

Statement by John Castelli, Deputy Commissioner for Legislative Affairs, on behalf of Commissioner & Chief Administrative Law Judge Fidel F. Delvalle at the NYC Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings, to the City Council in Connection with the Int. 991

January 31, 2019

Introduction:

The Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings (“OATH”) is the City’s independent administrative law court. In 1979, Mayor Koch established OATH by executive order with the goal that there would eventually be one centralized City Administrative Law Court to adjudicate cases. The Health Tribunal, Taxi and Limousine Tribunal, and Environmental Control Board were subsequently transferred into OATH. In accordance with Mayor de Blasio’s overall commitment to provide City residents and small businesses with an administrative law process that is impartial and fair, OATH established a Trials Division and Hearings Division to ensure a more streamlined administrative law court. OATH’s Trials Division Administrative Law Judges serve five year terms, one more year than the Mayor, and adjudicate the more complicated cases including NYC Civil Servant Disciplinary cases, Loft Law cases, City Contracts disputes, City Issued Licenses, Discrimination cases under City Human Rights Law, and Lobbyist Registration Cases among others. OATH Hearings Division adjudicates summonses issued to residents and small businesses by NYC enforcement agencies, including among others, the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Department of Transportation, Department of Sanitation, Department of Environmental Protection, Department of Buildings, Fire Department of New York, Taxi and Limousine Commission, and New York City Police Department.

OATH’s mandate is to foster judicial professionalism, fairness, impartiality, equality, and a commitment to the integrity of the administrative law judicial decision-making process. As the City’s administrative law court, OATH’s function is to provide due process in cases that originate from the City’s numerous enforcement agencies in a fair and impartial forum that is also convenient and accessible to the public. OATH has been working for the past four years to consolidate adjudications and improve court services to ensure greater transparency, equity, and fairness for City residents and small businesses.

Int 991

This bill in its current draft seeks to require that upon proof of corrections, OATH dismiss Taxi and Limousine Commission (TLC) issued summonses for violations pertaining to inoperable vehicle lights. In particular, § 19-902 of this bill seeks to clarify 35 RCNY § 80-22(b) of the rules of the city of New York by granting to OATH Hearings Division hearing officers the authority to dismiss a violation enforced by the TLC where a driver fails to personally inspect and reasonably determine whether the driver's vehicle lights are in working order if the driver corrects the violation within one-half hour after sunset on the first full business day after the violation occurred, and presents proof of the correction to OATH on or before the hearing date. As drafted, evidence ascertained and evaluated outside of the hearing does not comport with OATH's mission to provide due process to the parties appearing before the hearing officer. Moreover, the petitioner agency, in this case the TLC, must have an opportunity to rebut or further examine on the record before the hearing officer, whether any offer of proof of correction submitted by a respondent driver is satisfactory in order to comply with due process requirements.

Furthermore, § 19-902(a)(5) of this bill seeks to require that OATH exclusively accept from the respondent evidence that a correction was made. As an administrative law court, OATH does not have any regulatory function. OATH's powers are exclusive to adjudications. The legal authority to regulate the safety standards of the For Hire Vehicle Industry resides within TLC and correction of a condition resulting in a summons also lies within the administrative agency that has the expertise to make such a determination pursuant to the applicable law. That said, OATH regularly encounters corrections and mitigation of penalties for summonses issued by other enforcement agencies. For instance, certification of corrections of violations of the respective codes enforced by the Department of Buildings (DOB) and Fire Department of New York (FDNY) must be approved by DOB and FDNY pursuant to the Building Code (§ 28-204.2) and Fire Code (§ 15-230) respectively in order for it to be sufficient as proof of correction. If certification of correction is not approved by the respective agency pre-hearing, then the respondent can present such evidence of correction at the hearing. Such evidence must comport with the regulatory agency's standards, so as to constitute a cure, or other mitigation of penalties. The enforcement agency then agrees or moves to amend the charge, or penalty, or otherwise withdraw the summons. OATH renders a decision and penalty, or not, based on some combination of proof of correction and review of the enforcement agency that has expertise in the area.

