CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

----X

May 21, 2010 Start: 2:42 pm Recess: 5:15 pm

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

JAMES VACCA Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Daniel R. Garodnick Vincent M. Ignizio

Peter A. Koo

G. Oliver Koppell Ydanis A. Rodriguez

Deborah L. Rose Eric A. Ulrich

A P P E A R A N C E S [CONTINUED]

James Vacca Opening Statement Chairperson Committee on Transportation

Philip Hom Counsel Committee on Transportation

Nevara Lopez Staff Analyst Committee on Transportation

David Yassky Chairperson New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission

Charles Fraser General Counsel New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission

Nick Economou Sergeant at Arms Committee on Transportation

Peter Mazer General Counsel Metropolitan Taxicab Board of Trade

Stephen Belatowitz League of Mutual Taxi Owners

David Pollack Executive Director Committee for Taxi Safety

Bhairavi Desai Executive Director New York Taxi Workers Alliance

A P P E A R A N C E S [CONTINUED]

Bill Lindauer Campaigns Coordinator New York Taxi Workers Alliance

Beresford Simmons DOV driver New York Taxi Workers Alliance

Biju Mathew New York Taxi Workers Alliance Author Taxi! Cabs and Capitalism in New York City

Ethan Gerber Greater New York Taxi Association

Guy Palumbo Secretary Livery Roundtable

Richard Thaler President Omni Media Networks

Called but did not testify: Edith Prentiss

2	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I'll call the
3	meeting to order. My name is James Vacca. And
4	I'm Chairperson of the Committee on
5	Transportation. I'd like to welcome you all here
6	today. And today we will examine four bills that
7	I've introduced and one bill that I've introduced
8	at the request of the Mayor. And these bills
9	arose from Oversight hearings that my Committee
10	held regarding alleged taxi driver overcharging.
11	We held that meeting on April 7 th
12	and we will also be addressing through proposed
13	legislation, allegations that some taxicab drivers
14	were not using Easy Pass lanes at the City's
15	crossings, often costing passengers money and
16	time.
17	The five bills are Intro number 232
18	which would amend the Taxicab Rider's Bill of
19	Rights to inform passengers of their right to a
20	taxicab with a working Easy Pass and payment of
21	tolls with such pass.
22	Intro number 233 which would amend
23	the City Charter to require that the TLC report on

Intro number 233 which would amend the City Charter to require that the TLC report on complaints and enforcement actions and to post this information on its website monthly.

Intro number 234 which would amend the City Charter to require a member of the Taxi and Limousine Commission be a licensed driver or retired driver.

Intro number 234 which would require certain information be collected by taxicab equipment, via taxicab equipment and shared with the TLC and drivers upon request.

Intro number 236, a bill that is introduced by the request of the Mayor, which would require fees of up to \$50, be charged for each taxicab inspection and reinspection, thereby reducing the number of total inspections and reducing costs borne by the City of New York.

The common theme to all the bills

I've introduced is to increase transparency and to

protect riders from scams anywhere near the

magnitude of what we've just experienced. Whether

we're requiring better reporting of complaints and

enforcement actions or requiring vendors to

collect and share data on rate information or

adding a line to the Taxicab Bill of Rights

regarding Easy Pass rules, we're trying to create

a system where a few bad drivers don't spoil it

2.0

2.3

for the bunch. And where both the TLC and the
public have a right to know when numbers don't add
up.

Make no mistake, if we want to restore people's faith in the taxi industry we need to act. We have a situation where according to the TLC's latest report, taxi passengers in this City got swindled out of more than \$1 million. We have a situation where--

SERGEANT AT ARMS: [Interposing]
Quiet please.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: We have a situation where 1,000 drivers will soon be stripped of their licenses. It is clear that TLC did not have the tools it needed to detect this scam or to quickly find out who was scamming whom, how much they were scamming and how often.

These bills seek to eliminate blind spots in our taxi oversight. During the hearing of the Committee on April 7th, TLC revealed, a, that it does not record how many rate code complaints come in each month, b, that some vendors never collected rate code information, c, that some vendors did collect information but

2.0

2.3

refused to share that information with TLC, d,
that in many cases TLC had to use guesswork to
determine which drivers intentionally overcharged
and which didn't.

I understand that the

Administration has objections to some of my bills and I'm open to suggestions. I'm willing to work with Chairman Yassky and the Administration to make these bills as effective as possible. But I do want you to know that I'm determined to do a better job. I'm determined to see that a package of legislative reforms passes the Council. And I think that these legislative reforms are important and will move the TLC into a new era of reform and transparency.

I want to assure that we have a taxi network that's efficient, safe and more important, reliable. So I thank you all for coming. I'd like to introduce the members of the Committee that are here today. To my extreme right, Council Member Vinnie Ignizio, my extreme right, Ignizio, you're right.

[Laughter]

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Very good Eric.

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

2	Very good Eric. To his left is Council Member Dan
3	Garodnick. In the middle of Dan and Phil Hom is
4	Eric Ulrich from Queens. Phil Hom our Counsel to
5	the Committee. To my left, Nevara [phonetic]
6	Lopez and Staff Analyst to the Committee. Council
7	Member Peter Koo from Queens, my colleague; and
8	next to him Council Member Ydanis Rodriguez of
9	Manhattan.

Okay I'd like to call up Commissioner Yassky and anyone you have from your delegation.

[Pause]

MR. DAVID YASSKY: Good afternoon Chairman Vacca and members of the Transportation Committee. My name is David Yassky. And I'm the Chairperson of the New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission. I'm joined today by Charles Fraser, General Counsel of the TLC. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to you today regarding Intro numbers 232, 233, 234, 235, and 236.

Intro number 232 proposes to amend the Passenger Bill of Rights to include a requirement that each taxicab be equipped with an

operational Easy Pass as well as the payment of tolls with the Easy Pass, are both mandates that are currently set forth in TLC rules. As an agency that licenses and regulates 50,000 vehicles and approximately 100,000 drivers, it is important that our drivers understand our rules, requirements and expectations and even more so that passengers understand their rights as consumers to enjoy a safe, courteous and reliable service.

To this end we believe that a clearly stated and informative Passenger Bill of Rights is an important tool. We have maintained a Passenger Bill of Rights in the yellow taxis for several years because we rely on passenger feedback to ensure that drivers provide the best possible service. This proposal, Mr. Chair, your proposal that the Bill of Rights be amended to include the Easy Pass information is an excellent one. We have already added that to our Bill of Rights but there's no reason not to have it formally required as you have proposed to do.

In this case, even more so than many others, an informed passenger is really our

best defense. If passengers know that they are entitled to go through the Easy Pass lane, I think that will make sure that, you know, they can monitor driver compliance a lot better than we can. So in short we support Introduction number 232.

Introductory number 233 involving the display of complaint and enforcement statistics on the TLC website: we do not currently list complaint and enforcement statistics on our website but we do agree with the Council that this is important information that should be made available to the public. When passengers report violations of our rules, they do so by calling 311 or filing a complaint on the City website. We then internally compile and analyze complaints based on data received from 311 and in many cases those complaints lead to enforcement actions.

We also compile data based on our field enforcement and the summonses issued by our inspectors. We have some operational concerns with how, you know, what is both the most informative for the public and the best way for us internally to report our data. So we would like

2.0

to work with you Mr. Chairman on the drafting of the specific requirements. But the principle that enforcement and complaint statistics should be up on the website when you said in your opening statement transparency, that's what this is. We agree with that principle. We would like to work with you on the drafting but in principle agree with what you're trying to accomplish.

Intro 234, this would amend the Charter to require a licensed or retired driver on the TLC Board of Commissioners. This one, unlike the first two and the next one, here there are some significant concerns. And I don't think that we're going to be able to agree with you on this bill. We believe that the concerns and interests of the more than 100,000 drivers we license are important. Without question they are.

And we try to work very closely with the industry to make sure that their needs are met, the needs of drivers. TLC licensed drivers provide outstanding service to millions of New Yorkers and tourists and many have years, in some cases even decades, of experience that can help guide the TLC in developing sensible rules

2.0

2.3

and regulations. All of those are good reasons to draw on the drivers for input.

However the Law Department believes that this legislation would be a curtailment of the Mayor's Charter mandated authority and thus would require a public referendum. That's a legal concern about the bill. Beyond that there is a policy concern which is that having a current driver on the TLC, on the Commission itself, would present numerous conflicts of interest in the course of the Commission's work. We do not think that requiring a licensed driver or retired driver is a good approach to ensuring that drivers' views are represented but I say again we do value the drivers' input.

We will therefore take steps to utilize existing Advisory Boards composed of stakeholders in our regulated industries. Indeed Mr. Chairman, this is something that I hope that you and the other Committee members can help us with. There are a few Council mandated Advisory Boards that need to be staffed.

And I would like to work with you and your members as we populate those Advisory

2.0

Boards. I think that's a more appropriate way to ensure input, not just from drivers but from other segments of the industry as well, particularly given, as I say, the inevitable conflict of interest that arises if an active driver were to vote on TLC rule changes.

Turning now to Intro number 235; that legislation would impose data sharing requirements on the TPEP vendors so that licensed taxicab drivers in the TLC can always access trip sheet data including the fare amount and the rate code used. You don't need me to tell you but Mr. Chair and Committee members but just for members of the public of course the TPEP acronym refers to the device that's in every taxicab that not only tracks trip sheet information, you know, the location and time of each trip and the fare charged and now the rate charged, the rate code as well, but also operates the passenger screens in back.

The TPEP system has been a remarkable success for the taxi industry. Today's New York Times, if you look on page A-9, I happened to notice, has a full page ad by VISA

2.0

2.3

saying, boasting about how introducing credit card usage into the taxis has made it much more convenient for passengers and they say in the ad more profitable for drivers.

So we believe the TPEP system has been a remarkable success for the taxi industry and for all those who rely on the vital transportation services that yellow cabs provide, particularly in the central business districts of Manhattan. The technology allows passengers the option of paying for their ride with a credit card and it's very important to us that we also now have access to valuable data that helps us understand the industry and helps inform our policies and rule requirements.

Currently all three TPEP vendors provide the TLC with the rate code used on all trips. All three vendors are required by current contract to make trip sheet available to every licensed taxicab in the TLC. Drivers can access their trip sheet data through one of the three vendors' web portals at any time of the day. There is no limitation to the number of times a driver can access this information.

So all that is to say that we
support the intent of the legislation. In its
current draft however, we believe it places undue
restrictions on the TLC's ability to negotiate and
work with the vendors to create a system that
meets the needs of the industry and the consumer.

We have drafted language that we believe will be

more effective at gathering important information and allowing for needed transparency of information and data.

In short, again, Mr. Chair, like with the second bill, we certainly share your belief that the data collected by the TPEP system must be accessible, you know, continually, to the TLC and needs to be accessible to drivers as well. We would like to make sure that whatever legislative, you know, requirements there are for our contracts with the vendors are drafted to give us the flexibility to craft practical solutions to the data transferring problems that we, you know, that we encounter. So we would like to work with you on that, on the drafting, but on the thrust of the bill I think we're in agreement.

