

**NYC DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TESTIMONY**  
**HEARING BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION**  
**ON INTROS. 206, 325, 334, 370, 497, 570, 867, 886, 928, 1010, 1011, 1066, 1140, and 1142**  
**October 31, 2018**

Good morning Chair Rodriguez and members of the Transportation Committee. I am DOT Deputy Commissioner for Traffic Operations Joshua Benson and with me today is Assistant Commissioner for Intergovernmental and Community Affairs Rebecca Zack. Together with our colleague Edward Grayson, Director of DSNY's Bureau of Cleaning and Collection, we are pleased to be here to testify on behalf of Mayor de Blasio on a number of bills before the Council on the issue of parking as well as several other topics.

I will begin with a little background on DOT's regulation of curbside parking in New York City and then discuss the bills before you today.

With approximately 76 million linear feet of curb in New York City, DOT believes curb space is a shared public resource that should be managed to safely benefit multiple users, including local businesses, bus riders, pedestrians, bike riders, and drivers—both visitors and residents alike. Proper curb management—the policies, programs and regulations which dictate the functionality of this space—is critical to allow the city to expand its travel choices, support business activity, manage congestion, improve neighborhood livability, reduce pollution, and enhance traffic and pedestrian safety.

When it comes to parking, DOT has over 385,000 signs specifying who can park when, where, and for how long. DOT maintains over 85,000 metered parking spaces served by over 14,000 meters and the ParkNYC “pay-by-cell” program. As we testified back in June, we have accomplished two major transformations of our metered parking system in recent years, one of the largest in the world, through the transition to Muni-meters and the launch of ParkNYC.

DOT is now exploring a third transformation, towards an integrated, license plate-based, electronic payment and permit management and enforcement solution. The rollout of ParkNYC together with NYPD's ASES enforcement handhelds for their TEAs, are potential first steps in this process, which would allow for much more efficient and fraud-resistant parking enforcement.

Since ParkNYC became citywide in July 2017, usage has steadily increased to the point now where 1 in 8 of the 2.3 million parking transactions in a typical week were handled by ParkNYC and usage continues to grow. Customers have reported that they strongly prefer the app to using the meters and find it far more convenient. They know about, use, and like the ability to extend their parking session from their smart phone. And we are happy to say that the data indicates relatively high satisfaction with the app overall.

On the other hand, DOT is learning that users of the app want to park longer than the one or two hour limits currently allowed for most passenger parking, and may be willing to pay progressively higher rates in order to do so. This is something we are trying with our regulations in Manhattan below 96<sup>th</sup> Street, where we recently added a second, higher-priced hour to one-

hour metered parking zones to offer a little extra time for those who need it while still promoting curb availability.

While some of the features proposed in bills today are ones we could explore in the future, DOT is also actively seeking input from the public about how to make it more convenient for them to park and pay for parking using customer surveys, to identify what improvements they would most like to see. In general, moving away from cash to virtual payments will lend greater flexibility.

When it comes to innovation, another area we are focused on is our regulations, which have not always kept up with the ebbs and flows of New York City. Changing land use and population shifts and evolving neighborhoods and travel modes are putting added pressure on the curb. New regulations such as those for our carshare pilot are one example of needed innovation.

But perhaps most glaringly, the structure of our metered parking rates for both passenger and commercial vehicles had not evolved very much as our city transformed. Incredibly diverse settings were served by similar regulations, providing little curbside management benefit to many areas that depend on meters to open up parking spaces for more people.

Recent meter rate changes are one example of beginning an effort to more closely match the prevailing regulations with the current activity and needs of many areas of the city by creating a tiered approach.

Finally, we know congestion is of concern to so many stakeholders, including, of course, this Council. At DOT we look to maximize the safe use of our shared street resources, including curbside parking, to address congestion and best manage this limited resource in such a dense city. So that is why it is important for people to follow our parking regulations, and why strong disincentives for not following those regulations are necessary.

Now, beginning with Intros. 325 and 334. As DOT, including Commissioner Trottenberg, testified in 2014 and again in 2015 on predecessors to these two bills, we understand it can be frustrating to overpay for parking. I am pleased to report that one of the chief features of ParkNYC is the ability to extend the parking session from your phone, up to the legal limit. This allows users to pay for only the minimum time needed, while retaining the ability to add time remotely if it is necessary to stay longer than expected. In practice, users report frequently taking advantage of this feature.

Regarding the proposals before you today, a system for electronic exchange of unused time as proposed in Intro. 334 is not something we have in our current system and would be logistically complicated. This is particularly true because the unit being exchanged is not simply remaining value, but remaining *time*, which is constantly diminishing. On the other hand, the option to pay from your phone as you go addresses the issue the bill seeks to solve by providing users a means to not buy more time than they need.

When it comes to the last increment of payment before a meter's hours end and the occasional need to go over the metered time, the ability with ParkNYC to pay as you go instead of in

advance has reduced the occurrence of this as well. A system without the use of cash would no longer require the use of increments, perhaps a solution to the issue in certain areas in the future.

Back when we testified in 2014 we produced some estimates of the actual amount of this type of overpaying. Of the amount that does occur, the majority is in the commercial environment. For passenger parking, updated for 2018 the amount is approximately \$35,000 of overpayment for all transactions annually, or a figure equal to about .0008 percent of the payments we process in typical week. On the other hand, the proposed solution would be an amount into the millions of dollars to absolve all parkers of the last increment of a meter's posted time

In partnership with the Council, DOT took the major step starting in 2013 of ensuring that meters are switched off and cannot accept payment outside the hours they are in effect. While this may sound straightforward, it was actually complicated on a programming level, and with a meter system as large as ours, the cost to implement was significant.

We also implemented the ability to pre-pay before the start of meter hours, so that you can pay for time up to the legal limit, starting when the regulations begin. Previously if you arrived before a regulation started and you wanted to pay for metered parking starting when the regulation began, you were forced to pay for the time before the regulation, in addition, in order to park.

These two steps eradicated the vast majority of overpayment issues faced by customers. Regarding both the bills today, reprogramming the existing system to meet these requirements would be costly and would take time to implement while providing a very small benefit. So DOT does not support either piece of legislation at the current time. But we look forward to continuing discussions about what we are learning customers want and making additional enhancements in the future, for both customer satisfaction and to best manage our curb for the purposes I have mentioned.

Next, I will speak about Intro. 570, which would waive parking violations when a single parking sign is illegible. Our durable, high quality signage has an average lifecycle of 10 years, and accordingly, last year we installed 138,975 signs, or about 10 percent of our stock, and over 135,000 signs the year before. DOT operates the largest municipal sign shop in the country to support the continual maintenance of our signs.

As background, over recent years, DOT has undertaken an effort to update our signage and reduce the clutter of excessive signage. In replacing old signage with current standards that will provide more legibility and better lifespan, we have focused on areas that we believe have a higher percentage of signs that are at or beyond their useful life. Overall, the public does a very good job of reporting signs that need replacing. And in the case of Alternate Side Parking, our single largest category of parking regulatory signs, DSNY notifies us when a sign is faded or has gone missing.

On most blockfaces there are multiple signs which display the parking regulation. When someone wishing to park encounters a faded sign, it is usually as simple as looking up and down the block for the next sign to confirm whether parking is legal.

