GENERAL TEAMSTERS LOCAL 959
STATE OF ALASKA

Affiliated with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters
Rick Boyles, Secretary-Treasurer
520 E. 34th Ave., Suite 102, Anchorage, Alaska 99503
Phone (907) 751-8501 • Fax (907) 751-8599

February 21, 2017

Honorable Louise Stutes, Co-chair
Honorable Adam Wool, Co-chair
House Transportation Committee
State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801

RE: House Bill 132- Transportation Network Companies and Drivers

Dear Representatives Stutes and Wool:

After reviewing HB 132, legislation that creates a foundation allowing Transportation Network Companies (TNC) and their drivers to operate in the state of Alaska, we want to go on record opposed to the bill in its current form.

Teamsters Local 959 is a statewide union and we represent workers in almost every industry in over 250 different classifications such as truck drivers, airline pilots, engineers, land surveyors, miners, telecommunication, nurses, bus drivers, construction workers, etc. As such, protecting workers, worker rights and benefits, is our job. We work with our employers to assure our members have health benefits, pension, safe work environment, and are treated with dignity and respect.

The Teamsters believe it is important to protect all worker rights whether it is safety on the job through OSHA, nurses overtime legislation, overtime laws and Workers' Compensation, to list a few. No worker plans to be injured on the job, but if they are the employee and their family should be protected. Reviewing many cases in the lower 48, and having spoken with some of the Uber drivers in Washington State, it seems these drivers should be considered employees of the company. When Uber operated out of Anchorage for a brief period of time, the Department of Labor & Workforce Development found their drivers were employees and fined them for not paying Workers' Compensation. Uber paid the fine but then stopped operating in Anchorage. It has been stated by some that taxi cab drivers are exempt from AS 23.30.230(a) and therefore the TNC drivers should be also. We would point out that under the statute not all taxi cab drivers are exempt and the communities around the state are able to set their own regulations depending on the needs. With respect to insurance Uber provides insurance for the customer and they also have control over all the rules and regulations that govern the drivers. That is not the case with a taxi driver.

In the city of Seattle the drivers are organizing and it was not without a battle. Their company spent millions of dollars fighting the proposed legislation and is now challenging it in court. Some of the complaints from the drivers included reduced hours,

inability to earn a living wage (pay cut by 15%), unfair terminations (app would be disabled if drivers spoke out), insurance pooling, company required expensive car upgrades, and fairness and respect issues; all of which are common employee issues.

In summary, HB 132 should recognize drivers of any TNC as an employee not an independent contractor. It is a special crave out for TNC's that sets bad public policy for workers in our state. The bill:

- Significantly diminishes the established criteria used by the State of Alaska to determine whether an individual is an employee or independent contractor, specifically the ABC test AS 23.20.525(a)(8)(A-C);
- Creates an unfair advantage for TNC companies;
- Allows an industry to write its own workplace standards as opposed to requiring compliance with established standards that equitably balances the rights between both workers and employers;
- Diminishes the revenue the state will see from Employer contributions for unemployment insurance and Workers' Compensation;
- Weakens the definition of what constitutes an "employee" for certain companies, opening the door for "Worker Misclassification" issues and allow bad actors into the industry;
- Deprives workers of a minimum hourly wage;
- Allows TNC's, some worth over $39 billion, to void all worker protections and pay little towards our state economy.

On behalf of working people in our state, especially those who are unrepresented, we ask that the existing work rules be enforced. These rules are intended to protect workers and important state programs. We ask that HB 132 be amended to protect workers, especially the drivers for these TNC's.

Your time and consideration of this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

TEAMSTERS LOCAL 959

Rick Boyles

Rick Boyles
Secretary-Treasurer

Copy: Representatives Claman, Drummond, C.Kopp, Neuman and Sullivan-Leonard

LAW OFFICES
BRENNAN ▪ HEIDEMAN
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

FROM THE DESK OF:
JAMES T. BRENNAN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
jbrennan@law-alaska.com

February 21, 2017

Representative Adam Wool
Alaska State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Re: CSSB 14, Regulation of Transportation Network Companies; Fiscal Note

Dear Representative Wool:

I am an Anchorage attorney with many years experience representing various components of the Anchorage Taxicab Industry in connection with municipal regulation of the industry. I am familiar with the regulatory issues which would be presented by the startup of transportation network companies (TNCs), including Uber, in Alaska, and have followed the development of SB 14, including the latest, committee substitute version.

The committee substitute, at Section 5, would, for the first time, saddle DCCED with administration/enforcement of the proposed new statute and regulations thereunder. This would be an entirely new role for the agency, regulation of motor vehicles. Because TNC regulation would also be brand new to the state (which has not previously engaged in regulation of passenger transportation, previously undertaken by the municipalities), this first-time foray into regulation will require adequate agency staffing. The TNCs are new players in the passenger transportation industry, and it would be a gross understatement to say that their entry into commerce has created headaches for municipal, state and national governments, worldwide. A new state law authorizing TNCs will require a full agency commitment to administer and enforce the new law.

The Fiscal Note accompanying the committee substitute is for $280,500, essentially for two new positions, one for an investigator and one for a consumer service specialist. In my opinion, this is inadequate.

The Municipality of Anchorage has Transportation Inspection office to handle regulation of taxicab and limousines under longstanding municipal code provisions. Though it administers regulation in only one city, it requires four fulltime employees. It is unrealistic to believe that a state agency administering

619 E. SHIP CREEK AVENUE, SUITE 310, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
TELEPHONE (907) 279-5528 TELEFAX (907) 278-0877

startup state regulation of TNCs in cities all over Alaska will be able to adequately enforce the statute with only two additional staffers.

