



House Transportation Committee

Public Hearing on HB1633 (Kinhead)

Provides for E-Scooter Programs and Private Ownership of these Devices

Monday, June 15, 2026, at 10:00 AM

Room G50 Irvis Office Building

Harrisburg, PA 17120

Agenda

10:00 – 10:10 a.m.

Call to Order

Member Introductions

Opening Remarks:

- Majority Chair Ed Neilson
- Minority Chair Kerry Benninghoff

10:10 – 10:35 a.m.

Testifier Group #1:

- Rep. Emily Kinhead, Prime Sponsor of HB1633, House District 20 (Allegheny County)

10:35 – 11:00 a.m.

Testifier Group #2:

- Jonathan Greer, President, Insurance Federation of Pennsylvania
- Timothy Knapp, General Counsel, Insurance Federation of Pennsylvania

11:00 – 11:25 a.m.

Testifier Group #3

- Rylan Seifert, Curbside Manager, Department of Mobility and Infrastructure, City of Pittsburgh
- Erika Duthely, Director of Government Relations, Lime Micromobility

- Karl Graybill, Advocate, Coalition for Active Mobility in Pennsylvania (CAMP)

11:25 – 11:30 a.m.

Closing Remarks

Adjournment

Attachments:

- Sunshine Memo
- HB1633 Analysis
- HB1633P1983
- Insurance Federation Testimony on HB1633
- City of Pittsburgh Testimony
- Lime Testimony
- CAMP Testimony
- PA Chiefs of Police Association Testimony

ED NEILSON, MEMBER
174TH LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT
CHAIRMAN, TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

127 IRVIS OFFICE BUILDING
P.O. BOX 202174
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17120-2174
PHONE: (717) 772-4032
FAX: (717) 783-1579



ASHTON CENTER
(AT HOLME CIRCLE)
16 OLD ASHTON ROAD
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19152
PHONE: (215) 330-3714
FAX: (215) 330-3717

House of Representatives
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
HARRISBURG

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 9, 2026

TO: House Transportation Committee Members

FROM: Representative Ed Neilson, Majority Chair
House Transportation Committee

RE: House Transportation Committee Public Hearing
Monday, June 15, 2026, at 10:00 a.m.

The House Transportation Committee will hold a public hearing on Monday, June 15, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. in Room G50 Irvis Office Building. The purpose of this public hearing is to receive testimony related to HB 1633 (Kinkead) which provides for electric low-speed scooter programs and private ownership of these devices.

Please contact Kyle Wagonseller (717-982-1114) or Josiah Shelly (717-371-4432) with any questions. If you are unable to attend this meeting, please submit an Official Leave Request Form to your corresponding Committee Chair prior to the meeting.

EN/KW

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE BILL ANALYSIS

Bill No:	HB1633 PN1983	Prepared By:	Kyle Wagonseller (717) 772-1786,6518
Committee:	Transportation	Executive Director:	Kyle Wagonseller
Sponsor:	Kinhead, Emily		
Date:	6/12/2026		

A. Brief Concept

Authorizes all cities, except Philadelphia, to establish shared electric low-speed scooter programs and provides for private ownership of these devices.

C. Analysis of the Bill

This bill creates Subchapter B.1 (related to shared electric low-speed scooters) under Title 75 (Vehicles).

DEFINITIONS:

The following terms are defined:

"Abandoned shared electric low-speed scooter" is a shared electric low-speed scooter that meets all of the following:

1. The user of the shared electric low-speed scooter is not visible to an individual making an initial report on a hotline that the shared electric low-speed scooter is abandoned.
2. The shared electric low-speed scooter is illegally parked on a highway or is on property on which the shared electric low-speed scooter is prohibited to be used or kept as provided under this subchapter or an applicable municipal ordinance or executive order.

"Authorized municipality" is any of the following:

1. A city of the second class (Pittsburgh).
2. A city of the second class A (Scranton).
3. A city of the third class (all other cities).

"Commercial electric low-speed-scooter-sharing enterprise" is a person that makes electric low-speed scooters available for rent to the public for use as determined by an authorized municipality.

"Electric low-speed scooter" is as follows:

1. A device weighing less than 100 pounds that:
 - i. Has two or three wheels.
 - ii. Has handlebars and an electric motor.
 - iii. Has a floorboard which can be stood upon while riding or a seat which can be sat upon while riding.
 - iv. Is solely powered by an electric motor or human power, or both.
 - v. Has a maximum top speed of 20 miles per hour.
2. The term includes a shared mobility system with an electric low-speed scooter if the shared mobility system meets the above criteria.
3. The term does not include:
 - i. A pedalcycle with electric assist.
 - ii. An electric personal assistive mobility device (Segway).
 - iii. A motorcycle.
 - iv. A motorized pedalcycle.

v. A motor-driven cycle.

"Hotline" is a complaint hotline established under this bill.

"Program" is a shared electric low-speed scooter program authorized under this bill.

OVERSIGHT:

PennDOT is the primary Commonwealth agency responsible for the oversight of (1) shared electric low-speed scooters (e-scooter) operating in this Commonwealth; (2) programs established by authorized municipalities; and (3) the adoption of required ordinances, any amendment to the required ordinances and any subsequent policy developed by authorized municipalities to ensure compliance with this subchapter.

