

# UC Berkeley

## Recent Work

### Title

Improving California's Bay Area Rapid Transit District Connectivity and Access with Segway Human Transporter and Other Low-Speed Mobility Devices

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9ps1910t>

### Authors

Shaheen, Susan  
Rodier, Caroline  
Eaken, Amanda

### Publication Date

2005

### DOI

10.1177/0361198105192700122

Peer reviewed



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA *Berkeley*  
**Transportation Sustainability**  
RESEARCH CENTER



## **Improving California's Bay Area Rapid Transit District Connectivity and Access with Segway Human Transporter and Other Low-Speed Mobility Devices**

*In Transportation Research Record*, No. 1927, pp. 189-194

2005

**Susan Shaheen, Caroline Rodier, and Amanda Eaken**

# **Improving California's Bay Area Rapid Transit District Connectivity and Access with Segway Human Transporter and Other Low-Speed Mobility Devices**

**Susan A. Shaheen, Caroline J. Rodier, and Amanda M. Eaken**

**Abstract:** To evaluate the potential for low-speed modes to improve transit access, the EasyConnect field test will offer shared-use Segway Human Transporters (HT), electric bicycles, and bicycles linked to a Bay Area Rapid Transit District station and surrounding employment centers in California. Because of safety concerns, research was conducted to understand the risks associated with these modes and potential risk factors. A review of the safety literature indicates that user error is the major cause of low speed mode crashes, and significant risk factors are poor surface conditions and obstructions to drivers' vision. As a result, an extensive training program and carefully selected routes have been included in the field test. The regulatory and legislative history of the HT is chronicled to understand how concerns about its interaction with pedestrians have produced legislation that includes specific safety requirements. The low-speed modes used in this project will be equipped with safety devices, and participants will be required to wear helmets. The survey results of 13 HT implementation projects provide insight into potential advantages and challenges to the field test. Results of interviews and meetings with field test stakeholders are presented with a discussion of their influence on the field test design. Finally, conclusions and future project steps are discussed.

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

Poor access to transit stations is a significant barrier to transit use in many urban regions. Parking during peak hours is often limited, and most people are willing to walk only about 1/4 mi to a transit station (1). Traditional transit feeder services, such as shuttles, can help extend the range of transit access, but may be limited by fixed routes and schedules. Recently, several innovative strategies have been implemented to improve transit access and transit use, including electric bicycles, carsharing, and personal neighborhood electric vehicles (2–6).

Another innovative device that may improve access to transit stations is the Segway Human Transporter (HT). The HT, brainchild of Dean Kamen, was unveiled in 2001 to accolades over its technological achievement and skepticism about its safety. The HT was designed for use in the pedestrian environment. It is a self-balancing, two-wheeled electric device on which the operator stands upright and steers using weight distribution and a hand control. The device weighs 83 to 95 lb and can attain a speed of 12.5 mph.

To evaluate the potential for low-speed modes to improve transit access, researchers have designed a field test, named EasyConnect, that will offer shared-use HTs, electric bicycles, and bicycles linked to a Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) District station and surrounding employment centers in California. Field test partners include California Partners for Advanced Transit and Highways (PATH), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), BART, Segway LLC, and Giant Bicycle Corporation. The Pleasant Hill BART station in the East San Francisco Bay Area is the field test location. Significant business development and a downtown

area are within a 2-mi radius of the BART station. The sidewalks are wide and underutilized, and a trail system links the station to local employers and neighborhoods. There is limited bus and shuttle service to area businesses. Employers are located near the downtown area, so the devices can also be used during the day for lunch, errands, or meetings (Figure 1).



**Figure 1:** Pleasant Hill BART station and surroundings.

In this paper the literature on the safety of low-speed modes is reviewed to identify potential risk factors that may need to be addressed in the field test design. The regulatory and legislative history of the HT in the United States is presented to help understand the safety concerns that have influenced its evolution. The results of 13 previous HT field tests are presented to gather lessons learned during small scale implementations. Results of stakeholder interviews and meetings are presented with a discussion of how they influenced the project design. Finally, conclusions and future project steps are discussed.