Among the requirements of the statute for which compliance, monitoring and enforcement by the agency will be required are:

- Required insurance provisions for both the TNC company and each TNC driver.
- Disclosure to all customers of safe fare rates, fare calculation method, and the customer's option to get an estimated fare before undertaking a ride.
- Display of pictures of arriving TNC drivers to customers.
- Provision for electronic receipts to customers.
- Disclosures to drivers by the TNC of the TNC's insurance coverage, including potential non-coverage in certain circumstances.
- Confirmation of compliance with independent contractor requirements, e.g., TNC not requiring specific hours, not restricting the drivers' ability to work with other TNCs or for other employers; and existence of a written contract with each driver.
- Enforcement of zero tolerance for alcohol and drugs.
- Local and national criminal background check for each driver, including a multi-state criminal records check and a national sex offender record check.
- TNCs obtaining driving history for each driver.
- Nondiscrimination.
- TNC's ongoing maintenance of required records.

On a state-wide basis, this is a tall order. The foregoing does not even take into account the need for establishment of some system for penalties, e.g., fines, suspensions and revocations, in the event of noncompliance by a TNC company or its TNC drivers. This will also require some provision for due process

procedures, including hearings, if a TNC company or its driver contests the agency's enforcement of the law.

Based upon the foregoing, it is my opinion that the Fiscal Note for CSSB 14 should be increased from its current total of $280,000 to an amount commensurate with at least four new positions in DCCED.

The Anchorage Assembly, which has far longer experience than the Legislature in regulating transportation of passengers for hire, is currently considering an extensive, 23 page ordinance to regulate TNCs, which contains substantially more protections for taxicab customers, the public safety, and other considerations, which CCSB 14 lacks.

If, as provided in Section 7 of the committee substitute bill, the state intends to entirely preempt municipalities from regulating TNCs, then the state needs to step up with adequate staffing and resources to administer and enforce its own regulation of TNCs.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

James T. Brennan

JTB;rs
3851\083
cc: Laura Stidolph

Hello Representative Wool

I would like to express my concerns with HB132 regarding Transportation Network Companies. As i feel there are many things wrong with this bill, Insurance too low, Uber drives down wages, cities would have no say in this matter what so ever and would lose revenue from enforcement , state would lose money, fiscal note is too low (should be closer to $400K per year), Criminal background checks are inadequate by Juneau police departments standards.

Uber should pay, Everyone else pay's, Just in Juneau the taxi industry pay's about $200,000 in sales tax, and other fee's associated with being a taxi (and thats just Juneau). Think about how much the cities could get from Uber if it were regulated properly, money that could go to schools, roads, jobs, etc.. Instead this could let a $5 Billion dollar company in for FREE. Thats just crazy to me.

There are many many more but i would like to mention something that is even more important:

BUYERS REMORSE, What happens if this passes and Uber is not what it seems and we just gave them an open door to the ENTIRE state, what do we do? well unfortunately there isn't an easy answer to that from what I have read, Once we let them in (unregulated) it would cost a fortune to get rid of them, Or even try to add regulation later. Uber will fight it tooth and nail, they are doing that all over the world now. Taxi's have been around since 1911 and no they are not perfect, I've also heard bad things about doctors, pilots, police officers, etc.. But to think they are all bad because of a few peoples actions? I think thats wrong. Even taxi drivers deserve to have a chance to continue making a decent wage to support there families.

If people want Uber that's fine, But they need to be on a level playing field with everyone else, And the cities, Towns, And municipalities need to regulate them locally like everywhere else does.

Thank you for your time,
James Harris
907-723-1882

CITY/BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
ALASKA'S CAPITAL CITY

OFFICE OF THE MANAGER
Telephone: (907) 586-5240; Fax: (907) 586-5385
Rorie.Watt@juneau.org

March 9, 2017

The Honorable Sam Kito
Alaska State House of Representatives
Room 403, State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801

RE: Senate Bill 14 and House Bill 132 re: Transportation Network Companies

Dear Representative Kito:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on pending legislation in House Labor and Commerce relating to transportation network companies and transportation network drivers. The City and Borough of Juneau recently had a work session with the Committee of the Whole to discuss SB 14 and HB 132. That discussion resulted in a great deal of concern over Sections 7 and 8 in CS for HB 132 (TRA) and CS for SB 14 (FIN). These sections prohibit a municipality from enacting or enforcing an ordinance regulating transportation network companies or transportation network drivers.

While the City and Borough of Juneau does not generally oppose "transportation network companies" we object to the provisions in the legislation that prohibit a home rule municipality from enacting or enforcing local ordinances that may regulate them. The City and Borough of Juneau believes that regulating local transportation is a local issue and requests these sections be removed.

We believe regulating transportation businesses such as taxis and the newer technology-driven transportation network drivers at the local level is consistent with Article X Section 1 of the Alaska Constitution which states "The purpose of this article is to provide for maximum local self-government…"

Taxis are a good example of localized governance. Recognizing the importance of safety, especially in situations where persons in more vulnerable states – leaving bars late at night – Juneau elected to regulate taxis through our local police department requiring background checks for drivers utilizing fingerprints. In Anchorage, several incidents caused the Muni to require taxis to install cameras. While Anchorage and Juneau regulate taxi fares the City of Fairbanks has

decided not to regulate fares. These are just three examples of local governments enacting ordinances or not enacting ordinances to manage local concerns.

That said we also recognize that the legislature has the authority to remove local control where state policies are meant to further a specific statewide policy and to uniform statewide application. Ultimately, the decision as to whether the fairly new technology-driven "transportation networks" meet the need for local preemption for statewide uniformity is a question for the legislature.

While we prefer retaining local control, if the legislature deems statewide uniformity to be necessary we ask that local control be retained as much as practicable. In this instance we suggest you consider adding authority or clarifying that the following powers are left to local control:

- Ability to require transportation network drivers to register as a business with the municipality, in the same manner as other businesses.
- Ability to apply sales tax ordinances.
- Ability to enact and enforce ordinances, not specifically targeted to prohibiting transportation networks from conducting business in the municipality.