Similarly, OATH does not have the regulatory power, expertise, nor capability to inspect repairs as provided in § 19-902(a)(6). Technically ascertaining whether a vehicle is roadworthy exceeds the authority and expertise of the administrative law court. OATH is exclusively responsible for weighing the sufficiency of evidence presented at the hearing and applying the applicable law.

Finally, OATH is committed to providing greater access to justice by improving the efficiency and timeliness of adjudications without impairing due process. The Chair and members of this committee are commended for the work they have done to further this commitment.

**Testimony of Madeline Labadie, Senior Advisor for Strategic Initiatives, and
Leandra Eustache, Managing Attorney - Prosecution Unit
New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission (TLC)
New York City Council
Governmental Operations Committee
(Intros No. 991 & 1249-A)
January 31, 2019**

Good morning Chair Cabrera and members of the Government Operations Committee. My name is Madeline Labadie, Senior Advisor for Strategic Initiatives at the New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission. I serve as TLC's Vision Zero program lead. Joining me is Leandra Eustache, Managing Attorney for TLC's Prosecution Unit. We are here today to provide an overview of the TLC's Critical Driver & Persistent Violator Programs, and to give our views on Intro. No. 1249-A and Intro. No. 991.

On February 18, 2014, Mayor de Blasio launched the Vision Zero Initiative – a comprehensive plan to end traffic fatalities in New York City. The message of Vision Zero is that traffic crashes that kill or seriously injure New Yorkers and visitors are preventable. The City's Vision Zero work focuses on education, enforcement, and engineering to drive down the number of serious crashes. This means ensuring drivers are paying attention to the rules of the road.

For five years, the Vision Zero Initiative has succeeded in reducing traffic fatalities on New York City streets each year, in contrast with other large cities throughout the country, where crash rates have increased. This success is due to the effective coordination of many City agencies, including the Department of Transportation, the Police Department and the TLC, key transportation stakeholders, advocates, industry groups, and the public.

As a regulatory agency, the TLC has an obligation to ensure that each passenger's riding experience is safe, reliable and accessible. The City Charter gives the TLC the power to establish and enforce the rules and regulations necessary to protect drivers, passengers and members of the public. TLC rules and the New York State Vehicle and Traffic Law are enforced in the field by TLC's 200 enforcement officers and the NYPD. The NYPD, with its larger force, issues the majority of traffic violations received by TLC-licensed drivers.

Along with the NYPD and DOT, TLC is one of the three lead Vision Zero agencies and our role regulating the largest professional fleet in New York City, which includes over 135,000 vehicles and 200,000 drivers, is critical to the City's Vision Zero success. TLC-licensed drivers cover over two billion miles each year, meaning they have a big impact on New York City streets. Our mission is to hold all TLC-licensed drivers to high standards so that the TLC Driver License is synonymous with safety. As an agency, we do this by requiring safe driving education, by developing pilot programs exploring in-vehicle technologies that deter unsafe driving patterns, and by incentivizing safe driving via positive reinforcement through our annual Driver Honor Roll, which recognizes our safest drivers. Although the majority of TLC drivers are safe – in fact 95% of TLC-licensed drivers maintained a safe driving record in 2018 – there are outliers who are not. It is imperative to identify those drivers immediately and, if necessary, remove them from the road before a tragedy occurs.

The Council provides TLC with several important tools that support the Mayor's Vision Zero agenda, including the Critical Driver Program, which monitors DMV violations

committed by drivers, and the Persistent Violator Program, which tracks TLC violations committed by drivers.

