

**NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
HEARING BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL  
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION  
SEPTEMBER 26, 2011**

Good morning Chairman Vacca and members of the Transportation Committee. My name is David Woloch; I'm the Deputy Commissioner for External Affairs at the New York City Department of Transportation (DOT). With me today is Ryan Russo, DOT's Assistant Commissioner for Traffic Management. We are here to testify on 3 bills related to outreach and data collection for projects DOT undertakes to improve the operation of and safety on our streets. Our work has helped to reduce traffic fatalities to the lowest levels ever, improve service for thousands of bus riders, and make dozens of critical corridors work better for all New Yorkers. As you know, we've also made tremendous strides in improving how we communicate and assess our initiatives, and are happy to continue to work with the Council to institutionalize and improve upon these efforts.

Two of these bills, Intros 626 and 671, relate to "major transportation projects"—projects that alter four or more consecutive blocks or 1,000 consecutive feet of street and involve a major realignment of the roadway, including either addition or removal of vehicle lanes, or full-time removal of parking. This term was defined by Local Law 90 of 2009, which requires DOT to notify affected Council Members and Community Boards of major transportation projects occurring within their jurisdiction. Within 10 business days of receiving notification, the Community Board may submit recommendations and/or comments on the project and/or request a presentation to the Community Board within thirty days.

For each of the major transportation projects that DOT has undertaken since the local law went into effect, DOT presented to all the impacted community boards; in

many cases, presentations were given to both the Community Board's transportation committee and the full board. For most projects, we go significantly beyond the law's requirements. For example, for the First and Second Avenue SBS, four open house meetings were held, we convened a Community Advisory Committee five times and held numerous other meetings with elected officials and other stakeholders during the 2010 design process. More recently, as part of the dialog about the extension of bike lanes on First and Second Avenues, we held over a dozen meetings this year.

In addition to our communication and dialog with communities, DOT also notifies relevant city agencies of major transportation projects. In particular, DOT regularly consults with the Police and Fire Departments as part of our planning process. For an initiative like First and Second Avenue SBS, we met multiple times with the Police Department to discuss various features of the project. Intro 626, requiring DOT to consult with these agencies and others, would codify what is generally our existing practice. We support the overall direction of this bill, though we need to work through the language with the Council.

Similarly, Intro 412, relating to community hearings on bike lane projects, would codify our usual practice, and with some adjustments we support this bill as well. For bicycle lane projects, DOT currently conducts meetings with local stakeholders and the public to solicit feedback and support, including presenting to at least one Community Board meeting and making that presentation available on our website. This process has been successful in gaining community understanding and support for bicycle lane projects, which are in many cases part of a larger safety improvement project requested by the community.

On 44th Drive in Queens earlier this year, for example, DOT added bike lanes to help reduce speeding on Vernon Boulevard to Thomson Avenue, a high crash corridor in Long Island City, Queens. Originally, DOT's proposal consisted of a traffic calming scheme without bike lanes, and later added the lanes at the request of the Community Board. This enhanced traffic calming project, consisting of high visibility crosswalks, left-turn bays, and bike lanes, was completed in June 2011.

Intro 671, a bill requiring the reporting of certain statistics relating to major transportation projects, is drafted in the same spirit as DOT's Sustainable Streets Index (SSI), an annual report providing data on recent trends in traffic, parking, travel and safety. As you know, that report complies with Local Law 23 of 2008 that was developed by the Council in collaboration with DOT. This report enables us to communicate our performance-driven approach to transportation improvements. It includes a section on "project indicators", an assessment of major DOT projects completed in the previous calendar year. This assessment covers the impacts on safety, usage for motor vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians, bus riders and travel times in the project areas.

For the projects covered in the SSI, DOT collects before and after data for each project to assess its impacts on safety, usage for motor vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians and bus riders and/or travel times through the project area. The third and most recent SSI, published in May 2011, introduces several new methods of looking at the street network, including a more expansive analysis of millions of taxi GPS trips to determine trends in travel speeds; face-to face surveys of travel modes and trip purpose in eight neighborhoods across the five boroughs.

