CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

----X

March 1, 2012 Start: 1:41 p.m. Recess: 4:15 p.m.

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

JAMES VACCA Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Council Member Daniel R. Garodnick Council Member David G. Greenfield Council Member Vincent M. Ignizio

Council Member Peter A. Koo

Council Member G. Oliver Koppell Council Member Jessica S. Lappin

Council Member Darlene Mealy

Council Member Ydanis A. Rodriguez

Council Member Deborah L. Rose Council Member Eric A. Ulrich

Council Member James G. Van Bramer

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

David Yassky Commissioner Taxi and Limousine Commission

Gary Weiss

Deputy Commissioner for Licensing and Standards Taxi and Limousine Commission

Martin Grindley Assistant Commissioner Taxi and Limousine Commission

Jasmine Le Veaux Attorney, Transportation Practice Group Windels Marx Lane & Mittendorf (on behalf of the Coalition of Transportation Associations)

Aviq Cabesa Board Member Livery Round Table

Jeff Rose Owner, Attitude New York Representative, Limousine Association of New York

James Grasso Representative New York City Fleet Livery Owners Association

David Pollack Executive Director Committee for Taxi Safety

Ethan Gerber Executive Director Greater New York Taxi Association

Peter Mazur General Counsel Metropolitan Taxicab Board of Trade

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Vincent Sapone Managing Director League of Mutual Taxi Owners

Bhairavi Desai Executive Director New York Taxi Workers Alliance

Bill Lindauer Member, Organizing Committee New York Taxi Workers Alliance

Victor Salazar Member New York Taxi Workers Alliance

Mohan Singh DOV Driver

Jeffrey Thomason Reverend

Male Voice Speaker did not identify himself

Alex Gardiner Taxicab Driver

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

۷	CHAIRPERSON	VACCA:	ZUIZ.	т'а

like to welcome you to the hearing of the New York City Council Committee on Transportation. James Vacca, and I'm Chair of the Committee on Transportation for the Council. Today, we're going to hear testimony on four bills affecting the taxi and for-hire vehicle industries, as well as have oversight on the topic of TLC's inspections, operations at their Woodside facility. Let me start with TLC's Woodside inspection facility. As many of you know, I've been Chairman of this Committee now for a little more than two years and ever since I became Chairman, I've been hearing about problems at the Woodside facility. The for-hire industry, especially the liveries, have come to my office time and time again to complain about inspection delays. There's not enough time, there isn't enough capacity, there aren't enough inspectors. It simply takes too long. The delays for brand new vehicles are especially galling. We've heard of drivers waiting three or four weeks, sitting there with a brand new vehicle, paying the insurance, paying for their TLC license, just

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

waiting to drive. Why should it take all that time for a brand new car to get on the road? whole point of getting a quick inspection for new cars, is to incentivize drivers to actually buy new cars. But by forcing drivers to wait for inspections -- [background noise] excuse me, I'll The whole point of getting a quick inspection for new cars is to incentivize drivers to actually buy new cars. But by forcing drivers to wait for inspections and lose pay while they wait, the TLC is incentivizing just the opposite. Why would a driver bother to invest in a new car if it means he might have to be off the road for days or even weeks? It makes no sense. He'll just driving the -- just keep driving the old car. It's a little ironic that all of us, I'm sure, want a more fuel efficient fleet, but we punish drivers for making that investment, by making them wait so long for inspections. The ultimate result of all these delays is one of two things, either a driver sits at home waiting for his inspection date to come, choosing to lose out on all those days or even weeks of lost wages, or he goes out and drives illegally, without his inspection,

2	because he can't afford those lost wages. I don't
3	want any driver to face that choice. These
4	drivers are small business owners who are driving
5	cars for their livelihoods to support their
6	families. We aren't exactly talking about the one
7	percent here. Every day that drivers have to wait
8	for an inspection, makes it more difficult for
9	them to earn a living. These are drivers who are
10	trying to do everything right, they're playing by
11	TLC's own rules, and yet they're faced with a very
12	difficult choice when they cannot get a timely
13	inspection. I have asked Commissioner Yassky on
14	several occasions to address this issue, at least
15	for a year, but I have to say I know that when I
16	first came in as Chair, I raised this as an issue
17	based on the complaints that I have received.
18	Today, we need answers. And I hope to receive
19	answers. Woodside clearly lacks the capacity to
20	serve all of the existing segments of the
21	industry. Capacity is an issue here. What is
22	going to happen when we add up all the components
23	of the five borough plan? Regardless of how the
24	details work out, there will certainly be more
25	cars on the road and that means more inspections.

Yellow cabs have to be inspected at Woodside three
times a year. I would assume any car authorized
to accept a street hail in the outer boroughs
would probably have the same rule: three times a
year. With 18,000 proposed outer borough permits,
that could mean and additional 54,000 inspections
every year. Plus, we will be selling 2,000
additional yellow cab medallions in the next
fiscal year, according to the Mayor. With all
those cars needing inspections, how will the TLC
possibly find time and resources to inspect them
all at Woodside. Whether or not all of these
vehicles are already on the road, or will be new
vehicles, doesn't matter. These vehicles only
have to be inspected at Woodside once every other
year under the current rules. Even if they're
already on the road, if they are inif they are
inspected three times every year like the yellow
cabs do, then that will mean even more
inspections. Woodside is already over capacity,
we must have another inspection station before the
five borough plan is rolled out. The drivers and
the riding public cannot accept the situation even
getting worse than it is now. Today, I expect to

hear specifics on what the TLC is doing to fix the
problem. Hearing that we need another year or two
is something I hope I will not hear, very
honestly. We've been aware of the issue for a
long time, personally I brought this up on many
occasions. Now, In addition to the inspection
piece, we're hearing testimony on four bills.
Intro 234-A is my bill, that significantly
restructures the TLC's advisory boards. Currently
the TLC has four advisory boards with 64 members.
There's a regular advisory board, a driver board,
a disability board, and a livery board. The
problem is none of these boards meet. The problem
is none of these boards have people. So, I don't
know what advice is given by people who don't sit
on boards that don't function. Industry groups
have come to me and said that the nomination
process may be onerous. The result is that
nobody's nominated to serve on the boards. So the
boards don't meet. And I want these boards to be
in place, I want them to give advice, as was the
intent when the boards were created. And my
legislation would form one advisory board, so that
people are at the table, TLC can go to them,

2	explaining new rules and regulations, and get
3	their input. TLC will meet with other
4	stakeholders as well. They'll meet with people
5	not on the advisory boards. But there should be a
6	formalized structure. And these boards, under my
7	legislation, are not here to hear grievances; my
8	legislation is designed so that all segments of
9	the TLC regulated industries have access to
10	knowing about any and all rules changes the
11	agency's proposing. This industry, the taxi
12	industry, is the most varied and diverse industry
13	that I've had the pleasure of working with now for
14	almost two-and-a-half years. Every segment of
15	this diverse industry has a right to know about
16	rule changes that affect them, and the livelihood
17	of their members. My legislation requires the
18	board to meet at least quarterly to discuss
19	whatever rules TLC is promulgating. I've taken
20	four boards that do not meet because there are no
21	members, and I've combined them into one board
22	with a requirement to meet. As I've said, this
23	advisory board is intended to give advice on
24	proposed rules, it does not replace TLC's need to
25	continue to meet with industry groups and

б

representatives if an when they have concerns
outside of the rulemaking process. This issue
came up at my, one of my very first hearings as
Chair of this Committee, and one of Chairman
Yassky's first meetings as Commissioner. It's
been two years, I've decided to move on this, I've
introduced the legislation, and I'm moving this
forward. Concerning other bills, Intro 695
sponsored by Council Member Lappin, prohibits
taxis from accepting street hails with their off
duty lights on. We saw a preview of TLC's plan
the other day, in New York Daily News, about this,
but I'd like to hear some more details beyond the
newspaper report. This is not something that I
was briefed on prior to the Daily News article,
and I'm not sure that the plan put forth will
address the issues raised by Council Member Lappin
in her legislation. Intro 676-A proposed by
Council Member Lappin removes some of the TLC's
restrictions regarding the number of hours
individual medallion owners must drive if they are
veterans, senior citizens, or inherited their
medallion through the death of a spouse.
Introduction 449, sponsored by my colleague,

б

Council Member Koppell, requires for-hire vehicles
to post signage in their cars informing passengers
that they have the right to accept a wheelchair
accessible vehicle. So these are our topics
today, and before I proceed with testimony from
the Commissioner, I'd like to call upon my
colleagues to speak. Let me first introduce the
Members of the Committee who've joined me today:
Council Member Vincent Ignizio, Council Member
Peter Koo, Council Member Eric Ulrich, Council
Member Jimmy Van Bramer, Council Member Ydanis
Rodriguez, Council Member Darlene Mealy, and
Council Member Oliver Koppell, to my extreme left.
Okay, Council Member Koppell is the sponsor of one
of the bills as I've indicated, and I will now
recognize the Councilman.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Thank you,
Chairman Vacca. It's a pleasure to be here and to
consider these measures, which I think have, all
have considerable merit. I want to welcome the
Chair of the Taxi and Limousine Commissioner, our
former colleague, David Yassky, who I think in his
relatively short time as Chair of that Commission
has really actively moved things forward, and I

2.

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

want to particularly thank him for his work with
the Mayor on getting livery hail, being people in
the outer boroughs being able to hail livery cabs.

DAVID YASSKY: [off mic] Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: representative of the outer borough who's been frustrated by the lack of available taxis on the legal basis, this is, I think, a major step forward, which I welcome and look forward to working with him on. The legislation I'm sponsoring just adds to inform the public that they're entitled with a livery cab to get an accessible cab. I cannot avoid stating, as the Chairman knows, that I'm seeking to get a commitment either through the Taxi Commission or through legislation, which is currently sponsored by 37 members, that the yellow cabs that are coming online as part of the taxi of tomorrow, are all accessible. This is something that would be a major civil rights victory, I recognize that there are reservations by the Administration but I'm hopeful that we don't get into a situation where I will have to, Mr. Chairman, seek to get a vote on this bill, because it, you know, it's something

that I, is sponsored by the, well over a majority of members. I hope we can work this out with the Speaker's Office, and with the Administration. In my opinion, it's important. I know that today is mainly about the livery industry and that's a whole other subject, with respect to accessibility, but as part of the agreement that was reached in Albany, I know that at least a significant number of the livery cabs will in fact be accessible to those who are wheelchair bound. And which I'm very happy about. So, I'm looking forward to the hearing, Mr. Chairman, I am supportive of these pieces of legislation and again, I want to welcome the Chairman and look forward to working with him.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you, and all the Members of this Committee work so well together, I appreciate their input and their advice at all times. I do want to single out Council Member Rodriguez at this time, because his concern, relative to the inspection issue, really, I think, prevailed upon me to have this hearing, and to move this item. And I thank him for always advocating for issues concerning the taxi

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	industry.	So,	thank	you,	Council	Member
3	Rodriguez.					

4 COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: [off 5 mic] Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Okay,

7 Commissioner Yassky, welcome.

DAVID YASSKY: Thank you. Good morning, Chairman Vacca and Members of the Committee on Transportation. My name is David Yassky, I Chair the City's Taxi and Limousine Commission. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today regarding the four introductory pieces of legislation affecting the City's forhire industries, and for, and speak to you about our inspection process in this oversight hearing. I would like to provide some, first of all I'm sorry, I would like to just introduce much of the TLC senior staff, is here with me, just so you know who, who is here: Deputy Commissioner Gary Weiss is our Deputy Commissioner for Licensing and Standards; Deputy Commissioner Ray Scanlon is our Deputy Commissioner for Uniformed Services Bureau, which includes both the enforcement and the inspections arm; and Assistant Commissioner Martin

б

Grindley is our Assistant Commissioner for Safety
and Emissions, which runs the inspection garage at
Woodside that you were speaking about, Mr. Chair.
Also, just to point out, we may not have had a
chance to meet her or interact with her yet, but
our somewhat new, few months now, General Counsel,
Miri Joshy is here, who has been an enormous
asset; and also some other TLC staff are here with
us. So, you've got the bulk of the agency. I
believe our inspections are proceeding on pace
today, even despite everybody being here. Am I
right? Yes, so, but there are a lot of TLC folks
here, because this is an important topic. So,
again, I would like to provide some basic
background information about our inspection
process and operations, one of our agency's points
of pride. As you know, the TLC operates a state-
of-the-art inspection facility in Woodside,
Queens. At this facility, we inspect vehicles
from all of the industry is regulated by the TLC.
We inspect yellow taxis three times a year. These
inspections are required for taxi operation and
each cab's inspection appointment is scheduled by
our safety and emissions division. Our staff

