2021.

As prescribed by SMMC Chapter 3.22 and its implementing Administrative Regulations, the selection committee (Selection Committee), which is granted an advisory function under Chapter 3.22, conducted its review and ranking of the operator applications and submitted its recommendation to me on May 4, 2021 (Attachment A). As the final step in the operator selection process, I have conducted my de novo review of all submitted materials and recommendations.

After considering the rankings of the Selection Committee and all submitted materials, and consistent with the process set forth in SMMC Section 3.22.060, I have selected Spin, Veo and Lyft to operate in the second pilot program. The initial allocation of permitted devices between the three operators is described later in this memorandum.

Background

Shared mobility continues to proliferate in cities across the country as an integral component of broader transportation networks. Santa Monica launched its first shared mobility pilot program in September 2018, which was designed to test entirely new areas of policy, regulation, operation, and enforcement for privately-operated shared mobility businesses. On March 9, 2021 the Santa Monica City Council directed staff to implement a second shared mobility pilot program that would build on the first pilot program, include new technologies that can improve public safety, consider different device types to meet the needs of different users, and select up-to four shared mobility operators to help drive competition. In Santa Monica and elsewhere, these devices have shown great potential to replace vehicle trips for short trips around town, but have raised community concerns about safety and enforcement, rider behavior, affordability, and service reliability.

Santa Monica is a desirable market for new shared mobility options because of the diversity of people and activities, the high-quality street network and the culture of active and outdoor living. Shared mobility devices provide an option to move without a car, reduce pressure on vehicle lanes and parking spaces, and increase overall access and mobility. Low emissions options also facilitate Sustainable City goals and improved local air quality. Given the potential benefits offered by shared mobility devices as well as the inherent challenges of the shared transportation service, Council directed the creation of a second shared mobility pilot program. The second pilot program is designed to continue to develop a regulatory structure, ensure effective compliance with applicable laws and to promote the health, safety and wellbeing of everyone in the community. The pilot program will directly address the new challenges posed by the introduction of new mobility devices.

Discussion

The Selection Committee reviewed the application submittals and scored each based on the ten categories outlined in the RFA. The categories were weighted to favor device durability and safety, new features that can help to limit poor rider behavior and haphazard parking, maintain affordability for all users, strengthen system/operations sustainability, and ensure system reliability. Based on these categories, the committee recommended the top three ranked service providers to operate (1) the top two ranked 2-wheel e-scooters and Class 1 e-bikes; (2) the top ranked Class 2 e-bike; and (3) the singularly proposed 3-wheel e-scooter and 2-wheel sit down e-scooters. The recommendation reflects the

committee's desire to support consumer choice, encourage competition, and test new shared mobility options to meet a wider range of mobility needs within the community.

After consideration of the Selection Committee's rankings and applicant materials, I ranked each application on the same criteria as used by the Selection Committee.

Experience

Many companies have developed experience in the industry since it began a few years ago. Many leadership level positions are held by people who have been in shared mobility – bikeshare, scooter share, carshare and related industries – and provide guidance at the corporate level. I credited a higher values to applicants who directly employed staff at all levels, and do not contract out field services to subcontractors. Having all elements of system operation consolidated under one entity leaves fewer opportunities for miscommunication and errors, such as balancing and field services, where the impacts are felt most directly by the community.

Financial feasibility and the ability to provide insurance was also considered by the Selection Committee based on submitted materials. All but one company provided requested financial information, and those who submitted have shown they have the financial wherewithal to operate their program and to provide insurance as set forth in the Administrative Regulations and RFA.

Compliance

Applicants were asked to provide information about whether they had pulled out of markets, independently or by municipal request, in order to assess reliability for the consumer. I gave higher value to operators who provided continuous operation even in financially-strained and/or pandemic conditions because these sudden changes make systems unreliable to the consumer and inhibit shared mobility's use as a relied-upon transportation service. Credit was also given to applicants with a history of seeking permits prior to operating.

Local Preference

Scoring criteria offered some points for local hiring and for local warehousing and office

space. The possible credit in this category was low, but the provision of Santa Monica-based operations impacts sustainability points as well due to vehicle emissions for maintenance and rebalancing tasks.