As demonstrated by the annual SSI, we agree with the idea behind Intro 671, but we also believe that since each project DOT conducts is unique, it requires a

customized data collection plan, which this bill does not reflect. Therefore we cannot support the legislation at this time, though we agree with the goals and are happy to continue to work with the Council on this topic.

Over the past few years, working with the Council, we've made great strides both in improving conditions on our streets for all road users and in how we study our projects and communicate with stakeholders. We look forward to continuing to work with the council on these issues. We would be happy to answer your questions at this time.

**Testimony of Eric McClure, Park Slope Neighbors  
New York City Council Committee on Transportation Hearing, Ints. 412, 626 & 671  
September 26, 2011**

My name is Eric McClure. I'm a co-founder of Park Slope Neighbors, a grassroots neighborhood advocacy group in Brooklyn.

The legislation before this committee today appears to be, in the best case, redundant and unnecessary, since the New York City Department of Transportation already consults at length with communities and affected agencies when considering major roads projects, especially those that include cycling infrastructure, and at worst, a naked effort to hamstring DOT's implementation of bike lanes and paths, which have been proved to make streets safer for *all users*, cyclists and pedestrians and drivers alike.

In my personal experience, DOT has done more to engage affected neighborhoods than any other city agency. In the case of the redesign of Prospect Park West, for example, DOT engaged in a four-year process of collaboration with Brooklyn Community Board 6, designing and implementing a project that has both made that formerly speeding-plagued avenue safer, *and* gained widespread local support.

I've appended to my written testimony a timeline of the development and implementation of the redesign of Prospect Park West; let me summarize briefly by saying that DOT – responding to a request by CB6 to calm traffic on PPW – presented initial plans in April 2009 to the Board's transportation committee, and to the full Board in May 2009; presented revised plans in a public open house and again to the transportation committee in April 2010; modified the project after implementation based on further Board input; and returned to the transportation committee six months after the project was installed to present post-implementation data. DOT is now planning to install several enhancements endorsed by the Board in subsequent committee and full board votes. In addition, DOT and the Community Board have maintained an open and ongoing dialogue during this four-year period.

Furthermore, this type of intensive, transparent, community-focused process is being replicated all over New York City. Multiple Community Boards have voted recently in favor of Class I bike paths that will run from Houston Street to 125<sup>th</sup> Street and back. Eleven of 12 Manhattan community boards voted this summer to endorse a trial of a car-free Central Park. In August, Manhattan Community Board 4 began working with DOT on the development of safe cycling routes between 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> Avenues and the Hudson River Greenway. And just last week, that same Board's transportation committee voted unanimously to endorse the extension of the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue bike paths from the 30s to 59<sup>th</sup> Street.

No other city agency collaborates more closely, or more openly, with the citizens it serves. Yet despite this unprecedented degree of collaboration, some people will never be satisfied – hence, the frivolous lawsuit over the Prospect Park West redesign, thrown out by a judge last month, and the legislation before this committee today, which appears to hold bicycling infrastructure to a different, higher standard than any other type of project under DOT's jurisdiction.

Requiring this unprecedented degree of i-dotting and t-crossing for projects that, *once again*, are proven to make our streets safer for *all users* – pedestrians and drivers as well as cyclists – doesn't just create more bureaucratic red tape. It potentially puts more New Yorkers, especially our most vulnerable street users, at greater – and greatly unnecessary – risk. The last thing we need is to erect roadblocks to better road safety.