ESCOOTER PROGRAM:

An authorized municipality may establish a shared electric low-speed scooter program (program) with a commercial electric low-speed-scooter-sharing enterprise (enterprise) within the boundaries of the municipality. To establish a program, a municipality must first adopt an ordinance which includes:

1. The following policies:

- i. An individual operating a program must be granted all of the rights and subject to all of the duties applicable to the operator of a pedalcycle.
- ii. An e-scooter may operate on a highway, a pedalcycle lane on a highway or a pedalcycle path owned by the Commonwealth or municipality and within the boundaries of the municipality.
- iii. An individual may not operate an e-scooter on a sidewalk unless the e-scooter is upright and appropriately docked in a designated parking area as determined by the municipality.
- iv. An individual may not operate an e-scooter on a freeway, highway with a posted speed limit of 35 mph or greater, or a sidewalk in a business district.
- v. An individual who is under 16 years of age may not operate an e-scooter.
- vi. An individual may not operate an e-scooter at a speed greater than 15 mph.
- vii. When operated between sunset and sunrise, an e-scooter must be equipped with:
 - A. A white lamp on the front visible from a distance of at least 500 feet in front.
 - B. A red lamp on the rear visible from a distance of at least 55 feet to the rear.
 - C. A reflector on each side.
- viii. An enterprise must provide information on customer support service for approval by the municipality.

2. The establishment of a complaint hotline:

- i. The hotline must be used to report abandoned e-scooters and violations of this subchapter.
- ii. The hotline telephone number must be displayed on each e-scooter.
- iii. The hotline may be through an existing municipal response center operated by the municipality.

3. The establishment of requirements addressing:

- i. Geofencing.
- ii. Rider limits.
- iii. Fleet size.
- iv. Vehicle maintenance information.
- v. Strategies to reduce negative interactions between e-scooter riders and pedestrians.
- vi. Parking and charging station installation and maintenance.
- vii. Data management and reporting.
- viii. Education, public awareness and public participation plans.
- ix. Fare structure.

A municipality may amend the ordinance or adopt a subsequent policy change to improve the operations of the program or further protect public safety. Each municipality that adopts an ordinance must notify PennDOT.

INSURANCE:

An enterprise must provide to the municipality proof of insurance coverage at the following levels:

1. Commercial general liability insurance coverage with a limit of at least \$2M for each occurrence and at least \$2M in the aggregate.
2. Automobile insurance coverage with a limit of at least \$1M for each occurrence and at least \$1M in the aggregate.
3. If the enterprise employs an individual, workers' compensation coverage of not less than required by Federal or State law.

SAFETY ISSUES:

If a program includes the use of a highway owned or under PennDOT's jurisdiction, PennDOT may restrict access permanently or temporarily to a segment of the highway if PennDOT identifies a pattern of safety issues that cannot be reasonably corrected. PennDOT must establish a process to examine the safety issue, which is limited to the evaluation of accidents and damage to property on the highway. PennDOT must establish a process to communicate the safety issue and consult with a municipality and enterprise prior to restricting access.

LABOR PEACE AGREEMENTS:

All operators and service providers of e-scooters must present a fully executed labor peace agreement with any labor organization representing the employees as part of their license application or within 90 days of being informed of the representation if their employees were not previously represented by the labor organization. Labor peace agreements must be made available upon request. In the event of a labor dispute, operators and service providers of e-scooters must take all reasonable steps to maintain service levels and minimize the impact on the public.

ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES:

A municipality may impose one or more of the following:

1. A fine up to \$50 for the failure to operate an e-scooter consistent with this subchapter.
2. A fine up to \$150 for the failure to park an e-scooter consistent with this subchapter.
3. A fine up to \$150 on an enterprise for each abandoned e-scooter that is not collected and returned to a corral or storage within three hours of the abandonment of the e-scooter.
4. A civil penalty up to \$1,000 on an enterprise for each day that the enterprise operates without the required insurance. The civil penalty must be used by the municipality for the safety, operation and management of e-scooters or pedalcycles.

It shall be presumed to be a reasonable exercise of police power to regulate and enforce the use of e-scooters consistent with this subchapter and the regulation of pedalcycles, as applicable. Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to prevent PennDOT on state-designated highways or local authorities on local-designated highways from the reasonable exercise of their police powers.

REPORTS:

Each municipality that has established a program, in coordination with PennDOT, must prepare an annual report on the deployment of e-scooters under the program. Each report must include the following:

1. The number of rides.
2. The number of accidents.
3. The frequency of use.
4. Any ordinance, regulation or policy adopted in accordance with this subchapter.

Each report must be submitted to the Chairs of the House and Senate Transportation Committees. Each report must be posted on a public website owned by PennDOT and the

municipality.

APPLICABILITY AND PRIVATE OWNERSHIP:

An e-scooter authorized under this subchapter shall not be required to comply with titling or registration requirements under Title 75 (Vehicles). Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to prohibit a person that is not an enterprise from owning or operating an e-scooter. The person shall not be subject to the requirement under this subchapter that apply specifically to an enterprise.

Effective Date:

For Pittsburgh, this act takes effect immediately.

For every other city, this act takes effect in 60 days.

G. Relevant Existing Laws

Act 24 of 2021 (Fiscal Code) authorized a two-year e-scooter pilot program in a city of the second class (Pittsburgh). This program expired on July 9, 2023.

There is currently no specific definition for "electric low-speed scooters" in Title 75 (Vehicle Code). Therefore, a scooter with no seat that is powered with an electric motor meets the definition of "motor vehicles" under section 102 of Title 75. "Motor vehicles" are governed by Chapters 13 and must be titled, insured, inspected, registered, and operated by an individual with a driver's license, unless otherwise exempt. There is no exemption currently provided for "electric low-speed scooters."

