GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

OFFICE OF THE D.C. TAXICAB COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

PROPOSED RULEMAKING FOR ESTABLISHING
A NEW PRIVATE SEDAN CLASS OF PUBLIC
VEHICLES-FOR-HIRE AND RULES PERTAINING
TO DISPATCH SERVICES

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY APRIL 30, 2014

+ + + + +

The Commission met in the Old City Council Chambers, $441\ 4^{\text{th}}\ \text{Street},\ \text{N.W.},$ Washington, D.C., at 10:00 a.m., Ron M. Linton, Chairperson, presiding.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

RON M. LINTON, Chairperson ANTHONY MUHAMMAD, Commissioner BETTY SMALLS, Commissioner STANLEY TAPSCOTT, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT:

JACQUES LERNER, ESQ., General Counsel MONIQUE BABCOCK, ESQ., Assistant General Counsel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRESENTERS:
Ride for Hire Dona Burney 7
DC Professional Taxicab Drivers Association Carolyn Robinson
International Brotherhood of Teamsters Royale Simms
Property Casualty Insurers Association of America Kevin Wrege
American Insurance Association Eric Goldberg
Yellow Cab Company of DC, Inc. Roy Spooner
Sidecar Elizabeth Stevens
Public comment
Adjourn

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 | 10:10 a.m.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I'd like to call to order this public hearing scheduled by the District of Columbia Taxicab Commission, in the Old Council Chambers on Wednesday, April 30^{th} , 2014. The time is now 10 minutes past 10, and we have before us for comment by interested parties proposed rulemaking for establishing a new private sedan class of public vehicles-for-hire and rules pertaining to dispatch services.

I want to emphasize that these are proposed rulemakings. They will be subject to significant review and evaluation and change based largely upon the comments that those who have chosen to come before the Commission today make to us, and to written material that may be sent to the Commission no later than -- what is, Mr. Counsel, the closing date for the recipient of written comments?

PARTICIPANT: That would be 30 days from publication so it's probably 30 days from next Friday.

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Yes, we anticipate publication on the $9^{\rm th}$ of May; therefore, comments will be accepted through the close of business on June the $8^{\rm th}$.

The hearing, as we have in the past, has been divided into two parts, and the first part are the representatives of associations and companies that are involved in either delivering this new type of service, or delivering existing service.

Each of these groups are divided into three panels, and the first panel will be the panel of people representing driver organizations. There are three organizations. Each organization may have up to 30 minutes to make their presentation. If that takes us past or up to 1:00, we will take a break at that time before going to the second part of the hearing,

which will be the presentations by citizens who have signed up to make five-minute statements to the panel.

Again, I want to emphasize that we're here to hear what it is that you're concerned about in these rules, either what's in them that you feel needs to be addressed, or what is not in them that you feel should be in them. We're not here to debate or to get into a discussion of how they should be finally shown, but to get from you the guidance based on your experience, your issues, and what you want us to understand.

With that, let me invite the members of the first panel, the driver panel. We have representing the organization Ride For Hire, Mrs. Dona Burney, representing DC Professional Taxicab Drivers Association, Mr. Nathan Price and Ms. Carolyn Robinson, and representing the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Mr. Royale Sims. I invite you all to the table to

1	sit here. Do we have microphones for the table,
2	Neville?
3	MS. ROBINSON: I have a question
4	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Yes?
5	MS. ROBINSON: before we start.
6	With this half hour, apparently, Mr. Linton,
7	this is the same scenario as before. The panel
8	has a half an hour
9	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: No, no, no. You
10	have a half hour for your association.
11	MS. ROBINSON: All right, thank you.
12	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Ms. Burney has
13	a half hour for her association. Mr. Sims has
14	a half hour for his association. I was hoping
15	that in setting this up our staff had provided
16	microphones so everybody could hear you,
17	including those of us who want to hear you. So,
18	if you'll bear with us for just a moment.
19	(Off the record comments.)
20	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: My apologies,
21	and with that the first person on the list, Ride

1	For Hire, Ms. Dona Burney. Ms. Burney, the
2	microphone is yours.
3	MS. BURNEY: Thank you, Chairman. I
4	want to thank you
5	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Can you pull it
6	a little closer? I do have some hearing
7	difficulties.
8	MS. BURNEY: Thank you. Is that
9	adequate?
10	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: It's not up
11	very high.
12	(Off the record comments.)
13	MS. BURNEY: First of all, I want to
14	thank the Commission for undertaking what is a
15	thankless task. At this point in time, I
16	certainly understand what it is to try to
17	accomplish a task when you have a hand tied
18	behind your back. And I feel like that is the
19	kind of task that was given to the Commission
20	in developing these regulations.
21	I am here on behalf of a website

called Ride For Hire. It was set up, it's a collaborative effort by several taxicab drivers. It was set up to fill that gap of insurance notification. It is intended to provide the insurance carriers of notification when a vehicle, a private vehicle is observed in an apparent commercial for-hire activity.

I have placed the revised Now, copies of my testimony on the podium for the esteemed members, and the difference between that and the one that was filed with you, I was not able to get the various attachments to you. And the very first attachment shows the front page of the Ride For Hire website, and it also shows the letters that went out to the various insurance carriers and the insurance commissioners of several states, as well as the DC Trial Lawyers Association so that they all are on the same page in being aware of this website that notifies the insurance carriers of the vehicles that are being operated without

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

commercial coverage in an apparent commercial enterprise.

Now, the gentleman in the back with the red jacket has copies of the forms that he can distribute to any drivers here to submit copies of these tags so that they can be placed on the website. Currently, there are about 600 vehicles already listed on that website. There is a need for 6-10,000 vehicles to be listed on that website because this is the estimated number now operating in the District of Columbia without the proper insurance.

Now, let me forward to my comments pertaining to the regulations. First of all, I concerned pertaining to the lack ammandatory insurance coverage, commercial insurance for private vehicles in a private endeavor. regulations What the state drafted, the proposed regulations, is that the driver is only required to provide to the DC Taxicab Commission a copy of the front and the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

back of his or her insurance card on that private vehicle.

This is inadequate. In my view, this should be expanded to include verification from that insurance company that they are aware that this vehicle is being used as a for-hire vehicle. For the Commission to accept this information and to not complete the circle of full information to the insurance carriers may well skip the bounds of aiding and abetting fraud because it certainly constitutes fraud carriers if the against the insurance individual drivers are attempting to use a private vehicle for a commercial activity outside of the bounds of that insurance policy. So, this needs some serious reconsideration to close that loop and go full circle, and be sure that the insurance carrier whose name is on that insurance card is a party to that process, and they are aware and give their permission.

Now, the second point I want to go

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

on also pertains to insurance, and it relates to the part of the regulations that state that the master policy of the company involved in the service, i.e., whether it be Uber, Sidecar, Lyft, that their insurance policy only extend to the vehicle at the time that it is on line with their system to take or is taking calls. Again, this suffers from the same defect as the lack of information to the insurance company. It does not go full circle and close the information loop. Now, what we are seeing on the street is that the vehicles for hire amass at certain points in the city and they sit and wait for fares. They may be logged into the system, they may not be logged into the system. CHAIRPERSON I, TNTON: Excuse You're talking about non-metered vehicles --MS. BURNEY: Yes, I'm talking about the private vehicles, sir. Yes, thank you. And I'm talking about the part of the policy -- the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

regulations that address the master policy for the companies.

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you.

MS. BURNEY: And the point here is these drivers frequently go around, either they are soliciting fares, cash fares off the street. I've had it done in front of me many times, or they can drive around and they can use their own personal cell phone with their consumer app for the service to look at it to see where the clusters of the vehicles are located to provide the service, and then they go on to an area where there is not a cluster of vehicles.

Well, under these proposed regulations they're not required to be covered for-hire vehicle when, in fact, they are participating but just not logged in.

Now, this flies in the face of a level playing field for all of the commercial vehicles because it's well recognized that many

of their activities are ongoing pursuant to 1 2 commercial activities whether they are 3 actually pursuing that fare or not. Whether they're going to the gas station, whether 4 they're driving to the garage for maintenance, 5 it's all part of that process. 6 7 So, when you develop a set regulations that ignores the fact that they can 8 9 be logged on through another system to be 10 totally monitoring when or not they're going to 11 plug in to start taking calls, it circumvents 12 the process and, again, is kind of aiding and 13 abetting fraud against the consumer here 14 because they have another way of monitoring 15 rather than being logged onto the company's 16 system for-hire. 17 Now, let's move on. 18 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Does that in 19 fact, Ms. Burney, allow them to steal rides from 20 others?

MS. BURNEY: Pardon?

1	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Would that
2	allow an individual to take a ride that was
3	really meant for someone else?
4	MS. BURNEY: What I'm saying here is
5	they are going on to their consumer part as if
6	they were going on to check to see if they were
7	going to hire one. All they have to do is press
8	to hire, but they don't actually hire. It pops
9	up and shows all of the
10	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Who is asking?
11	MS. BURNEY: Pardon?
12	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: It shows who is
13	asking for rides?
14	MS. BURNEY: Yes. And so they go
15	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: All right.
16	Which they could do that regardless of what
17	company they were affiliated with.
18	MS. BURNEY: Well, all
19	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Because you get
20	all the apps and they could ask for anyone, so
21	they're affiliated with Company A, they could

1	still look at Company B and see who is looking
2	for rides.
3	MS. BURNEY: Yes. Yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: And then take
5	those rides.
6	MS. BURNEY: Well, I'm not dealing
7	with the crossover here.
8	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I'm just
9	interested in the possibilities.
10	MS. BURNEY: And that's an
11	interesting spin because that is entirely
12	possible. My concern here is that when they go
13	to one of these apps on the consumer side and
14	they are doing it to monitor the level of
15	business activity, they are not mandated to be
16	under the commercial policy coverage, and that
17	part that loop needs to be closed. It's just
18	a shortcoming in the regulations as proposed
19	here.
20	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Yes.
21	MS. BURNEY: Thank you. Now, going

1 on, I don't want to take too much time because 2 we've got --I'm 3 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: not charging you for my questions. 4 (Laughter.) 5 MS. BURNEY: Ask any questions you 6 7 have. 8 9 concern is this whole My next 10 process of the Commission issuing a license on 11 behalf of that vehicle to operate as a private 12 for-ride vehicle, or private for-hire а 13 vehicle, but it does not go through DMV. And, 14 to me, this is a serious breach of our Consumer 15 Protection laws throughout America and Canada. 16 Wherever you go, every state in the nation has 17 some process with the vehicle titling that 18 requires that if a vehicle is to be used under 19 extensive usage, like whether it's 20 taxicab, a police vehicle, a fleet rental,

these are all exceptional amounts of usage

which will place extended usage and wear and tear on that vehicle, so the states make a notation of that on the title of the vehicle. It's called a branded title. And once a vehicle becomes branded, there is a brand on the title, it can never be removed. That brand serves as a warning in the subsequent use car market that hey, beware, if you purchase this car it may have run for four, six, eight, ten hours a day, seven days a week in a heavily congested urban area, i.e., you may be purchasing a lemon so you are forewarned.

This is a very significant part of the Consumer Protection laws in America to avoid the consumers unknowingly purchasing lemons. And by this license being issued only through the DCTC, it short-circuits this, and it aborts the entire intent of this consumer protection aspect, so I think this needs to be rethought. And if these private cars are going to be used for hire, they've got to go through

a titling process at DMV also.

Now, my next point, I was very upset when I logged on to the DCist website, and I am a great fan of DCist. I read them regularly. I find out what's going on in the city. I know the new hot venues, I know where there's going to be a big activity at a club or a big show, so I know where to go to look for fares.

I logged on there several days ago and I saw a statement by Sidecar that they perceived this set of regulations to be an effort to run them out of business in the District of Columbia. Well, I read further and the rationale according to the DCist after contacting Sidecar was that their drivers would look at a call that was dispatched and they would accept or reject it on the basis of reasonableness.

I'm sorry, guys, this is a violation of the DC Human Rights Act. It's a violation of the Civil Rights Act, the civil rights of every

person who is rejected a call based on that driver's perceived reasonableness. It is a violation of the federal civil rights laws. And, in my view, Sidecar is just plain not welcome in this jurisdiction if an integral part of their business model is to come here and to profile based on destination.

This is considered racial discrimination under the law, and this is considered a violation of civil rights, so this is an absolute no-no. And we are skirting close to the same type of discriminatory behavior by some of the others.

Notably, when you get a company, and I don't have to name the name, that uses as their customer base only the persons having a large enough credit card balance to maintain an open account with them; this discriminates against the more disadvantaged members of our community. This is wrong.

One of the things that happened

recently was that a person that I have regarded well in my lifetime and many of the younger people may not have the same sensibility that I have, I'm here as a 70-year old grandmother. I grew up during the civil rights era, and I have been a strong supporter, at least mentally, psychologically, in spirit of the efforts of the greats in our society, including the Reverend Jesse Jackson. And within the last two weeks, Jesse Jackson came on board pointing out that the likes of the Silicon establishment in California was behaving in discriminatory practices in the hirings of blacks, the hirings Latinos, of the appointments to board memberships of blacks and Latinos, and the funding of projects for black and Latinos.

Okay, guys, we see the same thing here. It is the same Silicon Valley crowd that has so viciously attacked, their cyber attacks, their cyber bully attacks upon DC City Council,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

and upon the Taxicab Commission to thwart the regulatory process.

We've got the likes of Kalanick who hired the Menlo Associates to conduct these cyber bully attacks. And Menlo Associates subsequently bragged publicly about their success in thwarting regulation in DC. Come on, Jesse Jackson, we need you here in DC right now because we are facing the same issues. And with the cherry picking that goes on through this elitist service we are a thin hair away from the same type of discriminatory practices that he is alleging against these same individuals in the Silicon Valley homestead.

Now, the final area that I have to comment, and it'll probably get covered by so many of the other people here, is the need for the level playing field. And that level playing field, we get into such issues as these regulations do not require the complete medical examination for these for-hire drivers. Most of

these drivers that we're seeing on the street are immigrant drivers who are coming here and they may have tuberculosis, they may have diabetes, et cetera. Taxi drivers are mandated to be tested for these semiannually.

We do not need a driver on the street with an infectious disease to be transmitted throughout our community. We do not need a driver that is diabetic who is going to go into a diabetic coma and kill a half a dozen people at a busy intersection, or the same thing with a heart condition. We do not need a driver with poor peripheral vision who is going to make a turn and wipe out some pedestrians. We don't need it. There is reason for these а requirements, and they need to be added in here.

There are so many expenses that have been added on to cab drivers within the last two years, and these have come at the hands of City Council. These are not imposed upon the for-hire vehicles.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Now, for City Council to set and impose these requirements on the DC taxi drivers and then turn their head and say oh, but competition can come in here. Dah, this is not competition. This is unfair competition because taxi drivers cannot vary their rates. These rates are set by law. If a taxi driver decides to charge anything other than that metered rate, that taxi driver can lose his or her license permanently.

Now, we allow UberX to come into this community, Sidecar, Lyft, they can cut their rates to below legally mandated taxi rates. This is unfair competition. This should be --

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Ms. Burney, I would call to your attention when you have a chance to look at Chapter 8. In Chapter 8, the proposed revisions would allow the digital dispatch services to which metered cabs have signed up with to go off meter to set rates

1	equivalent to the way that it is proposed to
2	have the non-metered cab set rate.
3	MS. BURNEY: Yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: So, they would
5	not it would only be street hails
6	MS. BURNEY: Yes.
7	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: that would
8	be linked to the meter. But please continue, you
9	make a
10	MS. BURNEY: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: very good
12	point.
13	MS. BURNEY: Thank you, and I am
14	aware of that, and we will deal with that in
15	detail when the appropriate hearing is
16	scheduled. One thing I would note is there
17	not going to be a hearing on that?
18	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: This is it.
19	MS. BURNEY: Oh, this is it? I
20	thought that
21	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: This is for all

1	those proposed regulations.
2	MS. BURNEY: Oh.
3	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: You're free to
4	send us your written comments. We welcome them,
5	so I ask you to go back and look at that, and
6	make sure you supplement what you're telling us
7	here today
8	MS. BURNEY: All right.
9	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: with your
10	comments on those other things.
11	MS. BURNEY: I do have a concern
12	there.
13	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: All right.
14	MS. BURNEY: One of my primary
15	concerns is that you have no control then over
16	rates. They may be bouncing all over town, and
17	the thinking behind this from what I have read
18	in the proposals and the panel study was that
19	this was a relatively small component of the
20	market, something like about 25 percent of the
21	market.

Well, that 25 percent, give or take a few percentage points, may have been valid six months ago. It is not valid today, because the thrust with all the discounts, et cetera, that has been offered by UberX in an effort to thwart the regulated rates has bumped this up probably closer to 40 to 50 percent.

On a given Friday or Saturday night, there are virtually no fares on the streets for taxicab drivers until the bars close when there is the thrust of persons, so I would concerned, first of all, at the base assumption that underlies the thinking here.