Finally I would like to discuss

2.0

Intro number 236, this as you said Mr. Chairman, you have introduced at the behest of Mayor Bloomberg and the Administration. This would authorize the Taxi and Limousine Commission to charge up to \$50 for each taxicab inspection.

Since the early 1990s and just as you know taxis are required to be inspected 3 times a year, every 4 months by the TLC. They all come; all the yellow taxis come to our inspection facility, our state of the art inspection facility at Woodside every 4 months. That's the way that we ensure that the vehicles are in tip-top shape to be offered out to the public.

We charge for those inspections as follows: since the early 1990s the TLC has charged \$50 to conduct a first inspection for yellow cabs. That fee is authorized under the Administrative Code, Section 19-504. If a vehicle fails the first inspection, the second inspection is offered at no additional charge. If the vehicle fails that second inspection then the owner is charged \$35 for the third inspection but all subsequent inspections are again performed at no charge. So we charge for the first and the third but not the

2.0

second and not anything after the third.

Now we have seen vehicles come in for more than 3 inspections numerous times, as many as 13 inspections. I guess that's the world's record before passage or before giving out—in fact there's a high failure rate of these vehicles upon first inspection, more than 40% of the medallion cabs fail their first inspection.

We are therefore proposing legislation that would authorize a fee of up to \$50 for all inspections and re-inspections.

If this legislation were enacted it would incentivize vehicle owners to maintain their vehicles at a higher standard of maintenance. It would free up appointments for other services, for other vehicles and reduce wait times for scheduling inspections.

In addition we are planning to pass TLC rules to charge fees for multiple--that's the inspections. Also this does not require legislation but I just wanted to make sure you know this, that we are also planning to charge fees for multiple transfers of for-hire vehicles. This has to do with the TLC processing of

applications by livery cars, car service vehicles,their applications to affiliate with a base.

Right now it's our practice if somebody wants to have 25 or 30 vehicles processed, we'll simply process them 1 single fee even though each one of those applications requires the same amount of clerical time by TLC employees. Going forward we are going to pass a rule that will charge the same \$25 fee for each vehicle that is processed by TLC.

That's not related or that's not covered by your legislation but it's kind of similar effort by the TLC where we noticed that there's a service being provided that we are currently not charging for. We want to make sure that the costs of our operation are spread fairly and appropriately.

So back on the inspections' side, I would like to certainly invite you Mr. Chair and any members of the Committee who are interested to come and visit our facility in Woodside to see the inspections and how the facility works. I think that you would see the folks at Woodside do a very good job making sure the vehicles are in good

2.0

2.3

2	condit	tion to	transpo	ort the	public	and,	you	know,
3	of cou	ırse th	at costs	money	to do.			

This concludes my testimony. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today on this proposed legislation. I'm happy to answer any questions that you have.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you

Chairman Yassky. I'd like to acknowledge the

arrival of Council Member Koppell, Council Member

Nelson and Council Member Lappin.

I did want to go into Intro 235
where I know the Administration has concerns as
per your testimony. You indicate that Intro 235
could place undue restrictions on the TLC's
ability to negotiate and work with vendors. My
feeling is that if 235 was in place we may not
have had the scandal that we just experienced.

Matt Daus, your predecessor, in his testimony of April 6th, stated that the TLC had no access to the Rate 4 data under the contracts that existed because Rate 4 did not exist when the original contract was in place. What I want is this information legislatively to be required to be collected.

2	Now this legislation would require
3	that the taxicab equipment shall record and store
4	all data including the fare rate used and any
5	other information required by the TLC. In the
6	hearing of April 6 th , Matt Douse testified that
7	when he originally asked for data from the
8	vendors, he or TLC was denied access and had no
9	access specifically to Rate 4 and time stamped
10	data. Is that, do you wish to dispute that? I
11	thought you were taking the microphone. Is that
12	?
13	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] No but
14	I'd like to
15	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]
16	Were you there with him April 6 th ? You were there
17	April 6 th , right?
18	MR. YASSKY: I wasn't
19	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]
20	You weren't in office yet.
21	MR. YASSKY:I want to respond to
22	your question but I didn't mean to
23	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Oh, go ahead,
24	no. Do you want to say something first?
25	MR. YASSKY: Well simply that

2.0

2.3

you	're	ri	lght.]	Let	me,	you	know,	please,	Ι	hope
VOU	wil	1	take	a	ves	for	an -	answer	here		

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Oh we will.

[Chuckling]

MR. YASSKY: We... here's the concern in a nutshell. It's we simply want to make clear this is not a limitation on our ability to get data from the TPEP vendors. In other words we want to make sure that we have... that as we think of information that we need to get at the TLC that may not be covered in the initial contract or in this legislation that we can provide for that. The short answer is you are right that all the data that's collected on rate fares, you know, all the trip data that's currently collected, we absolutely ought to have access to.

And we welcome your effort to provide that legislatively. We want to make sure that we can go beyond that, to other non-trip sheet data as necessary. You know, information about the drivers, perhaps information about how passengers pay but without, you know, without limiting. We have access to other data as well. I think those are really drafting changes and not

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: You would want

24

25

it under every situation.

2.0

2	MR.	YASSKY:	Yes

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: All right. So now if the data is out there that would stop riders from getting scammed and the TLC does not now require that it be collected, all right, how is my bill something that you... I get from you that you don't disagree with my bill-
MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] No and

MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] No and I--what I really realized--

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]

You just don't want to be required to do it but my concern is that we did give TLC over the year by not having this legislation, we did give you latitude and the latitude that TLC was given resulted in a lax type of policy that resulted in fraud.

MR. YASSKY: So just, again, to be clear. I think my statement was not clear. We like the bill. We think that with some minor drafting changes the Administration can support the bill. So for example where you speak of, you know, 7 days—after a written request of 7 days, we just want to be clear that we don't have to wait 7 days. If it's indeed technologically

possible and, you know, not unduly burdensome for us to request information and get it immediately, that we can get it that way. Do you see what I'm saying?

We just want to make sure that we can... that your kind of floor on what the vendors have to do in terms of providing information is not interpreted as a ceiling. I don't think that's your intent. I'm sure it's not. I'm sure it's not. So that's why, as I say, those are really in the nature of minor drafting changes. On the substance we are in agreement and I think we'll be able to move forward on this.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: My other concern in one of the bills was regarding having a TLC, a taxi driver or a retired taxi driver on the TLC board. And I realize you have concerns about legislation. And Commissioner, again, since you've been at TLC I know you've made significant changes. But I have to tell you, you alluded to Advisory Boards that exist. But I cannot find any record of when they last met.

MR. YASSKY: They haven't.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: These Advisory

2	Boards are prescribed by law not by policy and I
3	cannot find any record of any of the boards
4	meeting. Who's on the boards or do they exist at
5	all
6	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] It is
7	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:and whyhow
8	did it happen all these years that no one's on
9	them even though the law requires it?
10	MR. YASSKY: It's time to
11	constitute them. You know, absolutely. And
12	that's whyas I say I would like to work with you
13	and the members of your Committee in making sure
14	that those are functional and functioning bodies.
15	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: And we need,
16	Commissioner, a mechanism from you to make sure
17	that they don't fall into this abyss again. They
18	were there for a purpose and I don't know what
19	happened years ago. And again those Advisory
20	Boards, Advisory Board minutes should be on the
21	internet, public. And I want people to know that
22	there is a place for them to go even if they are
23	advisory. But there are no records of any
24	meetings at all.
25	MR. YASSKY: We definitely need to

on that. And beyond that, you know, I think we, when you just now speak of a place for people to go with input, I think there is a lot of opportunity for us to get more feedback from the driver community, also from the passengers, you know, both on the yellow taxis and livery side, you know, there are a lot of folks who are stakeholders in the system who aren't industry members but who are passengers. And we want to make sure that their concerns are being heard by the TLC.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I do want to go to my colleagues in a minute but I did want to touch on these scandals and the status of the scandal. And I know you've taken quick and decisive action. But I do have some questions.

Was Mr. Chima [phonetic] the person who allegedly overcharged more than 1,000 times, was that the worst offender or where there people worse than him that you found as a result of your investigation?

MR. YASSKY: There are drivers with... who overcharged more passengers or at least

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 2
2	where we identified more overcharges than Mr.
3	Chima.
4	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: So there are
5	not passenger
6	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] Drivers
7	not passengers
8	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:there are
9	drivers, sorry
LO	MR. YASSKY:there are drivers
11	who
12	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]
L3	Charged more than 1,000 times
L4	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] Yes.
L5	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:overcharged.
L6	MR. YASSKY: Who overcharged more
L7	than 1,000 times and more than the number of
18	overcharges we found from Mr. Chima. Yes.
L9	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Is there an
20	approximate number of drivers that fall into that
21	category?
22	MR. YASSKY: I can certainly get
23	that to you and, you know, get that to you in a
24	speedy way, even if you're looking to have that
25	today.

2	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Are we talking
3	more than 20, more than 30?
4	MR. YASSKY: There were I believe
5	there were in the neighborhood of 40 drivers who
6	we, where we identified 1,000 or more overcharges.
7	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: The drivers in
8	those cases, I know you will seek revocation of
9	licenses but in those cases are you seeking
10	criminal action?
11	MR. YASSKY: Well we are not, as
12	you know, criminally prosecuting body. The
13	Department of Investigation and the Manhattan
14	District Attorney have, you know, the, cliché
15	phrase, ongoing investigation.
16	But I believe that they are
17	actively looking at these cases and you know, I
18	know that they are working because I know that
19	they've spoken to people in the industry and are
20	collecting evidence. And I, you know, I'm
21	expecting to see a decision by them at some point
22	in the not too distant future as to whether and
23	how many criminal prosecutions to initiate.
24	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Commissioner,
25	you stated in the report you issued to the public

2.0

2.3

2	you stated that a driver who committed up to 49
3	overcharges will have the option to surrender
4	their TLC license or face significant fines. Does
5	this mean that a driver who committed 40
6	overcharges will just turn in their license and
7	not pay the fine or will they have to do both or
8	and my last question as a part of that set is how
9	do we collect those fines?

MR. YASSKY: Well we, this is something that maybe we can work on together; our authority to fine is limited to \$350 for the first overcharging offense and \$500 for a second overcharging offense. And we don't have authority to fine people for third and subsequent offenses. So there is an argument, it hasn't been litigated, but there is a pretty strong argument that the maximum fining authority we have, even with the case of someone who overcharged 100s if not 1,000-plus times is \$850.

So now you may say well that's a fine, that's up to the criminal, you know, let the DA kind of seek a stiffer fine than that but--

CHAIRPERSON VACCA:

[Interposing]

25 I'd say that's mind-boggling.

2.0

2.3

2	MR.	. YASSKY:	Well
4	I*IIX •	· IMOOKI•	MCTT

3 CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]

4 That's outrageous.

MR. YASSKY: Well that's, you know that is something that we could address together that would take a change in the Administrative Code and while we have not looked at that internally I certainly would be, I mean the whole Administration has not. You know, I would like to pursue that discussion with you.