### Prospect Park West Redesign Timeline

3/2/06	Several hundred participants in a Park Slope Civic Council transportation forum cite speeding on Prospect Park West as the neighborhood's #1 traffic problem
3/07	DOT adjusts Prospect Park West (PPW) traffic signals to reduce speeding, but the ultimate reduction proves insignificant
6/13/07	Brooklyn Community Board 6 (CB6) votes to support a study of a possible bicycle path along PPW
6/20/07	CB6 writes to DOT in support of a Traffic Calming Plan for nearby 9 <sup>th</sup> Street, and requests that DOT also evaluate "traffic-calming measures on PPW, including the possible installation of a one-way or two-way Class I bicycle path on the east side of PPW"
3/09	Park Slope Neighbors delivers more than 1300 petition signatures to DOT, requesting significant traffic calming on PPW, including a two-way Class I bicycle path on the east side of PPW
4/16/09	DOT presents its proposed PPW redesign to the CB6 Transportation Committee
5/13/09	CB6 votes to support the proposed path, asking that installation be delayed until September 2009 for DOT to respond to community concerns about pedestrian crossings, street cleaning, storm water runoff and loading and unloading
7/13/09	CB6 writes to the DOT Brooklyn Borough Commissioner: "we have been seeking relief from speeding traffic along the Prospect Park West corridor for some time now"
4/12/10	DOT presents its revised proposal for PPW at an Open House co-sponsored by New York City Council Members Steve Levin and Brad Lander and CB6
4/20/10	The Park Slope Civic Council writes to the DOT Brooklyn Borough Commissioner: "we believe that the excess capacity on Prospect Park West leads to speeding and creates a dangerous condition for the many users seeking access to the park"
4/29/10	DOT presents its revised proposal for PPW to the CB6 Transportation Committee
6/10	DOT begins installation of the PPW redesign
10/10	DOT modifies the path by delineating pedestrian islands, striping loading zones, and adding two loading zones and a no-standing zone
12/7/10	Council Members Steve Levin and Brad Lander report the results of their community survey to gather feedback following the installation of the PPW path, which finds broad public support for the path
1/20/11	DOT presents its evaluation of the bicycle path to the CB6 Transportation Committee, which include bicycle counts, traffic volumes, traffic speeds and crash data
3/11	New York State Assembly Member James Brennan reports the results of his community survey to gather feedback regarding the PPW path, which finds broad public support for the path
3/11/11	CB6's Transportation Committee holds a public hearing to gather community input on the PPW path. Speakers support the project by an 8-to-1 margin.
4/13/11	CB6 votes unanimously to support DOT's proposed additional enhancements to the path, including raised pedestrian islands and rumble strips



## TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

127 West 26th Street  
Suite 1002  
New York NY 10001  
Tel 212 629-8080  
Fax 212 629-8334  
transalt.org

### Board of Directors

Daniel Kaizer  
Jeff Prant  
Laurie Falk Davidowitz  
Laurence W. Levi  
Colin Beavan  
Christine Berthet  
Kenneth Coughlin  
Curtis Cravens  
Mike Epstein  
Steve Hindy  
Mary Beth Kelly  
Steve McMaster  
Neysa Pranger  
Lela Rose  
Mark Seaman  
Paul S. White  
Howard Yaruss

### Advisory Council

Marc Agger  
Thurstan Bannister  
George Beane  
David Byrne  
Majora Carter  
Ramon Cruz  
Joshua David  
Paul Gertner  
Mark Gorton  
Alex Herzan  
Rich Kassel  
Mary Beth Kelly  
Robert Kotch  
Janet Liff  
Stephen Lyle  
Adam Mansky  
Peter Meitzler  
Matthew Modine  
Dr. Linda Prine  
Henry Rinehart  
Lisa Sladkus  
Steve Vaccaro  
Dr. Harold Varmus  
Lloyd Westerman  
Adam Wolfensohn

Testimony Submitted by Paul Steely White  
City Council Transportation Committee Hearing of September 26, 2011  
On Int. 412 (Requires the department of transportation to hold hearings with affected community boards three months before a bike lane is constructed.)

There is no not-for-profit organization more dedicated to Community Boards' success than Transportation Alternatives. We encourage hundreds of ordinary New Yorkers to attend their board's meetings. We have authored and distributed dozens of primers over the past thirty years detailing how Community Boards function. We are the only not-for-profit organization in this City that puts significant effort into encouraging New Yorkers to become Community Board members. We do this work because we understand that community input is a necessary element of all successful large-scale streetscape redesign.

Transportation Alternatives opposes Intro. 412 because it is less devoted to encouraging community input than it is to singling out bicycle lanes and slowing their implementation at the expense of New Yorkers' safety.

