

NYC DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TESTIMONY
HEARING BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
ON INTRODUCTIONS 84, 314, 332 445. 596-A, 848, 857, 898, 910, 927, 932, 935, and 942
June 12, 2018

Good morning Chair Rodriguez and members of the Transportation Committee. I am Margaret Forgione, Chief Operations Officer at the New York City Department of Transportation. With me today are Deputy Commissioner for Traffic Operations Joshua Benson and Assistant Commissioner for Intergovernmental and Community Affairs Rebecca Zack. Together with our colleagues Deputy Chief Michael Pilecki and Oleg Chernyavsky of NYPD and Chief Ed Grayson, Director of DSNY's Bureau of Cleaning and Collection, we are pleased to be here to testify on behalf of Mayor de Blasio on a number of bills before the Council on the issue of parking.

I will begin by talking about the three proposals to require DOT to create residential parking permits or "RPPs." I will then address several bills that deal with preventing misuse of city-issued parking permits, or placards, before turning to the remaining bills.

Background

First, a little background on DOT's administration of curbside parking in New York City. With approximately 76 million linear feet of curb in New York City, DOT believes curb space is a shared public resource that should be managed to safely benefit multiple users, including local businesses, bus riders, pedestrians, bike riders, and drivers—both visitors and residents alike.

When it comes to parking, DOT maintains over 85,000 metered spaces. Additional non-metered parking may be subject to Alternate Side Parking or "ASP" regulations, or with no posted restriction, but still subject to general provisions of the law on parking on public streets. And just as population density, land use, and car ownership vary widely across the city, the amount and type of available parking varies widely by neighborhood type as well, but the vast majority of curb space citywide is available for residential parking. In many areas the greatest percent of curb space is provided for the storage of personal vehicles.

In recent years, we have accomplished one major transformation of our metered parking system, one of the largest in the world, through the transition to Muni-meters. We are now exploring a second transformation, towards an integrated, license plate-based, electronic payment and permit management and enforcement solution. The rollout of the ParkNYC, "pay-by-cell," program was the potential first step in this process, which could allow for much more efficient and fraud-resistant parking enforcement.

Residential Parking Permits (Intros. 848, 857, and 898)

Now, RPPs. Intros. 848 by Council Member Levine, 857 by Chair Rodriguez, and 898 by Council Member Moya each direct DOT to create an RPP system, in Manhattan north of 60th Street, city-wide, and in East Elmhurst, Queens, respectively. Each of the otherwise identical bills would direct DOT to determine the areas, times of day, and days of the week in which such a system would apply and the schedule of fees, while requiring that at least twenty percent of

spaces within such areas are available to non-residents for short-term parking, and that permits not be required for streets adjacent to commercial, office, or retail use.

An RPP system for New York City has understandable appeal and is not a new idea. However, I would caution that DOT has consulted with our counterparts around North America and report that for cities that have such programs, the benefits are elusive—and in many cases they have downsides for some residents, businesses, and visitors that can be challenging to manage. So today I will put forward several cautions for anyone considering such proposals.

Legal Questions

First, while we are always receptive to reviewing varying interpretations of the law, the City's long-held understanding is that any RPP program would require State authorization. The New York Court of Appeals has made it clear that in the absence of specific authorization, localities are prohibited from restricting highway use—including parking—based on residency. Consistent with that judicial determination, more than a dozen other towns and cities have implemented residential parking programs in New York State after receiving express approval from the State Legislature.

Equity

Setting aside the legal limitations, RPP programs pose a significant question of equity. They favor local resident's ability to store their cars in the program area, often one with good access to transit, while restricting the ability of others to park in the area. These others can include those who may lack access to good transit and be more car dependent, and are driving to the area in order to then access transit or nearby jobs, schools, or services.

Efficacy

Now turning to the all-important question of efficacy. The appeal of an RPP program is based on the idea that if a significant portion of parkers are non-residents prior to the introduction of the program, requiring permits could make it easier for residents to find parking. However, previous observations by DOT have indicated that there may be fewer "outsider" vehicles in New York City neighborhoods than people may perceive, with many actually belonging to local residents. Rather, in New York City, on-street parking scarcity is mainly driven by the large number of resident-owned vehicles compared to the number of spaces available.

