

Communication from Public

Name: Jed Pauker

Date Submitted: 08/25/2019 11:23 AM

Council File No: 17-1125-S7

Comments for Public Posting: Re: Council File 17-1125-S7 Honorable Council Members, This is to ensure that my comment (to CF 17-1125-S6 - and updated here) receives correct routing: This is to advise that, with some regret but no remorse, I amending my use of the City's mobile MyLA311 system to report the several dockless scooter parking violations I see every day. Following 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 scooter ID, when most violations I encounter involve two or more scooters that could reasonably be reported on a single ticket and electronically separated for action during back-end processing. Its 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 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 do remain for over twenty-four hours before relocation. Vehicle parts also pepper the landscape - mostly kickstands, but also plastic reflectors or broken scooters - lying on the ground or sidewalks. While I can't know for sure 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 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 brains, 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 vehicles' proscription against traveling on streets with automotive speed limits over 25mph. Both rule changes clearly endanger rider and public safety. As such, I urge you to "add back" 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 such that e-scooters cannot operate 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. While the obviously 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