Another concern raised was the issue around sufficiency of background checks. Currently the legislation would prevent a municipality from requiring a background check that utilized fingerprints, a requirement currently enforced for taxi drivers doing business in Juneau. It's important to note that the Alaska Legislature currently requires fingerprint background checks for a myriad of reasons:

> *AS 12.62.400. National criminal history record checks for employment, licensing, and other noncriminal justice purposes.*
>
> *(a) To obtain a national criminal history record check for determining a person's qualifications for a license, permit, registration, employment, or position, a person shall submit the person's fingerprints to the department with the fee established by AS 12.62.160. The department may submit the fingerprints to the Federal Bureau of Investigation to obtain a national criminal history record check of the person for the purpose of evaluating a person's qualifications for*
>
> *(1) a license or conditional contractor's permit to manufacture, sell, offer for sale, possess for sale or barter, traffic in, or barter an alcoholic beverage under AS 04.11;*
>
> *(2) licensure as a mortgage lender, a mortgage broker, or a mortgage loan originator under AS 06.60;*
>
> *(3) admission to the Alaska Bar Association under AS 08.08;*
>
> *(4) licensure as a collection agency operator under AS 08.24;*
>
> *(5) a certificate of fitness to handle explosives under AS 08.52;*

(6) licensure as a massage therapist under AS 08.61;

(7) licensure to practice nursing or certification as a nurse aide under AS 08.68;

(8) certification as a real estate appraiser under AS 08.87;

(9) a position involving supervisory or disciplinary power over a minor or dependent adult for which criminal justice information may be released under AS 12.62.160(b)(9);

(10) a teacher certificate under AS 14.20;

(11) a registration or license to operate a marijuana establishment under AS 17.38;

(12) licensure as a security guard under AS 18.65.400 - 18.65.490;

(13) a concealed handgun permit under AS 18.65.700 - 18.65.790;

(14) licensure as an insurance producer, managing general agent, reinsurance intermediary broker, reinsurance intermediary manager, surplus lines broker, or independent adjuster under AS 21.27;

(15) serving and executing process issued by a court by a person designated under AS 22.20.130;

(16) a school bus driver license under AS 28.15.046;

(17) licensure as an operator or an instructor for a commercial driver training school under AS 28.17;

(18) registration as a broker-dealer, agent, investment adviser representative, or state investment adviser under AS 45.55.030 - 45.55.060.

We suggest that the legislation either provide for municipalities to regulate the sufficiency of a background check or that the legislature adopt a statewide standard that requires fingerprints under AS 12.62.400. We believe the need to ensure the safety of our residents when businesses are providing transportation is as important as requiring it for a substitute teacher making as little as $11.00 an hour, a massage therapist or teaching commercial driving.

Thank you again for providing an opportunity to comment. We believe it is very important to promote and preserve local control and allow the most flexibility at the local level of regulating local commercial transportation. Please let us know how we can constructively engage in the remaining days of this legislature.

Sincerely,

Duncan Rorie Watt
City and Borough Manager

Tally Teal

From: Rep. Sam Kito
Sent: Tuesday, March 07, 2017 4:43 PM
To: Tally Teal
Subject: FW: UBER/LYFT Transportation companies

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

-----Original Message-----
From: akhouse@belfast.servershost.net [mailto:akhouse@belfast.servershost.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 07, 2017 3:41 PM
To: Rep. Sam Kito <Rep.Sam.Kito.III@akleg.gov>
Subject: UBER/LYFT Transportation companies

From: Debbie White <debbie@isellalaska.com>
Subject: UBER/LYFT Transportation companies

Message Body:
Please make sure we have local authority. We've worked to hard to set up rules that protect the public: Insurance, driver health/physicals, vehicle condition, etc.

I hear you had some personal bad experience with a taxi but please don't punish an entire industry over one mistake.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Representative SAM KITO III (http://akhouse.org/rep_kito)

House Labor & Commerce: 3/12/17
cc: Sen Stedman:
cc: Rep Kriesethomkins:

Rarely, do we see as misguided a bill, in the legislature, as Senator Costellos' bill to promote internet taxi operators. Firms like Uber and Lyft. (SB 14)
Costellos' bill would usurpe municipal taxi management. And, replace it with a state system gamed to promote interstate "ride providers".
In doing so, it would sacrifice municipal oversight that regulates taxi fares (by imposing a ceiling on the maximum fares allowed, by city statute) and eliminating local screening of drivers with criminal backgrounds. Most of us, noted the Uber driver (Michigan, I think) who turned out to be a serial killer.
More importantly, the public should note, that, when you dial that interstate taxi service provider; 25% of the fare goes outside Alaska. And, that 25% is about half of the profit from ~~the~~ fare. Almost half the fare is expenses, for the operator. Money spent in other local businesses for fuel, tires, mechanics, etc.
The bills sponsors claim to be "promoting economic growth". In reality, they are reallocating existing

business to outside, ~~and~~ untaxed, out of state corporations. They claim they will promote efficiency, as "ride providers" would be "most active in times of peak demand." But, that's the problem, now. Too many "cherry-pickers", suck the profits out of the business. Without providing reliable service to the public. Where are they when you need them?

Real Cab drivers work long shifts to provide reliable service. So, that when you need a ride to the airport, or home from the bar, someone will actually respond to your request.

Costellos' bill would ~~simply~~ sacrifice public safety, and ship millions of dollars ~~(statewide)~~, in taxi revenues, outside Alaska.

It is my hope the Sitka City Assembly will ~~would~~ take a stand against SB 14.

Taxi operators, and drivers bust their ass for this community. They deserve more respect from the public, and legislators pandering to outside corporate interests.

