

Bike Auckland response to Abley questions regarding the safety of E-Micromobility in Auckland

1. Do you see e-micromobility pose a greater safety threat to users and/or non-users than non-powered micromobility? If so, to what extent and why?

E-micromobility improves the accessibility of this mode of transport, inviting a wider and sometimes less experienced audience. E-mobility devices are often heavier weight and may travel more quickly than unpowered devices. This combination of user inexperience with greater mass and speed has the potential to pose an increased risk to road user safety. The extent of this risk will be relative to the environment in which micromobility is utilised, and the experience level of users - meaning that risk can be reduced both by adapting the transport environment, and by increasing usage rates - and thus experience levels - within the population.

Where micromobility, including bicycles - whether powered or otherwise - mixes with heavy vehicle traffic, small mistakes can easily be fatal. Bike Auckland see this as the largest potential safety threat to e-micromobility users: Their increased popularity in unsuitable environments will inevitably bring them into conflict with large vehicle users. As such, separating large motor vehicle traffic out from environments utilised by pedestrians and micromobility users is a principal control on the extent of any safety threat posed by e-micromobility.

While micromobility occupying a pedestrian space carries a similar risk of collision, the consequences of such collisions are likely to be less serious. However, the solution to both hazards is the same - separation of modes reduces the extent of any safety threat posed by micromobility uptake.

2. What do you see as being the key differences between hired and privately owned e-micromobility vehicles from a safety standpoint? Do you see one type as being safer than the other, and why?

The availability of on-demand e-micromobility devices improves accessibility to this mode of transport, which may result in less experienced users operating these devices.

It may be inferred that owners of e-micromobility devices tend to gain experience with these devices through ownership and regular use, and that this would improve their operational safety. This remains speculative, however, and differences in rider behaviour between a cautious beginner and a confident, experienced rider may be negligible.

Bike Auckland expects that as the micromobility environment changes and on-demand micromobility is normalised, most users will be experienced in their use and safe behaviours will emerge.

3. Notwithstanding potential/upcoming regulatory changes from the Ministry of Transport, what is your position on e-micromobility riders using the footpath? Feel free to differentiate types of e-micromobility in your answer.

Bike Auckland feels that where other safe, suitable infrastructure is not available and usable,

tolerating the use of the footpath may be the safest option for micro mobility users, including cyclists - whether powered or unpowered. We believe that, particularly where there are deficiencies in separated pathways, the user is the best person to decide where it is safest for them to be - whether road or footpath - and that where safe infrastructure is provided, this would be a preferable space for the majority of micromobility users.

Many other options, such as formal speed limits for e-mobility on footpaths, are considered problematic, as they could create an environment where resources are wasted on sporadic and inconsistent attempts to check and control such speeds, as well as creating an environment that places the responsibility of safety - and potential media blame - largely on the users, rather than on the system designers (inconsistent with Vision Zero).

4. Notwithstanding potential/upcoming regulatory changes from the Ministry of Transport, what is your position on e-micromobility riders using cycle lanes/tracks? Feel free to differentiate types of e-micromobility in your answer.

Bike Auckland feels that as most forms of micro-mobility follow similar movement patterns, they can comfortably co-exist within cycle lanes and tracks, provided those lanes are built to a high standard which allows sufficient space and suitability for different forms of micromobility to interact and co-exist (such as having room to pass, continuity, and clearly understandable routes and intersections).

5. Which interventions or policies do you think would improve the safety of e-micromobility in Auckland the most, both for riders and non-riders?

Pedestrians, micromobility and large motor vehicles each have unique characteristics which mean that their interaction within the same space will always introduce a higher level of risk. Bike Auckland strongly believes that separated infrastructure will provide a space which is both safe and, importantly, *feels* safe, as the appearance of safety is as important as statistical safety in terms of adoption and use. Such infrastructure has the potential both to relieve any existing pedestrian-micromobility conflict, and also to isolate the significant hazard presented by large motor vehicles.

