

**NYC Department of Transportation Testimony Before the
City Council Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
December 4, 2023**

Good afternoon, Chair Brooks-Powers and members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I am Eric Beaton, Deputy Commissioner for Transportation Planning and Management. With me today is Rick Rodriguez, Assistant Commissioner for Intergovernmental and Community Affairs. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of Mayor Eric Adams and Commissioner Ydanis Rodriguez on DOT transparency and notice requirements.

DOT feels strongly that high quality public input makes our projects better, so it is worth taking the time to do it well. We have been working to strengthen our relationships across the city – including with faith communities and immigrant communities – to ensure we are able to broaden the feedback that helps to shape our projects. We are always happy to take any feedback you have about critical stakeholders and strategies as we develop projects in your communities.

At the same time, we want to acknowledge that there is a balance that we need to strike between depth of community engagement and getting stuff done for New Yorkers. We need to make our streets safer, create a better public realm, and help people get where they need to go quickly and efficiently. It is important to do this while working closely with communities, but we also want to make sure that we right-size engagement processes to make sure we are delivering our work equitably around the city and moving aggressively. As the Mayor announced last week, we are doubling our intersection safety commitment to 2,000 intersections per year, including 1,000 with daylighting, which I know has long been pushed for by our partners in the council, especially you, Chair, and we are grateful for your partnership in making sure we can get these needed safety enhancements in quickly.

I know that there has been concern about how DOT engages with communities, and I want to take a moment to talk about some of the ways that we have been working to expand how we do this, and make sure we are connecting with people and reflecting local concerns in our work.

When DOT develops a project, our Borough Commissioners develop outreach plans that reflect each unique community. This includes formal engagements with Community Boards and briefings for Council Members and other elected officials, but also ways to reach out directly to the public including workshops, surveys, onsite walkthroughs, and flyers posted through the project area and often handed directly to business and homeowners. We work directly with local stakeholders, such as Business Improvement Districts, faith organizations, older adult centers, and other locally important institutions. We also work closely with our peer agencies, including the police department, fire department, sanitation, parks, small business services, and other agencies where relevant.

One focus of this Administration is making sure we are hearing directly from New Yorkers, many of whom may not have the ability to attend formal meetings in the evening. Our Street Ambassadors meet New Yorkers where they live, work, and socialize. They engage people in conversations about DOT projects at locations and times that are convenient for them. They often do outreach in active neighborhood spaces during the morning rush, in the evenings, or

over the weekend. The Street Ambassadors also do merchant surveys where they walk business to business along a corridor to speak directly with business owners and get feedback about DOT proposals. The Street Ambassador team is comprised of multi-lingual public engagement specialists who speak 10 languages.

This model has been successful in getting feedback from community members and for sharing information about DOT's Street Improvement Projects. For many projects, we get thousands of responses, far more than we could get at any individual meeting, and particularly focused on local residents and stakeholders. Going forward, we want to continue to find innovative ways to make sure we are getting important community feedback, and make sure we are communicating clearly about what is happening on our streets.

I also want to acknowledge that we often get many more requests than we are able to fulfill, a situation that will continue to be a challenge through the current budget crisis. We do our best to prioritize work so that we are both addressing the most critical locations and also performing work equitably citywide. We appreciate your partnership in helping to prioritize requests and your understanding when our resources are limited.

Legislation

Turning to the legislation before the Council today.

Introduction 172

First, Intro. 172 sponsored by Council Member Hudson. This bill would require DOT to provide 60 days advance notice to affected council members, community boards, and community organizations prior to the designation, permanent change to, or removal of an Open Street.

DOT is proud to run the largest and most successful Open Streets program in the country. The program transforms streets into public space open to all. These transformations allow for a range of activities that promote economic development, support schools, facilitate pedestrian and bike mobility, and provide new ways for New Yorkers to enjoy cultural programming and build community.

DOT shares the Council's interest in providing sufficient notice and opportunity for community feedback for Open Streets. We recently proposed rules for the program that would achieve a lot of these same goals and would be happy to discuss the best way forward with the Council.

