CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

----X

December 4, 2008 Start: 10:13am Recess: 12:05pm

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

JOHN C. LIU Chairperson

## COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Joseph P. Addabbo, Jr.

Simcha Felder

Daniel R. Garodnick

Vincent Ignizio G. Oliver Koppell Jessica S. Lappin

John C. Liu

Miguel Martinez Michael E. McMahon

Darlene Mealy Diana Reyna Larry Seabrook David Yassky

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

Matthew Daus Commissioner/Chair Taxi and Limousine Commission

Chuck Frasier General Counsel and Deputy Commissioner Legal Affairs

Ron Sherman President Metropolitan Taxicab Board of Trade

Ethan Gerber Executive Director Greater New York Taxi Association

Vincent Sapone Managing Director League of Mutual Taxi Owners

Frances Loughlin Cab Driver

Erhan Tuncel Owner/Driver, Member League of Mutual Taxi Owners

Bhairavi Desai Executive Director New York Taxi Workers Alliance

Bill Lindauer Member Taxi Workers Alliance

Osman Choudhury Member Taxi Workers Alliance

Victor Salazar Owner/Operator, Member Taxi Workers Alliance

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

Beresford Simmons Member Taxi Workers Alliance

2 CHAIRPERSON LIU: Welcome to

today's hearing on the City Council's Committee on Transportation. My name is John Liu and I have the privilege of chairing this committee. Today we have called this oversight hearing for the purpose of examining the mileage mandate on taxis and for looking at Intro 876 which would reduce the replacement cycle for taxicabs that are not hybrid or wheelchair accessible.

On June 3rd and September 10th of this year this committee conducted hearings on the city's miles per gallon requirements for taxis and black cars. Many in the taxi industry raised safety and availability issues about the hybrid cars that were to become taxicabs. Some disability rights advocates have also stated concerns that the miles per gallon mandates would be an obstacle to their goal of 100% accessible vehicle fleet because there are currently no accessible hybrid vehicles. These disability rights advocates have also argued that clean air and accessibility are two goals that the TLC should address in tandem and not separately.

In September of this year, the taxi

industry filed a law suite in federal court
arguing that the city's miles per gallon
requirements were invalid under federal law among
other things. The federal court granted the taxi
industry plaintiffs a preliminary injunction
preventing the city from enforcing these miles per
gallon requirements. After this setback, the city
went to a back up plan to green the taxi fleet,
announcing a plan that would create incentives as
well as disincentives by raising the lease cap for
hybrids and reducing the lease cap for non-hybrid
vehicles. The city also announced that it would
no longer pursue this miles per gallon mandate.

We'll examine the city's new plan and also hear testimony on Intro 876, a bill introduced by Council Member David Yassky who I believe is going to join us shortly. His bill would reduce the replacement cycle for non-hybrid vehicles used as taxicabs. Currently these non-hybrid taxicabs have a replacement cycle of three years if it is in a fleet and five years if it is operated by an owner/driver. Councilman Yassky's bill would reduce the replacement cycle for these vehicles to one and a half years.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

Council Member Yassky's bill would also repeal a section of the administrative code that allowed the TLC to automatically retire a hybrid taxicab if it fails an inspection during the extended replacement cycle that was granted to hybrid taxicabs under a law adopted earlier by the City Council.

There are a lot of issues that we can address today. I don't anticipate this hearing going on into the afternoon. I think we can get all the points out in a succinct period. I will start by saying that when the Mayor announced the miles per gallon mandate, 25 miles per gallon this year and 30 miles per gallon for all taxicabs next year in his August 2007 speech. We thought it was a laudable goal that we wanted to clean our air as quickly as possible. that, given a timeframe of basically a year and a half to go at that time, that a year and a half between the April 22, 2007 mandate and the October 2008 implementation date. That was a reasonable period to achieve a laudable goal.

As that date approached and as concerns raised by industry grew louder because

2.0

there appeared to be ongoing accessibility safety and availability issues, that we started then holding hearings a year after the Mayor's announcement. We started holding these hearings in June of this year, about 14 months after the announcement by the Mayor, thinking that at that point there should have been enough time, enough progress given that time had elapsed.

Unfortunately the progress in June of this year clearly had not been reached. In September we held another hearing as the October deadline was eminent. At that point it appeared that not enough progress had been reached at that point. And so unfortunately there had to be legal proceedings in court to the point where we now are at a point where I believe we should have been at six months ago, with the administration and the industry working together to put together a solution that makes sense for the most important people in this process, which is the general public and the people who rely on taxicabs.

So let's get to it. Let's put some of the issues out there and see what we're going to do as a city to move forward and to keep the

interests of the riding public. As well as to make sure that the concerns of the drivers involved in this, the tens of thousands of drivers and ultimately the people who invest in the taxicabs, which would be the industry itself. All of their concerns are met and addressed.

We had been joined by Council

Member Ignizio from Staten Island and Council

Member Felder from Brooklyn and Council Member

Miguel Martinez from Manhattan. We have a Land

Use hearing going on concurrently next door where

I will have to, I guess sooner rather than later,

go next door momentarily to cast my vote. Let me

turn the floor to Council Member Yassky, the prime

sponsor of Intro 876. And while he makes his

comments I will briefly step out next door to cast

my vote. Council Member Yassky.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: Thank you very much. As you know Chairman Daus and TLC folks, I thought that you took a huge step forward for the city and really beyond. Because what the city does is they model for the rest of the country, really the rest of the world by seeking to green our taxi fleet. I think that Chairman

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Liu when he said unfortunate litigation, I think it was deeply unfortunate that some of the folks in the industry are seeking to halt a progress toward a cleaner, greener taxi fleet that you set in motion.

I commend you for reacting quickly to the judge's decision by outlining some steps. As you know I joined you and the Mayor a couple of weeks ago to announce and call for quick action to put the city back on course toward a cleaner, greener taxi fleet. I commend you for announcing that. All I want to do today is urge you to move forward with not just all deliberate speed by all possible speed towards putting those steps in place. Because this is our environmental problems even though they're not on the front page now because of the economic crisis but they get more urgent with each passing day. So I urge you to act speedily on the steps that you outlined at the Mayor's press conference and I look forward to your testimony here.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Thank you Council Member Yassky. I want to thank the staff of the committee for their hard work in putting this

2.0

hearing together, Phil Hom our Legislative Counsel and Chima Obichere our Finance Analyst and Joseph Mancino our Policy Analyst. With that, we're delighted to be joined by officials from the Taxi and Limousine Commission including Chairperson Matt Daus and his compatriots. Matt would you like to proceed.

MATTHEW DAUS: Good morning, thank you Mr. Chairman. I will introduce my compatriots. The one on my right is Andy Solkin our First Deputy Commissioner, on my immediate left is Peter Shankman Assistant Commissioner for Safety and Emissions and on my far left is Chuck Frasier is General Counsel and Deputy Commissioner for Legal Affairs. Good morning again Chairman Liu, members of the Transportation Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today about Intro 876 and for its proposed changes to the administrative code.

Council Member Yassky as well as other council members have been outspoken leaders in promoting a safe and clean taxi service. The TLC shares the Council's goals and continues working to ensure the for hire taxi and limousine

industry meets the higher standards for drivers and passengers. The TLC strict vehicle standards including vehicle retirement requirements are an integral part to ensuring a safe and clean fleet of taxicabs.

The TLC is committed to Mayor
Bloomberg's sustainability vision as outlined in
PlaNYC. As part of PlaNYC we have been working
with the taxi industry and the City Council to
develop policies and standards that help us to
achieve a cleaner and more fuel efficient for hire
transportation system available to all New
Yorkers.

Before commenting specifically on
Intro 876, I would like to provide some background
on the work of the TLC in this area. The TLC has
been at the forefront of both the use of clean
vehicles and requiring the higher safety
standards. Since the early 1990s the TLC has
operated its own inspection facility, which is a
licensed New York State Department of Motor
Vehicles facility inspecting on average 60,000
vehicles each year in compliance with DMV safety
and emissions criteria. As well as TLC inspection

standards of which there are several.

pass over 250 component inspections that cover safety, performance, emissions and TLC standards in order to continue to operate as a TLC licensed vehicle that serves the public. In 1996 the TLC took the unprecedented step of instituting a taxicab retirement age of three years for fleet vehicles and five years for all other vehicles. Along with the retirement requirement, TLC also required that only new vehicles with less than 500 miles on the odometer are eligible to be placed into service as taxicabs.

These new regulations changed what was an old vehicle fleet with an average age of over eight years to a fleet with an average vehicle age of 2.3 years. The TLC standards are the highest in the country and resulted in the removal of old, less efficient and dirty vehicles from city streets while improving the safety and emissions of taxicab vehicles. Each new vehicle placed on the road must comply with the latest safety and emission standards set by the federal government.

In November 2005 with guidance form the Mayor and the Council, the TLC approved specifications for the use of hybrid electric vehicles as taxicabs. Since then more than 1,600 of these cleaner, more fuel efficient vehicles have been placed into service. I think the current number is 1,639 to be exact. The overwhelming majority of these hybrids are being operated voluntary on unrestricted or standard medallions. These vehicles continue to meet and in some cases exceed the highest safety standards and are cleaner and pass inspections at a rate comparable to or better than the standard vehicle types.