6. Is there anything else you would like to point out?

While it is always worthwhile to gather information on potential hazards, Bike Auckland understands that a clear and persistent hazard is presented to “soft” road users by large motor vehicles. Bike Auckland strongly encourages this hazard to remain the focus of safety efforts, recognising that there are limited resources for messaging, enforcement and infrastructure improvements.



Formerly Blind Foundation

22 April 2020

Accessible Streets Regulatory Package 2020 Consultation

To: NZ Transport Agency
Private Bag 6995
Marion Square
Wellington 6141
New Zealand

Electronic submission via email to accessible.streets@nzta.govt.nz

1. Blind Low Vision NZ (formally known as the Blind Foundation) welcomes the opportunity to make this submission on Accessibility Streets Consultation.
2. Blind Low Vision NZ is the operating name of the Royal New Zealand Foundation of the Blind, an incorporated charitable society under the Incorporated Societies Act 1908.
3. Blind Low Vision NZ's purpose is to enable approximately 14,000 clients and members who are blind or have low vision to be self-reliant and live the life they choose.
4. Our vision is a life without limits. As the leading provider of practical and emotional support to people with vision loss we work with clients to find the tools and technology for them to be as independent as possible, enabling them to enjoy life and participate fully in society.
5. Our services include providing vision loss rehabilitation, equipment and training to continue reading and communicating, and services that facilitate mobility, socialisation, recreation, education and employment.
6. This submission relates to Accessible Streets Regulatory Package consultation.

Blind Low Vision NZ

Phone 0800 24 33 33 **Web** blindlowvision.org.nz

General Comments

7. A lack of accessible transport options is one of the important issues Blind Low Vision NZ clients face every day. For our client's accessible footpaths and being able to travel safely and confidently on these is essential to be able to access the environment, services and facilities, transport connections, social connections and undertake daily activities.
8. We actively work with central and local government to promote the safety of pedestrians who are blind or have low vision, and we are also a member of the Living Streets Aotearoa coalition promoting safe and accessible footpaths.
9. The Accessible Streets Regulatory Package has been highly anticipated over the past year. Its name indicates it should contain good news for all citizens, including those who are more vulnerable, but instead it largely represents a regression in the accessibility of our streets for those who are blind or have low vision. It is effectively making all footpaths shared regardless of designation.
10. Blind Low Vision NZ is broadly supportive of the overall objective of the Accessible Streets Package in enabling people to use more active modes of transport safely. However, it must not be at the detriment of the safety and confidence of other footpath users who may not have the same luxury in choice of their mode of transport.
11. If pedestrian spaces are changed to support the safety of users of transport and recreational devices by permitting them on the footpath, what options are left to support the safety of pedestrians who have no other options?
12. Our position is that footpaths should be prioritised as safe and accessible for pedestrians, and that therefore transport devices and recreational (such as E Scooters, other micro-mobility devices and adult cyclists) should be used on cycle paths or the road, not the footpath, to ensure pedestrian safety.
13. We note that many proposed changes outlined in the Accessible Streets Regulatory Package are inconsistent with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD). This is a breach of human rights for the one in four New Zealanders who have a disability ([Stats NZ, 2013](#)), and many other vulnerable pedestrians such as seniors and pram use who depend on the accessibility of New Zealand footpaths.
14. More specific comments about the proposals are provided below.

Proposal 1: Change and re-name the types of devices that can used on footpath, shared paths, cycle paths and cycle lanes

15. Blind Low Vision NZ supports the inclusion of powered wheelchairs as legal footpath users.
16. Blind Low Vision NZ supports the new categories for unpowered and powered transport devices but does not support permitting all powered transport devices, cycles and e-bikes to use the footpath at all times. Exceptions would be for children with current wheel size requirements.
17. This is also an opportunity to specify those not permitted to be on the footpath as well as the speeds for shared paths. We are also concerned at the process for further declarations and how the impact on pedestrians and specifically those who are blind or have low vision will be determined.
 - a. 15 km/hour is too fast for devices to be travelling on footpaths. As noted in the package, this is around three times the speed of walking for an average pedestrian, older pedestrians and those with impairments are slower.
18. Reliance on behaviour will not guarantee safety (real or perceived) for the pedestrian. Current infrastructure is not designed to make all paths shared in use.