And then the second is, it is not in the interest of the consumer not to have service available to every person in the District of Columbia at a reasonable rate. And I think the little old lady that I picked up out off Benning Road at about -- one of the upper streets about two blocks on this side of the Maryland line, she was going all the way to DuPont Circle at

5:00 in the morning. She was a cook at a senior 1 2 citizens home, and the only way she had to get to work at that hour because public transit was 3 4 not operating and it was an early Sunday morning, her fare ran in excess of \$25. 5 Now, if we're going to surge, and 6 7 people like that -- and I already felt quilty charging her that much to go to work for the type 8 9 of job that she was in. This was mandatory transportation for her to get to work to feed 10 11 the senior citizens at a senior citizens home. 12 If you're going to surge that and it's going to 13 cost her \$50 to get a ride to work, this woman 14 can't afford to go to work on that day. It is 15 not in the public interest to surge these rates 16 because too many people in the outlying areas 17 rely on the radio business in order to get to 18 work. It's a basic transportation need. Okay, I've said enough. Thank you. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you, Ms.

Burney, very much. I trust that you are aware

1	that the City Council will be holding a hearing
2	on the 12 th of May on the legislation that's
3	(Off the record comments.)
4	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: It's May 12 th ,
5	I believe, but you can check with them.
6	MS. BURNEY: Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: And it's on the
8	bill introduced by Chairwoman Cheh and Council
9	member Grosso, which would significantly
10	modify the authorities of this Commission in
11	dealing with the private with what they call
12	ride shares, and we call private sedans.
13	MS. BURNEY: Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Now, I would
15	just tell all of you so it's clearly understood,
16	we make a <mark>fetish</mark> of referring to this new
17	element as private sedan service for the simple
18	reason that the federal government has a
19	definition of ride share that affects a number
20	of things which are connected with federal

programs and affects the municipalities. What

1	this service is does not meet the definition of
2	the federal ride share, so we do not call it or
3	refer to it as ride share. You want to call it
4	shared riding maybe, or as I refer to it
5	electronic hitchhiking, but it is not ride
6	sharing. It is private sedan service.
7	Thank you, Ms. Burney, and we'll
8	turn now let me ask, do any of the other
9	Commissioners have any questions that you'd
10	like to ask at this time? Mr. Tapscott?
11	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: No, thank
12	you.
13	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: None. Mr.
14	Ferguson, Mr. Muhammad?
15	Thank you again for your comments.
16	They've been very helpful.
17	MS. BURNEY: Thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I trust you
19	will give us a written supplement.
20	MS. BURNEY: Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: At this point I

1	would like to recognize Ms. Carolyn Robinson.
2	Has Mr. Price come in yet, Ms. Robinson?
3	MS. ROBINSON: I don't
4	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Nathan Price,
5	are you with us? No, he does not seem to be, so
6	I invite you to go ahead, ma'am, and present
7	your testimony.
8	MS. ROBINSON: Good morning,
9	Chairman Linton, and all the Commissioners.
10	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I'm sorry.
11	MS. ROBINSON: Oh, you can't hear me?
12	Okay. Good morning, Chairman Linton.
13	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you.
14	MS. ROBINSON: And the Commissioners
15	present, Tapscott, Muhammad, Ferguson, and
16	Betty Smalls. And, of course, our General
17	Counsel, Jacques Lerner and his assistant.
18	I'm glad to be here today. The
19	proposed rulemakings for establishing a new
20	private sedan class of the public service
21	vehicle for hire rules and pertaining to

dispatch, that's what we're supposed to be here for today.

The proposed rulemakings are Chapter 2, Definitions, Chapter 8, Operation of Taxicabs, Chapter 12, Luxury Services Owners, Operators and Vehicles, Chapter 14, Operation of Sedans, Chapter 16, Dispatch Services, and Chapter 17, Private Sedan Service, Businesses, Operators, and Vehicles.

This indicates that there are proposed and final changes and the creation and revision of two new chapters regarding the new private sedan class. Chapter 2, Definitions, in essence, all of the definitions from the Chapter Subsections 399, 499, 599, 699, 799, 899, 999, 1099, 1299, 1399, 1499, 1599, and 1699 were deleted and reserved.

Now, in Chapter 2, Application and Scope, 203 in the event of a conflict between definition of this chapter and the definition of another chapter of this type, the more

specific definition shall apply. This is an indication that definitions conflict from chapter to chapter.

Ι have with the concerns definitions for black car, black car service, digital dispatch, digital services, DCTC commercial operators license, DCTC operator's identification card, DCTC license vehicle for hire license, a licensing document, Commissioner which is interesting because the Commissioner in the definitions relates to DISB. I didn't know DISB was a Commissioner in regard to the taxicab. I thought they were only involved with insurance and the private sedan service vehicle.

My concern is (B), and the private sedan vehicle is no more than 10 years of age at entry into service, and more than 12 years of age while in service. My question is, why private sedans, a newly created class, has a different leverage regarding vintage than

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

taxicabs, since the definition for public vehicle for hire includes taxicab, limousine, or sedan. I question if the amendment would create the regulatory framework for licensing and regulations for a new class of the public vehicle for hire to be called private sedan service.

My comments regarding Chapter 8 have been republished since 2012. I testified on June 6^{th} , 2012, and June 13^{th} , 2012 when the proposed amendments were republished December 23rd, 2011. I addressed limousines, they're multi-jurisdictional, whether licensed or unlicensed, Uber, Taxi Magic, Black Car Service Sedans, the rest of the limousine service, et cetera. The problems existed then and continue to exist presently. Apparently, DCTC is regulating to eliminate the taxicabs who have paved the way for the new created entities.

Chapter 12, Luxury Services Owner,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Operators and Vehicles, taxicabs and public vehicles for hire is amending subsections by striking sedan and inserting black car.

My question regarding Section 1213, Wheelchair Accessibility requirements for LSC organizations providing sedan service/black car, can you identify which black car service is wheelchair accessible?

I am a member of the Regional Taxicab Regulators Task Force which is under the Council of Governments and a member of the DCTC Disability Advisory Committee, and there has been any discussion regarding black car service and wheelchair accessibility.

chapter 14, Operation of Black Cars and Private Sedans, 1400. I do agree black cars should be required to the collection and payment of the District of Columbia passenger surcharge. The Application and Scope, 1400.3, Additional Requirements for the Owners and Operators and Vehicles that participate in

Black Car Service are contained in Chapter 12. Additional Requirements 1400.4, for the Private Sedan Service are contained in Chapter 1400.5, Additional 17. Requirements for Digital Dispatch Service are contained Chapter 16. 1400.7, this chapter shall apply to private sedan services beginning when is the implementation date. You have these amendments but you don't have when the implementation date is. Chapter 16, Dispatch Services.

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Let me just counsel you on that. The reason why these proposed ones don't have implementation dates, because that will depend upon when a final decision is made. You can't put an implementation date until you know when they're going to go into effect. So, that traditionally has been set with the final vote.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay. With the final rulemakings, I thought they go into effect 30 days after they're published. Isn't that the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1	general procedure?
2	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: That's the
3	general procedure, yes.
4	MS. ROBINSON: Oh, okay. So, they're
5	published. Right?
6	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: When the final
7	rule is published.
8	MS. ROBINSON: Okay.
9	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: It generally
10	it will then contain the implementation
11	date.
12	MS. ROBINSON: Okay. Chapter 16,
13	Dispatch Services. These proposed rules are
14	intended and expected to deter and prevent
15	consumer fraud and abuse. This threat to the
16	safety of passengers and drivers and operators
17	from road services which will be able to make
18	their apps available to Smart Phone users,
19	enter the District, steal credit card
20	information, dispatch uninsured and unlicensed
21	drivers, operators and vehicles, and fail to

collect or remit passenger surcharge, and depart before the office has even been alerted of their presence.

The Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment commands that no state shall deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws, which is essentially the direction that all persons similarly situated should be treated alike.

Okay. Chapter 16, Mr. Price was going to expound on. I'll read some of the stuff that I have. He had other notes. 1601, I have the General Requirements, 1602, Operating Requirements, 1602.6, each DDS which processes digital payment for the public vehicle for hire should comply with the requirements with the passenger rates and charges set forth in 801 for taxicab service, and 1404.1 for Black Car and Private Sedan Services.

1602.11, the following provisions of this Chapter 5 shall apply to each dispatch

service, 508, anti-discrimination, 511, fraud, 512, bribery, 513, threats and harassment.

Operators and Vehicles. We have a real problem, but I'll get to that later. 1602.18, Digital Payment Systems for Black Car and Private Sedan Service. Each DPS unit shall allow the operator to provide the passenger with a written or electronic receipt. The vehicle's electronic manifest containing all quarterly reportable trip data and all information required for receipts within the prior 24 hours capable of being printed and transmitted electronically.

My problem with that, Mr. Linton, is if passenger -- public vehicles for hire, taxicabs can't have electronic manifests, why are you creating a new sedan service that can use electronic manifests? And why are they transmitting quarterly reports to TSIC instead of daily reports? Corresponding with the surcharge, are you going to charge them a

surcharge? Pursuant to 1609.19, 1602, excuse me, .19, a single data fee consistent to the structure across all digital payment systems. Will all these vehicles be under the surcharge, and will they be reporting to DCTC? Passenger surcharge for the Black Car and Sedan Service.

Chapter 17, the Private Sedan Service, I have quite a few questions regarding 1700.3, Additional Requirements that. Applicable to the Drivers and Vehicles that participate in the Private Sedan Service are contained in Chapter 14. 1700.4, Additional Requirements Applicable to Digital Dispatch Service that participate in the Private Sedan Service are contained in Chapter 16. 1700.6, I think you explained how you are working with those effective dates. 1700.7, AIn the event of a conflict between a provision of this chapter and provisions of another chapter of this title, the more restricted provision shall control.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1713.2, Each operator shall at all times be in compliance with Chapter 14 and this chapter.@ You know, I have concerns, and quite few of these amendments and proposed are frequently repetitious rulemakings several chapters which tends to be confusing, apparently written in manner to accommodate the entity vaqueness intends to do the business in the District of Columbia without rules and regulations. This matter, again, has the public vehicle for hire industry competing against each other causing conflict.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

You know, there are a lot of things. You know, we go through this with these proposed rulemakings and, of course, you see I've read all the amendments pertaining to these new rules and regulations, and sometimes it's a travesty, you know. You get the regulations, you try to comply with them, you see what's

going on, and as soon as you get that in sync, then you have a new proposed regulation, and a new time. And how do the drivers participate? How do you -- and you refer to them as drivers sometimes, you refer to them as operators. You know, you cast out the sedan and you put black car in its place, but then you have regulations regarding black car and sedans. So, I want to know how is the DCTC and God forbid if we go into this new agency what will happen, you know. How do you expect us to operate, you know? what I see, and what I've observed it is Title 31, that's apparent this DCMR for taxicabs and public vehicles for hire that hasn't been published since July 2004, and this is, you might as well say May, 2014.

You know, it's not a good scene, Mr. Linton. And, of course, you know with my experience, I've been a public service vehicle operator since 1975, and I have been in attendance to most meetings, most hearings,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

most committees, most everything, and I see where the industry is going. And it upsets me to no end to see that we're just going through the motion, spitting out stuff. You got people making regulations that have no knowledge of even history. They never -- even though you do have two public service vehicle operators on the Commission, it is apparent that you are not getting feedback or correct information from the two drivers that could help the drivers here.

The Taxicab Commission was established to assist the drivers, not to put the drivers out of business. And, apparently, this is the real turnaround with the Generation Y, K, whatever other generation that's coming into existence and making all these plans, and putting us out.

I am also a senior citizen. I'm 66-years old, you know, and I'm a fourth-generation Washingtonian, and it really

1	upsets me to see the new age and the new things
2	that are happening that are really casting us
3	aside. Thank you.
4	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you, Ms.
5	Robinson, for your testimony. I trust that you
6	will take advantage of supplementing it with
7	any further written comments you have, that you
8	also will take notice of the City Council's
9	hearing on May 12 th , and take advantage of that.
10	MS. ROBINSON: I already signed up.
11	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: There are a
12	number of things you've raised, particularly in
13	the area of selectivity of who gets a ride and
14	who doesn't, and I assure you we will take a very
15	careful look at it based on your suggestions.
16	Are there any questions that anyone
17	has for Ms. Robinson? Mr. Ferguson?
18	MR. FERGUSON: I do have one
19	question. At our last deliberation we did talk
20	about the differentiation between
21	classification of sedan's life span when you

1	last met. And I was wondering if that was
2	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: And it is
3	something which I would expect that we will
4	continue to review and analyze as we move
5	forward.
6	MR. FERGUSON: Okay.
7	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: These are not
8	the final regulations. We've already begun to
9	have discussions regarding the modernization
10	approach. Commissioner Muhammad.
11	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Yes. Ms.
12	Robinson, would you suggest that the taxicab
13	get rid of paper manifests and use the
14	electronic one as it's being proposed by
15	sedans?
16	MS. ROBINSON: Well, Commissioner
17	Muhammad, this is the 21 st century, and if most
18	of the applications, most of the other entities
19	that are trying to do business in the District
20	of Columbia are using Smart Phones, websites
21	and things like that, it would be more apparent

that we do get rid of the written manifest. What purpose does it serve?

The Commission gets all of our data on a 24-hour basis, so they know what they're doing. Big Brother is watching us all the time, you know, so it shouldn't be any issue with that. And I'll give you an example.

Some time ago, I was unfortunate to be stopped by one of the public vehicle for hire inspectors regarding a manifest, and he wrote me a citation, and I had a hearing. And I went to the hearing, and I had my Title 31, and I also told the hearing examiner that other entities, the limousine service and all those, they use electronic manifests, and the District of Columbia Government needs to come up to speed to the 21st century, you know. And if they can do it, why can't I?

Well, fortunately, with my conversation the ticket was dismissed, and she told me I need to start doing the manifest. But

1	these are the kind of things, if you're going
2	to do it for one, you've got to do it for
3	everybody.
4	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: And, also,
5	do you remember when we implemented the MTS
6	system?
7	MS. ROBINSON: Oh, absolutely.
8	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: This
9	Commission voted to allow taxis to go through
10	inspections for one year at DMV. It has never
11	
12	MS. ROBINSON: Been implemented.
13	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: been
14	implemented. I suggest you go to City Council,
15	get all the testimony and you can input it for
16	their consideration of what we're saying today.
17	Also, remind them of the plan that was presented
18	by Council Member Bowser, so we will not have
19	Council Members investing in Uber and the rest
20	of the sedan services that are coming into
21	Washington, D.C., and on their boards.

MS. ROBINSON: Well, that's true,
Mr. Muhammad. And I'm sure you're familiar,
too, because you also are on the DCTC
Accessibility Advisory Committee. And that was
something that we brought up in our meeting. I
mentioned to the representative from Council
Member Cheh's office that with the change, if
they're going to do the Agency, they tried to
do this before when Dan Tangherlini was the
Director of DDOT. And at that time, we had more
unity with drivers, and we protested because
they were going to make us under the
transportation czar with DDOT. And that was
before, but I did mention to Council Member
Cheh's representative at the meeting that that
was then, this is now. And I'm sure that with
all of her persuasion, this will take place this
time. So, I wonder sometimes, you know, who's
watching who, but who's zooming who?
CHAIRPERSON LINTON: For the record,
let me just note that the implementation of the

1	once a year inspection would require a change
2	of their regulations. I think they're going to
3	change them in the coming year, however.
4	MS. ROBINSON: Well, Mr. Linton,
5	Chairman Linton, that means it's fruitless to
6	make decisions, have them on record, and then
7	they're never implemented, because I brought
8	that up with the Task Force from Council Member
9	
10	(Simultaneous speech.)
11	MS. ROBINSON: We do this all the
12	time.
13	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: There are
14	certain circumstances where we don't have the
15	authority to override them. In this case, we've
16	adopted the regulation where we only require
17	once a year inspection. They have declined to
18	change their regulations to implement it.
19	MS. ROBINSON: Well, DMV, you send
20	Ronnie over there to DMV for our registrations
21	and stuff, so they - it's just - it's really sad

what the District of Columbia Government is not doing --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

(Simultaneous speech.)

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: -- the Mayor and the Council.

ROBINSON: Well, they're MS. familiar with me, too. The Transportation Committee, most of them know me. I worked on the campaign for Council Member Grosso, so -- and Ms. Cheh knows me. I've been in her office many, many, almost too many times, you know. And that's part of the problem with the Taxicab Commission, because we originally were under Transportation under Council Member Graham, then it was Fraud, then we went to Michael Brown, then we went to Vic Alexander, then we went to Tom Wells, you know, and now we're under -- and they got rid of him, and now we're under Mary Cheh, so how can the Council even think about doing anything to help us when you're shifting everything around, throwing things,

1	you know, like we're in the zoo and you're
2	feeding the monkeys or whatever.
3	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Well, I invite
4	you to testify before
5	(Laughter.)
6	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you,
7	ladies and gentlemen
8	(Off microphone comment.)
9	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: I commend
10	the ladies for testifying today. I think you
11	brought out a lot of good points, a lot of good
12	points. And we as the cab drivers in this city
13	are doomed. Everyone else is getting respect
14	except us. I've been on this council. I voted
15	against a lot of regulations since I've been
16	back, but one or two votes is not going to get
17	anything. And what the City Council, as far as
18	I'm concerned, is doing to cab drivers, I don't
19	know how they have a conscience to wake up and
20	look in the mirror.
21	And it's not getting any better,

1	it's getting worse, because everyone every
2	time one of these other companies pick up a
3	driver a passenger, they're picking up your
4	passenger. And they're putting you out of
5	business. And no one seems to care about it. But
6	I appreciate your all's testimony.
7	MS. ROBINSON: Well, we're cab
8	drivers for life. Right?
9	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you very
10	much, Ms. Robinson. I would invite you, Mr.
11	Sims, now for your testimony on behalf of the
12	International Brotherhood of Teamsters and the
13	drivers it represents.
14	MR. SIMMS: Thank you, Council,
15	thank you Commission Chairman. I'd also like to
16	thank my fellow panelists.
17	My name is Royale Simms. I'm a
18	Business Agent for Teamsters 922. My primary
19	responsibility is representing the Washington,
20	D.C. Metro Taxi Operators Association and the
21	more than 2,200 members.