To date, a conservative estimate shows these vehicles have traveled over 100 million miles, helping to reduce the city's carbon footprint with the ultimate goal of improving air quality, reducing respiratory disease as well as reducing our need for imported oil. In addition, fuel efficient cars have saved drivers millions of dollars in operating expenses because they use less gas.

In December of 2007 the TLC

unanimously passed rules requiring new taxicabs to achieve a minimum of 25 miles per gallon beginning on October 1 of this year. An industry group sued the city shortly before the rule was to take effect. And a federal judge issued a preliminary injunction, finding it likely that the city was pre-empted from setting fuel economy standards for taxis under the Federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

Rather than appeal the ruling, the TLC has been working closely with the Mayor to create a package of financial incentives and disincentives to encourage the use of fuel efficient vehicles. The TLC is exploring raising the fee or lease cap drivers pay to medallion owners who purchase cleaner vehicles. The TLC is also considering lowering the lease cap on less fuel efficient vehicles so that medallion owners who choose to purchase them bear the financial burden for the higher cost of gas, not the driver.

We hope that changing the lease caps will have significant impact on the medallion owner's purchasing decisions while also holding drivers harmless. The next step will be for the

TLC to commence its public review process and develop rulemaking proposals this month at the Commission meeting which is scheduled for December 18<sup>th</sup>. Where TLC staff and the Board of Commissioners will discuss these changes followed by a public hearing in early 2009.

As to Intro 876 specifically, this intro proposed reducing the retirement age for non-hybrid or accessible vehicles to one and a half years for both fleet and non-fleet vehicles. The TLC is open to exploring modifications to our vehicle retirement rules to create additional incentives to increase the number of hybrid vehicles on the road in addition to the proposed lease cap changes as announced by Mayor Bloomberg.

As the Commission considers these lease cap changes, we would like the opportunity to further analyze and discuss retirement incentive options with our Board of Commissioners through the TLC rulemaking prior to enacting or rendering a final opinion on this propose legislation. It is important to weigh both proposed incentives together as they are both related to the same goal of promoting hybrids.

This review would include

addressing related issues such as whether to continue the current retirement age differential between fleet and non-fleet vehicles if TLC were to retire non-hybrid vehicles sooner. And also ensuring that TLC inspection procedures to allow hybrid cabs to remain on the road longer than non-hybrid taxicabs are reasonable and appropriate.

For the reasons I have stated, in conclusion I would as the Council to defer consideration of Intro 876 for the moment to allow for proper analysis of lease changes proposed by the Mayor to first be considered, passed and implemented by the Commission. To this end TLC welcomes the opportunity to update and involve the council members on the impact of these changes as the Commission considers them.

Again, the TLC would like to thank the leadership of the Council for working with the Bloomberg administration to accomplish many important changes that improve the city's taxicab fleet over the years. We look forward to working with the members including Council Member Yassky. We thank you for your kind words earlier as well

as Chairman Liu, to build upon the progress that
we have made by continuing to implement
progressive rules and sound policies. Thank you
fro the opportunity to testify and I would be
happy to answer any questions that you might have.

much Commissioner Daus. We have been joined by also members of this committee, Council Member Joe Addabbo from Queens, Council Member Oliver Koppell from the Bronx and Council Member Michael McMahon from Staten Island. We're going to hold on to Mike McMahon and Council Member Addabbo for as long as we can. We have a couple more hearings where we'll be joined by them before they move on to their respective state and federal positions. Congratulations. We are also joined by, and I certainly would never have forgotten him, Council Member Larry Seabrook of the Bronx.

I want to thank you Commissioner

Daus for your statement. I just want to, in the

spirit of cooperation, just make sure we're all on

the same wavelength, on the same page. Let me

just say that in November 2005, I guess you could

call it guidance; we call it a legislative

2.0

2.3

mandate.

In November 2005 the TLC finally took action after the City Council had for a long time, implored the TLC to approve a hybrid electric vehicle that could be used in connection with the medallions that were restricted for use on clean air vehicles. We're glad that the TLC after a prolonged and protracted process, finally approved clean air vehicles for use as taxicabs, after we had to legislate a time frame because it took so darned long.

Since November 2005 we're very happy that in addition to being able to use those vehicles on those special medallions in the market place that many participants in the car industry here in New York City have taken it upon themselves to buy hybrid vehicles. To buy clean air vehicles so that they can help keep our air safe as well so we thank the TLC for finally approving a vehicle after a long discussion and some battle in November 2005, to approve those clean air vehicles.

In December 2007 the TLC certainly did unanimously pass rules requiring new taxis to

2.0

achieve 25 miles per gallon beginning October 1,
Commissioner. That's, I guess in some ways
correct. But I think more accurately from the
point of view from this Committee, we will remind
you once again that in April 2007 where the Mayor
stated explicitly that he'd like to have the 25
miles per gallon mandate by October 2008, greatly
accelerating an original time frame of 2012.

That raised some concerns at the time because it seemed to greatly accelerate a time frame that everybody was already working towards. But this Committee gave the TLC and the administration plenty of leeway because it had still time, in April 2007, a year and a half to go before the October 2008 mandate was put in place. I just want to make sure we're all on the same page here.

The TLC is now no longer going by the Mayor's April 2007 mandate? That all the vehicles adhere to the 25 miles per gallon requirement by October 2008, is that correct?

COMMISSIONER DAUS: A very long question, I'm trying to follow it. I think based upon your initial comments, Mr. Chairman, I don't

2.0

2.3

know if we're on the same page. We're certainly in the same book but we're not on the same page.

I do take a little bit of issue with the way we clarified and explained the history behind this.

Again, I do believe it was certainly guidance that we took from the Council.

We testified for a numerous number of years going back as you mentioned even to mid to late 2005. But hybrids were around and available then and we hadn't tested them. That whole time frame was exercising due caution and prudence to test them. Thankfully they have performed well, to the point where it looks like it's really the future. Right now as we speak, as this hearing is taking place in Washington the CEOs of the Big Three are driving up in hybrids and electric cars. If that isn't a statement unto itself that it is the future... And it is the future at the TLC as well.

I think to answer your question it would be October 1 has come and gone. There's a law suit that has a preliminary injunction that was decided against the city. We're working on other measures that we believe can achieve our

mutual and shared goals, which I think we both share, of moving as fast as we can to a cleaner fleet. So it's not going into effect.

There are some details that we will be sharing with the industry in the coming weeks with negotiated discussions that are taking place involving the law suit as to what vehicle owners are expected to do and not to do. Because apparently there are very few, if any, Crown Vics available right now for people to put on the road. We're negotiating and its active negotiations and I really can't go into it.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Right. We've been joined by Council Members Dan Garodnick from Manhattan and Jessica Lappin from Manhattan.

That's great. We do share the goal of cleaning our air as quickly as possible but just to make it perfectly clear. This has been a series of hearings so I need to make sure there is continuity from one hearing to the next. In June and again in September when we held the previous hearings, this committee had asked the TLC to reconsider what seemed to be an arbitrary deadline of October 1.

2	The TLC testified that it would
3	not. That it would go ahead with that original
4	mandated time frame. The TLC has now abandoned
5	that time frame, as you said. It's come and gone.
6	COMMISSIONER DAUS: Not
7	voluntarily, we were ordered to by the judge in
8	federal court.
9	CHAIRPERSON LIU: Okay. So
LO	COMMISSIONER DAUS: [interposing]
11	We lost a motion for preliminary injunction. It
12	was a preliminary injunction basically against us-
L3	-
L4	CHAIRPERSON LIU: [interposing]
15	Right. I believe there's public record that TLC
L6	was going to appeal that decision and you are now
L7	stating for the record you are not going to appeal
L8	that.
L9	COMMISSIONER DAUS: No, the Mayor
20	had announced that we're not appealing the
21	preliminary injunction decision. The law suit is
22	still currently pending. It hasn't been
23	dismissed. I'd been advised not to go into the
24	details. I don't know all the details and

discussions that have taken place. I know a

2	stipulation was signed and had been submitted to
3	the judge about where we go next in the law suit.
4	The long and the short of it is, I wasn't at the
5	last two hearings. I did watch and read the
6	testimony. I'm sure that you probably cautioned
7	against the date and I'm sure we probably said
8	we're moving forward. The court had stopped this,
9	it wasn't a voluntary decision. We were ready,
10	willing, able. We believe the industry was
11	considering the high number of voluntary hybrids
12	that just make practical economic sense that are
13	being put on the road despite our loss, which is
14	now 1,639, 12%.
15	CHAIRPERSON LIU: There is a
16	preliminary injunction, that doesn't necessarily
17	dismiss the law suit.
18	COMMISSIONER DAUS: Right.
19	CHAIRPERSON LIU: The
20	administration has now decided that it is not
21	going to appeal that preliminary injunction.
22	COMMISSIONER DAUS: Correct, that
23	ruling.
24	CHAIRPERSON LIU: But obviously at

this point, and maybe it is too obvious that you

2	don't feel like you have to say it. But the
3	administration is no longer going on that 25 mile
4	per gallon mandate.
5	COMMISSIONER DAUS: Yes, we're
6	prohibited from doing so right now.
7	CHAIRPERSON LIU: No, the court
8	hasn't ruled anything so you're not prohibited
9	from doing anything.
10	COMMISSIONER DAUS: Yes, it has.
11	My counsel would like to clarify and back me up.
12	CHUCK FRASIER: The fact that a
13	preliminary injunction is not a final disposition
14	does not make it any less binding. We could not
15	enforce that mandate except to be in contempt of
16	court. It's not an option.
17	CHAIRPERSON LIU: Okay. So you're
18	saying that you're taking the preliminary
19	injunction to be a final decision.
20	MR. FRASIER: No, it's a decision
21	pending the outcome of litigation. But while that
22	litigation is pending, which it still is, we have
23	no legal option but to comply with the injunction.
24	CHAIRPERSON LIU: Okay. But you're
25	not pursuing it any further so you're basically

2.0

letting it drop.