If the supply of permits significantly exceeds the number of parking spaces in a zone, the permit is no guarantee of parking availability—just a permit that residents must now obtain for the privilege of circling the block looking for parking, exactly as they did before. In this case, only a system that incorporates either rationing or pricing to control the number of permits will actually ease the search for parking—meaning waitlists, or a mechanism such as auctioning.

Other difficult decisions

Designing a permit system would involve many other difficult decisions and management issues. First would be whether and how communities opt-in, based on criteria, and what the size and locations of zones would be. Hours of operation would need to be determined—daytime, overnight, weekdays, weekends—and would have a lot to do with the intended goals of the program. Decisions about drawing zone boundaries would also be key to the goals and

operations of any program, but could also become entangled in the politics of perceived neighborhood boundaries.

Any system would be best targeted to where it is most likely to produce a benefit: areas with high parking demand driven chiefly by out-of-area parkers rather than the high number of cars owned by residents themselves relative to the available parking. And, ideally, there would be other transportation options equitably available to those out-of-area drivers. But this reality might not prevent residents of neighborhoods that are not good candidates from campaigning for permits none-the-less, were the City to have a program.

Furthermore, in much of the City, the division between clearly residential and commercial areas is less defined than in many other places. And even in purely residential areas there are many legitimate uses of the curb that are challenging to deal with in an RPP system: home healthcare workers, people making deliveries and building repairs, family visiting from out of town, local residents who rent a car from time to time, and people shopping at a nearby business.

And if demand for permits exceeds supply, or if the price is significant, we would have to consider various claims for hardship or other exemptions, as well as the question of whether an applicant's possession of off-street parking should be a factor in whether they receive a permit.

Likewise, managing any system of visitor passes would be logistically complicated. In speaking with the other cities with RPP, this is one of the biggest challenges. This is an area where fraud is an issue and other cities have had to contend with the illicit trade of permits.

Finally, while cost would depend heavily on exactly what approach is used and for how much of the city, any system would be a significant and costly undertaking and would require substantial new enforcement.

With numerous trade-offs and limits to the potential benefits, DOT would caution against an RPP program.

Placard Misuse (Intros. 927, 932, 942, 596-A)

Now, turning to the topic of placard misuse. This administration shares the goal of comprehensive electronic tracking of permits as well as clear policies for their distribution and welcomes a conversation about increased penalties for misuse. We therefore support the intent of Intros. 927, by the Speaker, 932, by Council Member Chin, 942, by Council Member Koo, and 596-A, by Council Member Williams.

DOT is taking the necessary steps to track all the permits it issues electronically in a database that can be made available to enforcement agents. The technology upgrades to our parking permit application funded in the FY19 budget will advance that. I would note that Intro. 927 charges DOT with tracking all city-issued placards, but should recognize the role of both NYPD and DOE as issuing agencies as well. And if the City built any such system, it would be done hand-in-hand with NYPD as the enforcement agency that would actually utilize it. Placard reform is a citywide effort.

Likewise, Intro. 942, which requires a comprehensive plan for permit distribution necessary for essential government services, should also recognize the role of these two agencies. And of the 13,849 agency placards DOT issues, only 497 are for our own vehicles. The several dozen other agencies for whom we issue the remainder would also need to be consulted.

When it comes to placard misuse, on May 22 DOT held a public hearing on a proposed traffic rule to create a new violation for misuse of placards and use of fraudulent placards. As a parking violation, having this rule available to NYPD's agents to use when conducting parking enforcement would allow a charge specific to the placard use rather than just the parking infraction, as is currently the case. This will allow us to capture better data on the extent of the problem and more readily take action to revoke permits for misuse.

Intros. 84, 332, 445, 887, 910, and 935

Now, turning to the other bills before the committee today. First, on Chair Rodriguez's bill to provide parking privileges for press vehicles, Int. 332, we defer to NYPD on the significant enforcement questions they raised in previous testimony about this version of the legislation. And we are willing to continue our dialogue with you, Chair Rodriguez, to explore if there are workable solutions to address the intention of the bill.