So, these companies, Private Sedan Service companies have ignored and outright broken laws here in the District of Columbia, and also around the country, and they haven't earned the public's trust for the privilege of self-regulation.

The proposed regulations improve safety by requiring Private Sedan companies to carry umbrella insurance, report background checks to the Commission, and place an obligation on licensing and driving record checks with the Commission. The regulations insure responsible drivers are safely hauling visitors and citizens of the District of Columbia. We have a few issues, though.

At a foundational level, requiring
Private Sedan drivers to receive training
before they're eligible to operate is a must to
insure drivers are operating in a safe manner,
but this regulation should also include strict
guidelines for operating any and all devices

required for their operation, so this includes their handheld devices, any other thing they use in the Private Sedan service operation.

The insurance requirements, service policy is a big balloon step protecting persons and property; however, in addition to the balloon service, I'm sorry, in addition to the balloon policy required by the Private Sedan service companies, each driver should be required to notify their primary personal insurance company of the use of their vehicle the for-hire in transportation industry. This will insure that all insurance providers have been notified and are aware of the risk involved. It will speed up the process of any claims that may arise from incident or accident from use of a vehicle in Private Sedan services.

The background checks will help maintain a cadre of Private Sedan operators with good moral character. Furthermore,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Private Sedan operators are screened for the use of illegal intoxicants. This screening should be reported to the Commission in some fashion. It shouldn't be trusted for the companies to do it by themselves. This step further prevents unqualified operators from being behind the wheel and putting passengers in danger.

Another safety regulation that shields passengers from unqualified operators is a duty of DCTC to inspect the complete driving records of all applicants. We commend the Commission for handling this operation. We believe it allows efficient and thorough government-to-government communication. This check you confirm whether or not the applicant has a valid driver's license and a clean record avoiding incidents where unqualified operators are able to enter the market and drive.

We are worried about consumer protection. By creating the regulatory

structure for this new class of service, DCTC has taken a positive step to protect consumers. Without regulation, companies will be allowed to enter the market. We should not fool ourselves and think that only three companies will enter this market. It's a growing market, should have regulations. and we And by implementing these regulations, showing true foresight.

However, these regulations protect the data and the proprietary information of Private Sedan companies, but it also limits FOIA. We do recognize that there should be some limits to FOIA, but any information that is available for a taxicab company through the DCTC under FOIA should also be available for Private Sedan service companies.

The Private Sedan businesses do not want to play by the rules. They have taken advantage of a legal ambiguity for profit sake even though there is no new business model here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

As the panel industry cited in a January 2014 report, there is nothing new about this new business model. Offering for-hire transportation services through the mechanism of a Smart Phone application that justifies the fundamental regulatory abandoning structure the Transportation For-Hire of changes the industry, or that level regulatory concern. The underlying principle insuring public continues to be safety. Regulation is the safety net that the public should rely on for its protection.@ The members of the Washington, D.C. Metro Taxi Operators Association agree in

The members of the Washington, D.C. Metro Taxi Operators Association agree in principle for the need for regulation in this new class of service. We also feel that regulations go a long way in correcting a broken system.

Our final concerns are if the DCTC is accepting 100 applications per week per company wishing to operate this service, there

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

should be a limit to the number of Private Sedan vehicles that are allowed to operate per company. Right now it says there's 500 applications maximum, but the regulations leave an ambiguity whether each company can provide more than 500 vehicles flooding the market, and really taking business away from taxicab drivers.

Secondly, since the surrounding jurisdictions are regulating Private Sedan services in a different way that really will restrict reciprocity between District residents we suggest that all licensing for Private Sedan services be limited to D.C. residents with D.C. registered vehicles.

Thirdly, we want to reiterate the need for notification of each driver in the Private Sedan service class to report his primary insurance company to the vehicle to clear any confusion about the responsibility of coverage. Fourthly, we're really concerned

about surge pricing. This practice has been reported in the media to go 10 times the normal rate. We feel this practice will hurt consumers who may not understand the practice and may be a victim of price gouging.

Next, there should also be a set age limit for vehicles used in the Private Sedan service. And, finally, we're concerned about the enforcement under this new class of vehicles entering the market. We demand equal enforcement for all drivers, vehicles, companies, PSPs, DDS services operating in the jurisdiction of the DCTC.

In conclusion, the Washington, D.C. Metro Taxi Operators Association recognizes the difficulty in setting policy with strong business interest pushing against public safety. Three San Francisco companies are currently vying for the market share in the District of Columbia. They're operating without regulation or enforcement. Lyft has

raised over \$250 million in one year. Sidecar has raised over \$20 million in venture capital, and Uber, the oldest and biggest company in the market has revenue of \$20 million a week. These companies do not want a level playing field. They argue against regulations, and they do not want to conform to the Transportation For-Hire industry regulations.

The taxi industry here in D.C. is the little guy. Until recently, they were individuals operating independently. With the Teamsters help, we have a voice. These regulations, if implemented, go a long way in insuring public safety and create a transparent set of rules and regulations and enforcement against Private Sedan companies.

The Washington, D.C. Metro Taxi
Operators Association supports the regulations
in principle as a foundation for leveling the
playing field in the vehicle for-hire
transportation industry here in our nation's

1	capitol.
2	Thank you for allowing me to speak
3	again, and we are ready to respond to any
4	questions.
5	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: (Off
6	microphone comment) legislation that would
7	deal with this class of taxi services. Do the
8	Commissioners have any questions for Mr. Simms
9	at this time?
10	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: I have a
11	question.
12	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Commissioner
13	Muhammad.
14	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Would the
15	Teamsters represent Uber or Sidecar, Lyft
16	drivers? Would the Teamsters represent them if
17	they decide that they want to be a part of the
18	Teamsters union?
19	MR. SIMMS: Currently, I don't have
20	an answer for that question. I can respond at
21	a later date. Is there

1	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Well, I think
2	it's an interesting question.
3	MR. SIMMS: It's a real interesting
4	question that we are the representative
5	(Simultaneous speech.)
6	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Basically, you
7	don't represent the drivers
8	(Off microphone comment.)
9	MR. SIMMS: Correct.
10	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: You provide
11	counsel and advice to their organizations.
12	(Simultaneous speech.)
13	(Off microphone comment.)
14	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: As I understand
15	it, you can correct me if I'm wrong, your
16	organization is not the drivers are not
17	Teamsters by membership. They are in their own
18	organization which you have a contract with to
19	advise and give them assistance. The question
20	really is will that organization accept into
21	its membership drivers that drive for these

other kinds of vehicles? That's what I think we 1 need to know. 2 SIMMS: And that's 3 MR. also 4 interesting question, but it could be the drivers themselves want to form their separate 5 organization, and so if they form the separate 6 7 organization with different interests than who we're already representing, then we wouldn't 8 9 have any conflict of interest. We wouldn't want 10 to set ourselves up for that, but we haven't 11 been presented any of those issues right now, 12 so we haven't really went down that road. But 13 I can get back -- I can get those answers to you. 14 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you. 15 COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: But you 16 would represent anybody who's paying 17 transportation rides for-hire. Correct? 18 MR. SIMMS: Right now we represent 19 taxi drivers in the Washington, 20 Metropolitan area. 21 COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: The

1	Teamsters represent the subways too. Correct?
2	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I think we need
3	to stay on topic. The drivers in our private
4	vehicle for-hire taxis, metered taxis are not
5	employers, employees, they're independent
6	agents, and they are not eligible for direct
7	union membership as taxi drivers or owners.
8	They have formed their own association, and
9	that association has retained the Teamsters as
10	an advisor and consultant to them. There's no
11	NLRB connection with the drivers through the
12	Teamsters.
13	MR. SIMMS: It's a private
14	association for the DC Metropolitan taxi
15	drivers, so the Teamsters are not representing
16	them directly. We're just advising and
17	consulting with their consent.
18	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: And speaking
19	for them.
20	MR. SIMMS: Yes.
21	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: So, if I

1	call a group of Uber drivers or Lyft drivers and
2	we form an organization and employee the
3	Teamsters to represent us, and we come with a
4	number of drivers, two or three thousand, four
5	or five thousand, and we pay \$25 a month would
6	you represent us?
7	MR. SIMMS: I disagree with the
8	premise about payment, it's about labor and -
9	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: You're
10	talking about dues. These are not
11	MR. SIMMS: We're not talking about
12	dues, we're talking about the interest of the
13	worker. We represent this organization because
14	they're the workers here, and they have been
15	oppressed, they haven't had a voice. So, what
16	we're doing is we're advising them on how to
17	better represent themselves, and how to
18	organize, and how to fight for their rights.
19	If there is another organization
20	that created a conflict of interest with their
21	rights, we would not represent them.

1	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Do they have
2	to pay dues, the drivers?
3	MR. SIMMS: They pay dues to the
4	organization that they're associated with, so
5	their dues go to their association, the
6	Washington, D.C. Metro Taxi Drivers Operators
7	Association.
8	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Do the
9	Teamsters receive any money from their
10	association?
11	MR. SIMMS: Yes, as a part of our
12	advisement and consulting.
13	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Thank you.
14	(Off microphone comment.)
15	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you for
16	your testimony. You've been very helpful. There
17	is some time left on this panel time, and I see
18	that Mr. Price has arrived. While Ms. Robinson
19	has made a very excellent presentation, if you
20	wanted to add
21	(Simultaneous speech.)

MR. PRICE: Yes, sorry for being 1 2 late, but coming out of Tysons, the traffic is 3 (Off microphone comment.) 4 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: And we did give 5 Ms. Robinson a lot of your time, so I would 6 7 appreciate your summarizing what you have to 8 say to us. 9 MR. PRICE: I don't have a lot to say, 10 anyway. The main thing that struck me with this 11 deal was our rights of equal treatment as we are 12 granted under the constitution. I like the idea that the Commission 13 14 taken on these called nonprofit has so 15 vehicles, and I don't see anything nonprofit 16 about them so, therefore, I implore this 17 Commission to look at anything, because people 18 don't work for zero, you know. Even when we had 19 people -- drivers at the Safeway in their 20 private cars taking passengers back home with

their groceries, they got paid. And what was sad

sometimes they made more than cab drivers in a day's time. So, we want the same protection.

And the reporting that they have to do for their surcharge, even though I totally disagree that we should be paying the 25 cents, now that we have been paying it, so should everybody, and the mechanism should be in place to collect that 25 cents, you know.

To me, if you level of the playing field and you track their movements like our movements are tracked, then maybe you can hold your head up at the end of the day, where right now we are being fleeced. And that's basically all I have to say.

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: And Ms. Robinson gave us a great deal to consider, so we'll include your interest in support of what she had to say. And I thank the panel, you've been very helpful in the matters that you've brought before us. And, again, remember the City Council hearing.

1	I will now invite the insurance
2	panel, the Property Casualty Insurers
3	Association of America, Mr. Kevin Wrege. And
4	the American Insurance Association, Mr. Eric
5	Goldberg, if they would join us at the table
6	here. And I see there are more than two of you
7	that are listed, so I'm going to ask if you would
8	introduce your colleagues as you're going
9	forward.
10	MR. WREGE: Sure, Mr. Chairman, and
11	thank you. I have with me a member of the trade
12	association I represent, Property Casualty
13	Insurers Association of America, GEICO
14	Insurance Company representative, Senior
15	Counsel, Larry Hinton. And Mr. Hinton is here
16	to also assist in answering any questions that
17	might come up from the Commission.
18	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: And you have
19	with you?
20	MR. GOLDBERG: Eric Goldberg with
21	American Insurance Association. I'm joined by

Rachel Jensen who's an attorney in our law department and an expert in automobile insurance issues.

of you have -- each group has 30 minutes each, so I'll allow you to decide who's going to make that presentation. Of course, if you don't have to take the 30 minutes, I don't think anybody here in the audience or us would object to it.

MR. WREGE: Thank you, Chairman Linton. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission and staff. My name is Kevin Wrege, and I'm an attorney and a founder and President of Pulse Issues and Advocacy. I Property Casualty Insurers represent the Association of America, also known as PCI. On behalf of over 1,000 member companies who together write more than 47 percent of the auto insurance written in the District of Columbia representing over \$147 million in premium. I thank you for the opportunity to speak to you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

today and share our views on proposed Private Sedan services.

I want to take a moment before I get into the written testimony just to make one point very clear. I'm well aware of the broader debate that's unfolding this morning raising broader regulatory issues around Private Sedan services and the traditional taxicab industry services provided in the District. We are not here to speak to that broader debate. In fact, we're not opposed to the market entry of entities such as Sidecar, Lyft, and Uber.

Our sole concern this morning, and my written formal testimony will reflect this, is a liability insurance issue that is not only one that's arisen here in the District, but has come up all over the country. Let me redirect you to my formal testimony to describe that issue.

Over the past -- and following the emergence of a market innovation introducing

web and Smart Phone-based tools allowing individuals to share goods and property. As some of these tools have morphed into commercial enterprises, questions are being raised regarding insurance coverages.

Commercial ride sharing which the DCTC proposes to regulate as Private Sedan services has taken the shared expense car pool concept several steps further by not only matching riders with drivers, but setting standards for participation and facilitating payment by credit card while taking a fee on each fare. These services have become a viable alternative to taxis in jurisdictions across the country.

These service offerings present a number of insurance issues that need to be addressed to protect the interests of Private Sedan services, drivers, passengers, other drivers on the roads, and Private Sedan companies, as well as automobile insurers. To

do that requires that all stakeholders have a clear expectation of what insurance coverage is being provided, when it is being provided, and by whom. That has been the basis for PCI's engagement on this issue across the country.

Many automobile insurance policies contain exclusions for vehicles being operated as a livery, or to carry persons or property for a fee. As the DC Taxicab Commission's January 24th, 2014 Findings and Recommendations on Ride Sharing explicitly stated, there would likely be no coverage on the driver's personal auto policy for injuries or damage arising out of an accident that occurred while involved Private Sedan services activities. Coverage would likely also be excluded for damage to the vehicle, medical payments, and uninsured or under-insured motorist coverage. The reason for the exclusion is simple. These kinds of activities present a significantly different and increased exposure to loss than personal

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

automobile policies are intended to cover.@

The emerging Private Sedan services companies have been providing insurance coverage but often say it is on an excess, or contingent, or umbrella basis, or that it drops down - should the driver's coverage not apply. They also provide different coverage limits under different circumstances depending on if the driver has accepted a ride or not.

These issues are а source of confusion for drivers and passengers who either erroneously believe that the personal automobile policy will provide coverage, or realize that it does not and are simply hoping for the best. This confusion is likely to result costly coverage disputes and delayed in compensation for accident victims.

While Private Sedan services have been around for several years, there have been very little in the way of legislation of regulatory activity regarding these programs

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

until this year. California's Public Utility Commission, the CPUC, which also regulates taxis and limousines, established the first and so far only regulatory regime for the essential equivalent of Private Sedan services last fall. The CPUC regulations characterize companies offering these services as transportation network companies, or TNCs, and regulates TNCs as common carriers. The CPUC requires safety inspections of TNC vehicles, background checks on drivers, and notably mandates insurance coverage to be provided by the TNC on a primary, as opposed to a secondary or umbrella basis if the driver does not have applicable coverage.

The CPUC regulations do not define when a driver is engaged in TNC activity. Significantly, the issue of when a TNC driver is engaged in commercial activity took on great urgency after a tragic accident in San Francisco on New Year's Eve. A young girl was struck and killed by a driver who had been

enrolled as a TNC driver. There is a dispute concerning whether or not the driver was engaged in commercial activity at the time of the accident, and lawsuits are recently filed against all of the parties involved. incident precipitated has number legislative and regulatory proceedings. Cities such as Chicago, Dallas, Seattle, Milwaukee, and Nashville are either discussing or have proposed ordinances regulating these services. States that have considered legislation in this area include Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Oklahoma, Virginia and Washington State.

As I said earlier, PCI does not oppose the Private Sedan services business model. Our members provide commercial as well as personal automobile coverage, and these new programs present an opportunity for commercial writers, as well. However, we do believe that there are some essential elements that need to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

be addressed to deal with the insurance issues surrounding Private Sedan services.

First, the current case law regarding private passenger auto policy livery exclusion must not be undermined. As you may know, insurance is unique and that the ultimate cost of providing the product is not known. Insurers use historical loss costs and must make assumptions to project those costs into the future to price their products appropriately. Changes in the law can mean that those assumptions will no longer be valid.

introduced in other states have attempted to undermine the livery exclusion by changing the definition of Private Sedan services or their equivalent, a private passenger auto, or personal automobile coverage, in effect requiring all drivers to pay for coverage for Private Sedan services' activities.