MR. FRASIER: The law suit remains pending. We're not appealing, we're not taking an interlockatory appeal of the preliminary injunction but the law suit remains pending.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Got it.

Judge Carrody ruled there is a likelihood of success that our adversaries will have on the merits. For those who are lawyers on the committee, they understand what that means. For the public, what that means basically is it is a binding court order as Mr. Frasier had mentioned. We are prevented because of that court order from moving forward now. But the law suit hasn't been dismissed yet. The Mayor and on advise of counsel as well, had basically made a decision not to appeal just that preliminary order from the judge that basically stops us now. Does that make more sense?

CHAIRPERSON LIU: It makes perfect sense despite the semantics and the wording. The bottom line is that the TLC arbitrary mandate of October 1 has failed. It's not that this

committee doesn't share your goals, really. This has always been an issue of accountability because the TLC has flip flopped back and forth on the hybrid and the clean air vehicle issue over the years that this committee has been under my leadership.

We just want to make sure that when the TLC takes actions, that they are accountable for them and that it doesn't cause unnecessary havoc in the industry and for the public. As we cautioned in this committee in September and June, after giving it plenty of time to make progress. We waited patiently. We didn't call hearings in 2007, we didn't call hearings earlier. We only called hearings when the time frame became eminent. We said are you sure this is going to go well for the industry and ultimately for our constituents. And ultimately it played out to be completely not the case.

Let's move forward from here. You call them your adversaries. Hopefully for now your partners in trying to craft a strategy to have a practical approach to get clean air vehicles quickly out on the roads. So now there

2.0

2.3

is this change in the lease cap. Did you want to
respond to anything I've said so far? You're
certainly welcome to do so.

COMMISSIONER DAUS: Sure. There was a lot that was said. There wasn't a question but first of all it wasn't arbitrary. It was obviously well thought out and--

CHAIRPERSON LIU: [interposing]
What was the basis behind October 2008?

production, high prices of gas, more vehicles
being manufactured. For the first couple of years
as I have testified many times, we wanted to make
sure that the vehicles were road worthy, that they
would work, that they would hold up well and they
have. We've looked at inspections over the years.
I think you know what the public record is on
that. It's been flushed out in prior hearings.

But then there did come a point that things, that the future sped up and it started going at light speed. To the point where over a year or so, hybrids became very popular because of the high price of gas, more became available and I believe it was very prudent. It

was not an arbitrary deadline.

We believe if we were not ordered by the judge to stop this program due to an antiquated provision, which is an unfair one in our view of the federal law in the Clean Air Act. Which essential tells us you can't have cleaner air as a state or city. Which we take issue with and Congressman Nather is going to be introducing legislation to try to fix that, that we've been prevented from moving forward.

Again, with all due respect, I only referred to the MTBOT as adversaries in the context of the law suit. They are our partners. They are stakeholders who we're actively in negotiations and discussions with them as well as the rest of the industry. We're going to be holding public hearings in the new year to explore some of the comments and issues that they may have with the lease cap incentives and disincentives which we believe are the next best thing that we can do to further clean air. That's basically my response. I think for the record you and I may have a disagreement as to what happened over these couple of years but that's my explanation.

2.0

2.3

CHAIRPERSON LIU: All right. Thank
you. We'll let it go at that. Let me turn it
over to my colleagues for some questions and I'll
have questions at the end if they haven't asked
them already. Council Member Miguel Martinez.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Thank you Mr. Chair. And I want to just tell you upfront that I want to excuse myself after questioning because we also have budget negotiation meeting going on downstairs. I want to thank you for the opportunity to be able to ask several questions.

Statement in terms of our responsibility to ensure that any public policy either by the administration, one of the city agencies or even ourselves when presenting legislation. It's always our responsibility to make sure it's in the best interest of our constituents. I have issues when you mention the fact that the hybrids, the production of these vehicles were more. It's true that they're popular but you're forgetting a statement which is these vehicles were not produced nor, unless you tell me otherwise, any of the manufacturers coming out publicly saying that

2.0

2.3

2 these vehicles are being produced for commercial 3 purposes.

As a matter of fact last time we had this hearing one of the most popular ones, which is Toyota went out publicly to say they wouldn't guarantee their vehicle for commercial uses. Having said that, has that changed. Last time we had this hearing we went over the amount of production. In fact, my understanding was that these manufacturers couldn't keep up with the demand not only by private citizens but yet alone to meet the demand of the commercial industry, which is taxi limousine. Which none of them were giving you a guarantee that they were going to produce X amount exclusively for New York City TLC. Has that changed?

COMMISSIONER DAUS: The first comment that you made may have been true years ago when they first started coming out with the vehicles. But we stood with the Mayor a few months ago over the summer with three of the top auto manufacturers that are standing by some of the vehicles, commercially supported, fully warrantied for use as taxicabs. And I'm sorry,

COMMISSIONER DAUS: I believe that 25

24

have?

in the current rules, those terms may be used with respect to owner and driver earnings. We're going to be changing those rules - it's within our authority -to have slightly different standards because we're using the lease cap to further policy initiatives. First of all raising the lease cap \$3 as proposed is in direct response to evidence that was submitted by the MTBOT during the law suit where they estimated that about \$6,000 per cost per vehicle during its lifetime would be required if they were to go from Crown Victorias to hybrids.

So we're relying on their data when coming up with the amount of additional expenses that hybrid owners should be compensated for since they have not had a lease cap increase since 2004 when we did our last across the board increase.

And number two, the disincentive proposal which is to lower the lease cap \$12 is intended as a policy matter to help drivers to hold them harmless.

There are many drivers in the industry that basically go from fleet to fleet on a 12-hour shift basis that don't have a choice of what vehicle to buy. So their friends and their

2.0

2.3

colleagues are renting from fleets that have the hybrid vehicles and they are making much more money. On average they're saving about \$15 per shift as a result of the gas savings. What we want to do is kind of equalize and balance and bring the earnings closer together.

We want to hold the drivers
harmless. Just because they happen to go into a
fleet who stubbornly refuses to go to clean air
vehicles, they should not have to suffer the
economic consequences when their colleagues are
going to other owners who have the hybrids
available and their making more money. Those are
the two policy reasons.

As I had mentioned in my prior testimony today, we are going to talk about what the Commission these vehicle retirement incentives that we're supposed to be talking about here today, that Council Member Yassky proposed with this bill. We'll talk about that at the Commission as well because they're all considered to be a combination of incentives and disincentives.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: But these

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 34
2	incentives are only applying to the fleet owners.
3	Any plans for non-fleet? Am I right?
4	COMMISSIONER DAUS: No, they're
5	going to apply to every medallion owner.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: I thought
7	the rules that TLC is now contemplating serves
8	lease cap reductions for non-hybrids seen only to
9	fleet. Is that right?
10	COMMISSIONER DAUS: It will
11	primarily impact them only because most of the
12	fleet owners use Crown Victorias. But no, by
13	definition we're contemplating looking at all
14	medallion owners that lease cars to drivers. That
15	would include some individual owner/operators,
16	that would include not driver owned vehicles but
17	people who get weekly leases there are rules to

18 lease both the medallion and the vehicle. So it's

going to effect a significant part of our

20 industry.

19

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Let me go back to my first question. With that statement or acknowledgement of the industry of producing or manufacturing these vehicles for commercial purposes for TLC, have you had conversations with

them about the type of manufacturing in terms of making them roomier for passenger space? The same is true in terms of driver safety and so forth.

Because one of the issues that has come up and we discussed is in terms of the space of these vehicles.

COMMISSIONER DAUS: I think I probably testified. If you look up press articles, I've said over the years is of course our goal is to have as much space in the back as possible. In fact, years ago I had asked that the Crown Victoria be stretched along with the former Chair, Diane McChekney and Ford did it. Of course, publicly, I would love to see the hybrids made bigger. I did have a conversation with Henry Ford, Jr. a couple of years ago when he announced that he was making For Escapes available for the industry.