So where we are certain we want to revoke people's licenses we are seeking the maximum fine of \$850 plus revocation. Where we are prepared to accept a fine and not insist on revocation, there we can, as a settlement, because all those people would be subject to revocation, we are saying to the drivers, we will settle with you for a fine instead of revocation. And in that case we can ask for a fine of X, in excess of \$850. So that's why, you know, in the case of 40 overcharges we will seek a \$4,000 fine in lieu of revocation.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I'm willing to work with you on legislation--

2.0

2	MR.	YASSKY:	[Interposing]	Great.
_	1110.	11100111		OI CAC.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: --you know, I think this is something we have to address.

MR. YASSKY: And then in terms of how we get the money, this, I think, is also there's a real need for Council legislation here. We, the TLC, as the authority to issue a fine and in the case of licensees we usually get that. We usually get the money because if they don't pay the fine, they don't get their license renewed. So for drivers or medallion owners or vehicle owners who wish to say in business, they have to pay our fine.

Where people leave the industry and we might, you know, my expectation or my guess is that you will see many people who are getting fines as a result of the overcharges, leave the industry. We have no real enforcement mechanism today to go after that fine money.

We would like authority for the Finance Department to treat that as debt against the City of New York that then they can seek garnishment of wages and all the traditional enforcement mechanisms they have for collecting

2	debt. Right now TLC debt is not treated that way.
3	And so that's something we're going to be coming
4	to the Council to ask for your help with. That
5	can be done by Council legislation by changing the
6	Administrative Code.
7	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Chairman
8	Yassky, are we saying that if you do enter into an
9	agreement with individuals who will keep their
10	license but will agree to a fine above the \$850
11	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] Yeah.
12	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:you don't
13	think
14	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] No I
15	mean in those cases I expect that we'll get the
16	money because they'll lose their license if they
17	don't.
18	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: You have that.
19	MR. YASSKY: That tool we have.
20	But where people leave altogether and are not
21	going to be drivers or who are not going to be
22	medallion owners or vehicle owners, there's a lot
23	of debt from folks like that that is sitting out
24	there. I'll get you a number and I think you'll
25	be impressed by the size of the number. It's

25

2	the reality is, you can always go and see things
3	that weren't done. It's true in my, I'm sure that
4	my successor in my last job now is finding all
5	kinds of things that were left undone there. I am
6	certain that that's
7	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]
8	I'm sure that's not true, you were a very good
9	Council Member.
10	MR. YASSKY: No, no, in all
11	seriousness. I'm sure it's the case. So the
12	issue is what do we have to do now. Absolutely,
13	this debt, this is a big number. And I am, it's
14	I'm glad you raised it. I wasn't planning to
15	raise it and it's also we have an internal
16	administration process for clearing our
17	legislation that is to be proposed to the Council.
18	We are talking within the Administration about the
19	best way to go after this bad debt. But I'm going
20	to seek your help on that.
21	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Lastly
22	Commissioner, Intro 236, I know that the
23	Administration is seeking this change and I do

want to talk to you further about this bill. But

when a driver, the first time a driver gets his

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 3
2	car inspected, my understanding is that right now
3	there is a charge but then there is not a charge
4	for subsequent inspections.
5	MR. YASSKY: Yeah. Well I wish it
6	were that simple 'cause that would
7	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing] I
8	tried to simplify it. I know it's more
9	complicated.
10	MR. YASSKY: Unfortunately,
11	confusingly, we charge for the first inspection,
12	not for the second, and then for
13	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]
14	And then the third.
15	MR. YASSKY:the third and then
16	not for the others.
17	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: And not for the
18	others. Now. Is there, when you're a cab driver
19	and you have to pass inspection, how many
20	checklist items are there? How many variables
21	must you pass?
22	MR. YASSKY: Well I don't know the
23	answer to that. [Off mic] Over 200 I'm told.
24	But here's the way to think about it. The

inspection is for 2 things. First it's just the

same as a Department of Motor Vehicle inspection for any vehicles owners on the panel, you know, every year you have to bring your car in to get inspected by a service station under the aegis of the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Part of our inspection is that
exact inspection. So yellow cabs don't have to
then come to Woodside and then go out again to a
DMV service station. They just get it done here.
Then in addition we inspect for a number of things
specific to taxicabs.

Is the meter operating properly?

We test, right, that would be the most obvious or maybe most salient thing, check to make sure the meter is operating properly. Are the seatbelts there in the back? Not just the front. You know, is the required signage there? Is the passenger screen working properly? All the things that are specific to taxicabs. So at any rate, that's the inspections, the DMV plus taxi-TLC specific.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: My concern here Commissioner is that of the 200, some of them can be relatively minor.

MR. YASSKY: Yes. And--

2	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]
3	Appeal, a sticker not beingor unpeeling, a rip
4	in linoleum
5	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] Yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:whatever you
7	call the seat. My question is do you think it's
8	fair on the second inspection to charge in light
9	of there being 200, some of them not relating to
10	safety of vehicle. Do you think it's fair on the
11	second inspection to charge? I could see
12	subsequently but I just think
13	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] We're
14	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:there being a
15	list of 200 that maybe something you want to
16	consider
17	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] We're
18	all right. I thank you for that. I will, we'll
19	I hear your suggestion. The vast bulk of
20	violations are not for cosmetic matters but are
21	for performance matters. And for what it's worth
22	we do distinguish between DMV and other safety
23	violations where the vehicle is off the road.
24	Just like with the DMV inspection
25	if they fail. And then the things that don't go

2	to safety, you know, you don't have the right
3	sticker, whatever, the seat is torn like you said,
4	where there you get what they call 10-day notice
5	which says, okay you can keep driving but you have
6	to come back and show us that you fixed it. So we
7	do recognize that distinction.
8	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: What's the most
9	time people have had, do you have a record of
10	people coming
11	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] Well I
12	told
13	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:15 times
14	MR. YASSKY:13 is the record.
15	But, you know, I'm sure I could
16	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]
17	13 is the record?
18	MR. YASSKY:break that if I
19	tried, right. I'm told 13 is the record.
20	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: And
21	Commissioner, this is anticipated to raise revenue
22	for the City of New York, I think you mentioned
23	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] It is.
24	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:around
25	\$700,000? Is that correct

2	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] Where
3	it's projects around \$600,000, \$700,000. I think
4	in all candor that it should be less than that
5	because the real goal here is to… and I'm not
6	saying people are doing anything wrong but I think
7	that the fee structure incentivizes owners to
8	treat that first inspection as kind of a
9	diagnostic. They come in. We tell them what's
10	wrong and then they go out and fix it as opposed
11	to maintain the car well throughout.
12	So the goal here is to encourage
13	continued maintenance so that the pass rate goes
14	up from 60% and there are fewer second
15	inspections. That's better use of our time and
16	keeps the cars on the road more. And if that's
17	the case then we'll raise less than that \$667,000
18	'cause there'll be fewer second inspections.
19	We'll see, you know, we'll see what the practice
20	is.
21	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: And
22	Commissioner, the inspection rate for first time
23	is 60%
24	MR. YASSKY: It's roughly [off mic]

Pass rate? [off mic] Okay. I'm told the pass

2.0

2.3

rate	is	47%	for	first	time	out.	Okay.	So I	was
wrong	a.								

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Okay. Thank
you Commissioner. I want to mention we've been
joined by Council Member Rose and I'll now call on
Council Member Garodnick.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Thank you Mr. Chairman and Commissioner. Nice to see you.

MR. YASSKY: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Let me just run through a couple of questions on a few of the bills. First one, Intro 232 sounds like we're all good on that one so I'll go right to 233.

From your testimony it sounds like you have some operational concerns about this one which is of course the requirement that TLC list complaint and enforcement statistics on the website. You noted that the reports of violations come to you via 311, NYC.GOV and your inspector's field enforcement actions. What I wanted to see if you could put a little more explanation on is the subject of what are the operational concerns that you have with the bill as it's written.

2.0

MR. YASSKY: Well. The requirement
that what we show on the website be disaggregated
by type of licensed vehicle and month such
complaint was received, we're not currentlythat
would require some internal work to, you know,
report the information in that way. Maybe that
work is worth doing but that's more specificity
than we'd like to see in this legislation

So that's our main, really, drafting proposal is to delete the language where it says "and disaggregated by type of complaint, type of licensed vehicle and month such complaint was received by the Commission and a summary of all enforcement actions".

[Pause]

MR. YASSKY: It would also take, we also want to make sure that we can use the categories that are currently in use by 311 or if those categories are going to be revised that we have a discussion about that. And we're not prepared right now to say we can commit 311 to revising the categories that they group their data into. So for example they lump all fare complaints together.

2	So if you wanted to just for, you
3	know, thinking out loud here, if you wanted to
4	take, you know, overcharging versus it took too
5	long of a route, that right now, those two things
6	would be lumped together in the 311 reports. And
7	if you want to disaggregate it, it would take some
8	work. So I guess we're just saying we need to
9	have a conversation on what the categories of
10	complaint are before we lock into anything.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay.
12	So it's not that you have any philosophical
13	objection to releasing any of this information.
14	It's
15	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] No.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK:just a
17	matter of how much work you would need to engage
18	in to be able to make it all happen.
19	MR. YASSKY: That's correct.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay.
21	And it seems like the month a violation occurred,
22	that seems like the easiest of the bunch. Because
23	you probably have that information at the ready
24	regardless, right?
25	MR. YASSKY: Yeah. We don't think

2	that we'd want to display it that way because it's
3	more, you know, we don't think it tells you all
4	that much as opposed to grouping things by year.
5	But there's not a real operational problem there.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay.
7	Well I don't need to negotiate the nuts and bolts
8	of this. We'll let the Chair do that with you.
9	But it sounds like there's general agreement about
LO	the goals of the bill and that it's just a matter
11	of hashing it out to find a way to make it work.
L2	MR. YASSKY: Yeah. I mean in
L3	particular, the month is something where I would
L4	say rather than write that into the statute maybe
L5	give us a little more flexibility if we think that
L6	the website would look confusing with it broken
L7	out by month we'd rather have the flexibility not
L8	to do that. But these are minor things. And
L9	again I fully expect that we can work on some
20	drafting revisions with the Committee that will
21	result in the Administration supporting the bill
22	and the Mayor signing it.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay.
24	On Intro 234, I understand from your testimony

that you have concerns about whether this

2.0

2.3

2	constitutes	а	curtailment	of	Mayor's	authority.
---	-------------	---	-------------	----	---------	------------

And the potential conflict of interest of having a current driver on the Board.

MR. YASSKY: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Now you also put in retired driver in the same sentence as current or retired driver. Can you explain the thought process as to why to not include a retired driver?

MR. YASSKY: You are correct that that was maybe a little bit sloppy use of language there because there's not--I don't think there's a conflict of interest problem there. There you simply have the, you know, the curtailment issue.