It is DOT's understanding that in the case of a missing, faded or defaced sign, the enforcement agent shall determine if there is sufficient parking guidance on the block, and only then issue the violation. As New York City Traffic Rules state, one authorized regulatory sign anywhere on a block is sufficient notice of restrictions in effect on that block.

Finally, while the proposal may be conceived to further incentivize DOT to replace illegible parking signage, were it enacted, it might in fact result in more motorists defacing signs so they can park illegally without consequence, only leading to further confusion of the current parking regulations. For these reasons, DOT opposes Intro. 570, while we encourage motorists to follow posted regulations that apply.

Next, on the topic of truck parking, this Administration recognizes that truck parking overnight and in residential areas is a significant issue. While the proposed pieces of legislation, Intros. 1010 and 1011, requires further discussion, we are exploring charges that are available to more frequently enforce higher fines than are currently being used and are working with NYPD to determine the feasibility. At the same time, the need for truck parking in the five boroughs is a reality and continued efforts involving multiple city agencies to identify new options or sites are necessary.

Now, moving to the topic of Leading Pedestrian Intervals or LPIs. Intro. 1142 would require DOT to install at least 400 LPIs annually at signalized intersections adjacent to hospitals, schools, and senior centers until all such intersections have received an LPI. On behalf of DOT, we strongly appreciate the Council's interest in the aggressive implementation of this proven safety measure. We have installed 2,774 LPIs since the start of Vision Zero, including 855 last year. To put this in context, since Vision Zero started installations are up by 5000 percent. In fact, we are hitting more than double our goal every year.

We prioritize placement at high-crash intersections and corridors. While we do consider locations such as schools, DOT believes the implementation of this treatment is best guided by the safety data and our engineering judgment and we therefore target Vision Zero priority corridors.

We are always happy to look at requests for specific locations, as well. But requiring DOT to follow a formula to target locations next to specific facilities for 400 installations annually could replace at least some other higher-crash locations that we would select. And having to follow such a formula could affect our overall efficiency as well, that allows us to install such high numbers of LPIs in recent years, a key Vision Zero accomplishment which we plan to continue. Therefore DOT opposes the bill as drafted.

Now, turning to Intro. 206, which would require DOT to install a pedestrian countdown display at every location with a red light camera. Pedestrian countdown displays provide a proven safety benefit to pedestrians. As DOT has testified previously, more than half of all the City's over 14,000 signalized intersections have a countdown display, and we have plans to install more.

When it comes to intersections that have been chosen based on safety data for installation of a red light camera, we reviewed those locations and currently close to two-thirds have a pedestrian countdown display as well. DOT will assess the remaining locations for possible countdown display installation based on our engineering judgment and specifications.

Regarding Intro. 928, this proposal would require no fewer than two diagonally opposite corners on each street intersection to have a street name sign for each street. This is the goal for all of our intersections, and it is the standard we are meeting when we replace approximately 12,000 to 13,000 street name signs each year across the City. However, meeting the requirements for all intersections citywide within 180 days of enactment as required by the bill would be a significant challenge to our resources and would divert efforts from vital safety work. Therefore DOT opposes the bill.

Regarding Intro. 867, this proposal would require DOT to assess every street in the City to determine whether to change its one-way or two-way designation. Conversions to one-way are in our Vision Zero toolkit as part of our Street Improvement Projects. Such assessments are appropriately guided by our data-driven approach for safety improvements, or by community interest. However, assessing all of our 6,000 miles of street in New York City for whether they should have one way or two way traffic flow is not an appropriate targeting of our resources. Therefore while we are happy to further discuss the topic of conversions, including how to identify the streets on which to focus, DOT opposes this bill.

Regarding Intro. 886 to permit “pet harbors,” to be placed in front of commercial establishments, modeled on an existing law for coin-operated rides, which dates back to at least the nineteen eighties. As you know, as our city has grown significantly, so have the demands placed on our sidewalks to accommodate larger numbers of pedestrians and our focus on accessibility for persons with disabilities has never been greater. DOT does not support this use of the sidewalk in light of population growth, accessibility needs and other potential uses of the sidewalk space. In addition to DOT’s purview, other City agencies have potential concerns and are in the process of reviewing this legislation.

Regarding Intros. 497 and 370 to add additional holidays to the ASP calendar, DSNY has testified on similar legislation in the past and remains opposed. These bills eliminate two additional days of alternate side parking during the year, in addition to the existing 34 alternate side parking holidays that are already in place, some of which are for multiple days. DSNY believes that their street sweeping vehicles are the most effective tool in the City’s street cleaning arsenal, and further reductions in street cleaning regulations would limit the effectiveness of this tool. We at DOT refer additional questions about these bills to them.

Finally, regarding Intro. 1040, promoting off-hour deliveries is an important tool to reduce congestion and emissions. DOT’s off-hour deliveries program focuses on shifting truck deliveries from peak period to off-hours in conjunction in specific congested areas such as Midtown Manhattan, Downtown Brooklyn, Flushing and Jamaica. We conduct targeted outreach to business locations, and also work with transporters and receivers to facilitate curbside access needed to support such deliveries.

The bill before the committee today is a worthwhile proposal that this Administration, including DCAS and DOT, would be happy to explore further before possibly implementing a plan. Challenges to off hour delivery can include the transporters ability to service off-hours deliveries, the availability of secure drop off facilities, the potential for refrigeration if needed, and other logistics. DOT has already initiated an assessment of deliveries to DOT facilities to examine opportunities for improving freight efficiency.

### **Conclusion**

I will finish by saying that with so much density of people and activity, we all know competition is very fierce for the many uses of the street and sidewalk in New York City. At DOT, we are continually improving and innovating how we manage this valuable resource safely and efficiently for the greatest benefit while balancing all of those competing uses.

Regarding some of our other signal and street treatments we are discussing today, DOT welcomes conversation with the Council about how we utilize all the tools in our toolkit and as I have said we are always happy to review a particular location. We would now welcome any questions.



# TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

**To:** New York City Council Transportation Committee  
**From:** Jack Davies, Transportation Alternatives  
**RE:** Testimony on Parking Regulations and Policy in New York City  
**Date:** October 29, 2018

---

Good morning. Thank you for convening this hearing and for the chance to testify. My name is Jack Davies. I'm the campaign manager for Transportation Alternatives. For 45 years, Transportation Alternatives has advocated on behalf of New Yorkers for safer and more livable streets. With more than 150,000 people in our network and over 2,000 activists throughout all five boroughs, we fight to improve biking, walking, and public transportation for all New Yorkers.

## Summary of position:

- Parking policy governing New York City is based on outdated and incorrect assumptions about the future of transportation in New York. Our parking policies assume cars are the primary mode of transit for New Yorkers.
- 80 percent of New York's open space is filled by parked cars and congested traffic -- a wildly unfair allocation of space in a city where the majority of citizens do not own a car and space is a precious commodity.
- Our parking policies, taken as a whole, should reflect reality and prioritize the needs of the many over the convenience of a few. Parking ought to be a last resort -- there should be a hierarchy of need for curbside space.
- Transportation Alternatives would, in particular, like to voice their strong support for Int. 1140 and Int. 1142.