I think what we did after that was we realized that clean air comes first, that's the most important thing. Not to use a pun, but it has to take a back seat. The lack of leg room has to take a back seat to clean air. In terms of recent discussions, I haven't had any more recent

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 3
2	discussions. Maybe Assistant Commissioner
3	Shankman has
4	COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ:
5	[interposing] But Commissioner, in your statement
6	am I hearing that clean air comes first before
7	safety?
8	COMMISSIONER DAUS: No, clean air
9	comes before leg room so you can stretch out.
10	Safety comes before all of that.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: I
12	understand that but looking at evidence of hybrid
13	vehicles that have been involved in accidents and
14	looking at a passenger in the back of the seat,
15	safety is a big issue. If a car is hit by the
16	back, some of the pictures that we've seen
17	actually the last hearing we had after your
18	testimony, some of the industry. You weren't
19	here.
20	COMMISSIONER DAUS: I didn't
21	testify but I watched it on T.V.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: How?
23	COMMISSIONER DAUS: NYC TV.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Oh, you
25	watch T.V.

2.0

2.3

2	COMMISSIONER	DAUS:	That's	probably
---	--------------	-------	--------	----------

3 all I watch.

[Laughter]

is that we were presented with several pictures of hybrid vehicles involved in accidents, evidence where it shows that the potential for serious injuries for a passenger sitting in the back of a vehicle. With the lack of space because of the closeness of the knees to the partition because you know the partition has that steel metal but even the driver himself, also, because of the lack of room in these vehicles. I think these are important issues that need to be considered as we consider clean air also. I think safety is a big component.

I think that one of the reasons, also, the Crown Victorias is such a popular vehicle in the industry is not only so much because of the leg room, it's also because of the endurance of these vehicles and also how strong the body of these vehicles are also. Am I mistaken by that?

COMMISSIONER DAUS: With all due

respect, I think I disagree on that. First of all, in terms of evidence that they're not safe, there is no credible evidence that we've seen. It was testified previously that there are many different layers of safety that go into play with these vehicles before they even get to us. So we're not concerned with that because we haven't seen any evidence that suggest that they're problematic. All the evidence we're seeing with respect to hybrids indicate that they're if not as safe as Crown Victoria, it could be safer.

The only thing that's really changed since the last hearing that you held is the Ford Escape by the Insurance Institute by Highway Safety did its own independent crash testing of all the vehicles and found that it was one of the top five safest vehicles, two levels of higher ratings higher than the Crown Victoria. This isn't who's best, who is better. We have a bottom line for safety. We want to make sure that all federal motor vehicle safety standards are met, that we inspect them four times a year which is more than twice as much as every other vehicle on the road.

I think they are safe. I will sit here and tell you we have not seen any credible evidence whatsoever to suggest that hybrids are unsafe or that any increased leg room makes a difference if you wear your seatbelt. I think Assistant Commissioner Shankman and my First Deputy Andy Solkin testified last time that there are, if you wear your seatbelt, significantly reduced chances that you're going to be hurt with or without a partition, regardless of the leg room.

Because it has a certain amount of leeway, if you are wearing a seatbelt with the shoulder restraint you're only going to go a certain couple of inches forward. It's irrelevant whether it's a two or three inches closer or six inches less leg room because you're just not going to propel outwards if you're wearing a seat belt. So you are significantly reducing your chance of getting injured.

When you brought up leg room

Council Member Martinez I thought you were talking about the comfort and convenience. If you had to go through a hierarchy of what's important, it's

2.0

2.3

safety, clean air and last but not least customer convenience and comfort. We'd love to see the hybrids made bigger. That would be great and some of them are. I think the Toyota Highlander is made a little bit bigger in the last two years.

So that's basically my response.

They're safe, unequivocally. We have not seen any evidence to the contrary. I think we explored this in tremendous detail not just in the law suit where evidence was submitted but the judge didn't rule or address safety. But also at the last hearing where I think there was extensive testimony from all parties including Ford by the way.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Thank

you, Commissioner. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have

to excuse myself. But we all share the same goal,

which is our environment. But at the same time

the issue of safety and practicability in terms of

making sure these vehicles are available and that

we have the right information is crucial. Thank

you Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Thank you Council
Member Martinez. Questions from Council Member

Yassky.

very much Mr. Chair. History here is important and useful, although—and it's true that for the early part of the administration I know that TLC had some questions about whether we were ready for a hybrid mandate. Ultimately, though, you went ahead and pushed for one and imposed one. I think that was the right decision, as I said before.

Now just to kind of cut to the chase, a court has said the mandate is invalid. Rightly or wrongly they've said that so we have to figure out where to go from here. Am I right? Is that the essence of where we are?

COMMISSIONER DAUS: Well they said we have a likelihood of success.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: They said it's invalid at the moment. There are further proceedings, maybe the court will change it. I hope they will. I believe it was wrong, the court was wrong. At the moment and we have to kind of proceed where we are, it's invalid. So we have to figure out how to move forward. Do you believe in the adage, if at first you don't succeed, try, try

_	COMMITTED ON TRANSPORTATION 12
2	again? Mr. Chair can I ask do you believe in that
3	adage as I do?
4	CHAIRPERSON LIU: Absolutely. It's
5	right up there with the Golden Rule.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: Exactly.
7	Treat others as you would wish to be treated.
8	Reduce your carbon footprint as you would wish for
9	others to reduce their carbon footprint upon you.
10	Is that correct?
11	CHAIRPERSON LIU: It's up there.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: I believe
13	that's somewhere in the Pentatuch, I believe. As
14	I understood the Mayor's proposal, which was I
15	think extraordinarily sensible was to recognize
16	that from the point of view of the driver there is
17	a real difference between leasing a fuel efficient
18	car and leasing a non-fuel efficient car in terms
19	of cost that they are bearing. The proposal is to
20	have the lease cap rates reflect that cost.
21	That's not a regulation of mileage. It has
22	nothing to do with the Clean Air Act.
23	I believe one consequence would be
24	that the fleets would then move towards hybrids or

towards fuel efficient cars. It's simply a

speed.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: With

4 lightning speed, thank you.

a presentation, discussion and then we'll be holding a hearing in early 2009. There are requirements under the administrative procedure.

I think you have to publish the proposals so there's at least a month or so to put it out to the public. But we're engaging in discussions and would have received feedback before then from the industry as to the expenses and the issues and how they feel about it. Work with them, not against them.

On the big issue, those were the only questions that I have. I do have another question I want to ask you about related to this. In the original mandate, as you know--even before the mandate when the Council and the Chairman's leadership provided for some hybrid only medallions and then further provided that the TLC should make the hybrid option available to fleets and individual owners.

The TLC also then put in place a

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

provision that imposed an additional, the way I would put it: imposed an additional inspection requirement on the fuel efficient cars as they approach their extended period. As you know, fuel efficient cars have a longer life cycle than the non-fuel efficient as far as the TLC regulations The way it is now the fuel efficient cars, if I understand it, if they fail two inspections prior to going to their extension period then they can't go into the extension period. And when they're in the extension period, if they fail an inspection at all they must be retired immediately as opposed to ordinary vehicles where when they fail an inspection, they can repair it, fix it and go back on the road.

I have to tell you I think that's unfair to the hybrid owners and the owners of the fuel efficient cars. I'd like to know what your views are on changing that.

COMMISSIONER DAUS: Sure. First, if I could have just a moment of privilege to just thank you, Council Member Yassky for your leadership and Chairman Liu. Going back in time on extended discussions which seem to have taken a

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 46
2	360 in terms of you asking us and then us moving
3	too fast for
4	CHAIRPERSON LIU: [interposing]
5	From our point of view it's a 180.
6	COMMISSIONER DAUS: 180. You would
7	know.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: 275. I'm
9	making that up.
10	COMMISSIONER DAUS: We applaud your
11	passage along with the Speaker of that law because
12	I do believe it played, in addition to the obvious
13	of more hybrids being available. And also the
14	high price of gas factored into all these
15	voluntary hybrids which now number 1,639 which is
16	about 12% or more of our entire fleet. We're
17	seeing our first vehicles that have been on the
18	road for many, many miles now enter into that
19	extension period that you so graciously offered to
20	them. I think it is one of the things that owners
21	look at when they decide to buy a hybrid or a non-
22	hybrid.
23	I think in addition to the price of
24	fuel they're looking at the extra age that they

have on the car. So I think now we have about 18

25

of our 1,639 hybrids have already entered into
that phase. I do believe in regards to prior
discussions I've had with the council member on
the inspection requirement, the law that you did
pass gave the TLC specifically the option to have
additional inspection requirements beyond the
three times per year in our rules. We did pass
those options that you gave us in the legislation.
It said may and we took the may as good advice and
a good signal and we passed rules that require
that.

I still think it's important as we are seeing for the first time, even though the hybrid is doing very well, entering into those later years of use, beyond three years, four, five, six, seven years of service. We want to maintain the option that if cars tend to break down and fail inspection for critical items that our Assistant Commissioner has the ability to take them off the road.

I think your point is, which I totally agree with you on, even though it's important that you not have a broken headlight, if you fail for a broken headlight as you enter into

2.0

2.3

your extension period, you should not have to buy
a new vehicle. You should be able to come back,
of course be taken off the road. You should be
able to come back.

We would have to do rulemaking to fix that. We will look into that, as I have promised you and that will be part of our discussions in the coming months. I do agree with you on that.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: Okay. Well thank you. I won't belabor it. As you say, we have discussed this informally. Whatever. I will formally ask you to consider that.