E. Prior Session (Previous Bill Numbers & House/Senate Votes)

2023-2024 Session:

HB 2218 (Kinkead) was introduced in the 2023-2024 session. It was reported from the House Transportation Committee (24-1) on 10/7/24. There was no further action.

2021-2022 Session:

SB 783 (Langerholc) was introduced in the 2021-2022 session. It was unanimously approved by the Senate Transportation Committee on 6/22/21. This bill was amended into Act 24 of 2021 (Fiscal Code).

SB 892 (Laughlin) was introduced in the 2021-2022 session. It passed the Senate on 6/22/22 by 47-2. It was referred to the House Transportation Committee on 6/24/22 with no further action.

This document is a summary of proposed legislation and is prepared only as general information for use by the Democratic Members and Staff of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. The document does not represent the legislative intent of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives and may not be utilized as such.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

HOUSE BILL

No. 1633 Session of
2025

INTRODUCED BY KINKEAD, ABNEY, McANDREW, SANCHEZ, HILL-EVANS,
HOHENSTEIN, GREEN AND K.HARRIS, JUNE 23, 2025

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION, JUNE 23, 2025

AN ACT

1 Amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated
2 Statutes, in special vehicles and pedestrians, providing for
3 shared electric low-speed scooters; and imposing penalties.

4 The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
5 hereby enacts as follows:

6 Section 1. Chapter 35 of Title 75 of the Pennsylvania
7 Consolidated Statutes is amended by adding a subchapter to read:

8 SUBCHAPTER B.1

9 SHARED ELECTRIC LOW-SPEED SCOOTERS

10 Sec.

11 3531. Definitions.

12 3532. Oversight.

13 3533. Shared electric low-speed scooter program.

14 3534. Insurance.

15 3535. Safety issues.

16 3536. Labor peace agreements.

17 3537. Enforcement.

18 3538. Police powers.

1 3539. Reports.

2 3540. Applicability and construction.

3 § 3531. Definitions.

4 The following words and phrases when used in this subchapter
5 shall have the meanings given to them in this section unless the
6 context clearly indicates otherwise:

7 "Abandoned shared electric low-speed scooter." A shared
8 electric low-speed scooter that meets all of the following:

9 (1) The user of the shared electric low-speed scooter is
10 not visible to an individual making an initial report on a
11 hotline that the shared electric low-speed scooter is
12 abandoned.

13 (2) The shared electric low-speed scooter is illegally
14 parked on a highway or is on property on which the shared
15 electric low-speed scooter is prohibited to be used or kept
16 as provided under this subchapter or an applicable municipal
17 ordinance or executive order.

18 "Authorized municipality." Any of the following:

19 (1) A city of the second class.

20 (2) A city of the second class A.

21 (3) A city of the third class.

22 "Commercial electric low-speed-scooter-sharing enterprise."
23 A person that makes electric low-speed scooters available for
24 rent to the public for use as determined by an authorized
25 municipality.

26 "Electric low-speed scooter." As follows:

27 (1) A device weighing less than 100 pounds that:

28 (i) Has two or three wheels.

29 (ii) Has handlebars and an electric motor.

30 (iii) Has a floorboard which can be stood upon while

1 riding or a seat which can be sat upon while riding.

2 (iv) Is solely powered by an electric motor or human
3 power, or both.

4 (v) Has a maximum top speed of 20 miles per hour.

5 (2) The term includes a shared mobility system with an
6 electric low-speed scooter if the shared mobility system
7 meets the requirements under paragraph (1).

8 (3) The term does not include:

9 (i) A pedalcycle with electric assist.

10 (ii) An electric personal assistive mobility device.

11 (iii) A motorcycle.

12 (iv) A motorized pedalcycle.

13 (v) A motor-driven cycle.

14 "Hotline." A complaint hotline established under section
15 3533(b)(2) (relating to shared electric low-speed scooter
16 program).

17 "Program." A shared electric low-speed scooter program
18 authorized under section 3533(a).

19 § 3532. Oversight.

20 The department shall be the primary Commonwealth agency
21 responsible for the oversight of:

22 (1) Shared electric low-speed scooters operating in this
23 Commonwealth.

24 (2) Programs established by authorized municipalities.

25 (3) The adoption of required ordinances, any amendment
26 to the required ordinances and any subsequent policy
27 developed by authorized municipalities, to ensure compliance
28 with this subchapter.

29 § 3533. Shared electric low-speed scooter program.

30 (a) Authorization.--An authorized municipality may establish

1 a shared electric low-speed scooter program with a commercial
2 electric low-speed-scooter-sharing enterprise within the
3 boundaries of the authorized municipality in accordance with
4 this subchapter.

5 (b) Ordinance.--To establish a program, an authorized
6 municipality must first adopt an ordinance, which must include:

7 (1) The following policies:

8 (i) An individual operating a shared electric low-
9 speed scooter authorized under a program shall be granted
10 all of the rights and shall be subject to all of the
11 duties applicable to the operator of a pedalcycle under
12 Subchapter A (relating to operation of pedalcycles).

13 (ii) A shared electric low-speed scooter may operate
14 on a highway, a pedalcycle lane on a highway or a
15 pedalcycle path owned by the Commonwealth or authorized
16 municipality and within the boundaries of an authorized
17 municipality.

18 (iii) Subject to subparagraph (iv)(C), an individual
19 may not operate a shared electric low-speed scooter on a
20 sidewalk unless the shared electric low-speed scooter is
21 upright and appropriately docked in a designated parking
22 area as determined by the authorized municipality.

23 (iv) An individual may not operate a shared electric
24 low-speed scooter on any of the following:

25 (A) A freeway.

26 (B) A highway with a posted speed limit of 35
27 miles per hour or greater.