The Critical Driver Program authorizes the TLC to suspend or revoke the TLC Driver Licenses of drivers who accumulate too many DMV points on their state-issued driver licenses. DMV points are given for dangerous moving violations, such as speeding, failure to yield to a pedestrian, and running stop lights or stop signs. TLC license points are accrued for similar traffic safety violations as well as violations that put passengers at risk. Through the Persistent Violator Program, the TLC holds drivers to a higher standard through retraining, suspension or license revocation against drivers who accrue too many TLC license points. The TLC enforces this strict standard as a front-line protection for the public.

Under the Critical Driver Program, if a driver receives six DMV points within a 15-month period, TLC can suspend the driver's TLC license. If the driver accrues ten DMV points within a 15-month period, TLC can revoke the driver's TLC license. The Persistent Violator Program works the same way, except with TLC points. Only 5% of drivers received any penalties under these programs last year because most maintain safe driving records.

We know that traffic safety violations and serious crashes are correlated. TLC analysis found that TLC-licensed drivers who received at least one traffic safety violation for dangerous driving behaviors that accrued DMV points, such as speeding and running red lights, were subsequently involved in 85% of all the crashes that led to injuries or fatalities. The Critical Driver and Persistent Violator programs are supported by evidence as effective enforcement tools to prevent crashes from happening in the first place.

As a sign of City Council and the Administration's partnership on Vision Zero, the Council passed Local Law 30 in 2014. The bill directed TLC to combine TLC points and DMV points for purposes of suspension or revocation so if a driver was issued violations by a combination of TLC officers and police officers, the driver wouldn't be treated differently than if all points had been issued by the same agency.

After voicing our significant concerns last month, we received Intro. No. 1249, version A, which reverses the serious negative safety implications of the originally proposed bill Intro. No. 1249. Intro No. 1249 would have eliminated the City's ability to use the Critical Driver program to get dangerous drivers off the road. Intro. No. 1249-A, however, restores this power by combining the Critical Driver and Persistent Violator Programs under one title. Substantively, this revised legislation does not change TLC's ability to suspend or revoke the TLC Driver License of drivers who accumulate too many TLC or DMV points for dangerous moving violations, while it ensures TLC licensees understand their safety obligations as professional drivers.

The Mayor and Council have made great strides in reducing traffic fatalities in the last five years, and there is still much more to do. Working together, I know that we can continue making the city's streets safer.

My colleague Leandra Eustache will now provide testimony on Intro. No. 991.

Good afternoon Chair Cabrera and Members of the Governmental Operations Committee. I am Leandra Eustache, Managing Attorney for TLC's Prosecution Unit. Intro. No. 991 would require the Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings (OATH) to dismiss a violation enforced by the TLC for defective vehicle lights as soon as the driver provides proof that the defect has been corrected no later than one-half hour after sunset on the

first full business day after the date of the violation. The forms of proof include statements from DMV inspectors, fleet operators, direct inspection of the vehicle by OATH and "evidence acceptable to the tribunal from any person that such person made the correction together with proof of purchase of any equipment needed to make such correction."

We support the Council's intent in Intro. No. 991 to provide our licensees with an opportunity to correct a violation without penalty rather than having to pay a fine. However, we think by working together that we can improve the introduction as currently drafted so that those changes would be beneficial for all drivers. For example, the introduction as currently written could be read as applying to only those summonses issued by a TLC enforcement officer. As other enforcement agencies issue TLC summonses, such as the NYPD, the Port Authority and MTA, we feel Intro, No. 991 should be drafted to clearly apply to any TLC summons, irrespective of the issuing enforcement agency. Additionally, we would encourage simplifying the process through which a driver can demonstrate that a light was fixed through the use of a TLC Condition Corrected Receipt, which is a form of proof regularly used by TLC and accepted by OATH hearing officers to show a vehicle defect was fixed.

We are committed to working together with you, Chair Cabrera, to ensure the text of Intro No. 991 and TLC's implementation of it benefit drivers and address vehicle violations quickly in the interests of safety.

Thank you for inviting us to testify today, and we will now take your questions.