Second, three bills deal with enforcement and suspension of ASP regulations.

Intro. 910 by Chair Rodriguez would allow drivers to remain parked on the restricted side of the street so long as the driver remains in the vehicle and readily moves for an approaching sweeper, as well as to re-park their vehicles on the restricted side of the street before the 90-minute street cleaning period expires, provided the sweeper has already cleaned the street.

Intro. 445 by Council Member Deutsch would temporarily suspend ASP regulations on streets adjacent to a filming permit that result in a loss of parking while Intro. 935, also by Council Member Deutsch, would suspend ASP regulations within a five-block radius of DOT resurfacing operations that likewise result in temporary parking loss.

I will start by saying that the impact of these proposals on DSNY operations is the first consideration. DSNY believes that their street sweeping vehicles are the most effective tool in the City's street cleaning arsenal. Clean streets are a vital part of healthy, vibrant communities, and ASP regulations are a critical part of the DSNY's work to keep our streets clean.

DSNY believes that these bills would severely hamper their ability to clean our streets and would be difficult to operationalize. Intro 910 also does not account for the fact that sweepers sometimes pass more than once during the ASP regulation period.

And I likewise defer to NYPD on the very significant enforcement problems raised by Intro. 910. All three bills introduce uncertainty among drivers, enforcement officers, and adjudicators about whether a particular regulation is or was in force, and the Department of Finance (DOF) believes that it would be challenging to verify if the circumstances presented in the legislation actually took place.

Regarding Intro. 445 and 935 to temporarily suspend ASP rules, DOF believes these bills would raise serious adjudication issues due to the difficulty of knowing whether or not a regulation was in fact suspended at a particular time and place. And DOF has previously testified on these concerns regarding this version of Intro. 445.

Unlike temporary city-wide suspensions on certain holidays for example, both film permits and street closures associated with DOT resurfacing, are at very specific, varied, and constantly changing times and locations across the City.

On the side of the administering agency—DOT in the case of 935—it may sound like a basic task to determine which blocks are subject to temporary suspension under the proposed laws in order to post notices (or direct the permittee to post them in the case of film permits). But each determination requires a parking loss analysis and interpretation of what ASP regulations are affected given the City's varied street grid and geography. And temporary signs could be subject to fraud or tampering and would need to be removed promptly as well.

Third, Intro. 84 by Council Member Deutsch deals with parking regulations associated with school hours. This bill seeks to make it easier and clearer for motorists to know if a "school days" based regulation is in force or not, and DOT is willing to explore this issue with the Council Member.

However, it could be challenging to compile an online list of exact days and times each individual school in the City is in session. DOT would depend on DOE for this information, and in the case of non-DOE schools a feasible mechanism to obtain it may not exist. Another route DOT could take would be to standardize the definition of "school day," but the Council should be warned that this would likely result in a net loss of allowed non-school parking availability.

Finally, I would like to discuss Intro. 887, by Council Member Gjonaj, regarding notice and comment before certain street changes. First, I would like to talk about the roll out of the Clear Curbs pilot, which I believe spurred this legislation. Since the Mayor announced his congestion plan, his staff, DOT, NYPD and other City partners, together met many times with elected officials and stakeholders to answer questions and invite feedback. We hosted a City Hall open house session, a briefing for elected officials and stakeholders in each borough, 12 separate meetings with dozens of industry groups and individual businesses who both make and receive deliveries, and Community Board presentations where requested.

Before the signs went up in each Clear Curbs pilot area, we sent our Street Ambassadors to visit local businesses throughout these zones and distribute informational materials about the pilot. DOT team members, our Commissioner included, have been on the ground in all of these locations to share information and answer questions, and have been working with local businesses and stakeholders as the pilot is ongoing.

We also continue to invite stakeholders to visit our website, nyc.gov/mcp (for "Mayor's Congestion Plan") or call our Borough Commissioners' offices to share their feedback with us. We will continue to seek feedback throughout the six-month Clear Curbs pilot and I encourage all of you to reach out to us at any time with your concerns and ideas.