[When you pinch half the profit from local operators' fares. There goes their money for vehicle maintenance. i.e. Public safety]

Sincerely
Sigurd Kettler
738 TAXI
Sitka

Tally Teal

From: Crystal Koeneman
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 2:51 PM
To: House Labor and Commerce
Subject: FW: HB 132

Importance: High

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Jon Bolling [mailto:jbolling@aptalaska.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 2:45 PM
To: Rep. Sam Kito <Rep.Sam.Kito.III@akleg.gov>
Cc: Rep. Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins <Rep.Jonathan.Kreiss-Tomkins@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 132
Importance: High

Hello Rep. Kito.

The City of Craig does not support HB 132 in its current form. It is important that the municipalities in which these vehicles for hire operate all be subject to local review, just as taxi and other vehicle for hire services are now. Craig has a long history of fairly regulating vehicles for hire. Our local requirements for vehicles for hire are simple: provide documentation of insurance; have vehicles checked by a mechanic for safety; have vehicles checked by local police officer for working lights, turn signals, and so on; commit to late hours of operation to provide the public with reliable transportation, especially to reduce the likelihood of intoxicated drivers; and other straightforward rules. Removing local review of Uber/Lyft-type vehicles for hire creates an unequal playing field.

Craig would welcome the addition of these new vehicle for hire services. Please do not adopt a bill that creates two different operating requirements for the same vehicle for hire service, while at the same time removing the opportunity for a modicum of oversight of one classification of this service.

Jon Bolling

Craig City Administrator

the city of
KENAI, ALASKA

"Village with a Past, City with a Future"

210 Fidalgo Avenue, Kenai, Alaska 99611-7794
Telephone: (907) 283-7535 / FAX: (907) 283-3014
www.ci.kenai.ak.us

March 16, 2017

The Honorable Sam Kito
Alaska State House of Representatives
120 4th Street,
Room 403 , State Capital
Juneau, AK 99801

RE: Senate Bill 14 and House Bill 132 re: Transportation and Network Companies

Dear Representative Kito:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on HB 132 pending in the House Labor and Commerce Committee. My primary concern with HB 132 is Section 8, which prohibits the City of Kenai and other municipalities from regulating transportation network companies and drivers. The City of Kenai, as a home rule municipality, should be able to regulate local transportation within the City. Regulating transportation within the City is consistent with the Article X Section 1 of the Alaska Constitution which provides for maximum local self-governance and a liberal construction for local powers. Please consider amending HB 132 to allow for a meaningful level of local control should the City desire to regulate transportation network companies and drivers to ensure fair business competition and safety within the City. I look forward to testifying when public comment is allowed.

Your consideration is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Paul Ostrander
City Manager

City of Ketchikan

March 17, 2017

The Honorable Sam Kito, Chair
House Labor & Commerce Committee
Alaska State House of Representatives
Rom 403, State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Representative Kito:

Re: Senate Bill No. 14 and House Bill No. 132, Acts Relating To Transportation Network Companies and Transportation Network Company Drivers

With regard to the above referenced subject, please be advised that at its meeting of March 16, 2017, the City Council considered Senate Bill No. 14 and House Bill No. 132, Acts Relating to Transportation Network Companies and Transportation Network Company Drivers. While the City Council has yet to take a formal position regarding "transportation network companies," the City of Ketchikan has significant concerns regarding the provisions of both bills that state:

> "The authority to regulate transportation network companies and transportation network drivers is reserved to the state, and, except as specifically provided by statute, a municipality may not enact or enforce an ordinance regulating transportation network drivers. This section applies to home rule and general law municipalities."

Unless modified and/or clarified, the City Council has expressed grave reservations over this language that would apparently limit the City's ability as a home rule municipality to address local transportation issues including, but not limited to, the following;

- application of local sales taxes;
- application of vehicle standards;
- the necessity of background checks for drivers;
- the requirement of adequate levels of insurance for vehicles operated under the auspices of transportation network companies;
- the ability to regulate vehicles operated by transportation network drivers wishing to access southeast Alaska ports of call;
- the application of standards imposed by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA); and

334 Front Street / Ketchikan, AK 99901 / PH: 907-225-3111 / FX: 907-225-5075

- the unfair competitive advantage over local cab companies that are required to apply for Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity to operate within the City of Ketchikan's jurisdiction.

If the Legislature continues to believe that statewide regulation of transportation network companies is necessary to provide uniformity across the state, the City Council respectfully requests that provisions be inserted in both bills to provide as much local control as necessary to address the specific concerns discussed above. The City of Ketchikan believes it is critically important to provide as much authority as possible at the local level to regulate commercial transportation entities. Such local oversight is necessary for the benefit of Ketchikan residents and the approximately one million cruise ship passengers that visit the community annually.

Should you have any questions on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Lew Williams III
Mayor

cc: Senator Bert Stedman
Representative Dan Ortiz
Councilmembers
Karl R. Amylon, City Manager
Katy Suiter, City Clerk

Tally Teal

From: Crystal Koeneman
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 10:14 AM
To: House Labor and Commerce
Subject: FW: House Bill 132 - Important online link

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Dennis Harris [mailto:customjuneautours@ejuneau.net]
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:18 AM
To: Rep. Sam Kito <Rep.Sam.Kito.III@akleg.gov>; Rep. Adam Wool <Rep.Adam.Wool@akleg.gov>; Representative.Andy.Josephseon@akleg.gov; Rep. Louise Stutes <Rep.Louise.Stutes@akleg.gov>; Rep. Chris Birch <Rep.Chris.Birch@akleg.gov>; Rep. Gary Knopp <Rep.Gary.Knopp@akleg.gov>; Rep. Colleen Sullivan-Leonard <Rep.Colleen.Sullivan-Leonard@akleg.gov>; Rep. Mike Chenault <Rep.Mike.Chenault@akleg.gov>; Rep. Bryce Edgmon <Rep.Bryce.Edgmon@akleg.gov>
Subject: House Bill 132 - Important online link

Dear Labor & Commerce Committee member:

I believe that you will find the online article regarding Uber to be very informative as your committee considers House Bill 132 today:

https://motherboard.vice.com/en_us/article/its-time-to-force-uber-to-tell-the-government-how-it-works

The article refers to a University of Washington research paper published this week that provides a much more in-depth look at "sharing economy" firms:

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2929643

Thank you for your careful consideration of this bill.