And I guess here I would remind you that 5 of the 9 Commission members are recommended by the Council.

There are currently 2 vacancies on the Commission both of which are Council filled slots. And, you know, certainly it's well within the ability of the Council to ensure that there's a retired, in this case, driver on the Commission if that's what you'd like to do.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay.

\$0 thereafter? Okay. Why, I think in your testimony you said that there were, it was 40% of them fail on their first inspection. And then there was a number that you just threw out a

22

23

24

25

2	minute ago which was 47%. Can you help us
3	understand what those two numbers are 'cause I
4	think I'm now a little confused?
5	MR. YASSKY: [Off mic] I said more
6	thanokay, apparently we said more than 40%
7	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK:
8	[Interposing] You did. That's correct.
9	MR. YASSKY:and finally the, I
10	believe that the current failure rate is running
11	around 47%.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: 47%.
13	Okay. I understand. So more than 40%,
14	specifically 47%. And from your perspective why
15	is that number so high? I mean that is a pretty
16	high number it seems to me.
17	MR. YASSKY: Well. You know, there
18	are two things you could say. One is cars drive
19	70,000 miles a year on veryon roads that, you
20	know, even though I think DOT does a tremendous
21	job in keeping them in as good a shape as they
22	can, are still difficult roads to drive on. And
23	so they have to be very durable. That's number
24	one.

Number two is I think that there

are some practices, I'm not saying by any means all of the owners, but some practice of letting the inspection tell us what's wrong we can go and fix it as opposed to trying to make sure that you pass inspection before you come in. That's the intent of this fee change is to incentivize the drivers to make—and the owners really, to make sure that they do their best to make sure they pass inspection the first time.

thinking out loud here for a second 'cause I'm not sure that this would actually work but would it create the right incentive if the first time they had to come in the charge was \$0 and that the only charge were invoked after they did not pass the first time around so that you have an opportunity to actually pass and avoid a charge. And then the charges only become in place once you have failed?

MR. YASSKY: I guess that's where we have to bring Mark Page in because that, your logic is impeccable on the incentive. To the extent it would reduce overall City revenue I'm going to assume that my colleague the Budget Director that's his call to make, not my call.

25

2	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay.
3	Thank you Commissioner. And I would just like to
4	as the Counsel to add my name to 232, 233, and 235
5	and we'll take a closer look at the other 2 for
6	now but we appreciate your testimony and I
7	appreciate the Chair's advocacy for all of these
8	bills. Thank you.
9	MR. YASSKY: Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you
11	Council Member Garodnick. I'd like to call on
12	Council Member Koo and then Council Member Nelson.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER KOO: Thank you Mr.
14	Chair and welcome our Commissioner. I have a
15	question on Intro 234. You said that there will
16	be a conflict of interest if you appoint a taxi
17	driver or retired driver on the Commission. And I
18	find it hard to believe.
19	MR. YASSKY: As Council Member
20	Garodnick pointed out that's really only true of
21	an active driver. Well an active driver has a
22	conflict of interest in say the cell phone rules,
23	thinking of things we just passed, that would be a

rule that would affect, you know, would affect

very directly his or her job.

2.0

2	COUNCIL MEMBER KOO: And if there's
3	like a medical commission or dental commission, I
4	would think we have doctors or dentists on the
5	board. I mean why do we make a taxi limousine
6	commission different? We should have at least one
7	member of the industry on the board so to voice
8	their concern, their grievance, you know.
9	In any other commission there's
10	always some professionals, members of that
11	profession the board. The Board of Regents for
12	education, the Pharmacists Board, they have some
13	pharmacists on the Board. The Dental Commission
14	or whatever. It is only right for them to have

MR. YASSKY: Well we could take a look at the conflict question--

representation on the Board.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOO: [Interposing]
Besides the--yea.

MR. YASSKY: --although I think, you know, I don't know how it's handled in other industries. I do think that, you know, much of what the Taxi and Limousine Commission does would affect a driver very directly. And I think the conflict of interest argument there is legitimate.

2	required to give them access for free. I don't
3	know. I mean I guess they have to get internet
4	access which may not be free but as long as they
5	have internet access then the vendors do not
6	charge them separately.
7	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Okay. And I
8	wanted to be clear on the bill, Intro 233, you
9	mentioned it. You would be willing to talk more
10	about that. But that is not just a 311
11	transparency bill which I do think is important
12	but it's also related to enforcement.
13	MR. YASSKY: Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I want to know
15	and
16	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] Yeah it
17	is.
18	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:and I
19	figuratively, the public wants to know what you're
20	doing regarding enforcement.
21	MR. YASSKY: Absolutely. I welcome
22	that.
23	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: You know a lot
24	of people are concerned about the street hails. A
25	lot of people are concerned about straight plate

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 52
2	vehicles.
3	MR. YASSKY: Yep.
4	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: And we know the
5	TLC is doing enforcement but how much of it and
6	what is
7	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] And what
8	are we getting for, you know, what are taxpayers
9	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:and what are
10	youyes.
11	MR. YASSKY:getting for their
12	enforcement dollars
13	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]
14	Yep.
15	MR. YASSKY:fair question. That
16	data should be available.
17	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Council Member
18	Nelson.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER NELSON: Thank you
20	Mr. Chair. Welcome Commissioner. Do you know or
21	is there an active teacher in the school system
22	that has some sort of a post at the Department of
23	Education?
24	MR. YASSKY: I?
25	COUNCIL MEMBER NELSON: Not a trick

with not just the representatives of drivers.

25

2	I mean the folks who have, you
3	know, formed organizations and are heading those
4	organizations but, you know, but tried to engage
5	as much as possible with groups of driver to
6	understand how what we're doing affects them. So
7	we're very serious about it. As far as the kind
8	of specific function of serving on the Commission
9	and voting on rule changes there are conflict
10	issues that I think are real.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER NELSON: We may need
12	an attorney to work this one out or corporate
13	counsel but having said that I'd really like to
14	see a driver or a retired driver on.
15	MR. YASSKY: Um-hum.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER NELSON: I was
17	impressed at one of our hearings when there was a
18	taxi driver in the audience and when the meter was
19	brought up he was shaking his head no [chuckling]
20	when somebody else was describing it and the
21	manner in which it was supposed to function. And
22	I grabbed the meter from him. You know, he
23	surrendered it.
24	MR. YASSKY: Um-hum.

COUNCIL MEMBER NELSON: Gracefully.

And we brought it up but he knew really what the issue was and was very informative. And I think that's a key word we can use here, informative as well as—well it wouldn't even be a balance based on the amount of the membership. But informative, so that's why I personally think it's a good idea to have a driver.

MR. YASSKY: Right. Well look, by the way, I'd have the same conflict of interest concern about, you know, an active fleet owner. That's not what the regulatory body is. Now but do we want to make sure that our policy decision are informed by, you know, every bit of feedback we can get from people who'd know best how a rule will affect the actual practice, namely drivers and other people in the industry? Yes, of course we do.

COUNCIL MEMBER NELSON: Yeah well I would not like to see the TLC composed of let's say, you know, 5 out of 9, you know, members who are having to be taxi drivers or retired. But I do think it's a great idea to have 1.

MR. YASSKY: All right Okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER NELSON: That was my

2	question and my statement as well. Thank you.
3	MR. YASSKY: I hear you.
4	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Commissioner,
5	one or two quick questions back to the
6	overcharging issue. You mentioned about revoking
7	licenses, administratively through the TLC. Once
8	you revoke based upon charges such as those we've
9	discussed, is there a way for the person whose
10	license you revoked to get the license back? Or
11	is the revocation permanent or is there a way in
12	subsequent time for that person to get their
13	license back?
14	MR. YASSKY: There's no legal bar
15	on reapplying for license [off mic]. I'm sorry.
16	There is. But for one year. So beginning one
17	year after the license was revoked the driver
18	could apply to have the license reinstated.
19	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Are we saying
20	even in the most extreme cases?
21	MR. YASSKY: Well that's
22	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]
23	Let's say such as
24	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] What I'm
25	saying is

2	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:	Mz	Chimaa
<i>)</i> .	THATRPERSON VACCA:	−-Mr.	('nıma'

MR. YASSKY: --there's no legal bar to applying. But I'm sorry, you're right. A complete answer would be that then the TLC would determine whether the person is fit for a license. And, you know, I think that it's likely that the TLC would determine that somebody who had overcharged 1,000 passengers was not fit for a license.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: How often can that individual then come back to submit another application for a license, once denied?

MR. YASSKY: Well it's funny you say that because our rules permit someone to apply as many times as they like for a license. Indeed, you could have a drunk driving conviction a week ago and there's no rule that explicitly prohibits that person from getting a license, just the general standard of fit for a license.

So in practice somebody with a drunk driving conviction from a week ago will be rejected I think every time. So we are talking about at the TLC, by rule, creating some categories in which licenses which people will be

by rule considered unfit rather than this case by case determination. Because not only is it a case by case determination but the applicant has the right to go to an administrative law judge and get a hearing on whether he or she is fit.

So that's pretty cumbersome for the case of the 1,000 passenger overcharge or for the case of the recent drunk driver. Where I think we could by rule screen them out, save us some administrative law judge hearing time and also be fairer to people rather than say, sure go ahead and apply even though the practical chance of getting a license is nil. So it's a bit of a legal, you know, it takes some work from Mr.

Fraser and his team to craft a rule that will screen people out and screen the right people out.

But they are happily engaged on that work.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I'll look

forward to seeing those regulations. It is hard

for me to fathom how some individuals who've

committed the most heinous type of crimes here,

the ripping off of passengers, could conceivably

come back to those jobs. And I certainly don't

want that to happen because I think the public is

2.0

2.3

owed	more	than	+ha+
Owea	IIIOT E	LHan	LHat.

MR. YASSKY: We'll get you a draft of that rule when we have it.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you.

Okay. Of the drivers so far, how many have had their licenses rescinded? Has anyone had their license rescinded so far in this investigation?

MR. YASSKY:

The first hearing is Wednesday, so day after tomorrow is when the first people are due. They got their notice of violation and they're going to be coming in starting Wednesday. Day after tomorrow. I--

I don't believe so.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]
I'm sorry.

MR. YASSKY: I believe that we have had already some people contact the TLC. They got the notice. They contacted to say where do I turn in my license. But I'm not sure that we have actually gotten any licenses back yet.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: In the time period from the findings that you made to Wednesday which is the beginning of your process, are the individual drivers in question--

25 We don't really have much we can

2	offer by way of plea bargaining, you know, if you
3	will, because our maximum fine is \$850. And even
4	that, I don't feel that somebody who overcharged
5	800 passengers, that we should say well we'll just
6	do away with your fine. I don't think that would
7	be appropriate or right. So we don't have much we
8	can offer in terms of plea bargaining. So we
9	don't know. It may be that people will choose to,
10	you know, that the bulk will choose to go through
11	a full hearing.
12	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: But without the
13	power of plea bargaining these hearings could take
14	months. The process could take months.
15	MR. YASSKY: Well it could take
16	more than
17	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]
18	More than months.
19	MR. YASSKY:months, so that
20	wouldit could take months
21	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]
22	Do you have a rubber room?
23	MR. YASSKY:it could be two
24	months
25	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

2	indeed, you know, that they have a lack of
3	integrity such that they will overcharge
4	passengers repeatedly, repeatedly, repeatedly,
5	should not be driving. And we're going to, you
6	know, as quickly as the process allows seek to get
7	those folks off the road.