28 (C) A sidewalk in a business district.

29 (v) An individual who is under 16 years of age may
30 not operate a shared electric low-speed scooter.

1 (vi) An individual may not operate a shared electric
2 low-speed scooter at a speed greater than 15 miles per
3 hour.

4 (vii) When operated between sunset and sunrise, a
5 shared electric low-speed scooter shall be equipped with:

6 (A) A lamp on the front which emits a beam of
7 white light intended to illuminate the shared
8 electric low-speed scooter's path and is visible from
9 a distance of at least 500 feet in front.

10 (B) A red lamp facing to the rear which is
11 visible at least 500 feet to the rear.

12 (C) A reflector on each side.

13 (viii) A commercial electric low-speed-scooter-
14 sharing enterprise shall provide information on customer
15 support service for approval by the authorized
16 municipality.

17 (2) The establishment of a complaint hotline in
18 accordance with the following:

19 (i) The hotline shall be used to report:

20 (A) Abandoned shared electric low-speed
21 scooters.

22 (B) Violations of this subchapter or the
23 ordinance.

24 (ii) The hotline telephone number shall be displayed
25 on each shared electric low-speed scooter.

26 (iii) The hotline may be through an existing
27 municipal response center operated by the authorized
28 municipality.

29 (3) The establishment of requirements addressing:

30 (i) Geofencing.

1 (ii) Rider limits.
2 (iii) Fleet size.
3 (iv) Vehicle maintenance information.
4 (v) Strategies to reduce negative interactions
5 between shared electric low-speed scooter riders and
6 pedestrians.

7 (vi) Parking and charging station installation and
8 maintenance.

9 (vii) Data management and reporting.

10 (viii) Education, public awareness and public
11 participation plans.

12 (ix) Fare structure.

13 (c) Amendments and policy changes.--An authorized
14 municipality may amend the ordinance adopted under subsection
15 (b) or adopt a subsequent policy change consistent with this
16 subchapter to improve the operations of the program or further
17 protect public safety.

18 (d) Notice.--Each authorized municipality adopting an
19 ordinance in accordance with subsection (b) or an amendment or
20 policy change in accordance with subsection (c) shall notify the
21 department of the adoption of the ordinance, amendment or policy
22 change.

23 § 3534. Insurance.

24 (a) Requirement.--A commercial electric low-speed-scooter-
25 sharing enterprise operating in an authorized municipality shall
26 provide to the authorized municipality proof of insurance
27 coverage as required under this section.

28 (b) Coverage amounts.--A commercial electric low-speed-
29 scooter-sharing enterprise shall maintain insurance coverage at
30 the following levels:

1 (1) Commercial general liability insurance coverage with
2 a limit of at least \$2,000,000 for each occurrence and at
3 least \$2,000,000 in the aggregate.

4 (2) Automobile insurance coverage with a limit of at
5 least \$1,000,000 for each occurrence and at least \$1,000,000
6 in the aggregate.

7 (3) If the commercial electric low-speed-scooter-sharing
8 enterprise employs an individual, workers' compensation
9 coverage of not less than required by Federal or State law.

10 § 3535. Safety issues.

11 If a program includes the use of a highway owned or under the
12 jurisdiction of the department, the department may restrict
13 access, permanently or temporarily, to a segment of the highway
14 under the program if the department identifies a pattern of
15 safety issues that cannot be reasonably corrected. The
16 department shall establish a process to:

17 (1) Examine the safety issue, limited to the evaluation
18 of accidents and damage to property on the highway.

19 (2) Communicate the safety issue and consult with an
20 authorized municipality and commercial electric low-speed-
21 scooter-sharing enterprise prior to restricting access.

22 § 3536. Labor peace agreements.

23 (a) Agreement required.--To ensure uninterrupted service and
24 minimize labor disputes, all operators and service providers of
25 electric low-speed scooters shall present a fully executed labor
26 peace agreement with any labor organization representing their
27 employees as part of their license application or within 90 days
28 of being informed of the representation if their employees were
29 not previously represented by the labor organization.

30 (b) Availability.--Labor peace agreements must be made

1 available upon request.

2 (c) Labor disputes.--In the event of a labor dispute,
3 operators and service providers of electric low-speed scooters
4 shall take all reasonable steps to maintain service levels and
5 minimize the impact on the public.

6 § 3537. Enforcement.

7 In addition to any fines or penalties relating to a
8 pedalcycle under Subchapter A (relating to operation of
9 pedalcycles), an authorized municipality may impose one or more
10 of the following:

11 (1) A fine for the failure to operate a shared electric
12 low-speed scooter consistent with this subchapter, not to
13 exceed \$50.

14 (2) A fine for the failure to park a shared electric
15 low-speed scooter consistent with this subchapter, not to
16 exceed \$150.

17 (3) A fine on a commercial electric low-speed-scooter-
18 sharing enterprise for each abandoned shared electric low-
19 speed scooter that is not collected and returned to a corral
20 or storage within three hours of the abandonment of the
21 shared electric low-speed scooter, not to exceed \$150 per
22 day.

23 (4) A civil penalty on a commercial electric low-speed-
24 scooter-sharing enterprise that does not provide the
25 insurance required under section 3534 (relating to
26 insurance), not to exceed \$1,000 for each day that the
27 commercial electric low-speed-scooter-sharing enterprise is
28 operated without the required insurance. The civil penalty
29 collected under this paragraph by the authorized municipality
30 shall be used for the safety, operation and management of

1 shared electric low-speed scooters or pedalcycles.

2 § 3538. Police powers.