Proposal 2: Establish a national framework for the use of footpaths

19. Blind Low Vision NZ has been particularly vocal about our concerns around the hasty introduction of transport devices like e-scooters and the possibility of other micro-mobility devices into communities over the 18 months. Over this time, accidents and fear continue to grow.
20. There is no focus within the package on the behaviours on the roads to address the issues for the more vulnerable in that space (cyclists, e-scooters, etc.). Moving this group to the footpath transfers the safety risk to pedestrians which is not resolved in this package. The need to have the appropriate infrastructure in place to support these changes is also not addressed – particularly on existing footpaths where the accessible path of travel is less than 1.8 m.

21. We believe all footpaths should follow the width suggested by NZTA Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide, which outlines that the minimum footpath width is 1.8m and the maximum width is 3m.
22. As noted previously, 15 km/hour is too fast for people to be travelling on footpaths, 5 km/hour is more appropriate.
23. Consideration to the length of devices, i.e. bikes with trailers should be part of the package if cycles are permitted on the footpath as they can block pedestrian access at crossings and intersections.
24. Shared paths should not be considered adjacent to school drop-offs, public transportation hubs, older persons housing and areas where there is high pedestrian traffic.
25. The package does not say how user behaviours will be managed and enforced. Who will be tasked with this?
26. Appendix 2 has stories from Blind and Low vision New Zealanders who shared a common story of issues and difficult experiences with inaccessible footpaths.
27. Anna (not her real name) asked us to especially include her story in our submission.
 - a. I'm sorry to complain, but I do feel those who are blind or have low vision are being (excuse the pun) overlooked.
 - b. After numerous incidents with other riders using the footpath (listed below), I started avoiding going out which is mentally unsafe - feeling trapped and uncared for by society sure makes you realise your vulnerability.
 - c. When I was a wheelchair user and could also use a mobility scooter, I was amazed how much harder it is to simply get around. I knocked over a bin but had no way of picking it up - which was seen by a passing motorist who shouted abuse at me for leaving it.
 - d. Having to go on the busy road to get around parked cars left me in tears - how was I to get around? I'm partially blind, the road is busy and frequently has boy-racer types swerving all over the road. Why should I have to risk my safety for others to abuse the space for all?

- e. Cyclists and scooters, they are often oblivious to others – they choose to zoom past, brush against you without notice and then glare at you for getting in their way. I thought this was what the cycle lane was there for.
- f. From randomly placed rubbish bins to cyclists racing past without so much of a bell, to cars parked over the pavement. I have sent emails to the rubbish collectors, and they made a genuine effort to put the bins back on the same side of the path, however, they have no control over where people choose to leave the bin in the first place.

28. In April 2019, we asked New Zealanders who are blind or have low vision and living in cities with e-scooter trials to share their thoughts on the introduction of the new form of transport devices. A majority of respondents agreed e-scooters should be kept off footpaths and many highlighted challenges around where they are parked.
29. We had over 200 respondents to our survey, showing that many people out there feel strongly enough on this topic to take the time to share their thoughts. Of these, 184 fully agreed that footpaths should be prioritised as safe and accessible for pedestrians and that therefore transport devices like e-scooters should be used on cycle paths or the road, not the footpath.
30. We also had many people comment on how discarded transport devices like e-scooters pose a real challenge as a trip hazard on the footpaths. In fact, for many, this was their main concern, and it's not surprising. People who are blind or have low vision will often learn a regular route that they travel, gaining confidence by knowing what to expect. Until now, we haven't had to anticipate the possibility of discarded e-scooters at any random point on a journey.
31. More information on the survey is available in Appendix 1
32. Blind Low Vision NZ is not satisfied that the draft "Land Transport Rule: Paths and Road Margins 2020" adequately ensures the safety of pedestrians and those who are blind or have low vision.
33. The proposed rules require that "for the safety of others sharing the footpath, users riding on the footpath" must:
- a. "behave in a courteous and considerate manner,
 - b. travel in a way that is not dangerous for other people using the footpath,
 - c. give right of way to pedestrians,