This bill prescribes mandatory hearings – and months of delay – for the City's most minor, routine and boring bike lanes. If enacted, Community Boards will have to host extra hearings for “share the road” sharrows on the edge of roadways, for bike lanes that leaves space for cars unchanged, and for space for bikes within parks. This delay will not accomplish the legislation's stated aims, but will instead keep New Yorkers less safe.

### **Current Law**

Less than two years ago, this Council enacted a bill which improves the process by which street improvements are made in this City. We supported Local Law 90 of 2009 because it struck the appropriate balance between “major transportation projects” and the routine work DOT does as part of its street management function.

According to Local Law 90, if a proposed project is longer than an avenue block, and also redistributes space previously devoted to vehicle traffic or parking, DOT is required to provide notice to the Community Board and Council Members, consult with them, and respond to their input. These steps are appropriate when the City is conducting a major transportation project.

DOT is not required to wait months whenever they install a crosswalk, or create more space for vehicle traffic, or paint sharrows on the road. In truth, even though it is not mandated DOT does consult with the Community Board even on these minor projects.

This is the appropriate balance. Neither Community Boards nor DOT have the capacity – nor the interest- in complying with the notice and comment process for every routine and “minor” transportation project. Such dialogue should be encouraged, but not required, or else there will be the pace of street safety improvements in the City will slow, and New Yorkers will be less safe.

### **The Effect of Intro. 412**

To be clear, Intro. 412 does not require DOT to have a hearing on all “minor” transportation projects. The bill would not require a hearing before DOT narrows sidewalks in order to widen travel lanes, or before DOT installs crosswalks to reduce pedestrian fatalities. Only minor, routine bicycle lanes need to be delayed and studied. And to what end? **Why vote to enact this double-standard?**

*This bill does not advance community outreach goals.*

Transportation Alternatives hopes this Council does more to promote community insight and outreach. Community Boards need more funding, and they need to do more to attract a more representative sample of New Yorkers to sit on the Board and to participate in their meetings. Intro. 412 instead guarantees more mundane, routine hearings to discuss literally the most boring bike lanes in our City.

*This bill does not advance motorist’s goals:*

This bill only addresses those bicycle lanes which do not reduce the amount of space devoted to cars and trucks. Indeed, most of the bicycle lanes around our City do not take space from cars- DOT instead narrows the width of too-wide vehicle travel lanes, which discourages illegally speeding, keeps aggressive drivers from dangerous “leap-frogging,” and helps traffic flow better. Bike lanes have consistently improved traffic around the City.

*This bill will not allay your constituent’s concerns about bicycling in your neighborhoods.*

Bicycle lanes have been shown to reduce crashes, injuries and fatalities for cyclists, pedestrians and motorists alike all over our City. Simply keeping everyone on the road out of each other’s way keeps them out of harm’s way. For instance, a bicycle lane encourages bicyclists to stay off sidewalks, which protects pedestrians.

There is no question that biking is more popular in some neighborhoods than others. But New Yorkers in every neighborhood bike- about 10% of New Yorkers ride their bike several times a month or more.<sup>1</sup> Those New Yorkers who complain about changes to their neighborhood have a neighbor who would prefer to bike in safety.

*This bill will keep New Yorkers less safe.*

---

<sup>1</sup> New York City Department of Health & Mental Hygiene Community Health Survey 2009, available at <http://bit.ly/orFRai>



The most comprehensive study on bike lanes in our City examined the 225 cyclist deaths that occurred between 1996 and 2005. Of those 225 deaths, only one occurred in a bike lane. In fact, because bicycle lanes help make traffic more predictable and orderly, streets with bike lanes have about 40 percent fewer crashes ending in death or serious injury; and that's for all street users, drivers and pedestrians included. For example, after a bike lane was installed on Manhattan's Ninth Avenue, all traffic-related injuries dropped 50 percent. Injuries to pedestrians dropped 29 percent and injuries to cyclists dropped 57 percent.

For these reasons, Transportation Alternatives respectfully opposes this bill.