Device Durability and Suitability

All applicants submitted materials indicating that their proposed devices are in compliance with applicable laws and the materials are accepted as true and accurate statements. Many applicants submitted multiple device types and iterations, and were asked to present the specific proposed devices at the demonstration showcase. I scored devices based on the type and model that were proposed at the demonstration, and neither the Selection Committee or I scored any device which could not be launched in a fleet of at least 50 by July 1, 2021.

Most e-scooters have significantly improved since the first generation devices. Most now incorporate dual or triple braking systems and have smoothed acceleration and braking movements. Many e-scooters now have some form of tip-over sensors and/or dual kick stands for stability while parked. And many also have front suspension and improved front and rear lights, including some with turn signals and braking lights. Some companies are also starting to incorporate swappable batteries to reduce waste and operational vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Overall, there have been many significant positive changes in the quality of the devices and riding experience.

There has been a proliferation of varieties of shared mobility devices, particularly in sit-down devices that are either categorized as scooters or bikes but have similar operational qualities of allowing for seated riding with or without pedals. From the consumer's perspective these forms and riding experiences are the same whether classified as bikes or scooters so I assessed them against each other. Since the Selection Committee considered 2-wheel and 3-wheel scooters separately I continued that distinction in my review.

There are also many new e-bike models that have been developed by newer e-bike companies. There are fewer obvious advances in the shared bike models from earlier generations, possibly because shared bikes have been in the market longer. As a result, when weighing bikes, I gave less credit to advances in shared class 1 bikes than I did

when weighing advances in shared scooter devices.

I credited devices with longer lifespans as these indicate an ability to withstand the wear and tear typical of outdoor shared use transportation. Longer duration reflects materials and design choices which are more appropriate for this situation, and which also positively impact the overall system sustainability.

All applicants discussed intent to increase interoperability with other transportation modes through integration in apps and trip planning, with some examples of active services. Credit was given to those applicants with existing partnership that are active for consumer use. Reduction of automobile trips is a priority of the City, so some credit was given to systems that showed strength in strategies to convert from driving or ridehail to shared mobility.

Maintenance/Operations

Operator maintenance and operations proposals were similar in many ways. All applicants developed their own software to track operations, with minor variations in the level of detail and whether they are using algorithms for predictive distribution or preventative maintenance. Some applicants further described field tracking and communication systems to guide rebalancing activities and complaint resolution. No operator proposed a continuation of the “gig-economy” workforce exactly as it had been done in earlier periods of e-scooter sharing, which had a substantially negative impact on maintenance and rebalancing operations. However, as noted previously, some applicants continue to rely on fleet subcontractors for all or portions of field services. Many aspects of the operation plan are prescribed by the Administrative Regulations and will be monitored and adjusted as needed during the second pilot program. Given the general consistency across the proposed operations, most operators received similar scores within this category.

Sustainability

Mode shift from a passenger vehicle to a form of shared e-scooters and e-bikes is widely accepted as sustainability improvement. Where there are meaningful differences between operators is in the approach to device life cycle (duration, reuse of parts) and operations VMT and emissions. I credited proposals that used “swappable batteries” because they reduce operations VMT, proposals that used EVs or e-trikes for field operations, proposals

that had the maintenance facilities in Santa Monica to reduce the length of vehicle trips, and that provided more robust details regarding parts reuse, battery recycling and current partnerships.

Safety and Rider Behavior Features

Safety and rider behavior are key components of the pilot program and all operators are expected to cooperate with each other and the City to deliver a comprehensive program. Many of the rider engagements have become standard industry-wide. For example, all applicants incorporate a driver's license scanning process and all proposals provide in-app education through screens, videos and pop-up notifications. Apps all show prohibited or "geo-fenced" areas and parking zones, and have only minor variations in whether they provide bike/scooter facility information or complementary business/destination information. To encourage proper parking all operators offer an incentive (typically $1 off the ride price) to park in designated zones and require a photo of the parked device at the conclusion of the ride. Some companies supplement this by deploying roaming staff to correct misplaced vehicles. All applicants discuss engaging with customers who are not following rules either through notifications, warnings or in some cases fines (but with little detail provided about the frequency of fines or warnings being issued). All applicants propose helmet education and distribution, with a few identifying "helmet detection" photo options and one having on-device helmet availability with sanitary covers.

