



## CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL

### AGENDA ITEM

---

Report: City of Glendale's Response to 2023-2024 Report by the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury re: Micromobility Devices

1. Resolution Approving City of Glendale's Proposed Response Letter to the 2023-2024 Report by the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury re: Micromobility Devices.

### COUNCIL ACTION

---

**Item Type:** Consent Calendar

**Approved for** September 17, 2024 **calendar**

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The City Council is being presented with the proposed response to the 2023-2024 Report by the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury re: Micromobility Devices.

## RECOMMENDATION

---

That the City Council approve the proposed response, authorize the Mayor to sign, and direct staff to submit the attached letter to the Presiding Judge of the Los Angeles County Superior Court, in response to the report entitled “Micromobility Devices” issued by the 2023-2024 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury.

## ANALYSIS

---

The 2023-2024 Civil Grand Jury conducted a study of micromobility devices, i.e. electric scooters and electric bikes. They looked at how vendors were permitted to operate within the City of Los Angeles, what the California DMV laws were that pertain to operating these devices, the use of private e-bikes and e-scooters, State legislation, community reactions and injuries or deaths caused by the careless riding of these instruments. The investigation found that following certain recommendations for using e-scooters and e-bikes would contribute to the United States’ Long-Term Strategy of lower emissions in the environment.

The report, entitled “Micromobility Devices: Pay Now or Pay Later”, was issued on June 28, 2024 (“Report”). The Report is attached as Exhibit 1. The Report made the following findings and recommendations:

### Findings:

- “2.1 Serious injuries and fatalities connected with micromobility devices are steadily rising.
- 2.2 Some communities are rejecting vendors.
- 2.3 Some electric scooter manufacturers offer liability insurance and some do not.
- 2.4 There is limited enforcement on violators riding on sidewalks, going in the wrong direction on streets, or exceeding the electric scooter speed limits.
- 2.5 There is no warning to pedestrians when an individual riding an e-scooter or e-bike is approaching people on the sidewalk.
- 2.6 Costs associated with micromobility device-related injuries create an economic burden on cities and businesses.
- 2.7 Most riders of e-bikes and e-scooters are not wearing helmets.
- 2.8 There is no official (internet, television, periodicals, social media, etc.) campaign associated with electric scooter or electric bike safety for operators and pedestrians provided by (add who you think should be providing this) (*error in original Report*).
- 2.9 There is inconsistency among the primary sellers of electric scooters as to the availability of liability insurance.
- 2.10 Senate Bill 381 requires the Mineta Transportation Institute to study injuries caused by e-bikes and how to improve rider safety.”

### Recommendations:

“R2.1 Ensure LAPD, LBPd, other local municipal law enforcement agencies and campus police agencies and other local law enforcement agencies enforce electric scooters

prohibition against riding on sidewalk, helmet requirements, and speed limits.

R2.2 Municipal governments should update permit agreements to require electric scooter manufacturers to offer liability insurance.

R2.3 Local Agencies should create local ordinances to make mandatory the use of helmets while riding any of the e-bikes or e-scooters.

R2.4 Law enforcement agencies (LAPD, LBPD, Community College Campus Police) should create a campaign to educate pedestrians and operators to use safety equipment, e.g., helmets.

R2.5 Law enforcement agencies (LAPD, LBPD, and Community College Campus Police) should create e-bike and e-scooter User Education Course (similar to driver education for autos).

R2.6 Municipal governments should update permit agreements to require electric scooter and electric bike manufacturers to add some type of warning signal on their devices such as a horn or buzzer.

R2.7 LA County Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County CEO, and Los Angeles City Mayor and City Council, and other major local city governments should support the passage of AB 381.”

The City of Glendale was asked to respond to recommendations R2.1, R2.4 and R2.5 in the Report.

Pursuant to Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05, the City must now submit an official response to the published Report indicating whether the City accepts the statements and recommendations. In its response, the City must either agree or disagree with the statements and state whether the recommendation has been implemented, has not yet been implemented, or will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation therefor. Below are the specific recommendations in the Report and the City of Glendale’s proposed responses.

Recommendation R2.1: Ensure LAPD, LBPD, other local municipal law enforcement agencies and campus police agencies and other local law enforcement agencies enforce electric scooters prohibition against riding on sidewalk, helmet requirements, and speed limits.

Response: The Police Department currently enforces laws pertaining to micromobility devices. The recommendation has been implemented. Officers issue citations for violations of law.

Recommendation R2.4: Law enforcement agencies (LAPD, LBPD, Community College Campus Police) should create a campaign to educate pedestrians and operators to use safety equipment, e.g., helmets.

Response: The Police Department will collaborate with other City of Glendale departments to create a campaign to educate the community regarding safety equipment for micromobility devices. The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. Implementation is anticipated by April 15, 2025.

Recommendation R2.5: Law enforcement agencies (LAPD, LBPd, and Community College Campus Police) should create e-bike and e-scooter User Education Course (similar to driver education for autos).

Response: An e-bike and e-scooter “User Education Course” would be beneficial for our community. The City has several e-bike instructors/riders at the Police Department and will utilize their experience to create a course for the community. The recommendation has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future. Implementation is anticipated by July 5, 2025 and dependent on staffing.

The proposed letter to the Presiding Judge is attached as Exhibit 2 to this report.

## **STAKEHOLDERS/OUTREACH**

---

N/A

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

---

It is anticipated that the enforcement, education and outreach programs contemplated by this report fall within existing programs and can be absorbed by the Department’s budget.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (CEQA/NEPA)**

---

The action being considered does not constitute a “project” within the meaning of the CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(a) as it has no potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment.

## **CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE**

---

This item is exempt from campaign disclosure requirements.

## **ALTERNATIVES TO STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

---

Alternative 1: The Council may choose not to adopt the proposed response, but then will be out of compliance with state law which requires a response.

Alternative 2: Council may modify the proposed response to the Micromobility Report by the Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury and adopt any such amended response.

Alternative 3: The City Council may consider any other alternative not proposed by staff.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION**

---

### **Submitted by:**

Manuel Cid, Police Chief

**Prepared by:**

Ann Maurer, Chief Assistant City Attorney

**Approved by:**

Roubik R. Golanian, P.E., City Manager

**EXHIBITS/ATTACHMENTS**

---

Exhibit 1: Report by the 2023-2024 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury: "Micromobility Devices: Pay Now or Pay Later"

Exhibit 2: City's Proposed Letter Response to Grand Jury Report