## TESTIMONY

Before the New York City Council, Committee on Transportation

Regarding Int. No. 412

September 26, 2011

Gene Aronowitz, 460 45<sup>th</sup> Street, Brooklyn, NY 11220

Some people ride bicycles to commute; others ride for pleasure. For me and others like me, it's a matter of life or death. I'll be 74 years old in a couple of weeks and have severe arthritis in both knees. I need to exercise but my options are limited: jogging is out of the question as is brisk walking. But cycling is perfect for me - no impact, a good aerobic effect and high caloric expenditure. I need to ride.

I have a right to be safe when I ride and safety is what bike lanes are all about. The need for bike lanes is also a matter of life or death. Cyclists are getting killed on the New York City streets – 127 of them between 2003 and 2009 and in that same period, 20,285 cyclists were injured<sup>1</sup>. I don't want to be counted in those numbers.

But it's been difficult and frustrating dealing with the gridlock I often encounter as I advocate for safe streets. I was a public official for 15 years including 10 as the Commissioner of Mental Health in Westchester. So when it comes to governmental obstructionist behavior, I know it when I see it and that's how I see Intro 412 – an attempt to obstruct the process of developing safe streets – an attempt to tie it in knots. It essentially seeks to duplicate a law that the Council passed just two years ago<sup>2</sup> but adds more red tape.

Politicians who think that preventing bike lanes is a good way to get votes must be reading different public opinion polls than I have. In an August 2011 Marist Poll, 66% of the City's adults supported Bike lanes<sup>3</sup>, even more positive than the two previous Quinnipiac Polls.<sup>4</sup>

I want you to support my ability to maintain good health in spite of my age and medical condition and I want you to make the possibility of my being maimed or killed on my bike a high priority issue but, even if you don't, I believe that your own interests would be well served by supporting and not impeding the increasingly popular development of bike lanes.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak in behalf of safe streets.

---

<sup>1</sup> Data from NYS Governor's Traffic Safety Committee <http://www.nysgtsc.state.ny.us/hsdata.htm>

<sup>2</sup> Section 19-101.2 of the NYC Administrative Code

<sup>3</sup> <http://maristpoll.marist.edu/89-about-two-thirds-favor-nyc-bike-lanes%E2%80%A6only-one-in-four-says-lanes-improve-traffic/>

<sup>4</sup> In a July, 2011 Quinnipiac Poll, 59% of New Yorkers said bike lanes were a good thing, up from 54% in March. <http://www.quinnipiac.edu/x1302.xml?ReleaseID=1628>

# MANHATTAN COMMUNITY BOARD FIVE

Vikki Barbero, Chair

450 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2109  
New York, NY 10123-2199  
212.465.0907 f-212.465.1628

Wally Rubin, District Manager

## **Testimony by Wally Rubin, District Manager of Manhattan Community Board Five, at the City Council Committee on Transportation, Monday, September 26<sup>th</sup> 2011**

My name is Wally Rubin and I am the District Manager for Community Board Five in Manhattan.

Community Board Five is chiefly Manhattan's Central Business District. We go from Union Square to Central Park and, with a few carve outs, from 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Lexington. As such, over the last three years, we've seen a lot of the Department of Transportation, as they created a succession of pedestrian plazas, bike lanes and traffic changes in our district.

With each of these efforts, they have reached out to us, the BIDs, and the greater community, to tell us of their plans and listen to our concerns. They have held forums and talk backs, co-hosted by a variety of community groups, including us, and made changes when concerns were expressed. They have listened and more than once gone back to the drawing board in response to what they heard.

In the Spring of 2010, for instance, they came to us with extensive plans to make changes to the traffic patterns, and create designated bike lanes and pedestrian plazas, around Union Square and on Broadway from Union Square up to 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. There was considerable concern expressed by businesses and residents around the Union Square and historic Flatiron district about some of these proposals.

Community Board Five took the unprecedented step of holding three public forums, over three consecutive months, so the community could air their grievances. More than 50 people showed up at each of these forums, which would be, for our board, an extraordinary turnout at even one meeting, but virtually unheard of for three consecutive meetings on the same topic. Many who came were furious over this or that proposal. Each time, representatives of DOT were there, listening and answering questions and they came back with proposed revisions in response to what they heard. Not every complaint was ameliorated, but the process of listening and adjusting was honored.