Introduction 810

Next, Intro. 810 sponsored by Council Member Bottcher. This bill lays out requirements for newsracks' maintenance and placement. DOT has previously supported newsrack reforms and would be happy to discuss this bill further with the Council.

Introduction 922

Next, Intro. 922 sponsored by Council Member Ariola. This bill would require DOT to notify the local Community Board and Council Member 15 days before removing a parking space. DOT has serious concerns with this bill as it would slow the pace of operations and be extremely

burdensome. Streets are fluid spaces and parking spaces are added and removed every day. Providing and receiving such notice would be overwhelming for both the agency and the recipients. For permanent removals, DOT already gives notice before implementing major transportation projects that involve the full-time removal of a parking lane, based on laws passed by the Council. This bill creates a much wider universe of notice by including both permanent and temporary parking space removals that could include temporary removals for construction or resurfacing. Overall, this would slow down a significant portion of DOT's work.

Introduction 1030

Next, Intro. 1030 sponsored by Council Member Williams. This bill would require DOT to make available and searchable on its website information on speed reducer and traffic control device requests. I'm happy to say that DOT already has such a page on our website. If you go to the [Contact the Commissioner](#) page on our website, you can find the link to the [Check Case Status Map](#). You can enter the case number or search an address to check on the status of a request. If a 311 service request was submitted, there is also a link on the page that takes you to the [311 page](#) to look up your previously submitted request. We would be happy to discuss this page further with the Council and how we could make this information more accessible.

Introduction 1033

Next, Intro. 1033 sponsored by Council Member Ariola. This bill would require DOT to consult with the Fire Department before approving an Open Street applications and certain bicycle lane projects. Further, this bill would require DOT to notify affected firehouses before approving an Open Street application, a bicycle lane project, and a major transportation project.

DOT works closely with our sister agencies and believes that such coordination is important. We already consult with FDNY on these projects, including meeting regularly with FDNY Bureau of Operations Planning Division and each FDNY Borough Commander to discuss our projects and solicit their feedback on potential issues that may arise—including concerns raised by local firehouses. These are important conversations that we will continue to have, but such communication must continue to happen in a centralized manner. We defer to our sister agency on how best to disseminate information between the Borough Commanders, FDNY Operations, and the firehouses.

Introduction 1120

Next, Intro. 1120 sponsored by Council Member Carr. This bill would require DOT to assess at least 100 speed camera locations each year to determine the feasibility of installing a raised speed reducer and where feasible, installing such device within one year. Additionally, DOT would be required to annually report on each assessed location, and in locations where both a speed reducer and camera are present, provide a recommendation for whether a camera is still necessary.

DOT has concerns with this bill as it would slow down speed hump installations and reduce the reach of our safety interventions. With this bill, instead of installing speed humps in new

locations based on the many requests we get, we would need to install them where a safety treatment already exists. Moreover, the two tools are best used in different types of locations.

Speed humps and speed cameras are two tools in our toolbox that address speeding, but we have many others that may be more appropriate for a particular location, such as a larger street redesign or signal timing changes. As always, please send us the locations where you have safety concerns, and we can evaluate them for the best treatment.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I would like to thank the Council for the opportunity to testify before you today on DOT's efforts to engage with and notify the public about our projects. We now welcome your questions.

Remarks for Council Member Kevin C. Riley:
Oversight on DOT Transparency and Notice Requirements
Intro 1033-2023

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

New York City Council
Council Chambers - City Hall
1:00 pm - 3:00 pm
Monday, December 4, 2023
Contact: Jayson Fox
###-###-####

Chair: Selvena N. Brooks-Powers

Members: Joann Ariola, David M. Carr, Amanda Fariás, Ari Kagan, Linda Lee, Farah N. Louis, Mercedes Narcisse, Lincoln Restler, Carlina Rivera, Nantasha M. Williams, Julie Won and Kalman Yeger

Background

T2023-4328 Oversight - DOT Transparency and Notice Requirements.