Among the more recent developments in the industry are tools for sidewalk detection, and there is a wide variety which reflects the relatively early testing phase of this technology. Methods include vibration detection, high-accuracy GPS and camera detection. Strategies and opinions vary greatly among operators. I credited applicants that proposed to launch devices which had new methods for sidewalk detection given how important this issue is for community members. The City will be working with companies over this pilot to track their findings on accuracy and effectiveness of the new technologies.

Education and Outreach

In the category of public education, proposals had a general consistency in the types and

strategies for outreach, with most operators expressing a desire and willingness to work with the City and stakeholders to develop and distribute safety information, attend events, meet with community groups and engage in other public outreach efforts. Since efforts around user engagement and education are specifically called out as required in the Administrative Regulations, it is expected that this will be an on-going effort by all operators. Given the general consistency across the proposed public education and outreach strategies, applicants received similar baseline scores within this category. Incumbent operators clearly displayed a superior knowledge of the community issues and stakeholders, and had an advantage in this category given the prior years of required outreach.

Affordability

Private sector operations of shared mobility systems come with the disadvantage of typically higher pricing structures for utilization, because public systems are traditionally subsidized to enable transportation options. Santa Monica's Breeze Bike Share was an unusual case where significant public subsidy wasn't necessary because of the strong bikeshare market in Santa Monica. Most operators typically charge an "unlock" fee of $1 plus a per-minute use charge ranging from $0.20-$0.50 per minute. Some operators specify a fixed price and others dynamically change price and notify users in the app. I credited proposals that provided a lower fixed price to lower the barriers to using shared mobility for daily trips and enable more residents to use them. I also credited programs that provided lower-priced income-qualified programs (and outreach to encourage sign-up) and programs for other user groups such as students and residents.

Customer Service

The customer service plans submitted by the applicants were similar in many ways with minor variations in the speed of response. All provide 24/7 call service with differences in the hours of the field operation staff available to address complaints. Most companies offer service in multiple languages, and some have more detailed plans for complaint tracking and incorporation of feedback into service revisions.

Based on the material and input received and the rationale described above, I ranked the

applications as follows:

Service Provider	Experience (10 pts)	Compliance (10 Pts)	Local Preference (3 pts)	Device Durability/ Suitability (20 pts)	Maintenance/ Operations (15 pts)	Sustainability (10 pts)	Safety & Rider Behavior (15 pts)	Education & Outreach (12 pts)	Affordability (20 pts)	Customer Service (10 pts)	TOTAL
Standing E-scooter, 2 wheel											
Veo	8	10	3	16	14	9	15	9	18	9	111
Spin	8	8	3	19	12	8	14	10	14	9	105
Bird	8	7	3	14	12	7	13	12	16	9	102
Superpedestrian	6	7	2	20	11	7	11	9	18	8	99
Lyft	9	10	3	10	13	7	12	11	15	9	99
Lime	7	3	1	19	11	6	12	10	18	8	95
Standing E-scooter, 3 wheel											
Spin	8	8	3	19	12	8	14	10	14	9	105
Seated E-bike, Class 1											
Lyft	10	10	3	18	14	9	14	11	15	10	114
Veo	8	10	3	15	14	9	14	9	18	9	109
Spin	8	8	3	18	12	8	13	10	14	9	103
Lime	7	3	1	19	11	6	13	10	18	8	96
Bird	6	7	3	10	10	7	10	12	16	9	90
Seated E-bike/E-scooter											
Veo	8	10	3	17	15	9	14	9	18	9	112
Wheels	6	6	2	15	10	8	13	9	17	8	94
Hopr	6	8	2	13	12	8	11	9	12	8	89

Device Allocation

SMMC Chapter 3.22 and the Administrative Regulations state that up to four operators may be selected. The regulations also state that at program launch, the total size of the City-wide device fleet shall not exceed 3,250 total devices (and no fleet under 50 devices).

Following the initial launch, the number of devices may increase or decrease based on utilization and other relevant factors. The Selection Committee noted the value in having operators provide more than one device, and that is reflected in the allocation recommendation and selection. Because two of the three chosen applicants are allowed to have more than one device, there are only three operators recommended for the second pilot program.