3 (a) Presumption.--For the purposes of this subchapter, it
4 shall be presumed to be a reasonable exercise of police power to
5 regulate and enforce the use of shared electric low-speed
6 scooters consistent with this subchapter and the regulation of
7 pedalcycles, as applicable.

8 (b) Construction.--Nothing in this subchapter shall be
9 construed to prevent the department on a State-designated
10 highway or a local authority on a local-designated highway from
11 the reasonable exercise of the police powers of the department
12 or local authority in accordance with section 6109 (relating to
13 specific powers of department and local authorities).

14 § 3539. Reports.

15 (a) Requirement.--Each authorized municipality that has
16 established a program, in coordination with the department,
17 shall prepare an annual report on the deployment of electric
18 low-speed scooters under the program.

19 (b) Contents.--Each report under this section shall include
20 the following:

21 (1) The number of rides.

22 (2) The number of accidents.

23 (3) The frequency of use.

24 (4) Any ordinance, regulation or policy adopted in
25 accordance with this subchapter.

26 (c) Submittal.--Each report under this section shall be
27 submitted to:

28 (1) The chairperson and minority chairperson of the
29 Transportation Committee of the Senate.

30 (2) The chairperson and minority chairperson of the

1 Transportation Committee of the House of Representatives.

2 (d) Posting.--Each report under this section shall be posted
3 on the publicly accessible Internet websites of the department
4 and the authorized municipality.

5 § 3540. Applicability and construction.

6 (a) Title and registration.--Notwithstanding Subchapter A of
7 Chapter 11 (relating to certificate of title) or Subchapter A of
8 Chapter 13 (relating to general provisions), a shared electric
9 low-speed scooter authorized under this subchapter shall not be
10 required to comply with certificate of title or vehicle
11 registration requirements under this title.

12 (b) Motor vehicles.--An electric low-speed scooter
13 authorized under this subchapter shall not be construed as a
14 motor vehicle.

15 (c) Private ownership.--Nothing in this subchapter shall be
16 construed to prohibit a person that is not a commercial electric
17 low-speed-scooter-sharing enterprise from owning or operating an
18 electric low-speed scooter. The person shall not be subject to
19 the requirements under this subchapter that apply specifically
20 to a commercial electric low-speed-scooter-sharing enterprise.

21 Section 2. This act shall apply as follows:

22 (1) For an authorized municipality that is a city of the
23 second class, the provisions of 75 Pa.C.S. Ch. 35 Subch. B.1
24 shall apply on or after the effective date of this paragraph.

25 (2) For an authorized municipality that is a city of the
26 second class A or a city of the third class, the provisions
27 of 75 Pa.C.S. Ch. 35 Subch. B.1 shall apply on or after the
28 date that is 60 days after the effective date of this
29 paragraph.

30 Section 3. This act shall take effect immediately.



June 15, 2026

To: Honorable Members of the House Transportation Committee

From: Jonathan C. Greer and Timothy L. Knapp

Re: Commercial deployment of e-scooters – House Bill 1633

Thank you for the opportunity to come before you today to discuss House Bill 1633 which seeks to authorize commercial deployment of e-scooters in Pittsburgh, Scranton, and cities of the third class in Pennsylvania of which there are fifty-three.

As each of you know, this is not a new issue for the General Assembly which authorized a commercial e-scooter pilot program in Pittsburgh in 2021 that expired in 2023. While we had misgivings about the program at the time, our discussions with Pittsburgh's Department of Mobility and Infrastructure demonstrated its commitment to responsible oversight and enforcement of the program that was accompanied by an insurance requisite. A representative from the Department of Micromobility and Infrastructure follows us on today's agenda, and we look forward to learning more about that experience from him.

With this as the backdrop, our testimony will focus on two fronts: The need for proper oversight and enforcement of commercial deployment and access to insurance in the case of accidents.

1. Oversight and Enforcement

House Bill 1633 grants significant authority to both the Department of Transportation and affected local governments regarding oversight of what the bill refers to as "a shared electric low-speed scooter program." With that in mind, it is imperative the committee also hears from PennDOT and affected local governments as to their thoughts on these programs. We also think law enforcement – both the state police and organizations representing local law enforcement – need to be part of this conversation.

We stress this at the outset because we don't believe Scranton has a Department of Mobility and Infrastructure and we doubt any of the third-class cities do either. This current lack of emphasis on micromobility issues in places other than Pittsburgh is a significant concern to us and should be to you as well: While the requirements in the bill as to what is to be contained in local ordinances sound good, they mean little without proper oversight and enforcement by local governments and the police. Absent that, there is a very real concern of unauthorized and illegal use of these devices with impunity.

This is not a hypothetical concern. Based on personal observations, we know the city of Harrisburg (a third-class city) does not presently enforce current laws prohibiting the use of ATVs and motorized dirt bikes on city streets. As an employer with offices located on Second Street, I have personally made an appeal to the city to enforce current laws in this area in the interest of protecting our employees. Unfortunately, nothing has changed.

We raise this for a simple reason: If current laws intended to protect the public are not being enforced in Harrisburg and other places like it, we see no wisdom in granting additional authority to these cities with respect to commercially deployed e-scooters.

2. Access to insurance

House Bill 1633 requires a commercial e-scooter enterprise to maintain insurance coverage in the amounts of \$2 million for commercial liability and \$1 million in automobile insurance. As a technical observation, we think the bill means to speak to a form of commercial auto insurance that separately defines and provides coverage for e-scooters in this context.

Not unlike our concerns with the bill's language with respect to oversight and regulation, this sounds better than it may be.

