

## Flourishing On Purpose - Rhys Jaconley

28 Feb 2019

What characteristics need to be considered when defining what an innovative vehicle is?

Speed, stopping power (brakes), type of fuel used as well as the terrain it is capable of traversing, as well as its most likely intended use

What differences between motorised wheelchairs and mobility scooters need to be recognised by this project?

no comment

What uses of innovative vehicles need to be considered as part of this investigation?

commuting, recreation and providing accessibility to those who are movement-impaired

What key factors need to be considered when determining safe rules of operation (including speed) for innovative vehicles on roads and road-related areas?

It seems like the guiding principle should be the likelihood of harm to the most vulnerable road users (pedestrians). I also suggest that the commission takes into consideration the following factors to balance against issues of harm/risk to the vulnerable:

- the desirability of a self-responsible and risk-aware population making their own transport decisions
- the desirability of 'rewilding' our public spaces in such a way that encourages an awareness of others and their experiences
- the myriad of immeasurable economic and social gains made when alternative transport options are made freely available and accessible to the general public

What are the practical and measurable outcomes required from a nationally-consistent policy and regulatory framework for innovative vehicles?

- Minimum required braking distance when travelling at speeds that could harm pedestrians
- Lifecycle provisions for the recycling and / or disposal of the e-waste of new products on the market
- Nationally consistent definitions

What evidence-based distinctions between acceptable and unacceptable levels of risk associated with the use of innovative vehicles could be considered to inform the way innovative vehicles are regulated?

It is important that when making these regulations that the commission make the distinction between risk to OTHER (i.e. pedestrians) and risk to SELF (i.e. the user). A large part of the appeal of these vehicles is for their recreational purpose; a purpose which carries a large degree of inherent risk to self. In the interests of autonomy and self-responsibility, I suggest that the commission move away from the paternalistic rationale of mandatory safety equipment (e.g. bike helmets) and measure acceptable risk only through the lens of risk to other road users. In summary: It's my right to put myself in danger and enjoy it, as long as in doing so I do not endanger others.