On the notice and comment periods for Community Boards, Council Members and BIDs, for certain types of street use changes lasting more than a week proposed by this legislation, I will say the following.

Overall, DOT incorporates different levels of community input and dialogue, often extensive, on *many* projects, because it can result in better designs and implementations. However, lengthy comment and discussion before taking any step is not always the best or most appropriate approach. And statutory notice and comment requirements can delay needed improvements, and make it more difficult for the agency to respond in an agile and responsive way to community and Council Member requests.

Finally, should this bill move forward, attention should be paid to avoid creating duplicative and conflicting requirements with existing law in the Ad Code, particularly 19-101.2, the Major Transportation Projects law, 19-167.4, the Muni-meter requirement, and 19-187, the bike lane requirement, and to avoid an increasingly complicated set of notice and comment requirements for different types of projects.

Conclusion

I will finish by saying that with so much density of people and activity, we all know competition is very fierce for the many uses of the curb in New York City. At DOT, we are continually improving and innovating how we manage this valuable resource safely and efficiently for the greatest benefit while balancing all of those competing uses. After you hear from my NYPD colleagues I would be happy to answer any questions.

FOR THE RECORD

To: New York City Council Transportation Committee
From: Jack Davies, Transportation Alternatives
RE: Testimony on Parking Regulations and Policy in New York City
Date: June 12, 2018

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

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

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

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

But car parking requirements, set by Moses over 50 years ago and more in line with a mid-size municipality than the most transit-rich city in the country, still largely govern New York. And these antiquated policies are costing New Yorkers.

The majority of New York City's space is being used inefficiently. Currently, 80 percent of New York's open space is filled by parked cars and congested traffic -- a wildly unfair allocation of

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

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

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

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

This is about fairness: car owners should have to pay rent if they plan to store their private property on public spaces long-term. According to a 2014 study by researchers at CUNY and NYU, more than half of New York City car owners would be willing to shell out upwards of \$400 per year for a residential parking permit, so long as it meant finding parking would be easier. The study price drops when we include those who wouldn't be willing to pay anything at all but it's still significant: \$215 per month -- 68% more than the most expensive annual parking permit in the nation (San Francisco, \$128/year).

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

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

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

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

Michele Birnbaum
1035 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10028
Tel & Fax: (212)427-8250
E-mail: mbfany@nyc.rr.com

June 12,, 2018

Testimony on Intro 848 and 857

I am a resident of the Upper East Side of Manhattan since 1967 and have had at least one car in my possession for all these years. I had garaged them for most of the years, but as the garages became too costly, I began to park on the streets, with that necessity having increased when the City Planning Commission lifted the requirement that new development include substantial on-site parking – a decision without wisdom, as it only served to benefit the existing garage owners with one garage spot reportedly being sold for one million dollars.

I am a member and founder of many community organizations and have worked on behalf of residents and businesses in my community for over 40 years. I currently remain very active, and there is not a day that goes by that I am not advocating for or trying to improve the quality of life in our city.

As a car owner, you would think that I would be in favor of resident permit parking, however, after much thought and careful reading of Intros 848 and 857, I am not.

These bills are sorely lacking in detail, and as we know, the devil is in the details.

While the Council Members are well-meaning, I don't believe it would be wise for them to consider these, as they are only **conceptual**, and prior to even a conceptual bill, I believe that all would have been better served if the sponsors came to their constituents first to find out if they **wanted** permit parking. These Intros presume we are **getting** permit parking, and now you are asking for some input on the details. But these details should have been offered and worked out **prior** to drafting any legislation. The order of things is wrong. The public should have been consulted first as to its interest and asked to offer details which then could have been included in the Intros.

Permit parking will have unintended consequences and will inconvenience more than it will help.

Building staffs, most of whom live outside the city and cannot afford local garage space, will not have a place to park. Even the friendly passing of parking spaces from building shift to shift has its charm and is very New York.

Since these permits would be for residents only, the small business owners would be

inconvenienced, as many use their vehicles for deliveries and private transport. Having to garage their vehicles could negatively impact their bottom lines.