8 CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Council Member 9 Rose.

> COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Good afternoon Commissioner. Being that I represent Staten Island and we don't have yellow cabs, we have livery and for-hire cabs, I was particularly interested in your statement that we are planning to pass TLC rules to charge fees for multiple transfers for for-hire vehicles. Would you explain what this new fee structure would look like and its rationale for it?

MR. YASSKY: Sure. As you know, we license not just yellow cabs but for-hire vehicles, livery cars. And livery cars have to be affiliated with a base. So you are licensed to own and then also to drive a livery car. furthermore you get a license as a base to take calls and dispatch cars in Staten Island and

2 elsewhere.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Um-hum.

4 MR. YASSKY: There is an

application that we process that affiliates a car with a particular base. It has been our practice and very frequently a car will switch from one base to another base. I've been working; it's like leaving a job and going to work at another place. It has bee our practice that if there are 25 cars that have been affiliated with 25 different bases and now they all come and they're going to affiliate with a new base, that new base will come in with an application for all 25 of those transfers. And we will process all 25 for 1 single fee. [Off mic] Of \$25.

Now if they come in with 25 applications, we're going to charge the \$25 fee for each one of those. And the rationale for that is very simply each one of them requires the same amount of clerical time. There's no kind of argument for a volume, there's no operational efficiency that argues for a volume discount.

It's the same in each case. We, you know, it was nice to be able to do that and provide that kind

2.0

of courtesy but in these times when we're,	you
know, we're actually cutting our operating	budget
at the TLC, it's just not something we can	afford
to do anymore	

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Well so this is a revenue generating purpose. And how much do you expect to generate from, you know, the new fee structure and--

MR. YASSKY: [Interposing]

Approximately--

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: --does it in fact help you close any of the gaps that you currently have?

MR. YASSKY: We expect it to raise approximately \$110,000. And I guess without that our operating budget cut would be \$110,000 bigger, yes. And it's, you know, you could say that's one of the ways in which we were able to avoid reducing our enforcement personnel which to me that was my main goal in the budget process was not to have a reduction in our enforcement personnel in the field. Because as it is, you know, as Chairman Vacca kind of was alluding to before, do I think that we are getting, you know,

_	
2	every unlicensed pickup off the street. Far from
3	it. There's a lot of enforcement that we still
4	need to be doing.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: So the base
6	will pick up the cost for each of the individual
7	cars that come in or the individual drivers will
8	pay the additional \$25 to the base?
9	MR. YASSKY: It could be either the
10	base or the vehicle owner.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Yeah. Okay.
12	Okay. I just have another question. You talked
13	about inviting us to your wonderful new DMV
14	certified inspection facility. And this has
15	become, you know, sort of a bone of contention for
16	Staten Island drivers that prior to this, prior to
17	last year, early last year; they could get their
18	vehicles inspected on Staten Island which would
19	keep them from losing virtually a whole day of
20	income
21	MR. YASSKY: [Interposing] Yes.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE:and now
23	with this facility, would you be open to looking

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: --and now with this facility, would you be open to looking at allowing Staten Island because of the distance, because of the fact that of the volume that you do

2	at your certified DMV center, would you consider
3	allowing them to continue or go back to being
4	inspected on Staten Island? It could be one of
5	your certified DMV, you know, operators. But this
6	has caused a hardship for the drivers on Staten
7	Island. Are you willing to look into this?
8	MR. YASSKY: No I think is the
9	short answer because it's not a change that
10	affected Staten Island only. What we did was,
11	whereas previously all livery cars could do all
12	their inspections at private service stations
13	throughout the City, the change was to say that
14	once every two years each livery car has to come
15	in and be inspected at the TLC inspection facility
16	at Woodside. So that's everywhere. Now Staten
17	Island is, you know, further from Woodside
18	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: [Interposing]
19	However, right, geographically
20	MR. YASSKY:than some places
21	although
22	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE:it's a
23	MR. YASSKY:although, you know,
24	it's no further than
25	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: [Interposing]

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: I just--and

25

2.0

2.3

much. Thank you Mr. Commissioner. We have three
panels I think. And our first panel will be Pete
Mazer, Metropolitan Taxicab Board of Trade; David
Pollack, Committee for Taxi Safety; and Steve
Belatowitz [phonetic], League of Mutual Taxi
Owners

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: We thank our Sergeant at Arms, Nick, who does a wonderful job. He keeps us quiet please. Okay. Sir, would you want to start?

MR. PETER MAZER: Sure. Good
afternoon Chairman Vacca and members of the
Committee. My name is Peter Mazer. I am General
Counsel to the Metropolitan Taxicab Board of
Trade, a 58-year old trade association that
represents 28 yellow medallion taxi fleets which
operate approximately 3,500 yellow medallion
taxicabs, roughly 25% of the taxi industry.

MTBOT fleets lease their vehicles to over 14,000 drivers and employ hundreds of mechanics, dispatchers, managers and other personnel at its garages in Manhattan, Brooklyn, Queens and the Bronx. At the outset I would like

2.0

to state that MTBOT shares with the City Council the goals set forth in the 4 Council originated bills, that the TLC become more open, transparent and accountable to the public as well as the individuals and businesses it regulates.

To that end we are always willing to work with the Council to ensure that these mutual goals are achieved. We are pleased to comment on the 5 taxi related bills being heard today before this Committee. The 4 Council bills as well as the Mayoral bill relating to increased fees.

First Intro 232, this bill requires that new language be added to the Passenger Bill of Rights pertaining to the requirement of every taxicab to have a working Easy Pass tag. It is important to note that the TLC already requires each medallion owner to participate in Easy Pass unless the driver elects to use his own tag. And I refer to TLC rules 1-37 and 2-27. The rules also require that Easy Pass must be used in all tolls in New York City.

The Passenger Bill of Rights is an excellent consumer protection tool that our member

fleets endorse. While it is not meant to express every passenger right afforded to the public,

MTBOT has no objection to the City Council requiring that this be included in the Passenger Bill of Rights.

We support this bill with the expectation that this year TLC will enact rules eliminating redundant stickers and signage in taxicabs which include the Passenger Bill of Rights since it is already shown on the TPEP monitor. This will alleviate the burden taxicab owners incur each time a sign or a sticker is changed, damaged, becomes faded, or is removed by a passenger.

Next onto Intro 233, one of the most persistent problems facing the yellow taxicab industry is the scourge of illegal livery street hails that occur every day throughout the City including the central business district. While yellow cabs are the only vehicles permitted by law to accept street hails, opportunistic livery drivers and even unlicensed drivers of straight plate vehicles illegally strip our drivers of these fares. While we are encouraged by Chairman

2.0

2.3

Yassky's recent remarks and requests for additional TLC inspectors, we fully endorse additional methods that highlight this serious problem.

Intro 233 requires that illegal street hail enforcement and other data be transmitted in the TLC's annual report to the City Council so that the Transportation Committee and the TLC can hopefully work together to end this practice once and for all. It may also be worth noting that working with the TLC directly to permanently include this data in the Mayor's Management Report.

Intro 234, MTBOT opposes this bill that requires that one of the four Mayoral appointees to the TLC be either a licensed or retired driver who has a license in the last 5 years. This provision will permit a driver to vote on matters that would directly affect his personal interests. It would most likely be a direct violation of the New York City Conflict of Interest law. It is also important to note that other jurisdictions like San Francisco had industry representation on their commissions only

2.0

to have them subsequently abolished because

members frequently had to recuse themselves from

deliberations and votes.

There is a more effective way to get the input of drivers. It is through the TLC's Driver Advisory Board which is already authorized and mandated to meet regularly by Section 19-520 of the Administrative Code. More importantly the Bronx and Brooklyn City Council appointive seats have been vacant for years. During the same period of time the Commission seats appointed by the Mayor have always been fully filled.

The City Council should be focused on filling these vacant seats and ensuring that they be filled as soon as possible after a vacancy occurs. Doing so would ensure that all of the Council's TLC appointees can effectively work with the Mayoral appointees to balance the many different stakeholder interests in this varies and complicated industry.

Intro 235, this bill requires taxi owners to store and provide fare data and other information to the TLC and drivers upon request within 7 days. MTBOT doesn't believe that this

bill achieves its intended purpose of providing
the TLC with greater access to fare data as it
will not require much that is not already required
by TLC rules as presently written.

And finally Intro 236, we should call this bill what it is, a revenue generator. While the ostensible purpose is to prevent owners from using the TLC inspection facility as a diagnostic center and to encourage them to make sure that their taxicabs are roadworthy when initially brought into the inspection facility, in reality the inspection process is highly subjective, often resulting in failures for visuals or other minor defects. The TLC could be encouraged by this new inspection scheme to fail more vehicles and generate more revenue.

Medallion owners already pay \$300 for required TLC inspections when they renew their medallion every 2 years. This covers the cost of the initial inspection. Many vehicles which fail inspection do so for non-safety related items, commonly referred to as visuals that can be corrected quickly. And these vehicles need not be fully re-inspected. MTBOT is nonetheless

Τ.	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION /
2	sensitive to the TLC's concern that vehicles can
3	be re-inspected for a third, fourth or fifth time
4	at no cost.
5	I want to thank you for your
6	consideration and I would also be happy to answer
7	any questions that you may have.
8	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Um-hum. I
9	thank you. you made some good points.
LO	MR. MAZER: Thank you.
L1	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Don't want you
12	to think I wasn't listening, I was listening. And
L3	I do think the point about having information in
L4	the Mayor's Management Report is something I'm
L5	going to see if we can modify the law. I
L6	appreciate that.
L7	More than the TLC annual report,
L8	the Mayor's Management Report really gives
19	statistical, you know, information. And the bill
20	that I introduced at the Mayor's request regarding
21	the fees, I have some concerns about it too. And
22	I'm going to work with the Administration. I know
23	what you're saying. I was thinking of traffic

MR. MAZER: [Interposing] Um-hum.

enforcement agents--

24

2.0

CHAIRPERSON VACCA:sometimes
traffic enforcement agents give summonses but
they're more driven by revenue than the traffic
infraction. So I'll take a look at that too.
We'll see if that's something that we can get a
consensus on. Thank vou. Sir?

MR. STEPHEN BELATOWITZ: Good afternoon Mr. Chairman, Council Members. My name is Stephen Belatowitz [phonetic]; I'm from the League of Mutual Taxi Owners. Our organization represents several thousand independent medallion taxi owners in New York City.