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

provides a comprehensive inspection for each taxi, divided into two major parts: the DMV emissions test and a visual inspection. In other words, the inspection includes what the DMV inspects for ordinarily when you, when any private citizen brings their, his or her car in for inspection, as well as taxi specific. So we test of course the meter, the credit card processor, and we do a visual inspection that the seatbelts - - work and so forth. That the partition is there, that the, it holds the license in the proper way, all of these taxi specific things on top the regular DMV inspection. The visual inspection checks for, for compliance with all TLC rules, required equipment, cleanliness and in-vehicle technology. This past year, our staff inspected yellow taxi cabs 5,000--52,804 times, there are 13,000 of them, so, but they come in, as I say, three times a year, plus if they, if fail an inspection, have to come back, so a total of 52 almost 53,000 inspections. Additionally, our inspectors see all for-hire vehicles. That's liveries, black cars, and luxury limousines, once every two years, and when a new vehicle is put into service, or a license is

transferred to a different vehicle. Vehicles
appearing for their regularly scheduled inspection
receive a DMV emissions test as well as a visual
inspection, much like yellow taxis; transfer and
new vehicles only receive the visual inspection
for compliance with TLC rules. This is necessary
to ensure driver and passenger safety, high
quality customer service, and to maintain fleet
quality. After passing the inspection, decals are
fixed to all vehicles, indicating to the public
that the vehicle there, that has the decal, is
licensed and safe. Our inspectors conducted
37,379 inspections for FHVs this past year, while
we've seen improved pass rates for the yellow
industry, only 63 percent of FHVs pass their
initial inspection; a sign the requirements may
not be met immediately. So, that's in part why
there are so many inspections, 'cause they come
back for reinspections. But I think it also
speaks to, in some ways, the need for the
inspection process. Before I go around to the
legislative items, Mr. Chair, in your remarks, you
raised questions about the time it takes, I guess,
for, for a vehicle to get inspected. That time, I

think we've done I think a pretty good job of
keeping that within reason. A car, a vehicle
owner that comes in and wants to have a new
vehicle inspected, and has all of the necessary
documents, will have that inspection within three
or four days. Now, oftentimes, it takes longer
than that, but it's because there is a document
missing. So, the vehicle owner brings in their
application, but there's an insurance document
required or an affiliation or form required. In
that case, then, we don't schedule the inspection
until the application is complete. I think that
makes sense, we don't want to do the inspection
when they'rebecause at the end of the
inspection, they put the sticker on; we don't want
to give the sticker out until the application is
complete. So, you said in your opening statement,
Mr. Chair, answers, I feel that, I mean the answer
is, we're currently maybe three-four days
[background comment: "Yes."] out, as of today.
That's been true for months. And, any rate, that,
that is, that's my answer. The, you also raised a
question about capacity, and I, too, am concerned
about that. We have seven lanes today, we have

six lanes today, we have six lanes today, that are
active. Once the, the borough taxi licenses are
issued, I don't know that we'll have more
vehicles, because it will be existing livery
vehicles that will be registered, presumably as
borough taxis, but they'll be coming in more
frequently, as you, as we just discussed.
Currently liveries just come in once every two
years. So, if instead they're coming in, well,
three times a year is the yellow rate, as I'll get
to in a second, I don't know that we need that,
but even if they're coming in three times a year,
so instead of once every two year, three times a
year, that's five extra inspections per vehicle in
the two year period, we're taking a couple of
steps. First of all, we have secured capital
funding to expand and have a seventh lane
available, that you know, that will take a little
bit of work on our part, but we have the funding
to do it. We have reorganized our work schedule,
rather than people being on four day shifts,
they're now on five day shifts, and that allows us
to make more time out of that workweek. We are
looking very hard at the opat options of going

longer into the afternoon, or earlier in the
morning. You know, we know we're going to have to
accommodate more capacity. One thing that I would
very much like to do, to tell you the truth, would
be rather than have a three time a year
inspection, I would like to move that to twice a
year. The reason that we have three times a year
in the yellow case, is a 30 year old consent
decree with the EPA that says that, one of the
ways that we responded to our Clean Air Act
mandates was to promise to inspect taxicabs three
times a year. You know, taxis, like all vehicles,
are vastly cleaner today than they were 30 years
ago. We, the onboard diagnostic equipment,
frankly, means that cabs are maintlike all cars,
are maintained much better than they were 30 years
ago. We think we have a pretty good case to make
that the rationale that underlay that requirement
of three times a year is no longer applicable.
Plus, we need the capacity. So, we are going to
be going to the court, seeking to change that
order, to allow us to go from a three times a year
schedule to a twice a year schedule. I make, you
know, no prediction as to the speed or the

2	outcome, courts being what they are, but Mr.
3	Chairman, I wanted to let you know, we are doing
4	that as a way of trying to expand capacity, as
5	well. I'm sure you will have more questions about
6	inspections. Why don't I give the rest of the
7	statement about the legislation, and then I'll
8	hear all the questions. The first proposed items
9	of legislation, Intro 234-A, amends current local
10	law requirements for advisory boards for the
11	Commission by collapsing the four currentlythe
12	four currently required into one. The legislation
13	also specifies how member are selected for the
14	Board and reserve seats for particular advocacy
15	groups and particular segments of the for-hire
16	industry. That's what it does, as you know, since
17	you introduced it. The TLC takes public input
18	very seriously, actively engages with our
19	regulated industries, and the riding public. For
20	example, we have established quarterly, regular
21	quarterly meetings with all of the industry
22	segments. And as you pointed out, Mr. Chair, this
23	is an extremely diverse industry, so there is a
24	trade association for large fleets. There's a
25	trade association for large fleets that have a lot

б

of the fuel efficient or accessible taxis. A
different, that's a different trade association.
There's a trade association for owner/drivers.
There's a trade association for medallion owners
and agents who operate in, not the fleet model,
but in the leasing agent or driver owned vehicle
model. So, that's four trade associations just
within the medallion owner side of the yellow. In
addition, there's an active segment of our
industry engaged in mortgage lending for
medallions. Of course, there are organizations
representing drivers. On the FHV side, there are
many industry models, as well. There are at least
two trade associations representing livery bases.
They are, as well, trade associations representing
black car bases and luxury limousine bases. So,
what we have chosen to do is rather than have a
large kind of advisory group structure, that all
of those folks would come in together, we have
quarterly meetings with each and every one of
those industry segments. I think they're
productive. I do not want to, I'm not claiming
that every industry segment is happy with every
TLC action. Or indeed that every industry segment

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is happy with any single TLC action. And there may be even an industry segment that is not happy with any TLC action. [laughter] But, it is not a lack of communication. I think that we, we've taken great--not pains, we've made great efforts to be thoroughly transparent, make sure that every industry segment understands the proposals we're putting on the table, has ample time to comment before any final decision is made. Understands our rationale for moving forward with them. the end of the day, absolutely, we've, we just did two past rules today that, you know, one, at least one industry player felt was a bad idea. there was, it was on the agenda, we had a month of discussion, active, we adopted it. Any rate, so, what I would say to you Mr. Chair is I, in candor, do not feel that an advisory group is necessary, but that's your decision to make, as the lawmaking body. I want to give you my honest, kind of advice, that we have in place a structure that does provide for feedback, from the industry and, and discussion. Nonetheless, and that, doing that kind of segment by segment is more productive than having everybody in a room when their interests

are often quite divergent. Having said that, I
understand well that it is a priority of yours,
Mr. Chair, so we of course stand ready to work
with you on crafting the legislation if it's
something that you choose to move forward with.
If you do, my only comment would e, I think that
the structure of the Board in Intro 234-A as
currently drafted is not quite balanced. There,
it has considerably more representatives of what I
would call the "business side" or the owner side,
than the driver side, or the employee side. And
then of the passenger side. There are really
three kind of broad interest categories. There's
the owners, or the businesses, so that's medallion
owners, leasing agents, mortgage lenders, bases;
those are business peopleemployers, if you will.
Then there's the drivers, who I think arein the
position here as employees or labor. So you got
owners, labor. And then there's the customers,
the passengers. And I would say that an advisory
board, to be useful, should be balanced among all
three interests. This structure here, it seems to
me, is, is weighted toward the owner side. So, as

should balance it among the three types of
interests that are represented. And certainly
ensuring, as you said, Mr. Chair, that the
diversity industry is also reflected. Okay. The
second proposed item of legislation, Intro 449,
adds language to the Livery Passenger's Bill of
Rights, regarding equivalent service for
passengers who use wheelchairs. Esteemed Council
Member Koppell's legislation, we think, I think
this is terrific, we fully support this bill.
Providing an expanding service to all New Yorkers
is a top priority for the TLC. Really, II won't
go on at length. We support this bill, it's a
good idea, we hope that you adopt it, and then we
will implement it immediately. I will say, as
Council Member Koppell knows, part of the bill,
the livery street hail bill, also does provide for
2,000 new medallions, all of which hare wheelchair
accessible. We're very eager to get those on the
road. I know that that does not satisfy your
concern, and go as far as you've called for. I do
want you to know that we're, we've set now, we're-
-plan to start in July with that auction and
continue, and get those medallions out on the

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

street. And that will be a very material number of new accessible taxis. Understanding fully that, that your position is that we need to go much further than that. So, this, though, is also a good opportunity to update you on the TLC's newly designed accessible dispatch system, which not--in addition to putting those cars on the street, take the ones that are already out there and increase the ability--not, forget increase, establish the ability of wheelchair users to take advantage of the cars that are out there. dispatcher will assign the closest available accessible taxi to the passenger. This is a system that we, we did in pilot form, it had its, we had a hearing on this, Mr. Chair, we discussed at length that it worked, from my perspective, soso. Did, did the job, but didn't do it nearly so well as it needs to be. Learned all the lessons from that, incorporated it into the new program. We've--did an RFP, let the contract, signed it, it's at the Comptroller's office now. Actually spoke to the Comptrollers' office just yesterday morning to check on the progress of it. As soon as it's registered, it can go into effect, and

people will be able to dial 311 and get a yellow
taxi and, again, fully understanding that Council
Member Koppell and others would say a drop in the
bucket, and just a start, but still it is a start.
And I want you to know that that is on its way.
Third proposed item of legislation, Intro 676-A.
This is a meaty one, Mr. Chair. This waives
minimum driving requirements for some taxicab
medallion owners. The Commission's "owner must
drive" rules, that's what, that's what's being
brought into play here. We have rules, the Taxi
and Limousine Commissioner, has rules of
longstanding, that require for certain medallions,
about 40 percent in theory, although there are
tons of exceptions, so in practice it's only about
20 percent, about 20 percent of the medallions
actually out there, subject to this requirement,
that for those medallions, the owner of the
medallions is required to drive the taxi. Okay?
The rest, anybody, they, you can rent it to
somebody, you can use, you can have a big fleet,
you can it to a fleet. But for these medallions,
the medallion owner is required to drive currently
190 or 180, 180 shifts a year. [background

comment: "Right."] 180 shifts a year. Which is,
you know, not quite fulltime, but significant
amount of time. This, we, at the Taxi and
Limousine Commissioner, believe very passionately
that the owner/driver segment of this industry is
a valuable segment, and that it is worth
preserving, and that our rules, if our rules don't
preserve it, it will disappear. Why do we feel
that it is worth preserving? Customer service is
a big reason, safety is a big reason, and economic
opportunity is the, in my mind, the biggest
reason. Datasafety, customer service, there's
data that owner driven taxis are in fewer
accidents, are on the road more. It suggests that
they're, those cars are maintained better, that
they're cleaner. They, and that the driver,
because it's his or her own vehicle, will drive it
more safely. And so there's some value there.
But the even greater value in my, in my mind, is
that it creates a career ladder for drivers. If
you go back 30 years, drivers thought it was a
kind of, almost expected course, and at least an
attainable course, that they would be able to own
their own medallion one day. And drivers who own

their own medallions earn significantly more.
It's a difference really between a low income
worker and a middle income, small business owner.
And unless our rules preserve a segment of the
market that's owner/driver, that opportunity to go
from low wage worker to middle income entrepreneur
will disappear. Because what keeps it in place is
that because the owner driver medallions have that
requirement, they are much less costly to
purchase. Now, don't get me wrong, they're still
costly. Current, you know, on the current market,
they trade for about \$700,000 as opposed to the
million dollars that the fleet medallions trade
for. If you got rid of the "owner must drive"
requirement, though, that gap would disappear.
And they'd all trade for a million dollars. And
we, every day, I mean, you could come to the TLC,
and come to the 22nd floor, and go to Stan James'
office, he's the guy that does these closings.
And most days, you will see, 'cause they often
will buy them in pairs, two guys there, and
they're almost always guys, who speak so-so
English, who probably came here ten years ago, who
have worked their tails off, and now are buying a

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

piece of the rock. And they're, they're now making this shift from driving for somebody else, and eking out a living, to owning their own medallion that will accrue equity and that there's going to, they're going to use to buy a house someday, or put their kids through college. This is still an American dream industry in a way that so little else is. And the, I think that if we were to do away with the owner/driver rules, we would be putting that at risk. And I think that would be a shame. So, that's the, that's what the "owner must drive" rules are all about. before us does not get rid of them entirely, I understand that, but what it does do is allow people at a certain point to lease their medallion out. And I think what we would have to expect is that as soon as people could, they would lease the medallion out rather than continue to drive it themselves, and we would've lo--as opposed today, where if, when they are ready to retire, what they have to do is sell the medallion. And that keeps those owner driver medallions in the market. I cannot support, do not support, with the TLC, do not support this piece of legislation, because we

believe it would put at risk the "owner must
drive" segment of the market that we believe is so
valuable. The final and proposed item of
legislation, Intro 695-A, would prohibit a taxi
cab from soliciting or accepting passengers with
their off duty light engaged, except for one
passenger along a driver's route. In other words,
they could pick up a passenger who's going along
the driver's route. I applaud the bill's sponsors
for addressing this issue. There is, you know,
while our drivers are good folks, and they work
hard, you know, I do believe that there is more
than we would like, abuse of the off duty light,
by which I mean drivers will keep the off duty
light on, and then cherry pick who they're going
to pick up and who they're not going to pick up.
And more than that, it creates just tremendous
confusion among passengers about whether a cab is
available or not. Some months ago, we solicited
feedback, we put out an industry notice, solicited
feedback from the industry and passengers, as to
what to do about the off duty light. We are
firmly of the view, that the off duty light is
confusing, does not convey the message it is

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

intended to. As a result, we are drafting rules, and will promulgate rules, to eliminate the off duty light altogether. In other words, the roof light will simply have two states: lit, meaning "I'm available"; unlit, meaning "I'm unavailable," either 'cause somebody's in the cab already, a passengers' in the cab, or because "I'm off duty." Rather than, well, the middle light is lit and the off duty light is lit, does that mean you can flag me down, doesn't it? So, we think that is a simpler, easier to understand, as somebody called me the day that this came out and said, "Oh, thank goodness you're doing this, although I have to say, I kind of felt like as a longtime New Yorker I had a bit of an edge, 'cause I could understand the system, and, you know, all the "I think his word was pigeons, but you know, "who don't understand, it gave me an advantage in hailing a cab." I don't think we want a taxi system that designed for insiders only. We want it for everybody. So, we are moving to eliminate the off duty light altogether; accordingly, this Intro is, we, I get the idea, I think it's a good idea, but it is moot. That concludes my testimony today

2	regarding our inspection process and the four
3	Introductions. Thank you again for the
4	opportunity to testify, and I'm happy to answer
5	any questions that you have.
6	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you,
7	Commissioner. And I'd like to welcome Council
8	Member Rose, who has arrived. Okay? Let me go
9	into a little bit of your testimony, Commissioner.
10	You here? Okay? [background comments] You've
11	arrived. That's what I mean. Very good.
12	[laughter] Now, let me go into the advisory board
13	legislation, Commissioner. I realize that you,
14	you've said today that you don't need advisory
15	board, advisory boards because you do more than
16	enough consultation with all segments of the
17	industry, basically. I can only point out for the
18	record that for two-and-a-half years, you and I
19	spoke about advisory boards and you never told me

DAVID YASSKY: Yeah, fair enough.