Hospital workers, an integral part of our community and who provide invaluable round the clock service, but who do not necessarily live here, will be heavily impacted by having to add the cost of a garage to their personal budgets.

Contractors who stream in every morning to do building work for residents and park in alternate side of the street spots or at uni-meters will be reluctant to do work in the area, because the cost is too high. It's hard to get contractors to do work in the area now, as they site the inconvenience of coming in, the traffic, dealing elevators and supers and building rules, and they charge for those inconveniences. Those costs will go up, or there will be a dearth of contractors, as many won't want to do business here at all.

What about the cost of such a permit? Will it be revenue generating or collect fees just to cover administrative costs? If it's revenue generating, then the monies should be designated for road maintenance and not go in to general city funds? But, wouldn't this mean that residents are being doubly taxed, as we already pay taxes for this purpose. If the cost would be just to cover administrative needs, then these will absolutely, necessarily increase over time and be unpredictable from the start.

Having just heard about these bills this past Thursday, I had little time to reflect, but I have many more concerns than what I have stated and too little time to express them.

Sometimes people have to be left to their own resourcefulness. Residents don't mind figuring out for themselves how and when to best park their cars. More rules often cause more harm.

And you can bet, you are opening up the flood-gates for fraudulent and counterfeit permits. Enforcing this program would be a bureaucratic nightmare.

Although these bills are well meaning, the risk of implementation is too great with too many downsides.

Please withdraw these bills, and let us work things out for ourselves.

Thank you !

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michele Birnbaum". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Michele Birnbaum

From: Davis, Townsend <Townsend.Davis@abc.com>

Subject: Hearing on Intro 332

Dear Sir:

Please enter this photograph into the record for today's hearing. Thank you.

Townsend Davis

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Edwin Cartagena" <ecrock51@yahoo.com>

To: "Davis, Townsend" <Townsend.Davis@abc.com>

Subject: NYP Zone



~Edwin Cartagena



National Press Photographers Association

120 Hooper Street • Athens, GA 30602
Phone: 716.983.7800 • Fax: 716.608.1509
lawyer@nppa.org

June 11, 2018

Hon. Corey Johnson
Speaker of the New York City Council
City Hall
New York, New York 10007

Re: In support of Intro 332-2018, Providing certain parking privileges for press vehicles

Dear Speaker Johnson:

I write on behalf of the National Press Photographers Association (NPPA) and the members of our organization working in New York City in support of Intro 332-2018, “Providing certain parking privileges for press vehicles.”

We are extremely concerned about the ongoing practices by the New York City Police Department (NYPD) of ticketing, booting and towing vehicles with NYP press plates and other clearly identified press vehicles while failing to enforce illegal parking by unauthorized vehicles in officially designated NYP zones. Additionally, we strongly object to the more recent policy of the New York City Department of Transportation (DOT) for significantly decreasing the number of NYP zones and parking spaces throughout the city and specifically in Manhattan.

These onerous actions (and inactions) threaten the ability of journalists to cover newsworthy events and matters of public concern because they are unable to access them in a timely manner due to the above referenced parking constraints. We view this as a direct prior restraint on our newsgathering abilities and the public’s right to receive meaningful information and images.

As noted by the United States Supreme Court in addressing First Amendment rights – “without some protection for seeking out the news, freedom of the press could be eviscerated.” *Branzburg v. Hayes*, 408 US 665 (1972). This state proudly guarantees those free press and speech rights under Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the State of New York, along with a well-settled state jurisprudence affirming First Amendment protections more broadly than those held federally.

In the city considered the media capital of the world it is crucial that press rights not be abridged by detrimental parking policies and practices but rather protected by a government supportive of those constitutional freedoms.