I only want to address you very briefly. I'm not Vinnie so this will be brief on Intros 232, 234 and 236. Regarding the Easy Pass requirements which is something that's already been on the books for the Taxi and Limousine Commission, there are going to be times where independent owners don't have enough cash if they're basing it on a cash replenishment to keep their Easy Pass up to speed. And there are guys that just don't have the credit status get be able to get a credit card for a replenishment on an Easy Pass account in that manner.

There are also times when passengers will just turn around and tell the driver, don't go into the Easy Pass lane. It's too long today. Take the cash lane. We're not against Easy Pass. We are very for the Easy Pass regulation. I'd just like to see the enforcement

of it being done with reason.

Regarding Intro 234 with having a Commissioner that was a driver. I think that personally is a great idea. There are certain things though I think you need to qualify with this. It needs to be somebody who drive a taxi and somebody that also has radio car experience and someone that is still active in the industry. A 5-year timeline where someone that has been on the road recently driving within a 5-year span, I think that's being a little bit too restrictive as a qualification.

And regarding Intro 236 with the reinspection fee, I know my guys come to me on a regular basis and what should I do; I have to go for inspection next week. And I tell them the first thing they need to do. Go to your mechanic. Get your car checked out from top to bottom. Make

2.0

2 sure everything is the way it's supposed to be.

3 This way you're only going to go in for your one

4 inspection. You're going to be out of there. You

5 don't go back a second time and waste time and

6 lose money, which is the key right there, because

7 these guys cannot afford to lose the money.

They're carrying mortgages on their cars and multiple medallions of hundreds of thousands of dollars. They can't afford to sit for half a day at TLC and lose a half a day's pay for reinspection purposes.

The fees, also, I think at the \$35 level for reinspection is reasonable. Business still is not spectacular. Traffic has gotten heavier in the City with all the restrictions on the different roadways.

And unfortunately even though the yellow cab is another form of mass transit, we don't have the same rights as City buses. We don't have the express lanes that buses have. And the competition from the illegals is getting outrageous and has been outrageous for years. And our guys are losing a lot of money because of the illegal pickups on the street. So I think that

2.0

2.3

the	way	that	the	st	tructure	is	set	ri	ght	. now	for
the	fees	shoi	ıld :	be	maintair	ned	as	it	is	right	now

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you. And before I go to Mr. Pollock, I did want to also respond to one other thing. I do want you to know that since I've become Chairman of the Committee we are trying to move and fill the vacancies on the TLC. The Bronx has a nominee that's gone through the process.

It's now at the Mayor's level and we expect that that will be a Council nominee.

And I will also speak to Brooklyn and my colleagues to try to move on that also. So I'm committed to filling the vacancies on the TLC and we've been having progress. Okay Mr. Pollack?

MR. DAVID POLLACK: Good afternoon
Chairman Vacca and distinguished members of the
New York City Transportation Committee. I'm David
Pollack, Executive Director of the Committee for
Taxi Safety, an association of licensed leasing
agents.

On behalf of the Committee which is proud to be part of a public transportation system that daily moves over one half million passengers

2.0

within the City of New York, I must urge that the
City Council carefully reconsider Intro 234.

While the Committee for Taxi Safety applauds the
goal of seeking greater input from the taxi
industry at the Taxi and Limousine Commission,
this bill would serve only one aspect of the
industry, the drivers. Other licensed
professionals such as leasing agents would be
excluded from service by this bill.

While asking for input and decision-making is a laudable goal, this should not be accomplished by elevating one industry voice at the expense of others at the regulatory body level. The TLC must pass rules and regulations that affect the entire industry.

Evenhandedness and fair play must be the hallmark of any regulatory body. To have any one segment acting as rule maker and regulator can only lead to distrust among all others.

In order to establish confidence that the decisions are made equitable and on an even playing field, licensed leasing agents must also be mandated members of the TLC. Lease agents work with both medallion owners and drivers. In

2.0

addition we are most akin to the professional expert requirement of the Board of Standards and Appeals on which we assume this legislation is modeled.

Our Committee has demonstrated time and time again our willingness to work with the City to implement its policies that provide reliable, safe taxi service to New York. Our members have embraced more fuel efficient cabs, credit card payments, and worked with the City to strengthen laws against dangerous illegal cab.

We believe our record clearly indicates that we deserve a seat at the table. Licensed agents should be mandated part of the Taxi and Limousine Commission.

On Intro 233, the Committee for
Taxi Safety is concerned. Reporting requirements
that each January the TLC released not only the
records of all meetings but also all the documents
in their possession. The bill language is so
broad that these publicly released documents may
contain personal data, information about home
addresses, finances and medallion ownership that
would compromise the privacy and security of our

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

drivers.

On Intro 235, data about fares is stored but not in the cab itself. It is linked to a central storage location. The bill proposes that fare data be available to the TLC within seven days of a request. How will this information be provided and who will provide it? In addition the bill sets forth that a former driver can request this information up to 12 times a year at no cost. Providing this information to 12 the driver is a multi-step process. If the driver wants this information, a driver should be able to see in real time all his relevant information 14 online.

> On 232 the bill is redundant with regards to Easy Pass. The TLC requirements already require Easy Pass and the Committee of Taxi Safety is prepared to work with the Council to address these concerns.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: I thank you very much for you input. I realize that the TLC already has that requirement regarding Easy Pass. I thought that based on the revelations that came out; legislatively we could add that to the

2	Passenger Bill of Rights. But I do understand
3	it's prescribed administratively. I will look
4	into your concerns regarding Intro 233. And I do
5	understand, now, regarding the driver on the TLC
6	MR. POLLACK: [Interposing] Well,
7	you know
8	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:I hear both
9	sides to the question. I hear that there could be
10	a Balkanization based on the constituencies that
11	are inherent.
12	MR. POLLACK: What's a
13	Balkanization?
14	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Chopping. A
15	chopping because if you give representation to one
16	group then other groups would also want to be
17	represented. I think that's where you were coming
18	from
19	MR. POLLACK: [Interposing] That's-
20	_
21	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:how do you
22	single out one group
23	MR. POLLACK: [Interposing] That's
24	exactly right. I mean even amongst drivers there
25	areand the yellow taxi drivers, you have drivers

2.0

who work for fleets, you have DOVE drivers who we represent, you have individual owner drivers, you have second drivers, weekend drivers. So which driver with the experience gets on the Commission?

It can go on and on.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Excuse me. I think much of the concern though came from drivers who felt that their voice was not being heard. That may go to the reality that the Advisory Boards that have been in place legally have not met as we brought out at this hearing. So therefore I can understand the concern. I think it arose because TLC has not been doing what it should have been doing for a while. I think today's hearing has pointed that out in several respects.

MR. POLLACK: It has. I filled out I think it was a 36-page form about 6 or 7 years ago to get on that Advisory Committee. And I'm still waiting to hear an answer.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Yes. I am determined to do the right thing. I'm determined to do things that should not have been allowed to lapse. And I want to get back to doing what we

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 86
2	should have been doing for a while.
3	MR. POLLACK: Thank you very much
4	Mr. Chairman
5	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing] I
6	thank you. I thank all of you for your input.
7	MR. POLLACK: I appreciate your
8	concern.
9	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: And your
10	input's important. Thank you.
11	[Pause]
12	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Ms. Desai, New
13	York Taxi Worker Alliance; Bill Lindauer, New York
14	Taxi Worker Alliance; Beresford Simmons, Taxi
15	Alliance; and Biju Mathew, Taxi Alliance. Ms.
16	Desai will please go first.
17	[Witnesses getting settled]
18	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Ms. Desai would
19	you please proceed?
20	MS. BHAIRAVI DESAI: Sure. [off
21	mic] Desai, the Executive Director [off mic]
22	Okay. Now it's on. [Chuckling] Good afternoon.
23	I'm Bhairavi Desai. I'm the Executive Director of
24	the New York Taxi Workers Alliance. Chairman
25	Vacca, Council Member Nelson, other members of the

industry, I'd first like to comment on some of the earlier issues that were brought up about the overcharge allegation.

I just want to put on the record that just because a summons has been issued does not mean that the driver is guilty. And, you know, I believe due process is a fundamental principle in our society. You know, outside of this particular issue we as people that live, work, breathe in America, we see due process as one of the most, you know, central principles of a democracy. And I don't think that the presumption of innocence should be thrown out the window just because the person who's being accused is a taxicab driver.

And if it does take months or even a year for a driver to have their due process rights exercised, I think that is something that we should support because, you know, I think it's a basic principle that, you know, the minute we discard it for one particular example, we really dilute the real value of it that we as Americans believe in. And so I think that patience in this case is important because it supports, you know, a

2.0

higher principle at play here.

Okay. On the specific Intros, we are absolutely in support of Intro 234. We don't think it's a conflict. You know, as Council Member Koo had said earlier as well as Council Member Nelson, it is one vote out of nine. That person is not going to overwhelm the majority vote in that room. It is one vote out of nine.

The majority of the rules that the Taxi and Limousine Commission promulgate have to with the function of the industry on the streets. And nobody is more aware of those intricacies than taxicab drivers and taxicab passengers. We can presume that eight of those nine members are mostly taxicab passengers, you know, even if they're not regular passengers, certainly, you know, they will have that experience and they bring that with them.

Well to have one out of nine members bring the experience of being a taxicab driver we think it is only fair. It will not overwhelm. It will not imbalance the vote. It will actually give drivers on the other side of the podium a face to look to who that can

confidently believe will help translate their experience and their position. That does not mean that that person has to agree. In no industry does every member of a workforce agree. We all know that is a basic reality.

And an industry like ours which is incredibly complicated by the different layers, whether you're a garage operator or you lease from a broker and are a DOV operator or you're an owner operator, you know, these are, you know, there are intricate details of each of these different categories that speak to actually a different economic experience. But the one link across the board is how drivers relate to the riding public and that is really the majority of the rules that are promulgated by the TLC. And we think that this would be a really welcomed, informative and educational voice to have inside the Commission.

In terms of Intros 233 and 235, they both relate to data. First and foremost we believe that all data should be aggregate. You must maintain the privacy rights of individuals which to me is as fundamental in our society as our due process rights.

2.0

I would not want to see, for

example, in the future that somehow, you know, the

data about complaints are linked to individual

drivers. I think that would be incredibly,

incredibly, utterly unfair. And if these Intros

are starting to lay the ground for how data is

distributed and collected with regards to drivers'

performance, then we say to you, we compel you,

you just keep that data aggregate.

Also in the same--just that I believe that a TLC summons does mean a driver should not presume guilt on behalf of the driver, similarly a complaint doesn't mean that that driver is guilty. I think the statistics that are put out there should be about convictions and not about complaints. And I don't think that's a matter of semantics, I feel that is a very important change that really should be made on this Intro.

In addition these convictions must be contextualized. For example, at one of the prior hearings it was noted that there were 3,000 complaints filed by passengers in one year.