COMMISSIONER DAUS: We will.

just consider it but to do it because I really do think...that's my position. I really do believe that it's just unfair. Especially to the folks who did take a chance as we kind of wanted them to, go out, do something a little new, a little different and invest in the hybrid cars. When we did that we said there's going to be a longer life cycle, I think we owe it to those folks to give them the benefit of that longer life cycle. Thank

you and Mr. Chair thank you for your indulgence.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Thank you Council Member Yassky. Thank you for spearheading that legislation that then provided the guidance that the TLC to do the right thing. All right. it. My last question for you is that you've talked about lowering the lease caps for certain vehicles that are already in widespread use. understanding is that, and I think Council Member Martinez eluded to this but I just wanted to make it more clear. That there is some rule that says that the TLC can not lower these lease caps unless there is substantial evidence. 

COMMISSIONER DAUS: Right.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: So you did mention a few things, is that the substantial evidence that the TLC will offer?

COMMISSIONER DAUS: Well there's definitely substantial evidence but we're going to change that rule probably anyway. Those are rules that we wrote, standards that we put into the law and we have the authority. If we need to change it to make it more clear moving forward for other policy reasons like holding drivers harmless, we

2.0

will.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: So you're going to change the rule that prohibits you from changing something so that you can change that thing. It's kind of like the term limits thing.

COMMISSIONER DAUS: We believe it's consistent with the rules as they are now but we're going to be re-writing the whole rule anyway. There is substantial evidence that drivers who are driving Crown Victorias are making much less money and that's not fair. They're making at least \$2 per hour less than hybrid drivers who are getting a windfall now, not only by driving a hybrid with increased gas savings but also with drastically reduced prices of gas. We want all our drivers to have equal earnings because that's fair. I believe that is somewhat consistent with the rule and certainly it's well consistent.

The substantial evidence that we're relying on is affidavits that the MTBOT put into evidence showing that it costs them \$6,000 per vehicle per year more to operate a hybrid. When you do the math that ends up being about \$3 more

2.0

per shift. And that's what we're proposing,
exactly what they had given us the evidence for.

That, sir, is the substantial evidence. Though of
course we exercise our option to take a fresh look
at that rule as well as the vehicle retirement
rules which I promise, Council Member Yassky, we
will look at.

actually read the entire sentence. I stopped at substantial evidence but given your comments about how we want drivers to be able to make as much money. Certainly we want drivers to make as much money as possible. It's not always been a stated policy of the TLC to ensure that that happens, that that is the case. But I want to read the rest of the sentence that this rule says.

Include substantial evidence of reduced operating expenses of the affected medallion owners. It's not my rule, I'm just trying to follow the rules here. It doesn't really say anything about the drivers. We're not opposed to drivers making more money but there are rules in place. If you're going to change the rule that's fine. But right now this is what the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

rule	says	substant	ial	evi	dence	of 1	reduced	
opera	ting	expenses	of	the	affec	cted	medall	ion
owner	s.							

COMMISSIONER DAUS: Right. With all due respect Mr. Chairman, the Council this year, every day changes standards, passes laws to change things that were done that they believe were unfair, may have been sound policy years ago. We believe that this is a -- I understand what you're saying that there's something in those rules that say, when they were drafted many years ago, over ten years ago, you need substantial evidence of reduced operating cost to lower it. We're going to change that, yes. Because we have another policy agenda here which is to create a disincentive, a policy reason to change the law just as the Council does every year, change laws to put different standards in place.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Right. But that basically says that you're going to change that rule.

COMMISSIONER DAUS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Because in fact there is not really that substantial evidence.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

choice as to what vehicle because there aren't as
many hybrids out there right now can make more
money in this tough economy

CHAIRPERSON LIU: I just want to get everything out in the open...

COMMISSIONER DAUS: It's out there.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: ...so we can avoid having another hearing about this. Council Member Yassky.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: I quess this really came out in the last back and forth. I understood the point that the Chairman was making, I just wanted to be crystal clear and I think you really just said this, Chair Daus that the previous standard, the standard that's now in place looks at only one factor, the operating costs to the medallion owner. What you are saying is that there are many factors that should come into play when setting lease cap rates including the impact on the drivers and possibly even the impact on New York City citizens who are air breathers. Yes, it's a change in the standard because there are other factors that are very, very legitimately should be taken into account.

fleet. Nobody has done more to push automakers to

25

build a green purpose built taxi than MTBOT and our colleagues. The issue has never been about whether or not to go green, the issue has been about when we can go green without compromising safety, comfort and service. The issue has even been about whether hybrid taxi is right for the taxi industry. One day it may be.

Our concern is that none of today's small hybrids provide enough rear occupant space to safely transport passengers when outfitted with partitions. And none of today's hybrids were designed to be 24/7 commercial taxi cabs. These findings were presented in an engineer's report by Bruce Gambadel; Hybrid Taxi Safety Report that was distributed to the Committee in September.

Mayor's well thought out PlaNYC 30 proposal that would begin greening the fleet in 2012, allowing time for safe, purpose built green taxis to replace the existing ones. We later agreed that based on assurances from the auto industry, we could start that process three years earlier, in 2009. But the city insisted on an accelerated 2008 plan.

2.0

2.3

Recently we brought a successful federal law suit against the city, stopping the mandate because we could not sit idle and watch what we knew would be a disastrous policy.

Engineers, automotive safety experts, even automakers themselves confirmed that non-commercial hybrid passenger cars and rollover prone hybrid SUVs were unfit for rigorous 24/7 taxi use.

We were supported in our law suit by two previous TLC commissioners who called the mandate ill-conceived. Every driver group whose members stood to directly benefit from gas savings opposed the mandate. All the major taxi associations opposed the mandate. And owners of more than 200 hybrid taxis who stood to financially benefit from a hybrid mandate due to the increase in the value of the alternative fuel restriction medallions opposed the mandate. These owners sited poor performance, high operating costs and limited availability amongst other issues.

We remain hopeful that together with the city, we could move forward as an

2.0

2.3

industry and finally provide taxi passengers with the greenest, safest, most comfortable and most accessible purpose built taxicabs. But the punitive measure recently announced by City Hall are counter-productive to this goal. Intro 876 is one of these measures.

A detailed analysis of this bill has been provided to your committee. In 2005 Councilman Yassky proposed a similar bill, Intro 734. It was opposed by the TLC and the taxi industry and did not pass. Now after a court ruling that held that only the federal government can set environmental standards for privately owned taxicabs. The bill attempts to circumvent that ruling by setting the same standards through rewards and excessive punishments that will coheres taxicab owners to purchase hybrids.

This will not withstand legal challenge. More importantly there are reducing the retirement cycles of vehicles of Crown Victorias and other vehicles from three years to an impossible 18 months. This bill places environmental standards above safety standards. In an industry that moves 240 million human lives

2 every year, safety must always be the highest
3 priority.

Let's take the greenest car on the road, the Toyota Prius which is an improved taxicab. Toyota, the largest manufacturer of hybrids in the world has publicly warned against using the Prius or any of its hybrids as New York City taxicabs because they are not intended for commercial use. And like hybrids, the Prius has never been crash tested with the bullet proof TLC mandated partition. Yet owners of the purpose built Crown Victoria with across the board five star safety ratings and a proven track record as a safe New York City taxicab, would be punished for choosing the safe manufacturer supported vehicle. That doesn't make sense.

According to Intro 876, any hybrid electric taxicab, even a Saturn Vue hybrid which has an EPA rating of 6 would get a full retirement cycle. But most gasoline powered vehicles like the Toyota Sienna, which also has an EPA rating of 6 would have its retirement cycle cut in half. We do not believe the Crown Victoria will be around forever nor should it. But hybrid taxis are not,

2.0

at least currently, the answer.

We should concentrate on developing the next generation of safe, comfortable, purpose built green taxis. We are pleased to report that despite the current economic turmoil, Ford is still planning to roll out its highly anticipated, purpose built, fuel efficient, ultra clean emissions, transit connect to New York City taxi market this summer. As committed to improving its fuel efficiency and emissions in future model years.

In the meantime, it is wrong to punish taxi owners who are committed to driver and passenger safety. MTBOT opposes Intro 876 as well as any attempt to arbitrarily punish owners who choose to operate safe, proven vehicles. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Thank you Mr. Sherman. Mr. Gerber.

ETHAN GERBER: Thank you Chairman Liu. Good morning Chairman Liu, good morning Councilman Yassky, good morning members of the Council. My name is Ethan Gerber, I'm the Executive Director of the Greater New York Taxi

Association. GNYTA is a progressive group
representing approximately 1,500 medallion taxis.

We are fully invested in the advancement of clean air fuel efficient vehicles. Indeed the majority of the vehicles in our organization are either hybrid or wheelchair accessible cars. I am a medallion owner myself and I successfully bid in the first auction of hybrid taxi medallions. Like our group's largest member, my personal automobile is a hybrid.

Years ago we anticipated that the future of the auto industry in general and the taxi industry in particular would be driven by fuel efficient green technology. We invested in these vehicles even before the TLC found it fit to approve these vehicles. Our motives for investing in this technology were not mere altruism or good citizenship. It was smart business.

In an age of depleting resources where oil and gas are under control of countries hostile to the U.S., where emissions are polluting the air our families breathe, it was clear to those who looked that automobiles including taxis would some day soon be cleaner, greener and more

efficient. We believe that it made sense to be on the forefront of that trend rather than rushing to play catch up later on.