There is little question that these

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

drivers are engaged in a commercial activity, one that changes the fundamental nature of the risk being insured. This is precisely the reason that there are separate policies and pricing for taxis and limousines and other vehicles that carry passengers for a fee. Private Sedan services and their drivers should have coverage that is primary and ideally applies on a 24 by 7 basis throughout the year.

We also believe that Private Sedan services operators should provide disclosures to their drivers regarding the insurance coverages they provide and notify them that their personal auto policy will not provide coverage for injuries or damage resulting from commercial activity. It is also important that the driver's personal auto insurer be made aware of their participation in such programs either from the driver or the Private Sedan services operator SO duplicate claims aren't made for accidents.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Finally, as I have said earlier, this new and innovative programs represent an opportunity for our members so we could encourage regulators to be careful not to preclude innovation in the insurance industry to respond to changes in how the transportation services market evolves, and how consumers use their vehicles in the future.

Once again I would like to thank the Commission for the opportunity to share our views on this issue. We have concerns about the way Private Sedan services insurance requirements are currently written; however, we believe that there is a way for the insurance issues to be addressed, and we look forward to the opportunity to work with all stakeholders as we move forward. I'd be happy to try to answer any questions the members of the Commission may have. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you, Mr. Wrege. I have a couple of questions. Would you

1	suggest that the individual drivers enlisting
2	to become drivers for these various Digital
3	Dispatch companies be required to have the
4	insurance themselves, that they take out the
5	insurance?
6	MR. WREGE: As to the commercial, the
7	primary commercial coverage, no, Mr.
8	Commissioner. We would suggest that the Private
9	Sedan services companies themselves provide
10	that coverage on behalf of B-
11	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Why wouldn't
12	you have the individual driver who is using
13	their own vehicle be responsible for their
14	insurance? The owner of a metered vehicle is
15	responsible for the insurance on that vehicle.
16	MR. WREGE: Right.
17	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Now, why would
18	we not consider that in terms of this mode of
19	transportation?
20	MR. WREGE: Well, I think it's a fair
21	question, and I B- it's my understanding that

1	say, for example, in the California situation,
2	the California Public Utilities Commission
3	directed that the companies themselves in this
4	space, the TNCs provide the coverage on behalf
5	of those drivers.
6	The regulatory regime may be
7	different in detailed ways here in the District
8	than in California, so what I would do is why
9	don't I supplement my response to that question
10	to make sure that we're getting you the right
11	information in terms of our position about who
12	specifically should be providing that
13	coverage.
14	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I would
15	appreciate it.
16	MR. WREGE: Sure. I just want to make
17	it clear that I believe that coverage should be
18	in place to protect all of the stakeholders on
19	the streets.
20	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I appreciate it
21	if in providing it you keep in mind, this is the

District of Columbia, not California. And too often I have been told since I have been in the position well, look what California is doing, look what New York is doing, look what they're doing, but we're not those jurisdictions. And very specific geographical have some differences, specific we have some very situations in governance because we're a small jurisdiction bordered by two states that are totally independent of us, can do what they want, so it's not what they're doing California. It's what given the conditions in the District of Columbia why the driver and owner of a vehicle that is enlisted in these Private Sedan services should not be treated from an insurance standpoint exactly as the driver -

MR. WREGE: Chairman, all points well taken. That's why I suggested that there may be differences in the way the industry operates here. I am not an expert on the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1 insurance industry or the regulatory B-2 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: No, Ι 3 appreciate that. MR. WREGE: I'm sorry, I'm not an 4 expert on the taxicab industry. I'm actually 5 not an expert on either, but I should say I know 6 7 much less about the taxicab industry, and I'm not intimately familiar with the regulatory 8 9 regime there. So, what I would say is we will 10 provide information on PCI's position on that 11 issue about who should be purchasing the 12 coverage. Larry, if you have other thoughts on t.hat.? 13 14 MR. HINTON: I think what you're 15 saying is adequate. We will provide a little 16 more research as to who should have the coverage 17 on that. The primary point that Mr. Wrege wanted 18 to say is that whomever is required to have it, 19 the insurance must B- it 20 commercial insurance to protect the residents

of the District of Columbia. And being a

1	national company, Mr. Wrege was not trying to
2	disrespect the District of Columbia.
3	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: No, I
4	understand that. I just -
5	MR. HINTON: We both understand and
6	appreciate your comments, and many times -
7	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: We want him
8	to understand that too often people look at us
9	as a trailer.
10	MR. HINTON: No, we love the
11	District. We play here, live here, spend our
12	money here, and Mr. Wrege has a residence here.
13	And GEICO is the largest carrier to write
14	private passenger automobile insurance here in
15	the District of Columbia, so we're vested here.
16	But his point was that we look globally to try
17	to find common issues to resolve ongoing
18	problems in various jurisdictions, and that was
19	his point about California.
20	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: (Off
21	microphone comment.) I would also appreciate

it, I was going to ask you a second question but, obviously, I think it should be a part of what you research.

In the situation where you have a structure in which the company which has the customer seeking the ride turn those customers over to another company which has the vehicles that are available to give the ride. How does the liability affect that situation? You understand what I mean? If I have - if I simply sign up people who want to use my app to get a ride in a Private Sedan, but I turn to you and I say here's somebody looking for a ride. Will you put them in one of the cars that have signed up with you? And that car has an accident, where does the liability fall?

MR. WREGE: Chairman, I don't know, and this raises a broader question, which is one of the reasons why we have such concerns about the issue of commercial versus private passenger automobile insurance is we are

	fearful that there will be gaps in coverage, or
,	there will be major fights in coverage while
,	victims are not cared for because the issues
•	that you're raising, that one in particular
	about others, are issues that may not well have
	been worked out legally here or elsewhere, so
,	that's why we're recommending that the
	commercial coverage be in effect 24/7 around
1	the clock without trying to make these
)	difficult distinctions between what
	constitutes commercial activity and what
,	constitutes private activity.
,	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I understand
•	that. Doesn't that also suggest that everyone
	who has a fingerprint on the activity should be
,	a party to that insurance?
,	MR. WREGE: Party to the insurance.
	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: That's
'	correct. In other words -
۱	MR. WREGE: Named on a policy.
	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: - if you put

1	the individual in a car but the car belongs to
2	another company that's making it available,
3	shouldn't both those companies have a
4	responsibility for the insurance liability?
5	MR. WREGE: Well, I think it's an
6	important question, and I will find out.
7	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you.
8	MR. WREGE: What the position is in
9	terms of who should be named where you're
10	looking at multiple entities. Again, it
11	underscores the complexity of the
12	circumstances surrounding these issues.
13	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Well, we would
14	appreciate your advice on that. Any of the other
15	Commissioners?
16	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Yes, I have.
17	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Yes,
18	Commissioner Muhammad.
19	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: I can
20	respect you as a business man not to be opposed
21	to the sedan service because you're looking to

1	make money if they have to get insured working
2	inside of Washington, D.C. What type of
3	insurance would you offer besides liability?
4	MR. WREGE: You're speaking -
5	(Simultaneous speech.)
6	MR. WREGE: With respect to private
7	passenger auto coverage or commercial
8	coverage, or what type of coverage are you
9	referring to?
10	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: What we are
11	speaking of, the passenger, the car for-hire.
12	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: But he's with
13	an association, you understand.
14	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Okay. But
15	he's an insurer. Correct?
16	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: No.
17	MR. WREGE: I represent a trade
18	association that in turn represents insurance
19	companies.
20	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: He's not
21	insurance, per se.

1	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Okay.
2	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: They're a trade
3	association.
4	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Okay, no
5	further questions.
6	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Commissioner
7	Tapscott? No. Thank you so much for taking the
8	time to join us. We'll look forward to your
9	comments that you're going to provide us on the
10	questions that we raised, and there are some
11	very interesting points that you've made.
12	MR. WREGE: Sure. Thank you, Mr.
13	Chairman. Thank you for your questions.
14	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Mr. Goldberg.
15	(Off microphone comment.)
16	MR. GOLDBERG: Yes, I provided them
17	already.
18	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: The sound
19	system is not working that good today. Can you
20	pull it a little closer?
21	MR. GOLDBERG: Is that okay, Mr.

Chairman?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Yes.

MR. GOLDBERG: Chairman Linton, members of the Commission, thank you. My name is Eric Goldberg. I'm a Regional Vice President with the American Insurance Association. I handle the Mid-Atlantic region. I'm joined with Rachel Jensen who is an attorney in our law department who's an expert on auto insurance issues.

AIA is a trade association with some 300 major casualty property insurance companies that also write a significant amount of commercial and private passenger automobile insurance in the District. This is а jurisdiction where our members actually like to write business. It's a very good jurisdiction from a regulatory standpoint, but our members also write insurance in all 50 states and in 130 countries around the world.

Let me also thank you and applaud

the Commission for taking steps to recognize this new and emerging form of transportation service providers, and also to protect consumers. Like PCI, our comments are focused only on Section 1706, the insurance section of this draft proposed regulation.

And I think Mr. Wrege made a number of excellent points, but let me just underscore that umbrella coverage which is contemplated in this regulation sits on top of primary coverage. It doesn't expand the underlying coverage, it extends it, but it doesn't expand the coverage. And in the context of private passenger automobile insurance coverage, there is no coverage for commercial activities.

There is a longstanding livery exclusion which says that if the driver is engaged in a commercial activity there is simply no coverage under that private passenger auto policy. Therefore, a commercial carrier cannot underwrite an umbrella policy that sits

on top of no coverage. That's why we believe the better approach is to have the Private Sedan services company provide the commercial coverage for the drivers engaged in commercial activity to make that coverage first dollar and not sit on top of any coverage, and to have it in place 24/7.

Me believe that this is the better method of protecting not only the passenger but any pedestrian or any other driver that might be injured in the event that the Private Sedan services driver is involved in an accident. It would eliminate or at least ameliorate the issues involved in having the injured party trying to determine whose policy applies to the accident.

I'll pause there and thank you, and try to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I have a question, and as a matter of fact - feel free to respond to this, also. I would like to know

if there is any reason or justification why a regulation could not ask the insurer to supply the Commission with the proof of insurance that had been sold to any operator falling under the requirement to have the insurance, rather than asking the insured to provide the documents necessary to demonstrate the insurance.

MR. GOLDBERG: Fair point. You know, when we provide proof of insurance, what that is is it's a snapshot in time. An insurance ID card basically says that at the time this card was issued there is coverage in place. Now, if the policyholder stops paying on the policy, well, there's no more coverage.

Really the better approach, we believe, is there has been a system that's developed through a joint working group of insurance companies and Departments of Motor Vehicles that sets up a real time insurance verification program, and it's a database that's maintained by Motor Vehicles. And what

that would enable regulators to do, or law enforcement to do is if a driver were pulled over, they could check in real time whether this coverage existed.

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I don't think you're quite getting the gist of my question. It's not verification, I'm concerned about whether there is insurance in effect or not. It's what are the provisions of the insurance policy because in our studies so far as we've gotten into this field, we find that there are various documents, some of which count, and some of which don't count, and which we can never be totally sure whether what we're seeing is, in fact, what will wind up before the judge if there's a lawsuit. What I'm asking is, is that you provide to anyone - your members do. They sell an insurance policy. The buyer gets a very thick binding condition for that policy. Now, is there any reason why we couldn't request and have compliance where the insurance company

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

provides us a copy of what they gave their customer?

MR. GOLDBERG: There really isn't a practical reason why that couldn't take place. Typically, it's done - our members typically work through independent agents, so really the request would go to the agent that issued the policy. But you make a valid point.

There's a longstanding principle of insurance law which is this. Only the insurance policy is the contract. That is the sole document that provides the rights and the responsibilities and the coverage that's outlined. There are secondary documents which are certificates of insurance, insurance ID cards, but those and of themselves do not convey any insurance rights. It's the policy. If there was a binder, if the policy were bound, the binder is the vehicle that provides that coverage. Once the policy is issued, the binder evaporates and the policy is the sole contract.

1	That's the only document that contains the
2	insurance obligation.
3	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Okay. And
4	that's the one which really tells the
5	regulatory body who's covered and who isn't
6	covered, and what kind of exceptions, and what
7	kind of conditions.
8	MR. GOLDBERG: Correct.
9	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Okay. So, from
10	a regulatory standpoint if we were to require
11	that the insured submits from their - instructs
12	their insurance company from whom they purchase
13	the insurance to submit a copy of what they have
14	bought, they could do that.
15	MR. GOLDBERG: I suppose they could.
16	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you very
17	much. Any questions?
18	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Yes. I'll
19	ask the question again. What type of insurance
20	do you insure vehicles for-hire? Is the driver
21	of the vehicle covered, because in Washington,

1	D.C. 90 percent of the drivers that drive taxis
2	only have liability, and it doesn't cover the
3	driver of the vehicle.
4	MR. GOLDBERG: Commissioner
5	Muhammad, insurance companies provide not only
6	liability coverage, they provide collision
7	coverage, uninsured motorist coverage,
8	personal injury protection coverage to provide
9	medical expenses, and basically the array of
10	coverages that you've outlined in proposed
11	1706.
12	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Okay.
13	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Commissioner
14	Tapscott.
15	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: I have none.
16	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: None. We thank
17	you very much for your testimony. It was very
18	helpful and we'll look forward to any comments
19	that you care to make to supplement the
20	responses to questions hopefully that I've
21	raised here.

GOLDBERG: Thank 1 MR. you, Mr. 2 Chairman. CHAIRPERSON LINTON: We will now 3 move to our last panel, the Company Panel, and 4 I invite Yellow Cab Company represented by Mr. 5 Sidecar represented 6 Roy Spooner, and Elizabeth Stevens. 7 (Background noise.) 8 9 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: If I can have 10 all your attention, please, so we can proceed 11 with testimony. I would certainly our 12 appreciate it. At this moment, I will invite Mr. 13 Roy Spooner, General Manager of Yellow Cab 14 Company of DC, Inc. to make his presentation. 15 Mr. Spooner, good morning and welcome. 16 MR. SPOONER: Good morning, 17 Chairman, good morning, Commission. I think Mr. 18 Ferguson left us as soon as I appeared at the 19 table. Thanks for the opportunity to present 20 comments on the proposed rulemaking on Chapter

17, Private Sedan service. I would like to thank

the DC Taxicab Commission for undertaking this Herculean task of trying to put a framework around an unregulated process.

Before I give my formal comments on this rulemaking I'd like to address the many inaccuracies that are being communicated on this issue. As one of the largest taxicab dispatch companies in the city, or in the region, the DMV region, we are at the immediate risk, one of the incumbents at immediate risk in this fight.

As a fully regulated taxicab company we must abide by strict rules that govern what color we paint our cars, what dome lights we put in our cabs, what technology we use in our vehicles, and what prices we charge. We accept every taxicab request and do our very best to fulfill them even when there is a low supply. We do not use algorithms to create hot and cold service areas, and filter which trips we will allow to be booked and served. We do not

have guaranteed fees and payments tied to a credit card, and cannot set on-demand prices. We do not manipulate demand and supply, do not have unlimited funds to provide free rides to create a fanatic following, then stick the customers with surge price later.

On top of regulated policies we have a public and moral obligation to serve every customer who requests our service, including the poor, the elderly, the disabled, and those not technologically connected and do so without rating them.

The argument is not about the taxicab industry versus Uber and all, or the industry trying to shut out competition or get protection. This is simply about equality and fairness.

Uber and others are not to be solely blamed for pushing the envelope or trying to disrupt our industry. It is the fault of the legislative body that allow them to operate

freely before the Commission was tasked to create a regulated framework for all parties to equally and fairly operate. Unfortunately, once the genie was out of the bottle there was no going back in.

Uber did not bring any significant technological breakthrough to the market. We already had that technology installed in all of our dispatch cabs. They had the financial resources and freedom to challenge the regulatory bodies and launch their product, while the taxicab industry was being mandated to go backwards technologically.

We recognize that this change is consumer-driven, and the taxicab industry must do a better job at service delivery. Despite the challenges or pressure the legislative body faces, it should not dismantle the firewalls that insured that public safety and consumer protection is transparent and secure.

I know that this will be a long

process and there will be additional opportunities for more presentations. I will restrict my presentation at this hearing to Chapter 17, and the specific items that we believe could significantly impact the for-hire service.

Insurance gap. It's been clearly established that significant there are insurance gaps between the public vehicle for-hire companies and the new entrants. The main difference being that public vehicle for-hire drivers must have commercial insurance 24/7 and dollar one. There should not be umbrella policies during specific specified in-service periods, and private during out-of-service insurance coverage periods. All public or private vehicle for-hire services should be required to have commercial insurance at all times.

Companies may add other coverage as deemed necessary. Should there be an

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

unfortunate incident, the city could be held liable for aiding and abetting insurance fraud by allowing the driver to use their private or personal insurance policy to qualify for a DCTC Private Sedan service license. No one should be allowed to use their vehicle to provide commercial for-hire service in violation of their private policy.

Private Sedan Service. It is widely known and recognized that Uber and all are not or connectors, but transportation companies. They hire and fire drivers, perform driver background checks, vehicle inspections, collect monies, pay drivers, and dispatch trips to them. The service they provide can either be either taxicab classified as or limousine/sedan service. They should have been slotted into one of these existing services, the limos or taxicabs, and the regulation loosened to allow ongoing innovation competition without sacrificing safety

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

protection.