As we craft city policy governing on-street parking, it's critical that we both appreciate the context the current rules were written in, and be mindful of the environment we're formulating new policy in, as we seek to create a safe, sustainable, and equitable New York.

The laws governing parking across the City were largely devised by power broker Robert Moses during an era of peak automobile production and use in the United States. As New York radically suburbanized in the 1950s, Moses and his City Planning Commission prioritized cars as the principal form of future transportation. As a result, the City deeded enormous amounts of public space to drivers for private car storage to meet the perceived increase in automobility, and gave no consideration to the new demands that an evolving New York would place on safety, equity, and other transportation resources, like the existing transit networks.

Of course, 21st century New York looks wildly different than planners in the 1960's envisioned. New York's residential population density is almost 20 percent higher today than in 1960. The majority of New York City households don't even own cars, and public transit remains the primary way most New Yorkers travel on a day-to-day basis. Subway ridership was 1.75 billion in 2016, over 100 million more total trips than just five years prior, and annual bus ridership was 638 million. Approximately 1.6 million New Yorkers rode a bike last year, and nearly half a million bike trips are made every day.

But car parking requirements, set by Moses over 50 years ago and more in line with a mid-size municipality than the

most transit-rich city in the country, still largely govern New York. And these antiquated policies are costing New Yorkers.

The majority of New York City's space is being used inefficiently. Currently, 80 percent of New York's open space is filled by parked cars and congested traffic -- a wildly unfair allocation of space in a city where the majority of citizens do not own a car and space is a precious commodity. Over half of New York City's land area is dedicated to public space, including streets and sidewalks. **On-street parking consumes 16,000 acres of our precious public space, or more than 16 Central Parks.** Most New York City streets are lined with cars, and as a matter of policy, we have accepted the idea that these cars should be afforded the opportunity, in one of the priciest housing markets in the nation, to live rent free -- all the while rent increases for actual people. Our parking policies assume cars are the primary mode of transit for New Yorkers -- but we know that's not the case.

Not surprisingly, this low price for on-street parking has led to a situation in which the curb is over-subscribed -- so much so, that finding a spot can take hours in some neighborhoods. And similarly, having car storage be the dominant use of curbside space for so long has engendered a sort of parking mania -- that every spot is precious and we must preserve each one at all costs, even if losing spaces would provide a benefit to public safety. It's not simply inequitable -- most New Yorkers don't even own cars -- but it also comes at a cost. What do we lose when we devote such a huge portion of our street space to storing private property?

Our parking policies, taken as a whole, should reflect reality and prioritize the needs of the many over the convenience of a few. The city needs to prioritize making public transit, walking, and biking the safest and fastest ways for everyone to get around the city, 24 hours a day. Transforming our streets into people-oriented public spaces, and radically improving our transportation system by reclaiming streets from parked cars and dedicating it to buses, bikes, and pedestrians is a proven way to dramatically reduce commute times, pollution, grow our economy, and most importantly, save hundred of lives every year.

This is not a call to ban all vehicular traffic from New York City, nor is it a campaign to demonize car owners, or penalize drivers. Our policies and actions must be in service of a mission to create a New York City where no one needs a car to get around the city quickly, safely, efficiently, and sustainably.

There's no universal single best use for the strip of land adjacent to the curb, but we can all agree there are better uses for this public land than free unlimited car storage. We should only grant space along the curb for the storage of vehicles where and when none of these other more important uses make sense. And when we do offer curbside space to private vehicle storage, it should never be granted free of charge.

Parking ought to be a last resort -- there should be a hierarchy of need for curbside space. At the top you would find uses that help provide space for moving people safely and sustainably (like bus lanes and protected bike lanes), followed by uses that provide access, like bus stops, bike share stations and bike corrals, and passenger loading areas. Then, freight loading for local businesses, which, in the era of Amazon, should be on not just commercial streets but residential ones as well. Other uses lower on the hierarchy, but still more important than car storage, include activation, (food trucks and parklets), greening (trees, bio-swales). Then, in the storage category, docking stations for shared vehicles (like Zipcar or Car2Go) and finally, private vehicle parking.

Fair cities start at the top of that list. In New York, the only major city where the majority of households are car-free, we've somehow decided to start at the bottom.



# TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

We recognize that for some there's an individual value to having a private car in the city that's easy to park. But we're the biggest city in the country and the greatest city in the world, and we're expected to think collectively and be leaders in the environmental and sustainability movements, especially in the current national political climate. New Yorkers are ready for these changes now -- recent polling shows that New Yorkers, even with an oversample of car-owners, overwhelmingly favor dedicating more of our street space for public transit, walking, and biking, even if it results in less parking. Voters will reward local and state elected officials who lead, boldly and aggressively, on transit reform. It is absolutely critical to the long term economic and social health and sustainability of the city that we fix our transit system, end gridlock as we know it, and make our streets safer. And we can't do this without comprehensively and strategically reforming parking.

Thank you.

**Council Committee on Transportation**

**Hearing: Introduction 886**

**October 29, 2018**

Dear Council Member,

Thank you for hearing Introduction 886, and for your advocacy on behalf of New York City's neighborhoods and transportation needs.

For your convenience, you will find enclosed (1) background information on Introduction No. 886, (2) prepared testimony by Chelsea Brownridge, (3) a letter of support from animal rights advocates, (4) a press clip from the Humane Society, and (4) letters of support from business owners and dog owners.

We will also be sending to the Chair and Committee counsel nearly 100 letters of support from dog owners, business owners and leaders in civil society, all of whom are in favor of Intro 886 and hopeful that the bill will pass.

We hope that this information is helpful, and if there are any questions please don't hesitate to contact Yoswein New York, Inc. at 212-233-5700.

## **Introduction No. 886 – 1 Pager Summary**

**Bill Summary:** A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the City of New York, in relation to allowing pet harbors to be placed on sidewalks in front of commercial establishments.

**Purpose:** Introduction No. 886 allows commercial establishments to provide animal guardians with a safe, secure and humane option for the short-term temporary harboring of an animal while an individual guardian conducts shopping or other related activities. This legislation allows for the placement of a pet harbor on City sidewalks in a manner that does not obstruct pedestrian movement. Specifically, the legislation requires that:

- No portion of a pet harbor may extend beyond three feet from the building line;
- A width of at least nine and one-half feet must be maintained on the sidewalk in front of a pet harbor without obstructing pedestrian movement;
- Pet harbors are removed from the sidewalks between the hours of 11pm and 7am;

### **Background + Public Policy Benefits**

Regulations currently prohibit many businesses and institutions – ranging from food-service establishments to pharmacies – from allowing non-service animals onto their respective premises. Yet, hundreds of thousands of New York City residents have dogs that often accompany them on walks or while they run errands. In instances in which an animal’s guardian wishes to patronize a business that cannot allow that animal onto its premises, the guardian is forced to either:

- 1) Not patronize a given establishment, thus resulting in lost revenue for the small-business and the City
- 2) Disregard health regulations and bring the animal onto the establishment’s premises, thus creating the potential for a conflict between the business owner and the dog guardian, or creating a situation in which the business owner could be subjected to a fine
- 3) Leave the animal unattended, either tied up on the side walk or in a car, thus subjecting the animal to potential harm or theft, or similarly, subjecting pedestrians to potential dangers from an animal that is tied up.