- Based on Lime's user agreement (which is 18 pages long), we question how beneficial its insurance will be to users. Rather, the coverage is primarily intended to protect Lime from third party damages caused by these scooters. The agreement states users "may" be provided first party coverage – which seems at odds with the user agreement's release of liability - but only after a deductible is paid by the user. How large are these deductibles? We have no idea.
- The user agreement also speaks vividly to the dangers associated with these devices: "Use of these services may result in bodily injury, disease, strains, fractures, partial or total paralysis, other ailments that could cause serious disability, mental or physical anguish, and death."
- Under the agreement, Lime is released from any such claims except for cases of willful misconduct or gross negligence. The existence of a commercial auto insurance policy in this context could theoretically provide first party benefits, but we don't see how given this language in the user agreement.

The user agreement provides fascinating reading and we could go further, but the point is this: For all the disagreements surrounding this topic, we think everyone agrees on the dangers associated with these devices. For that reason, we believe proper oversight and enforcement is imperative as is adequate insurance for both first and third parties. In our view, this bill fails in both regards.

Thank you again for the opportunity to speak before you today. We are happy to answer questions.

Good morning members of the Committee,

My name is Rylan Seifert and I am the Curbside and Shared Mobility Program Manager for the City of Pittsburgh's Department of Mobility and Infrastructure. I'm here today to speak on behalf of the City of Pittsburgh in support of giving municipalities, including Pittsburgh, the option to authorize shared e-scooter programs.

From July 2021 to July 2023, Pittsburgh implemented a successful shared e-scooter pilot, the only one of its kind in the Commonwealth. The City wishes to share learnings from our pilot in order to compel the state to take action to give cities the option to authorize shared e-scooters.

During the two-year pilot, we saw over one million rides and 230,000 unique users; incredible numbers considering the total population of the city proper is a little more than 300,000. On average, we had over 13,000 monthly active users – this peaked at over 20,000 monthly riders during the summers. 1.4 million miles were traveled by scooter with the average trip length being just over a mile long. 44% of scooter riders used the mode to get to work and a third of riders used scooters to connect to transit. This data shows that scooters serve first-and-last-mile trips to better connect residents to transit and the places they want to go.

Our program sought to set a new standard for how e-scooters are managed in cities. Unlike other programs, we prohibited sidewalk riding and parking. To support this, we built hundreds of dedicated scooter parking corrals and electrified stations and were one of the first cities to test sidewalk detection technology.

Equity was a key consideration in our pilot policies. We used robust distribution and geofencing policies to ensure scooters covered gaps in our existing transit system and made them more affordable in predominately low-income and transit-poor areas. 85,000 trips were taken in these so-called "access zones", areas which together have only 55,000 residents, or about 18% of the City's population. All of these policies are now best practices in shared mobility programs around the country.

Through a survey conducted by the Shared Use Mobility Center, we found that shared scooter system users were more likely to be transit users and to not have access to a personal automobile compared to non-system users. Data showed that shared scooter users were more likely to be non-white, lower-income, and twice as likely to lack access to a car compared to those who did not use the program services. This demonstrates that shared e-scooters are an essential tool to make mobility in Pittsburgh easier, more affordable, and more reliable.

We learned many lessons from the pilot, and we're prepared to make changes to our e-scooter policy to address the concerns we heard during the pilot. This includes installing more scooter corrals to address sidewalk parking, creating a new fee schedule for violations to hold the operator and riders accountable, stepping up enforcement of incorrect parking and riding behaviors, and increasing coordination with Public Safety to address safety concerns.

While shared e-scooters became an essential part of our transportation network during the pilot, private scooters, which are available by purchase through common retailers and online, are still in use. There is nothing to prohibit the sale of private e-scooters nor are there any regulations guiding the safety or standards of these devices. In comparison, the City's ability to implement guidelines for shared scooter operators give us the ability to apply sensible and safe standards such as speed caps, wheel size, lights and reflectors, geofencing, and parking restrictions. By giving the City the option to authorize a shared scooter system we can create an option with guidelines for this otherwise unregulated form factor.

The City of Pittsburgh strongly urges the House Transportation Committee to pass legislation to give cities of the second class the option to authorize a local program. Uncertainty at the state level prevents the City from improving equitable and reliable transportation options for our residents. To be clear, for a shared scooter system to return to Pittsburgh we would need local reauthorization and competitive process to select an operator or operators. However, successful passage of this bill is the first step toward ensuring that thousands of riders who used shared e-scooters can once again have access to this safe, reliable, and affordable mode.



Erika Duthely
Regional Head of Government Relations, US East
Lime

Pennsylvania House of Representatives
Transportation Committee
June 15, 2026

RE: Public Hearing on HB1633

To the Honorable Members of the House Transportation Committee,

My name is Erika Duthely and I am the Regional Head of Government Relations at Lime. I appreciate the opportunity to submit testimony in support of House Bill 1633, which provides for electric low-speed scooter programs and private ownership of these devices. I commend the Committee's ongoing efforts to build a contemporary regulatory structure for micromobility in Pennsylvania.

Lime, the premier global shared micromobility operator, has an extensive record of collaborating with municipalities across the U.S. and worldwide to deliver e-scooter and e-bike services. Our experience has shown that HB1633 represents a vital step forward in modernizing Pennsylvania's transportation landscape. By creating a clear regulatory framework for shared electric low-speed scooters, this legislation empowers municipalities to offer sustainable, efficient, and equitable micromobility solutions to their residents and visitors.