In the end, Community Board Five voted to support the DOT effort, with the proviso that they come back to us after a period of time with their evaluation of how things were working. True to their word, DOT reported back to us last month. In cooperation with the Union Square Partnership, they had done various tests and surveys in the area and found that most of the changes they made had either positive effects or at least no negative effects on traffic flow and pedestrian safety. Local business owners found no deleterious effect from the changes put in place and some, of course, had profited from the increased foot traffic. DOT's evaluation showed that there were still one or two trouble spots or matters that needed further improvement or greater enforcement. That this was still a work in progress, like most things in New York, was acknowledged by DOT.

What was remarkable was that, after the crush of residents and businesses in attendance at all three meetings the year before, virtually no one from the public came to this follow-up discussion. We could detect none of the anger or fear that was palpable before the plan was put in place.

Community Board Five is grateful for our relationship with Margaret Forgione, Manhattan Borough Commissioner of DOT, and the others at DOT with whom we have worked. We only wish that other city agencies would be as responsive and as interested in our input as is DOT.

We thank you for this opportunity to speak today.

My name is Nancy Gruskin and I am the Founder and President of the Stuart C. Gruskin Family Foundation. For those of you here that are not aware of my story, my husband, Stuart, was struck and killed two years ago by a delivery biker speeding in the wrong direction as Stuart crossed a Midtown street on his lunch hour. Soon after, I felt compelled to create the Foundation and to understand what was happening in our city streets with regard to bicycle/pedestrian incidents. At that time, I was surprised to learn that no one was keeping accurate statistics and vowed that the foundation would fill that void. With the help and leadership of Councilwoman Rosie Mendez, and many members of this committee, Mayor Bloomberg signed into law Intro 374A this past Feb, which mandates the collection and reporting of these statistics which will begin in June of 2012.

I support Intro-671, and applaud any opportunity to gather more data about how New Yorkers use the city streets. The sponsors are taking a necessary and thoughtful step through this legislation to ensure that the safety and efficiency of our new transportation improvements can be measured.

I am here today to ask that you make the proposed law even better, representing that the future of our streets may not resemble the past, and include the most important pedestrian safety metrics.

As proposed, the only measured behavior is vehicular speed. However, to be most effective, this bill should include reporting of data about unlawful behaviors that have proven to be far more dangerous, including failure to obey traffic signals, as well as failure to yield. DOT reporting shows that 47% of accidents that result in serious pedestrian injury occur at signalized intersections, while only 21% are primarily due to speed. While understanding speed rates is an important element in analyzing the success of a project, it provides only a small part of the picture.

The NY street looks far different today than it did only a decade ago. We have made great strides in considering the needs and behaviors of not just motor

vehicles, but cyclists and pedestrians, as well. This law needs to reflect that or I fear that we will all be in this room next year, updating this legislative language. Complete streets need complete data, and collection needs to apply not just to motor vehicles, but to bicycles and pedestrians, as well.

The foundation's mission fully supports city cycling. However, that cycling MUST be safe. And, how do we know that it is safe unless we have the hard data to back it up? We will have the city data in June but just last week, the foundation released a brand new study which revealed that in New York there are roughly 1,000 pedestrians a year (55% in NYC) that end up in a hospital emergency room due to an incident with a cyclist. And these numbers are low as they don't factor in victims who don't require hospital visits, people who visit walk in clinics, or a physician's office or who don't do anything. This study, compiled by Hunter College, strongly suggests that things are not as safe as we might hope for them to be between the cyclist and pedestrian link. I would hope that gathering the hard data will help the city create better and more effective safety programs and the foundation would be happy to be a part of this dialogue.

As NY moves into the future as a city with a modern transportation network, we need to think about safety in a modern way. Not only do we need to know more about how major projects treat all street users, but we need to use today's tools to bring this information to the public. In line with this Council's commendable approach to data transparency, I would request that the data be posted on the DOT website in addition to being handed to Community Boards and City Council. If this process is open, engaging and inclusive, it will be a phenomenal success.