Dennis P. Harris
12th Street LLC
544 W 12th St
Juneau, AK 99801-1524

Cell (907) 209-8387
customjuneautours@ejuneau.net
http://www.customjuneautours.com
Like my Facebook page: https://www.facebook.com/JuneauCustomTours

CITY OF FAIRBANKS

Jim Matherly, Mayor

800 CUSHMAN STREET
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701-4615
OFFICE: 907-459-6793
FAX: 907-459-6787
jmatherly@fairbanks.us

03/01/2017

The Honorable Adam Wool
House of Representatives
Alaska State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Re: Opposition to Section 7 in HB132 - Transportation Network Companies

Dear Representative Wool:

This letter is to respectfully inform you that the City of Fairbanks opposes HB132 as it is currently written. My specific objection is the explicit provision pre-empting local authority to regulate transportation network companies. The City believes that it should be the municipality's decision to regulate vehicles for hire and not dictated by the State. Our opposition would be removed if the bill were to include an opt-in and/or opt-out provision. The concept that this bill is addressing is sound; the regulating authority is where our concern lies.

Thank you for all your efforts on behalf of this great State.

Sincerely,

Mayor Jim Matherly

ALASKA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
Alaska Conference of Mayors

One Sealaska Plaza, Suite 200 • Juneau, Alaska 99801
Tel (907) 586-1325 • Fax (907) 463-5480 • www.akml.org

March 21, 2017

House Labor & Commerce Committee
Rep. Sam Kito,
Alaska State House
Room 403
Juneau, Alaska 99801

RE: HB 132 – Transportation network Companies

Dear Rep. Kito and members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this bill which has such an impact on local governments.

I must mention my disappointment in the process thus far. Throughout the committee hearing process, all invited testimony has been granted to out-of-state business people. When it was time for Alaskans to testify, there was suddenly a two-minute time allowance with no questions allowed by committee members. These bills are passed for the benefit of Alaska AND Alaskans.

I realize there were many people wanting to testify, but that shows how important this bill is and perhaps why the committee needs to ask questions and understand the issue as thoroughly as possible. What was especially troubling was the "local government" expert from Washington, DC, who obviously had never been to Alaska, never talked to Alaska municipalities and probably has no plan to ever show up here yet, was given unlimited time for questions.

I would like to list AML's objections to this bill since the two minutes did not afford me the opportunity cover the bill's shortcomings:

- AML finds it troubling that HB 132 erodes Section 10 of the State Constitution calling for "maximum local self-governance." HB 132 represents a radical departure from long standing precedent to honor local option when adopting legislation so important to local governance.

- This concern is compounded by the state reserving all regulatory authority to itself and THEN refusing to fund any state oversight or enforcement. (no fiscal note and no finance referral)

- HB 132 preempts local sales taxing authority, which essentially means local governments must pay for local infrastructure and public services, such as roads and police protection provided to TNC's, without the means to pay for those services. On the other hand, local taxi companies pay for these public services through sales taxes like other any entity which does business in a municipality. HB 132 provides special and exclusive exemption for TNCs and their drivers from local taxation and regulation. In our view this is poor public policy and unfair to other local government tax payers. It also is very unfair for the state to set up a special class of business with such unfair competitive advantages to local taxi companies who pay local taxes and are locally regulated. Who pays to provide the multitude of local services which must be provided to TNCs and their drivers?

- Competition is welcomed by municipalities, but HB 132 sets up an unfair competitive scheme.

- Local governments regulate entire transportation "systems" in their community. Allowing a number (?) of new cars in the mix that will be part of this system but that are "untouchable" by the actual local regulators is unwise and an invitation for some serious safety violations.

- HB 132 reserves the regulatory authority exclusively to the state but **doesn't** name an agency to oversee and enforce the regulations **nor** does it fund such state regulation. AML believes this is a serious legal flaw which will leave the public interest unprotected and will engender needless litigation and associated costs for local governments, businesses and citizens.

- While TNCs refer to themselves as a "ride sharing" company, remember, they are a **for-profit business**, just like the cab companies.

- The State of Alaska has over 140 boards and commissions that regulate everyone from hairdressers to massage therapists..... but these TNCs would be exempt from regulation? Who in state government will provide regulatory oversight and enforcement with no funds or regulation authority?

- During invited testimony, the Uber rep, when asked why they did not want local regulation, said, "We would **rather** have one set of regulations." The word "rather" is a fairly loose word on which to build public policy.

- Utilities and transportation systems are regulated in the State of Alaska to protect the citizen. Rates under TNCs are not consistent. They change according to the traffic/weather/etc. Whether regulation of rates is wise is not the issue as much as the regulation of "some" rates and not others.

- The most important overarching deficiency in the bill is the rather comprehensive system of statutory compliance requirements including record keeping, insurance, disclosures, contractor requirements, criminal background checks,

driving record checks, etc. WITHOUT naming a funded state regulatory agency to enforce them AND simultaneously preempting ALL local regulation. This seems irresponsible, poor public policy and sets a terrible precedent for local governments and their citizens.

In summary, the Alaska Municipal League finds the Legislature's attempts to preempt local control and/or regulation (which includes taxes) to be highly objectionable.

AML urges the committee to adopt a local opt in or opt out provision which preserves long standing municipal prerogative.

Sincerely,

Kathie Wasserman

Kathie Wasserman
Executive Director

Inspiring Personal Independence

SOUTHEAST ALASKA INDEPENDENT LIVING

3225 Hospital Dr, Suite 300, Juneau, Alaska 99801, 1-800-478-SAIL, ph/tty: 907-586-4920, fx: 907-586-4980

March 21, 2017

Re: SB14——-HB132—

Dear Legislator,

I'm writing to share my opposition to HB132/SB 14. I'm opposed to the bill for several reasons including concern for the safety of Alaskans and unfair competition that could result in less availability of accessible (ramp or lift equipped) taxis for seniors and people with disabilities.