- d. 15 km/h is far too fast. We propose a speed of 5 – 8 km/h. This is a very fast walking speed.
 - e. ride a device less than 750mm wide so multiple people can still use the footpath.”
34. Rules that require users to simply exercise courteous behaviour offers no protection or reassurances to our clients. Blind Low Vision NZ believes vulnerable footpath users cannot depend on people’s good behaviour when using the road.
35. Blind Low Vision NZ fully supports the use of transport devices as active mode of transport. They help people get where they need to quickly and easily. However, for the safety of our clients, they should not be used on footpaths.
36. Transport devices on footpaths are proving a real issue for pedestrians who are blind or have low vision, and it shouldn’t have to be that way. There is a solution that can work for all parties, and that involves keeping the e-scooters off footpaths.

Proposal 3: Establish a national framework for the use of shared paths and cycle paths

37. Blind Low Vision NZ agrees that more people are using more devices footpaths and shared paths more frequently. This creates issues for New Zealanders who are blind or have low vision.
38. Blind Low Vision NZ supports the installation of cycle paths. These should be physically separated from both motor traffic and the footpath. Pedestrians should not be able to veer into the lanes without knowledge. Signage or road markings are not sufficient for those who are blind or have low vision to identify changes in road space designation.
39. As previously stated in Paragraph 25 under commentary for proposal 2: Blind Low Vision NZ is not satisfied that the draft “Land Transport Rule: Paths and Road Margins 2020” adequately ensures the safety of pedestrians and those who are blind or have low vision.
40. Blind Low Vision NZ objects to the changes that allow “Transport Devices” using shared paths to travel at speeds up to 50km/h. This speed limit is not safe for while these devices are sharing the path with vulnerable road users. 30 km/hour on shared paths where the pedestrians are travelling at less than 5 km/hour is too

fast, and there will always be a requirement to cross the pathway to access crossing facilities and services.

41. Blind Low Vision NZ is concerned that allocating space for the direction of travel within a shared path may not be safe or easily interpreted by persons who are blind or have low vision. People who are blind or have low vision generally travel closer to the building line and move out to the road to locate and access crossings.
42. We believe that a sign or marking on shared paths isn't sufficient to prioritise or exclude a particular user. Wherever possible, there should be a researched and agreed* physical detectable separation between pedestrians and users of wheeled recreation and transport devices
43. Pedestrians who are blind or have low vision need to be able to identify when they enter a pathway that is designated a shared path. Written signage and painted markings alone should not be relied on. Note the tactile delineator for shared spaces should not be used within shared paths as this will be confusing and a safety issue.
44. Blind Low Vision NZ proposes installing detectable physical separation or barriers between the cycles and pedestrians rather than making paths shared - particularly in busier environments which would create a safe path for more vulnerable uses.
45. Pedestrians should always be the first priority. Pedestrians and vulnerable footpath users need to be prioritised, and their safety needs to be considered more in the Accessible Streets Package.
46. Blind Low Vision NZ objects to allowing local ruling authorities, like local councils to change rules in certain areas, as this impacts the safety of New Zealanders who are blind or have low vision. New Zealand roads require consistent standards across the country.
47. Blind and Low vision New Zealanders told us that inconsistent rules make it difficult to navigate the streets as they move between different cities and regions in New Zealand. We've heard multiple stories where people learned to navigate their cities streets with accessible features, and when they've travelled to other cities in New Zealand, they have found it difficult, distressing, and disorientating to navigate other city streets which don't have these same accessibility features.
48. Blind Low Vision NZ is a proud member of the Access Alliance. The Access Alliance is a group of organisations advocating for the introduction of accessibility

legislation to set up the framework to put accessibility at the heart of a more inclusive Aotearoa New Zealand, to the benefit of us all.