Int 0172-2022 A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, in relation to notification and community input regarding designation of, removal of and changes to open streets.

Int 0810-2022 A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, in relation to newsrack requirements and to repeal and replace subdivision a of section 19-128.1 of the administrative code of the city of New York

Int 0922-2023 A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, in relation to notification of the removal of parking spaces

Int 1030-2023 A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, in relation to the department of transportation posting information on traffic control device and speed reducer request on its website

Int 1033-2023 A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, in relation to requiring the department of transportation to consult with the fire department prior to approving open street applications and certain bicycle lane projects and to notify affected firehouses prior to approving open street applications, bicycle lane projects, and major transportation projects.

Sponsors: Joann Ariola, Robert Holden, Kevin C. Riley, Kalman Yeger, Lincoln Restler, Selvena Brooks-Powers, Joseph Borelli, David Carr, Ari Kagan, Inna Vernikov, Vickie Paladino

Council Member Sponsors: 11

Int 1120-2023 A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, in relation to requiring a raised speed reducer feasibility assessment at speed camera locations

Committee Remarks

Thank you Chair.

I'm here today to emphasize the crucial importance of Intro 1033, a fundamental step towards strengthening agency partnership, calling on the Department of Transportation (DOT) to collaborate effectively with the FDNY to guarantee that our city's transportation projects align with the safety needs of our communities.

Every district is unique, with its own set of dynamics and challenges, making it imperative to approach projects on a case-by-case basis. This is precisely where Intro 1033 becomes indispensable.

I'm proud to be a co-sponsor of this legislation, mandating that DOT consults with the Fire Department before approving open street applications and certain bicycle lane projects. By requiring notifications to affected firehouses before green-lighting these projects, we are placing a critical check on the decision-making process.

While the intention of street design projects is to strike a balance among the needs of pedestrians, riders, and drivers alike, they can sometimes omit critical functionalities that vary from one community to another. In my district, the White Plains Road protected bike lanes have elicited ongoing concern from numerous residents, business owners, and municipal workers, including our local Fire Department.

With the lanes altering parking and conflicting with our elevated train network, inevitable congestion has hindered the flow of traffic in one of our community's busiest business markets. This poses a potential challenge to the ability of firefighters and EMT professionals to promptly act in emergency situations where response time can be decisive to optimizing life-saving interventions.

Recognizing the importance of truly accessible streets, my office has endeavored to find a balance among district needs and citywide transit upgrades through collaboration with DOT. Safety concerns raised during site visits and community input sessions have gone unaddressed while conditions continually worsen, rendering the bike lanes and parking spaces both ineffective and hazardous.

Intro 1033 is not aimed at impeding the progress to transform our streets to safely accommodate our expanding means of transportation; rather, it seeks to guarantee responsible and community-oriented advancement through multi-agency partnership. It serves as a guiding light, emphasizing that transportation projects must resonate with the authentic needs and safety considerations of our neighborhoods.

I urge my colleagues to endorse this bill, as it signifies a dedication to the well-being and safety of our constituents. Thank you.



New York City Council Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
Oversight Hearing on DOT Transparency and Notice Requirements
December 4, 2023
Testimony of Eric McClure, Executive Director, StreetsPAC

As we near the end of 2023, we are faced with the reality that New York City will finish the year with roughly the same number of traffic deaths as we experienced in 2022, a figure, at +/- 250 fatalities, that's about 25% higher than in 2018, the safest year on record. At the same time, we will again fail, significantly, to achieve many of the mandates required by the Streets Plan. We remain, sadly, a very long way from achieving Vision Zero.

It is that context that makes several of the bills being heard this afternoon so disappointing. Rather than furthering efforts to move us closer to Vision Zero and advance the work of the Streets Plan, some of the legislation on today's agenda seems intended to hamstring the work of DOT. At a time when we're losing, on average, five New Yorkers to traffic crashes every week, the City Council should not be advancing legislation that would hamper street-safety and public-space projects or take roundabout aim at the city's life-saving speed camera program.