The effort to create the third rail of service is well intended, and an attempt to support established businesses that are at risk. Unfortunately, there are too many gaps that can be exploited with unintended consequences to the consumers.

entrants can be easily qualified as vehicle for-hire, and whether it is private or public is not relevant. By creating this third rail of service would separate rules, can result in a dramatic shift of resources from the highly regulated public vehicle for-hire, to the lightly regulated private vehicle for-hire service. There is nothing in the regulation that would prevent existing taxicab companies like us, or licensed taxicab drivers from changing their business model from regulated public for-hire industry to the less regulated private for-hire service with demand prices,

limited consumer coverage, self-governance, and no transparency or consistency.

Taxicab drivers and provide Private service. The provision that Sedan allows taxicab drivers to participate in and provide sedan service will have the same devastating impact as creating a third rail of service. Removing the firewall that should exist between services would result these two deregulation unintended of the taxicab industry, and create confusion and chaos to the riding public.

The unregulated and cross-pollination of providers, drivers and off-meter pricing would be significantly exploited to the detriment of the riding public and would violate DCTC's obligation to insure public safety and consumer protection. The public must be able to rely on public transportation to be consistent, affordably priced, and transparent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Surge pricing. It is our official position that there should be no surge pricing in private or public vehicle for-hire service. Just off record, this morning coming over here we looked at the Uber app and they were doing two times the normal rate. They were surge pricing this morning during the rainfall.

We may support a fixed fee or surcharge during certain operating periods or special circumstances such as snow emergencies or when demand is high and supply is low.

By allow entities to freely set prices could result in deliberate the manipulation of the supply chain to create an artificial demand and escalating prices. It is legislative body's responsibility the insure that by all means that the public is protected from unscrupulous operators who may exploit any circumstances to themselves.

Caps. The proposed rulemaking has

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

no set caps for the number of companies, vehicles, or drivers while the taxicab industry has caps for all of the same categories. With an unlimited cap, the private sedans B- with no cap I should have said there, the Private Sedan service will be able to build B- easily build its resources to dwarf the taxicab industry in a short span of time if they have not already done so.

The continuing argument that taxicabs would still be able to provide street hails has a diminishing shelf life. There is a growing decline in street hails as they are replaced by e-hails. The decline will continue as more customers upgrade their cell phones and take advantage of the available mobile services. I think it's predicted in the next year 85 percent of customers will have Smart Phones.

Accessibility. This critical service is not addressed or advanced in this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

proposed rulemaking. Private Sedan service should be charged with providing equal accessibility to all persons desiring to use their service. These companies should be required to demonstrate and serve all areas of the city and just not selected operating areas at certain times of day.

The taxicab industry is charged in the Taxi Innovation Act to eventually provide 100 percent wheelchair accessibility. Providing services people accessibility needs with accessibility needs, individuals without Smart Phone or credit card should not be the burden of one industry while the other industry is allowed to build its core business on exclusivity. If more companies and drivers converge to the new Private Sedan service, it will significantly decrease the possibilities to expand accessibility service.

Operating areas and services. The propose rulemaking does not clearly define the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

operating jurisdictions of boundaries for drivers joining or operating within the new service. The industry has recommended that this new service should be restricted to certain operator areas and not be allowed to occur at points of embarkation and disembarkation like airports, train stations, metro stations, or establishments like hotels and convention centers that have cab stands with registered taxicab drivers.

apply and no allowances should be provided to allow pickups and drop-offs in non-domicile area. The proposed rulemaking does not place any limits on the Private Sedan service booking advance trips and having corporate accounts. Since they are defined as sedan service, they are allowed to directly compete with the existing dispatch companies.

Self-governance. The proposed rulemaking makes some progressive strides in

licensing and registration of Private the Sedan services, service drivers and vehicles, but the rulemaking falls short by allowing the Private Sedan services to self-govern several key public safety areas like background check, driver background checks, screening, vehicle inspections, and driver training. They are growing concerns by transportation industry experts, the legal community, national governing bodies, and the media about the potential danger and public safety risk to allowing any transportation service using private drivers to self-govern.

Every aspect of the current public vehicle for-hire licensing, certification, screening, testing, training, and inspections is controlled by the Commission. The rules should be applied equally to the new service.

Closing. Again, I applaud the Commission for trying to tackle this most difficult task you are legislated to regulate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

You are being placed along with the industry in the role as villains against the beloved disrupters. Your main responsibility has to be to insure in the final outcome that there is a viable public vehicle for-hire industry that is technologically advanced and equipped to meet the needs of all consumers and not just a selected group.

DCTC is obligated to protect public safety, especially when the core service being provided is on public roadways and has potential safety impacts for third party and property. The underlying principle is public safety and regulation, must be the safety net that the public relies on, protection. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you, Mr. Spooner, for your very good remarks and suggestions in there, and your observation is astute. Nobody loves a regulator, but we accept that as a fact of life.

I'd like to ask you, Mr. Spooner, in 1 2 your testimony are you suggesting that the regulations should require rate setting for the 3 private sector sedans, the Black Car services, 4 as well as for the metered vehicles? 5 MR. SPOONER: What I'm saying, sir, 6 7 is that Chapter 17, Ι know the individually knowing this from being part of 8 9 the panel, giving my input to the panel, I know 10 where you're trying to go with this, but the 11 third rail of service that you're creating, I 12 want to make -13 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I don't care 14 what you think where we're going. What I'm 15 trying to do is to get from your mind what you 16 think we should do, not where you think we're 17 going. Are you suggesting that all classes of 18 service should be regulated on a rate set basis? 19 MR. SPOONER: Well, let me simply say 20 this. Uber, Sidecar, and Lyft are dispatch companies. They're dispatch companies. We're 21

1	trying to put a flower around it, but they're
2	dispatch companies.
3	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: But should we
4	set their rates or not set their rates?
5	MR. SPOONER: You should have
6	transparent rates.
7	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: The
8	requirement is that the customer be advised in
9	advance of booking the trip as to what the
10	estimated cost is within 10 percent, so the
11	assumption was that they would have the option
12	then -
13	MR. SPOONER: Well, I think it has
14	nothing to do with rates only. It has to do with
15	- I think it has to do with a wider aspect. They
16	currently can exclude who they want. Their app
17	does not come on if you're in certain areas. If
18	you're trying to get an Uber taxi in a certain
19	part of the city, it doesn't light up.
20	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: But that's a
21	different issue.

1	MR. SPOONER: It's not, because I
2	have to take all those calls. If they're under
3	the same rules as us and says that they have to
4	take every call, they have to book every trip
5	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: (Off
6	microphone comment) if you're a public vehicle
7	for-hire, and they are a public vehicle
8	for-hire, you are going to meet the same public
9	accommodation requirements of all public
10	vehicle for-hire. Okay? You can't be exclusive
11	on that, and that's what you're going to have
12	to -
13	MR. SPOONER: But we're not
14	classifying them as public vehicle for-hires.
15	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: (Off
16	microphone comment).
17	MR. SPOONER: Well, if we are, then
18	there's no Chapter 17. They'll be in Chapter 8.
19	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: All right.
20	Thank you.
21	MR. SPOONER: You understand what

1	I'm saying, is that that's - I think what I'm
2	saying is that I know where you well intend and
3	trying to do, but once you open that box, once
4	you open that third rail of service, right? If
5	you look at Chapter 17 as it is defined today
6	there is no incentive for any taxicab company
7	or any taxicab driver to remain under Chapter
8	8. There is no incentive.
9	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Well, that
10	means the end of street hails as we know them
11	then, so we let anybody pick up off the street.
12	MR. SPOONER: Well, they're doing it
13	today.
14	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Because
15	- well, but whether they're doing it illegally
16	is not the issue we're addressing here.
17	MR. SPOONER: I got that, sir.
18	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: What I'm trying
19	to do is try to deal with regulations, not what
20	they're doing.
21	MR. SPOONER: What I'm suggesting is

1	that - what I'm suggesting, if Uber, Lyft, and
2	Sidecar are dispatch services, if they are
3	dispatch services which we all pretty know they
4	are, that's what they're doing, they're
5	dispatching trips. Let them have the ability to
6	do the same things as a dispatch company that
7	we are doing today. Take some of the regulation
8	off of our backs so we can use the same
9	innovation and technology that they're using so
10	we can directly compete with them. That's the
11	leveling of the playing field.
12	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Then submit to
13	us some written legal language that does that
14	from your standpoint.
15	MR. SPOONER: I could certainly do
16	that.
17	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you.
18	That's what we would like to see.
19	MR. SPOONER: But we would also be
20	saying that Chapter 17 shouldn't exist.
21	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: You can say

1	whatever you desire to say. I'm not trying to
2	tell you what to say, I'm trying to tell you what
3	to give us so we understand what it is you're
4	proposing.
5	MR. SPOONER: I can certainly do
6	that, sir.
7	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: So, we would
8	certainly welcome that to look at what fits or
9	doesn't fit with what we're thinking.
10	MR. SPOONER: I can certainly do
11	that, sir.
12	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: All right.
13	Thank you.
14	MR. SPOONER: I will do it before the
15	deadline.
16	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: As regards
17	another question that came up in the earlier
18	discussion relative to using an electronic
19	manifest in a metered vehicle in place of a
20	written manifest. The object of using the
21	written manifest is we're unable to see how a

1	hack inspector would be able to review cash
2	rides in a stop or review of a driver in service.
3	Can you tell us if there's a way in which an
4	electronic manifest could be used so that a hack
5	inspector could at the time that he has stopped
6	a vehicle review the rides of that shift?
7	MR. SPOONER: Well, first of all, I
8	understand that - I am confused about the
9	requirement that a hack inspector needs to know
10	at that moment what exactly the driver is doing.
11	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: You need to
12	provide it.
13	MR. SPOONER: But I'm saying, I -
14	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Take my word
15	for it, we need to know.
16	MR. SPOONER: The only way you can do
17	that is from a paper manifest because you
18	couldn't do it from electronic. Let me address
19	the electronic -
20	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: You can't do it
21	on the electronic manifest, if they have an

1	electronic manifest that includes all rides.
2	MR. SPOONER: If I can address it for
3	one second. I know there's a requirement of an
4	electronic manifest. I want to clear something
5	up for the drivers.
6	The information that the PSP sends
7	to the back office, that information is
8	truncated. I mean, it's - you can't readily
9	identify who the driver is. There is a concern
10	from drivers that if you want to have electronic
11	manifest and you want to push that, then you're
12	going to have - the drivers will have to
13	understand they're going to have to allow that
14	to be untruncated.
15	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: (Off
16	microphone comment).
17	MR. SPOONER: You'd have to allow it
18	to be untruncated. And if they allow that to
19	happen, then there could be electronic
20	manifest. But right now in its current form
21	because the information is truncated to

1 identify 2 CHAIRPERSON LINTON:

Well, we'll - that's an interesting comment and we'll look into it from that standpoint. Any questions?

All

right.

(Off microphone comment.)

to just - I'm sitting here listening to everybody, and I really do share a lot of your sentiments because I feel like there should be an equal playing field if we are going to incorporate these new rides coming into our town. However, I think that you should take it upon yourselves to meet with the City Council, because once they establish the rules and regulations, we have to do the best we can within the parameters that are given for us to make decisions. I think you need to start with the City Council.

I would just like to see a show of hands of how many people are planning to go down

to the hearing on May 12th and testify? Okay, thank you very much. I think this is where you need to start.

MR. SPOONER: Madam Commissioner, we've been there, we've done that. We recognize your position as the Commission. We strongly support the effort that the Commission is trying to do with the legislative mandate. If you listened to my testimony, I basically said that's what you're doing. And I appreciate the Commission being open to us continuing to provide comments, and I think through that we'll work through some things.

We recognize that the task could come from the legislative body. That is why I've said I'm not going to sit here and blame Uber and Sidecar and them for finding an opportunity do business. They were given that opportunity by a legislative body, not by the Commission. The Commission did its job, and then they were you can't do your job, so we recognize all of

1	that. But as we move forward, the only fears on
2	equality we're talking about is not about just
3	companies being able to survive. We don't have
4	any protections as dispatch companies or a
5	taxicab company. We're not asking for any of
6	that. We're asking for an equal opportunity to
7	compete. And what is good for us, is good for
8	them because we're serving the same public, and
9	we should serve the same public.
10	COMMISSIONER SMALLS: And I agree.
11	MR. SPOONER: Okay.
12	COMMISSIONER SMALLS: I agree.
13	MR. SPOONER: Thank you.
14	COMMISSIONER SMALLS: But I think we
15	all need to work together more closely and maybe
16	we could come up with some solutions that would
17	satisfy everybody.
18	MR. SPOONER: I quite agree. Thank
19	you.
20	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Mr.
21	Spooner, airplanes have, trains have, buses

1	have some type of surge pricing. Would you
2	support surge pricing for taxis?
3	MR. SPOONER: I do not.
4	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: This is part
5	of the digital age.
6	MR. SPOONER: I do not.
7	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: When they
8	did not have - when you flew a plane you could
9	put your bag on free. Now they took that away
10	from taxis.
11	MR. SPOONER: I do not.
12	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: When you
13	have take another passenger on a plane you have
14	to pay for it. You can't take all your children
15	because you're paying for yourself.
16	(Simultaneous speech.)
17	MR. SPOONER: Can I address it,
18	please?
19	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Don't make a
20	speech.
21	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: No, I'm -

1	MR. SPOONER: Can I address it,
2	please?
3	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Quickly.
4	MR. SPOONER: Can I address it,
5	please? I think in my testimony I clearly stated
6	that we do not support surge pricing for public
7	vehicle for-hire. We understand there are
8	certain circumstances you may have to. They're
9	surcharging like we do for snow emergencies and
10	such like, but I think customers who use the
11	service should have some transparency, should
12	have some consistency, and we're not in the
13	business of price gouging.
14	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: So, you go
15	along with the others? Planes do it. If you had
16	a plane, eat on an airplane -
17	MR. SPOONER: I'm in the taxicab
18	industry, and I can't speak for any other
19	industry.
20	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Let's take
21	public transportation for-hire.

1	MR. SPOONER: Are we done?
2	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: We're never
3	done. We're going to be back here again.
4	MR. SPOONER: Thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you
6	very much, Mr. Spooner. I turn now to Ms. Beth
7	Stevens with Sidecar. Please proceed, Ms.
8	Stevens.
9	MS. STEVENS: Hi, my name is
10	Elizabeth Stevens and I'm the General Counsel
11	of Sidecar. I want to thank Chairman Linton and
12	the rest of the Commissioners for the
13	opportunity to be heard here today.
14	As I've spoken with you before and
15	presented what Sidecar's model is all about,
16	but I'll briefly go over it again. We are not
17	a dispatch company. We are a platform that
18	allows riders and drivers to share a ride. We
19	are - I've heard a lot about Uber today, and we
20	are fundamentally different from Uber and Lyft

in the way that we offer our services to drivers $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +\left$

and riders to share a ride.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

One of the key components and the way that we see the future of ride sharing is that a passenger inputs both its pickup and destination locations, and that enables the driver to say oh, yes, I'm going that way, too. I can share a ride with you, and so to your this Linton, point, Chairman is digital hitchhiking. But digital hitchhiking only works if the driver and the passenger are going the same way. And the proposed regulations currently prevent destination from passed - in Chapter 16 from being passed to the driver before this match is made. That would fundamentally prevent service from our operating.

A second feature of Sidecar that's fundamentally different from our ride sharing competitors is that we offer passengers the choice of which driver they would like to request a ride from. When you enter donation you

are presented with a number of drivers, five to 1 ten drivers. You're able to see that driver's 2 3 picture, that driver's vehicle, perhaps you want a nicer vehicle because it's Saturday 4 night date night, or perhaps you're super price 5 sensitive and you don't really care what the 6 7 vehicle is. We also allow our drivers to set 8 9 their own prices, and that price is in that 10 view, so the passenger is shown what the price 11 of the ride will be before they have even 12 requested the ride. Without Destination that 13 ability of this marketplace doesn't work, and we will be forced to leave the District of 14 15 Columbia. 16 The second point I'd like to raise-17 CHAIRPERSON I_TNTON: That. also 18 allows the driver to decide who they're going

STEVENS: The driver is only

to service, and who they're not going to

service.

MS.