I have been involved with Alaska transportation issues for quite some time. Here in Juneau, my agency, Southeast Alaska Independent Living, Inc. (SAIL) partners w/ a local taxi co. to provide ramp-equipped taxi service. And we've done this for over a decade. SAIL has also been working in partnership with the City of KTN to promote accessible taxi service. Just last week the KTN City Council introduced an ordinance to incentivize the use of ramp-equipped taxis.

It is my understanding that the bill would override local regulations and prevent new local regulations about TNC (Transportation Network Companies). I believe this would be a tremendous mistake.

- Taxicab drivers possess an expensive form of insurance—primary commercial auto liability insurance coverage—that covers street hails. This type of insurance typically costs $3-5,000 annually per vehicle. Without regulation of insurance coverage, as in this bill, Alaskans will be less safe;
- TNC's have driven down wages for taxi drivers wherever they go;
- TNC's will not pay cities or the state anything. This will equate to tremendous lost revenue to our municipalities in sales taxes, inspections, fees, permitting, etc.
    - Municipalities need this money for schools, roads, etc.
    - If traditional taxi companies are forced out of business:
        - the City and Borough of Juneau, for example, would lose $50k to $200k per year in tax revenue
        - and the little headway we've made promoting accessible taxis would be lost;
- Lax background checks are also not a good thing. For example, in Juneau drivers are required to have a ten year background check, not the mere seven years proposed by this bill. Again, this means Alaskans are less safe.
- This bill would allow price gauging. TNC's have surge pricing, whenever there is high demand such as during peak-volume times, emergencies or natural disasters, TNC's have been known to raise their price 2x, even 10x...certainly unaffordable for many. Again, this would not a good thing for Alaskans.

In closing, TNC's are billion dollar+ industries that should pay to operate like everyone else. This bill provides an unfair advantage to TNC's over other businesses, make Alaskans less safe, and should traditional taxi companies fold, make accessible taxis for our seniors and people with disabilities far less available, if not obsolete. Please do not pass this bill.

Sincerely,

Joan O'Keefe

From:	Crystal Koeneman
To:	House Labor and Commerce
Subject:	FW: HB 132
Date:	Monday, March 27, 2017 10:54:28 AM

From: Victoria dance [mailto:magicdance10@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 26, 2017 12:59 AM
To: Rep. Sam Kito <Rep.Sam.Kito.III@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 132

Dear Mr. Kito,

Uber has a terrible reputation. Just recently they've had a tumultuous few weeks after several negative stories about their workplace practices and ethics. Even the "captains" are jumping ship.

Several executives are quitting, including the president, Jeff Jones. Why bring this company into Alaska? Please don't support HB 132.

Thank you,

Victoria Dance

2695 David St.

Juneau

From: Crystal Koeneman
To: House Labor and Commerce
Subject: FW: HB132-SB14
Date: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 1:23:48 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: James Harris [mailto:juneautaxi2@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 4:24 PM
To: Rep. Sam Kito <Rep.Sam.Kito.III@akleg.gov>; Rep. Andy Josephson <Rep.Andy.Josephson@akleg.gov>; Rep. Louise Stutes <Rep.Louise.Stutes@akleg.gov>; Rep. Gary Knopp <Rep.Gary.Knopp@akleg.gov>; Rep. Colleen Sullivan-Leonard <Rep.Colleen.Sullivan-Leonard@akleg.gov>; Rep. Chris Birch <Rep.Chris.Birch@akleg.gov>; Rep. Bryce Edgmon <Rep.Bryce.Edgmon@akleg.gov>; Rep. Chris Tuck <Rep.Chris.Tuck@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB132-SB14

representatives,

I would like to mention that under current Bill (HB132) there is no requirement for medical exams for TNC drivers. It is imperative that transportation drivers have regular medical exams, This is very common and in most cities and states TNC drivers have medical exams performed by a qualified physician, In Juneau this is done bi-anaully and we use a CDL type physical. Yes, This would rule out certain individuals people with heart problems, certain types of diabetes, high bold pressure, vision and hearing problems possibly, Ect… I can see no reason that this cannot be agreed on by this committee.

This bill written as is, A Taxi driver who fails a medical exam could immediately go and drive for a TNC.
This is very common exam and most drivers providing commercial transportation get a physical. There is very little in this bill to protect passengers as it stands please amend to add medical exams, This should be a no brainer.

Thank you
James Harris
907-723-1882

ALASKA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
Alaska Conference of Mayors

One Sealaska Plaza, Suite 200 • Juneau, Alaska 99801
Tel (907) 586-1325 • Fax (907) 463-5480 • www.akml.org

March 30, 2017

Rep. Sam Kito, Sr.
House Labor & Commerce Committee
State Capitol Building
Juneau, Alaska 99801

RE: SB 14 – Transportation Network Companies

Dear Rep. Kito and members of the Committee,

I am attaching my earlier letter of March 21, 2017 which identifies AML's concerns with HB 132. All of AML's concerns with HB 132 remain with SB 14.

SB 14 is vague and ambiguous as to whether there is any remaining local control. In fact, the bill states that,

"The authority to regulate…is reserved to the state…except as specifically provided by statute." (See Section 8).

In contrast, the Senate debate included statements that local governments **could** require a local business license, impose sales taxes and enforce local ordinances regulating traffic, parking and zoning. SB 14 needs to "clearly" resolve the extent of local control. As written, the bill is simply too ambiguous. AML prefers clarity on these important issues.

Also, please note that SB 14 does not address the issue of airport management vis a vis TNCs, either for the state DOT or for municipally-owned airports. This is an important issue which also needs to be addressed.

The other major issue is that while SB 14 includes some minimal state TNC regulations, it fails to designate a state agency to oversee or enforce them. Moreover, there is no funding for that function in any case.