## **2 LITERATURE REVIEW: SAFETY OF LOW-SPEED MODES**

This section summarizes the key findings of a literature review on the safety of low-speed modes that operate in the pedestrian environment, including walking, bicycling, skating, skateboarding, riding scooters, and operating wheelchairs [reported previously by Rodier and Shaheen (7)]. Because these safety data are not currently available for the HT, the findings on similar low-speed modes provide important insights into potential issues for the field test. Conclusions are made about the relative risk of each mode, the most significant risk factors, and implications for the field test.

All low-speed modes discussed in this paper are used for “purposeful” travel to varying degrees; however, pedestrian, bicycle, and wheelchair modes are used more commonly than skates, skateboards, and scooters. Skates and skateboards are most frequently employed for recreational and sporting purposes (8). Scooters have only recently become popular; however, the available information indicates that many children use them for recreational purposes (9).

Operational characteristics across the low-speed modes are described in Table 1. All wheeled low-speed modes travel at significantly higher speeds than pedestrians. Bicycles and skates appear to travel at the greatest speeds and have the greatest space requirements for braking distance and turning radius (10–12). The space requirements for wheelchair turning are also significant (13).

**Table 1:** Summary of Operational Characteristics Across Low-Speed Modes

<b>Low-Speed Mode</b>	<b>Speed</b>	<b>Width</b>	<b>Braking Distance</b>	<b>Turning Radius</b>
Pedestrians	2.7 mph	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Bicycles	15 mph	3.3 feet	15 feet	56.3 feet
Skates	10.5 mph	4 feet	20 feet	Not available
Skateboards	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available
Scooters	5 to 8 mph	14 inches	Not available	Not available
Wheelchairs	4.1 to 7.1 mph (electric)	2.5 feet	Not available	2.1 to 4.2 feet

The relative safety risks and common risk factors by low-speed mode are presented in Table 2 (14). The risk of being injured on a low-speed mode appears to be relatively small (injury rate per 10,000 days of participation). Skateboarders have the greatest injury rate (2.15%), followed by bicyclists (2.05%), skaters (1.71%), and scooter riders (1.03%) (15). Approximately 0.1% of wheelchair riders are killed in crashes. Crash rates are not available for pedestrians.

It appears that most low-speed mode crashes do not involve collisions with other low-speed modes or motor vehicles (when data are available; 16). However, available data suggest that collisions most often result in more fatal or serious injuries to pedestrians and bicyclists. Most crashes involve the low-speed mode only (63% to 80%).

The most common risk factors for low-speed mode crashes are surface conditions, user error (e.g., excessive speeds or wrong-way travel), motor vehicle driver error, obscured driver vision, and device design characteristics (e.g., inability to brake) (17–22). The young are most commonly injured in low-speed mode crashes, with the exception of wheelchairs (15, 17, 19, 20). It appears that younger people use low-speed modes more often (23). In addition, the young may be less experienced and have poorer judgment, and thus may make more errors when operating the devices (24). The design of skateboards and scooters also appears to make use by children more dangerous (16).

Literature review results on the safety of low-speed modes have important implications for the proposed field test. Because user error was determined to be a major cause of crashes for low-speed modes, extensive training will be required of participants. Issues of particular concern that will be addressed during training are transitioning from paths to roadways at crosswalks and intersections, wrong-way travel, and driveway dangers. The results of the literature review indicate that poor surface conditions were a significant contributing factor for low-speed crashes, and thus the paths included in the field test will be carefully selected to maximize surface condition quality. Paths have also been selected that avoid obstructions to driver vision of low-speed mode users. In addition, training will include practice and instruction on the best ways to handle more challenging surface conditions. The project will restrict participant age (under 18 years and over 60 years excluded).