19

20

1	passed the passenger's rating and the
2	passenger's first name. There's no picture -
3	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: The passenger
4	knows where they're going, so if the rider wants
5	to go into 2400 Martin Luther King Avenue S.E.
6	and doesn't want to go there, he can turn that
7	ride down. Right?
8	MS. STEVENS: And I routinely get
9	rides to that address.
10	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: But I'm saying
11	he can turn the ride down, or she can turn the
12	ride down.
13	MS. STEVENS: Absolutely. They could
14	also -
15	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: The driver can
16	make the determination what sections of the
17	city they want to go to, and what people they
18	want to pick B- I simply want to know whether
19	that's true or not.
20	MS. STEVENS: They get to choose
21	where they would like to go, but that is B-

1	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Who they want
2	to give the ride to.
3	MS. STEVENS: I don't know what basis
4	they would decide who to give the ride to
5	besides Destination. All that's shown to the
6	driver is the passenger's rating and the
7	passenger's first name. There's no picture,
8	there's no other identifying -
9	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: What's the
10	basis of the rating?
11	MS. STEVENS: The basis of the rating
12	is previous rides with other drivers, in the
13	same way that passengers rate drivers, drivers
14	rate passengers.
15	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: They don't tip
16	enough, they're black.
17	MS. STEVENS: They don't B- well,
18	first of all, they don't B- they rate before
19	they're paid so a tip doesn't have anything to
20	do with it. And second of all, we've had no
21	complaints, and we've been operating for over

a year in the District, and for several years 1 in California, of racial discrimination. This 2 3 is something we're particularly concerned 4 about for obvious reasons, and we pay close attention it. have received 5 to We no complaints. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Well, they don't know that they're being picked up or not. 8 9 How would they complain? 10 MS. STEVENS: If they don't get a 11 ride routinely they would complain. I mean, my 12 point is if you B- there are lots of benefits 13 these electronic allow to systems that 14 passengers and drivers to share a ride, and 15 Destination is the only way for this to happen. 16 If you just want taxi replacement services, 17 then you can have these rules that are just taxi 18 replacement services. 19 The key thing that's been mentioned 20 here and an assumption that every speaker before me has made is that ride share drivers 21

are full-time professional drivers. These regulations specifically limit drivers to less than 20 hours a week. That's not a full-time driver. And these regulations don't match that idea, so if these aren't full-time drivers, why do they need 24/7 commercial insurance? That does not make any sense.

These drivers are driving their personal vehicles. To impose 24/7 commercial insurance on the ride share companies would B- well, at least Sidecar. I can't speak for the others, would put us out of business. The expense of commercial 24/7 insurance, liability insurance alone would be more than what the average driver earns per year as a casual ride share provider.

Currently B- there was a question about how and when Sidecar provides coverage. We have \$1 million excess liability coverage which is more than most livery and taxi services are required to have. That million dollar

covers from the period that the driver clicks accept ride and is on their way to pick up the passenger until the passenger exits the vehicle.

implementing We starting are tomorrow a \$50,000 collision policy that would protect drivers. It only has a \$500 deductible for drivers which we believe is far more competitive than any of our brethren who have collision policies. This also operates regardless of underlying personal the collision insurance that driver might have.

recognize is We that there ambiguity in the personal insurance market, and that is because each commercial livery differently. exclusion reads Some of policies read while transporting a passenger, others have a more generic no livery. We've been waiting for the personal insurance market to clarify with their users whom they have a contract with what ride sharing is covered and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1	what's not.
2	In the interim, our commercial
3	liability policy operates either as an excess
4	policy, so if the driver's personal policy
5	chooses to pay but is not enough, or covering
6	down to dollar zero if the personal insurance
7	denies. We believe this is fair until the
8	personal insurance companies clarify how they
9	are providing services.
10	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Can you provide
11	us with the name of an insurance company that
12	would provide insurance under that
13	circumstance?
14	MS. STEVENS: Provide what kind of
15	insurance, just so I'm clear?
16	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Personal
17	insurance.
18	MS. STEVENS: Personal insurance B-
19	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: On a vehicle
20	that is being used as you're describing it.
21	MS. STEVENS: We have almost every

1 insurer -CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Can you provide 2 3 us the name? 4 MS. STEVENS: Sure, we have State policyholders, 5 Farm have Farmers we policyholders. 6 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: That's fine. 7 I'm not asking for it here. Would you submit to 8 9 us a list of the companies that you know will provide the kind of primary insurance for the 10 11 vehicle before the commercial kicks in. 12 MS. STEVENS: So, just to clarify, 13 these - our users have these personal 14 insurance. Whether -- we've instructed our 15 drivers that they should discuss with their 16 broker whether or not their policies cover 17 while they're providing ride sharing services 18 or not, so I can't - I can provide you a list 19 of what policyholders have that on our service, 20 but I can't comment on whether they would or

would not accept service. The contract isn't

1	with me, it is with the driver.
2	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: All I'm trying
3	to elicit is if you could give us names of
4	insurance companies who say yes, we will give
5	standard personal insurance on your vehicle
6	even though we know that there are times when
7	you're going to be carrying people
8	commercially.
9	MS. STEVENS: So, as I said, I can
10	tell you what policyholders are on our system,
11	but I can't tell you definitely whether or not
12	they would provide service or not.
13	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Okay, you can
14	tell us who they are.
15	MS. STEVENS: I'd be more than happy
16	to provide that list.
17	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Okay.
18	MS. STEVENS: There are another - a
19	number of other regulations that we believe are
20	over-burdensome on the TNCs, and frankly we
21	don't understand the point of them. The rules

that you guys are proposing unfortunately put a lot of burden on us in a way that would prevent casual drivers from participating, which is really what we want. We want someone when they're running out on an errand to flip on the app and say is anyone going to the grocery store? Is anyone going to the Smithsonian? Is anyone going to the Verizon Center, and share a ride with that person. That's our long-term goal.

In the interim, we do have people that are providing rides and not necessarily going the same way, but to get to our long-term enough drivers goal we do have to have participating and using the system. So, in order to do that, those regulations required casual drivers to have a commercial operating license, to display a permanent vehicle decal, to have six hours of training in third-party person, have safety to and each driver, because inspections,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

drivers set their own rates, and set their own prices for rides, we require each driver to clear their rate setting with the DDS.

All of these regulations would only dissuade casual drivers from participating. Professional drivers who are already on taxi or a livery have no problems with these, but they're not going to do it for 20 hours or less, so we're caught between a rock and a hard place. We want casual users, but these rules will mean they won't participate.

Some of the other rules that we believe are particularly burdensome is the requirement of - you guys have asked us for a lot of things about our drivers and about what they're doing, and you want contemporaneous records. And these are particularly burdensome for us to provide on a regular basis.

We believe, and we've been operating this way in other jurisdictions, and I understand that you're not other

jurisdictions, but we maintain all of these records electronically, and at a moment's notice can provide them to you. We believe that's much more effective than continually providing some sort of feed of documents. I'm not even sure what you guys are going to do with all of them, or where they would even go, but we believe that the audit feature would be much more effective and would be able to capitalize on the fact that we have real time information about the drivers, where they've gone, what they've done, as well as an in app support line and email system for customer complaints, a zero tolerance policy, et cetera.

I'd be happy to take any questions that you might have.

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Well, Ms. Stevens, thank you very much, very interesting point. I do have a few questions. I don't know if I can keep this on long enough for whatever reason, but we want it working.

You know, it isn't Sidecar that I'm concerned about. I'm sure that with the size of the corporation and the amount of investment in it, that this is a reputable company that wouldn't for consider a minute doina dishonest thing. It's the guy who comes in here named Joe Smith that nobody knows that takes the same conditions that allow you to operate and winds up ripping off credit cards, identity theft, or even assaulting people in their vehicle, having accidents, creating all kinds of things, and we don't know who he is.

I don't understand, for example, why you object to the fact that we would like to have anybody doing business as a public vehicle for-hire, and that's what you are whether you want to or not, as long as your drivers charge for their time in any way, shape, or form. You want to do those rides for free, or voluntary contributions like slug lines, then you're not a public vehicle for-hire,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

you're outside of all this stuff. But if you're
a public vehicle for-hire, anybody could come
in here and they cannot register with us, which
you've objected to doing. They cannot tell us
who they - what cars they're using. And, as I
understand it, the proposal even among you is
that you - I could live in West Virginia, sign
up with you, come down here on the weekends and
take rides from you. I'm not your neighbor. I'm
coming from state - I can come from Florida and
do that. Now, why would you propose that that's
a way to do business in the District of
Columbia?
MS. STEVENS: With all due respect,
Chairman Linton, you're misunderstanding what
I'm saying. We don't - we're not saying that
there shouldn't be any regulations. What I'm
suggesting to you is that these proposed
regulations are far too onerous given the fact
that you're limiting drivers for 20 hours.
CHAIRPERSON LINTON: (Off

1	microphone comment) having you register as a
2	company doing business in the District of
3	Columbia.
4	MS. STEVENS: I never suggested we
5	had a problem with that. What I -
6	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Then you will
7	tell the council you don't object to that. What
8	is onerous about having us look at the devices
9	you use in your apps so we understand how they
10	work, and how to use them?
11	MS. STEVENS: I've given you that
12	demonstration before, so clearly I have no
13	issue with it.
14	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: But that's
15	still a position which your people have -
16	MS. STEVENS: No one has taken that
17	position from Sidecar.
18	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: What is onerous
19	about you filing with us what cars have applied
20	and been approved by you to operate in the
21	District of Columbia?

MS. STEVENS: Again, I have not 1 objected to those. So, if you're imputing from 2 3 other ride sharing services -4 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: When I testify I can tell the Council Sidecar has no objection 5 to telling us these things. 6 MS. STEVENS: The objection that I 7 have is the burden that you put in the - how many 8 9 times and when you have to report. All I'm 10 suggesting to you is, for example, part of the 11 regulations require that drivers be 12 specifically listed on our insurance policy. 13 Our insurer doesn't even require that. That 14 seems to me above and beyond what's necessary 15 here. 16 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: We'll take that 17 under consideration and value that from a legal 18 standpoint on that. Right now, my concern is 19 that the exemptions that are being sought by the 20 Private Sedan companies, and maybe you don't

seek all of them, but you're the only one here

1	testifying, limits the ability of the
2	Commission to enforce against street hails, and
3	we have many vehicles out there with private
4	license plates doing and picking up street
5	hails and telling our inspectors oh, it's all
6	right. I work for so and so. We're allowed to
7	do this.
8	MS. STEVENS: Well, if you have a
9	Sidecar driver that's pulled over from a street
10	hail, I want to know because they'll be -
11	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: How do we know
12	if it's a driver from - if you don't tell us.
13	MS. STEVENS: It doesn't matter. If
14	they've -
15	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Oh, yes, it
16	does.
17	MS. STEVENS: - accepted a street
18	hail, they should get a street hail ticket.
19	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: No. We can't
20	pull every -
21	MS. STEVENS: That's irrelevant.

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: - single vehicle with a - remember you don't H-tags, you don't L-tags. You have Virginia or Delaware, or you have Florida or Georgia tags on there. We can't pull every single private vehicle over and say it looks to us like you're doing street hails. If we know the cars that are eligible, that you say are eligible to service you, and we have those, then our hack inspectors have that compendium with them. And then they know they don't pull over some car where the back seat person is going to say what are you talking about, that's my cousin. I'm telling you what life is really like out on the street. MS. STEVENS: And I understand that, and as I've said before, we're happy to work with you on some rules that make a little bit

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: It's not the

more sense that reflect your concerns for hack

inspectors. I'm happy to discuss that further.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1 hack inspectors I'm worried about. They can 2 take it. MS. STEVENS: I'm talking about the 3 information needed for them to do their job. 4 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: What. 5 Τ happening is an increasing number of vehicles 6 7 who are not even affiliated with any one of the so called Private Sedan companies now flooding 8 9 the streets and pretending that they are 10 private sedans. We don't know whether they are 11 or not, and we don't have the resources even 12 with our Task Force made up of our partners in 13 the Metropolitan Police and the other police 14 department to enforce without having a list of 15 who you have approved as vehicles, who you have 16 approved as drivers. 17 MS. STEVENS: Well, we can provide 18 that, but my broader point is that there are 19 technological solutions to this. For example, 20 if you're pulling a driver over we can discuss

having some sort of in app certificate that

would only be given to approved activated 1 2 drivers so that your hack inspectors could look 3 quickly at the app. I understand. What I'm saying, Chairman Linton, is that there are ways 4 to do this that will provide you with the 5 information that you need. But that was not my 6 7 primary point. CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Well, it's one 8 9 of my primary points. And it's one of the things 10 that I see that is being pushed by your segment 11 of the industry. And that is, that you have 12 certain things that are fine to regulate, but 13 they have to be on an honor basis. We don't have 14 any way to know whether you're doing it, or 15 whether you don't. 16 While I don't have any question that 17 your company is an honorable decent company, I 18 can't quarantee that that's true of everybody 19 that comes in to take advantage of -

always been that we'd be subject to audit. We'd

MS. STEVENS: And our suggestion has

20

1	submit these records under penalty of perjury.
2	If a bad actor chooses to participate you have
3	all the appropriate power to enforce, levy
4	fines, and punish.
5	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Not if we don't
6	know who they are.
7	MS. STEVENS: But then they'd just be
8	a gypsy cab.
9	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: That's what
10	we're getting to.
11	(Simultaneous speech.)
12	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Commissioner
13	Muhammad.
14	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: How does
15	Sidecar compensate?
16	MS. STEVENS: We take up to 20
17	percent of the dollar amount paid by the
18	passenger to the driver.
19	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Okay. I'm
20	sure one of your greatest focus is to protect
21	the company from liability. Correct?

1	MS. STEVENS: I am their General
2	Counsel.
3	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Okay. So, a
4	taxi driver has to give a FBI background check,
5	every six months a police clearance, every six
6	months a police clearance.
7	(Simultaneous speech.)
8	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: When do we
9	do? Yes, hold on, every year, or every two
10	years. All you're requiring is to show a
11	driver's license that says on this B- what you
12	passed out.
13	MS. STEVENS: It's not just the
14	driver's license. We do a Social Security
15	number based background check. The only
16	difference between our B- I can't get access to
17	an FBI background check. That's not an option.
18	That's only for government B-
19	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: You can't
20	get access to their driver's license until they
21	show it to you either.

1	MS. STEVENS: That's correct, but
2	they're not on boarded as a driver until we get
3	a copy of the driver's license. And we verify
4	that it's accurate with a Motor Vehicle record
5	check.
6	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: But that's
7	before they come here to apply to be a Sidecar
8	driver. Correct?
9	MS. STEVENS: When they have time on
10	line they provide us with a copy of their
11	driver's license, a copy of their personal
12	insurance, then they submit their Social
13	Security number and consent to do a federal and
14	county background check.
15	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Because I
16	can submit to you a driver's license that says
17	valid on the date, but it could expired B-
18	MS. STEVENS: Which is why we do a
19	Motor Vehicle record check which tells us that
20	the driver's license is, first of all, exists.
21	Second of all, is active and gives us any Motor

1	Vehicle record, so if you had a reckless
2	driving, for example, we would see that in the
3	Motor Vehicle record check.
4	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Because in
5	your statement it doesn't say -
6	MS. STEVENS: Oh, I apologize. I
7	didn't put everything we did in that, but I do
8	have a supplementary -
9	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: And also the
10	way I think would be proposed by industry is
11	that you would select a third party or in some
12	cases do it yourself. Why would you object if
13	we said we're going to designate those national
14	companies who can do background checks as the
15	ones that you need to use since we would know
16	that they're the ones who do them properly and
17	have the access?
18	MS. STEVENS: I can't speak for the
19	rest of the industry. I am only speaking for
20	Sidecar.
21	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: NO I

understand that. 1 STEVENS: We use a national 2 MS. 3 certified background check company. We're more than happy to show you whatever you need to give 4 you comfort for that. I would not want to have 5 the city be responsible for the background 6 7 checks, and the pure reason is it's - you guys just move too slow. I can do it -8 9 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Why you 10 wouldn't want us to say these are the companies 11 that you can use? 12 MS. STEVENS: You're free to do that. 13 I would just recommend that we think ours, which 14 Ridge Verification Services, is Red 15 excellent background check company, and we 16 would hope that they would be added to any list. 17 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: That may very 18 well be, but what I'm trying to say is that in 19 my experience, which may be limited to only 26 20 years, at least, that there are companies who

offer things that then don't do them properly.

1 And they needed to be vetted out. 2 Now, the way this is structured, and 3 the way I see it coming at us, is that you'll be able to pick any company you want to do your 4 vetting on your driving. Whether that company 5 is actually meeting its responsibilities is for 6 7 your observation, not ours. And we may not think it is. So, what if we gave - we said look, you 8 9 can have it done. Here are six or seven 10 companies that we find that are acceptable to 11 us for doing background checks. 12 MS. STEVENS: As I said, I think we'd 13 be perfectly fine with that concept. We have zero interest doing our own background checks. 14 15 Let me be really clear about that. We want to 16 outsource this. 17 CHAIRPERSON I_TNTON: We're 18 perfectly comfortable with doing it, too. We do 19 a very good job at it. 20 MS. STEVENS: Yes, you just, 21 unfortunately, take too long for us.

1	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Commissioner
2	Tapscott.
3	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: Yes, that
4	was really, what is your preference for doing
5	this, is why are you trying to take the business
6	of the cab drivers away. Why are we doing things
7	that cab drivers have to go through to do their
8	daily work, and you don't want those rules. You
9	want your own rules.
10	MS. STEVENS: Because we are
11	fundamentally not a taxi dispatch company.
12	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: But you're
13	picking up people.
14	MS. STEVENS: We're providing
15	transportation.
16	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: But that's
17	the same thing a cab does.
18	MS. STEVENS: But that's like saying
19	that you shouldn't have cars because there are
20	horse and buggies. Innovation is coming. It's
21	moving forward. A phone-based taxi dispatch

1	company needs to innovate, and in the absence
2	of them innovating, Sidecar and other ride
3	sharing companies have come in with the
4	ultimate long-term goal of providing shared
5	rides when people are going to common
6	destinations.
7	(Off microphone comment.)
8	MS. STEVENS: What do you mean why
9	you need it? We've got too many cars on the road,
10	traffic is a nightmare. We're increasing
11	plumes. We're not.
12	(Off microphone comment.)
13	MS. STEVENS: That's not B- as I said
14	before, that's not the long-term goal. I'm
15	sorry. I couldn't hear you over the crowd.
16	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: Why don't
17	you want to be regulated like the cabs?
18	MS. STEVENS: As I said, we believe
19	that we offer a better service that meets the
20	needs of consumers as they have said out in
21	public.