While recent advancements in technology have created solutions for the above problems, New York City’s administrative code has not been updated to explicitly allow for, and regulate, the placement of pet harbors in front of retail businesses. Introduction No. 886 would create a framework that would allow for businesses to place pet harbors – such as the technology-enabled dog houses piloted by Brooklyn-based startup Dog Parker – in front of their respective premises, and thus provide animal guardians with a safe, secure alternative to leaving an animal unattended, or violating New York City health regulations that restrict the presence of non-service animals from certain establishments.



244 Fifth Ave. Suite R290  
New York, NY 10001  
T.212.252.2350 • F212.591.6383  
[www.AnimalAllianceNYC.org](http://www.AnimalAllianceNYC.org)  
[info@animalallianceny.org](mailto:info@animalallianceny.org)  
Adopt a Little New Yorker Today!®

October 25, 2018

Dear Chair Rodriguez and Members of the Transportation Committee,

My name is Jane Hoffman and I am the President of the Mayor's Alliance for NYC's Animals. I am writing to express our support for Introduction No. 886 – a New York City Council bill that would allow commercial establishments to place pet harbors in front of their businesses.

The Mayor's Alliance for NYC's Animals is a 501(c)(3) non-profit charity that works with more than 150 partner rescue groups and shelters to offer important programs and services that save the lives of NYC's homeless animals. Since our founding in 2003, we have remained committed to transforming New York City into a community where no dogs or cats of reasonable health and temperament will be killed merely because they do not have homes.

As an organization dedicated to the well-being of animals and ensuring that all animals have a safe and humane home in which to live, we are proud to support efforts to create safe and secure environments for New York City pets. Solutions that make pet ownership more feasible are likely to increase the likelihood that more pets can find homes, and decrease the likelihood that pets end up in shelters. Additionally, we support advancing opportunities for animal guardians to spend more time with their pets, as this is positive for both animals and their guardians.

Introduction No. 886 would have a positive impact on several of these fronts. Pet harbors enable animal guardians to spend more time with their pets, and make it easier for pet owners to run errands and go about daily life accompanied by their pets. As such, they decrease barriers to pet ownership. Additionally, pet harbors would offer a safe and secure alternative to tying up a dog and leaving it unattended.

In closing, we believe that pet harbors would positively augment New York City's pet services landscape, and respectfully urge you to support this legislation.

Sincerely,

Jane Hoffman  
President



## High-tech pets

### Startups could make for happier pets and pet owners

By Bethany Wynn Adams  
August 2018

When I see dogs outside pharmacies or grocery stores, tied to lampposts or sitting in cars with windows cracked, I feel conflicted. Dogs want to be with their pack at all times, and I love that after a long day at work, people want to bring them along on car trips and errands. People talk about mommy guilt, but dog mommy guilt is oh-so-real, and I get that. But I know that dogs tied outside are vulnerable to weather, theft or simply getting loose. And I wonder if many dogs might be happier—and safer from rising temperatures—left at home instead of sitting in cars in parking lots across the U.S. Yet I feel even more conflicted when otherwise loving pet owners talk about how their pets hang out at home—often crated without bathroom breaks—for hours while they work, commute, run post-work errands or even hit happy hour. Americans who work full-time work longer hours, on average, than workers in any other developed country. The length of our average commute gets longer each year. And we have the fewest number of paid vacation days, on average, in the developed world. That's depressing for us and negatively affects our quality of life—but it's also depressing for our pets and negatively affects *their* quality of life.

In the animal welfare community, we'd like to see animals go to homes where they'll receive the best possible care, and in the past, that's meant draconian adoption restrictions on busy professionals, young singles or city dwellers without yards. Today, we recognize that almost anyone can be a great adopter and pet owner—but that doesn't mean they won't need a little help. So how can we make pet care easier while ensuring the health and happiness of the pets in our communities? In the future, pet care tech startups may be part of the answer. In 2018, funding of pet-related startups has already reached \$519.3 million, compared to \$67.2 million in all of 2012. Pet care is big business, and if widespread financial forecasts are to be believed, it's only getting bigger.

*(Editor's note: Animal Sheltering magazine does not accept or receive financial compensation of any kind for mentioning products in our magazine articles. I selected each product based on online reviews, my personal opinion of its potential and/or unique attributes that make it stand out from the pack!)*

#### **Dog Parker/DogSpot** (Similar to: Nothing I've found!)

**What is it?** "A shareable, high-tech, vet-grade dog house" placed outside of businesses that don't welcome pets. Members sign up for the free DogSpot app, which provides a map of DogSpots that you can reserve and unlock. Once your dog is inside the temperature-controlled, UVC-sanitized doghouse, it locks automatically. You can monitor your dog through the app's Puppy Cam while you run errands. If your phone dies, you can use your member card to unlock the Dogspot. DogSpot help is available 24/7.

**What's cool about the idea:** Although it's currently a bit pricey and only available in some cities, I think the Dog Parker/DogSpot is an indication of something exciting: The acknowledgment that dog-friendly communities are important to the well-being of people and pets, even if businesses aren't or can't be on board, and a growing awareness of the dangers of leaving dogs tied up or in cars. Unfortunately, not everyone loves the idea: NYC's Transportation Department recently ordered DogSpot to remove its kennels from sidewalks, although a Brooklyn city councilmember has introduced a bill that would allow the kennels.

**What the company says:** "We envision a network of DogSpots in every walkable city."

October 28, 2018

Hello,

My name is Steven Plac, and I'm the owner of City Roots Realty, a boutique real estate company located in Park Slope. I would like to offer my official statement to the New York City Council in support of DogSpot and reinstating its services in the city. I personally experienced the numerous benefits of DogSpot when I installed a device outside of my business in June 2017, until the operating license was revoked in the spring of 2018. We're located on a bustling block, between a grocery store and several eateries, and DogSpot was a game changer for local residents. Several came into the office to thank me for the providing their pets with a safe place to stay while they ran errands or grabbed a quick bite to eat. Many told me that they didn't feel comfortable leaving their dogs tied up outside on the sidewalk, but DogSpot allowed them to leave their pets outside with ease. I was glad to be able to help and to use DogSpot to further the sense of community that my business has always strived for.

Further, I noticed that while DogSpot does take up a portion of the sidewalk, tying a dog up ultimately takes up a greater amount of space. When people walk by a tied-up dog they typically move a few extra feet out of the way. This can cause extra congestion and disruption in foot traffic. At the same time, dogs are often tied to bike racks, taking space away from bikers looking to lock up. Perhaps most importantly, DogSpot is safer for the public. An estimated 4,000 people are bitten by dogs each year in New York City according to the NYC Department of Health and DogSpot can help reduce this number. Ultimately we all benefit with DogSpot, and I feel strongly that it should return to the community.

Steven Plac, Owner of City Roots Realty



October 29, 2018

Dear Chair Rodriguez and Members of the Transportation Committee,

As the owner/operator of a small business in New York City, I was unable to attend the hearing on Introduction 886, but I am writing to inform you of my wholehearted support for this legislation.