**Table 2:** Summary of Key Results from Literature Review on Safety of Low-Speed Modes

Low-Speed Mode	Injury Rates	Regulated Location	Frequency of Crashes Type	Frequency of Crash by Location	Common Risk Factors	Commonly Injured Age Group
Pedestrians	Not available	Sidewalks	Only: 63% Motor vehicle: 36% Bicycle: 1%	Nonroad: 48% Sidewalk Road: 43.4% Intersection No crosswalk	Only: surface conditions Motor vehicle: pedestrian & driver negligence	Young
Bicycles	2.05 per 10,000 participation days	Sidewalks discouraged	Only: 67% Motor vehicle: 29% Bicycle: 3% Pedestrian: 2%	Road: 58.3% Intersection Driveway Nonroad: 26.4% Most bicycle only on sidewalk	Only: surface conditions Motor vehicle: wrong way bicycle travel & obscured driver vision	Young
Skates	1.71 per 10,000 participation days (in-line skating)	Some bans on sidewalks	Only: 80.5% Skaters: 5.9% Motor vehicle: 3.5% Bicycle: 2.5% Pedestrian: 0.8%	In-Line: Road: 34.9% Sidewalk: 27.0% Roller: Park/rink: 50% Sidewalk: 27.8%	Surface conditions Collisions	Young
Skateboards	2.51 per 10,000 participation days	Some bans on sidewalks	Not available	Other (indoor areas, parking lots, and driveways): 36.8% Sidewalks: 18.4% Roads: 1.6%	Excessive speeds: 51.3% Obstructions: 17.9% Collisions with motor vehicle 7.7%	Young
Scooters	1.03 per 10,000 participation days	Some bans on sidewalks	Not available	Nonroad: 67% Most on sidewalks: 21% Road: 27.2%	Surface conditions Excessive speeds Inability to brake Motor vehicle conflict	Young
Wheelchairs	7.6 fatal per 100,000 users per year (14)	Sidewalks	Not available	Sidewalk: 0.3% Most occur inside	Trips and falls Ramps	Elderly

### **3 REGULATORY AND LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF HT**

The HT was designed for operation in the pedestrian environment; however, with two electric motors and the ability to move people and cargo, the HT could be classified as a motor vehicle and thus prohibited from use on sidewalks—the most ubiquitous form of pedestrian infrastructure. This section chronicles the regulatory and legislative history of the HT at the federal, state, and local levels. The history is reviewed to identify potential safety concerns raised by stakeholders and legislative approaches to address those concerns.

#### **3.1 Federal Regulations and Legislation**

Federal legislative activity to secure approval for the use of the HT in the pedestrian environment began in 2001. These efforts contributed to the NHTSA’s determination that the HT should not be classified, regulated, or licensed as a motor vehicle. The Consumer Product Safety Commission (CSPC) also ruled that the HT should be regulated as a consumer product. The NHTSA and CSPC worked together to develop and define a new classification for the HT—an “electric personal assistive mobility device” (EPAMD). This term is defined as follows:

The term “electric personal assistive mobility device” means a self-balancing, non-tandem heeled device that (A) was to transport only one person with personal baggage; (B) is powered solely by an electric propulsion system and; (C) has a top motor-powered speed not in excess of 20 miles per hour (25).

Federal bill S. 2024 was then introduced to enable use of the HT in the pedestrian environment. The bill contained three key components: (a) the term “electric personal assistive mobility device” and its definition; (b) a set of operating guidelines that allowed the use of the device on “bicycle trails and pedestrian walkways constructed or maintained by Federal-aid highway funds;” and (c) a description of the controlling authorities, which qualified the use of the device by stating, “when State or local regulations permit” (25).

The bill was officially introduced on March 15, 2002, read twice, and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works. The last action on the bill was an amendment to the title on June 17, 2002. At this point, legislative efforts began to be focused at the state and local levels. The proposed federal bill’s three-part structure (EPAMD definition, operating guidelines, and controlling authorities) served as a template for state legislation.

#### **3.2 State Legislation**

At the state level, legislation to allow the use of the HT in the pedestrian environment progressed rapidly. In December 2001, New Jersey passed EPAMD-enabling legislation, and in February 2002, New Hampshire passed similar legislation. By October 2003, 40 states and the District of Columbia had passed enabling legislation. Five states (Alaska, Kentucky, Colorado, Louisiana, and Minnesota) did not require EPAMD legislation because they had no prohibition against powered conveyances on their sidewalks. The remaining five states (Connecticut, New York, Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming) have not yet passed legislation (26). See <http://segway.com/general/regulatory.html> (26) to access state HT legislation.