And I'd go more than that.

any such thing.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: And this comes as news to me today. You told me several times, you were thinking of how to reconfigure them, and

2	then I waited for you and I waited for you. So I
3	proposed something that's open to be tweaked,
4	maybe it's not perfect, but I waited for two-and-
5	a-half years for you to suggest what you told me
6	you wanted to suggest, because we needed to have
7	functioning advisory boards.
8	DAVID YASSKY: That is true. And
9	more than that, I think I told you that I would
LO	propose a good structure for advisory boards, and
11	every time we would sit in our office and, and
12	think about how to make up and advisory board,
13	honestly, we could never figure out a good way to
L4	do it, right, that was better than what we've been
15	doing on an informal basis.
L6	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Well
L7	DAVID YASSKY: But I should've just
L8	told you that.
L9	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Commissioner
20	DAVID YASSKY: But, that's, that's-
21	_
22	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I
23	DAVID YASSKY:that's just my two
24	cents.
25	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: But

б

Commissioner, I appreciate getting a structure for
an advisory board where everyone feels included
and nobody feels excluded, that is difficult. And
I'm not saying that the recipe I presented is the
perfect recipe, I'm open to suggestions. But you
were a former Councilman, and you sat in this
chair as I did for years, and you know that one
thing this Council has to look at, is not even,
even if you are the, you, above anyone else, even
if you above anyone else consult with everyone, to
the umpteenth degree, you consult until you have
laryngitis, even if that is the caeven if that
is the case, we in this Council have to formalize
for future generations. You will not be there at
a certain point.

DAVID YASSKY: So true. Yes.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: So, that's the role of this Council. We often enact legislation that is formalizing a structure beyond a commitment of a certain Commissioner who is here today but could be gone tomorrow. So that's where I'm coming from with this.

DAVID YASSKY: Excellent rationale.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: So, I'd like

б

you to go back, and I'd like you to look at, to see what I proposed, and I'm open to your suggestions. And I want to hear from you as I am going to hear from other stakeholders, regarding this legislation. Okay, 'cause that--

DAVID YASSKY: Very good.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: --that's the reality. All right, let me go on to Woodside for a minute. Again, we had spoken, and I know you are concerned about this. We've had complaints especially from Staten Island drivers, that it's very difficult for them to reach Woodside.

DAVID YASSKY: It is far.

a lot of money on the road, taking away from what they could be doing, getting fares and doing their work. So, we had, we had--right, Council Member Rose was in on those discussions with me. So, we had said that we would, oh, I had asked you to especially look at the Staten Island component, and when you couple that with the overutilization of Woodside, I thought that the Taxi and Limousine Commission had even put out an RFP to get--didn't you put out a request for proposal for another

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 site? Weren't you looking for other sites until
3 recently?

DAVID YASSKY: Well, we, we have not put out an RFP, we have done work toward that. It's, and I, but I want to be modest about, you know, what I think we can accomplish. It's, it's costly, first, first of all, and you know, every six months, or probably four months it is, we get, you know, a new PEG letter, and we have to cut back here and cut back there. It's costly, and it, and it's a challenge, because we have a workforce and we are very efficient where we are now. And we want to be able to match that level of efficiency and quality control, somewhere else. I'm not saying that we have given up on the idea. What I am saying is, we've done some work on it, if you like, we could sit with you and kind of give you a full briefing on what we see as the obstacles toward, to implementing an alternative site. Money is certainly one of them. And you know, I guess what I could say is, I'm not saying that's not happening, but nor can I sit here and tell you that I know we're going to do it, either.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I do know, of

course, that we have a fiscal situation in our
City. I also know that when TLC tows cars off the
street, you are using space at Woodside to also
house some of the tows that you do.

DAVID YASSKY: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: So that

compounds the space issue.

DAVID YASSKY: It does.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: And I'm going to tell you something else. That when the reality comes before us, of a five borough taxi plan, I expect the Taxi and Limousine Commission to get the cars off the street that are not cabs at all.

DAVID YASSKY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: The cabs that do not have TLC plates, people who take it upon themselves to say, "My car is a cab today," and they're, they're picking people up who are unsuspecting, who have no idea whether the car is insured or registered, or whether the, whether the driver is licensed. Where are we going to take these cars? The Police Department tells me, Mr.-- and you know, I have been involved, and at a micro level, scheduling these type of seizures, in

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

too?

communities throughout the City, and I've been
told that we have to wait for the Police
Department to identify space in their tow pounds.
Well, they don't have space in their two pounds.
So these cars now are going to end up in Woodside,

DAVID YASSKY: This--

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Where?

DAVID YASSKY: Mr. Chairman, this is great. You, we have discussed this before, yes, our desire to seize car--not just ticket, but seize cars that are not licensed by TLC, to be, and they're doing TLC work. So, you're right that the, the main issue for us is the storage capacity. And the PD tow pounds are full up, they have no room, they may a day here, a day there, they do, but for the most part they don't. Deputy Commissioner Scanlon has, in extraordinary, you know, kind of resourcefulness, has walled off some of our own parking lot, yes, at Woodside, that we use as a makeshift two pound, for cars that we seize. Not a great, not what it was designed for, not a permanent solution by any means, but at least it's given us some capacity, and it's

б

enabled us to seize more cars than we were before.
What we really need is offsite capacity. We put
out a, it wasn't an RFP, it was a bid. We, we
asked for somebody to step forward and, and
contract with us, to store cars that we have
seized. We, we got two bids; unfortunately
neither was from a qualified bidder when they,
when more due diligence was done. So, and we were
kind of asking for a lot. You know, in the usual
fashion, it was a 50 pageit was many pages, and
it said you have to do all this stuff. So now
we've put together a more streamlined version that
would give the operator more flexibility. You
know, we wanted them to have something in every
borough, and be super easy for us. We've said,
"Okay, we'll do more work." And, but just all we
want is you take the, the cars off our hands. So,
we, that will be out on the street within the next
two weeks, Mr. Chair. And what I would, I will
email it to you, and to every member of the
Committee, and to all of our industry
stakeholders. I'm taking this opportunity to make
a public plea to our industry stakeholders to help
us find somebody who will work with us doing the

vehicle storage. Because I am convinced that if
we had unlimited, we could seize 40-50-60 cars a
day. And get them off the street, period. So,
Mr. Chair ,we are moving forward on that.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: But what does that mean in terms of getting another facility besides Woodside?

vehicle storage, we are, that, we did the, we did an RFP, got no acceptable bids; doing a second version, be out in two weeks. And I'm very, very hopeful that we'll get a good response to that one. In terms of an inspection one, there I have to just repeat what I said a minute ago: We're looking at the Staten Island issue, it is, it is, has operational challenges and it is costly. I say that not, we have not ruled it out, and I would be happy to sit with you and go over in detail what we see the issues are, and what we see the cost of is. And maybe you would help us overcome that.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: It appears to me that you're reducing the number of inspections on the yellows from three to two?

from three to two, besides the Woodside issue?

2 Space and resource

DAVID YASSKY: I would say the question is, is there a need for three?

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Right.

DAVID YASSKY: And when the, that three number was put in place, again 30 years ago, it, the primary argument was environmental, that these cars drive so much that to make sure that their emissions, you know, that they're meeting emissions standards, you want to see them every four months. They, the worst car today is much less polluting than the best car 30 years ago. And even apart from that, again, they have the onboard diagnostic equipment. And so, I think that, so we, and we back it up with numbers—

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: But

Commissioner, I--

DAVID YASSKY: --we're better off at two, two in 2012 than we were at three in 1978.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Commissioner, I know that the emissions, as you said, I'm sure it is an issue. However, I have to say that I would think that 30 years ago the reason for three inspections was because people felt that these

2	cars are on the road so much, that they should be			
3	checked three times a year.			
4	DAVID YASSKY: Right.			
5	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: A cab, a cab			
6	puts a lot of miles on the car. I don't know if			
7	I don't know if 30, 30 years ago the key issue was			
8	emissions, or even if now the issue is emissions.			
9	I think the issue is, is safety. There must've			
10	been a reason why three was picked over two. And			
11	I would think it was because of how much time			
12	these cabs spend on the road. And the wear and			
13	tear.			
14	DAVID YASSKY: Right.			
15	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: So, I know you			
16	have an accommodation you have to make regarding			
17	your facility at Woodside, but I don't want that			
18	accommodation made in any way that would			
19	DAVID YASSKY: If we			
20	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:infringe on			
21	public safety, or minimize what we do in that			
22	regard.			
23	DAVID YASSKY: Certainly, certainly			
24	not. Well, first of all, so there was, at that			
25	time there was no mandatory retirement age. There			

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 45		
2	is a retirement age now. I think, and I don't		
3	know what our, what the industry stakeholders		
4	think of this, you know, you can ask them and		
5	we'll see. But my guess is they would concur.		
6	Well, we'll see. For our part, we don't think		
7	that you compromise safety by going from three to		
8	two. Like		
9	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Well, let me		
10	say		
11	DAVID YASSKY:like many things		
12	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:you always		
13	consult with people, as you've stated.		
14	DAVID YASSKY: Yes.		
15	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Have you		
16	consulted with the yellow cab industry regarding		
17	going from three to two? Did you consult with the		
18	stakeholders?		
19	DAVID YASSKY: This is a, a		
20	breaking news, right here. True		
21	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: So		
22	Commissioner. [laughter] Commissioner.		
23	DAVID YASSKY: Yeah.		
24	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: You said before		
25	that there's no need for advisory boards because		

24 CHAIRPERSON VACCA: But this is

25 like--

2	DAVID YASSKY:when we talk to	
3	our, our regulated industry about relaxing	
4	restrictions, rather than imposing new ones, they	
5	tend to be receptive. I would not, I don't want	
6	to presume anything. But when, what this would	
7	mean would be instead of three times you're having	
8	to take your car out of service and lose, lose the	
9	dollars for that day, you only do it twice a year,	
10	my guess is I won't get a lot of pushback. But	
11	you're absolutely	
12	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I understand,	
13	Commissioner. Okay, why don't we go to questions.	
14	I'm sorry. Council Member Ignizio.	
15	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Yes, thank	
16	you very much, Mr. Chairman. And welcome,	
17	Commissioner, how are you?	
18	DAVID YASSKY: Thank you.	
19	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: As you	
20	know, I represent probably the, well, I represent	
21	the largest district in the City, and	
22	DAVID YASSKY: Yes.	
23	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: One which	
24	is probably the most rural, although not rural as	
25	much as would like. Several years ago, we sat	

б

here with then Chairman Daus, and we said,
"There's going to be an issue, because Staten
Island bases are going to go there, and it's going
to take two-and-a-half to three hours to get there
in traffic, two or three hours back, and then have
to wait there for several hours." And Matt Daus
stood there in your seat and said, "No, we don't
think it's going to happen, 'cause we're going to
get cars in and out of here in an hour." And
everybody in the audience, much, very similar to
the audience here, kind of laughed, smirked, and
said, "It's never going to happen." And
anecdotally we had to say, "Well, we'll hope for
the old Annie song, you know, 'The Sun'll Come Out
Tomorrow,' and it will happen."

DAVID YASSKY: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Well, it won't happen. Well, in fact, it actually did. We were fighting then for an additional facility on Staten Island, and my understanding is during the discussions of the universal hail legislation, this was raised by certain stakeholders on Staten Island that this was an important thing that you were all going to look at. So, I'm asking for

2	somewhat greater specificity than the Chairman did	
3	in regards to what did the TLC do to seek or what	
4	are they doing to seek and additional facility in	
5	the borough of Staten Island, with regards to	
6	inspections?	
7	DAVID YASSKY: To date, the work	
8	we've done is all internal. It iswe have mapped	
9	out what it would take to have a satellite	
10	facility, what the cost would be, what issues	
11	need, the operational issues would need to be	
12	addressed.	
13	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Yeah, what	
14	would it be	
15	DAVID YASSKY: I'm not, I will have	
16	to get back to you with a dollar number that, that	
17	we are, can stand behind, 'cause I would like to	
18	get that dollar number to be as low as possible.	
19	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Okay. Do	
20	we know if it's in the tens of millions, is in in	
21	the millions, or is it	
22	DAVID YASSKY: Well	
23	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO:hundreds	
24	of millions?	
25	DAVID YASSKY:so, there are	

2	different ways that this could be accomplished.		
3	If you're talking about city owned and facility,		
4	it would certainly, it would certainly be in the		
5	millions. I don't know if it would be in the		
6	eight figures or the seven, but it would be in the		
7	millions.		
8	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Okay.		
9	Because I'm pressed for time, I'm moving quickly.		
10	DAVID YASSKY: Okay.		
11	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: So, it		
12	sounds to me like OMB, Mr. Chairman, and Mr.		
13	Chairman, is somewhat driving this process, as		
14	they do in, in everything we do, in City		
15	government. But		
16	DAVID YASSKY: I'm not, to be		
17	clear, I'm not trying to pass the buck onto them,		
18	I'm told, "Here's your budget, you got to live,		
19	make your choices"		
20	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Oh, I get		
21	it, Chairman.		
22	DAVID YASSKY: So it's, that's our,		
23	that's our choice.		
24	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: I get it,		
25	but OMB controls a lot in this Administration.		

2.	DAVID YASSKY:	Yes.

than any other Administration that I've seen in the history that I've been involved in. But that being said, the, the same entity that OMB speaks with great fanfare of the billion dollars they're going to raise on sales of medallions. So, how does your administration, which you're representing, speak out of, in my opinion, a forked tongue, that we're going to have a billion dollars here on this side, but we don't have enough money for the infrastructure to run the agency on the other side.

DAVID YASSKY: It's consistent, as you know.

COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: It's inconsistent.

DAVID YASSKY: The--No, I don't, I don't think so. Because while the medallion sale, which of course the primary purpose of which is to improve service for people, will also bring in a considerable amount of revenue, one shot revenue, but revenue nonetheless, for the City, still every dollar that we spend of that has got to be, pass

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the same test that every other dollar of revenue passes. Is it being spent on the most urgent need, right? It still competes with homeless shelters, police officers, and teachers, and if, not that a Staten Island inspection station is not worthy, it is a worthy purpose, but has to be weighed against all the other worthy purposes.