Lime strongly supports the framework established in this bill, which provides cities with the necessary tools to manage these programs effectively. Key components of the legislation ensure that shared electric low-speed scooter programs operate safely and responsibly through provisions such as:

- **Local Empowerment and Control:** The bill allows authorized municipalities—including cities of the second class, second class A, and third class—to voluntarily opt-in. This ensures local leaders can tailor scooter-sharing programs to meet the specific needs of their communities.
- **Safety and Accountability:** The legislation prioritizes public safety by establishing standardized speed limits (maximum top speed of 20 miles per hour), parking regulations to prevent abandoned devices, and requirements for commercial enterprises to maintain complaint hotlines. It also provides clear paths for municipal oversight and enforcement, including penalties for non-compliance.
- **Economic Opportunity:** Past pilot programs, such as the two-year pilot in Pittsburgh, have demonstrated significant benefits. That program alone created 535 full-time equivalent jobs with an average hourly wage of \$19.62 and contributed \$1.68 million in



wages to the local economy. Furthermore, 42% of riders reported using e-scooters for shopping, dining, or essential errands, supporting local businesses.

- **Sustainable and Integrated Mobility:** E-scooters offer a carbon-free alternative to short car trips, helping to reduce traffic congestion. In Pittsburgh, survey data showed that 33% of scooter trips replaced car trips, equating to 330,000 fewer car trips over the pilot period.
- **Insurance Requirements:** The bill establishes clear insurance standards for commercial operators, including requirements for general liability and automobile insurance, to ensure financial responsibility and protection for all parties.

Lime is committed to partnering with Pennsylvania cities to build a future where transportation is shared, affordable, and carbon-free. We urge the Committee to report HB 1633 favorably so that residents across the Commonwealth can access these critical transportation options.

Sincerely,

Erika Duthely
Regional Head of Government Relations, Lime

House Transportation Committee
Testimony on HB 1633 (Kinkead)
Monday, June 15, 2026, 10am

Introduction

The Coalition for Active Mobility in Pennsylvania (CAMP) champions state-level policies in support of active mobility with a focus on promoting healthy, safe, affordable, and environmentally sound transportation choices for people across PA. Active mobility is defined as walking, biking, and using wheelchairs or other micro-mobility or assistive devices (low-power, low-weight, low-speed) to get to everyday destinations – including accessing transit and trails.

We are in support of HB 1633 (and SB 1008 or Abby’s Law) overall. Micromobility devices expand transportation options for pedestrians beyond traditional public transit and personal vehicles. Among these options, low speed electric scooters (e-scooters) have emerged as an inexpensive and convenient way for individuals to reach their destinations, particularly over short distances. In 2019, there were approximately 29 million e-scooter trips nationwide, reflecting their growing role in modern transportation systems.¹

E-Scooters Provide Additional Transportation Options

During a two-year pilot scooter share program in Pittsburgh, over a million trips were recorded. A report, submitted to both the Pennsylvania House and Senate Transportation Committees, showed that over 212,000 signed up to the program, and that these users traveled some 1.25 million miles through the end of April 2023.² Most trips were fairly short, but longer than a comfortable walk, with an average length of 1.24 miles. A separate study showed that scooter users of lower incomes made use of the program the most frequently.³ Nearly half of riders used the scooters to commute, 44.9% used them to meet family and/or friends, 23% used them for dining out and shopping and 19% used them for running errands.

Portland Oregon's 2018 shared e-scooter pilot study found similar results.⁴ Portlanders primarily used e-scooters for transportation. 71 percent of Portlanders reported that they most frequently used e-scooters to get to a destination, while nearly a third of respondents (28.6 percent) said they most frequently used e-scooters for recreation or exercise. Survey respondents also indicated that e-scooters replaced driving and ride-hailing trips. 34 percent of Portland riders and 48 percent of visitors reported that they took an e-scooter trip instead of driving a personal car or using Uber, Lyft, or taxi.

Documentation of Increased E-Scooter Ridership

The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia (BCGP) conducts an annual bike count report analyzing bicycle trips taking place in the morning (7:30-9:00 AM) and during the evening (4:30 to 6:00 PM).

¹ https://drive.google.com/file/d/1989E38FjoQO41AtvtNdNAbsfKwXayMGa/view?usp=drive_link

² <https://move-pgh.com/blog/who-rides-the-scooters-and-why>

³ <https://www.portland.gov/transportation/regulatory/escooterpdx/documents/2018-e-scooter-findings-report/download>

⁴ <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1361920921003941>

In 2025, of 15,816 micromobility devices counted, scooters made up 14%⁵, compared to 10% in 2022.⁶

In Philadelphia and across Pennsylvania, a significant number of residents have adopted e-scooters as a primary or supplementary mode of transportation because it meets their needs. While there are some assumptions that e-scooters are only seen in large city centers, there are surprising numbers of the devices in use in small cities and at times even small towns. They are more likely to be seen in college towns, but are showing up as viable transportation alternatives for people who need to travel two or three miles down a state road to a manufacturing job site. Such devices are typically purchased on-line and a requirement of notification of legal status and restrictions like age should be provided at point of sale both on-line and in store.

Information About Economic impacts of E-Scooters

E-Scooters provide an opportunity for cities to increase economic activity and generate revenue. The city of Milwaukee, WI, generated \$ 436,000 in new revenue for the city through a shared E-Scooter program.⁷ According to Georgia Tech, the availability of e-scooters drive down congestion, which could in turn result in annual national savings: *“The researchers found that e-scooters and e-bikes do, in fact, reduce congestion on the road by substituting some personal vehicle or ridesharing use rather than only public transit or walking. When the estimated saved time for drivers nationwide is translated into monetary value, Asensio approximates that it adds up to \$536 million a year.”*⁸

We ask that the House Transportation Committee support this important legislation along with continuing to support HB 291, Representative Daley’s Parking Protected Bike Lane bill, which has been previously passed by the committee, so that not only do more people have the opportunity to choose safe micromobility options they also have safe places to use them.