The state legislation shares the basic features of the proposed federal bill, but many states expanded the three-part structure to clarify the HT's exemption from motor vehicle status and to permit its use on pedestrian infrastructure. The operating guidelines were also expanded or made more specific in the legislation passed by many of the states. Much of this language addressed the environment of use and safety concerns. For example, many states

- Expanded the “usable infrastructure” from “bicycle paths and pedestrian walkways” in the federal bill to include streets, roads, and highways;
- Granted users the rights and duties of pedestrians (Connecticut, New York, Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming) or the rights and duties of bicyclists and motor vehicle operators, depending on the allowed operating infrastructure (New Jersey, New Mexico, Utah, and Wisconsin);
- Required users to yield the right-of-way to pedestrians, to give an audible signal when passing pedestrians, and use lower speeds on sidewalks (North Carolina, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Virginia, Washington, Florida, Iowa, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Maine, Tennessee, South Carolina, Rhode Island, Delaware, Michigan, Minnesota, Washington, D.C., and Hawaii);
- Required additional equipment, such as lights and reflectors, when operating the HT between dusk and dawn (New Hampshire, New Mexico, Virginia, Missouri, Iowa, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Maine, Vermont, Tennessee, South Carolina, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, California, Georgia, Connecticut, Hawaii, and Oregon);
- Required HT users to wear helmets (teenagers and younger in Utah, Pennsylvania, Georgia, and Florida, and all ages in New Jersey); and
- Included minimum age requirements of HT users (Utah, Virginia, Missouri, Arizona, Iowa, Vermont, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Hawaii, and Oregon).

### **3.3 Local Legislation**

Of the 40 states and the District of Columbia that passed enabling legislation, 31 allowed local jurisdictions to restrict use of the HT. California's legislation enabled a city and county by ordinance to “regulate the time, place, and manner of the operation of electric personal assistive mobility devices” to protect the safety of the elderly, disabled, and bystanders.

New York restricts the use of the HT in cities with a population of 1 million or more (e.g., New York City). However, some press reports suggest that city officials may not be enforcing the ban. The New York City police department is currently testing the HT as part of a field test program.

Despite widely publicized discussions in many jurisdictions, there have been few actions limiting HT use. While 24 local jurisdictions have discussed restricting HT use, only four have actually done so. In California, the cities of San Francisco and La Mirada have citywide sidewalk bans, and Healdsburg has banned the device on four square blocks in the downtown center (27, 28). San Francisco has also banned the HT from public transit stations and vehicles. A ban was enacted in the Washington, D.C., metro transit system area (District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia), but it is temporarily not being enforced.



Safety concerns raised by advocates for the elderly, disabled, and pedestrians appear to be the force behind most of the local bans. The weight (83 to 95 lb), maximum speed (12.5 mph), and quiet operation of the HTs on sidewalks with limited space are the primary sources of concern. The disabled and elderly feel particularly vulnerable because their physical limitations may make it difficult for them to hear, see, or move out of the way of a relatively quiet, fast, and heavy moving device on a sidewalk (29, 30). Pedestrians appear to be more concerned about the use of these devices on congested or narrow sidewalks and paths.

Segway LLC has countered activists' concerns by asserting that the HT is safe, easy to use, and environmentally beneficial. To make their case, Segway LLC and HT owners have provided demonstration rides to citizens and local officials. In Davis, California, after three owners demonstrated the HT's use on downtown sidewalks, the safety advisory commission "did not feel that there were safety issues with the Segway," and the city council stopped a motion to ban it (31). San Mateo, California, chose not to implement a contemplated ban after learning of Seattle's cost savings from incorporating the HT into its municipal fleet. San Mateo is now pursuing funds to supplement its municipal fleet with HTs (32). Authorities in Capitola, California, have also adopted a "wait-and-see" approach after a demonstration ride (33).

The state-specific legislative provisions to increase the safety of HT use, and to permit local jurisdictions to restrict its use, are of particular relevance to the design of the research field test. The field test design will consider the use of safety equipment to minimize user risk, incorporate age restrictions, and include clear rules of use in the instructional handbook. It is also interesting to note that while 31 states allow local governments to restrict the use of the HT, to date only three jurisdictions ban its use on sidewalks. It appears that most local governments have not found the HT's impact on sidewalks sufficient to warrant restricting its use. During the feasibility analysis, researchers introduced stakeholders to the HT (both with demonstrations and information), identified their potential concerns, and addressed those concerns in the field test design.

#### **4 LESSONS LEARNED FROM PREVIOUS HT PILOT PROJECTS**

Since the HT was unveiled in 2001, 6,000 units have been sold internationally and in all 50 states. HT markets include individual consumers and public and private employment sectors. Key consumer markets include individuals who require mobility assistance but do not meet the strict definition of impairment, urban or short-distance commuters, and recreational users.