49. This accessibility legislation would set the framework to develop consistent New Zealand standards across all domains of life, like public spaces and transport. This would allow every New Zealander to be able to fully participate in society, have the equality of opportunity to learn, to get a job, and to take part in the community and social life.

Proposal 4: Enable transport devices to use cycle lanes and cycle paths

50. Blind Low Vision NZ supports enabling transport devices to use cycle lanes and cycle paths.
51. We support that the intended change to “encourage faster transport devices, like e-scooters or skateboards, to move off the footpath and onto parts of the road where they’re less likely to come into conflict with pedestrians or fast-moving motor vehicles”.
52. These intentions are consistent with our position is that footpaths should be prioritised as safe and accessible for pedestrians and that therefore transport devices should be used on cycle paths or the road, not the footpath, to ensure pedestrian safety.
53. As previously raised in this submission, we object to transport devices still being able to use the footpath if they keep to the speed limit.
54. We also object to transport devices being able to use shared paths. As outlined in Proposal 3, “Transport Devices” using shared paths would be allowed to speed up to 50km/h. This speed limit is not safe while these devices are sharing the path with vulnerable road uses.

Proposal 5: Introduce lighting and reflector requirements for powered transport devices at night.

55. Consideration needs to be given to the height and angle of the light particularly on shared paths where these can cause glare and reduce the vision of pedestrians.

Proposal 6: Remove barriers to walking, transport device use and cycling through rule changes

Section D: Give priority to footpath, shared path and cycle path users over turning traffic where the necessary traffic control devices are installed.

56. Blind Low Vision NZ supports this in principle but has concerns that people who are blind or have low vision may not be able to identify that this is a crossing where they have priority. This will require a significant change in driver, pedestrian and on-road cyclist behaviour.
57. Blind Low Vision NZ also request that there be an addition in the Road Code and the development of a White Cane Law that requires drivers to give way when they see the white cane.
58. Guidance on design needs to include visual and tactile features, consistency in application, physical speed reduction for on-road vehicles and texture change to increase the sound of approaching vehicles.
59. There needs to be a nationally consistent approach to support this change. White lines alone will not be visible for all pedestrians. Blind Low Vision NZ are keen to be included in research to develop the treatments that will be meaningful for our clients.

Proposal 7: Mandate a minimum overtaking gap for motor vehicles passing cycles, transport devices, horses, pedestrians and people using mobility devices on the road

60. Blind Low Vision NZ support minimum overtaking gaps and recommend the definition to include the furthest extent of a mobility device, i.e. long cane users have a cane arc that extends beyond their body width. We have clients who live or travel through environments without marked lanes where there are no footpaths.

Appendix 1 – Additional information about the April 2019 survey

Blind Low Vision NZ (formerly Blind Foundation) contacted clients in Auckland, Lower Hutt, Christchurch and Dunedin in March to invite them to feedback on the Blind Foundation's position on e-scooters, and share their personal stories.

A total of 210 people responded to the survey.

Our position is that footpaths should be prioritised as safe and accessible for pedestrians, and that therefore e-scooters should be used on cycle paths or the road, not the footpath, to ensure pedestrian safety.

In response to the question, "Do you support the Blind Foundation's proposed position on e-scooters?" 184 respondents (88%) said yes, 5 respondents (2%) said no and 21 respondents (10%) said to some extent.

Verbatim themes from the open-ended question inviting people to share their stories, included (roughly in order of frequency):

- E-scooters being left lying around is a real problem, both for pedestrians and guide dogs.
- It would help if e-scooters emitted some sort of noise.
- Possibly some of the adverse effects could be mitigated if the e-scooters were limited to walking speed.
- E-scooters lying around makes learnt routes harder to follow.
- Because e-scooter users are charged by the minute, there is an incentive to go as fast as possible.
- Low vision pedestrians without a cane are essentially indistinguishable from sighted pedestrians, so e-scooter users have no means of knowing to take more care.
- E-scooters can cause people to lose their balance, even if they are not physically contacted by them at all.