Int. 0172-2022 – Support in Principle with Reservations

We certainly support what we believe to be the motivation behind Int. 0172, which is to prevent the summary removal or modification of an Open Street at the whim of someone with the power to make that happen. As is too often the case, the effort to make streets safer or more inviting to uses other than driving and parking requires numerous hurdles, while undoing such changes can happen quickly.

On the other hand, many of the notification steps for implementing Open Streets are already built into the official process, and rather than legislating additional steps, we believe that the measures called for in this bill, especially those that would prevent the rapid undoing of projects, could be addressed in DOT's rulemaking process. We urge that this be negotiated rather than legislated.

Int. 0810-2022 – Support in Principle with Reservations

We support efforts aimed at improving the placement and maintenance of news racks, which continue to clutter limited sidewalk space even while many publications have moved from printed paper to electronic publishing. As with Int. 0172, however, we

believe the intent of Int. 0810 may be better accomplished through rulemaking rather than legislation.

Int. 0922-2023 – Oppose

We oppose Int. 0922, which would require 15 days' notice to Community Boards and Council Members before removal of parking spaces. We believe this would create an unnecessary and unwarranted bureaucratic process that would not have any effective benefit.

Int. 1030-2023 – Support in Principle with Reservations

We support the principle behind Int. 1030, which is intended to increase the transparency of and access to information about the status of requests for traffic-control devices and speed-reducing infrastructure. However, we believe that at least some of this information is already published by DOT, so this is another case in which we think a negotiated outcome is preferable to legislation. This type of information should be publicly accessible in an easy-to-find and easy-to-navigate dashboard, so we urge DOT to work with the bill sponsors to arrive at a satisfactory outcome that improves the transparency and availability of data.

Int. 1033-2023 – Oppose

We oppose Int. 1033, which would create unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles for the implementation of Open Streets and bike lanes and would also recreate a process that is already happening at the borough command level. DOT regularly consults with the Fire Department when developing and implementing street projects of all types, but this happens at a management level. It would not make sense administratively for DOT to have to consult with individual fire houses when a command and communication structure already exists within FDNY.

Int. 1120-2023 – Oppose

We oppose Int. 1120, which would require DOT to assess the installation of speed humps at a minimum of 100 speed-camera locations annually. While we're all for speed humps and other measures to reduce speeding, there's already a long backlog of speed hump requests, and we know that speed cameras by themselves are effective at reducing speeding, since most drivers who receive one or two tickets change their behavior and slow down.

As the Staten Island Advance wrote when reporting on the introduction of this bill earlier this year:

“City data shows that, as of December 2020, speeding has dropped by an average of 72% at locations where the cameras have been installed, with injuries falling by 14%.

“The cameras have also shown to deter repeated speeding offenses, with the majority of vehicles only receiving one or two violations since the program began in 2014.

“Additionally, in 2021, more than half the vehicles that received a speed camera violation did not receive a second one.”

We suspect that the intent of this bill is ultimately more about opposition to speed cameras than it is about aiming to improve street safety.



**New York City Council
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure**

Administrative Code in Relation to Newsrack Requirements

**Monday, December 4, 2023
1:00pm**

**Testimony: Zach Beresin, Operations Analyst
34th Street Partnership / Bryant Park Corporation
1065 Avenue of the Americas Suite 2400
New York, NY 10110
###-###-####**

34th Street Partnership and Bryant Park Corporation support the changes proposed in Int 0810-2022, specifically in amending how newsracks are placed and maintained. In our two districts, and in other BIDs, newsracks are regularly maintained at a high standard. However, the current state of the many other newsracks in the city contributes to disorder on the streets, often being empty, or serving as receptacles for garbage. The amendments address these issues by establishing clear standards, ensuring that newsracks are placed and maintained in a way that promotes a cleaner and more orderly urban environment. We believe these changes will enhance the overall quality and walkability of our city's sidewalks.

Thank you.



