

Communication from Public

Name: Russell Howes

Date Submitted: 06/26/2019 04:24 PM

Council File No: 17-1125-S6

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Transportation Committee, I am writing in regards to Gil Cedillo's motion 17-1125-S6 requesting that his Council District be excluded from the city's dockless vehicle pilot because of safety concerns. Councilmember Cedillo voted in favor of the pilot program on September 4 and September 28, without expressing reservations about the relevant safety concerns. I attended several of these meetings and observed the Councilmember ignoring public comments expressing many of the safety issues cited in the motion. Nine months later, now that the scooters have migrated to his district and infuriated his own constituents, he seems to have seen the light on these important safety issues. I applaud his responsiveness to his constituents and apparent concern for their safety and well-being. However, what's good for the proverbial goose is good for the gander--either the dockless vehicle program is beneficial for Los Angeles or it isn't. Access to low-cost transportation alternatives would be eroded in District 1 if this were to pass--just as it would in any other Council District. All Angelenos deserve the same safety protections, and it's not right to single out a single council district for preferential treatment just because its Councilmember happens to be more responsive to constituent concerns than others. If Councilmember Cedillo is concerned about the safety of children, pedestrians, and cyclists in his district, I hope these concerns extend to all Angelenos, including those in Council District 11 where scooter usage is highest. I hope he will become an advocate for pedestrian and cyclist safety and advocate for changes to the dockless pilot that will increase pedestrian safety and operator responsiveness and accountability. However, I think that his motion 17-1125-S6 marks one council district for special treatment based on concerns that affect the whole City, and is thus not good policy. I do not think it should be approved by the Transportation committee. Sincerely, Russell Howes

Communication from Public

Name: Russell Howes

Date Submitted: 06/26/2019 04:25 PM

Council File No: 17-1125-S6

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Transportation Committee, I am writing in regards to Gil Cedillo's motion 17-1125-S6 requesting that his Council District be excluded from the city's dockless vehicle pilot because of safety concerns. Councilmember Cedillo voted in favor of the pilot program on September 4 and September 28, without expressing reservations about the relevant safety concerns. I attended several of these meetings and observed the Councilmember ignoring public comments expressing many of the safety issues cited in the motion. Nine months later, now that the scooters have migrated to his district and infuriated his own constituents, he seems to have seen the light on these important safety issues. I applaud his responsiveness to his constituents and apparent concern for their safety and well-being. However, what's good for the proverbial goose is good for the gander--either the dockless vehicle program is beneficial for Los Angeles or it isn't. Access to low-cost transportation alternatives would be eroded in District 1 if this were to pass--just as it would in any other Council District. All Angelenos deserve the same safety protections, and it's not right to single out a single council district for preferential treatment just because its Councilmember happens to be more responsive to constituent concerns than others. If Councilmember Cedillo is concerned about the safety of children, pedestrians, and cyclists in his district, I hope these concerns extend to all Angelenos, including those in Council District 11 where scooter usage is highest. I hope he will become an advocate for pedestrian and cyclist safety and advocate for changes to the dockless pilot that will increase pedestrian safety and operator responsiveness and accountability. However, I think that his motion 17-1125-S6 marks one council district for special treatment based on concerns that affect the whole City, and is thus not good policy. I do not think it should be approved by the Transportation committee. Sincerely, Russell Howes