January 31, 2019

Testimony on Intro 1249A-2018 TLC's Critical Driver- and Persistent Violator Programs

*Testimony before the New York City Council Committee on Governmental Operations
Testimony by: Marco Conner, Deputy Director, Transportation Alternatives*

Chairman Cabrera and Committee members, thank you for the opportunity to testify. For 45 years Transportation Alternatives has advocated on behalf of New Yorkers for safe, inclusive and livable streets. With more than 150,000 people in our network and over 500 activists throughout all five boroughs, we fight to promote biking, walking, and public transportation as sustainable alternatives to the car.

Transportation Alternatives supports the amended A-version of this legislation -- intro 1249A-2018. Making sure drivers are operating safely and trying to improve drivers' working conditions are not mutually exclusive. That New Yorkers should have to choose between the livelihoods of drivers and safe streets is a false dilemma, and unfortunately this false assertion was at the heart of the original version of this bill which would effectively have eliminated the New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission's Critical Driver Program as a tool to address dangerous driving by more than 100,000 professionally trained and licensed drivers on pedestrian-heavy NYC streets.

We strongly commend you, Chairman Cabrera, for amending the original bill, the language of which we believe did not reflect your actual intent to streamline TLC's enforcement programs on behalf of FHV drivers. We are encouraged by your concern for both TLC licensed drivers' livelihoods and for victims of traffic violence and safety on our streets. We fully support your commitment and quest to address both issues.

This amended legislation would help streamline TLC's Critical Driver Program and Persistent Violator Program. For this legislation and in future initiatives it is critical that no changes be made to TLC's ability to suspend licenses when a driver has accumulated six or more Department of Motor Vehicle points and revoke a license at 10 DMV points. It is critical that TLC's ability to suspend and revoke licenses based both on DMV points and its own enforcement points, or a combination of the two, is preserved. We will strongly oppose any effort to the contrary.

The Critical Driver Program has helped save lives by holding professional for-hire drivers to a higher standard -- as they should be. Under this program in 2018, more than 2,000 drivers had their licenses suspended, and more than 800 had their licenses revoked. This pales in comparison to the enforcement capability of the TLC's second-most-effective enforcement program, the Persistent Violator Program, which yielded just over 100 suspensions and no more than a handful revocations in 2018. Replacing the former program with the latter would have made our streets less safe for *everyone*, including drivers themselves and their families.

Despite the success of Vision Zero with consistent reductions in traffic fatalities in our city, New Yorkers are still killed at tragic rates and are exposed to unacceptable dangers when simply walking, biking or driving -- dangers that result overwhelmingly from speeding, failing to yield to pedestrians, and distracted driving. In 2017, drivers licensed by the TLC were involved in at least 30 fatal crashes, an increase of approximately five deaths from 2016. None of those drivers lost their TLC license that year. Citywide, 222 people died in 2017 in traffic crashes, and since 2001 more than 5,000 people have died in crashes on city streets, with more than 60,000 people injured every single year. Dangerous driver choices are the primary cause or a contributing factor in 70% of pedestrian fatalities. People of color and low-income New Yorkers are up to three times more likely to be struck and injured by motor vehicles, and as such stand to gain the most from effective traffic enforcement by the TLC.

Addressing this epidemic of carnage and suffering is a responsibility shared by all. Professional drivers, particularly taxi and FHV drivers, have the greatest responsibility -- they spend more time in traffic and through their driving lead the way for either more reckless or safer driving by all New Yorkers. The responsibility professional drivers have for the safety of others can not be overestimated. Professional drivers receive special training because they are operating a lethal multi-ton vehicle. The primary purpose of the TLC must be to ensure drivers operate with the highest level of diligence for the purpose of protecting everyone from harm.

Deterrence research shows that effective enforcement against dangerous driving must be visible, widespread and consistently applied. Additionally, drivers must know that apprehension and legal consequences for dangerous driving is likely. For this reason the Critical Driver Program must be preserved.

We urge this committee and the full Council to ensure that the important work by the TLC to protect New Yorkers is strengthened, and not diminished, in your laudable and important quest for justice on behalf of all New Yorkers, including FHV drivers.