After speaking with my peers throughout the U.S., it appears this bill is being pushed across the country…….with varying degrees of success……..and varying degrees of problems. We would like to state other related concerns which we believe shows the need for regulation.

1. Why should profit-making businesses be able to utilize local government services (police protection; road maintenance; etc.) without paying for them in the form of sales tax, like those imposed on all other businesses.
2. Why should our State government financially support (through local tax exemptions, etc.) one business model above all others?

3. In light of new reports on recent problems with TNCs (privacy breaches; complete non-involvement concerning accidents involving TNC drivers; charge of accident damages foisted on TNC riders; etc.), why would there be NO ONE regulating these issues if and when they do arise?

AML supports the local option amendment as proposed earlier. This amendment allows local government bodies the option of local regulation if they choose to exercise that power, consistent with Article X, Section 1 of the Alaska State Constitution.

AML questions the policy which allows a single, favored business model to be given special treatment to the detriment of local governments and their citizens. AML does NOT oppose TNCs, but firmly believes TNCs need to abide by the same rules that apply to other businesses which offer similar services. Pre-empting local control is not an acceptable way to address TNC business model issues.

We strongly recommend that these issues be resolved.

Sincerely,

Kathie Wasserman

Kathie Wasserman
Executive Director

ALASKA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
Alaska Conference of Mayors

One Sealaska Plaza, Suite 200 • Juneau, Alaska 99801
Tel (907) 586-1325 • Fax (907) 463-5480 • www.akml.org

March 21, 2017

House Labor & Commerce Committee
Rep. Sam Kito,
Alaska State House
Room 403
Juneau, Alaska 99801

RE: HB 132 – Transportation network Companies

Dear Rep. Kito and members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this bill which has such an impact on local governments.

I must mention my disappointment in the process thus far. Throughout the committee hearing process, all invited testimony has been granted to out-of-state business people. When it was time for Alaskans to testify, there was suddenly a two-minute time allowance with no questions allowed by committee members. These bills are passed for the benefit of Alaska AND Alaskans.

I realize there were many people wanting to testify, but that shows how important this bill is and perhaps why the committee needs to ask questions and understand the issue as thoroughly as possible. What was especially troubling was the "local government" expert from Washington, DC, who obviously had never been to Alaska, never talked to Alaska municipalities and probably has no plan to ever show up here yet, was given unlimited time for questions.

I would like to list AML's objections to this bill since the two minutes did not afford me the opportunity cover the bill's shortcomings:

- AML finds it troubling that HB 132 erodes Section 10 of the State Constitution calling for "maximum local self-governance." HB 132 represents a radical departure from long standing precedent to honor local option when adopting legislation so important to local governance.

- This concern is compounded by the state reserving all regulatory authority to itself and THEN refusing to fund any state oversight or enforcement. (no fiscal note and no finance referral)

- HB 132 preempts local sales taxing authority, which essentially means local governments must pay for local infrastructure and public services, such as roads and police protection provided to TNC's, without the means to pay for those services. On the other hand, local taxi companies pay for these public services through sales taxes like other any entity which does business in a municipality. HB 132 provides special and exclusive exemption for TNCs and their drivers from local taxation and regulation. In our view this is poor public policy and unfair to other local government tax payers. It also is very unfair for the state to set up a special class of business with such unfair competitive advantages to local taxi companies who pay local taxes and are locally regulated. Who pays to provide the multitude of local services which must be provided to TNCs and their drivers?

- Competition is welcomed by municipalities, but HB 132 sets up an unfair competitive scheme.

- Local governments regulate entire transportation "systems" in their community. Allowing a number (?) of new cars in the mix that will be part of this system but that are "untouchable" by the actual local regulators is unwise and an invitation for some serious safety violations.

- HB 132 reserves the regulatory authority exclusively to the state but **doesn't** name an agency to oversee and enforce the regulations **nor** does it fund such state regulation. AML believes this is a serious legal flaw which will leave the public interest unprotected and will engender needless litigation and associated costs for local governments, businesses and citizens.

- While TNCs refer to themselves as a "ride sharing" company, remember, they are a **for-profit business**, just like the cab companies.

- The State of Alaska has over 140 boards and commissions that regulate everyone from hairdressers to massage therapists..... but these TNCs would be exempt from regulation? Who in state government will provide regulatory oversight and enforcement with no funds or regulation authority?

- During invited testimony, the Uber rep, when asked why they did not want local regulation, said, "We would **rather** have one set of regulations." The word "rather" is a fairly loose word on which to build public policy.

- Utilities and transportation systems are regulated in the State of Alaska to protect the citizen. Rates under TNCs are not consistent. They change according to the traffic/weather/etc. Whether regulation of rates is wise is not the issue as much as the regulation of "some" rates and not others.

- The most important overarching deficiency in the bill is the rather comprehensive system of statutory compliance requirements including record keeping, insurance, disclosures, contractor requirements, criminal background checks,

driving record checks, etc. WITHOUT naming a funded state regulatory agency to enforce them AND simultaneously preempting ALL local regulation. This seems irresponsible, poor public policy and sets a terrible precedent for local governments and their citizens.

In summary, the Alaska Municipal League finds the Legislature's attempts to preempt local control and/or regulation (which includes taxes) to be highly objectionable.

AML urges the committee to adopt a local opt in or opt out provision which preserves long standing municipal prerogative.

Sincerely,

Kathie Wasserman

Kathie Wasserman
Executive Director

From:	Skyler Mazon
To:	Rep. Sam Kito
Subject:	HB132
Date:	Thursday, March 30, 2017 12:55:53 PM

I feel it is important for local regulation. It promotes fair competition by holding vehicles that operate at a commercial capacity to certain standards. Ride Share services who operate unrestricted will have an unfair advantage because they won't be subject to local regulation. Please keep this in mind when considering House Bill 132, thank you.