And I'm not prepared to say now, it outweighs every other worthy purpose.

COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Right, but what I'm saying is, I think you have a core mission that I believe, the moneys derived from your agency ought address first and then go beyond into the City coffers what which fund all the other programs. Is there a possibility of taking advantage of an, perhaps a TLC on the road scenario, whereas you take a, tractor trailer, if you will, we, me, Debbie Rose and Jimmy Oddo, buy a tractor trailer, which has that what you would need for overall inspections or just new car inspections, just the visual inspection. Once a month, so that those in our communities can, and those in Southern Brooklyn, can take advantage of something like that.

DAVID YASSKY: So, that's option
two, aftOption one would be owned, you know,
City owned constructed. Option two is take
advantage of some, of an existing facility, either
periodically or routinely. That's really what
we're focusing on, because I think that'll be a
lot easier to accomplish, and a lot cheaper. We
still, you know, that, but I'm still not ready to
say that that's, that we're going to move ahead
with that.

COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Okay. And can I--what are the hours of the Woodside shop? I know you said you were looking at potentially extending hours, so what, just, I just don't know what they are.

DAVID YASSKY: Well, it's, it's open from 5:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. We start scheduling, when is the first scheduled inspection, though? [background comment] 5:45, and last is 3:00 may--3:00 o'clock? [background comment] Okay, for yellow, they scheduled from 5:45 to 11:00 a.m., and for FHVs [background comment] from 11:00 till 4:00. Okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: And I

don't, just, 'cause I don't know the business, is it, is there a possibility of going to a 24 hour operation? Is that not a desired approach? It can't be done because of certain reasons?

DAVID YASSKY: It's not that it cannot be done, that, you know, requires more personnel, obviously. And we're going to have to hire more personnel to handle the workload. And we will, you know, structure that in the most cost effective way possible. I think it's likely that we'll have to offer more hours than we do now.

and finally, if you walk me through the new car inspection that came up, the Chairman had raised it, you have a brand new car, it needs to be inspected, we are hearing from, from owners that it takes roughly two to three weeks to get that car on the road, which I'm a layman, right, so to the layman saying, "Why, it's brand new, that doesn't make any sense to me." Can you walk me through what the process is and why it would take two to three weeks for it, to get that car on the road.

GARY WEISS: The average timeframe

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	from	the	point	in	time	that

COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Yes, sir,

4 can you identify yourself, please?

GARY WEISS: I'm sorry, my name is Gary Weiss, I'm the Deputy Commissioner for Licensing, it's Licensing and Standards. average time period that it takes from the point in time that you as a new licensee, from the moment that you walk in my door at Long Island City, to the second floor and say, "I want to submit my application, "okay, to put a new vehicle on the road, you've never been licensed by us before and neither has the vehicle, is eleven calendar days. Generally speaking, it takes about, from the point in time that, after you have submitted your application, we take your payment, we issue something called a DMV plate letter, you go to the DMV, and you obtain the plates. You let the base know, who then in turn notifies us. takes about three days to schedule you to actually appear at Woodside. It's not a three or four week time period.

COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Okay.

mean, I guess some of the owners will come and say

the Committee understands, our issue is that we
saw this coming, you know, and that's the
frustrating part to me, that we knew we would be
here X amount of time later and here we are. So,
that's why, Mr. Chairman, I feel my frustration,
that's why I'm

DAVID YASSKY: No, it's, it does-COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: --you

weren't even here for that.

DAVID YASSKY: --it's a long drive, it is a long drive to Woodside, no question, from Staten Island. I mean, from other, some other parts of the City, too, but that's when you have one location, there are going to be parts of the City that are far from that. If we did it in, you know, Bay Ridge then it would be closer, but it's not. I understand.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you,

Council Member Ignizio, and I'm going to go to

Council Member Rose nest. But I just wanted to

clarify on thing. About inspections, the TLC regs

do talk about inspections, and they say "If the

vehicle has accumulated fewer than 500 miles

traveled at the time the vehicle arrives at the

2	Commission's facility for inspection, the
3	inspection will be for only a visual inspection."
4	DAVID YASSKY: Correct.
5	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Then the next

clause says, "If the vehicle is a year 1996 or later model, the vehicle must pass the vehicle inspection requirements set forth in Section 301 of New York State Vehicle and Traffic Law, a visual inspection of the interior and exterior of the vehicle, and an inspection to verify compliance with any and all other applicable laws, rules and requirements."

DAVID YASSKY: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: So which of these are we enforcing? Are we enforcing--

DAVID YASSKY: Both. And the first one where you say under 500, what the means is, that's right, we don't have to hook, you don't have to go through the lanes, and do the emissions testing, and the brake testing; all we do, essentially, is verify that it's the vehicle that's got the same VIN as the license number and put the sticker on it. And that's, but that's a core function, because we don't want anybody but

2 the TLC employees to put the sticker of legitimacy
3 on the vehicle.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: But then the next clause says that after 1996, the vehicle must pass the vehicle inspection requirements of New York State Traffic and Vehicle Law, and a visual inspection, and another inspection to verify compliance with other laws.

DAVID YASSKY: You know, Martin jump in, if I'm--but, I'm not, you know, so familiar with the statute, that language, but I, if I got it, it's the, under 500 is kind of an exception to the second one. In other words, you have to, we, we give you the DMV inspection and the rest of it, but if you're less than 500 miles, then just the reg--then just the TLC specific.

MARTIN GRINDLEY: Assistant

Commissioner Martin Grindley. If, for a visual inspection, when the car arrives at Woodside--I'm sorry for my voice, anyhow--once a car there, we're basically verifying that we're, applying the sticker to the current car, we're checking the registration, make sure the right plate is on the car. You'll be surprised to see how many cars

2	will show up with different plates, and so on.
3	So, want to make sure that all of those things is
4	right if the car is in the 500 mile. Normally
5	take about 25-30 minutes. And the car would leave
6	Woodside. Your second question about the DMV and
7	a visual inspection, as the Commissioner explained
8	earlier, we do have DMV safety and emission
9	inspection. And also as TLC inspection, which
10	is a visual inspection. At this point, we want to
11	make sure the signs and the decals and all those
12	stuff is applied to the car. It's one inspection.
13	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: So, if the car
14	has less than 500 miles, and it's after 1996
15	model, that car must go through a full inspection.
16	DAVID YASSKY: That is correct.
17	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: So then, if
18	it's under 500 miles, the only inspection is not
19	visual. 'Cause one, one, this is 59A-04E, one, in
20	one paragraph it says one thing, and the next
21	paragraph is saysI'm not clear on when
22	MARTIN GRINDLEY: Well
23	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: -if it's under
24	500 miles, if it's under 500 miles, it's only a
25	visual inspection.

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 62
2	MARTIN GRINDLEY: Anything under
3	500 miles is only
4	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Then
5	MARTIN GRINDLEY:a visual
6	inspection.
7	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:then the next
8	paragraph says, "After 1996 or later model, the
9	vehicle must have inspectfull inspection,
10	visual, all applicable laws, rules and
11	requirements.
12	MARTIN GRINDLEY: Right, well
13	basically what you're doing
14	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: That means top
15	to bottom.
16	MARTIN GRINDLEY: Top to bottom.
17	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: So top to
18	bottom, so I just bring it to your attention
19	because it is conflicting, and I don't, I didn't
20	know what to mean, I didn't know what it meant.
21	DAVID YASSKY: [off mic] It sounds
22	like you're saying that the under 500 part should
23	be an exception to the 1996 ongoing.
24	MARTIN GRINDLEY: It's to model
25	year.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	DAV	ID YASSKY	· Voc
_	DAV.	ID IMPOUL	· 1CD.

3 CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I'd like to

4 mention we've been joined by--

DAVID YASSKY: Good catch.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: --Council

Member Garodnick, and I would now call upon Council Member Rose.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Thank you.

Thank you, Council Member Rodriguez, for letting me go, I have to get to Staten Island. I want to say that I, it's really frustrating that, for you to come to this hearing today, having just still have just internal conversations about the Staten Island garage. We've given you quite a lot of, you know, time, I feel, to, to have at least vetted this, this issue. And to be able to come back with some sort of real figures on what the costs would be. And, and how we could be moving forward. With that said, you know, I was glad to hear that you have identified a person whose sole purpose will be, initially, to, to get all of that taken care of. And, and I'm sure you'll be bringing us back some information shortly. So, I would like to know, is there a timeframe by which

inspection at that time? I don't mean you have to

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

z Leii we every	2	tell	. me	every-
-------------------	---	------	------	--------

MARTIN GRINDLEY: Could you please repeat the question?

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: [background comments] Could you just tell me what [crosstalk]

MARTIN GRINDLEY: Okay, excuse me.

The inspection basically is from start of inspection, we would check the OB, the, which is your regular vehicle emission testing, if you would take your car to a regular emissions station. We check your tires, tire pressure, tire depths. And I'm not sure you're talking about FHV or medallion, but however, in the medallion case, in an FHV then you wouldn't have a metered test; however, you would do a custom exterior inspection of the vehicle to make sure that the car is clean. It's painted properly, all the markings are present. Seatbelts are working, and so on. From thereon, we will perform brake tests on the vehicle, to make sure that the brake is working properly. Also checking the emergency brake to make sure--

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Okay--

MARTIN GRINDLEY: --in case of an

2 emergency, that would happen.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Okay, so I, I get, I get the, the general idea. Is there anything that is so unique to this inspection, that that could not happen outside of the Woodside inspection center?

DAVID YASSKY: Well, there's two issues. One is that part of the inspection is unique, the marking that the, you know, vehicle, that the driver's license is displayed properly. Those are things that ordinary, are not part of any ordinary DMV inspection. In the case of a taxi, there's many more things like that, obviously, there's the meter, the credit card, the credit card reader—

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: There's the window and--mm-hmm.

DAVID YASSKY: But there's also an integrity, some question, or kind of quality assurance question. We only moved, and I guess it was Council Member Ignizio that was saying a few years ago, when you talked about this and raised the concern about, "Well, Staten Islanders will be inconvenienced." That was, that discussion

must've taken place when we began requiring FHVs
to come to Woodside in the first place. Unlike
yellow taxis, which the TLC's been inspecting
directly for decades, the FHVs, the TLC began
inspecting the FHVs directly only two years ago.
The, the reason was that we, that were convinced,
and I think that have been proven correct, that we
would have better quality control about the
inspection if it was onsite, TLC employees, rather
than if it was any service station. If I, what I
mean is, that a serva service station that's,
doesn't have the public interest mandate and
mission that we do, would be not as rigorous in
ensuring that the vehicle meets the standards, as
we are. And that's the, that was, I think, the
biggest part of the rationale.
COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Because at
one time there was, the inspections were happening
on Staten Island, they were basically the DMV,
without the, the visual TLC component, right.
DAVID YASSKY: They still are, by
the way.
COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: SoOkay.
DAVID YASSKY: In other words,

2	right, this is just once every two years, those,
3	those vehicles are required to be inspected the
4	same every four, every four months, just like
5	taxis are. But, so that's, say, six times in two
6	years. Five of the six, they can go to any
7	private service station.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Right.
9	DAVID YASSKY: The, only one of the
10	six is required to be at Woodside. And, you know,
11	as the Deputy Commissioner points out, right,
12	we're talking about 300, there are 300 vehicles
13	that are, are licensed on Staten Island. It's not
14	that they're not significant, I'm just saying it's
15	300 out of the 25,000.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: And, but, but
17	does Staten Island service stations could very
18	easily take care of that number. That's a
19	manageable number.
20	DAVID YASSKY: Yes.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: You know, you
22	have a TLC office there, where you have a
23	DAVID YASSKY: We do?
24	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE:I was told
25	that there's an office there. And you have a

staff person there. Whyare there any barriers,
you know, prohibiting that TLC staff people who
would be able to maintain the integrity of the
visual inspections and whatever stickering is
required? Why couldn't TLC officials be
dispatched or stationed or housed at, on a, at
Staten Island, at one of your already approved DMV
inspection stations, to do the, the TLC part, that
you know, where you are, you're really concerned
about maintaining the integrity. So, I'm talking
about instead of building a facility now, I'm
talking about manpower, I'm talking about moving a
staff members to do that.

DAVID YASSKY: Right. Well,

that's--

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: And since it's only once every two years, you know, it wouldn't even seem like that would have to be a fulltime position for someone, that they could rotate, you know, their--

DAVID YASSKY: That is in fact what we're looking at doing, and that's the, you know, that's what we have to figure out the costs and the operational issues that it raises. I'm not

DAVID YASSKY: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: --you know,

24

2	for this report back. And I want you to know that
3	this is an issue that's not going away for us.
4	DAVID YASSKY: I understand that.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: And thank
6	you
7	DAVID YASSKY: Thank you.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Thank you,
9	Mr. Chair, and thank you, Council Member Ydanis
LO	Rodriguez, for giving me your time. Thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you,
12	Council Member Rose. Council Member Rodriguez.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Thank
L4	you, Chairman Vacca. First of all, I would like
15	to congratulate and thank both Commissioner Yassky
L6	and Chairman Vacca for your leadership on this
L7	important industry.
L8	DAVID YASSKY: Thank you.
L9	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: I think
20	that looking to protect a, all sectors is a
21	different task. And you've been doing it like
22	always looking for a, the livery taxi drivers,
23	yellow taxis' owners and drivers. And, and
24	workers' rights, it's very important. I mean, we
25	don't live in a perfect world, neither we have a

2	perfect city, and there's always a space on where
3	to improve. And I hope that I know that that's
4	what we're going to be, what we are looking when
5	we have this type of hearing. You know, of
6	course, like as someone that represent northern
7	Manhattan areas, you know, like
8	DAVID YASSKY: Yes.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ:I have
10	a, I don't know if have a, like the biggest
11	numbers of livery taxis company, but there's a big
12	number that we have in my district. I started
13	with a question and how many inspection is that
14	the livery taxis have to go through every year?
15	DAVID YASSKY: Three a year with
16	and one, at least one out of every two years, has
17	to be at our facility at Woodside.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Okay.
19	And how much revenue do you raise from
20	inspections?
21	DAVID YASSKY: All right, it's
22	about \$4 million. I may have that exact number.
23	But if, if somebody can get it for me, the exact
24	number I'll gay it's about \$4 million and

correct it when I get the correct number.