Between high rents, business costs and competition, running a restaurant in New York City is incredibly difficult. Across the city, we are seeing empty storefronts where neighborhood institutions used to be, and small locally owned businesses like mine pushed out to be replaced by large corporations and chain restaurants.

As a businessperson, I am always looking for ways to draw customers and ensure that my business is as welcoming as possible. And as a dog lover I have a lot of concern for when Dogs are tied up outside of our restaurant. Given how many residents in our neighborhood have dogs, accommodating them and showing we care is important. Sadly, especially in my neighborhood, I've found myself turning customers with dogs away, or else watching as they chose not to stop in because we didn't have a safe place for their dogs to wait.

Legislation that would provide clear permission for these pet harbors to be placed outside of my business would be welcome news. Pet harbors are not different from so many other things that are allowed on the sidewalks like displays of products outside of retail stores or flowers and fruit and vegetables for sale about side of small corner markets, I want to provide this service to my customers and by passing this bill, neighborhood businesses like ours will have another way to invite customers and better meet our communities' needs benefitting everyone involved.

Thank you for your service, and for your time and consideration in reviewing this letter,

**Nico Daniele**

Executive Chef/Owner of Bella Gioia  
Executive Chef/ Co-Owner Chubby's Sandwiches Food Truck  
Owner of Danco Restaurant Group LLC  
Co-Owner and Founder of Buon Amici Hospitality Group LLC  
(646)-413-2226  
(347)-223-4176  
(551)-697-5030  
[nico@bellagioianyc.com](mailto:nico@bellagioianyc.com)  
[nico@chubbyssandwiches.com](mailto:nico@chubbyssandwiches.com)  
[info@bellagioianyc.com](mailto:info@bellagioianyc.com)  
[bellagioianyc.com](http://bellagioianyc.com)  
[chubbyssandwiches.com](http://chubbyssandwiches.com)

Bella Gioia | 209 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue | Brooklyn NY 11217

Dear Chair Rodriguez and Members of the Transportation Committee,

I am a dog owner living in New York City and I am writing in whole-hearted support of Introduction 886 (Espinal).

In Ridgewood, Queens, I am far too often faced with difficult choices because so many businesses cannot accommodate pets. It can be hard to have a dog in NYC because living in a small apartment, my dog does not have the luxury of space and socialization when confined to our home 8 hours a day. I just want the opportunity to take him with me whenever I have to leave the house so he can enjoy spending more time with me.

DogSpot allows my dog to be included when running errands or enjoying a day in the city. Having more businesses become dog-friendly means not having to abandon my family member every day.

I think that changing NYC sidewalk regulations in this simple way to make more places dog-friendly is a fantastic idea and would benefit everyone from dog-owners to their dogs to the businesses who adopt this innovative technology.

The idea of being able to bring my dog Fred with me wherever I go without restriction is so exciting and would make my life and his life so much easier and enjoyable.

Kindly,  
Alyssa Schulman

1625 Putnam Ave  
Ridgewood, NY, 11385

Dear Chair Rodriguez and New York City Council,

My name is Deborah Orr and I am a dog owner living in New York City.

As a dog owner living in Park Slope, Brooklyn, I am often stuck with difficult choices because most errands here are made on foot. There is just no time in the work day to give my dog the exercise and socialization she needs without also taking care of some daily shopping for my family. Yet many stores don't allow dogs and it is unsafe to leave my dog tied up outside.

When I used DogSpot in Park Slope, it made my anxious dog less stressed, kept her safe, and kept her out of the hot sun too. She could go to more places with me, which makes for a calmer and better socialized dog, who can therefore be a better canine citizen of NYC.

Please pass this bill, it would help so much.

Sincerely,

Deborah Orr  
422 5th Street  
Brooklyn, NY 11215

Dear New York City Council Transportation Committee,

My name is Andrea and I am a dog owner. I am writing in support of Introduction 886.

As a dog owner living in Williamsburg, I know that many businesses cannot accommodate pets. It can be hard to have a dog in NYC because dogs are not allowed inside of many places that don't even serve food due to the strict health codes. That's why you need to leave your dog outside which means that you constantly worry that this would allow a thief to dognap your dog and hold it for ransom (THIS HAPPENS!!!).

I used DogSpot every time I went to the grocery store. It is an amazing service and I feel confident my dog is safe and comfortable while I spend 15 minutes getting my groceries. The grocery store doesn't allow non-service animals inside. DogSpot allows me to make the most of my time - I can walk my dog for exercise on the way to and from grocery shopping. We are all crazy busy in NYC and this service adds a huge peace of mind when out and about all day. And your pup doesn't have to sit at home alone all day either!

Sincerely,

Andrea Morin

65 S 11th Stree, Apt 6D  
Brooklyn, New York 11249

Dear Chair Rodriguez and NYC Council,

As a dog owner living in Brooklyn Heights, I am far too often faced with the reality that many businesses cannot accommodate pets. It can be hard to have a dog in NYC because I refuse to tie up my dogs outside of businesses and leave them vulnerable to theft or harm from strangers. They are not “pets” to me, they are my children. My world revolves around them, and being forced to jeopardize their safety because NYC regulations lack innovation and care for its residents, is unacceptable. I want them to come everywhere with me and enjoy this city, but NYC does not allow them anywhere.

I order EVERYTHING from Amazon and rarely ever go to local businesses because it is incredibly inconvenient to run errands or shop when you have dogs. Having pet harbors like Dog Spot available would allow me to explore my neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods more, give my money to small businesses who want to accommodate their customers, and be able to enjoy a long day of errands with my dogs by my side. It would also allow me to walk more often rather than take an Uber everywhere and benefit my health significantly. DogSpot would not improve my life, it would dramatically change my life (as well as the ones of millions of other dog owners) for the better!!

The possibility of living more easily with my dog in the city is very exciting, and legislation that meets NYC residents where they are must be encouraged.

This bill would make my life with my dog better and I urge that the Council pass this legislation. I look forward to the day when I can truly enjoy this great city alongside my best friends, Cookie & Noodles.

Sincerely,

Lauren McManus  
Brooklyn Heights

Dear Council members,

My name is Thea Domber and I own a dog.

It is hard to have a dog in NYC because dogs require a lot of exercise and outdoor enrichment -- sniffing things, being able to relieve themselves, and enjoying the world outside of our apartment which is very hard to accomplish in this city.

To have a well-behaved dog inside, they need enough activity outside! Having DogSpot in Prospect Heights was SO great -- we could take our dog along on grocery shopping trips, trips to the dry cleaners, and even dinner! Always knowing Cinnamon was safe and secure just a few feet away made all the difference. She truly appreciated the opportunity to have more outside time and as a result was an even happier and more well-behaved dog inside. Happy tired dog, happy neighbors. Trust me, some of our neighbors' dogs could really use DogSpot to get out more!!

This bill is important and it makes sense to pass it.

Thank you,

Thea Domber  
580 St. Nicholas Ave, Apt 6E  
New York, NY 10030

Dear Chair Rodriguez and Members of the Transportation Committee,

My name is Alex Beyard and I am resident of New York City. I am writing to ask you to pass Introduction 886 (Espinal).

I live with my very active dog Stella in Williamsburg/Greenpoint, and I struggle to find enough time to spend with her, especially outside of my small apartment, it can be very tough. Being so limited in where you can take them around the city makes it even harder.