Applicants also noted the value of having a critical mass of devices so that customers feel that devices are readily available in many locations. I also considered the limited space available in the right-of-way and the relatively larger form of shared e-bikes and seated e-scooters. With this in mind, each operator will have a primary concentration of devices in one type of device, with Spin and Veo having a secondary device allocation with at least 200 devices to facilitate customer access. This allocation is given in order to provide maximum flexibility during the second pilot program and encourage a robust exchange of ideas and innovative technology. Devices are allocated as follows:

	Veo	Spin	Lyft	Total
e-scooters, 2-wheel	200	500		700
e-scooters, 3-wheel		200		200
e-bikes, class 1			600	600
e-bikes, class 2	500			500
Total Devices	**700**	**700**	**600**	**2000**

A distribution of devices amongst the operators resulting in some operators offering both e-bikes and e-scooters will helpfully inform City staff about the potential benefits of an operator with more than one device and the opportunities for integration that may result.

Additional Considerations

Drop Hubs -- Some applicants proposed the installation of proprietary drop hub stations that would provide additional designated parking space for their devices, and in some cases an opportunity to install advertisement kiosks. The City has already installed over 175 bike share/shared mobility drop hubs throughout the City and will look to expand that footprint in the coming year. Through the course of the pilot program all drop hubs will be

installed by the City, made available to all permitted operators, and not include any operator specific branding, advertisements, or sponsorships. Applicants were not given any additional points for offering drop hub installations or advisement/sponsorship plans.

Summary

I, the Chief Mobility Officer/Assistant Director of Transportation select Spin, Veo and Lyft to participate in the City's current shared mobility device pilot program, bringing together three pioneering companies in the field of transportation innovation and shared mobility. Each operator is allocated 600-700 devices as detailed above. These companies bring a wide range of experience and device types that will allow the City to conduct a comprehensive and informative second pilot program.

Prepared By: Francie Stefan, Chief Mobility Officer/Assistant Director of Transportation

Attachment A

Mobility Division, SaMoDOT
1685, Main Street, Mail Stop 38
Santa Monica, CA 90401

Memorandum:

Shared Mobility Pilot Program Selection Committee Recommendation

To: **Francie Stefan, Chief Mobility Officer, Santa Monica Department of Transportation**

From: **Shared Mobility Selection Committee**

Date: **May 4, 2021**

Re: **Selection Committee Rankings**

Background

On March 9, 2021 the Santa Monica City Council directed staff to implement a second shared mobility pilot program that would build on the first pilot program, include new technologies that can improve public safety, consider different device types to meet the needs of different users, and select up-to four shared mobility operators to help drive competition. The Council adopted Ordinance No. 2630 that established a second pilot program for shared mobility devices and defines the program's term, scope and procedures. Council amended the Ordinance on March 23, 2021 to allow up-to four service providers to operate in the City and extend the pilot program term from July 1, 2021 to March 30, 2023.

Goals for the 21-month pilot program include:

- Offer a variety of shared mobility options to residents, employees and visitors to Santa Monica;
- Reduce emissions from short trips and connections to transit;
- Ensure use of the Public right-of-way (PROW) benefits public mobility;
- Protect public health and safety;
- Reduce sidewalk, pathway and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) blockages;
- Continue to increase user awareness of safe and legal behaviors for operating devices;

- Ensure operators are responsive to pervasive issues and service complaints;
- Catalyze industry improvement in devices, technologies, and service that deliver better outcomes;
- Maintain flexibility as the industry continues to rapidly evolve;
- Focus oversight onto priority areas of reliability, affordability, safety and sustainability;
- Modernize management tools and use technology to be more effective and efficient; and
- Create an enforceable framework for managing shared mobility services.

In order to be able to quickly adapt and to implement effective solutions to new challenges, the pilot program is also guided by Administrative Regulations that support implementation of the ordinance and can be updated during the pilot program. The Administrative Regulations included as an attachment to the Request for Applications (RFA) and posted to the City's website on May 4, 2021. All documents are available on the City's website: https://www.smgov.net/Departments/PCD/Transportation/Shared-Mobility-Pilot-Application-and-Selection-Process/.

Participation in the pilot program is determined through a competitive procurement and selection process. The City released the RFA on March 17, 2021 seeking applications to select up to four operators offering various shared mobility device types to provide citywide services during the pilot program.