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 74
2	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: That's
3	for the, all inspections, or for particular?
4	DAVID YASSKY: All, for all
5	inspections.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: \$4
7	million a year.
8	DAVID YASSKY: I believe that is
9	correct.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: And, and
11	how much is the budget to operate the Woodside
12	facility?
13	DAVID YASSKY: You know, I'm not
14	sure I have that off the top of my head. I don't,
15	I would have to get that to you.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: And, and
17	of course I'm coming more from the suggestion on,
18	on how to expand this, the, the services at the
19	Woodside facility. There's no doubt that major
20	improvement has been made under your leadership,
21	like
22	DAVID YASSKY: Thank you.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ:not
24	only I was a, the number one but I've been
25	working with, when I was at City College, but also

2.

at, I've been, I have many friends and family
members, and, and I work very close with many
other livery taxis owners, so I believe that I am
very familiar with that industry.

DAVID YASSKY: You are.

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: So there's no doubt that two years ago like the waiting period time, days, to get inspection was too long, and you've been able to reduce it. But-

DAVID YASSKY: Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: --still

I believe, I think that, and getting from you and us, we need to work to see how we reduce those four days or three days, because especially the livery taxi drivers like those people like, that's the only opportunity that many of them have, in order to bring their income to the family. So, I hope that you can look first of all on, first on looking at another site, on where to expand the Woodside facility. And also looking at the possibility of making the facility a 24 hours operation. Is that doable? Do you think that--?

DAVID YASSKY: Well, I'm not, I

2	don't think, I, I doubt that 24 hours would make
3	sense. I do think that some expansion of hours
4	might, you know, might well be cost effective.
5	And I mean, the extra lane is material, you know,
6	the lane, an extra lane's another 60 cars a day.
7	So, another 300 cars a week, we can process.
8	That's, that's very material right there. And,
9	and we are looking at what we need to do on ours,
10	'cause, you know, if we, if we
11	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Well
12	DAVID YASSKY: Look, we don't want
13	to come do too much in advance, we'll see how many
14	new licensees show up, how many replace existing.
15	So, but we know that we have to keep that number
16	reasonable.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: When,
18	when the insurance expire
19	DAVID YASSKY: Yeah.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Does the
21	driver doesn't have to go back within, to another
22	expansion at the time?
23	GARY WEISS: [off mic] No, they do
24	not.
25	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: They

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 77
2	don't?
3	GARY WEISS: No.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Is it
5	something new, or they never, never had to?
6	GARY WEISS: They never had to.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Never
8	had to.
9	GARY WEISS: They're required to
10	let us know by rule if their insurance is expiring
11	and[background comment] I'm, I apologize.
12	They're required by rule to let us know when their
13	insurance expires, and to provide us with a copy
14	of a new policy within ten days after any change
15	in their insurance. There's no need for a, an
16	inspection of the vehicle at Woodside, because of
17	anything related to insurance.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: And what
19	about when the, when the license on the permit,
20	what is it called, the diamond?
21	GARY WEISS: It's the license.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: The
23	license expire.
24	GARY WEISS: When the license
25	expires, there are, there is that one inspection,

×	

they're quite lengthy, but it, they'll in some

2	ways provides an opportunity to make other
3	corrections, that would be a good way to do it, if
4	necessary. I will make sure that we, so you don't
5	have to look in the City Record, Mr. Chair, we
6	will send you a copy of the draft rules, as well.
7	Obviously there's the public comment period, but I
8	very much would welcome, you know, any feedback
9	from the Council, from your, from yourself, from
10	your Committee, on our proposed rules. We are,
11	anticipate a hearing later in March, and then a
12	vote in April, so that we can get those licenses
13	on the road. So
14	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you.
15	DAVID YASSKY:that'sthank you,
16	Mr. Chair.
17	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Commissioner,
18	one thing, would you mind leaving
19	DAVID YASSKY: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:leaving one
21	person behind
22	DAVID YASSKY: Of course not.
23	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:at least,
24	because I'd like them to listen to the others who
25	testify.

25

2	DAVID YASSKY: No, our, we have a
3	valued staffer who's right here and is prepared to
4	do just that. Thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: And Council
6	Member Lappin expresses her regrets that she could
7	not be here. Okay? Thank you. Okay, we will
8	call up our first three speakers. [pause] Jose
9	Altimatro [phonetic], I'm sorry, he just left.
10	Jasmine Lavue [phonetic]. Are you here, Jasmine?
11	Oh, that's you. Come on up, Jasmine. Livery Aviq
12	Cabassa [phonetic], Cabesa [phonetic], Aviq.
13	Arthur Groban [phonetic]. That's, oh, I'm sorry,
14	okay. Didn't say it right, but come on up.
15	[pause] I'll be limiting each speaker to three
16	minutes. Okay? Try your best to, to stick to
17	that limit. Why don't we hear first from Jasmine?
18	Speak into the mic and state your name for the
19	record.
20	[pause, background noise]
21	JASMINE LE VEAUX: [off mic] Hi,
22	good afternoon, is this microphone on? [on mic]
23	Hello? Hi, good afternoon, my name is Jasmine

Laveau, and I'm affiliated with the law firm of

Windels Marx Lane & Mittendorf, and it's

Transportation Practice Group. I'm appearing on
behalf of the Coalition of Transportation
Associations, also known as COTA, and its Chairman
Matthew Daus, who was unable to attend today.
COTA is the Coalition of all the limousine and
black cars trade associations in the New York City
Metropolitan area, and includes the Luxury Base
Operators Association, the Black Car Assistance
Corporation, the Limousine Association of New
York, the Long Island Limousine Association, the
Limousine Association of New Jersey. Our law firm
is also general counsel to COTA, the Luxury Base
Operators Association, and the Limousine
Association of New Jersey. The mission of COTA is
to work together to support the economic integrity
and sustainability of the four higher ground
transportation industry, and to support and
promote reasonable and sound government regulation
to further those purposes. The members of COTA
have reviewed Proposal No. 234-A, and while we
generally support the efforts of the City Council
in increasing industry input and access at the
TLC, we believe the current draft bill will not
lead to a productive or effective board or

stakeholder input structure. The TLC for many
years has had separate advisory boards that are
tailored for each different regulated industry:
livery, black care, limousine, taxicab, commuter
van, etc. Former TLC Chairman Matthew Daus relied
heavily upon these boards in making decisions.
And also created the first ever Office of
Constituent Affairs at the agency to deal with all
stakeholders on a daily basis to supplement Board
input. It is my understanding that some or all of
the boards may have become dormant, but that the
Constituent Affairs functions and roles remain in
place. We believe that combining all of the
regulated industries into one board would not be
pragmatic, as the issues affecting them are
diverse and in some instances entirely irrelevant.
Instead, we recommend the reinstitution and
codification in the law of the former black car
and limousine advisory board. Representatives
should reflect the various business forms and
modes of operation in the industry, including
bases that operate both independent contractor and
employer models, black car cooperatives, black car
franchises, luxury limousine base groups, drivers

2	and intermunicipal representation of various
3	government entities and industry groups of the
4	metropolitan area that conduct significant
5	business in New York City. To make the Boards
6	productive, we recommend mandating a certain
7	number of meetings per year, and including
8	government officials whose roles have a
9	significant impact on our industry, including
10	representation from the New York City Department
11	of Transportation, New York City Police
12	Department, and that a few members of the TLC
13	Board of Commissioners become more involved and
14	serve in an official capacity on the Advisory
15	Board to supplement the Chair's work. I see that
16	my time is [time bell] running out.
17	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you.
18	JASMINE LE VEAUX: Thank you.
19	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: And we'll
20	certainly accept your testimony, as well, so we'll
21	have it in total.
22	JASMINE LE VEAUX: Great, thank you
23	so much.
24	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you. Mr.
25	Cabesa?

2	AVIQ CABESA: Hi, my name, good
3	afternoon, my name is Aviq Cabesa, and I am Board
4	Member of the Livery Round Table. For those who
5	do not know, the Livery Round Table is a
6	coordinating council of five livery industry
7	association. We represent over 14,000 livery
8	drivers, 240 base operators, and over 5,000
9	dispatchers and telephone operators. Thank you
10	very much for letting me speak today. I'm going
11	to start with the oversight, because the, what I
12	would like to first of all really commend you for
13	taking this initiative into, into looking at the
14	time it takes to, to get a car, and especially the
15	new car, on the road. And I will tell you here
16	that the numbers we heard here from the TLC, the
17	three to four days, and the ten days complete
18	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Scuze me. I
19	would like our speaker to be given attention.
20	Please proceed.
21	AVIQ CABESA: So give me more time.
22	[laughter] Look, I mean, the TLC, that the
23	Chairman and others said it's going to be three to
24	four days for, for the inspection, and then ten

days or eleven days for complete process, I can

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

tell you right now, we bite with two hands. was not said by the TLC is what happens when it's not? What happens when I have all the document, and I am asking for an appointment, and I do get it in two or three, three weeks, or that specific appointment which should take three to four days, takes ten and eleven days to get. So, I think that the rule that you're looking to do is actually put them on record to say, "If you're not able to provide a meeting within what you say is acceptable, which is three to four days, what's the alternative?" Put the accountability on the TLC to say, "If the Woodside inspection cannot be given within three to four days, allow that vehicle a waiver from that inspection and allow them to go to the regular DMV inspection. So, I think what we did not hear, and I can tell you on behalf of our members, we would love to see a brand new vehicle going on the road within ten to eleven days. It does not happen on average. that's as far as it goes. As far as the advisory board, the Commissioner was right, he's meeting with a lot of advocacy group, the Livery Roundtable enjoys a quarterly meeting, but the

problem is that those meetings are after the rules
have been formsort of, the idea was formulated
and they were proposed. And there's no public
record as to what was said about those proposals.
So I think the advisory board you're advising is a
great, great thing to do, so they will meet before
they fall in love with their creation, before they
create the law, okay, and I am assuring you that
if this happen, you'll have less objection once
those proposals are being proposed. So, as far as
this goes, I strongly support you. Your
initiative. Now, as far as the Koppell initiative
about the livery passenger bill of right, again, I
think that we're, we're missing two points here.
The problem is not the languageI'm sorry, the
problem is not posting something about wheelchair
within the livery vehicle, the problem is the
language, 'cause the language speaks about equal
service, equal availability, and equal rate.
Anybody that understand this business know that on
the prearranged section, the only way [time bell]
you can have equal availability is if you have all
your fleet wheelchair accessible. The for-hire
industry offer different type of services which do

not exist with the wheelchair accessible type like
the sedan for three people, we don't have a sedan
for wheelchair users; minivan for five people, we
don't have minivans for five users, for five
wheelchair users; SUVs, stretch limos, you name
it. So, the language should say that, that you
should be able to ask for wheelchair accessible,
but not equal availability, definitely not equal
service, it does not exist. And when you speak
about, one last thing, when you speak about equal
rate, we need to understand that you're speaking
about equal rates solely when it's one passenger.
Because the minute I have to take two or three, I
need to bring two or three vehicles. So, I think
there's much more to it, it's, I was amazed to
hear the Commissioner supporting this, where the -
- themselves are looking for an alternative to
their six or seven F rule [phonetic], which this,
the Commissioner is on record saying it's an
impossible for the bases to implement. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you. Our
next three speakers and Jeff Rose, Limousine
Association of New York; James Grosso [phonetic],
New York City Fleet Livery Owners Association

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

[backgro	ound comment] On, okay, that'll be our
panel.	Okay? Then we'll come back to the next
panel.	[pause, background noise] I should
mention	Councilman Greenfield has joined us.
[pause,	background noise] Who would like to go
first?	Okay, introduce yourself, sir.

JEFF ROSE: Mr. Chairman, members, thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Jeff Rose, I'm the owner of Attitude New York, and I'm here to represent the Limousine Association of New York. We work on behalf of the hundreds of companies and thousands of employees who make their living providing premium chauffeured transportation. While the word "limousine" may conjure up images of wild partying and oversized stretch limousines, that is really a very small part of what we do. Stretch limousines actually constitute less than ten percent of the vehicles in this segment of the for-hire vehicle category. We are mostly small business entrepreneurs struggling to make a living in difficult economic times. And while our image may be dominated by the passenger in the backseat, our real value to New York is in the tens of thousands

б

of jobs we provide and support, as well as
contributing to the vast network of the City's
transportation options. Chauffeurs, dispatchers,
office staff, mechanics and car washers are just
some of the New Yorkers who depend on luxury
limousine services to earn a living. While I'm
happy to answer any questions that you have about
our industry, I'm here primarily to address the
issue of the advisory boards. As an industry, we
are eager to offer our expertise in contributing
to the health and wellbeing of this economic
engine, we seek to foster a greater understanding
between regulators and the legislators who rely on
their input as to how these businesses operate and
serve their clients and customers. While clearly
well intentioned, these bodies can sometimes
devise, impose and execute regulations that
despite the goal of serving the riding public, can
hamper economic development and diminish customer
service. Additionally ,we see no advantage to
maintaining an adversary relationship between
regulators and these enterprises. As an industry,
we welcome healthy, sensible regulation and free
market competition. While we strongly support

reestablishing industry advisory boards, we
believe that lumping together all segments of the
industry into one group will not best serve these
goals. In delineating the various categories and
subgroups, the TLC tacitly acknowledges that
there's a wide range of operating models and
consumer demands. We feel that the diverse, we
feel that diversity of representation is ideal.
As well, there is another goal that we seek. We
would like to see a true partnership between
regulators and the companies that service the
transportation market. The relationship should
not be merely a tug of war between more regulation
and less. We strive for a climate that allows
companies the flexibility to innovate, coming up
with better ways to serve the riding public,
maintain public safety, and contribute to economic
growth. We urge the powers that be to see that
these boards do not become merely a perfunctory
gesture to the various stakeholders, but rather
that our input and expertise be utilized in a
truly productive partnership. Thank you for the
opportunity to speak on behalf of the hardworking
women and men of this industry.

2	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:	I thank you,

Mr. Rose. Let me ask, based on the last paragraph or two. [pause, background noise] Based on the last paragraph or two, you mentioned here that you were concerned about having more than a perfunctory role, do you think now that some, that the stakeholders such as yourself have a perfunctory role? Have you been consistently consulted as the Commissioner indicates he's always in consultation with stakeholders pertaining to their interests?