Skyler Mazon
2806 John Street
Juneau, Alaska 99801

From: jotnorth.jt
To: Rep. Sam Kito
Subject: Hi Mr. Kito
Date: Thursday, March 30, 2017 12:38:29 PM

I am writing today to ask you to advocate for local control in the event uber and lyft come to Alaska.
The playing field needs to be level with medical exams, strict background checks and fees and taxes at the same requirements as local taxis comply with.
These large companies will be taking millions of dollars directly out of state at the expense of local companies and independent drivers (small business owners).
In addition we independent small business owners who drive taxis are business license holders.
We also have commercial insurance policies.
Please consider these things as you move forward.

Sincerely,
John G. Tribuzio
Juneau, Ak

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy Express 3, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

Tally Teal

From: Whitney Noziská <carpe_diem50@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2017 10:51 PM
To: Rep. Sam Kito; Rep. Justin Parish
Subject: Please No Uber

Categories: Committee

Hello Sam & Justin,

I'm writing to oppose the Uber bill you'll be conducting hearings for on Friday.

Everything I've read about how these transportation network companies work takes a similar trajectory: shiny, happy start marked by an increasing uptick in exploitative practices as the need for headquarter profits goes up. Customers and Corporation are left content: Drivers get squeezed.

We don't need another non-AK-based company to set up shop here and leave little good in its wake. One that pays some low-wage/low-skill local worker to do the drudge work, while the profits get siphoned and shipped off to build another community.

If Juneau's desperate to offer app-based transportation to tourists, let's pass an initiative that encourages our local high school students/coding club to create one that keeps our specific concerns and community in mind. That way Alaskans, not the New York Stock Exchange and Silicon Valley, will enjoy all the potential benefit, as well as have a direct say in how it's set up and run, so we're able to protect the pay and people in our own city and state.

Sincerely,

Whitney A. Noziska

Tally Teal

From: Debbie White <debbie@isellalaska.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2017 3:24 PM
To: Rep. Sam Kito
Subject: ride-sharing

Ride sharing - Please don't forget LOCAL CONTROL! We have rules for a reason.

I get that you are mad at taxi drivers over something, and I do not need to know the story.

All we are asking for is a level playing field, with everyone playing by the same rules.

Debbie White, Broker/Owner
Southeast Alaska Real Estate
8585 Old Dairy Road #102
Juneau, AK 99801

907-789-5533 Office
907-789-5504 Fax
907-723-9886 Direct/Cell

On Mon, Mar 27, 2017 at 5:48 PM, Rep. Sam Kito <Rep.Sam.Kito.III@akleg.gov> wrote:

March 27, 2017

Tally Teal

From: FBKS Taxi <alaskacab@gci.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2017 6:34 PM
To: Rep. Sam Kito
Subject: SB14

Mr. Kito

It was brought to my attention that SB14 had been introduced, so I thought I would chime in my two cents worth.

I'm a firm believer in the free market, but we all need to be on the same playing field, I don't think the state should just open the door to some multi billion dollar company, completely unregulated, while I spend tens of thousands a year on state and city licensing and permits, along with commercial auto insurance to operate my taxi cab business. Lets not kid ourselves, Transportation network companies are acting as taxi companies, they are summoned to pick people up and provide transportation for money.

I have been told it will cost the state hundreds of thousands of dollars if TNC's are allowed to operate in Alaska, can we afford this?

Thank You
Eric Olson
Fairbanks Taxi Services LLC.
PO Box 80927
Fairbanks,Alaska 99708
907-452-5976

Tally Teal

From: James Harris <juneautaxi@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2017 8:36 AM
To: Rep. Sam Kito
Subject: HB132

Representative Kito,

First let me start by thanking your taking the time to meet with me yesterday. I would like to mention a couple of points that was brought up during the meeting.

Uber "ridesharing" I did some looking into it and you were correct, Uber does offer this service and its called Uberpool. Though i can tell you that this service is very limited and only offered in 29 cities of the nearly 600 cities Uber operates in.

Another point that was mentioned was drivers taking direct trips from passengers, this happens daily with taxi's. However this is not allowed with an Uber (another reason the state does not see them as independent contractors) But the fact of the matter is Uber drivers do this regularly also. When an uber driver does this its called a "cash trip" (not allowed) i will give you an example with an article I found http://gawker.com/nyc-has-impounded-500-uber-cars-since-april-for-picking-1712012779 In my mind this proves the need for enforcement for Uber. In Juneau, Taxi's have a half million dollar policy plus 100k per passenger medical, When an Uber does a "cash trip" they are extremely underinsured with 150k insurance, The higher insurance kicks in ONLY when they have a passenger booked through the App. So basically if an Uber driver gets a call on there cell phone for a pick up of if they pick up a passenger off the street they will not have full coverage.

Traveling between towns, I have researched this and as long as the origin of the trip started in an authorized area the destination would be of no concern provided they are within there insurance radius. (Taxi's also do this)

Cost to the state, As you know Alaska has a large deficit to deal with and I would hope that adding 200k to 400k for enforcement on Uber would be the right direction for all of us. Letting Uber in free of charge in my mind makes 0 sense, A lot of cities use Uber's money to help with deficits… example: philadelphia they use 2/3 of the money made off Uber to help subsidize the school district. Uber is a 5 billion dollar corporation, When any other HUGE corporations come in they usually invest somewhat in the cities or state, This is not the case at all with Uber, In fact I can't think of a single way they would spend money here.On top of that 25% of the money people spend on uber leaves as soon as there card is swiped. Some people may say well we are getting more jobs, The problem with that is that Uber drives down wages wherever they go, So do we really need more low paying jobs?

In closing, I feel this bill is over reaching and unnecessary, Uber does not need an open door to the entire state to effectively operate in Alaska. Let the cities and towns decide if they want Uber, And let local regulations decide the terms for Ubers entrance.

Thank you for your valuable time,
James Harris