Thank you.

##

Attached

- *Letter dated 10/3/18 from Dana Lerner on behalf of Families for Safe Streets in support of TLC rule change to increase wages for FHV drivers in NYC.*



December 3, 2018

New York City Taxi and Limousine Commissioners
33 Beaver Street
New York, NY 10004

Dear Taxi and Limousine Commissioners:

I am writing on behalf of Families for Safe Streets (FSS) to strongly support your proposed rule change being that would increase the wage for NYC for hire vehicle drivers. Families for Safe Streets is comprised of hundreds of individuals fighting for legislative and policy change. All of our members have lost a loved one or been seriously injured in a crash — many from TLC licensed drivers. Some of us have lost buried our children, our spouses, our siblings and our parents while others have suffered life-altering injuries including lost limbs, traumatic brain injuries, physical pain and emotional trauma. We banded together to fight for change because we know the price for failing to take traffic violence seriously.

My 9-year-old son Cooper Stock was killed nearly five years ago by a reckless taxi driver. It is a nightmare that no parent should ever have to endure. But horrifically, it happens all too often. Every 38 hours someone is killed in NYC and nearly 200 people are injured every single day. We are facing a preventable public health crisis. We can and we must do more.

Safety must be a priority and one key way to ensure that professional drivers are setting a standard of safety is to ensure that drivers are well paid. The current rule is a good first step to ensuring that professional drivers can earn a livable wage. Over 90% of drivers for the biggest FHV companies such as Uber and Lyft will receive a raise that is estimated to be approximately \$7,500 per year. Approximately 80,000 drivers that previously had no guaranteed earning will now be assured of minimum wage protections. A minimum average gross income equivalent to \$26.50 per hour gross and approximately \$17.22 per hour net after expenses is progress. All drivers will benefit from greater transparency about their earnings, deductions and rights. Yellow taxi garage drivers will see lower credit card fees, increasing their take-home earnings by nearly \$1,000.

But more is needed. The rates above are still significantly lower than the wages most FHV drivers were earning before the significant expansion of the industry. It is imperative that all TLC licensed drivers can earn a livable wage. Higher wages make is less likely that drivers speed and drive recklessly just to get to their next job. They also will make it harder for critics to successfully fight to weaken TLC's critical, life-saving enforcement authority.

Thank you for your consideration. Please also feel free to reach out to us at info@familiesforsafestreeets.org or (844) 377-7337.

Sincerely,

Dana Lerner (mother of Cooper Stock, 8/9/04-1/10/14)



39-24 24th Street, 2nd Floor

Long Island City, NY 11101

Phone: (718) 784-4511

Fax: (718) 784-1329

E-mail: pmazer@metrotaxiboardoftrade.com

Peter M. Mazer
General Counsel

TESTIMONY OF PETER M. MAZER

General Counsel

METROPOLITAN TAXICAB BOARD OF TRADE

Government Operations Committee

January 31, 2019

Good morning members of the Committee. My name is Peter Mazer, and I am General Counsel to the Metropolitan Taxicab Board of Trade. We represent the owners and operators of about 5,000 medallion taxicabs, and we operate a full service driver's resource center. From 1998 through 2004, I served with the Taxi and Limousine Commission, first as an Administrative law Judge in its Tribunal, then as Chief Judge, and finally, as its General Counsel.

