

Communication from Public

Name: Jed Pauker

Date Submitted: 08/25/2019 12:49 PM

Council File No: 17-1125-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Re: Council File 17-1125-S3 Please see the attached file, which updates and presents my prior comment to CF 17-1125-S6 in a more easily-readable format than the text-only submission tool provides.

August 26, 2019

Re: Council File 17-1125-S5

This is to ensure that this comment (originally to CF 17-1125-S6 - and updated here) receives correct routing:

Honorable Council Members,

This is to advise that, with some regret but no remorse, I am ending my use of the City's mobile MyLA311 system to report the several dockless scooter parking violations I see every day. Below is a thumbnail summary of my experience with the system.

While the mobile system is appreciated, its operation is unreasonably onerous and time-consuming: It requires a separate ticket for each vehicle ID, when most violations I encounter involve two or more vehicles that could reasonably be reported on a single ticket and electronically separated for action during back-end processing.

The vehicle identification model often requires a reporting party to move the offending device into an orientation where its ID number can be viewed for reporting. This imposes a hardship when several vehicles are piled up on the ground, requiring digging through as many as half a dozen vehicles to get to one vehicle's ID - which I have had to do on several occasions.

These are just two challenges that effectively chill reporting and thereby decrease the quantity of reports submitted in relation to the number of violations observed.

Further, on any given day, the number of violations I observe exceeds the number of reasonably reportable incidents by a factor of three or more. In other words, I see at least three times as many violations as I might be able to report under ideal time and vehicle access circumstances. I simply haven't the time to report every safety and regulatory violation I see.

On report effectiveness: Last weekend, I saw two vehicles illegally lying in an infamous area of surreptitious storage among trees and atop shrubs which bravely and repeatedly endure their impact and weight until they - the plants - expire. I have reported dozens of instances in that and other locations many times in recent months, only to find that - contrary to the two-hour removal promise - vehicles might not be moved until the next day, and often remain for over twenty-four hours before relocation.

Vehicle parts also pepper the landscape - mostly kickstands, but also plastic reflectors or broken vehicles - lying on the ground or sidewalks. While I can't know for certain whether orphaned parts come from early generations of flimsy vehicles or whether they are from new, supposedly sturdier models, I can say that the parts I see generally appear to be from Bird and, sometimes, Lime vehicles.

As civic-minded as my decade-plus of Neighborhood Council service bears out that I am, I can no longer afford to invest 2-5 minutes per reporting instance when what time I have remaining

on this earth grows ever shorter and, frankly, is better invested in helping to protect the world at large that your children and grandchildren will inherit, should they not - god forbid - prematurely expire after a collision with an errant sidewalk e-scooter rider.

On that grim safety note, I urge you to consider applying motor vehicle governance to these motor vehicles: Require license plates, Department of Motor Vehicle registration and rider education, testing, licensing and a DMV record tie-in to lock in their acknowledgement of safety and regulatory requirements. This no-brainer would go a long way toward resolving e-scooter safety issues.

Speaking of brain protection, you may know that Bird sponsored 2018's successful AB2989 in the California State Legislature. The bill negligently removed the e-scooter helmet requirement for adults. It also removed the state proscription against e-scooters traveling on streets whose automotive speed limits exceed 25mph. Both rule changes clearly endanger rider and public safety. As such, I urge you to restore both requirements in any and all permanent e-scooter permitting models that you may consider.

Finally, I urge you to require e-scooter firms to apply currently available geo-fencing technology to prevent e-scooter operation on sidewalks. While I prefer that the City would motivate residents and visitors to exercise - walking and riding bicycles, I understand that CLEVR has applied for an operation permit; their geo-fencing purports to prevent e-scooters from traveling everywhere that they are prohibited. If effective, their system (and deployment by other operators of a like system), combined with use of LADOT's regulatory powers, will ease what would otherwise present a hefty burden on law enforcement resources.

Software opens a world of critical safety tools and common sense rider advisements before and during use, and at ride's end. The City has a public safety mandate to require vehicle providers to deploy them. *There is no reason why the automotive industry should be even one step ahead of the e-scooter industry on this.*

While the demonstrably unsafe and intentionally predatory introduction of e-scooters will leave an ugly scar where a welcome mat could have been, I remain hopeful that the City will find the courage to prioritize safety and sustainability for humans at a time when the gold ring for both is still reachable.

As always, thank you for your service and for your consideration.

Best,

Jed Pauker