Association has met with the Chairman's office on a quarterly basis. I would agree with what Dr.
Cabesa said, that sometimes regulations come down the pike before comment is sought. I think that there's been more consultation but I think that the relationship between the industry and the regulators could be better. There's always room for improvement. I don't seek to criticize, but I'm saying that, for instance, there were times when out of town consultants were sought to reestablish the rules of the Taxi and Limousine Commission, or to rewrite some of these rules. We

en a
≘,
ld be
fore
with

JEFF ROSE: Well, I find many
things out. Are you referring to the Taxi and
Limousine Commission specifically? [laughter]

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I'm not
referring to the Oscars, I'll put it that way.
[laughter]

JEFF ROSE: Well, there is a sense that on occasion, the consultation is perfunctory. That our input will not have the weight that we would like it to. And again, part of that is because sometimes it seems that there is not a confrontational but a, maybe a contrary relationship. We, in the industry, seek sensible regulation. We want the reputation of the

2.

industry to be enhanced. And we would like to
work with the Taxi and Limousine Commission to
enhance the reputation of the industry. We're not
bad guys who are looking to get out from under
regulation. But certain regulations seem not to
serve the public, or the safety of the public at
large. And we would like, I think, more weight to
be given to the opinions, not in the sense that we
want less regulation, but we would like to see
better, more sensible regulation.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I thank you.

JEFF ROSE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Sir, would you state your name for the record, please?

JAMES GRASSO: My name is James

Grasso, and I represent the New York City Fleet

Livery Owners Association. And we're also part of
the Livery Roundtable. I'd like to thank the, the

Committee and the Chairman for allowing us to
speak. To avoid confusion, I will be reading

Arthur Grover's statement, and then answer
whatever questions. "With great respect, it is
with great respect that I address the City Council
today, not only as a base owner and vehicle owner,

but I also speak on behalf of the base owned
fleets throughout New York City. My name is
Arthur Grover, and I am proud owner of Mid-Island
Car Service, a for-hire base located in Staten
Island, New York. And President of the New York
City Fleet Livery Owners Association, a 501(c)(6)
organization that represents fleet owners
throughout the City. Since September 1, 2009, all
new livery vehicles that have been required, have
been required to be inspected at the Woodside
facility before they are issued their licenses and
allowed to be utilized by the base. As a base
owner for nearly 31 years, I have experienced
changes in regulations and policies that have made
it very difficult and often financially harrowing
to operate. The issues that I would like to
discuss regarding the TLC inspections fall into
two categories. The timeliness in which the
vehicle owner receives an appointment, and the
financial hardship that the base owners in Staten
Island and South Brooklyn experience each time
that a vehicle is brought to the Woodside
Inspection Facility. It is important that I
stress how my base and those I represent differ

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

from many other FHV bases throughout New York City. Our type of bases are often referred to in the industry as 'fleets' and I am not only, I not only own the base, but I also own the vehicles affiliated with the base, too. Unlike many base owners who own one vehicle, my financial burden is difficult to shoulder. I am responsible for the cost of the insurance on all the vehicles, the upkeep and maintenance of all the vehicles, all TLC fees, vehicle registrations, inspection fees and workers compensation insurance, which oftentimes cost close to \$1,500 per vehicle. Those base owners who do not own any vehicles need not worry about these things, they are the vehicle owners' responsibility. One major similarity between the various types of FHB bases is that the base owner must apply for the DMV appointment. most cases, the appointment is not scheduled for upwards of three weeks, after the application is This is extremely detrimental to the submitted. fleets. The vehicle has already been inspected by a New York State inspection facility, in order for it to be registered and a premium payment has been made on the insurance. However, the vehicle

cannot be used until it is inspected again at the
TLC inspection facility. Base owners on Staten
Island South Brooklyn also face an issue that
differs from the rest of the City. Many of us are
required to travel upwards of 45 to 68 miles round
trip per inspection. For example, my vehicle's
must travel 64 miles round trip, which can take
close to three hours on average. Staten Island
bases may pay toll charges in order to return back
to Staten Island each and every time we travel to
Woodside. Once the vehicle arrives at Woodside
facility, the whole inspection process can take up
to [time bell] four hours" [background comment]
All right, thank you. "The inspection time
coupled with the travel time often results in the
base paying the transporter a full day's pay. If
a vehicle fails, then it is brought back to Staten
Island, repaired and brought back to Woodside
inspection facility to be reinspected. At this
point, we have traveled 128 miles in order for the
car to be considered road worthy. Again, this
results in additional day's pay, toll charges and
pay the ever escalating fuel costs. Often, if the
vehicle passes inspection, it may be given a ten

day notice to correct. In this case, the vehicle
passes, but there may be a couple of items that
need to be corrected. The vehicle can be used,
however it must return within ten days of the
initial inspection to prove that the items have
been rectified, or the license received will be
revoked. Unfortunately based on fleets, not just
in Staten Island and South Brooklyn, have had
multiple cars schedule for inspections on the same
day. Logistically, it is difficult to coordinate
this. The base takes a huge financial hit due to
loss of work that the vehicles would cover if they
were on the road, payroll to have the vehicles
taken for inspection, gas, tolls. This differs
from the independent drivers who own their own
vehicles. This further contributes to the
financial hardship already experienced by
struggling bases. And we had actually suggested
to Chairman Yassky almost a year ago, to model
what the New York State DOT does, and have
satellite inspection facilities like they do for
buses. And they seem to agree on posting an RFP,
but as we know, it never came to pass."
CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I thank you.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you very

much. Our next panel, David Pollack--oh, no, Mr.

24

2	Grover, your son spoke for you, I'm sorry.
3	ARTHUR GROVER: [off mic} Yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Yes, okay,
5	that, Mr. Grover. Okay, thank you.
6	ARTHUR GROVER: Son-in-law, please.
7	[laughter]
8	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Just because we
9	look alike [laughter] people assume
10	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: David Pollack,
11	please, Executive Director of the Committee for
12	Taxi Safety; Peter Mazur [phonetic], Metropolitan
13	Taxicab Board of Trade; Ethan Gerber, Greater New
14	York Taxi Association; and Vincent Sapone
15	[phonetic], LAMTO [phonetic]. If I could ask Mr.
16	Pollack to please go first.
17	DAVID POLLACK: I'm going to speak
18	on two of the Intros, one being Intro 676 for the
19	advisoryI'm sorry, the advisory board, which is
20	actually Intro 234-A. I want to applaud you, Mr.
21	Chairman, for this advisory board legislation.
22	And thank you for recognizing the many drivers who
23	will be recognized and represented in all segments
24	of the industry. Historically, a little
25	historical note, the current boards pretty much

became dormant under this administration. And
although, you know, the TLC does ask to meet and
maybe they do meet sometimes with industry
associations, maybe they don't meet sometimes with
industry associations, but what this association
has found, most of the time chooses to ignore any
industry input, and I want to thank you for this
legislation once again. Hopefully, the TLC will
use this advisory board to listen to all issues,
as opposed to surprise legislation without any
industry input, which seems to be a current
policy, in our opinion. The other Intro I want to
speak about is 676-A, the leasing of the
medallion. The "owner must drive" rule has pretty
much outlived its usefulness. And the existing
rules, right now, which is supposed to be the new
rules, actually penalize American veterans and
penalize widows, whose husbands have passed, and
want to lease their medallions. Not only does it
penalize them, you know, monetarily penalizes
them, \$50,000. Give us five grand as a penalty
and you can lease your medallion under these
certain circumstances. There's no doubt with the
presentation to OMB that from \$987,000 in

2	summonses last year to \$2.7 million required, that
3	there's a money issue here. And it's a shame that
4	medallions widows and veterans have to be the
5	subject of, of income searches by the Taxi and
6	Limousine Commission. And I did want to just
7	thank Councilwoman Lappin for introducing this
8	bill. It's, it's overdue. The present rules are
9	very complicated, you know, you work this many
10	days, if you don't work that many days, you pay an
11	X amount of fee; if you don't work this many days,
12	you pay a larger fee. You know, and the fact is,
13	contrary to belief, most of the individual owner
14	medallions that are purchased, are drivers who are
15	long term leasers, Who lease the medallion, many
16	from my members, saved enough money to purchase
17	their own medallions. And this bill helps to
18	alleviate the dove model. [time bell] The old
19	bill.
20	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you very
21	much, Mr. Pollack. Oh, Council Member Lappin is
22	here. Welcome, Council Member Lappin.
23	DAVID POLLACK: I just thanked you.
24	[laughter]

COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: [off mic]

2 Thank you, thank you for thanking me.

3 CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Mr. Pollack

4 just thanked you. Mr. Gerber, would you proceed.

5 ETHAN GERBER: Yes, thank you,

6 Chairman, and thank, members of the Council. I'm

7 | from the Greater New York Taxi Association, which

8 is the owners association which the Chairman

9 recognized as being progressive in accessibility

10 and hybrid taxis. I'm primarily here to talk

11 about Intro 234-A, which revises and consolidates

12 the taxi advisory boards. As you know, it was

13 brought up almost two years ago by you, Mr. Chair,

by the, by the Committee, and by Chairman Yassky,

who pledged that he would revise it, and in fact

16 no such effort was made. It's very important,

17 also, in his comments that I read yesterday, he

did not mention owner, owner input, he did not

19 mention lender input. He never acknowledged the

20 importance of, of agency input. The very people

21 charged with buying, maintaining the vehicles,

22 securing medallions, getting them on the road,

23 | didn't seem to warrant input. We have quarterly

24 meetings, as he said, or at least we have

25 scheduled quarterly meetings, sometimes they don't

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

take place. But many of the agendas, especially one comes to mind is the livery plan which radically changed the industry more than it has changed since 1937, was somehow not brought up in our quarterly meeting which only took place a couple of weeks before it was announced by the Mayor. We learned about that the way many people learned about it, from the media. I received a telephone call from a reporter about two hours before I received the telephone call from the TLC to give me a heads up about something. We have often learned about events from the media, as we did with the change in the rooftop lights. heard about several initiatives, we hear them first often at TLC meetings, we heard several initiatives just today. This is exactly why an advisory board composed of all aspects of this industry is vital. This agency needs input and it needs oversight. In recent years, the TLC has reinvented the industry almost monthly. Every month, the Commission meets and almost every month proposes radical changes to the industry and its drivers. Imagine any business trying to operate when the basic rules change dramatically every

month. When rules are issued controlling every		
minutiae of business, and when infractions of any		
kind could result in literally thousands of		
violations and hundreds of thousands of dollars in		
fines, it's almost impossible to keep the industry		
going. This bureaucratic nightmare seems to be		
relished by the City. The Mayor proposed that the		
new budget is going to comprise almost \$2.75		
million in fines, a dramatic increase from last		
year. The more complicated the rules, the more		
the fines. In recent years, the TLC has gone		
beyond its stated purposes in the New York City		
Charter. The Charter calls for setting standards.		
This TLC has now created exclusive contracts. We		
have an exclusive vehicle coming up, we're		
there's a new RFP apparently being launched, for		
an exclusive school. [time bell] We're not		
talking about standards. I applaud you, Mr.		
Chairman, for this. I would like a moment, if I		
could talk about the other two initiatives, if		
that's all right. [background comment] Okay. As		
far as, as far as the "owner must drive" rules, we		
were at a commission, open commission hearing that		
was held in The Bronx on a rotating schedule this		

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

year. The, the room was filled with, literally with, with widows and, and orphans of drivers who were left with a dilemma of what to do with these vehicles. It was also filled with people who had driven a car for 30-35 years, and were forced to suddenly sell that medallion no matter what the market conditions are, and whatever the prevailing impact on their estate planning is. People who, who have invested their lifetime building an asset, should not be, should not have to be forced to sell that asset simply because they're taken ill or they just reached the age where they themselves feel it's no longer comfortable to drive. It's, it's really, seems to be against the first principles of transportation and the first principles of the TLC, to force someone to drive a cab after they themselves feel that it's not in their best safety interests, and the safety interests of the public, to drive. Just--as far as, as far as the inspections, you asked if the Chairman had, had asked us our opinion about that. Sure, since we heard it today for the first time, I'm sure we'd like to talk about it. However, I am hoping and trusting that the Chairman was being

2	honest with us and that the TLC's stated purpose
3	is honest that it is to just simply make things
4	better and easier, and that it's not just to race
5	to the lowest common denominator, and say that now
6	that we're having livery service we're going to
7	bring down inspections for everyone, change the
8	rooftop lights for everyone, and do everything to
9	take away what has become a national standard of
10	yellow, simply to have all other cars compete with
11	it. And I trust that's the case. Thank you.
12	[applause]
13	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you. If
14	I could interrupt, perhaps Council Member Lappin,
15	do you wish to say
16	COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: [off mic]
17	Sure! Well, we can, I can wait till the panel's
18	finished, or is the panel finished?
19	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: No, we have one
20	more speaker, and then
21	COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: [off mic] I
22	can wait till he's done.
23	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Okay.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: [off mic]
25	And I have questions.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for the record.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: We have one more gentleman on this panel, and then I'll, before the next panel, I'd like to call on Council Member Lappin. Sir, would you introduce yourself