December 4, 2023

Re Intro 810 – News boxes
Testimony

CHEKPEDS is a non-profit organization that has been advocating for pedestrian safety and additional sidewalk space for residents of New York City for the past 15 years.

We applaud Intro 810 intent to clarify the language related to News boxes placement. Indeed, news boxes are one of the many obstacle pedestrians have to contend with when walking to work on our congested sidewalks. Their presence is particularly problematic because they are not fixed and are regularly moved to inappropriate locations where they encroach on the right of way.

We respectfully suggest the following additions to this legislation:

- News boxes are often used as seats under sidewalk sheds and facilitate the congregation of drug users. It would be very helpful to require that news boxes be prohibited on blocks where a sidewalk shed is present. If they were permitted, a minimum distance of 100 ft to the shed should be required.
- It would be very useful, at least in Manhattan, if publications were compelled to use multi – publication boxes that are fixed on the sidewalk. Such boxes used by Business Improvement Districts have been very successful in removing congestion and keeping the sidewalk orderly. A Department of Transportation-approved unit would go a long way towards streamlining this process.
- The term “in close proximity” is too vague to allow proper enforcement. Generally, any distance that is not defined in feet will be impossible to enforce

Very truly yours,

C. Berthet, co-founder, M. Treat, co-founder,

Chinatown BID's Testimony to Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

On behalf of the Chinatown Business Improvement District, we give this testimony in regards to the proposed legislation on Newsrack Requirements. It is no secret that congested sidewalks create unpleasant walker and visitors' experience and hinder movements for seniors and pedestrians, therefore, any relief at key bottlenecks and portals is a good step in the right direction and should be explored.

Testimony on 12/4/23 Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Hearing

Open Plans writes today to testify on the set of bills discussed at the December 4th, 2023 meeting of the City Council Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Most of the bills discussed have the stated goal of trying to make the Department of Transportation more transparent. However, it seems clear that many have the true intention of delaying improvements to our streets. While we support some of these bills, we believe that many of the bills have provisions that would put in place barriers to transforming our streets to be more people-centered and livable. The city is already behind on its Streets Plan mandates, and such bills further delay these legally-mandated mandates. Further comments on the discussed bills are below:

- **We strongly oppose Int. 922.** This bill would be an incredible barrier to change on our streets, and a mistake to pass. Intro 922 would cement parking as the default use of our city's curb when we should be transitioning into making our curb work for all users, not just those with cars. At a time when DOT is trying to make transformational change at the curb with their Curb Management Action Plan and already struggling to meet the mandates in the Streets Plan, this requirement would serve as an impediment to making our streets more safe, efficient, and livable. Council Members regularly bemoan the lack of progress on the Streets Plan while simultaneously putting up barriers to its implementation — this is yet another example of that. To make real progress on the Streets Plan, every Council Member must do all they can to support the plan, not pass legislation that impedes it.
- **We oppose Int. 172 as written.** We strongly suggest amending this bill to only include the permanent removal of an Open Street. DOT is already behind on its Streets Plan commitments, and further delaying their progress through excessively long notice periods is counterproductive. We should be looking to expand access to open space across the city, not putting in place regulations that have proven to slow down progress. This is particularly true for the excessive involvement of Community Boards, which have historically proven to not be good faith partners on Open Streets.
- **We oppose Int. 1120.** Street infrastructure that disincentivizes speeding is good, and we need to further expand such infrastructure around the city. However, infrastructure that disincentivizes speeding and automated enforcement can

and should be used together; they are not mutually exclusive. Speed cameras work — full stop. As of December 2021, speeding at locations with a fixed speed camera dropped 73% on average according to DOT. We should be expanding automated enforcement — enforcement that has proven to be both more effective and equitable than manual enforcement — not passing legislation that would scale automated enforcement back.

- **We support Int. 810.** Ensuring that there is ample space near street furniture and transportation infrastructure is important for its success and widespread use. Additionally, newsracks should not impede pedestrian flow — in many places, especially in the Manhattan Core and where sidewalks are narrow, our sidewalks are already cluttered.
- **We support Int. 1030.** DOT is historically not transparent around its decisions to disapprove certain safety improvements, and this bill would increase both transparency and accountability for the agency.