I would like to extend a heartfelt thank you to Chairman Vacca for all of his wonderful work championing bike/ped issues and to all the bill sponsors for working to provide more data and greater transparency for impacted communities.

Thank you.

Good morning. My name is Ralph Perfetto, and I wish to speak in favor of Intro. No. 412, requiring the Department of Transportation to hold hearings with affected community boards before a bike lane is constructed, because each street in a community board district may be different physically, or in the way the volume of vehicle and pedestrian traffic is conducted.

While I can see the merit in Mayor Bloomberg's initiative to encourage bicycling to cut down on automobile traffic and pollution, while helping people to live healthier lives through cycling exercise, I see it as a single-minded plan without a comprehensive study on the impact on unregulated cycling on pedestrian safety.

While I was employed in the Office of the New York City Public Advocate I investigated a case where a bicycle outing sponsored by Transportation alternatives in Pelham Park, Bronx, NY. When the group of cyclists exited the park a frail elderly man happened to walk by the exit, on the sidewalk, and was struck by a bike. He later died of his injuries. I became active for responsible cycling when a dear Rabbi friend of mine was knocked down by a delivery boy riding on the sidewalk in Bay Ridge, Brooklyn. He never fully recovered from his injuries.

One day after the Pelham Park incident I faxed a memo from the Public Advocate's office to 76 precincts in the City, reminding them of the law prohibiting adults from riding bicycles on the sidewalk, and that the penalty was a \$50.00 fine. That evening as I walked from the Municipal Building to the City Hall Subway Station on Broadway I had a discussion with a police officer from the 40th Precinct. I had my back to the sidewalk as we spoke by that entrance to City Hall Park. Just then a man approximately in his mid 30's dressed in spandex and wearing a helmet brushed by me at a rate of high speed into the park. After that memo was sent I saw only one police precinct take that memo seriously and do something about it. That was Brooklyn's 84th Precinct; they confiscated the bikes of offenders. I have witnessed many seniors, or handicapped people, crossing a street properly at an intersection nearly get mowed down by cyclists who suddenly appear at a top speed in the bike lanes.

If you want to see how serious the enforcement is on Rogue Riders, then get the number of moving violation summonses issued to motorists, and the number issued to bicycle riders since only January of this year, and my case will be substantiated.

I want to thank you for this opportunity, and hope that you initiate a comprehensive study, followed by legislation to make the streets safe for pedestrians by regulating Rogue Riders.

Sincerely,  
Ralph Perfetto  
7119 Shore Road, #2G  
Brooklyn, NY 11209  
718-836-9702

September 26, 2011

Ian Dutton  
137 Sullivan St. #17  
New York NY 10012  
idutton@me.com

Thank you for allowing me to address you regarding the proposed Intros. 412, 626 and 671. My name is Ian Dutton and until earlier this year, I was the vice-chair of the Transportation Committee of Community Board 2, Manhattan, which encompasses Greenwich Village and Soho.

Our district was the first in the city with a mature bike lane network, the result of years of advocacy for relief from the crush of motor vehicle traffic that predates my time in the community. I can say categorically that DOT has not installed a single bicycle infrastructure project without first obtaining the approval of CB2, and to my knowledge, has not done so in ANY community district in at least the last 5 years. On the contrary, DOT has held off and reconfigured proposed bike lane installations when they were faced with negative outcomes at the community board level, such as on Eighth Ave. in Chelsea or on Broadway approaching Union Square.

Local Law 90 already applies to installation of bicycle infrastructure and my experience is that DOT adheres to the letter and the spirit of this law, and this law gives community boards sufficient input in the implementation process.

In many cases where bicycle lanes are installed, they are done so at the suggestion and urging of communities through community board resolutions and requests. Specifically regarding Intro. 412, this actually intends to have the effect of forcing neighborhoods to wait out an extended waiting period for safety upgrades for which they have been advocating, delaying the desired benefits unnecessarily.