PETER MAZUR: Sure. Peter Mazur, Metropolitan Taxicab Board of Trade. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, and members of the Transportation Committee. MTBOT is a nearly 60 year old trade organization which is composed of 33 medallion taxicab fleets that operate more than 3,500 yellow medallion taxicabs throughout New York City. Today, I will be speaking to three of the bills on the Committee's agenda: Intro 676-A, 234-A and 695-A. Firstly, MTBOT fully supports the three "owner must drive" exemptions provided for in Intro 676-A. The "owner must drive" rules, originally enacted by the TLC in 19909, helped ensure that taxicab service remains safe and reliable by recognizing the important role that individual, independent, owner operators play in the taxicab industry. More than 20 years after the rule was enacted, the TLC made some needed adjustments to the rules last year, to reflect the

realities of the taxicab industry of today, and to
avoid some hardships faced by owner operators.
MTBOT supported these changes, standing besides
those members of the industry, such as spouses of
medallion owners, who would face unreasonable
hardships if they were forced to sell their
medallions. The TLC made some significant changes
to the longstanding rule. This legislation would
codify and clarify some of those changes, as well
as provide additional protection for medallion
owners who are serving their country in the
military, or who are approaching a normal
retirement age. We are pleased to support this
bill which would also strengthen the owner drive
taxicab industry by enabling all inheriting
spouses, persons currently serving in the
military, and those over the age of 62, to make
their own decisions, to plan for future needs.
Intro 234-A, which seeks to establish a new Taxi
and Limousine Commission Advisory Board,
eliminating existing boards and replacing them
with one board to consolidate the myriad of
viewpoints in the taxi, for-hire regulated
industries, the goal to provide public and

industry input before the Commissioner is
laudable. However, the TLC has had advisory
boards in the past. Sometimes they met regularly
and provided valuable input; at other times, such
as now, they are virtually nonexistent. Any
opportunity for members of the public to provide
feedback to a regulator is good. However, for an
advisory board to be successful it must be
representative, and it must be participatory. To
that end, we suggest that the Speaker of the
Council and Mayor appoint an equal number of
representatives from among candidates recommended
by the affected constituencies. We also recommend
that the Council be given regular reports
regarding the effectiveness of the advisory board,
and a mechanism be established to ensure that the
Board has a full contingent of representatives and
meets regularly. With respect to Intro 695-A,
relating to new penalties for misuse of off-duty
lights, we're opposed because this bill is
punitive against drivers, because the conduct
described herein is already prohibited in TLC
rules. We feel that the fine in place for this
infraction is appropriate and bona fide refusals

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

advisory board--

and currently be prosecuted [time bell] and
properly punished even if a driver does so under
the guise of being off duty. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: You know, I, I did want to comment, Mr. Mazur, on your testimony, and I thank you, of course, first. But this issue of an advisory board having a diversity of opinion, and that that may be a reason not to have an advisory board, that's a reason perhaps not to have a policymaking board, because if you have a policymaking board, and you have everybody disagreeing on things, well then you can't make policy and you can't be, you can't have a real structure. However, an advisory board is just that. I'm trying to being into the room people with different opinions because I want them to be heard, and I want them to be consulted, regardless of the point of view they represent. So, on that basis, I think the objection to an advisory board because the industry has such diversity, I think that's a mitigating factor for an advisory board. PETER MAZUR: I didn't speak the

25 CHAIRPERSON VACCA: No, no, I know,

2 I know.

3 PETER MAZUR: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: No, I know, I think your testimony was that we should tweak it and look at the appointments and, and I understand, I appreciate that. No, I just wanted to comment because I know that some people have said that they're not for it based on the diversity of the industry. Well, that's a reason to be for it. That, so I don't understand that, but I do un-I do appreciate your testimony, and I do know you're position. And like I said, any bill that we suggest here, I want to hear from you, I will take your input and we will see, maybe it works a little better, and your suggestions are appreciated. Council Member Jessica Lappin.

COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: Thank you.

Is anybody from the TLC still here? [background comments] Okay. It's too bad that I was so late I couldn't engage with Mr. Yassky personally, because, you know, these to me are two pretty common sense initiatives. And I want to thank Alex Courtner [phonetic] for bringing one of them to my attention. I do not understand why we would

б

penalize good people, citizens of this City, who
are unfortunately serving this country in wartime,
or who are the widows of someone who owned a
medallion. And this to me seems like a very
common sense way to allow individual medallion
owners to sell those medallion owners on their own
timeframes. They're assets that they have
purchased and that they have owned, and that they
have driven those hours for potentially a very
long time. So, I do hope that we will be able to
move forward on that. And I also, you know, I
sort of, I don't appreciate the Administration and
Chari Yassky just coming in and testifying against
it. If there are things that he would like to see
us change, to address some of his concerns, well
then I'm always very happy to her that. I think
constructive feedback is helpful in the
legislative process. Finding constructive ways to
deal with real issues that maybe we hadn't
anticipated is one thing; just opposing a bill is
another. And as somebody who has served in this
body, he should know it's not particularly
helpful. I would also say, when it comes to the
off-duty lights, again, I have heard both

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

anecdotally but also have experienced myself, that there is a real increase in the abuse of the offduty lights, and some of the testimony we've heard so far I think agrees with that. And I put this bill in, in part initially in a parochial way, because I have a taxi stand on 79th Street that the TLC doesn't do a lot of enforcement at, where drivers put on their off-duty light when they're in the taxi stand. Not a rest stop, not a rest stand, not a relief stand, an active taxi stand. The whole concept to me that you would pretend to be off-duty in a taxi stand, is ludicrous. just want to take fares where they want to take them, which is Wall Street, and they don't want to pick people if they're going anywhere else. And they think it's a really cutesy way to get around the existing rules. And I don't think it's so cute. So, I do think this would be one way to address that. Again, I think, and I don't know if Mr. Yassky said explicitly under his envisioned change, if people would be able to pick up fares on the way to the garage or not. Did he--? Okay. 'Cause I happen to live near the 59th Street Bridge, and I think a lot of times people are

2.

picking up lares on their way back to the garage,
and there's nothing wrong with that if they're
truly at the end of their shift. It's the cherry
picking that is illegal and problematic. So, I
guess my question would be, to any one of you,
what percentage of the individual medallion owners
do you think would be impacted by this bill? And
maybe you don't have the answer, but if you do,
you know, how many people do you think we're
really talking about here?

ETHAN GERBER: Which bill are we talking about?

COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: Oh, I'm sorry, I should've been specific. The owner must drive rules.

growing segment of the industry, as we all know,

42 percent of all medallions when they're sold

have to be owner drivers. Any purchased after

January of 1990 must be driven by the owner.

That's how many years ago is, was that now? As,

as those dri--as those medallion owners get older,

as they go off to war, as they pass away, I have a

situation now, for example--and I will answer your

question, I promisean owner died in February.
And the widow wants to lease the medallion. The
rules say in November you must apply, in November
you must apply to lease it for the next year and
pay a \$5,000 penalty. So, we have to wait till
November? Yes. But you can't put the medallion
in storage for more than 60 days, so you have to
sell it. Well, she doesn't want to sell it.
Well, she can get a hack license. But she's too
old to get a hack license, she doesn't think she
can pass the test. Your bill just makes it
simple. And I would say it, you know, I don't
have exact figures on it, I'll try to get it, but
it's certainly in my mind thousands of medallions
COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: Well, and
that's, you know, that' the thing, it's, you hear
the personal stories and they're really

the personal stories and they're really
compelling. And they're heartbreaking. And they
don't make sense. And that's what I hate about
government, when you have 18 different rules that
all conflict with each other, and it make it
impossible for somebody, and effectively force
them to sell, when maybe it's not the right moment
in time for them to sell. But anyway, thank you

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

very much, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you. And I thank Council Member Lappin, when I heard before, Commissioner Yassky indicating that he goes out of his way to consult with stakeholders, I truly had to take exception, and I tell you why. And out of respect to my colleague, I did not bring this up when she was not here. But we are a legislative body, and we should demand, if nothing else, respect for the institution. Council Member Lappin submitted a bill concerning the lights. The bill was submitted some time ago, it went through the legislative process, it went to our legal people to review, and I scheduled a public hearing. The TLC knew that this hearing was scheduled and they knew what was on it. And to have a Daily News article two days before the hearing announcing that he was doing basically what Council Member Lappin's bill prescribed, without even calling Council Member Lappin or myself, I found to be outrageous. As a courtesy, if nothing else, this body was entitled to that phone call. [applause] And I--It is, it is the institution that we represent as a Council of the

2.

City of New York. Whether it's good or not is
another issue. But he decided, and for him to
come here today and say that Council Member
Lappin's legislation is redundant? Please. It's
not redundant. It's something that this Council
thought of, that he did implement, but him not
even advising us before the hearing that that was
the case, I do thin was inconsiderate. Okay. Mr.
Sapone.

COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: I have to just say one mor thing.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Yes, Council Member.

really like my ideas, 'cause by the way this is the second time [laughter] he made some big announcement in the paper a while back about the horn honking, how somebody who lived in Manhattan had given him this great idea to do an education initiative, etc., etc., whereas I had written to him months before, asking him to do exactly what he did. I never even got a response. And then he said he got the idea from somebody else.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [off mic]

2 Really.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: So, ladies and gentlemen, whenever you read the papers next time, realize that these many good idea may come from the people on this dais right here. [laughter] We are a thinking bunch. We are a deliberative bunch. Okay. Mr. Sapone, would you want to come up, please?

VINCENT SAPONE: [off mic] - - you guys have a seat? Sure. Thank you. [pause, background noise] What'd I do? [background comment] I gave it to him, I believe. You got it. I gave it to him.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Please identify yourself for the record.

VINCENT SAPONE: My name is Vincent Sapone, I'm Managing Director of the League of Mutual Taxi Owners, better known as LOMTO. We've been established since 1934. If it's of any importance, my father drove in 1938, my first hack license was issued in 1963. But I'm only 49. [laughter] Anyway, I want to congratulate you, Council Member Lappin. What you're doing here is

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a god save for the senior citizens and the future senior citizens. And I want to thank the whole Council for helping to support this. You know, if a guy bought a medallion when he was 45 years old, the TLC wants him to drive till he's 80. You know, it's ridiculous. These guys are on the road 20 years or so, I mean, any driver on the road 20 years is a long time. And even lease drivers, they work six-seven days a week, okay? They should be able, the owners should be able to lease their car or at least work three days a week, or four days a week. No, who, who waits till their 75 years old to retire besides me? Nobody. So, I want to congratulate you for this bill, you have it in front of me, my thanks to all of yous, but I want to say something else. The TLC keeps talking about storage spaces, storage space. What's wrong with [Randall's Alan]? Maybe they can build something there. They make enough money off of these people and off of me. You know, they hire tons of people, the past couple of years, you don't know who anybody is anymore. There's plenty of room to build a garage and plenty of money from the City. From them, anyway. And I don't know

2	what they do it. Anyway, I want to salute you,
3	salute you, Mr. Chairman, and salute you, too.
4	And thank you for considering this bill, and this
5	is a godsend from upstairs to help the senior
6	citizens. Thank you. [applause]
7	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you. We
8	salute you, too, I guess. Our last panel isoh,
9	there's one more, there's two panels, okay. Ms.
10	Desai, New York Taxi Workers Alliance; Bill
11	Lindenauer [phonetic], New York Taxi Workers
12	Alliance; Mohan Singh [phonetic], New York Taxi
13	Workers Alliance; and Victor Salazar, New York
14	Taxi Workers Alliance. [pause, background noise]
15	Wouldwould you ple
16	BHAIRAVI DESAI: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Yes, thank you,
18	introduce yourself for the record.
19	BHAIRAVI DESAI: Yes, good
20	afternoon, everybody. My name is Bhairavi Desai,
21	I'm the Executive Director of the New York Taxi
22	Workers Alliance. I would like to focus mainly on
23	Intros 234, 676-A and 695-A. My other colleague
24	will be talking more about the inspections. In
25	terms of the advisory board, you know, we under

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you know, it's, it's a good concept, but it is concerning that when you look at the 13 posts that have been identified, you know, in reality, only two of them would really represent drivers. fact, out of the four, out of the five that would be to represent the taxi industry, it's four would be, four of those representatives would either be owners or agents or lenders. Only one would be a lease driver. We're talking about the majority of the workforce in this industry, and we would have one representative. There's a real issue, a power inequity, not, you know, you're, you've been focused primarily on the inequities between, you know, the, those of us that are within the industry or in labor, and the regulatory agency. But what about the power inequities that exist among ourselves within the industry itself? That doesn't get addressed in this, and in fact it puts us at a disadvantage. And so we do think that, you know, the configuration of the advisory board very much needs to be redone. I have to just, you know, I have to say, you know, Chairman Vacca, I wish something like this had been introduced when, you know, our former TLC Chairman was around,

because really the only time that we as the
drivers organization ever really got to see him
was pretty much at a public hearing, where he'd
kind of walk away as we were testifying. And so,
you know, we get your larger point that the
communication should be institutionalized, because
it clearly changes depending on, you know, who
occupies that seat of the Chairperson. But I want
to say that, you know, historically, it's been the
drivers that have not had a seat at that table.
And while I hear the industry really crying foul
nowadays, I remember in the past 15 years they
never had a problem with accessing the TLC before.
In terms of the "owner must drive" rule, it's
really indicative of how one of the former
panelists had referred to it as the rule regarding
the leasing of medallions. 'Cause that really is
what it comes down to. While, you know, first of
all, we would, we, we've always supported
exemptions regarding the "owner must drive" rule;
however, there have to be provisions in there to
protect the next generation of drivers. What we
would say to you is that this bill should be
amended to state that if you're granted an

my colleagues.

exemption, that medallion must be leased out
solely for DOV operation. [time bell] Because
one of the reasons that we want to preserve the
owner operator model is because those are the
medallion owners that always charge a lower lease
to the second shift driver. You know? And when
that mednowadays, these medallions are being
leased out by fleets, where you're being charged
close to, you know, over \$900 a week, compared to
a DOV model where you would be, well, if they were
following the rules and not overcharging or, you
know, charging too much on the interest, the
driver would be able to charge less. And
secondly, it's still part of that ladder that, you
know, you're talking about earlier in terms of
growth within the industry, for, for the next
generation of drivers. We think this is a
critical amendment which needs to be added in
order to preserve the tradition of owner operated
medallions for the next generation of drivers. I
know my time is up
CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you.
BHAIRAVI DESAI:so I'll yield to

2 CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you.

BILL LINDAUER: Okay, I'm Bill

4 Lindauer, of the New York Taxi Workers Alliance.

5 Excuse me, I have a cold. I'm so happy to note

6 that no show jobs are not limited to the state

7 government, that they have them in the City

8 government. Frankly, I think this plan is totally

9 unwieldy, and it's unbecoming for the taxi tycoons

10 to whine like a kid who doesn't have daddy's total

11 attention. I find the Chairman Yassky very

12 outgoing, he reaches out to all aspects of the

industry, and to the public, and of course, of

14 course they don't have, of course the tycoons

don't have the Chairman's total attention, they

16 | feel hurt. And let me mention a couple of things,

17 | silly things, like the horn blowing. It's

demeaning and insulting and discriminatory, Ms.