1	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: What makes
2	you believe -
3	MS. STEVENS: Well, first of all, you
4	can use a credit card on our system. Second of
5	all, you can actually -
6	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: Credit
7	cards in our system.
8	MS. STEVENS: After getting yelled
9	at many times by taxicabs in D.C. where I lived
10	here for seven years, I would say not really.
11	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I take
12	exception to that. We're at 96 percent
13	frequency of credit card usage -
14	MS. STEVENS: Well, with all due
15	respect, my point is that the public wants this.
16	We've provided and filled a gap where there was
17	one. And our point is we're not objecting to
18	regulations. We're just saying that there are
19	smarter ways to regulate that doesn't reflect
20	1970s taxi dispatch systems. We have higher
21	insurance requirements than our taxi or

1	livery-
2	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: That has
3	nothing to do with who's driving your car.
4	MS. STEVENS: We do -
5	(Off microphone comment.)
6	MS. STEVENS: I do. We do Social
7	Security number background checks. We do Motor
8	Vehicle record checks.
9	(Off microphone comment.)
10	MS. STEVENS: The only difference is
11	that yours has fingerprints and ours doesn't.
12	And that's about identity, not about the
13	background check.
14	(Off microphone comment.)
15	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: Being a
16	South East resident do I call for Sidecar to
17	come to my residence and pick me up. Do you think
18	you're going to provide service for me?
19	MS. STEVENS: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: Do you have
21	any record?

1	MS. STEVENS: Of providing rides to
2	Anacostia? Yes, absolutely.
3	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: Do you know
4	where, let's say the South East area, you know
5	the South East area?
6	MS. STEVENS: I do.
7	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: Supposing I
8	don't want to ride with someone that's already
9	in the car?
10	MS. STEVENS: I don't understand
11	what you mean. You don't want to ride with the
12	driver?
13	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: No.
14	Supposing there's another passenger in there I
15	don't want to ride with.
16	MS. STEVENS: We don't have that
17	model. Yes, we're talking about having that
18	capability but we don't have it yet. So, that
19	you could opt out, let's say you were getting
20	a shared ride program like you would suggest,
21	you could opt out.

1	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: I don't have
2	that. I'd have to take everyone. I have to take
3	everyone that wants a cab. And you can opt out
4	because you don't want to take them?
5	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: No, I think
6	what she's saying, Stanley, is that they don't
7	take multiple unaffiliated people for rides B-
8	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: I'm sorry. I
9	understood that she was saying if they're going
10	the same direction.
11	(Off microphone comment.)
12	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: They're not
13	picking up multiple people who are not -
14	COMMISSIONER TAPSCOTT: I want to
15	make a statement. To me it's just the same as
16	you union busting. That's what you're trying to
17	do to the cab industry in DC.
18	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Counsel says
19	that's not the position of the Commission at
20	this time. Any other questions? Thank you, Ms.
21	Stevens. Appreciate your comments, so you know

1 what you're going to get as a result of that. 2 would appreciate any further We written submission you'd care to make on this matter, 3 and I'm sure that there are going to be a lot 4 of changes made to this proposal so that it will 5 go through a second comment period. Thank you 6 7 very much for appearing at this time. MS. STEVENS: Great. Thank you for 8 9 your time, appreciate it. 10 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I'm going to 11 call a recess until 1:30, at which time I trust 12 all of you have signed up as the general public 13 to speak will come back. I will be here. I hope that my fellow Commissioners will, but I will 14 15 be here to listen to you, so will Counsel. We're 16 very interested in your comments and what you 17 have to say about these regulations. So, we will 18 recess until 1:30. 19 (Whereupon, the proceedings went 20 off the record at 12:41 p.m., and went back on

the record at 1:42 p.m.)

afternoon, and my apologies. And welcome to you for coming back to this room. I was not aware that we were being preempted from continuing in the other room, and had to hastily make arrangements to have an alternative place because we very much would like to hear from the individuals who have asked to address the Commission on the matter of new private sedan class proposed regulations and the for-hire rules pertaining to dispatch services.

There is a fairly long list. I do hope that they will come back to this room and to tell us. What I will do is call names and if they're not here, I will go back, and I will start with the ones who are here, and eventually go back and pick up those as they come. So, I'd like to start out by asking if Mr. Garshaw Birbo is with us? Is he here or not? Mr. Omar Henderson? Mr. Jimmy Garza?

Yes, Mr. Garza. The witness chair is

1	right up here, sir. So, if you would come here
2	and just speak. The microphone is activated
3	there, and if you would go ahead, you have five
4	minutes to tell us what you would like to tell
5	us about those regulations. Do you have
6	prepared testimony?
7	MR. GARZA: No, sir.
8	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: All right.
9	Well, you go ahead and tell us what you would
10	like us to know. Have you looked at the
11	regulations?
12	MR. GARZA: Yes, sir, I have.
13	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Okay. So,
14	please then give us your opinions, your
15	comments, and what you think we should know
16	about it.
17	MR. GARZA: Thank you. Just for the
18	record, I am an UberX driver, I'm a Lyft driver,
19	and a Sidecar driver.
20	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Do they allow
21	you to do all three?

1	MR. GARZA: Yes, sir.
2	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I wasn't aware
3	of that.
4	MR. GARZA: Yes, sir.
5	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I thought they
6	were going to be very exclusive.
7	MR. GARZA: There's no exclusionary
8	agreements for them, so I can help out with the
9	best of them.
10	I am not a full-time driver. I just
11	do this in my spare time when it's convenient
12	for me, and just to pick up a little bit of extra
13	money. However, I do know some people that are
14	full-time partner drivers for the Private Sedan
15	services in the city.
16	We are concerned about this 20-hour
17	limit on drivers, and the licensing that you
18	want. I believe it's 100 per week, that would
19	cause considerable delays of people.
20	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: No, there is no
21	requirement in our regulations anywhere for any

1	driver that would pertain to 100 a week.
2	MR. GARZA: No, it was 100 per week
3	C-it's a -
4	(Off microphone comment.)
5	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Oh, it's - my
6	attorneys tell me the provision you're
7	referring to is one that would set a cap of the
8	number of applications being considered at any
9	one time. Now, I don't have any strong feelings,
10	and I don't know that anyone on the Commission,
11	so tell us your feelings about that, and we'll
12	be glad to hear what you have to say about it.
13	MR. GARZA: Well, coming from my
14	point of view, I would say that that would
15	severely limit people from being able to make
16	a living for their family.
17	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Why? I mean, it
18	hasn't nothing to do with them. It has to do with
19	how many people can be processed at one time by
20	the company.
21	MR. GARZA: Exactly. So, those

1	people that are waiting after that 100 cap,
2	they'll have to wait for the next month, though.
3	Correct?
4	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: No, it just
5	says that - we'll have to restudy it -
6	MR. GARZA: Okay.
7	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: - based on
8	your raising this point. I would think it means
9	that the company cannot keep accumulating
10	people without processing them. Either you sign
11	them on or you tell them they can't do it.
12	MR. GARZA: Right.
13	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: But you can't
14	build up 1,000 and then all of a sudden decide
15	to give out 1,000 at one full crack. That's what
16	I assume, and we'll have to look at it and see.
17	MR. GARZA: Okay, thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: It wasn't
19	intended, in my judgment, to be any kind of
20	limitation on how many people could work.
21	That's a whole different issue.

1	MR. GARZA: Okay, thank you.
2	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I might comment
3	one other thing, in terms of your questions on
4	the 20 hours a week, if you get a full face card
5	from the DCTC you can work full time.
6	MR. GARZA: Okay.
7	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: But if you
8	don't want to get a license from us that makes
9	you a commercial driver, you're a part-timer.
10	MR. GARZA: All right.
11	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: You're just
12	doing this to pick up extra money.
13	MR. GARZA: Okay.
14	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: And we've made
15	it possible under these proposed regulations
16	for people who don't want to be full-time
17	commercial drivers to function.
18	MR. GARZA: Okay. All right. In
19	regards to the Private Sedan services not
20	accepting every ride, from my personal view I
21	have tried to do that. I have accepted every

1	request that's come in. And I don't care what
2	part of the city it's in. I can go to anywhere
3	in the South East. I'm sitting in Arlington, I
4	many times have traveled up to Howard
5	University to pick up some students and take
6	them to their destination. I don't feel
7	- there's no discrimination in that
8	whatsoever.
9	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Where do you
10	live, Mr. Garza?
11	MR. GARZA: Arlington.
12	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: But you don't
13	live in the District.
14	MR. GARZA: No, sir.
15	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: You don't pay
16	any taxes here?
17	MR. GARZA: No, sir.
18	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: You don't pay
19	any fees or register, or any application. You
20	just simply come here, make money, and then go
21	home.

1	MR. GARZA: Yes, sir.
2	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Okay.
3	MR. GARZA: I've lived here in the
4	area for 21 years, retired military. I like
5	these Private Sedan services. I hope that we can
6	come to some sort of resolution to where we can
7	all work together.
8	I don't like the taxi companies, you
9	know, just hating us so bad. I feel that there's
10	enough work here for everybody. You know, we
11	don't pick up people off the street. We're not
12	able to hail. We're on the apps.
13	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: You understand
14	that
15	MR. GARZA: Yes, sir. I just -
16	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: And you
17	understand that the proposed Council
18	legislation would remove from the Commission
19	the authority it needs to keep that from
20	happening.
21	MR. GARZA: Right. And I'm thrilled

1	that, you know, things are moving along. And I
2	hope that will be, so everybody will have a fair
3	shot, because somebody said that there's a
4	B- they want to make the playing field level.
5	I totally agree with that from the Private Sedan
6	service point of view. I hope it can, and I'm
7	willing to stay here and work on that.
8	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Well, we
9	appreciate that.
10	MR. GARZA: All right, thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Any questions?
12	No. Thank you for taking the time to come with
13	us. Mr. Seth Levy. Is Mr. Levy here? Ms. Ross?
14	Mr. Atilla Nagy? Mr. Cankat Vatanandiran? Mr.
15	Mahmood Ahmad? Mr. Kamran Vafai? Mr. Naeem
16	Malik? Mr. Nadeem Muhammad? Mr. Addis
17	Gebresellassi? Mr. Ifran Jamali? Ms. Eartha
18	Clark?
19	MS. CLARK: I'm here. Do I have to
20	come around?
21	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Yes, ma'am,

1	would you please come to the witness seat.
2	That's where we're recording. We do make a
3	record here.
4	Is Jessie Black with you, Ms. Clark?
5	You might all come around. I see you have Kelly
6	Dalton. No, that's a different - is Jessie with
7	you?
8	MS. CLARK: No, they were here
9	earlier. A lot of people left. They're not
10	coming back.
11	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Okay. Well,
12	we're glad you came back. We appreciate it. And
13	please go ahead and tell us what you'd like us
14	to know about your view on these regulations.
15	MS. CLARK: My- well, good afternoon
16	now. It was morning earlier. And I'm a D.C.
17	resident, I've been a driver for over 43 years.
18	And my concerns are these regulations, all of
19	them, and I'm not saying they all came from
20	here, but through the legislative council,
21	they're all geared against cab drivers. We're

on the bottom of everything. We haven't and not getting a fair shake at all.

Enforcement of these unregulated for-hire vehicles is for safety reasons. Liability, and everything for the public. We as cab drivers out here, our mayor has said D.C. for one. Well, we have a big problem here with that because it seems that we have one set of rules for cab drivers, and another set of rules for all the Lyft, Uber, UberX, and Sidecars coming in here. They have been operating for quite a while, and enforcement is necessary, and regulation of these vehicles. There time when 90 days have expired quite a while ago, and we are being shafted by that because we're not getting that fair shake, and enforcement, I find it hard to believe that the DCTC, the City Council, and everybody in this city can find ways to enforce, impound our vehicles, find every rule and everything against cab drivers in here, but nobody can seem to come up with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

rules to regulate all these entities that's coming in in this city.

We're not asking for a handout. We want a fair shake, and an even playing field.

And with these regulations, you've over-regulating us, and we can't compete with it. And I think it's very unfair until there's a resolution to it, and whatever, and we can get some answers. Something have to give.

With the apps they're using, the apps are in the phones. At the bottom of any time or any given day, every person for hire is using a vehicle. That vehicle should have all the rules and regulations that the DC Government requires taxicabs to do. through We qo inspections, we pay all these fees for licenses, we pay all these fees for everything, everybody gets paid in this city except the cab driver, from the PSPs, the credit card, every service that is offered. We're not getting our fair shake at all. And I don't think it's right,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

and I don't think it's fair. And until these laws or something is done, a resolution, if the problems can't be enforced, I think DCTC should step up the effort and start enforcing these things on all these illegal entities in this city. Because I figure you all can find the time to do it with cab drivers, hey, a fair shake with everybody. If you're illegal, you're illegal. I want to thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Well, I want to just let you know that in the month of April we did impound nine Uber cars. We don't just turn our heads away from it. We did impound nine. It's far more than that, but I don't have all the statistics in front of me.

MS. CLARK: Well -

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: But that's neither here nor there. We're listening to what you're saying about it, and it would be helpful to know the specific provisions what you think should be emphasized or not emphasized, but we

1	appreciate your comments and we'll take them
2	into consideration. Do you have any questions?
3	MS. CLARK: Thank you.
4	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Yes. Would
5	you be in favor of a 20-hour work week for these
6	Private Sedan cars?
7	MS. CLARK: A 20-hour work week?
8	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Limit.
9	MS. CLARK: The limit? Well, we have
10	cab drivers who work. The problem is if they're
11	going to work 20 hours, it's not the amount of
12	time they work. It's what they should be doing.
13	They should have the same rules that we are
14	under for the 20 hours, or whatever time. The
15	thing is enforcing it on them, and whatever.
16	That's it. We don't -
17	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: They can't have
18	the same rules because they're prohibited from
19	taking street hails.
20	MS. CLARK: Well, they're doing
21	street hails out there.

1	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: But that's
2	where we're putting the enforcement on.
3	MS. CLARK: Well, they're doing
4	hails.
5	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: We're not
6	giving them that privilege.
7	MS. CLARK: Well, they're doing them
8	anyway. And I understand that the time that you
9	spent -
10	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: So, it isn't
11	that they should have the same rules, you want
12	to make sure that we enforce that they don't do
13	-
14	MS. CLARK: Enforce the rules -
15	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: - what they're
16	not allowed to do.
17	MS. CLARK: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: And that's what
19	we're trying to do.
20	MS. CLARK: Then do that well.
21	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you very

1	much.
2	MS. CLARK: All right, thank you.
3	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Kelly Dalton?
4	Toussaint Webster? Any other person that is
5	present with us now who would like to address
6	the Commission? Would you please come forward
7	to the witness chair and give us your name and
8	contact.
9	MR. ABRAHA: I believe I was
10	registered. I don't know why -
11	(Off microphone comment.)
12	PARTICIPANT: Okay, we just did it
13	- he's on the list.
14	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Where is - who
15	did I -
16	PARTICIPANT: He's up above Ms.
17	Eartha Clark. He's the name Abraha.
18	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: My apologies,
19	sir. I did skip you, and that's not very good.
20	I think I got carried away with Ms. Clark.
21	MR. ABRAHA: I wrote good morning,

but good afternoon. My name is Ziena Abraha, and I have been a DC taxi for 18 years. I have residence in D.C., Ward 5. I am here to talk about the fairness.

As a taxi driver I pay all my dues for license, training, background checks, face ID, inspection, dome light, the new paint, everything I did special series September 2nd until now. I'm suffering by the Taxicab Commission who agreed to do that. But the lawful side, when drivers from the Private Sedan service companies like UberX, Lyft, Sidecar operated in the street of Washington, D.C., without full filing any legal requirements of the DCTC, and the District of Columbia, place it for all tax operators.

They have been operating legally for over one year, and this has put me and my fellow drivers at a major disadvantage and put our livelihood at stake.

As the Commissioners of the

District you are in the position to regulate it 1 2 and bring fairness to this industry. On behalf 3 of myself and the thousands of fellow drivers who are strictly regulated and are serving the 4 city, we ask you to bring the fairness as soon 5 as possible. Can I add a little bit? 6 7 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Yes, you certainly can. 8 9 MR. ABRAHA: Yes, allow what I have about part-time sedan service. 10 11 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Yes, please. 12 MR. ABRAHA: Well, like she say, 13 there is cab drivers, some of them they work in 14 the government, some work for a company, some 15 of them work in the hotels, they work part-time 16 as a taxi. So, they are operated same like a 17 full-time taxi driver. But at this time, from 18 me and other drivers, we are afraid because our 19 life, it is in danger, especially I'm living in 20 D.C. Okay? I am 58-years old, like four or five

years ago I tried to get out from this industry.