Finally, my neighbors and I are constantly exposed to so many negative effects of the incessant crush of motor vehicles that has diminished the vibrancy of our downtown neighborhoods. Why is it then that the Council focuses so narrowly on bike lanes rather than considering legislation that would add similar barriers to actions that could potentially lead to higher rates of motor vehicle use? Why is it that projects that add vehicular lanes or increase the availability of parking are not also subjected to community board input, waiting periods, and follow-on studies of these projects' impacts?



Testimony Transportation Committee 9/26/11

In 2003 The Rudin Center for Transportation at NYU conducted a joint study with NACTO. The sole conclusion was that to achieve a responsible bike culture in New York City a cooperative approach was needed. Over the past three years The Coalition Against Rogue Riding is aware of two times when the Dept. of Transportation and Transportation Alternatives have refused to participate in a Task Force on the issue. The result is an "irresponsible bike culture".  
Bike bedlam. A PUBLIC SAFETY CONSID.

These bills constitute an effort to do legislatively that which has not been done reasonably and cooperatively. CARR endorses them whole heartedly.

Last night on 60 Minutes a segment was devoted to Police Commissioner Ray Kelly. The focus was the formidable counter terrorism department established under his watch. There is no question the NYPD knows what is going on in the streets and on the sidewalks. It is also clear that when Mayor Bloomberg decides to focus on public concerns like Hurricane Irene or the Tenth anniversary of 9-11 no expense is spared. No stone left unturned.

In a recent "Numbers Guy" column in the Wall Street Journal Carl Bialik quotes Bruce Hoffman director of Georgetown University's Center for Peace and Security Studies. "Terrorism is not a numbers game. That is the point of terrorism! A small group of dedicated well trained and highly motivated individuals can have a disproportionate impact on any society's sense of security and profoundly affect government policies." If power broker Robert Moses expended unreasonable zeal facilitating use of the automobile then the virtually zero tolerance for motorvehicles expressed by Mr. Mark Gorton and pursued by Transportation Alternatives through the Department of Transportation is equally unwise and radical. Two wrongs don't make a right.

Jack Brown  
Spokesman  
Coalition Against Rogue Riding  
CARRNYC.blogspot.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: Ryan Russo, Assistant Commissioner

Address: 55 Water Street - 9th Floor

I represent: NYC 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: 7/22/11

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: David Wolock, Deputy Commissioner

Address: 55 Water Street - 9th floor

I represent: NYC Department of Transportation

Address: 1216 ...

**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: 9/24/2011

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Dacey Rubin

Address: COMMUNITY BOARD FIVE

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

Address: 450 SEVENTH AVE.

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. 412 et al Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: 9/26/11

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: ERIC McCLURE

Address: 423 4TH ST.

I represent: PARK SLOPE NEIGHBORS

Address: SAME

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 412 Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: 9/26/11

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Paul Stealy White

Address: 127 W 126 NYC NY

I represent: Transportation Alternatives

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

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 626 Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

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

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Karen Georgen

Address: Pedestrians for Accessible Safe Streets

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. 611 Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: 9/26/11

Name: Nancy Bruskin (PLEASE PRINT) (Bruskin)  
Address: FOUNDATION

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

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

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 34712 Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: 9/26/11

Name: Jack Brown (PLEASE PRINT)  
Address: 335 E. 6<sup>th</sup> ST.

I represent: COALITION AGAINST ROGUE RIDING

Address: (GREENWICH Village Block Assoc.)

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 412 Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: 9/26/11

Name: Gene Aronowitz (PLEASE PRINT)  
Address: 460 45<sup>th</sup> Street, Brooklyn, NY

I represent: Transportation Alternatives

Address: 127 W. 26<sup>th</sup> St, New York

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. 412 Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: 09/26/2011

Name: JAN DUTTON (PLEASE PRINT)

Address: 137 SULLIVAN ST.

I represent: SELF

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

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 412 Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: 9/26/11

Name: RALPH PERFETTO (PLEASE PRINT)

Address: 7119 SHORE ROAD #26

I represent: SELF

Address: BROOKLYN, NY 11209

**THE COUNCIL  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 412 Res. No. \_\_\_\_\_

in favor  in opposition

Date: 9/26/11

Name: Daniel Pearlstein (PLEASE PRINT)

Address: 612 West 137th St. (003)

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

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

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