I drafted the original rule that created the Critical Driver Program--- the very Program you are considering repealing today, and consolidating with the TLC's point -based Persistent Violator Program. I drafted the original Critical Driver Rule in 1998 because we were then in a crisis with many dangerous drivers on the road, and with no clear mechanism for the TLC to suspend or revoke their licenses. At the time, TLC staff argued to their Commissioners that this Program was needed because the Department of Motor Vehicles and its Traffic Violation Bureau (TVB) were ineffective at suspending and revoking unsafe drivers. We argued at the time that without the proposed Critical Driver Program, the TLC did not have a mechanism readily at its disposal to keep dangerous drivers from transporting passengers for hire. While it was evident to me and other TLC staff that this rule was absolutely needed to keep the public safe, the Commissioners did not vote to pass the rule, believing it was duplicative of other provisions of

law, and unfair to drivers. But the TLC did not give up, and in 1999, the Commissioners reconsidered and passed rules establishing the first Critical Driver Program. At the time we celebrated this accomplishment as a major step in protecting the riding public. Subsequent changes were made to the rules over time, including amendments approved by the City Council in Local Law. But the general concept has remained the same: get DMV points on your license and your TLC license is in jeopardy of suspension or revocation.

Nineteen years later, I stand before you to urge the repeal of the very program I helped to create. But I also urge you now to not replace it with a program that simply combines a driver's DMV points with his or her TLC points. If I believed for one minute discontinuing the practice of suspending or revoking drivers based on an accumulation of TLC points would in any way whatsoever make the public less safe, or allow more dangerous drivers to remain on the road, I would be joining the chorus of those urging its retention through this bill. But unlike nineteen years ago, when it was necessary for the TLC to discipline drivers based on their accumulation of DMV points, today this no longer necessary. In fact, penalizing drivers for DMV points, including points accrued in their personal vehicles is unnecessary, redundant, deprives drivers of due process, and in fact, does nothing to get unsafe drivers off the road.

So what has changed? The first big change occurred when the City Council enacted provisions (now codified as 19-512.1 of the Administrative Code), granting the TLC broad powers to summarily suspend and ultimately revoke any driver who the TLC believes is a threat to public safety. The TLC can commence a proceeding before the Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings (OATH) to revoke a license for any act it deems unsafe, irrespective of the drivers' prior record and irrespective of the number of points a driver may have. Indeed, just in the past several months the TLC used its powers to seek revocation of drivers' licenses solely for red light camera violations--- a violation that carries zero points. I may disagree with the TLC's use of red light camera tickets in this manner, but I agree that the TLC has broad powers to commence revocation proceeds against any licensee it deems to be a threat to the public. That driver goes before an independent OATH judge and receives a hearing. And the judge will determine if the driver is a threat to the public. And the Chairperson gets to review the Judge's recommendation.

What also has changed, is that with disciplining drivers based on a *per se* accumulation of DMV points, there is no determination regarding a driver's fitness or threat to the public before he or she is stripped of their license. All that is needed is a calculator and a calendar. If you have the requisite points within a certain period, you are guilty, end of story. No review of your record. No determination of whether your record makes you an unsafe driver. If you may have been previously suspended by DMV for the same violation, it does not matter. With the TLC, you are punished again.

What has changed is that, unlike in 1999, we see today that at the TVB, hearing officers are far more likely to impose suspensions and revocations on repeat offenders. And since 2004, every driver who accumulated six DMV points also faces a mandatory Driver Responsibility Assessment from DMV. The net result--- pay a fine or get suspended. The MTBOT driver's center handled 1,668 traffic court summonses in 2018. About 40% were dismissed; of the remainder 31 resulted in DMV suspensions or revocations. And in every single conviction, the hearing officer reviews the entirety of the driver's record, including when the offenses occurred, and makes a determination as to penalty, including possible suspension or revocation. And every driver involved in a serious accident will attend a DMV Safety Hearing which can result in license revocation. So the DMV and its TVB arm today is taking bad driving far more seriously than it did nineteen years ago.

Under the TLC Critical Driver Program of today, most drivers settle for a fine in lieu of suspension or revocation. While I applaud the Commission for offering these settlements, and softening the harsh effects of the rule, it belies the argument that Critical Driver is a necessary public safety tool; it becomes a cost of doing business for licensees. During the past two years, our MTBOT Drivers' Program handled 258 Critical Driver cases. 138, or 53%, were dismissed. This was generally because the driver took a defensive driving course, or the computer that generated the summons miscalculated points. Of the 120 cases in which drivers were in violation, there were 29 thirty-day suspensions imposed and 15 drivers were revoked. The remainder, 76 drivers, paid a fine and continued driving. If the Commission believed any one of these drivers posed a threat to public safety, it could have commenced revocation proceedings.