DogSpot allowed me to both plan walks that could include errands, and it also allowed me to stay out and about with my dog for longer periods of time while also still having the flexibility to go into stores to quickly grab things I needed.

Please consider this legislation as it would make a big difference in my life.

Sincerely,

Alex Beyard  
128 Newton Street, Apt 1B  
Brooklyn, NY 11222



**NY City Council Committee on Transportation**

Testimony regarding “Introduction 886: Allowing pet harbors to be placed on sidewalks in front of commercial establishments”

October 29, 2018

Chelsea Brownridge, Founder, Dog Spot

---

Good afternoon Chair Rodriguez and members of the Committee on Transportation. My name is Chelsea Brownridge. I’m the founder of DogSpot, a company that manufactures pet harbors here in New York City. I am here to call on the Council to pass Introduction 886 which would clarify the laws to explicitly allow placement of pet harbors on city sidewalks. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to present testimony and explain why this legislation is important for New Yorkers and small businesses.

DogSpot was born in a garage in Bedford-Stuyvesant in 2014 as a solution for people who need a place for their pet while they go into a store or restaurant. I started this business because I saw the need for this type of service for small businesses and for New Yorkers like me, who cherish every moment we can get with our animal companion. For more than two years, DogSpot operated a network of these safe, internet-connected, climate-controlled dog houses on Brooklyn sidewalks without incident in partnership with dozens of local merchants.

From the outset, we had hoped to work closely with the City and were able to develop a partnership that led to being awarded seed grants through NYCEDC and the Brooklyn Public Library, and even an invitation from City Hall to Barcelona, Spain to exhibit as part of a pavilion that the Mayor’s Office organized at the Smart City Expo there. Then, unexpectedly, the Department of Transportation ordered our dog houses removed, putting us in an impossible bind. We were being forced to choose between removing the houses from the businesses and members we were serving, or fighting in court the city we love and wanted to grow our business in. We opted to remove our dog

houses from public sidewalks at that time, not for lack of belief in our service or the benefit we bring to the City, but in favor of collaboration.

Receiving the cease and desist order from the Department of Transportation was a shocking and enormously disappointing event for our small company. In very short order it forced us to stop serving our customers, let some of our staff go, and refocus our operations and strategy on opportunities for growth outside of New York City. Luckily, we were fortunate enough to be quickly met with enthusiastic invitations from other municipalities across the country that were excited about the benefits that we could offer their cities, including Washington DC, Baltimore, Orlando, Kansas City, and Columbus, among dozens of other cities.

I agree wholeheartedly with the presumed basis of the DOT's concerns - that pedestrians can move freely through city sidewalks – and for this reason took great care to manufacture our houses to be non-obstructive and to work with businesses to place our houses in out-of-the-way locations. Unfortunately, DOT's order was issued in deference to well-intentioned but antiquated regulations that fail to account for new technology and design, an approach that stymies innovation rather than serving the general public as it intends. As our technology evolves, our city's regulations must evolve along with it.

Introduction 886 would help fix this regulatory failure, providing a path that would allow for a service that New Yorkers and small businesses want and need. One in seven households in our city have at least one dog, and there are approximately 600,000 dogs across the five boroughs. This legislation will provide those dog guardians with a safe and humane alternative to leaving dogs unattended, or to leaving them at home. This legislation also provides opportunities to support retail business owners that currently cannot allow dogs into their stores. Rather than turning customers away, retail businesses – many of which we know are struggling in New York City, as we've seen with so many empty storefronts – will be able to give pet owners a safe and convenient option in their neighborhood, thereby encouraging them patronize local businesses rather than walk away for lack of options for their pet.

Lastly, this bill will send a message to other entrepreneurs that will echo for years to come: when you take the time to work with government, government can work with you as well. My business is just one that will be impacted by this bill. Other entrepreneurs who leverage new

technology to solve today's urban challenges are watching, waiting to see if New York City's governing bodies are welcoming to innovative problem solving.

I strongly urge the Council to support Intro. 886, legislation that supports New Yorkers like me and the small businesses that New Yorkers love. The Council has an opportunity to encourage the City to adapt and allow for services and innovative solutions that will make life and business in New York City better, and I hope the Council seizes it. I'd like to thank Councilmember Espinal for his leadership, and I thank Chair Rodriguez and the entire Committee again for allowing me to speak. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.



---

**Testimony of Kendra Hems  
President  
Trucking Association of New York**

*Before the*

**New York City Council  
Committee on Transportation**

*Regarding*

**Parking Regulations in New York City**

Good Morning. My name is Kendra Hems and I serve as the President of the Trucking Association of New York. I would like to thank Chairman Rodriguez and all the members of the committee for the opportunity to testify before you today. For over 85 years, the Trucking Association of New York, a non-profit trade group, has represented the trucking industry in New York, advocating for the industry at the local, state and federal levels. We provide educational programs to our membership, which enhance their safety and maintenance efforts and offer numerous councils and committees to meet the diverse needs of our membership. TANY comprises over 600 member companies from New York, Canada, every border state, and other states across the country and is the exclusive New York affiliate of the American Trucking Associations (ATA).

There are several bills being heard today but I'd like to focus on Int. 1010, Int. 1011, and Int. 1140. While it is necessary and important for drivers to take federally-mandated rest periods, we do not condone drivers parking their vehicles on residential streets for multiple days. TANY has proposed some language to Int. 1011, which we have included in this testimony, clarifying that trucks show proof such as a bill of lading that proves they are actively engaged in business and should not be issued a fine. Many of our members need to unload large amounts of freight and other cargo from their trucks, which in some cases could exceed the proposed 90-minute time limit. It is also common that drivers may arrive at a location earlier than expected and before the business is open to receive deliveries and should not be fined for this standard business practice. Furthermore, TANY believes there may be inadequate signage concerning commercial vehicle parking in some areas of the city and would require a deeper review of the current signage before TANY is willing to consider the increase in fines as stated in Int. 1010.

With regard to Int. 1140, TANY has been supportive of the concept and practice of off-hour deliveries to the extent that customers can accept them. Many businesses do not have dedicated staff to accept deliveries at off hours. Recently, DOT Commissioner Polly Trottenberg pointed out that a supermarket on the Upper West Side is actually prohibited by their lease from receiving off-hour deliveries. Int. 1140 recognizes that the City of New York is a large consumer in the city and requiring them to implement an off-hour delivery program in city-owned building sets an important example for other consumers.

TANY also supports Int. 570 and tentatively supports Int. 867, which would review street widths though we would like further clarification on the intent of the bill and are happy to meet with Council Member Adams and her staff to discuss the bill further.

We look forward to continuing to work with the City Council to conduct outreach and educate our members on current parking regulations and prevent future abuse.

Thank you for your time and I'm happy to answer any questions.

---

**TRUCKING ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK**

7 Corporate Drive • Clifton Park, NY 12065 • (518) 458-9696 • (518) 458-2525 fax • [www.nytrucks.org](http://www.nytrucks.org)

## New York City Administrative Code

Intro's 1010 & 1011 amend the same section of the NYC Administrative Code. 1010 will increase penalties for violation of this section and 1011 will reduce parking limit from three hours to 90 minutes. CM Miller's amendments are highlighted in green and red below. TANY suggested language appears in blue.

