



MEETING LOG

SUBJECT: ASTM F15.58 Subcommittee Meeting on Micromobility Devices

OP PLAN ENTRY: Self-balancing Scooters and Light Electric Vehicles/Micromobility Devices

DATE OF MEETING: 5/8/2025

LOCATION OF MEETING: Virtual

CPSC STAFF FILING MEETING LOG: Stephen Harsanyi (ESHF)

FILING DATE: 5/14/2025

CPSC ATTENDEE(S): Kevin Lee (EXRR), Einstein Miller (EXRR), Jay Kadiwala (ESEF), and Stephen Harsanyi (ESHF)

NON-CPSC ATTENDEE(S): Contact ASTM for attendee list.

Summary of Meeting:

The ASTM F15.58 subcommittee (SC) convened to discuss task group updates pertaining to the following products: (1) self-balancing scooters (SBS), (2) commercial electric-powered scooters (e-scooters) for adults, and (3) electric-powered balance bikes (e-balance bikes).

1. Self-Balancing Scooters – The SC reviewed the draft standard for SBSs. This review included addressing previous ballot comments on the draft and making additional improvements. In particular, the SC’s discussion included the following:
 - *Guards and shields* – Requirements for guards and shields to prevent crushing, laceration, and pinching hazards. The SC is considering the related requirements specified in ASTM F963, section 4.13, on folding mechanisms and hinges for toys.
 - *UV Inhibitors* – Whether UV inhibitors should be required for exposed functional components composed of plastic. The task group chair opined there should not be UV inhibitor requirements because of variability in product use (e.g., some products are used exclusively indoors) and that it would be better to leave it to the manufacturer to determine what is appropriate. Several members opined that UV inhibitors are more important for products like outdoor trampolines that are likely to be exposed to UV for long periods and potentially have a reduction in safety due to extended UV exposure. The SC decided to move the requirements for UV inhibitors to the appendix as a recommendation.
 - *Marking and labeling requirements* – CPSC staff informed the subcommittee that the Ad Hoc Language task group is making updates to their recommendations, such as font



type size. The SC decided to postpone matching Ad Hoc until the Ad Hoc document is finalized.

- **Motor Output** – CPSC staff explained the requirements that address the fall hazard associated with the user overpowering the product’s motor, and therefore, its capability to remain level.
 - **Test Methods** – Development of test methods for specifications that do not have corresponding testing requirements.
 - **Audible Alerts** – Clarification of audible alert parameters in the test methods section.
2. **Commercial Electric-Powered Scooters for Adults** – The SC reviewed the draft standard for commercial e-scooters for adults. The SC briefly discussed the following topics, among others: waterproofing and dust intrusion, grip dimensions for brake levers, motor power limits (*i.e.*, specify continuous rated power), requirements for accessible clearances for moveable segments (*i.e.*, exclusion of the wheel and its support system, the rear brake/braking system, and brake levers), and kick-to-start requirements (*i.e.*, exclusion of seated scooters). The SC spoke at greater length regarding the following:
- **Stopping Distance** – Whether it is more appropriate to require deceleration rates than a stopping distance. One member opined that the proposed stopping distance of 15 ft when traveling at 15 mph is too onerous for them to meet. CPSC staff explained that staff tested e-scooters that met this requirement, and that another manufacturer in the SC previously indicated they could meet the requirement. The member requested consideration of the German eKFV small electric vehicles ordinance, which specifies deceleration rates when applying single (1.54 m/s^2) and multiple brake (3.5 m/s^2) configurations.
 - **Marking and Labeling** – Multiple points were discussed, as summarized below:
 - Whether it is acceptable for products to be printed with an email address rather than a phone number for reaching the e-scooter company’s help line. The task group chair recommended requiring a phone number and explained that it is important that users have a way to immediately get support, such as if the product emits smoke.
 - Whether the required warning, “Collisions and falls have resulted in death,” should be “toned down.” CPSC staff advocated for the current language and explained that consumers commonly underappreciate the nature and severity of e-scooter-related collisions and falls, and that it is critical to have vivid and compelling warnings.
 - Whether the digital forced acknowledgement warnings should be shown every time the product is ridden, whether the standard is clear about how frequently the user is to see the warnings, and whether there is too much verbiage. CPSC staff advocated for the digital forced acknowledgement warnings to be shown once every time the user connects to the product because these warnings may be the only warnings the user ever sees for the product, and the user may forget the warnings after the first exposure. CPSC staff recommended the SC consider whether the requirement clearly indicates that the digital forced acknowledgment warnings are only to be shown once per ride, and whether the warnings verbiage should be reduced.



- Whether the digital forced acknowledgment warnings should be more clearly aligned with the digital safety section information. CPSC staff explained that the two mediums vary in the amount of information they should contain but agreed that the mediums should be aligned where appropriate.
3. **Electric-Powered Balance Bikes** – The SC discussed the scope of the draft standard for e-balance bikes. This discussion included the following topics:
- **Toy** – SC members agreed that the e-balance bikes covered by the standard are not toys subject to ASTM F963 on toys.
 - **Speed and Use** – CPSC staff voiced concern that the draft scope indicates speeds up to 30 mph for children’s products. Other members opined that the maximum speed is appropriate because of the intended use of the products and because the requirements account for kinetic energy. Staff responded that they remain concerned about the maximum speed and indicated that the standard is currently addressing two very different products: e-balance bikes intended for competitive use (typically used by experienced riders on designated tracks and with full-body protection) versus non-competitive use (typically used by inexperienced riders in residential areas and without full-body protection). Currently, the SC intends to address both types of e-balance bikes in the same standard, but with different requirements for each type.
 - **CPSC Staff Activities** – CPSC staff explained that they are currently working on regulations for (1) micromobility lithium-ion batteries, and (2) mechanical hazards associated with electric-powered bicycles. Staff indicated they will update the SC when the two notice of proposed rulemakings are published.

Next Steps:

Self-Balancing Scooters – CPSC staff plans to make updates to the draft SBS standard as discussed in today’s meeting. The SC plans to ballot the standard in the coming weeks.

Commercial Electric-Powered Scooters for Adults – The SC will continue to work on the draft standard, particularly on the topic of stopping distances versus deceleration values. The SC intends to ballot the standard in the coming months.

Electric-Powered Balance Bikes – A new task group will be formed to work on the draft standard. The SC intends for the task group to meet in June 2025.