That's 3,000 out of 164,250,000 rides completed in

that 1 year in minimum. These numbers have to be contextualized so that, you know, we don't paint an entire workforce with a broad brush.

Similar exactly to what happened 2 months ago. We need to learn from that experience, not only in terms of what data should be required but also how to respectfully talk about, you know, allegations against actions of drivers without really damning the entire workforce. And so we feel this is another critical thing that must be added.

I will actually end it here but actually just lastly say that we also do not favor Intro 236 which would raise the fees on inspections. Drivers, a majority of car owners in this industry are actually individual taxi drivers, whether they are an owner operator who own also the medallion or they are driver owned vehicle operators who lease the medallion but own the vehicle.

On average they pay \$8,000 to \$10,000 per year just to maintain the car let alone the additional expenses to get ready for an inspection and the time involved to go into

2.0

2.3

inspection which sometimes on average is an entire
day's worth of income and the lease that you've
already paid out of pocket. It would just be
insult upon injury to raise those fines as far as
we're concerned. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you. Mr. Lindauer, but I just ask to be excused one minute. Council Member Nelson will take the mic, the Chair, okay? Hold on. Mr. Lindauer, you go.

COUNCIL MEMBER NELSON: I get to be Chair by attrition.

[Chuckling]

MR. BILL LINDAUER: Hello. My name is Bill Lindauer. I'm with the New York Taxi Workers Alliance and I drove a cab in New York City for 30 years. Talk about working hard, perhaps being exploited, being oppressed by the police and the TLC, I've gone through it all. I've paid my dues [chuckling].

Let me talk about the overcharges.

Last Thursday's public hearing at the TLC,

Chairman Yassky said it was one-tenth of 1% of all
the rides. You have a better chance of winning
the Lotto than you have of getting ripped off by a

2.0

cabbie. I mean this is absurd. And I believe many of those cases will disappear into thin air in closer examination by independent sources who are not clueless.

It's an insult driver of enormous magnitude. How are we going to get our reputations back? How are we going to get our business back? I know it's not Mr. Yassky's fault. It's his despotic predecessor Mr. Daus. But it's the drivers who suffer. And even though there are 50,000 drivers in the New York City, their voice is hardly ever heard.

Maybe we get 10 or 12 minutes a year to speak at a monthly TLC public hearing.

And we don't have lobbyist. We don't have the money that the brokers have. We don't have--some don't have anywhere near the money that the wealthy garage owners have. They have influence.

And they have money. And they have power.

Drivers just have truth and decency on their side. And the decent thing to do would be to have a driver on the TLC as Council Member Koo says, one voice could not overwhelm nine. And there's a tendency of course, at least in the

2.0

2.3

2	past, for	Commissio	ners	to be	e bullied	by	the T	'LC
3	Chairman.	Whether	this	will	continue	I	do not	
4	know. Tha	nk you.						

5 COUNCIL MEMBER NELSON: Thank you 6 Mr. Lindauer. Yes Sir.

MR. BERESFORD SIMMONS: Good
evening Councilmen and my name is Beresford
Simmons. I'm with the Taxi Workers Alliance. And
I'm an immediate driver. I'm what you call a DOV
driver. I am bankrupt with all the fees that I
have to pay. I'm supposed to be going for
inspections tomorrow. And I have already spent
over \$800 on my car and I'm not finished spending
yet. I still have some things to do. So with
extra dues and extra fees to be paid it's, you
know, pretty harsh on a DOV driver.

There are many different drivers in the industry, you know, as many of the people here said before. You have the guys who lease 12 hours. You have DOV drivers. You have independent owners. Today's world is not as easy. I've been driving for 40 years I'm in this industry. So when you hear some of these guys sit here and create rules and regulations and have

2.0

never been a driver in their life, it hurts my heart to see because when I'm the airport and I'm speaking to other drivers they have the same complaints that I have.

There are many guys now who are suffering from blood clots in their legs, moving to their hearts. No place to go to a bathroom.

No decent food to eat. We work 24 hours a day and we only have a restaurant that is open until 11:00 o'clock at night and from thereon we have no place else to go. There are now more women in the industry than ever before and I know how they feel. You know, we have to utilize the gasoline stations, McDonald's. And if you don't have money to spend in some of these places you can't use these bathrooms.

Anyway. This industry is getting harder and harder. Yes there have been a few guys who have done crooked things. But the way they are blanketing the overall industry, it makes my heart cry. At first when they came with the GPS they told us that they weren't going to use it against the drivers.

My broker turned my meter off seven

and to bring my Social Security number there for him. Two, to change the top, the sign on the top of the cab. That put me back two days, so now I owe him money. And then three, I owe him money and he start turning my meter off.

So these are some of the things that drivers are going through out there in the streets. And this is an industry that needs to be investigated deeply. None of these guys know what the drivers are going through. They can come here and they can sit and they can tell you all of their concern about what they own and what they're in charge of. But some of them have never driven a cab a day in their life.

I am one of the guys who have to be dealing with some of your children, some of your children out there who are drunk in the street and have to take them home. They don't know where they're going. They don't know their addresses.

So these are some of the concerns. So if you have a driver, an immediate [phonetic] driver on the Commission, they will learn more about what is going on in the streets.

2	As far as I'm concerned none of
3	these guys give a damn about us. And I'm totally
4	upset because I am now trying to get my children,
5	my sons to drive a cab in New York City. Make
6	this industry a career for a young person, not a
7	slave sweatshop. Thank you very much.
8	[Applause]
9	MR. BIJU MATHEW: Hello? Yeah.
10	It's difficult to go after Beresford
11	SERGEANT AT ARMS: [Interposing]
12	Your name Sir.
13	MR. MATHEW:yeah I will. My
14	name is Biju Mathew and I am part of the New York
15	Taxi Workers Alliance and the author of the book,
16	Taxi! Cabs and Capitalism in New York City
17	published by Cornell University Press. I
18	mentioned the latter fact for a very important
19	reason that I'll come to in a few seconds.
20	I want to start commenting on the
21	Easy Pass law and I think it's fine and I think
22	the stipulation that the Easy Pass be provided by
23	the medallion owner is the most fair one because
24	drivers, as you said, as many people have already

pointed out, sometimes we don't have the credit to

2.0

ensure that each time they go through a toll booth they have the money on the Easy Pass. So it's really important to ensure that the medallion owner furnishes the Easy Pass in there.

Now to come to the rest of the legislation, as far as the 235 is concerned, there is this entire focus which kind of makes visible the kind of biases that already exist within public discourse and within spaces of legislative action about drivers. Wherein all the information that is sought, to be there, and to be released to be on the website, to be part of the Mayor's Management Report, etcetera, is all about drivers.

Can we have a whole bunch of other information? Right? For instance the number of complaints filed against garages and against brokers. Why isn't that part of the regulatory structure that we are really concerned about? Given that garages and brokers have been overcharging drivers for years at this point. Right?

Why is it that we can't have a whole bunch of information about the amount of technology failure that's happening in this

industry? Right? I mean we at the Taxi Workers
Alliance and me personally talking to drivers know
that the whole technology TPEP system has failures
on and off regularly affecting the daily working
of a driver.

Why is that we don't have mean time between failure reports and data related to that? About technology failures out there on the websites, out there transparently available to the public? Why is it—I mean for instance a passenger getting in and hearing from a driver a statement saying my credit card's not working immediately at this point because of the discursive structure created which puts the driver as constantly the person who's doing the wrong thing, immediately produces suspicion.

Whereas it is indeed true that the credit card system fails all the time. It happens regularly. Right? So why can't we have that data so that people like you, people like the public, have a better sense of what's happening? Why can't that be part of this legislation? Why not think about the number of fare beaters?

Drivers, you can talk to any taxi

2.0

driver and he or she will tell you the frequency with fare beating happens is pretty significant in New York City. Why not have that data up there? Why not have data about assaults? Taxi driving is the second most dangerous profession in this country, as per the Department of Labor.

Why not have that data about the number of assaults that the drivers are facing?
Why is it that we do not, through the use of data, work towards producing a reasonable and a correct image of a hardworking driver? And I want to connect this to the question in the other legislation which is about a driver representative.

If the Transportation Committee is really keen on correcting a historical bias and it is the work of public institutions like the City Council and the Transportation Committee to work and think through historical biases and correct them. This industry has had a long term bias against drivers.

And as has been repeatedly said, one active driver on the Commission cannot overwhelm the driver (sic). And now let me--and

the whole question of conflict of interest. I
mean conflict of interest is an issue that should
come up through experience. Let's see how a
driver does on there.

Now the reason why I mentioned that I'm an author of a book is because I have worked with the Taxi Workers Alliance, I'm one of the cofounders of the Alliance, and yet a reputed press like Cornell University Press did not find it alarming thing to do to get a book by me published as a book which is used within scholarship, within the university structures, as something that's part of discourse.

Why? Because they also at the back of their head potentially have an idea that education is part of social justice work. Right? So if you want to correct a historical bias let's work at it by putting an active driver on the Taxi and Limousine Commission and seeing what the effects of that are. Right? I mean I think that this whole conflict of interest fulcrum that's being used is in my opinion a complete bogus.

One final comment before I stop and that's got to do with... actually that's it. Thank

2.0

Alliance who are present at every City Council meeting I've ever been to and every Taxi and Limousine Commission, they do make their voices heard.

The question is not whether their voices are going to be heard, it's whether they're going to be one voice and one voice only representing one segment and one segment only of those industries that are regulated by the Taxi and Limousine Commission. The Taxi And Limousine Commission regulates not just black cars, not just yellow cars but black cars, livery cars, limousines and ambulettes [phonetic], just to name a few.

Your term, before, Balkanization is absolutely correct Mr. Chairman. There are as many different types of driver, there are DOV drivers, there are livery drivers, there are limousine drivers, there are yellow drivers, there are black car drivers. Many of these are in direct competition with each other and jockeying for the position of who would be the spokesperson would be as difficult as it would be to determine who would be the spokesperson of let's say the

2.0

2.3

2	yellow own	ers. There	are	several	owners	groups.
---	------------	------------	-----	---------	--------	---------

We all represent different segments of the industry.

I would like to address briefly a couple of the other issues. On 232, the Passenger Bill of Rights on the Easy Pass, there was some media involved alleging that there were largescale, a large group of drivers that were passing the Easy Pass tolls, not using them to generate extra fares.

We at Greater New York Taxi
Association believe that that report was widely
exaggerated. The idea that drivers would wait on
line unnecessarily instead of picking up fares is
counterintuitive. Also there's a lot of reasons
why one might do that.

Several of my garages, several owners and several drivers that I am aware of have had problems with Easy Pass. They have had bill disputes. Account disputes. And we wouldn't want to create the impression that every time there is an issue with Easy Pass or with a card that's not working or there may be some other legitimate reason why drivers are going through. So I

2.0

applaud the Committee and it should be included in the Bill of Rights but I also believe that we should be careful in labeling people.