The decision to invest in duel efficient clean air vehicles was not, however, without cost or without risk. The vehicles were, especially at first, difficult to acquire, expensive and costly to repair. They were also an unknown commodity; no one knew how they would hold up in the wear and tear of driving on the toughest streets in America. Especially when compared to the tried and proven war horse of the taxi industry, the Ford Crown Victoria. It is for this reason that many of the other owners held back. From these owners perspective the risks and costs outweigh the benefit of being among the first to innovate.

We've had some experience with these vehicles and we have found, especially during the recent exorbitant spike in gasoline prices that drivers must prefer hybrids. They seek these cars out and prefer them over Crown Vics. With gas prices over \$4 per gallon last summer, drivers had to pick up many fares just to

2.0

2.3

pay for the fuel in their tanks. These cars save the drivers money on each shift and every trip.

Drivers lined up to drive them. Even now that the cost of gas has returned to becoming just slightly over outrageous, the savings to the drivers are still significant.

These savings, however are not passed on to the owners. The legislation before you today seeks to encourage owners to place fuel efficient vehicles on the road. It does so in part by eliminating a portion of a prior legislation that on it's face granted an extension to the retirement age of clean air taxis. But through the mangled, sausage making quality of legislation, it gave the TLC the power to eviscerate that incentive. To that end we applaud your efforts.

The intro seeks to unnecessarily punish those who purchase a Crown Victoria, however. GNYTA believes that the market will punish people enough when drivers flock to others who lease hybrids. Market forces will eventually overwhelm them just as they have overwhelmed the short sided Detroit automakers. The second part

of the legislation is a transparently mean spirit.

It is unbecoming to the dignity of this body to see to the furor of an administration that eventually will get what it seeks. There is no critical need to needlessly punish individuals who make the mistake of purchasing gas guzzlers; the

market will take care of that.

The original legislation that this intro seeks to change was intended as an incentive to owner to purchase hybrid taxis. 19-535 of the administrative code of the City of New York, on it's face extended the retirement age of alternate duel vehicles from the current three years to four years. You may recall that the TLC originally opposed the legislation. As a compromise the legislation included paragraph three that gave the TLC broad powers to implement the Council's mandate. The TLC then used those powers in that paragraph to impose virtually insurmountable conditions to qualifying the incentives.

In short, the legislation together with the TLC rules enacted under the legislation's authority took away the extension if a vehicle failed a single TLC inspection during its

extension. It should be noted that medallion taxis inspected three times a year often fail the extremely thorough 250 point TLC inspection that Chairman Daus talked about a few moments ago.

They are given opportunities to correct whatever the TLC deems inadequate. If the purpose of the bill was to give an incentive, then paragraph three stripped that incentive. It seemed that the TLC preferred the stick to the carrot.

Today the Council on the one hand proposes to set the TLC straight on the intent of the law by removing the TLC's authority to create unreasonable conditions as obstructions to vehicle extension incentives. On the other hand, the proposal also capitulates to the pension for using a stick to beat people into going along with ideas by reducing the time a non-clean air vehicle can be on the road to a mere 18 months.

In an age where businesses across

America are failing, this extremely punitive and
hostile act to New York business is extremely
short sided. Had the Council passed true
incentives the last time around, and not the
transparently flawed version, which took with one

2.0

2.3

2 hand what gave to the other. This may be a non-3 issue.

The error of malicious government is ending. President Elect Obama has vowed to package bail outs of Detroit with conditions of advancing green, clean air vehicles. He has not, and will not punish businesses for failing to be innovative. He has vowed to reward businesses that are innovate. Good government awards the innovators. It does not punish the timid. It knows that market forces will eventually force the cautious to swim or sink with the tide.

Members of the Council, reconsider the intro. Enact the first part which will finally give the incentives you intended to give two years ago. I thank Councilman Yassky for addressing the unfair requirements of the extension. But do not enact the second mean spirited portion which is intended to inflict harm. You are better than that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Thank you. We have questions from Council Member Yassky.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: Thank you.

I want to get to the issue about the incentives

2.0

and the difference in life span. But just on the question of the inspections that I discussed with Chairman Daus before and that you addressed, Mr. Gerber, in your testimony. I just want to be clear. We had earlier spoken about this and you had expressed a concern that the bill as drafted would get rid of the entire extension of time for fuel efficient vehicles. I take it from your testimony you now agree that as drafted what it does is it cures the inspection problem and puts in place--

Ger: [interposing] I do Council
Member and I thank you. I spoke to your Council
about that as well. I do agree and I think that
it cures the defect from the last legislation.
Thank you.

just want to make sure. On the incentives, truthfully and I'm not sure if it's semantic or not. I'm not sure if I understand where there's a difference between incentive, award or a kind of punishment, disincentive. But do you agree, and I'm just curious about both of you, that there should be a difference in life span or retirement

2.0

cycle between fuel efficient and non-fuel
efficient? Do you support that concept or do you
not support that concept?

): You want to take it first?

Ger: I agree that those who thrust themselves into the market, who took the risk and assumed the risk should get the benefit. I do want to point out that there hasn't been on the extensions and on the lease caps, there hasn't been a grant of an additional lease cap in over four years, despite serious market conditions changing. The cost to the fleet owners have gone up and to lower the lease cap is just simply a punishment and, like I said, it's a mean spirited punishment. I think it's unnecessary.

I think that the extension of time is an incentive to put more expensive vehicles on the road. There is no question that the vehicles are more expensive. It's no question that the vehicles are more expensive to repair. The parts of the hybrid vehicles are significantly more expensive. For example, there is a battery section in a door. So a door to a hybrid is dramatically more expensive than the door of a

2.0

2 Crown Vic.

Taking these risks and increasing these costs should be rewarded and that's what good government does. It puts incentives to go beyond what normal businesses would do.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: But, no, I think I agree with possibly all of that. Just so I'm clear. You're saying you think it's a good idea to have a difference in life cycle between fuel efficient and not fuel efficient or that's not a good idea?

Ger: I think it's a good idea to increase the lifestyle from three years to four years or five years, depending on the type of classification as you originally intended to. I do not think it's a good idea to decrease the life cycle of the Crown Victoria or the other vehicles.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: And Mr.

Sherman.

): MTBOT's position has always been the same as far as wanting to work with this Council, work with the city and green our fleet with a commercial purpose built vehicle that can achieve everything. We think that's right around

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 the corner.

Ger: I do, too.

): We are really the only ones pushing that along with our colleagues to get that In getting there, it would be very nice if done. we could get the support of this Council and the support of this city which we are talking to at this point in trying to work out the details of this. What were trying to achieve is we have no problem with incentives for people to green their fleet and that is something that we would actually encourage and would really like to work with this body and the administration to work towards that. All the disincentives that were announced in a press conference, which we haven't seen the rules that have been drafted or trying to be drafted to change. According to our counsel and our professionals, would all be challengeable.

What we would really like to do is get away from wasting time and money and fighting disincentives. And actually go towards working and using the power of this Council, once again, and the power of the Mayor's office to work with manufacturers like the Taxi of the Future project,

2	to come up with green, purpose built vehicles that
3	solve both.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: Here, here.
5	I agree with you on the not wasting time part,
6	certainly. In terms of the pushing for a green,
7	purpose built vehicle, I applaud your efforts
8	100%. I offer whatever service and assistance I
9	can provide. I would be shocked if everybody in
10	the Council didn't agree with me on that point,
11	that whatever we can do to assist you in your
12	efforts to push for a green purpose built vehicle,
13	I would love to do. So please do just let me know
14	what I can do to be of use in that effort. And I
15	stand ready to do that.
16	): The number one thing that can
17	be done is stop the disincentives and stop the
18	COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY:
19	[interposing] Yes, that connection
20	): [interposing] Let's get to the
21	carrot and let's work together to get this
22	accomplish.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: I really
24	don't want to waste the Chairman's time and I say
25	sincerely Mr. Chairman you cut me off at any

2.0

2.3

point.	Because I'm not sure I get the connection
between	rules that do candidly, yes, push, force,
whatever	the industry to in the meantime, before
there is	a purpose built vehicle, push toward the
more fue	l efficient as opposed to less fuel
efficien	t among those that are available now.

I'm trying to understand the connection between those rules and getting Detroit to do a purpose built green vehicle. Maybe you can tell me why you think that the disincent--

): [interposing] It's quite clear to me as I testified numerous times in front of this Council and I said what MTBOT wanted from the get go is we endorse the 2012 implementation. We sat on the Taxi of the Future project. We even said that we feel that we could get there with the automobile manufacturers in 2009. But by going through this whole process that we're involved in and all the litigation, it has brought us away from--

## COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY:

[interposing] It's really distracted Detroit.

It's distracted the Big Three from developing that purpose built vehicle.