The RFA required applicants to submit robust information in ten primary categories to get a complete understanding of the proposed system and operations. The complete list of requested information starts on Page 5 of the RFA and includes:

1. INTENT: Overall vision for the service.
2. OPERATOR INFORMATION: Including project team, qualifications, experience operating shared mobility systems, and history of compliance with permitting, state and local law.
3. EQUIPMENT: Including specific details of the proposed devices, durability, sensors and GPS, and ability to launch July 1, 2021.
4. MAINTENANCE: Strategy for ensuring that all devices in the fleet are and remain in good working order, clean and safe to operate for a wide range of users.
5. SYSTEM BALANCING and REDISTRUBUTION: Strategy for daily balancing among the defined deployment zones, and avoiding obstructions, hazards, or problem devices in the Public right-of-way, etc.
6. OPERATIONS SUSTAINABILITY: Strategy for maximizing the sustainability of system and operations.

7. RIDER BEHAVIOR AND ROADWAY SAFETY COMPLIANCE: Strategy to ensure riders comply with the rules of the road and observe the appropriate etiquette while riding.
8. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT, OUTREACT & SAFETY/ RIDING EDUCATION: Strategy to engage with the community and educate your customers in order to ensure the safety of riders and all roadway users.
9. AFFORDABILITY: Strategy to ensure that shared mobility systems remain affordable for all users as a viable mode of transportation and provide access opportunities for users from every socio-economic level.
10. CUSTOMER SERVICE: Strategy to provide responsive customer service to riders and non-rider community members that creates a positive experience and quickly resolves and tracks issues.
11. DATA: Compliance with program data requirements.

Applications were due on April 13, 2021. An optional bidder's conference was offered online on April 6, 2021. A recording of the pre-conference was posted on the project website. Approximately 30 people interested in bidding attended the conference. The RFA was posted on the City's ProcureNow website, notice was given to relevant companies registered in the system, and advertised in the Santa Monica Daily Press. A total of 97 registered users downloaded the RFA from ProcureNow.

The RFA outlined that the City is seeking the best qualified operators, and that each proposal would be rated on the following scoring criteria:

1.	Experience operating shared mobility device systems, and financial viability and stability.	10 points
2.	Compliance record with Federal, State or local law, or rules and regulations.	10 points
3.	Local Preference.	3 points
4.	Device durability for shared use.	20 points
5.	Proposed maintenance and operations plan.	15 points
6.	Sustainability of operations.	10 points
7.	System features that ensure roadway safety and compliance with riding rules and etiquette.	15 points
8.	Proposed education and outreach plan.	12 points
9.	Commitment and strategies to ensure affordability for all users.	20 points
10	Proposed customer service and community complaint response strategies.	10 points
	Total Possible Points	125 point

Applicants with the highest score are deemed the most qualified. Applications could be disqualified if they make false statements or material omissions, fail to provide information requested, or propose to operate in a manner that endangers public health and safety.

Applications were reviewed by a Selection Committee comprised of staff with appropriate knowledge and experience and at least one expert in shared mobility who is not a member of City staff.

The Selection Committee's task is to review all applications and make a written recommendation to the Chief Mobility Officer based on the proposed ranking of each qualified candidate. The Chief Mobility Officer is tasked to review all materials and recommendations de novo and make the final selection.

Discussion

the City received applications from 8 different service providers that each proposed between 1-3 different device types for shared use in Santa Monica. The Service providers that applied are listed below in alphabetical order.

1. Bird
2. Hopr
3. Lime
4. Lyft
5. Spin
6. Superpedestrian
7. Veo
8. Wheels

Some providers proposed device types that would not be operated under the Shared Mobility Administrative Regulations and therefore were not considered by the Selection Committee. One provider proposed a motorized moped, which cannot be operated as part of the Shared Mobility Pilot Program (SMMC Section 3.22.020(g)) and therefore was not considered by the Selection Committee. Some providers proposed various versions/generations of certain device types, which were considered collectively and received only one device score by the Selection Committee.

Applications were distributed to the Selection Committee on April 14, 2021. An in-person device demonstration event was held on April 22, 2021. At the event each operator was given 15 minutes to showcase their devices to Selection Committee members. The Selection Committee met via Zoom on April 28, 29, 30, 2021 to discuss their review and to score the applications.