Appendix 2 – More Stories from Blind and Low vision New Zealanders

Story 1

I fully support your [Blind Low Vision NZ's] submission regarding the dangers of scooters on footpaths.

Now, with increased foot traffic on footpaths [during the COVID-19 lockdown], it is imperative that the government insists that all bicycles must be ridden on the roads, which are much quieter than normal.

I have, in recent days, had several scary encounters with whole families riding on narrow footpaths around my normally quiet and civilised neighbourhood. Yesterday, a father on a bike with a dog on a lead, followed by 2 children, whizzed past me and the last child forced me into a hedge.

Story 2

I was in Auckland City sometime before Christmas last year, and was walking across a pedestrian crossing. Someone on an e-scooter came from behind me and then as he passed me he cut right in front of me.

I have limited peripheral vision and got an absolute fright. I did not hear or see him coming.

The scooters should absolutely not be on the footpath. With impaired vision it can be very frightening to have the e scooters on the same footpath as I am.

I think they are highly dangerous to visually impaired people, as well as sighted people. Get them OFF the foot path please!!

Story 3

I live and work in Auckland CBD and am blind (achromatopsia, roughly 5-10% normal vision on average, varies with light levels). I have had numerous close calls with e-scooters since they were introduced.

The worst incident involved multiple e-scooter riders speeding through a crosswalk on Queen Street while pedestrians were crossing. It was clearly a race.

Due to the speed (and my eyesight) there was absolutely no chance of my being able to get out of the way. I am in good physical shape and was able to keep my feet. Anybody of slight build or frail would definitely have been knocked down.

I walk up and down Queen Street and other streets of the CBD every single day and regularly observe scooters being operated at dangerous speeds where impact with a pedestrian would most likely cause injury. I entirely agree they do not belong on footpaths.

Story 4

I have nearly been run over by an e scooter on Quay Street while walking to a concert at Spark Arena.

The driver of the scooter could see my daughter and I walking towards him but he continued straight for us at speed and expected us to step out of his way.

On the way home, I nearly walked into 3 e scooters which were left in the middle of the path which were hard to spot in the dark. Fortunately, my daughter warned me about them before I tripped over.

Story 5

E-scooters are being dumped on paths where they can easily be tripped over.

The new black and white scooters are harder to identify on the footpaths because of colour contrast. They are so quiet when you are walking and they pass you it is very unsettling.

I like the idea of them travelling on cycle ways and the road but where will they be left once the user has finished with them?

Story 6

I'm partially sighted, and although I've generally found e-scooter users to be sensible I've had 2 incidents where I could have easily been hit because I didn't see one coming, and because the scooter was on the footpath & going much too fast.

I totally agree with the Foundation's position, and I also feel that powered vehicles, as well as bicycle users, who generally share the road with cars etc., should all have to sit & pass a version of the road code appropriate for them, and should have to have a license since they, like cars & motorcycles, are potentially dangerous vehicles.

Story 7

I now have a permanently damaged back because not an e-scooter rider but a scooter rider hit me against a wall and I have considerable pain whenever walking now.

Story 8

It is not just blind or vision impaired people who are at risk, but also elderly people, small children, and people with dogs on leads.

Now that cycle ways are being strongly advocated for, then the scooters should be in that environment too. Scooters on pavements at 27kph is ridiculous and dangerous, especially as they are quiet. There is no training given, and no rules either.

I don't agree with suggesting a ban but agree some changes should be looked at. Such as audio emitting devices fitted to the scooters, which work when they are running, speed restrictors on all scooters set to no more than 15 KPH which is about as fast as someone running, also designate a collection points for scooters or add on additional fines.

Story 9

I have had personal experience with near misses with persons riding e- scooters however it has been how they are left at the conclusion of travel that has caused me problems as well.

I had occasion to travel to Queen Street in Central Auckland and within a very short distance >500m I had walked into 4 of these devices as I was unable to see them (I have dense right field hemianopia so I have zero right field vision). And with the crush of pedestrians I hit four of these devices with my cane as I was unable to steady myself due to the number of people around me and fell over dropping my items I was carrying.