In summary, let's get unsafe drivers off the road--- we can all agree on that. But let's give every driver a fair hearing an opportunity to defend his or her record. But again, penalizing drivers for DMV points, including points accrued in their personal vehicles is unnecessary, redundant, deprives drivers of due process, and in fact, does nothing to get unsafe drivers off the road.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today. If you have any questions, I will be happy to answer them.



Testimony to the New York City Council

For Hire Vehicle Committee

January 31, 2019

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Jeanette Williams and I am a member of Families for Safe Streets. My son Troy Williams was killed by a hit-and-run driver on March 1, 2018 on Sedgwick Avenue near Undercliff in the Bronx.

I received a telephone call from the police around 2: 00 am stating that Troy was dead. This is a day that I will never forget. The past ten months have been so devastating. I feel as if I am in a never ending dream and I can't wake up. Troy's death made me understand how it feels to have a broken heart. Truly my heart is broken and I don't know how or when it will ever be mended.

Troy was the father of four young men and the grandfather of a grandson and a granddaughter who will never have the opportunity to know him. He also left a younger brother and a host of other family members and friends. Troy was my first born son. He and I had a wonderful relationship which meant more to me than anything in the world.

Troy was a wonderful guy that cared about others and often put them before himself. He was a funny guy who loved to have fun and his smile would light up any room that he entered. My son was a hard worker and at the time of his death he was employed at Columbia University as a Fire Safety Officer. Troy was a graduate of John Jay College and

continued to advance his career. Troy also volunteered with boys at the Harlem Jets Athletics League and Holcombe Rucker Community League. At Troy's home going service I was able to see how many lives he had touch in his short time on this earth. Though his life came to a tragic ending I am able to hold on to the wonderful things he accomplished in his life.

Through my sorrow I have chosen to work with Families for Safe Streets to advocate for change. I am here today to remind everyone how important it is support legislation that prevents these senseless deaths. We were horrified to see the original version of this legislation that would have weakened the TLC's efforts to get dangerous drivers off the road. Professional drivers have an obligation to be the safest drivers on NYC's streets. We are pleased that this version maintains the critical enforcement role because we need to be doing more, not taking steps backward.

I hope someone here today from the City Council can also help me pressure the police to find who was responsible for killing my son. I have heard nothing from the NYPD and cannot even get them to certify the cause of death. Finally, I welcome your help fighting for better lighting, more speed cameras, and other traffic safety measures in that area and other areas throughout the city to prevent any other family from experiencing the devastation that me and my family has had to endure this past year.



**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 991 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 1/31/18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: JOHN CASSANO

Address: 100 CHURCH ST

I represent: CATH

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: MARCO CONNER

Address: _____

I represent: Transportation Alternatives

Address: _____

**THE COUNCIL
THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

Appearance Card

I intend to appear and speak on Int. No. 991 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 1/31/18

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: AMY SLIFKA

Address: 100 CHURCH ST. NY 10007

I represent: CATH

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. ^{1249-A} 991 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 1/31/19

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Leandra Eustache

Address: _____

I represent: Managing Attorney - Prosecution Unit

Address: NYC TAXI & Limousine Commission

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. ^{1249-A} 991 Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 1/31/19

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Madeline Labadie

Address: _____

I represent: Senior Advisor for Strategic Initiatives

Address: NYC Taxi & Limousine Commission

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: _____

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: Jane He William

Address: Family for 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. _____ Res. No. _____

in favor in opposition

Date: 11/31/2019

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: PETER MAZER

Address: 39-24 24th STREET, LONG ISLAND CITY, NY

I represent: METROLOCITAN TAXICAB BOARD OF TRADE

Address: Same

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