Therefore, NPPA and its members urge the City Council to support and enact Intro 332-2018.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Mickey H. Osterreicher

Mickey H. Osterreicher
NPPA General Counsel

Chairman
MILO E. RIVERSO*

Vice Chairmen
LOUIS J. COLETTI*
RALPH J. ESPOSITO*
CARL GALIOTO*
MAUREEN A. HENEGAN*
CYRUS J. IZZO*
GREGORY A. KELLY*
HENRY KUYKENDALL*
GARY LaBARBERA*
JILL N. LERNER*
MITCHEL W. SIMPLER*

President & CEO
CARLO A. SCISSURA*

Treasurer
SABRINA KANNER *

Secretary
JOSEPH G. MIZZI*

General Counsel
MICHAEL S. ZETLIN*

Past Chairman
RICHARD CAVALLARO*

Directors
HUSAM AHMAD
JOSEPH J. ALIOTTA
VINCENT ALVAREZ
JAMES G. BACH
AINE M. BRAZIL
LYNNE P. BROWN
PETER CAFIERO
ANDREW CATAPANO
VICTORIA J. CERAMI
EDWIN CHRISTIAN
CHERYL MCKISSACK DANIEL
WILLIAM J. GILBANE III
JOHN J. GILBERT III
DAVID M. GREENBERG
SHARON GREENBERGER
SUSAN L. HAYES
JOSEPH A. IENUSO
MARIAN KLEIN FELDT
CHRISTOPHER LARSEN
GEORGE E. LEVENTIS
JEFFREY E. LEVINE
ANTHONY E. MANN
ANTHONY MANNARINO
PETER A. MARCHETTO
CHRIS MCCARTIN
CHARLES F. MURPHY
MYSORE L. NAGARAJA
TERRENCE E. O'NEAL
RAYMOND M. POCINO
JOHN F. POWERS
TODD RECHLER
FRANCES A. RESHESKE
JONATHAN D. RESNICK*
LAWRENCE P. ROMAN
MICHAEL F. RUSSO
ANTHONY P. SCHIRRIPIA
SCOTT SELTZ
VICKI MATCH SUNA
MICHAEL J. SWEENEY
MATTHEW VAN BUREN
ELISE WAGNER
CHRISTOPHER O. WARD
IRIS WEINSHALL
ELI ZAMEK
*Executive Committee Member

DIRECTORS EMERITI
RICHARD T. ANDERSON
RAYMOND P. DADDAZIO
PETER L. DICAPUA
JOHN M. DIONISIO
MARY-JEAN EASTMAN
PETER GOETZ
STUART E. GRAHAM
RICHARD SETH HAYDEN
JOHN F. HENNESSY III
THOMAS IOVINO
LEEVI KIL
HERBERT K. KOENIG
JEFFREY M. LEVY
JOHN V. MAGLIANO
WILLIAM A. MARINO
GERARD A. NEUMANN
ROBERT S. PECKAR
THOMAS Z. SCARANGELLO
FRANK J. SCIAME
ROBERT E. SELSAM
DOMINICK M. SERVEDIO
MARILYN JORDAN TAYLOR
DANIEL R. TISHMAN
RICHARD L. TOMASETTI



June 12, 2018

**New York City Council Committee on Transportation
Councilmember Ydanis Rodriguez, Chair
Introduction 857-2018**

We are writing regarding the urgent need for increased funding to support New York City's transportation infrastructure. Recently introduced legislation, Intro. 857, which would create new fees for residential parking permits, offers an important opportunity to help meet this objective.

Intro. 857 dictates that the new parking permit fees, "shall be credited to the general fund of the city of New York." We recommend that the Council instead dedicate any new user fees on motor vehicles like this to a fund specifically supporting New York City's vital transportation infrastructure.

The New York Building Congress represents more than 550 constituent organizations, collectively comprising over 250,000 skilled tradespeople and professionals, including contractors, architects, engineers, unions, real estate managers, developers, and owners. On behalf of our membership, the NYBC advocates in support of public policy that helps our members: by promoting smart capital spending, encouraging creative public-private partnerships, and stimulating economic and infrastructure growth.

The City faces a crossroads: in order to increase economic mobility for all of the City's residents, accommodate a swelling population, and continue to remain economically competitive, much of the City's mass transit, roads and bridges urgently need to be improved and expanded. Funding for the Brooklyn Queens Connector, improvements to key roadways to permit better bus and pedestrian access, new mass transit connections including the Gateway Program, and vital improvements to local and State roadways all face enormous funding gaps. A dedicated user fee from parking permits could provide a small but meaningful contribution to this funding gap.