While I did so, I feel that not only riding these devices on the footpath, but having no designated places to leave them will cause accidents like mine and possible injury to Visually Impaired Persons like myself.

Regulation around these needs to be comprehensive in all areas around e-scooters as how they are ridden is only part of this problem. I have recently returned from Christchurch and the while the street is wider the issue of persons leaving them in unsuitable and dangerous position is the same.



Story 10

I think they have no place on footpaths. I have very impaired vision and am also deaf. I no longer come to the city as I feel it is too dangerous.

Story 11

On the North Shore where I live and work there are a growing number of privately owned e-scooters, so changes need to be broader than just the hire companies (Lime etc.).

The issue for me is that they travel fast and are almost silent; riders take the whole footpath and pass very close at speed without any warning.

I was nearly hit by a private scooter traveling fast while I was standing at the bus stop this morning.

Any scooter/bike/mobility aid should be limited to walking speed if used on the footpath. Pedestrians should always have priority.

Story 12

A scooter is an "automated vehicle". Roads are for vehicles, therefore, footpaths are for pedestrians.

Story 13

Strict rules must be applied such as speed and misuse of them which should bring a heavy fine to offenders.

Most roads are too narrow for extra lanes. I think e scooters are a great and cheap form of transport. A form of scooter ID / owner ID would also help.

Extra traffic wardens employed by council and funded by heavy fines would soon educate the owners.



Micromobility Study – Input Form

Abley are undertaking a study into the safety of e-micromobility on behalf of Auckland Transport. Our definition of e-micromobility for this study only includes electricity powered micromobility, such as e-scooters, e-skateboards, e-bikes, hoverboards, and Segways.

The aim of the study is to better understand risk factors of micromobility including behaviour and infrastructure. We are looking at risk both for users and non-users of e-micromobility. Our findings will be submitted to Auckland Transport as an evidence base and with associated recommendations. It will inform future policies and interventions to make e-micromobility safer for everyone in Auckland.

In order to ensure we have a comprehensive understanding of the topic, we would appreciate your organisation's answers to the following questions. You are welcome to skip questions if they are not of interest and to attach other evidence or content if needed. Thank you for your time.

1. Do you see e-micromobility pose a greater safety threat to users and/or non-users than non-powered micromobility? If so, to what extent and why? **It is not the e-micromobility that poses a greater safety threat to others, but the users of them.**
2. What do you see as being the key differences between hired and privately owned e-micromobility vehicles from a safety standpoint? Do you see one type as being safer than the other, and why? **Without any experience or personal knowledge, it is likely that privately owned e-micromobility vehicles would be safer because the owner is very familiar with the equipment and its personal foibles.**
3. Notwithstanding potential/upcoming regulatory changes from the Ministry of Transport, what is your position on e-micromobility riders using the footpath? Feel free to differentiate types of e-micromobility in your answer. **E-bikes must always be on the road/cycleways. Where cycleways exist, e-scooters and other e-mobility vehicles that can achieve similar speeds to bikes and e-scooters should use cycleways. E-scooters and similar speed vehicles should only use footpaths provided their speeds do not exceed 10Km/hr, accompanied by a code of behaviour. Footpaths are for feet and pedestrians and their safety must be top priority. They have nowhere else to walk.**
4. Notwithstanding potential/upcoming regulatory changes from the Ministry of Transport, what is your position on e-micromobility riders using cycle lanes/tracks? Feel free to differentiate types of e-micromobility in your answer. **Absolutely, where cycle lanes exist, they should be used by e-micromobility vehicles**
5. Which interventions or policies do you think would improve the safety of e-micromobility in Auckland the most, both for riders and non-riders? **Sensors on e-mobility vehicles that sense congestion on pavements and control the speed of the rider. Maybe it is possible for sensors to pick up on drunk users. Unfortunately, we cannot rely on people to show the courtesy and consideration necessary when using such equipment.**
6. Is there anything else you would like to point out? **Greater emphasis needed on ensuring users are aware of their responsibilities and need for consideration of others**

