



Planning for Micromobilities in Canada: Transportation Policy Review

Nathaniel Clark Frisbee
Dr. Jason Gilliland
Dr. Jinhyung Lee



Western

Background

- Micromobility: transportation over short distances; provided by lightweight and single person vehicles
- Accessibility: the ability to reach opportunities and resources
- Key Policy Challenges
 - Transit efficiency
 - Safety
 - Facilitate Micromobility
 - 'First and last mile' transit
- Policy Relevance:
 - Equity
 - Policies targeting climate change
- Light Electric Vehicles: an electrically powered bicycle or scooter. Identify policy
- Battery pack:
 - Removeable and rechargeable
 - Connected to and powers wheels
 - Controlled via the handlebars
- Most common forms:
 - E-bikes
 - E-scooters
 - Mobility scooters

Objective

- To identify any policy gaps that exist in Canada regarding LEVs
- Go through macro, meso, and micro level policy intervention on LEV implementation
- Determine if different LEV implementation approaches are superior to others

Methods

- Identification of 26 different Canadian municipalities
 - Determined based on the presence of a public university within the urban growth boundary
- Analysis of these municipal Transportation Master Plan
- Qualitative data analysis
 - Nvivo software was used
 - Search for specific LEV policies
 - Search terms: light electric vehicles, electric, cyclists, cycling, bicycles, pedelecs, LEVs, e-bikes, e-scooters, scooters

Results

Quebec	Alberta	Ontario	British Columbia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provincial ban on e-scooters ▪ Uptake in popularity of e-bikes ▪ E-bikes expected to overtake traditional bikes in popularity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Popular uptake in LEVs ▪ Promotion of public and private sector collaboration ▪ E-scooters are far more common than e-bikes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provincial pilot program ▪ Kicks legislative decision to municipalities ▪ Creates stark differences within the province 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subsidization program for LEVs in an attempt to decrease second car purchasing ▪ 6 municipalities given the option to participate in an e-scooter program

Urban Planning Tendencies

Quebec	Historically rooted in nationalism. Do not want outside influence on provincial policy.
Ontario	Shift to fiscally conservative and socially progressive. Attempt to be the standard setter for new transportation policy
Alberta	Individualistic and promotes public-private collaboration in free-markets
British Columbia	Moralistic populism and relies heavily on the influence of social movements that values sustainability and wellness

Key Findings

- There are significant policy differences regarding LEVs in Canada
- E-bike and e-scooter policy must be different for both to be successful as they target two different groups of people
- Provinces who have imposed a ban had very relaxed policy regarding e-scooter implementation

Conclusions

- LEVs can significantly impact micromobility as they are a viable option for all ages
- Canada can benefit from a more coordinated approach on LEV policy as the current landscape has led to significant differences across the country

References

- Mulcahy, K. V. (1995). Public Culture and Political Culture. *Quebec Under Free Trade: Making Public Policy in America*, ed. Guy Lachapelle (Quebec: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 1995), 335-62.
- Wilson, J. (1997). The Ontario Political Culture at the End of the. *Revolution at Queen's Park: Essays on Governing Ontario*, 55.
- Barrie, D. (2006). *The other Alberta: decoding a political enigma* (Vol. 16). University of Regina Press.
- Carty, R. K. (Ed.). (1996). *Politics, Policy, and Government in British Columbia*. UBC Press.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Lee and Dr. Gilliland for their support over the duration of this internship. Without them this project would not have been possible.

Contact Information

- nfrisbee@uwo.ca
- jgillila@uwo.ca
- Jinhyung.lee@uwo.ca