1	I get training HVAC, when I filled out online
2	I didn't get any offer to get a job because of
3	my age. So, how do I save this, my job? That is
4	a problem for me.
5	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: You're driving
6	now?
7	MR. ABRAHA: Yes, I'm driving now
8	full-time, but I can't afford to live over what
9	they are doing. Nobody enforce it, stop special
10	UberX. Thank you so much.
11	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you very
12	much for your comments, very interesting, and
13	we will certainly take a good hard look at what
14	you said. Do you have any questions you want to
15	ask? Thank you so much.
16	MR. ABRAHA: You're welcome.
17	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Carol, did you
18	want to speak? Please come forward.
19	MS. TYSON: Would you give us your
20	name and affiliation?
21	MS. TYSON: Hi, I'm Carol Tyson from

the United Spinal Association. And thank you so much for squeezing me in and for sticking around for five more minutes. I really appreciate it.

So, I'll just read bits and pieces of what's written here. Chairman Linton and distinguished members of the Taxicab Commission, thank you, and staff, thank you for the opportunity to offer testimony.

Before I begin, I would like to thank the Commission and taxi operators for providing accessible service. Even though it's limited, it's vital in the District. I would also echo concerns that were raised this morning regarding the potential for discrimination amongst transportation network companies and the importance of creating a level playing field in DC's public vehicle for-hire industry.

I am a Senior Policy Associate for United Spinal Association. Founded in 1946 by paralyzed veterans, United Spinal is the

1	largest disability-led nonprofit organization
2	serving and representing the interests of more
3	than a million Americans living with spinal
4	cord injuries and disorders. We believe that
5	people with disabilities who reside or work in
6	the District of Columbia or who visit our
7	nation's capitol must have equal access to all
8	transportation options.
9	In the interest of full disclosure,
10	as people here now, or some people, I currently
11	serve as the Vice Chair of the DC Taxi
12	Commission's Disability Advisory Committee.
13	This testimony reflects the views of United
14	Spinal Association only.
15	Regarding the proposed Chapter 2
16	rules for definitions, United Spinal suggests
17	including a definition of a wheelchair
18	accessible vehicle.
19	A proposed rule for Chapter 8 in
20	Section 801.5 would allow -
21	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Let me - excuse

1	me, Carol.
2	MS. TYSON: Yes.
3	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Would you
4	provide us with your recommendation then?
5	MS. TYSON: Sure. I think there's a
6	definition somewhere in existing law.
7	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Well, for the
8	purpose of this record if you would send us -
9	MS. TYSON: Yes.
10	CHAIRPERSON LINTON:
11	- specifically what your organization feels
12	the rules should define it as.
13	MS. TYSON: Absolutely.
14	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you. Send
15	it to Mr. Lerner, our counsel. Thank you.
16	MS. TYSON: A proposed rule for
17	Chapter 8, Section 801.5 would allow for taxi
18	companies to continue to charge the telephone
19	digital dispatch fee of \$2.00. Section 801.6
20	would allow taxi trips processed by a digital
21	dispatch service to use a non-taxi meter fare

in lieu of the taxi meter fare required by Section 801.7.

As you are likely aware, there are currently only about 20 accessible taxis in the District, that's .03 percent of the entire fleet. Successfully hailing an accessible taxi would prove challenging.

Recently, a disability advocate was scheduled to meet with me, a representative of the Taxi Commission and staff from the Council Member's office to discuss the future of the Taxi Committee. This advocate missed the majority of our meeting because his accessible taxi was late. It turned out there was only one accessible taxi running in the entire city that day.

Just this week a United Spinal Board member and disabled Marine Corps veteran, Terry Moakley, was in town to meet with other veteran organizations on Capitol Hill. He had reserved an accessible taxi in advance, and was so

excited to take advantage of the service that he wore a necktie that included images of taxis. Mr. Moakley was disappointed to receive a call roughly 10 minutes before his scheduled pickup to let him know there were no accessible taxis available.

With few accessible taxis, SO United Spinal is deeply concerned with the unintended discrimination against wheelchair users who may only access a wheelchair accessible taxi or a sedan through telephone or digital dispatch service. We believe the increased fare results in discrimination prohibited by the Americans With Disabilities Act, the DC Human Rights Act, and DCTC regulations.

United Spinal supports the inclusion of Section 1603.70 which requires a report on the wait times and fares charged to passengers seeking wheelchair accessible service. We are extremely encouraged to find

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

discrimination prohibited pursuant to Section 818. Discriminatory conduct includes not picking up a passenger with a service animal, or discrimination based on disability. As many sedan or black car drivers may not be familiar with disability etiquette or requirements, we urge you to include Disability 101 Sensitivity Training that's provided to taxi drivers currently, and basic training requirements for Private Sedan operators.

United Spinal continues to be pleased that the Public Vehicle For-Hire Innovation Act of 2012 requires some sedan operators to be getting wheelchair accessible vehicles starting December 31st of this year. We ask you to consider including in Section 1607 the penalty for sedan companies that do not comply.

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Let me just tell you that when they go to renew their certificate of operation, if they cannot

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1	provide the certificate that they have met the
2	requirements, they won't get a certificate of
3	operation until they do.
4	MS. TYSON: Okay, that's good. A few
5	more points. We note that Chapter 16, Section
6	B-
7	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: And I can tell
8	you, you are aware, that applies only to
9	companies with 20 or more vehicles that are
10	owned by the company.
11	MS. TYSON: I am very aware, yes,
12	that it really is not going to get us very much.
13	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Well, I
14	wouldn't say that. I think it could do with
15	60-70 new vehicles.
16	MS. TYSON: I would be very happy
17	with that. We note that Chapter 16, Section
18	1602.7 requirement. The dispatch services for
19	taxis and public vehicles for-hire permit
20	passengers to request an available wheelchair
21	accessible vehicle. We would ask that in the

event the dispatch service does not have wheelchair accessible vehicles at their disposal, that these services provide contact information for, or contact directly a taxi or sedan company that does provide the service. Alternatively, the Taxi Commission could maintain a list available on its website and other formats for sedan operators and dispatch services that do provide accessible service.

Regarding Section 1602.10, we would ask that the final rules note that dispatch services shall insure their websites are compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and that all communications regarding their services are offered in accessible formats as required by the Americans With Disabilities Act.

United Spinal thanks the Commission for its efforts to insure accessibility to public vehicle for-hire service in the District, and we are eager to continue to work

1	in partnership with all stakeholders, and will
2	continue to advocate for an accessible fleet
3	that will benefit all. Thank you.
4	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you,
5	Carol. Mr. Waters had the second to last
6	paragraph. That's your bailiwick. We can
7	respond to that. Let me also say for the record
8	that are embarked on planning now and moving
9	forward that should we be successful, and I like
10	to think that that will be successful, within
11	two years I would anticipate that the number of
12	wheelchair access vehicles that would be in
13	service at that time would exceed 400. We're not
14	at this point ready to discuss in detail what
15	those plans are because we still have to get
16	some agreements and move forward, but it's
17	beginning to look very promising.
18	Is there anyone else at this time?
19	Yes, sir, would you come forward?
20	MR. KOYTCHEFF: Certainly, sir.
21	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Take the

witness chair and tell us your name and your affiliation.

MR. KOYTCHEFF: Wonderful. My name Raymond Koytcheff, and hopefully is majority of this time can be used to answer any questions that you have concerning the apps that allow passengers to connect with privately run sedans. Since I started driving with Sidecar when it first came to DC pretty much last April, Lyft about a month after they launched, I also driver with UberX, I have used Uber, you know, probably like once a weekend to connect with UberX. I've lived in DC for 24 years I want to say now, so I'm pretty familiar with how taxis have been running on that side of things. I've used all the apps as passengers.

And I think the only points in the regulation that I would like to bring up are about the 20-hour restriction for any drivers because in my personal experience, I did seasonal work January to April that occupied

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

about anywhere from 20 to 50 hours of my week. And those times as far as being a ride share or, you know, as they call it share ride, drivers call it that way. I would, you know, only have like max 10 hours to spend then. But once you kick back into the time when I had more time to drive, then that's obviously going to be more than 20 hours, and I need to make money one way or another.

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Let me call to your attention, the 20 hours is a limitation for a non-commercial driver. There's nothing that prevents you from coming down and applying for a full face card that is recognized by us, and then driving in that platform. It doesn't say you have to drive more than 20 hours. You can drive, some of - we have taxicab drivers with face cards who drive three or four times a month. Make just a little bit extra money, they've been driving for many years.

What it says is that if you don't

1	want to apply to DCTC for a face card which would
2	allow you to - and you can elect - it's a
3	universal face card. You can drive an L-car, an
4	H-car, or a private sedan, or a black sedan. You
5	can drive for as few or as many hours you want.
6	If you don't want that, and you want to just
7	drive for the private sedan, then you're not a
8	commercial driver, and your license is limited
9	to a 20-hour part-time thing. So, it's an
10	elective on your part what you want to do.
11	MR. KOYTCHEFF: And what's that term
12	period of the face card?
13	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: As long as you
14	keep renewing it, most of them renew every two
15	years, as I -
16	MR. KOYTCHEFF: Every two years?
17	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: It's \$125 a
18	year, you go through our background check, you
19	go through our training program. You drive for
20	whoever will hire you to drive their vehicles.
j	

MR. KOYTCHEFF: Exactly. Okay. So,
I think the questions to bring out, and it would
be great to just sort of put down what are the
DCTC, because there are certain bullet points
on which every single company that's been
discussed today, they have an answer to every
single question. And I think the reason why
they've been so successful in attracting
drivers is because at the same time as covering
their bases and making sure that anybody who's
on the road is a person who that company would
see fit to be on the road, they're able to do
so at a reduced cost both to the company and to
the driver. Because I know there are a lot of
other drivers like me who are saying okay, well,
you know - and like the gentleman, I don't know
where he went now, but the gentleman who was the
public comment before, the second one prior, he
had said, you know, there are a lot of costs to
driving a taxi. And I think a lot of those costs
don't exist even though the same B- not

necessarily the same, but the same points are
addressed by, you know, the Private Sedan
companies. So, without having any onerous
costs, they're still covering all the bases
without saying B- you know, for instance,
because it's an e-hail, there's no reason why
the car would need to be a specific color
because the person who is looking on the app,
they already know what to expect. They don't
need to be looking on the street for a taxi, so
that cost automatically is eliminated. And in
the same sense, I think there are a lot of costs
that, you know, people don't decide to become,
you know, full-time as there would be, you know,
drivers with a face card, because the costs are
less. That is because they're trying to drive
less, more as part-time as opposed to
full-time. If I'm working 40-50 hours a week,
yes, I'm going to shell out extra money to be
able to do so, but if I'm working less, then why
should I pay that extra money?

1	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: That's exactly
2	why we put the 20-hour limitation.
3	MR. KOYTCHEFF: And I think, also,
4	the 100 drivers per week approval process, I
5	think that's one thing that's in question among
6	the different communities.
7	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Well, you'd
8	have no trouble if a company came in here and
9	got five, six, seven hundred applications and
10	sat on them until they were ready to dump them
11	on the street all at one time.
12	MR. KOYTCHEFF: I'm sorry?
13	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: I said you
14	would have no trouble if I came in here and I
15	set up my ABC company, Private Sedan company,
16	and I had my app, signed up people to use it,
17	got five or six hundred drivers to come in and
18	sign up and drive for me, and I held those until
19	I was ready to dump them on the street at the
20	same time. You have no problem with that?
21	MR. KOYTCHEFF: I would say as long

1	as they're qualified and otherwise -
2	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Okay. So, you
3	don't have any concern about the economic havoc
4	that something like that would bring. You don't
5	understand what the purpose of that is.
6	MR. KOYTCHEFF: The economic havoc?
7	Well -
8	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: You know, you
9	may think this is a do gooder job, but not a one
10	of these companies in my view as an economist
11	see this as but another way to do business. And
12	in business the objective is to make as big a
13	profit you can and defeat your opponent. Now,
14	that's what the taxis are. And the taxis are is
15	dominate the number of vehicles that are on the
16	street, so if I can throw more vehicles on the
17	street than anybody else can, then I could
18	overcome the opposition. You could flood the
19	streets and cause everybody else to take a price
20	drop.

MR. KOYTCHEFF: I think that's

1	definitely a tactic.
2	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: You get more
3	people - you get more cars chasing less
4	customers that need them. It doesn't work.
5	MR. KOYTCHEFF: And the customers
6	would be? I mean, I'm just - is it the person
7	who is B-
8	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: You think the
9	customers only have one app?
10	MR. KOYTCHEFF: No, not at all.
11	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: No, they have
12	multiple apps.
13	MR. KOYTCHEFF: You know, I don't
14	live in San Francisco, but I'm pretty sure -
15	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: So, they call
16	one, and then when that doesn't show up, or when
17	they can't find that, they call another, and
18	then - the point is you need to look at it to
19	see what creates chaos. Unregulated, you've got
20	chaos. And what they're finding out already is
21	it's not turning in as much money as they want,

1	so they're taking street hails. Have you taken
2	street hails?
3	MR. KOYTCHEFF: I have never.
4	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: You never did.
5	But can you tell me that nobody in the private
6	sedan has taken a street hail?
7	MR. KOYTCHEFF: I certainly cannot.
8	But your job is to write the rules, and they
9	should be followed. Is somebody going to break
10	the rules? Probably.
11	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: But then when
12	the company goes to the City Council and says
13	but we don't want to give them this information
14	that would help them enforce the rules, you
15	wouldn't support that.
16	MR. KOYTCHEFF: Which information
17	would that be?
18	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Without
19	knowing the vehicles that they've signed up,
20	there's no way that we can enforce against
21	street hails, because the vehicles are licensed

from Florida, from Georgia, from Delaware, from Pennsylvania. They're not using only District vehicles with a District plate on it. They're under the law that's being proposed, they would be able to sign up B- if I lived in West Virginia, I would be able to join UberX and come down the weekends and drive around on Washington, and pick up as many rides as I wanted, as well as electronic and street hails. Nobody is going to know what I am, or what I'm doing. And then I go to West Virginia on Sunday afternoon and relax.

MR. KOYTCHEFF: Sure. No, it's just -- that's an excellent point because I did have something I did want to share with everyone present in the room, which is that when you're driving as somebody, and even if it's Hail-O and you're driving a District taxi, if you have somebody who requested you, there's no point why you're going to pick up a street hail. And if you're driving and you're not getting

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

requests sort of back to back, before you would see a street hail, so the incentive B- there is no incentive whatsoever to pick up a street hail for one reason, also, a person who you're picking up off the street, you have no guarantee of payment there because through any app-based system where you would be providing a ride for money, you know that that person is linked up, credit card is there. The person who is off the street hail, they might be doing cash, and that's a big reason why drivers are also attracted to drive for the company B-

CHAIRPERSON LINTON: So, let me say this. I admire you. You're an honest man, and you're a local. Unfortunately, my experience is that the industry is full of people who would not share your opinion.

Now, the simple way that if I wanted to do this, is to get my personal car, tag in some other state, get my square, pull up alongside some obvious visitors to the District

of Columbia who are not familiar with the cab system and say I work for so and so, we're a taxi company. You look like you're looking for a ride. I can give you a ride. Yes, I take credit cards, I have the square, and you can run it through my square, which puts it on their personal telephone, their personal Smart Phone, which they can then convert and capture the credit card information on.

I'm afraid that my experience in three years of doing this, and 26 years of policing tells me that there are a lot of people out there who will not follow the rules because they are like you. And what I see is, is an effort to keep from having regulations that would allow a government agency to insure that only people like you are driving. But we appreciate your comments.

MR. KOYTCHEFF: Okay. I'm pretty sure it's been over five minutes. Right?

21 CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Well, that's

1	all right. Everybody could leave if they want.
2	You're very interesting.
3	(Laughter.)
4	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Do you have any
5	questions?
6	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: Did you have
7	to do a police clearance?
8	MR. KOYTCHEFF: For?
9	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Background,
10	background check.
11	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: You said you
12	drive for these sedan service. Right?
13	MR. KOYTCHEFF: Yes, they all have
14	background checks.
15	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: No, I said
16	did you have to do one. What they have and what
17	you do is two different things.
18	MR. KOYTCHEFF: I'm pretty sure. I
19	mean -
20	(Simultaneous speech.)
21	MR. KOYTCHEFF: What is the

1	definition of a police clearance?
2	COMMISSIONER MUHAMMAD: When you go
3	to the police precinct, you take B- they give
4	you your fingerprints and they check to see if
5	you have any record.
6	MR. KOYTCHEFF: For that? No. They
7	did a background check, which I guess is a
8	different thing.
9	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Without
10	fingerprints.
11	MR. KOYTCHEFF: I've had police
12	clearance before, you know, if I have a secret
13	clearance at NRL. Me personally, if that's the
14	question. But as a matter of statement for the
15	companies, it is not a police clearance. It is
16	a background check.
17	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: There's a
18	difference.
19	MR. KOYTCHEFF: Yes, okay. Perfect.
20	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Thank you very
21	much.

1	MR. KOYTCHEFF: Okay.
2	CHAIRPERSON LINTON: Appreciate it.
3	I thank all of you for taking the time to come
4	back to our mistake of having to bring you to
5	the 11 th floor. I appreciate the comments. There
6	were some very good comments that we will look
7	at and take into consideration. We don't
8	pretend that this proposed regulation is the
9	answer and end all. We're going to be revising
10	and addressing it, trying to get it where it
11	will achieve what all parties hope that it
12	achieves. So, thank you and this hearing is now
13	concluded.
14	(Whereupon, the proceedings went
15	off the record at 2:23 p.m.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	