Respectfully,
Open Plans

Sara Lind
Co-Executive Director
sara@openplans.org

Jackson Chabot
Director of Advocacy and Organizing
jacksonchabot@openplans.org

Michael Sutherland
Policy Analyst
michael@openplans.org

Greetings City Council Transportation Committee

My name is Bill Bruno and I'm offering my comments on some of the bills being considered by this committee on December 4. My overall concern is the unnecessary delays these bills, if passed, would create for needed safety and other improvements.

Int. 922 would create delays in necessary safety measures such as daylighting, which by necessity must entail replacing parking spaces to create lines of sight at intersections. Further, the bill requires notice for the removal of a parking spot but it doesn't require notice for the removal of any other spot, be it a bike rack, pedestrian plaza, loading zone, or anything else. There is no reason to make parking a default use that gets a higher priority than any other use. The DOT's Curb Management Action Plan and other Streets Plan requirements represent an approach that looks at all possible curb uses and not just the free car storage that is the currently dominant use.

I also have reservations about Int. 1120. Speed cameras have proven to be effective in deterring speeders, with many people who have been caught not being repeat offenders. Although speed bumps have their place, they shouldn't be used as a substitute for speed cameras.

Testimony Meant for the December 4, 2023 hearing by New York City Council,
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

My name's Christopher Day. I've been a citizen of New York City for over 33 years. I also run a blog called Stenonymous that is dedicated, in part, to documenting and explaining corporate lies and propaganda. I am troubled by the premise of this meeting, installing at least 100 solar-powered traffic control devices and studying their efficacy, because I have seen how solar promises are used to mislead decision makers in much the same way that decision makers were misled by big oil to push everybody into recycling, only for us to find out in a 2020 NPR report that only a laughably small percentage of plastic is truly recycled. The public ethos is such that once we've accepted something as "good for us," we stick to it no matter the merit of the idea, wasting countless dollars and hours in the process. What's worse? Post-purchase rationalization keeps decision makers defending all but the most indefensible positions.

To drive home the point of how solar specifically can be used to generate big headlines without delivering on its promises, one need only look to the case of Solar Roadways. In brief, the idea was to replace roadways with solar panels designed for roadway travel. I had the privilege of following a scientist named Phil Mason (Thunderf00t) online, and that scientist explained over a series of videos why the idea had no merit and was a waste of time and money. In substance, it was clear that damage to the glass and the flatness of the panels would severely reduce the energy generation of the panels. Subsequently, millions of dollars were thrown at Solar Roadways, because society cares what scientists think about as much as Congress cared about Carl Sagan's 1985 testimony. If you haven't heard of that, you know what I'm talking about.

The point I'm trying to make here is that there should be an obvious benefit to doing this before we start spending money on "trying it out" or "testing it." There should be clear, powerful, and articulated benefits BEFORE we waste – let's say "invest" – the time and energy. The political landscape in America is such that we try things out, find reasons to justify them after the fact, and then never ever correct the error, even if given decades to do so (see trickle-down economics). Therefore it is our duty as Americans and New Yorkers to acknowledge that and take extra steps to ensure we do not buy into bad ideas. Prevention is a whole lot more practical and a lot less expensive than cure.

I am going to include some things I believe the council should find answers to or take into consideration.