This section presents the key findings of a survey, conducted from August to October 2003, of 13 HT pilot projects in the public and private sectors, including manufacturing and distribution, law enforcement and emergency services, postal and delivery services, municipal transportation, park and recreation, transit and employment centers, universities, and leisure.

The results of the survey yielded a number of general "lessons learned." Key challenges reported by the HT pilot projects include

- Importance of training for safe use in a range of environments;
- Need for additional safety equipment (e.g., helmets, lights, and vests);

- Relatively short battery life, particularly on unpaved terrain;
- Weight-related challenges of transporting the device (e.g., in trucks used for emergency responses);
- Building security and lack of parking, which may restrict downtown travel use; and
- User height greater than 6 ft, 4 in., which may restrict access to garages that are 7 ft tall or less (most problematic for law enforcement patrol in urban areas).

Key advantages reported by the pilot projects include

- Travel time savings, greater access, and fewer parking hassles in downtown areas;
- Reduced vehicle operation and maintenance costs;
- Increased emergency access to locations not accessible by trucks, cars, or golf carts;
- Greater efficiency (i.e., faster meter reading, deliveries, or patrols);
- Environmental benefits (i.e., from the use of clean fuel vehicles); and
- Improved public relations.

In general, it appears from this limited survey that the HT may yield economic and environmental benefits when it is carefully applied for selected purposes and locations.

## **5 EXPERT INTERVIEWS AND STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

To anticipate and address stakeholder concerns, expert interviews and stakeholder meetings were held during the project’s initial phase. During these interviews and meetings, stakeholders were introduced to the HT and provided the opportunity to operate it. The community development and planning departments in the field test jurisdictions helped researchers identify safe routes for the program by identifying locations with poor sidewalks, lack of sidewalk connectivity, high traffic, and hazardous intersections. Bicycle and pedestrian groups also helped identify safe routes for bicycles and electric bicycles. Police departments asked that the program equip the low-speed vehicles with lights, reflectors, and bells and require participants to wear helmets when riding. Police also helped identify routes to avoid. The BART accessibility/disability task force requested that the HT be walked and not ridden in the BART station or on BART property. Members of the Independent Living Center in Contra Costa County, a residential community for people with disabilities, requested that the low-speed modes be equipped with bells, that riders say “on your left” if passing a blind person, and that riders give the right-of-way to disabled persons. The design of the field test accommodates stakeholder requests and uses their advice in the selection of the low-speed mode routes.

## **6 RENTAL MODEL**

To investigate fully the range of uses in employment settings, the HT, electric bicycles, and bicycles will be tested in a variety of applications throughout the day. There will be two primary user groups in this study (and rental model): commuters at the end of the workday and employees during the day. Each morning, a specific group of trained employees will take BART to the station, check out a reserved device from the rental vendor, and ride the device to work. Once at the office, the device will be available to a larger group of trained employees for off-site meetings, errands, or lunch appointments. At the end of the day, the commuter will ride the device back to the transit station, where it is stored and recharged. Additional groups, such as

residents who live near the BART station, could be added during a second phase of the field test demonstration, if appropriate. If local residents were added, they would have access to the device on evenings and weekends.

At each employment site, a reservation system for using the HT, electric bicycle, and bicycle will be developed in conjunction with participating employers. A safe and secure storage system will be deployed in conjunction with Segway LLC, a rental agent at BART, each employment site, and local municipalities. The devices will be visible and secure during commute hours. The units will be stored and recharged overnight in a covered facility. In addition, the HT devices will display signage indicating that they cannot be operated without a smart access key, to discourage theft.

## 7 CONCLUSIONS

The field test at the Pleasant Hill BART station and the surrounding community is planned to introduce shared HTs, electric bicycles, and bicycles to suburban transit and employment centers. A comparative evaluation of the three devices, HT (new), electric bicycle (technologically enhanced), and bicycle (traditional), should contribute to an understanding of the context in which the different low-speed devices may increase transit access most cost effectively. As the survey of the HT pilot projects suggests, there are preliminary signs that the HT can produce economic benefits (e.g., time savings and reduced vehicle operation and maintenance costs) and environmental benefits (i.e., reduced vehicle emissions) when it is carefully applied for selected purposes and locations.