§ 19-170 Limitation on parking of commercial vehicles. a. When parking is not otherwise restricted, no person shall park a commercial vehicle in excess of three hours, except that if the commercial vehicle is a tractor-trailer combination, tractor, truck trailer or semi-trailer, no person shall park such vehicle in excess of 90 minutes, unless actively engaged in business. For purposes of this section, the term commercial vehicle shall mean a motor vehicle designed, maintained, or used primarily for the transportation of property.

b. Notwithstanding the foregoing, no person shall park a commercial vehicle on a residential street from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m. For the purpose of this subdivision, residential streets are defined as those streets, or parts thereof, which are located within a residential district under the zoning resolution. Where a commercial vehicle is parked in violation of this subdivision, it shall be an affirmative defense to said violation, with the burden of proof on the person who received the summons, that he or she was actively engaged in business, or staged to conduct business, at the time the summons was issued at a premises located within three city blocks of where the summons was issued. Burden of proof shall include, but not be limited to, a bill of lading that indicates the location at which the business was conducted, documentation indicating the driver was on duty but not driving, or other such documents to prove the drive was engaged in business. This subdivision shall not apply to vehicles owned or operated by gas or oil heat suppliers or gas or oil heat systems maintenance companies, the agents or employees, thereof, or any public utility.

c. 1. Except as otherwise provided in paragraph two of this subdivision, a violation of this section shall be punishable by the monetary fine authorized for violation of the rules and regulations of the commissioner in paragraph one of subdivision a of section twenty nine hundred and three of the New York City Charter.

2. A first violation of this section, when the commercial vehicle is a tractor-trailer combination, tractor, truck trailer or semi-trailer, shall be punishable by a monetary fine of [two hundred fifty dollars] \$400. Any such subsequent violation of this section by the same owner, as defined in paragraph a of subdivision one of section two hundred thirty-nine of the vehicle and traffic law, within a six month period shall be punishable by a monetary fine of [five hundred dollars] \$800.

d. Any commercial vehicle parked in violation of subdivision a or b of this section shall be subject to impoundment by the department. Any motor vehicle impounded pursuant to the provisions of this subdivision shall not be released until all applicable towing and storage fees have been paid. The commissioner shall be authorized to promulgate regulations concerning the procedure for the impoundment of vehicles.

e. The sanctions and fees provided for in this section shall be in addition to any other sanctions, fees or remedies provided by law or

regulation.

**TESTIMONY OF NEW YORK STATE SENATOR LEROY COMRIE BEFORE THE  
NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL | COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION  
OCTOBER 29<sup>TH</sup>, 2018**

Good Morning, Chair Rodriguez and members of the Committee on Transportation; I wholeheartedly commend you for taking up one of the most essential quality of life issues in our City—parking and the regulations that govern it.

Some people may think we have too many parking restrictions and regulations already on the books; however, for the hardworking families of my Borough of Queens who have some of the longest commute times in the nation, when they come home to find tractor-trailers, or commercial vehicles, or school buses taking up whole blocks of public parking—and they can't effectively or safely drop off their children, or bring in groceries, or get inside on a cold evening—we know that no matter how many regulations we have in place—they are not working to effectively benefit our constituents.

The truth of the matter is that under the current parking regulation structure commercial vehicles have little to no disincentive to blatantly disregard the law and park wherever they like, in particular they have been queueing up like convoys on every available space throughout our neighborhoods, especially by our school and parks. They stay well past the legal 3 hour limit, most stay overnight, some set up shop for days on end.

In addition to reducing the overall stock of scarce parking spaces for our hardworking residents who often have to own cars because the MTA has underfunded public transportation in Queens since its very inception, these commercial vehicles often idle their engines, and fill the neighborhood with harmful emissions.

The situation is not only frustrating but it is a bread and butter quality of life issue that has real world public health impacts. I'm heartened the Council is seeking to address it.

I'm here specifically to testify in the strongest possible support of two Introductions on the agenda by my great colleague, friend and champion of our Southeast Queens constituents—I. Daneek Miller. Council Member Miller has wisely sponsored two pieces of legislation (both of which impressively enjoy the co-sponsorship of 32 colleagues)—known collectively as the Commercial Truck Abuse Act—that seek to get at the heart of the problem of commercial vehicles clogging our streets.

- ❖ Introduction 1010 would increase the fines on commercial vehicles that park overnight on a residential street—a first violation would now be \$400, and subsequent violations within a six-month period are raised to \$800. These figures represent a near-doubling of existing fines and send a message that violators would be foolish to add fines to their cost of doing business.
- ❖ Introduction 1011 would halve the amount of time that commercial vehicles are allowed to park on residential streets from three hours to 90 minutes. This is time sufficient to conduct business but to also sends a strong message that residential streets are off limits to parking and idling unrelated to the delivery and transportation of goods.

I commend and congratulate Council Member Miller for his tenacious work on this issue and I pledge to him that I will continue to work tirelessly to pass companion bills that I carry in the New York State Senate—Senate Bill 5465 (Comrie) | Assembly Bill 8363 (Vanel) which closely mirrors Intro 1010 and Senate Bill 8429 (Comrie) which would punish commercial vehicles that intentionally remove identification makers, such as registration stickers, license plates, and VIN numbers in order to attempt to evade ticketing for underlying offenses, such as illegal parking.

Conclusively, I urge the Committee and the entire Council to move swiftly to pass Intros 1010 and 1011 and to send the strongest possible message to commercial vehicles that they can no longer abuse our communities with their unwanted, harmful and illegal presence.

Thank You.



# ADDISLEIGH PARK CIVIC ORGANIZATION

Addisleigh Park Civic Organization P.O. Box 120023 St. Albans, NY 11412

Tel. (516) 939-8717 or email: [info@AddisleighParkCivic.org](mailto:info@AddisleighParkCivic.org)

October 26, 2018

Good Morning Chairman and Committee Members. I am Sandra Tullock, Chair of Traffic and Safety, Addisleigh Park Civic Organization. I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to present this written testimony regarding Councilman Miller's two "Commercial Truck Act" 1010 & 1011 which I fully support.

Before I give my testimony, I would like to provide you with a brief history about Addisleigh Park Civic Organization, (APCO) and the residents of Addisleigh Park Community. Perhaps after reading this you will begin to understand why the homeowners of this community are so passionate, protective, and proud of our small historic neighborhood.

***The mission of the Addisleigh Park Civic Organization is to engage in or support activity that: 1) encourages the greatest sense of community among its residents; and 2) serves to protect the value of homes in this historically unique neighborhood.***

***The Addisleigh Park Civic Organization strongly advocates for the home owners in this triangular shaped Queens area surrounded by Sayres Avenue on the north, 180<sup>th</sup> Street on the east, Linden Boulevard on the south and Marne Place on the west.***

Through the consistent and persistent advocacy of APCO'S past and current leadership, in 2011 Addisleigh Park was granted Historic designation. APCO's executive leadership and general members attribute this monumental fate to its famous jazz musician of yesteryear such as Ella Fitzgerald, Count Basie, Brook Benton, John Coltrane, Lean Horne, Illinois Jacquet, and Fats Waller. Sports figures Roy Campanella, Joe Louis and Babe Ruth. Author, activist and educator, W.E.B. Du Bois, Roy Wilkins, NAACP Head, Civil Rights activist, and Percy Sutton, Black Political Leader, all who once called this community their home.