Each eligible device received separate application score and could receive a total of 500 points based on a maximum of 125 points in the 10 categories, and 4 reviewers for each application. While the committee recommendation is unanimous, individual committee members differed on the ranking within each operator and device.

Recommendation

The Selection Committee recommends the Chief Mobility Officer select the top three ranked service providers to operate (1) the top two ranked 2-wheel e-scooters and Class 1 e-bikes; (2) the top ranked Class 2 e-bike; and (3) the singularly proposed 3-wheel e-scooter and 2-wheel sit down e-scooters. The committee's recommendation reflects a collective desire to support consumer choice, encourage competition, and test new shared mobility options (the 2-wheel e-scooter and Class 1 e-bike categories are existing options within the City, whereas the 3-wheel e-scooter and 2-wheel sit down e-scooter categories would introduce new options to Santa Monica).

The top scoring operators were:

- 2-Wheel E-scooter: Spin (426 total score) and VEO (420 total score)
- 3-Wheel E-scooter: Spin (427 total score)
- 2-Wheel, Sit Down E-scooter: Wheels (411 total score)
- Class 1 E-bike: Spin (426 total score) and VEO (420 total score)
- Class 2 E-bike: VEO (416 total Score)

The committee agreed that these devices would provide the best mix of shared mobility options for a wide variety of mobility needs and noted particular strengths in these following areas:

- Individual operators offering a suite of shared mobility options for ease and simplicity of app use.
- Safety features such as dual braking, hands-free audio navigation, and integrated turn signals.
- Durability, safety, comfort, and accessibility considerations, especially for older/less mobile adults and novice riders.
- Technological capabilities such as in app and audio alerts and communications, real-time geofencing, sidewalk detection, phone charging, and integrated helmet and tip-detection technology.
- Commitment to equitable access, service, and variable pricing offerings, including low-income plans.

- Opportunity to test new advanced technology (i.e. device self-repositioning and device hailing).
- Regional connectivity across jurisdictional boundaries.

Although not included in the committee's recommendation for the second pilot program, the committee expressed notable interest and enthusiasm for the e-cargo bike option in meeting additional user needs and preferences (i.e. carry heavier loads, add child bike seat, accommodate multiple people).

Final Score Table

Service Provider	Device Type	1. Experience	2. Compliance	3. Local Preference	4. Device Durability/ Suitability	5. Maintenance/Operations	6. Sustainability	7. Safety and Rider Features	8. Education and Outreach	9. Affordability	10. Customer Service	TOTAL
Bird	2-Wheel E-Scooter(s)	36	34	10	65	46	30	43	35	57	31	**387**
	Class 1 E-bike	34	34	10	63	44	30	42	35	57	31	**380**
Hopr	Class 2 E-bike	35	32	8	64	46	32	43	34	46	32	**372**
Lime	2-Wheel E-Scooter(s)	35	35	7	53	47	30	42	33	53	31	**366**
	Class 1 E-bike	35	35	7	58	47	30	42	33	53	31	**371**
Lyft	2-Wheel E-Scooter(s)	37	34	10	60	48	32	45	35	62	34	**397**
	Class 1 E-bike	37	34	10	62	48	32	45	35	62	34	**399**
Spin	2-Wheel E-Scooter(s)	37	35	9	70	50	34	53	37	64	37	**426**
	3-Wheel E- Scooter(s)	37	35	9	70	50	34	54	37	64	37	**427**
	Class 1 E-bike	37	35	9	70	50	34	53	37	64	37	**426**
Superpedestrian	2-Wheel E-Scooter(s)	33	33	7	65	49	28	36	34	56	28	**369**
Veo	2-Wheel E-Scooter(s)	36	34	9	68	51	33	50	37	65	37	**420**
	Class 1 E-bike	36	34	9	68	51	33	50	37	65	37	**420**
	Class 2 E-bike	36	34	9	66	51	33	48	37	65	37	**416**
Wheels	2-Wheel E-Scooter (Seated)	36	34	9	71	47	33	51	37	60	33	**411**

Prepared by: Linda Cogswell, Selection Committee Secretary