Safety concerns about the interaction of the low-speed devices and pedestrians during the initial phase of the project prompted a literature review on the safety of low-speed modes. The results of the review indicated that the risk of crashing is relatively small and often does not involve collisions with other low-speed modes or motor vehicles. The crashes that do occur are most frequently the result of poor surface conditions, user error, obscured driver vision, and the design of the low-speed mode. Many of these risk factors have been minimized in the planned field test by careful selection of routes, by training, and by requiring additional safety equipment.

It appears that efforts to familiarize officials and stakeholders with the HT have helped stem, to date, most of the threats to ban the HT (because of safety issues) that have occurred in numerous local jurisdictions. Only four local jurisdictions have banned the device and only five states have not passed HT-enabling legislation where it would be necessary. Safety requirements in much of the state-level legislation may have been included to address stakeholders' safety concerns. From the beginning of the project, PATH researchers took steps to involve local stakeholders and officials in the field test design.

The next phase of this project includes implementation and evaluation. The evaluation will consist of three main components: (a) pre and post-field test focus groups of HT, electric bicycle, and bicycle users; (b) detailed before-and-after questionnaires and travel diaries; and (c) a bystander survey. Data will be analyzed to assess modal shifts (e.g., reduced auto use and increased BART use); parking impacts; safety (i.e., users and bystanders); health effects; community perceptions; and cost effectiveness. Lessons learned from this field test will be

reported at the conclusion of the research and may be used to inform the design of other shared-use, low-speed mode projects.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The authors thank Caltrans's Division of Research and Innovation (DRI) and the Division of Mass Transportation for their generous contributions to this research. The authors also acknowledge the contributions of Linda Novick of California PATH Jeffrey Spencer of DRI. The authors thank Segway LLC and Giant Bikes for their generous contributions to this research project.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Cervero, R. Walk-and-Rider: Factors Influencing Pedestrian Access to Transit. *Journal of Public Transportation*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 2001, pp. 1–25.
2. Shaheen, S. A. Dynamics in Behavioral Adaptation to a Transportation Innovation: A Case Study of CarLink—A Smart Carsharing System. Report UCD-ITS-RR-99-16. Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Davis, 1999.
3. Shaheen, S. A., J. Wright, D. Dick, and L. Novick. Carlink—A Smart Carsharing System Field Test Report. Report UCD-ITS-RR-00-4. Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Davis, 2000.
4. Shaheen, S. A. Commuter-Based Carsharing: Market Niche Potential. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, No. 1760, TRB, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 2001, pp. 178–183.
5. Shaheen, S. A. and J. Wright. Carlink II: Research Approach and Early Findings: UCB. Report UCD-ITS-PRR-01-39. California PATH Research Report, University of California–Berkeley, Richmond, 2001.
6. Shaheen, S. A., M. Meyn, and K. Wiprywski. U.S. Shared-Use Vehicle Survey Findings on Carsharing and Station Car Growth: Obstacles and Opportunities. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, No. 1841, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2003, pp. 90–98.
7. Rodier, C., and S. Shaheen. Improving Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) District Connectivity and Access with the Segway Human Transporter and Other Low Speed Mobility Devices. A Report for the California Partners for Advanced Transit and Highways. University of California, Berkeley, 2004.
8. Williams, C. Parks Play Catch-Up on Extreme Sports. *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, July 12, 2002. <http://accessatlanta.com/ajc/metro/0702/12xrec.html>.