Additional detailed notes on the specifics of the proposed legislation are being provided in writing.

Thank you for your consideration,

On behalf of the Coalition for Active Mobility in Pennsylvania

Made up of:

10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania

Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia

Bike Pittsburgh

Mobilify

Pennsylvania Downtown Center

Cc: Chair, Senator Judy Ward and the PA Senate Transportation Committee

⁵ <https://bicyclecoalition.org/2025-bike-counts-summary/>

⁶ <https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/a94373c7697d45ddb70aef071933481>

⁷ <https://youtu.be/ldJXaHoJExc>

⁸ <https://iac.gatech.edu/electric-scooters-car-use-atlanta>

Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association

3905 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 • Tel: (717) 236-1059 • Fax: (717) 236-0226 • Web Site: <http://www.pachiefs.org>

From the perspective of the Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association and the law enforcement community, these amendments represent a meaningful attempt to respond to earlier concerns. However, even taken together, they only partially address the core issues of **enforceability, roadway safety, and clear legal authority**—and several of the most significant concerns remain unresolved.

There are a few areas where the proposals move in a constructive direction:

- **Local registration and inspection authority**
Allowing municipalities to impose registration fees and inspection requirements introduces a layer of accountability that is currently absent. This could improve oversight at the local level, particularly in higher-density areas.
- **Restrictions on high-speed roadways and certain locations**
Prohibiting e-scooter operation on highways, roadways above 40 MPH, and in business-district sidewalks helps mitigate some of the most dangerous use cases and aligns with basic roadway safety principles.
- **Parental responsibility provisions**
Adding language around parental responsibility and unauthorized purchase for minors begins to address a critical gap involving underage riders, though enforceability remains a concern.
- **Creation of a general “unauthorized device” offense**
Establishing a forward-looking enforcement tool for emerging micromobility devices is a practical step that provides officers with clearer authority than currently exists.

Despite these improvements, several of the most significant law enforcement concerns are not adequately addressed:

1. Enforcement remains impractical in real-world conditions

- A **warning-first penalty structure**, followed by relatively low fines (\$50 / \$200), is unlikely to deter unsafe behavior.
- Officers still face the same fundamental issue: **safely stopping riders**, particularly minors or inexperienced operators, remains difficult and potentially dangerous.
- There is still no clear mechanism to ensure **compliance with registration, inspection, or local rules at the point of contact**.

2. Lack of mandatory, statewide standards

- Registration and inspection are **optional at the municipal level**, leading to a patchwork of rules that vary widely across jurisdictions.
- The insurance provision is discretionary (“may”), meaning **many riders will remain uninsured**, leaving motorists exposed.
- There is still **no universal licensing, training, or education requirement**, which was a central concern.

3. Continued liability exposure for motorists

- Even with location restrictions, e-scooters will still operate in mixed traffic environments where:
 - Riders may behave unpredictably
 - Visibility remains limited
 - Speed differentials create conflict points
- The amendments do not materially resolve how **fault and liability will be assessed**, particularly in scenarios involving inexperienced or underage riders.

Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association

3905 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 • Tel: (717) 236-1059 • Fax: (717) 236-0226 • Web Site: <http://www.pachiefs.org>

4. Penalty structure lacks meaningful accountability

- The relatively low fines and warning-based approach do not reflect the **potential severity of harm** associated with unsafe operation.
- Replacing municipal fine authority with standardized penalties may actually **reduce local flexibility** to address problem areas.

5. Physical and operational risks remain unchanged

- No amendment can address the **inherent limitations of e-scooters**:
 - Small wheels and instability
 - Limited braking capability
 - Reduced visibility
- Without stronger operational controls, these risks persist regardless of regulatory structure.

Additional legislative proposals

- **S.B. 824 (protected bike lanes)**
While protected infrastructure may improve safety for bicycles, its benefit to e-scooters is indirect and does not resolve enforcement or behavioral concerns.
- **H.B. 1633 (shared scooter programs)**
Reintroducing shared systems in select cities may provide more controlled environments, but it also expands overall usage and does not address statewide enforcement challenges.
- **Careless and reckless driving amendments (Sections 3714 & 3736)**
Clarifying applicability to e-bikes is helpful, but it does not materially change enforcement realities for e-scooters or prevent unsafe operation.

These amendments **improve the bill at the margins**, but they do not resolve the central issue:

Law enforcement still lacks a clear, consistent, and enforceable framework that ensures safety for riders, motorists, and officers alike.

Key gaps remain in:

- Practical enforceability
- Statewide consistency
- Rider qualification and training
- Meaningful accountability and deterrence

While the proposed changes demonstrate responsiveness to LE concerns, they fall short of establishing a system that law enforcement can reliably implement and that meaningfully reduces risk on public roadways.

From a LE and public safety standpoint, the fundamental question remains unchanged:

Does this framework reduce risk—or does it formalize and expand a system that remains inherently difficult to regulate and enforce?

At present, the law enforcement community would continue to have significant reservations and would likely maintain that a clear, statewide prohibition—or a far more robust and enforceable regulatory structure—is necessary to adequately protect the public.

Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association

3905 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 • Tel: (717) 236-1059 • Fax: (717) 236-0226 • Web Site: <http://www.pachiefs.org>

Scott L. Bohn

Executive Director

Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association