A recent Building Congress report, *How to Save New York City's Infrastructure: Dedicate Revenues*, enclosed here, provides a variety of suggestions to employ user fees in support of core city infrastructure. We believe this legislation provides a meaningful opportunity to continue this conversation.

Now is the time to think creatively about how to support the transportation networks that interconnect New York City's diverse and growing population and facilitate economic mobility. We look forward to speaking with you and the City Council about this in the near future.

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____
 in favor in opposition

Date: 6-12-18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Leslie Ramos

Address: _____

I represent: 52nd Street Partnership

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____
 in favor in opposition

Date: 6/12/18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Oleg Chernyavsky, Deputy Chief Michael Pilecki

Address: _____

I represent: NYPD Traffic Enforcement District

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____
 in favor in opposition

Date: 6/12/18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Oleg Chernyavsky (Chur-nov-skee)

Address: NYPD Director of Legislative Affairs

I represent: _____

Address: _____

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

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6-12-18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Rebekah Zack

Address: Asst Comm'ssioner for Intergov

I represent: and Community Affairs

Address: NYC DOT

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6-12-18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Margaret Forgiore

Address: Chief Operations Officer

I represent: NYC DOT

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6-12-18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Joshua Benson

Address: DCI for Traffic Operations

I represent: NYC DOT

Address: _____

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK *RESIDENTIAL PARKING PERMITS*

Appearance Card

[]

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6-12-18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: HARRY MALAKOFF

Address: 340 W 28th St, MAN.

I represent: PRIVATE CITIZEN

Address: _____

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

[]

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 332 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6/12/18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Townsend Davis

Address: 77 W. 66th St. New York, NY ~~10023~~

I represent: WABC-TV (Ch. 7)

Address: 7 Lincoln Pl., New York NY 10023

THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

[]

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6.12.2018

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: John Daves

Address: 111 John St. Suite 260

I represent: Transportation Alternatives

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 332 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6-12-18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: STEVE SANDS

Address: _____

I represent: Self Employed

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Jane Tillman IRVING

Address: _____

I represent: New York Press Club

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 587 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6/12

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: David Eisenbach

Address: 201 E 12th St PH 12

I represent: Friends of SBTSA

Address: _____

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

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. press party Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6/12/13

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: PETER MCGOWAN

Address: 524 W 57th St

I represent: CBS

Address: 524 W 57th St NY, NY 10019

press party
**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6-12-18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: DAVID HANDSCHUTT

Address: _____

I represent: Freelance Photographer

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 887 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6-12-18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Meredith Phillips Almeida

Address: NYC BID Association

I represent: _____

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 332 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6/12/18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Robert Roth

Address: 240 Kent Avenue, Brooklyn 11249

I represent: self

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6/12/18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Elizabeth Lara

Address: _____

I represent: Resident

Address: Battery Park City North

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 332 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6-12-18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Todd Mansel

Address: 4 NY Plaza

I represent: NY D. by News/UP NYPPA

Address: _____

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

Permit parking

THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6-12-18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Michele Birnbaum

Address: 1035 Park Ave

I represent: _____

Address: 1035 Park Ave

THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: June 11, 2018

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Schellie Hagan

Address: 60 Dewitt

I represent: Preserve Our Brooklyn Neighborhoods

Address: _____

THE COUNCIL THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6-12-18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Edward Grayson

Address: DSNY, Director Bureau of Cleaning and
Collection

I represent: _____

Address: 125 Worth St. NY, NY 10013

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 332 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 6-12-18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Bruce Collier

Address: 2170 Brigham St #4A

I represent: New York Press Photographers Assn.

Address: 2170 Brigham St

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: WELLINGTON Z. CHEN

Address: 217 PARK ROW, 2ND FLR SUITE 9

I represent: CHINATOWN BID / NYC 10038

Address: (SAME AS ABOVE) PARTNERSHIP

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: STEPHEN CHEUNG

Address: 128 CAYAYETTE ST. # 203 N.Y.C.

I represent: CHINATOWN BID

Address: _____