

**Submission
No 209**

**INQUIRY INTO USE OF E-SCOOTERS, E-BIKES AND
RELATED MOBILITY OPTIONS**

Name: Mr Jim Donovan

Date Received: 18 August 2024

Secretary,
Portfolio Committee No 6 - Transport and The Arts
NSW Legislative Council
Parliament House
Macquarie St
Sydney 2000;
Submitted via website

18 August 2024

Dear Secretary,

Inquiry into the use of e-scooters, e-bikes and related mobility options

Submission

This submission does not attempt to cover the whole subject of electric mobility devices. Rather, it is intended to record several matters that don't seem to get enough attention.

The following is organised in sections corresponding to the terms of reference.

a. *the current and anticipated role of all three levels of government in enabling and encouraging safe electrified active transport options*

(No comments on this term)

b. *opportunities to reform the regulatory framework to achieve better and safe outcomes for riders and the community*

Regulation could help with:

- o ensuring that the motor, battery and charging equipment are of appropriate quality. An example of a battery that doesn't seem up to standard is illustrated by the case of Stephan Fischer who is being sued in defamation by a Queensland company called Deep Cycle Systems for reporting their batteries don't have the capacity of other brands. See [this video](#).

As for charging equipment, I understand that Australia-wide there is about one fire a week started by charging an e-mobility device. That is not necessary, as shown by the much lower incidence of problems caused by charging electric cars.

- o discouraging the insurance industry from requiring home insurers, especially large strata plans where there can be no control over what happens in the numerous private homes, to warrant that e-mobility devices will not be charged in the building.

c. *local council, industry and stakeholder perspectives on the utilisation and impact of e-mobility devices in the community*

(No comments on this term)

d. *opportunities to improve mobility, the customer experience, safety for users and the community*

The most obvious opportunity is enforcement of the road rules and of the limits that unregistered mobility devices are supposed to comply with. Also, there should be a public education campaign to apprise the e-mobile community of electrical/fire risks and the risks that their vehicles expose pedestrians to.

e. *the potential benefits and risks of existing regulatory and policy settings, including the Roads Act 1993, Road Rules and Road User Space Allocation Policy and other related legislation regarding safety, traffic, and personal convenience*

As long as the regulatory and policy settings are widely ignored, their benefits remain potential and academic.

f. *the extent that e-mobility devices have positive community benefits such as encouraging mode shift, relieving congestion, addressing social disadvantage and tourism*

(No comments on this term)

g. *opportunities across government to improve outcomes in regard to e-scooters, e-bikes, and related mobility options*

At least one brand of device (the OneWheel, made by Future Motion Inc. of Santa Cruz) can only be serviced overseas. That includes apparently straightforward work like the battery replacement which inevitably becomes necessary. To receive any maintenance service, the device must be freighted to USA and subsequently freighted back. There are costs and risks associated with air carriage of devices containing lithium batteries.

Manufacturers should be encouraged to set up maintenance facilities in Australia.

h. *best practice in other Australian and international jurisdictions*

(No comments on this term)

i. *the economic analysis of e-mobility contribution to safe transport at night for shift workers and women, to mode shift and to first and last mile transport, and*

(No comments on this term)

j. *any other related matters.*

(No comments on this term)

Jim Donovan