19 Lappin. I drove for 30 years, and if you cannot

20 understand the present roof light system, I

21 suggest you take your special ed course, because

22 it's so damn easy. It's not rocket scientist. If

23 the residents in your area, maybe hedge fund

24 managers--

25 CHAIRPERSON VACCA: You know what?

times. And then most of the time, I'm coming out

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of the line in complete disagreement with the TLC. There's always, I find myself paying a \$35 summons for reinspection, even though I remember years ago there used to be a reinspection fee if you failed a second, or the second inspection you go by. But this time, most of the time, they fail you at the first one, and for silly things, sometimes, like for things that should not be failed visually. And the other thing is that if you fail and you need money to repair your car, you need to go back on the street and work for at least two more It used to be the time that they'll give you the, the possibility or the option to work for two weeks or so, so you earn enough money to repair the car, and then to - - inspection and pass. So, I think the TLC should reinstate that habit before, it worked perfectly well for, for all drivers who went for inspection. And in terms of the roof lights, taxi drivers, they're very hard working people, they are dedicated, they're, to the City of New York, like myself, 24 hour seven. And they, they deserve to make a living. They also, they also have the right to, to pick up a passenger or two on the way home, I think it's

2	only fair. The leases are very, very high, and
3	it's obviously that they are also good citizens
4	of, of the, of this great City. And they deserve
5	also an honest, you know, honest attention, from,
6	from the Council. And taking, if you, if taking
7	the livelihood of a taxi driver for not using the,
8	for picking up two passengers or whatever, for
9	having the off-duty lights, that is taking the
10	livelihood of a whole family. So I think that
11	particular part of that, that bill is, as a taxi
12	driver, is really unfair, you know, I think
13	owners/operators, widows and veterans, they
14	deserve to have an honest living and maintain the
15	medallions and all that, but what about the taxi
16	driver? [time bell] The taxi driver needs to
17	maintain an equity, I mean, a livable income. So,
18	I, I strongly opposed to that particular
19	COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: May I
20	interject with just a question. 'Cause you said
21	an honest living. You know what?
22	VICTOR SALAZAR: Yes.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: You're not,
24	you're not allowed to pick up fares with the off-
25	duty light on, unless you're headed to the garage,
l	

2 right?

VICTOR SALAZAR: I am, after, in the rules it says that after nine hours of driving a yellow cab, I have the, the right to ask a passenger where is he going, after nine hours of operating the shift. [background comments] Not anymore? [background comments] At the end of my shift. Okay.

and I think that's an important point to clarify, and to make sure that, that drivers know, that you're, you're not allowed to pick up fares, just driving around, while you're on your shift, with your off-duty light on, just the way you're not allowed to refuse to take somebody where they want to go, if it's not someplace that you want to go.

VICTOR SALAZAR: No, I'm, I'm
referring to the, to the last minute, to the last
hour of the shift. In the last hour of the shift,
I may be in the west side and I'm--

COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: Right, so the bill make an exception. So, just so you're clear--

25 VICTOR SALAZAR: Yeah.

2	COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN:want to
3	make sure you're clear, 'cause I don't think you
4	understand the bill. There is a provision where
5	you can, in my legislation, not necessarily what
6	the Chair's talking about
7	VICTOR SALAZAR: Yes.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN:not what
9	David Yassky proposed, but my bill, we clearly
10	say, that you could, while you are on your way
11	back at the end of your shift, you would still be
12	able to pick somebody up. Even if you have your
13	off-duty light on. So, what I'm saying is, we
14	agree.
15	VICTOR SALAZAR: Great.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: Okay.
17	[laughs]
18	VICTOR SALAZAR: Great. But one
19	thing, though, what happened if I'm, if the
20	passenger request you going this way, and I'm not
21	going that way, okay. And then, the guy, or the
22	person, makes a complaint. And then, I'm there on
23	every day, and somebody else makes another
24	complaint, what happen then, that I will, I will

be summons twice and revoke my license?

2	COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: You
3	shouldn't be. No, I would say you shouldn't be.
4	Yes. I just want to[crosstalk] I just want to
5	be clear.
6	VICTOR SALAZAR: IN the case of my
7	brother, in the case of my brother, David, okay,
8	he stops for a coffee break, he forgot to turn the
9	off-duty light on, he walked out, get a cup of
10	coffee. A passenger came in, say, "I need a
11	ride." He say, "I'm having my coffee break." So,
12	he made a complaint. We get all the, all the
13	papers, and when he went to the court, at , he
14	submitted enough evidence that he was actually not
15	refusing a passenger, because in the data show
16	that he went twice that day to Brooklyn. So he
17	never refuses a fare. But then the TLC give him a
18	notice
19	COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: Yeah, so,
20	that's a, you know, that'sright.
21	VICTOR SALAZAR:for not having
22	the off-duty lights on.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: And that's
24	a separate thing, I just wanted you to understand

the bill that we were discussing today, that we

2 agree.

VICTOR SALAZAR: And that affects

over 26,000 drivers out there.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you, sir,

would you state your name for the record, please.

VICTOR SALAZAR: My name is Victor

9 | Salazar.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Oh, I'm sorry,
Victor. No, I meant the gentleman next to you.

[laughter] Sorry.

MOHAN SINGH: I am Mohan Singh, and good afternoon to everyone. I am a DOV driver.

The problem with me that I, whenever I go for inspections, I got a lot of problems. The thing is that when I enter the facility to get my car inspected, it takes a long time. Another thing is, when it is failed, so they don't give me time to repair it and come back. They just say, "Okay, you come again," and they charge \$35 another time, next time. Another thing is that after 3:00 o'clock, after 3:00 o'clock, if I, in the morning - I got to bed and go back at 3:00 o'clock, they refuse me to enter the facilities. Where their

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

time is at till 4:00 o'clock. So, it was Friday, and I went there at 3:00 o'clock, 3:10, they refused it, and I have to wait for Saturday and Sunday so I have to lose three days. And three days lease I have to pay from my pocket. Another thing is, when they give a complaint, okay, this, this is not good, they don't write clearly. Last time, they wrote what? That loose door rubber. Which means the rubber is to be changed. I went repaired the rubber, later on I went again, they charge me \$35, they said no, the door is broken. I said, "I didn't see anything broken." But I have to pay the money, and go again. So this thing happens, we have to be several time, and they should give out some time so that we can go back and earn some earning, also, at the same moment. Regarding the off-duty, off-duty, you are saying, "Okay, you cannot -- " well, when, I work eleven hours. Okay, on the twelfth hour I want to go home. Somebody come, "Okay, I want to go to up, upper East, upper West." I am downtown. live in Queens. So what do you say? What should I say? I say no, if I say no, I got refusal ticket. And this ticket is not small, it's \$500.

And I got kids, which are going to college, and I
have to see my family. Nothing happens for that.
But the thing is that they charge me for it. So,
these are the things which we have to face. There
are many other things, just like the medallions.
The medallions are when they are made, they are
sold. When they are sold, they are sold
specifically to the number, to the big brokers.
So we want that you should lease them to the
drivers who take care of the services [time bell]
and take care of the cars, and they can get the
benefits. But you people just give them the
person who pays more money. They have money, we
don't have money. So we, we break our body, we
break our everything, and they earn the money. So
what we should do, I mean, this is, this is, this
would be taking that, the driver, so should be
considered, and should be given some medallions on
the same price but on leases. So instead of
paying the lease to the brokers, we can pay the
lease to the TLC, they can take the money. The
same thing, why not the same thing? So later one
we can then earn it.

COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: Thank you,

2	thank you. I didn't realize that the Chair had
3	stepped out. Okay, thank you very much for your
4	testimony. Is there another panel, that was the
5	concluding panel? Okay, this is the last panel.
6	Reverend Jeffrey Landau [phonetic], Alex, I cannot
7	read this. [background comment] Yes, it is.
8	Thank you. [pause, background noise] [off mic]
9	Go for it, gentlemen, whoever wants to start, hit
10	it.
11	MALE VOICE: Reverend, you can go
12	first.
13	JEFFREY THOMASON: I'll be brief, I
14	don't need three minutes. I'm appalled. I gave
15	you all copies of this, the Taxicab Fleet Drivers
16	Rights, excuse me, I'm pretty sick, so don't sit
17	too close.
18	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I just need you
19	to state your name for the record, please.
20	JEFFREY THOMASON: Jeffrey
21	Thomason, I'm the Reverend Jeffrey Thomason. In
22	the top right hand section you'll see under weekly
23	lease cap for a standard vehicle, is the number
24	666. Now, 666 is in poor taste at best. It's
25	insensitive and at worst it's, it's objectionable

that the Taxi and Limousine Commission would
choose the use the number of the Beast, the
Antichrist, in its official publication. It's
appalling to me that they would mandate, mandate,
that this is the maximum number that weekly driver
would have to pay per week and that a lease
company would accept it and deposit it, as well as
put up signs that are 24 inches by 36, two feet
by, by three foot signs, in every fleet garage, in
Brooklyn, Bronx, Queens, Staten Island and
Manhattan. It's offensive to me as a Christian,
and it should be offensive to at least one person
in the City Council, at least one person in the
Department of Transportation, at least one person
in the Transportation Commission, it should be
offensive to at least one person in TLC. I can't
imagine that I'm, I'm, I regret that I'm here to
be here for this. It's crazy. I look at this and
I see one number, under weekly lese cap, not two,
but on the left hand side of this, I see AM and
PM, as if there's a big differentiation, and there
is. There's a couple hundred dollar
differentiation that a night driver would save if
they got this weekly lease cap, than if a day

2	driver would save, if they got a weekly lease cap
3	So, I guess I have two questions. One is, why in
4	the world would anybody choose this number? And
5	two, why aren't there two separate weekly lease
6	cap amounts, one for a day driver and one for a
7	night driver? 'Cause clearly night drivers pay a
8	lot more, maybe they make a lot more, I don't
9	know. But if a day driver, to sit in traffic, in
10	New York traffic particularly, no offense to New
11	York, and the wonderful work that the Department
12	of Transportation has done to make the streets
13	easier to navigate by putting in floating bus
14	lanes and parking lanes and this, that and the
15	other thing, you can't turn here, can't turn
16	there, can't turn here at 7:00, can't turn here
17	after 7:00. Why wouldn't they get a commensurate
18	break as to the, the night drivers? That's it,
19	thank you very much. Sorry to bother you, but
20	COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: No, thank
21	you.
22	JEFFREY THOMASON:this is wrong
23	to me.
24	MALE VOICE: Before I tebefore I
25	testify today, and pay attention to this,

<u> </u>	Q	G 7	Ti1-	⊥ lo −
Z 1	Committee	Counsel	Frank.	THE

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: It's, it's Mr.

4 Frank.

5 MALE VOICE: Mr. Frank, sorry.

6 CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you.

7 MALE VOICE: He, the TLC is having

8 an appeal of a ruling today from a while back,

9 that was before Judge Daniels of the Supreme

10 Court. And he, I forget what he, what he actually

11 did, but they're appealing that ruling today, and

12 you'll probably read about it in the papers

13 tomorrow. And I'm here to speak about Intro 449,

14 and 695-A, which is the livery taxi bill of

rights, which will allow the off-duty light of a

16 cab to be gotten rid of or removed, making it

17 easier for a prospective passenger to pick it up.

18 And also Intro 243 and 243-A, the taxi charter,

19 would allow certain things to become accessible,

20 which are currently inaccessible right now, such

21 that they improved the accessibility, the inside

22 seats of a livery cab, for the disabled. Thanks

23 for allowing me to testify today.

24 CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you, sir.

25 Sir, would you want to--?

2	ALEX GARDINER: Oh, sorry.
3	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Introduce
4	yourself, please, and
5	ALEX GARDINER: My name's Alex
6	Gardiner [phonetic] and I'mthank you for letting
7	me speak. I'm honored. I, this bill 676-A came,
8	I believe, as a result of me calling the Chairman
9	and, and asking him for, to give us a break after
LO	driving for so many years. I, I'm, I'm going to
11	be 70, I'm a Vietnam veteran, and, and he never
L2	called back. And kept having other people calling
13	me, and telling me all kinds of stuff, and didn't
L4	make any sense. And finally, one woman from one
15	of his sections said, "Well, if you don't like it,
L6	why don't you call the City Council." [laughs]
L7	So, I did that. And luckily I got Ms. Lappin.
L8	[laughs] [pause] And she graciously put that in.
L9	[weeps]
20	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: It's okay. Do
21	youI think you
22	ALEX GARDINER: I
23	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: You want to
24	speak in support of Council Member Lappin's bill.
25	ALEX GARDINER: 676-A.

2.

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Okay, are you
all right to do that? Because if you want, you
can give us written testimony, I don't want you to
get upset.

ALEX GARDINER: Well, just that ... we've been always treated very badly by the TLC. Whenever they, they have a hearing, if they find you not guilty, they, they somehow they have a right, it goes, it goes up towards some other place and then they bring it back, and even though you were found not guilty by their own judge, they find you guilty again. I have, I had to go twice through that. And I've heard that other people have gone through three times, where you're found not guilty and then brought it back and they're collecting millions and millions of dollars off our backs. They never really listen until they come in front of the City Council, who they have to speak with. And they lie about a lot of things. [time bell] But I think that after 30 years, and being a [weeps]

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Okay, okay.

ALEX GARDINER: Being a Vietnam veteran, I think we should have the right to just

2	lease it out, without being slaves, this is really
3	slavery. He said that the people are getting the
4	individuals, they should leave the right for
5	somebody else, he mean the American dream is to
6	slave. And then, give it to somebody else to
7	slave for another 30 years, without being able to
8	realize the American dream.
9	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you.
LO	ALEX GARDINER: So
11	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I'm going to
12	have to ask you to conclude, okay?
13	ALEX GARDINER: Okay. I, I'm
L4	sorry.
15	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: No, don't be
L6	sorry.
L7	ALEX GARDINER: I'm hoping this
18	honorable body of Council Members, not only agree
L9	with us, but show us that you care. Don't shelve
20	and bury this bill, but bring it up and pass it.
21	Thank you.
22	MALE VOICE: Thank you.
23	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you.
24	Thank you. [applause] Thank you. There being no
25	further speakers, it is now 4:15, this Committee

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION	142	
2	Hearing of the Committee on Transportation, is		
3	hereby adjourned.		
4	[background noise]		

I, JOHN DAVID TONG certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

Signature

Date March 20, 2012