2	): At this point the mandate has
3	been withdrawn and as a taxi operator, Ford
4	because of the litigation and because of the
5	threats have stopped producing the Crown Vic,
6	which they are now putting back on to their line.
7	So we can not get a vehicle until late January,
8	early February to move the process forward.
9	We look at the Crown Vic and
10	choices with incentives on hybrids today to work
11	towards the Taxi of the Future. So what I'm
12	saying is instead of going in all these different
13	directions that involve us challenging each other.
14	If we work together, we can put pressure on
15	Detroit and other manufacturers to get what we
16	want. The technology is around the corner and
17	they're looking to build that vehicle.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: I won't
19	take
20	): [interposing] And it's very
21	soon.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: I won't
23	take any more of the committee's time, Mr. Chair.
24	The best way and this has been proven true again

and again and again, the best way to force Detroit

and push Detroit toward a purpose built vehicle would be to say, the only vehicle they could sell in New York as of some date would be one that meets the following standards. The courts have thrown up a question as to whether we could do that or not. But if you did that you're right, if we said the only vehicle you could sell to New York taxi owners—

): [interposing] I thought that's what the Taxi of the Future project was.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: If we said the only vehicle you can sell is one that's 25 miles per gallon, yes, that would absolutely push them toward a greener vehicle. If we said the only vehicle you could sell is one that's 30 miles a gallon, that's what you could do. That's what of course the Mayor's rules did. That's what you succeeded in invalidating with your law suit. So it is crystal clear to me that the only thing that has stood in the way of this city aggressively pushing Detroit toward greener taxi fleet, towards producing greener cars that can be used as taxis is the law suit that you instituted.

The only question I would like you

Frances Loughlin and Erhan Tuncel and that will be

25

2	followed by a panel led by Bhairavi Desai of the
3	New York Taxi Workers Alliance and several other
4	members of the Taxi Workers Alliance, who I'll
5	leave the order up to the Alliance itself, Osman
6	Choudhury, Bill Lindauer, Victor Salazar,
7	Beresford Simmons and Cliff Adler. Gentlemen
8	please proceed when you're ready.
9	VINCENT SAPONE: Good morning Mr.
LO	Chair.
11	CHAIRPERSON LIU: Good morning.
12	VINCENT SAPONE: Distinguished
13	Councilman, thank you for giving me this
L4	opportunity to speak. My name is Vincent Sapone.
15	I'm the Managing Director of the League of Mutual
L6	Taxi Owners. We have over 3,000 members, 90% of
L7	them are owner/drivers.
L8	I have a few things to say but I'm
L9	going to keep it short today. First of all, I
20	heard a lot of talk about worries about cab

going to keep it short today. First of all, I heard a lot of talk about worries about cab drivers. If everybody was so worried about cab drivers they should give us an increase because it's long enough and expenses are up, not just gas is up. Our mortgages are up, our rents are up, our food is up, our health insurance is up;

everything is up. So if anyone really cared they would push the TLC or the Mayor and give us some sort of an increase. We're the only ones that have to wait eight years against the conductor or the token collector getting an increase every year, not working half as hard as us.

I want you to know something. I have grandchildren. One was a preemie. I have certain problems myself. We're not against clean air, not at all. We want clean air, more maybe than a lot of people that spoke here today because I come from a family that has breathing problems. But you know what? The cars you want to give us to use will destroy my organization's drivers. They can't afford to be in those cars. They are much more expensive, they don't hold up, they're too tight to be in there six, seven days a week, 12 hours a day.

No one here or at the TLC ever drove a cab. I'll challenge anyone to get behind the wheel of a taxi for three months. Go behind the Ford Escape and tell me. You know what? I'll give you my salary every week to do that and tell me what you feel, how it is. Everyone thinks life

is beautiful. Life is not beautiful. I'm willing to work with the City Council and the TLC in getting the right car, a clean air car. This deal was shoved down our throats.

Doard. I think it's been flushed down the toilet by now because nothing's happening. We were right on the right track. We had the Sierra club there. We had design trust there. We had fleets there. We had drivers there, working on a project to get the right car. All of a sudden out of City Hall comes an announcement we want 25 and 30 miles a gallon of gas.

First of all, it was mentioned by
the TLC the Highlander does not get 25 miles to
the gallon and that car is \$55,000. Everybody
wants us to do but no one thinks about our cost
and how we're going to be comfortable and secure
in a car that's not really the car made for a
taxi. It's okay to go to church with or to temple
or the railroad station. But to be on the
road...there are certain people that probably will
testify about how nice it is. But I don't believe
it for a minute.

maybe saving the gas, yeah. And there are people where \$10 a day means a lot or \$15. Maybe not to me because I'm passed that point. I drove for 35 years. My father drove for 30 years. City Hall should have came to the taxi industry and say this is what I want to do, what do you think? If this

Let me read you something. I also

The only thing I think is good is

can not work, let's work on something that will make it work. Not just say you got to do this.

That's not fair.

have--I don't have but we have a federal credit union that deals with the transportation industry. Last year some time people from the Mayor's office came to the federal credit union talking about financing these hybrids. They were asked a question and this is no lie. This is according to the Mayor's office. They said if every medallion taxi and every black car were hybrid the carbon footprint in New York City would be reduced by .05% and they added 80% of the carbon footprint comes from heating systems and buildings. So how many lives are we going to save if we put this on hold until we get the right car? I want to know.

What are we saving here?

Is it only for people's names to be in lights on Broadway? I did this and I did that.

But I screwed 4,000 people. I'm sorry, I shouldn't use that word. Well I hurt 4,000 small business people. It's enough with this business.

They're driving me nuts. But cab drivers need a steady increase just like everybody else and it's time City Council forced the TLC to do that.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Thank you.

[Applause]

14 CHAIRPERSON LIU: Guys please

proceed.

Mr. Chairman and council members. I thank you for the honor to speak here with you today. I've been a medallion owner since 1994. I would like to help the environment by using a clean air taxi but the choices we have today, the Ford Escape, the Prius, the Camry are small cars. I have sat in all three and had a hard time getting in and getting out of these vehicles. They are not meant to be taxis. The leg room in the back of these

2 cars is very little.

Week and feel more comfortable in a Crown

Victoria. When you work 12 hours a day you need
to be comfortable. When passengers get in my car,
they tell me what a nice car, comfortable and
roomy car I have. I think we should wait to see
if Detroit could get together to come up with a
good, clean burning car that could be used as a
taxicab. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Thank you and could you identify yourself for the record.

MR. LOUGHLIN: Frances Loughlin.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Thank you. Mr.

Erhan. Identify yourself first, please.

Tuncel. I'm an owner/driver and a LOMTO member.

Good morning Chair, council members. It's an unfair practice for any politician to try to paint medallion owners as irresponsible and uncaring for our environment. We care simply because we live and work in New York City. We are raising our family, our children in New York City.

The bill that you're about to vote

on is a direct result of Mayor Bloomberg's and the TLC's unwillingness to listen to industry's concerns about the hybrid vehicles currently in the market. These hybrid vehicles being used as taxis are simply an abolishment of our country leading standards on taxi safety and comfort, which has taken years to accomplish.

paragraph from one of TLC's press releases coinciding with Ford Motor Company stretching Crown Victorias. "We are especially grateful that the Ford Motor Company has been so responsive to our request for a bigger, more consumer friendly taxicab. These taxicabs are bigger and better and will offer the riding public more value for their premium fare and that's always been a goal of TLC." Of course they're talking about the stretch Crown Victorias.

A couple of months ago TLC rightfully so, did away with the requirement to have vinyl covers on the front seats of the newer vehicles just because a car manufacturer put out a warning. TLC was warned that these pose manufactured vinyl covers may, and I say again

may, interfere with the deployment of the front and side airbags. Well, all the hybrid car manufacturers are refusing to stand by their vehicles when used as a taxi. They all have made statements to that fact.

In my humble opinion they're saying this, what we and medallion owners have been saying for years, "hybrid vehicles fitted with partitions and/or tampered with and altered to comply with TLC regulations are not safe to use as a passenger vehicle." Having said all that, I strongly believe we can have our cake and eat it too. I'm confident that a safe and comfortable and environmentally friendly taxi is on its way. It will just take a year or two at most.

You do not have to punish the owners who are insensitive to our environmental needs while trying to continue with our exemplary standards on taxi safety and comfort for both drivers and the riding public. I'm asking you to strike down the part of the Intro 876, which reduces the life span of non-hybrid vehicles. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Thank you very

much, gentlemen. We now call upon the members of the New York Taxi Workers Alliance. Bhairavi Desai and any assortment of the five additional people who have signed in. Ms. Desai please proceed when you are ready.

BHAIRAVI DESAI: Good morning. I'm Bhairavi Desai, Executive Director of the New York Taxi Workers Alliance. At the outset, let me say after hearing the Chairman's testimony I don't even know if we need to be in existence since he seems to be the new union for taxi drivers. When gas prices were close to \$4.50 people were working on the streets over 12 hours a day. We were essentially crying. We had every single argument. Every other industry in the transport business got a surcharge except us.

Even the ownership was actually supporting the surcharge at that point in time. The TLC turned around and said to us, well gas prices will come down don't worry about it. Now all of a sudden they want equity among driver incomes. I believe equity in an industry is equality between the ownership and the workers not among classes of drivers. But putting that aside,

we have a fundamental problem with the so-called incentive program, which is about raising the leases of the hybrid vehicles.

has greatly exaggerated the amount that drivers save per year through hybrids. The number they've thrown around is \$5,000 a year in gas savings.

Now the savings are proportional to the price of gas. So for example, when the price of gas was \$4.38 over the summer the savings between a hybrid and a Crown Vic would have been about \$17 per shift. But when the price of gas is what it is today, the savings between a hybrid and a Crown Vic is about \$9 per shift.