9. Eisner, R. Wheels of Danger? ABCnews.com, Aug. 16, 2000.  
<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/living/DailyNews/scooters000816.html>. Accessed July 14, 2003.
10. Allen, D. P., N. Roupail, J. E. Hummer, and J. S. Milazzo II. Operational Analysis of Uninterrupted Bicycle Facilities. In *Transportation Research Record 1636*, TRB, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1998, pp. 13–15.
11. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, Office of Compliance. *Requirements for Bicycles*, 2002.
12. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C., 1999.
13. Axelson, P. W., D. A. Chesney, D. V. Galvan, J. B. Kirschbaum, P. E. Longmuir, C. Lyons, and K. M. Wong. *Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access; Part I of II: Review of Existing Guidelines and Practices*. Federal Highway Administration, 1999.  
<http://fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycleped/access-1.htm>. Accessed July 16, 2003.
14. Calder, C. J., and R. L. Kirby. Fatal Wheelchair-Related Crashes in the United States. *American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*, Vol. 69, No. 4, 1990.
15. U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission. *Unpowered Scooters*. *Consumer Product Safety Review*, Vol. 6, No. 4, 2002. [http://cpsc.gov/CPSCPUB/PUBS/cpsr\\_nws24.pdf](http://cpsc.gov/CPSCPUB/PUBS/cpsr_nws24.pdf). Accessed July 16, 2003.
16. Stutts, J. C., and W. W. Hunter. *Injuries to Pedestrian and Bicyclists: An Analysis Based on Hospital Emergency Department Data*. 1997. [http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped\\_bike/docs/to3.pdf](http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/docs/to3.pdf). Accessed July 9, 2003.
17. Hunter, W. W., J. C. Stutts, W. E. Pein, and C. L. Cox. *Pedestrian and Bicycle Crash Types of the Early 1990's*. Office of Safety and Traffic Operations R&D, Federal Highway Administration, 1996.
18. Osberg, J. S., S. E. Schneps, C. D. Scala, and G. Li. Skateboarding: More Dangerous Than Roller Skating or Inline Skating. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, Vol. 152, Oct. 1998, pp. 985–991.
19. Allingham, D. I., and D. MacKay. *In-Line Skating Review, Phase 2*. Transportation Association of Canada, Ottawa, 1997.
20. Frankovich, R. J., R. J. Petrella, and C. N. Lattanzio. *In-Line Skating Injuries: Patterns and Protective Equipment Use*. *The Physician and Sportsmedicine*, Vol. 29, No. 4, April 2001.
21. Engoy, D. *Campus Crime Skateboarding*. 49er, May 1, 2000.  
<http://csulb.edu/~d49er/spring00/news/v7n112-crime.html>. Accessed July 9, 2003.

22. Abbott, M. B., S. A. Hoffinger, D. M. Nguyen, and D. L. Weintraub. Scooter Injuries: A New Pediatric Morbidity. *Pediatrics*, Vol. 108, No. 1, July 2001.  
<http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/cgi/content/full/108/1/e2>. Accessed July 14, 2003.
23. Orenstein, J. B. Injuries and Small-Wheel Skates. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, Vol. 27, No. 2, Feb. 1996.
24. Committee on Injury and Poison Prevention, American Academy of Pediatrics. Skateboard and Scooter Injuries. *Pediatrics*, Vol. 109, No. 3, March 2002, pp. 542–543.
25. Library of Congress. Federal Bill S. 2024.  
<http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?c107:2:./temp/~c107pE2kFY>. Accessed July 23, 2003.
26. Segway LLC. Regulatory. <http://segway.com/general/regulatory.html>. Accessed July 23, 2003.
27. Sprague, M. La Mirada City Council Votes to Ban Segways. *Whittier Daily News*, May 27, 2003. Accessed June 6, 2003.
28. McMahon, P. Watch Your Step: Segways Ahead. *USA Today*, June 17, 2003, pp. 1A, 2A, 4A.
29. Walk San Francisco. Why We Are Pursuing Banning Segways from Sidewalks of San Francisco. <http://walksf.org/segways/why.htm>. Accessed July 22, 2003.
30. Walk San Francisco. Ordinance Amending the San Francisco Traffic Code by Banning the Operation of Electric Personal Assistive Mobility Devices on all Sidewalks in the City and County of San Francisco and in Public Transit Stations and Public Transit Vehicles.  
<http://walksf.org/segways/legislation.htm>. Accessed July 22, 2003.
31. City of Davis City Council. Minutes of the Meeting of the Davis City Council, June 4, 2003.  
<http://city.davis.ca.us/meetings/councilpackets/20030604/A04Jun03.pdf>. Accessed July 7, 2003.
32. Fraley, M. Council May Buy Segway Scooter Fleet. *San Mateo County Times*, April 23, 2003. <http://sanmateocountytimes.com/Stories/0,1413,87~11268~1344764,00.html>. Accessed April 23, 2003.
33. Turner, R. Segway Quietly Rolls Through Town. *Santa Cruz Sentinel*, Jan. 30, 2003.  
<http://santacruzsentinel.com/archive/2003/January/30/local/stories/10localhtm>. Accessed April 23, 2003.

*The contents of this paper reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the state of California. This paper does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.*

*The Public Transportation Group Executive Board sponsored publication of this paper.*