1. Are these devices going to be more expensive than the mass-produced non solar ones? Will the proposed cost savings beat that increase in cost? If there aren't cost savings, what are we doing? What's the projected best-case scenario? What's the projected worst-case scenario?
2. Are there a large variety of manufacturers to choose from, or will the city be stuck dealing with a small pool of suppliers that can easily manipulate the price through

- collusion or tacit parallelism with impunity in the same way the court reporting & stenotype services market was manipulated by a small group of competitors?
3. Are these devices feeding energy back into the grid and theoretically returning money to the city, or are they simply being used to power the traffic control devices? Do the savings and/or earnings compensate for any increased cost per unit (see 1)?
 4. How will the solar panel be angled? Solar panels generate the most electricity facing south, titled 15 to 45 degrees. This seems like kind of a difficult thing to do with a traffic control device. So right out of the gate, we're likely talking about wasting potential energy generation for the feel-good statement of making our traffic lights solar.
 5. If we're talking about the panel going above the device with the tilt, we are likely talking about drastically increasing the surface area of the device. What kind of complications might that cause in heavy wind conditions? This might seem like a doomsday prepper thing to ask, but let's face it, if having a big flat panel on top of your traffic device makes it more susceptible to the wind grabbing it and throwing it somewhere than a device that doesn't have it, maybe we should talk about it. We are likely to have increasingly severe weather events over time as more energy from the sun is retained by the Earth's atmosphere, this means we need practical designs that will withstand increased wear, tear, and weather.
 6. What kind of calculations have been done on the efficacy already? As stated, Phil Mason and other educated people were able to perform calculations that showed the idea of Solar Roadways was not worthwhile without a single device being installed (forget that the idea was subsequently funded anyway). Similarly, we should have a good idea of the efficacy before we even install, and if we don't, it means somebody just wants this to go through because "yay, solar."
 7. What percentage of the city's energy bill is dedicated to traffic control devices? Are there other larger line items that would make more sense to complement or supplement with solar?

In the interest of fairness I did ask on the AskNYC subreddit whether anyone had any ideas contrary to mine, and before the mods shut down that discussion, one person stated they believed a lot of good could come from these small studies. I see the merit in this line of thinking, but given the financial status of the state and city, I think it's important for us to be choosy, specifically on something with a positive political charge like solar.

I am hopeful that my testimony and the concepts I've raised therein are genuinely considered. If there is a clear benefit to our city, then I stand in support. But if we are doing this just to do it and make our city seem more modern, progressive, green, or whatever the case, then let it go. We have had far too many leaders in America jump on an idea because it sounds good. We need you all to do what's best for the City of New York, not what you think we want to hear. Thank you.

<https://www.npr.org/2020/09/11/897692090/how-big-oil-misled-the-public-into-believing-plastic-would-be-recycled>

<https://interestingengineering.com/innovation/solar-roadways-engineering-failure>

My name is Manuel Caughman, I am a member of the Board of Directors at the Robert Couche Senior Center located at 137-57 Farmers Blvd., Springfield Gardens, NY 11434. I am also a member of Community Board 12 for the last twenty-three years. I would like to address the issue of illegal truck parking at this location. Tractor Trailers and Box Trucks are constantly parking overnight and for days in front of the parking lot and the building. This presents a clear and present danger to the seniors entering and exiting this location. We have reached out to 311 and the 113th Precinct. I must say that the Commander of the Precinct has ticketed the trucks numerous times but they continue to park there. One of staff members from the Center spoke to one of the truckers about the illegal parking and he was told belligerently that he had a right to park there. We are requesting that "NO OVERNIGHT COMMERCIAL PARKING" signs be installed to protect the safety of our Seniors. Farmers Boulevard is an extremely busy street and we are trying to protect our senior citizens for an accident waiting to happen. I thank you in advance for your consideration in trying to rectify this critical situation.

Manuel Caughman

###-###-####

mannyjr146@aol.com

**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: Eric Beaton

Address: _____

I represent: Department of Transportation

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: Rick Rodriguez

Address: _____

I represent: Department of Transportation

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 5/18

Date: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: ELIZABETH ADAMS

Address: 11 John Street

I represent: Transportation Alternatives

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: 12/4/23

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Covey O'Leary, Assembly District 16

Address: 53rd St. NYC

I represent: Hollis, 70th Assembly 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: 12/4/23

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Christopher Leon Johnson

Address: Buffalo Ave HDIC 1123

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: 12/4/23

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Raul Rivers

Address: _____

I represent: _____

Address: _____