Now if you assume the TLC's theory and gas prices have indeed stabilized, let's take the current price of gas a look at what the savings would be at the end of the year. With a hybrid the drivers would end up paying about \$6,600 towards the gas. With the Crown Vic for the same mileage per shift, at the end of the year they would pay about \$8,400. That is a difference of about \$1,800 in the gas savings between the hybrid and the Crown Vic at the end of the year.

With the proposal on increasing the leases they essentially are looking to wipe out those savings. So all I can see in this quite duplicitous—I hear in the publishing world that the next dictionary that comes out with the word duplicity it's going to have a link to the TLC web site on it. I've never seen an agency that is more underhanded and changes rules at their own will when it serves their own political purposes.

As the Chairman himself said, they are policy initiatives.

I don't mean to digress, it's just you listen to them testify and you can't help but to feel enraged when they're claiming to do this on behalf of drivers. We all know that every single issue that has affected drivers, they not only stand silent but they actually support from the background.

So the savings that they're talking about, again, would be wiped out with the new higher leases. In essence what the administration because they lost the law suit which drivers are not part of. What they're now looking to do is essentially use the workers to subsidize the

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is completely unfair and it's 2 industry. really the--

[Applause]

The saddest part of this whole program is it is so typical of the TLC. I don't want to digress but when you look at their current credit card program, in any other industry it's used to generate revenue. Well the way that TLC has implemented in our industry, drivers lose 5% on every fare. It's similar to their approach on hybrids. What could essentially be a savings is now being turned into a wage cut. It is immoral. It's unethical. It is completely duplicitous and it is going to be at the heart of it, practically speaking, incredibly counter productive.

We need an alternative to the current approach that the administration has That alternative should be to encourage taken. and increase the opportunities for individual drivers to become vehicle owners. That's who you see purchasing wheelchair accessible and hybrids. But the current plan that the TLC has put forth does the very opposite. Again, it is counter productive and it is punitive not only to the

medallion and own their own cabs. This is a great

disincentive for that. Who can keep paying car

are finding it extremely hard to meet their

payments when they have to retire their car after

Already individual medallion owners

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

a year and a half?

2.0

2.3

2	payments. I'm sure many of them are near
3	foreclosure on their medallion payments because
4	the cost of the medallion itself is so high. This
5	is a rush job, this proposal. I think it requires
6	greater thinking. A year and a half is
7	preposterous for everybody, whether it's a fleet
8	cab or an individual owner.

Try to keep the drivers in mind. We are not making a decent income thanks to the misguided policies of the TLC and the mayor.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Thank you.

Osman. Identify yourself please.

OSMAN CHOUDHURY: My name is Osman Choudhury, I'm a member of the Taxi Workers
Alliance. I have been driving for the last 12
years. I started driving a Crown Victoria. And nine years I drove the Crown Victoria, after that I got a serious back pain because the lower seat.
Even when the car goes through inspection, they never checks out the driver's seat. They don't care about the driver's seat. They only take care of the seat for back passengers.

That's a lot of problems to drive a 12 hour shift and stay in the lower seat, they

have serious back pain, kidney problems. This is since I started. Then soon as I quit my job somebody gave me the advice to go drive a different car like a higher car. That I found a hybrid because I'm driving. The Altima, I started the hybrid car, driving. I don't have any physical problems.

I also have two things I get on benefits. I save on the gas and another thing is the environment it's very nice. In several years, like three years in the hybrid on the street, when the gas price gets maybe higher at that time--our real friend given the jump start to our economy. Because I drive 12 hour shift and when I drive my friends drive the Crown Victoria. They can drive 12 hours. They can not drive because slow time they're scared about the \$4 gallon for gas. They a little bit work, then they go home.

But when I drive the hybrid on anybody that drive the 12 hour in the city that's cruising, that's why I prefer the hybrid cars.

Also I hear here the hybrid cars, they mentioned the \$6,000. I don't agree with that because I've been driving for three years in the hybrid car,

the - - Garage. They have it car. You can go there, how much the expenditure there. The \$6,000 is a lie. You can go there and they have their doings there. They have their invoices there, how much for particular maintenance things.

Other things I hear somebody say, they need to increase the lease. But I don't want to do the increase the lease, \$2 for the increase of the lease. The measurable benefit is the garage owners. We don't get the lease, some garages are charging daily prices, like over \$850 they're charging for regular cars. The hybrids are at least \$900 they're getting. If you drive the lease all the 667, the \$200 extra getting money there. How are they losing money?

I have a lot of friends that buy
their car and lease their medallion. They pay the
lease for 800 something and buy their car, two and
a half years the Crown Victoria car they pay it
off. But what they said that they're losing
money. Work in the garage, they don't lose. We
work seven this week; we're suffering. But what
are they losing the money and they said that new
things are going to increase the lease. They're

messed up the driver doors are working in the garage, they can not stay in the street, people don't take the cab, all the time that's happening.

Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Thank you very much.

VICTOR SALAZAR: Hi, my name is

Victor Salazar. I'm an owner/operator in New York

City. I purchased the medallion at one of the

previous auctions. I'm having a very difficult

times paying the mortgage and on top of that with

the high insurance. More or less, buying the

hybrid now to me represents a big investment at

the moment. The most important thing that I would

like to tell the Council, we taxi drivers are

really suffering with the situation of the prices.

Still even though they actually went down, we're

still having a lot of problems.

I, myself, end up getting a second loan on my medallion due to the fact that the rigorous maintenance that the TLC imposes on us creates an extra expense for us owners. Because of the economic crisis, we're sustaining very difficult moments. I ended up getting a second

loan on my medallion in order to pay my credit card bills. I was using those credit cards in order to cover the charges on maintenance and all the high expenses that come along here in the City of New York. That's one point. On the fact of how we're managing right now our lives here in New York City.

Another part is that the TLC is saying their most concerned about the safety for the driver and not for the owners. But actually forcing us to get into the smaller cabs is definitely not a safety issue at all. The TLC is bragging a lot about the Ford Escape. But most of Ford Escapes they are forced to have the L-shaped partition, all my friends who drive these taxis with the L-shaped partition are having a lot of difficulties and it creates a lot of problems and division and everything. So definitely is a safety hazard.

Another problem obviously is that we owner drivers, operators and my other brothers who drive their cars and lease the medallions, we use them also for our personal purposes. For us, safety is one of the most concerns because we deal

2.0

2.3

2	also with our relatives. Basically that's the
3	most important thing that I have to say.
4	Everything else has already been said very
5	clearly. So I really hope that the members here
6	today will consider all the facts that we are
7	expressing as taxi drivers. That's basically what
8	I have to say.
9	CHAIRPERSON LIU: Thank you Mr.

Salazar.

MR. SALAZAR: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Your points are well taken. I guess I was a little bit easy on the TLC for all of a sudden standing up for workers' rights. Thank you. Do we still have Mr. Simmons and Mr. Adler? Cliff Adler. Mr. Simmons please proceed.

BERESFORD SIMMONS: Good afternoon council members, ladies and gentlemen. I thank you to be here. I thank for you guys to be listening to what we the drivers have to say today. My name is Beresford Simmons and I'm a member of the Taxi Workers Alliance. I've been driving a taxi in New York City for over 35 years and still driving. I'm one of the guys who are

2.0

out there with the drivers and hearing the complaints every day.

between the million year brokers and the Taxi and Limousine Commission and we are the small guys in between. I have nothing against the hybrid but it's not tested for being a cab in New York City. It's small and there are a lot of complaints.

Very small cars, a lot of complaints, you have an accident the guys get trapped in the car with the L-shaped partition; there's no way out.

The Taxi and Limousine Commission have a policy where when you go for inspections, even if you have a brand new car, that car can fail the inspection. Me, as an individual driver, I'm what you call a dove driver who buys the car and leases the medallion. If I go for inspection this morning and I fail the inspection, whether it's a brand new car or not, I do not get a sticker on the window. They take my sticker off and I have to go and find a mechanic to fix this car immediately. If not, I won't be working until this car is fixed.

There is not enough mechanics out

there for these hybrid cars. The fleet owners, yes, they have great mechanics in their shop but as an individual owner I have to go and find a mechanic. Where can I find a mechanic that will work on my car immediately? So most likely I will be off the road for two, three or four days or maybe more. My broker is not going to wait for me to get any money from anywhere next two weeks to pay him. He wants his money right away as these guys know. I'm not going to be long.

I drive a wheelchair accessible car and the wheelchair car has a lot of space in the back. My passengers love the car so any consideration about these hybrid cars, consider a car with a lot of space. Until they can do that for the passenger--I'm very concerned about the passenger. As I said I've been driving for quite a while and I thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON LIU: Thank you very much Mr. Simmons. With that, we see that we are being joined by a large number of members of the public for the purpose of participating in the next City Council's hearing with the Committee on Aging. So sit tight and there being no other

testimony for this hearing of the Committee on Transportation, the Transportation Committee hearing is adjourned.

## ${\color{red} \underline{C} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{E} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{R} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{T} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{I} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{F} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{I} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{C} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{A} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{T} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{E}}$

I, Amber Gibson, 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 February 18, 2009