Since the mid-nineties to the present, this community has witnessed 18-wheel Municipal Waste Trucks, commercial and semi- trailer trucks, park from Friday evenings to Monday mornings throughout our neighborhoods. There are incidences where they have parked at the dead end on 180 and Sayres Avenue for weeks on end. When they do finally leave the location, they leave behind discarded tires and other garbage. In the summer, because of the unpleasant stench emanating from these trucks, we are forced to keep the windows in our homes closed. Needless to say, this creates a health hazard for

our seniors and family members who suffer from various respiratory illness and allergy conditions. Upon closer inspection, often time my neighbors and I have seen liquid substance dripping from trucks' crevices.

On early Sunday mornings at the dead end at 180<sup>th</sup> Street and Sayres Avenue and on 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue between 179<sup>th</sup> Place and 180<sup>th</sup> Street is where a van will drive up and power hose wash the Municipal Waste Trucks parked at these locations from top to bottom. Additionally, at this same location, another truck with a two-man crew, will perform tire and mechanical repairs. This includes tire changing and servicing of the engine. This loud drilling and banging generally occurs after 10PM weeknights or before 7AM on weekends. When they are through servicing these vehicles, they leave behind dozens of old and worn tires haphazardly left either on the sidewalk on 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue or 180<sup>th</sup> Street and or at the dead end on Sayres Avenue.

Increasing parking fines and reducing the time these 18-wheel commercial trucks and semi-trailer trucks can park, will alleviate the adverse impact these trucks have on our community and environment.

Thank you.

Sandra Tullock  
Chair Traffic and Safety  
Addisleigh Park Civic Organization  
917.783.2345

October 29, 2018

Good morning Chairman Rodriguez. Thank you to all of the Committee Members for holding today's hearing on Intro 886.

My name is Allie Feldman Taylor and I'm the president and founder of Voters For Animal Rights. I am speaking to today in my capacity as a professional dog walker and volunteer animal rescuer in Bedford-Stuyvesant and Bushwick, Brooklyn.

I urge the Committee to support Intro 886 which would allow pet harbors to be placed on public sidewalks of commercial establishments in New York City. Having met with the founders of DogSpot and thoroughly evaluated the pet harbor, I believe that they have done an excellent job of addressing the safety and behavioral needs of urban pets and their caretakers. I also spoke at length with my dog walking clients who are also in support of the pet harbors.

Pet harbors are a win-win for New York City's dogs, pet guardians, animal rescuers, and local businesses. The availability of safe, convenient, affordable care for dogs makes it easier for New Yorkers considering adoption to make the decision to welcome a pet into their family – and keep them permanently. Decreasing barriers to adoption is one of the best ways to help more homeless animals find their forever homes.

Additionally, every year numerous dogs are stolen by well-intentioned pet parents who stop into a store for just a minute. Pet harbors would provide a secure alternative to tying up a dog and leaving them unattended.

Over the years, our city has evolved to become more accommodating to growing families with children, and now, as dogs become a part of an increasing number of New York City families, too, we are seeing our city policies change, with more dog-friendly restaurants, bars, and transportation options. I believe that pet harbors would positively broaden our city's pet services, and urge the passing of Intro 886.

Respectfully,

Allie Feldman Taylor  
786 Jefferson Ave  
Brooklyn, NY 11221



## Humane Society of New York

ANIMAL CLINIC / VLADIMIR HOROWITZ AND WANDA TOSCANINI HOROWITZ ADOPTION CENTER  
306 East 59th Street, NYC 10022 / tel: (212) 752-4842 fax: (212) 752-2803

### **OPPOSITION TO INT. 886**

The Humane Society of New York opposes Int. 886 which would allow pet harbors to be placed on sidewalks in front of commercial establishments. Our pets are sentient beings and should not be left unattended in structures in front of commercial establishments. They should also not be tied up and unattended in front of such establishments, a practice which should violate leash laws and jeopardizes the animals and the public.

Pets in "pet harbors" can easily become very anxious and stressed. They could become ill. They can also be taunted. While such enclosures would presumably have ventilation and temperature controls, what if such controls fail? What if pet guardians leave their animals for extended periods of time? Even though there might be systems in place for pet guardians to monitor their pets and to be contacted, there is no assurance that the pets will be attended to in a timely manner.

We appreciate that people enjoy sharing their day with their pets and we encourage that. However, when pet guardians do errands, go to the gym, a coffee shop, or elsewhere where animals are not allowed, arrangements should be made which consider the best interests of their animals, such as leaving their animals home or in a pet care facility where the animals will be properly monitored. Simply put, animals deserve better than being placed on our sidewalks in large containers ("harbors") or being left tied up unattended.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elinor Molbegott, Esq.  
Legal Counsel/Animal Issues  
Humane Society of New York  
Direct #: 516-746-6505  
[elinorm328@aol.com](mailto:elinorm328@aol.com)

10-18

ESTABLISHED 1904

Supported by: Private & corporate contributions • Foundations • Benefits • Bequests  
Matching gifts • Non-cash contributions • Workplace giving campaigns

ALL CONTRIBUTIONS AND GIFTS ARE TAX DEDUCTIBLE

Website: [www.HumaneSocietyNY.org](http://www.HumaneSocietyNY.org)

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. \_\_\_\_\_ Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Edward Grayson

Address: Director, Bureau of Cleaning & Collection

I represent: Dept. of Sanitation

Address: 125 Worth St, NY NY 10013

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. \_\_\_\_\_ Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Rebecca Zack

Address: Ass. Commissioner

I represent: Inter governmental / Comm Affairs

Address: NYC DOT

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. \_\_\_\_\_ Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Josh Benson

Address: Dep. Comm for Traffic Operations

I represent: NYC DOT

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. \_\_\_\_\_ Res. No. 1140

in favor  in opposition

Date: 10-29-2018

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Jack Davos

Address: 111 John St - NY, NY

I represent: Transportation Alternatives

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 1011, 1010 Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: 10/29/2018

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Clyde Vanel

Address: 97-01 Springfield Blvd, Queens Village, NY

I represent: District 33

Address: Same

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 886 Res. No. ~~1011~~

in favor  in opposition

Date: 10/29

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Kelly Hodges on behalf of Allie Taylor

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

I represent: Voters for Animal Rights

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 886 Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Sandy McCallion

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

I represent: Dog Owner

Address: 157 Midwood, Brooklyn

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 886 Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Betsy Sargisson

Address: 49 8th Ave Park Ave

I represent: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 886 Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: 10/29

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Chelsea Brownridge

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

I represent: Dog Spot

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 1011 Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: 10/29/18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: ZACH MILLER

Address: 7 CORPORATE DRIVE, CLIFTON PARK, NY

I represent: TRUCKING ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK 12065

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. \_\_\_\_\_ Res. No. 1010

in favor  in opposition

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: BRUCE KRAFT

Address: 244-40 HURACE HARDING EXP

I represent: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Please complete this card and return to the Sergeant-at-Arms