As far as the other Intros, the penalties for the inspection, it should be pointed out Mr. Chairman that we believe that there are almost 220 points of inspection on a New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission inspection. One of our consultants in our group is the former Assistant Commissioner of Safety and Emissions. I was speaking to him earlier.

There are 110 DMV individual inspections, those are mostly safety level. Ones we think of when we think of safe vehicles, emissions, brakes. But there's other TLC inspections that are strictly onto the TLC. And you gave the example of ripped upholstery, scratches in the paint, stickers on the partition put there by consumers or other groups. All of these could result in a 10-day notice is what the Chairman Yassky mentioned.

That 10-day notice means you have to come back and get that car re-inspected. So again you do have to pay the fare. So I do urge

this Committee that it's very well intentioned
that you encourage participation. You encourage
good cars but that this is not done strictly for a
revenue basis.

in the responsiveness, I think they go towards the transparency of the Taxi and Limousine Commission. And I believe I'd just like to say on behalf of the GNYTA, both under your chairmanship, Chairman Vacca and also under the new regime of David Yassky, it appears that we're heading towards a much more transparent, much more open, much more dedicated group and leadership in the City. Thank you very much.

MR. GUY PALUMBO: Good afternoon
Chairman Vacca, members of the Committee. Thank
you for allowing me to testify today. My name is
Guy Palumbo. I'm the Secretary of the Livery
Roundtable.

We would like to present our objections basically for Intro 234. We agree with the basic concept of having the industry represented by the TLC on the Board. And we do welcome your efforts. Over the years--but we do

2.0

have some problem with it. Over the years we have expressed our interest in having such representation but have been unsuccessful.

In the past there was an Advisory
Board and everybody's been talking about it here
today. It was required by Local Law Title 19-520
called the New York City Taxi and Limousine
Commission's Livery Advisory Board. There were
several types of boards. And I've attached the
law to our presentation there.

Board was put under the TLC's Office of
Constituent's Affairs and was conducted a couple
of meetings. And we've also attached some
correspondence pertaining to that Board. But then
in August of 2006 for some reason and we were
never made known aware of it ceased to exist.
There are several subcategories and licenses
issued by the TLC which we would like you to be
aware of. A lot of people unfortunately confuse
and mismatch words with the industry itself.

And I'll quickly go through them even though I am sure you are aware of them.

However there are the yellow medallions. There

23

24

25

_	
2	are 13,294 vehicles listed by the TLC. Our
3	community car service which unfortunately gets
4	nailed with the name livery and gypsy,
5	unfortunately, the community car services, we have
6	460 bases and we represent 21,204 vehicles, the
7	largest single segment of any of the industry.
8	There are the black car services
9	even though many of our cars might be black.
10	There are 74 bases, 7,783 vehicles. There are the
11	luxury limousines, 172 bases with 4,656 vehicles.
12	Community vans and paratransit. So if you take
13	just the community car services and combine the
14	black car and the luxury and almost the yellows we
15	outrank them as far as total numbers.
16	Each of these particular
17	subdivisions of the industry represent unique
18	types of service and have separate licenses, rules
19	and methods of operation: taxi brokers, garages,
20	base owners, owners of vehicles, etcetera. And we
21	agree with the Commissionernot the Commissioner,

We disagree with the idea of a driver as such. Without being demeaning and we're

I'm sorry, the Chairman in the category of

Balkanization of the industry.

not knocking drivers, they are the key people in our industry, in the taxi industry, in the black car, in the community car, in the paratransit, etcetera. It regulates all through the bases.

The TLC regulates these people through the bases.

And the problems and the operations of the bases are seen only by the bases.

The problems and the licensing when they get a suspension or they have to get their vehicle licensed or have an inspection goes through the base. And we have accountability rules. A driver can never be enough. I'm not saying it shouldn't be.

But the driver can never be enough.

And a base owner must be included. Assuming a driver or a retired driver or a base owner or one, just one of them or both is selected, it presents a problem as to what segment of the industry does he or she come from. A luxury limousine driver or base owner would no way know what has the interest of except—would only have the interest of the luxury base. Such a driver or a base owner of a luxury base, and I was previously with luxury bases, only have the idea, have no concept of what

2.0

a community car is. And I'm sure that they have even less understanding of a yellow taxi.

We believe that an Advisory Board that is made up of proportional representations of each industry segment should be formed. In the past there was concern about the potential large size of this Advisory Board and the law indicates not more than 20 people. This should not be an issue because the TLC will not need to consult with the entire industry or the entire Advisory Board but only that subsection of that particular industry. The TLC, as I said, again, can consult with that.

We would like to work with the Commission and the Committee in developing these methods. We think it's a worthwhile and definitely needed improvement of the TLC.

Going off the record, not off the record, but off the testimony, if you will look in the back of that document you will see that there is the TLC required Boards which included a Driver Board. There are several different Boards required. And there is also some correspondence there and the application.

And there is also, and this is something that you will have to decide, there was some question about the DOI doing investigations on this Board. And it was our understanding, separate from this, that the Commissioner, the TLC Commissioner could appoint the Livery Advisory Board and that's what the law says as I understand it. I'm not an attorney.

However as an attempt, again, as I understand it from people who were on that board back then, it was taken out of the realm. And it was, very truthfully, we're going to intimidate you by giving you a 16-page or a 32-page document for the Department of Investigation 'cause you cannot be on an Advisory Board without this.

Separate from when the Commissioner can have his own Advisory Board and as we understand it does not require DOI. I don't know where that lies. I believe it's a question for the Council to address. Does that Advisory Board appointed by the Commissioner have to go to City Hall and/or the Department of Investigation? It was used as an intimidation. That's what I'm told by people who were on the Board before.

2.0

2.3

2		I'm	available	for	any	questions.
---	--	-----	-----------	-----	-----	------------

3 Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you.

Thank you both for your input and your help. And I do want you to know that that was what I was thinking about 15 minutes ago. The Community Education Councils which replaced the School Boards went through this whole DOI thing 17 pages. And then there was an agreement about 3 years ago to give them a reduced form. I think it was 2 pages because many members in the CEC said we're volunteers. We're here trying to help and this is really a disincentive for us even to get involved. So if that's an issue here I think there is a

MR. PALUMBO: There's one other point to that. As I understand it if you look at the correspondence attached, the Commissioner then, with all due respect to Matt who I happen to like, Matt Daus, used his own in-office Office of Constituency Affairs in effect rather than have the Board or the Advisory Board meet with him. It was put under a sub-sub-subdivision and left that way and then ceased to exist.

precedent for addressing it.

2	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Now you're
3	getting to the question of what does Mr. Yassky
4	envision the relationship between him and the
5	Advisory Boards. Are we going to have Advisory
6	Boards for window dressing? Are we going to have
7	Advisory Boards that will have true input and
8	access?
9	MR. PALUMBO: Absolutely. We
10	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: [Interposing]
11	Gotcha.
12	MR. PALUMBO:we fully agree and
13	we interpret it, and again not being attorneys,
14	but if we read that the way it was written, it
15	seems it supposed to be with the Commissioner. I
16	think it clearly says that and I may be wrong.
17	Obviously he can't meet with everybody every time.
18	And perhaps but when you take from
19	the Commissioner level, not even to a Deputy
20	Commissioner, and, you know, shovel it onto the
21	then General Counsel and then under the General
22	Counsel put it one step further, make a new office
23	called Constituents Affairs, and then don't meet.
24	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: No the heart of
25	the matter is when you say meet with the

2	Commissioner, it could be the Commissioner or his		
3	designees. So the heart of the matter is what		
4	does the Commissioner envision for these Councils.		
5	MR. PALUMBO: Absolutely. And he		
6	indicated he wants to revive it. I think if		
7	you're going to revive it, across the board, for		
8	the drivers, for the bases, for the livery, for		
9	the black, whatever combination it is, using the		
10	law as the basis, find out where he's going with		
11	it.		
12	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: You bet I will.		
13	MR. PALUMBO: Thank you.		
14	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you.		
15	Thank you both. Mr. Thaler, you will be our last		
16	speaker.		
17	MR. GERBER: Thank you.		
18	[Pause]		
19	[Witness getting settled]		
20	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Please		
21	introduce yourself for the record.		
22	MR. RICHARD THALER: Yes. My name		
23	is Richard Thaler, representing myself and my		
24	company. I'm the CEO of Omni Media Network.		
25	Gentlemen, hopefully last but not least, I'd like		

to first address Intro 233. I think the intention and the focus of this Intro should be prevention of overcharge not reporting after the fact.

And by that I mean it is a simple matter to require the Taxi Commission to require the vendors to disable the manual button for Rate 4 and have the taxi meter manufacturer which is a minor, very, very minor weights and measures issue, when the GPS receiver of the system identifies the boundary crossing automatically switch over to Rate 4 without driver intervention. And I would imagine truthfully a driver may often forget to hit Rate 4 and in fact undercharge the passenger.

The fact of the matter is when the Mayor was shown the system that created this whole thing in February of 2004, this system was addressed. It was a fully automatic system to address the out of town into Westchester and Nassau rate change. I think that the TLC unexplainably just, it was an oversight, in not requiring this feature. And that puts everything to rest.

With regard to 235, apparently

everything in 235 is already required in the

Administrative Code and within the contracts. The

no fees payable provision of the vendor contracts,

page 33, the master contract, require that the

trip records be supplied, all of the trip records

be supplied to the Taxi Commission.

"trip record information shall be available to the TLC, the taxi driver medallion owner, taxi owner, and/or leasing agent upon reasonable demand based on parameters set between the TLC and the approved vendors". But in addition if in the future new kinds of data should be required other than the existing cited trip record data, there is a requirement in the Administrative Code that in addition to the record as well as such other information as may be required by the Commission.

So the Commission can under the Administrative Code in fact set whatever additional data. I thought that the intention of this rule might be cruising data for example.

Non-trip record data. There's a lot of stuff in the controller area network, hundreds and hundreds of pieces of information. So I didn't know what

2	was implied here. But as far as what this 235		
3	Intro requires, that's all there in the		
4	Administrative Code and the vendor contracts.		
5	Just as a final thought, when		
6	Committee Member Nelson was talking about		
7	conflicts of interest, I'll give you another		
8	example he could have cited. What about a		
9	lobbyist member of the Taxi Commission? It could		
10	have been used as an example. Thank you.		
11	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: Thank you very		
12	much.		
13	MR. THALER: You're welcome.		
14	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: There being no		
15	further business I'd like to thank the members,		
16	especially my colleague Mike Nelson who stuck here		
17	with		
18	[Applause]		
19	CHAIRPERSON VACCA:and Mike,		
20	Mike, I owe you one. Okay. Thank you all for		
21	coming. The meting is adjourned.		
22	COUNCIL MEMBER NELSON: Will you		
23	let me be Chair?		
24	[Pause]		
25	CHAIRPERSON VACCA: The meeting is		

1		COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 118
2	over.	
3		[Gavel banging]
4		

CERTIFICATE

I, Laura L. Springate 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.

Lama L. Springete

Signature ____Laura L. Springate_____

Date _____May 31, 2010_____