



June 6, 2017

Governor Bill Walker
Alaska State Capitol
P.O.B. 110001
Juneau, Alaska 99811

RE: HB 132 – Transportation Network Companies – Veto Request

Dear Governor Walker,

The Alaska Municipal League respectfully requests that you veto HB 132.

This legislation is badly flawed as it undermines local governments, threatens public safety and lacks any oversight and enforcement mechanisms. It is simply poor public policy as it is currently drafted.

The following are specific practical problems and legal deficiencies of HB 132:

- AML finds it troubling that HB 132 erodes Section 10 of the State Constitution calling for “maximum local self-governance.” HB 132 represents a potentially unconstitutional departure from long-standing precedent to honor local option when adopting legislation so important to local governance. Section 8 of the bill reserves (preempting local control) regulation authority over TNC and TNC drivers to the state. The only exceptions are for sales taxes and traffic ordinances; otherwise TNC and its drivers are not subject to any local regulation. This creates enormous problems for local governments. For example:
 - Locally owned airports – The Legislation allows State-owned airports to regulate TNCs, especially with regards to passenger waiting zones. That regulation ability was NOT given to municipally-owned airports. Therefore, cabs must wait in “cab zones” and TNCs will be able to pull up anywhere.
 - Differing safety requirements from taxis – cabs must go through a municipally regulated vehicle safety inspection before transporting customers. This requirement has been removed for TNCs.
 - Differing background checks from other transportation drivers – Municipalities have set up background check parameters for all transportation drivers within their municipality. Uber argues that this blocks out drivers from getting a “second chance” after a mistake.
 - Disabled passengers treated differently. TNC companies will not have to provide Handicap Accessible Vehicles.

- People traveling using Medicaid vouchers, especially disabled travelers, will suffer from decreased service since TNCs only take credit cards.
- TNC drivers will be able to use valuable downtown parking spaces rather than traditional “cab zones.”
- After testifying many times during the process, AML was able to insert the ability for municipalities to charge a sales tax on TNC trips. However, with no State authority and with TNCs being responsible to basically no one, it will be difficult to keep track of who TNC drivers are and of their business transactions.
- These concerns are compounded by the state reserving all regulatory authority to itself while simultaneously refusing to fund any state oversight or enforcement OR to identify any state agency that might exercise those powers. Literally, there is no one to call if a TNC fails to follow any state regulations. This is a very serious flaw, especially in the light of the rash of regulatory violations which seem to follow Uber in most locations in which it conducts business. (See attached reports outlining many unresolved legal issues and investigations of UBER from around the country). The U.S. Justice Department has an open criminal investigation into Uber for evading regulators using software called “Greyball.” Why would Alaska invite such a company(s) into our state without any local or state oversight or enforcement mechanisms. AML suggests that it is very questionable public policy, indeed.
- Competition is welcomed by municipalities, but HB 132 sets up unfair competition.
- Local governments regulate entire transportation “systems” in their community. Allowing a number (?) of additional cars and drivers into the mix of the system that are “untouchable” by the municipality is unwise and an invitation for some serious safety violations.
- While TNCs refer to themselves as “ride-sharing” companies, please remember they are all “for-profit”, publically owned businesses. Cab companies that will be negatively impacted by HB 132 are usually owned by local Alaska business owners.
- The State of Alaska has over 140 boards and commissions that regulate everyone from hairdressers to massage therapists.....but these TNCs, who will be responsible for transporting ourselves, our friends and our family members will be exempt from local regulation? While the bill is full of misleading information, inferring that State oversight will be provided, we at the local level are concerned with the ramifications when things begin to go wrong and it is realized there IS no regulatory authority (state or local) and no funding to provide what the bill requires.
- Utility rates and transportation system rates are regulated in the State of Alaska to protect the citizen. Rates under TNCs are never consistent. They change according to the traffic/weather/time of day/etc. Whether regulation of rates is wise is not the issue as much as the regulation of “some” rates and not others.
- In summary, perhaps the most important overarching deficiency is the failure to name a funded state regulatory agency to enforce HB 132 TNC requirements AND simultaneously preempting nearly all local regulation. This seems

irresponsible, poor public policy and sets a terrible precedent which threatens local governments and its citizens.

- We note that the Municipality of Anchorage recently adopted a comprehensive set of regulations to address issues related to TNCs and TNC drivers. HB 132 completely overrides this local regulatory structure in favor of a state-wide system, absent oversight or enforcement mechanisms. This is very objectionable and unfair to all Alaska local governments who wish to exercise local control and to long-standing local transportation companies who have lawfully operated under local regulations for years.
- We note that HB 132 allows for local governments to “prohibit” TNCs from doing business in their communities after the local government puts the issue on a regular election ballot (Section 8.c). This prohibits the local governing elected body from making that decision and prohibits them from regulating TNCs. Most municipalities would welcome TNCs, but not under the “my way or the highway” scenario. The election provision is inadequate, expensive and cumbersome. This is a hollow concession to local control.

In summary, the Alaska Municipal League finds the Legislature’s attempts to preempt local control and/or regulation, to be highly objectionable. AML respectfully urges you to exercise your veto to preserve long-standing municipal prerogative and state-wide public safety.

Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kathie Wasserman". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Kathie Wasserman
Executive Director

Attachments

The Washington Post

The Switch

Justice Department opens criminal probe into Uber

By Elizabeth Dvoskin and Craig Timberg May 4

The Department of Justice has launched a criminal investigation into Uber's use of a secret software that was used to evade authorities in places where its ride-hailing service was banned or restricted, according to a person familiar with the government's probe.

The investigation is in its early stages, but deepens the crisis for the embattled company and its chief executive and founder Travis Kalanick, who has faced a barrage of negative press this year in the wake of high-profile sexual harassment complaints, a slew of high-level executive departures, and a consequential trade secrets lawsuit from Google's parent company.

The federal criminal probe, first reported by Reuters, focuses on software developed by Uber called "Greyball." The program helped the company evade officials in cities where Uber was not yet approved. The software identified and blocked rides to transportation regulators who were posing as Uber customers to prove that the company was operating illegally.

Uber declined to comment on the criminal investigation. The Department of Justice declined to comment, citing its practice of not confirming or denying possible investigations.

In a letter last week to Portland authorities, who had requested information about the program as part of a civil probe, Uber said greyballing refers to the practice of showing some customers a different version of the app than most customers see. Uber's attorneys said the program was used "exceedingly sparingly" in

Portland, and that the company had not used it since April 2015, when Portland adopted preliminary rules allowing Uber to operate.

Uber, which is valued privately by investors at close to \$70 billion, has a reputation among Silicon Valley companies for a hard-charging workplace culture that is driven by Kalanick himself. The 40-year-old is known as a quick-tempered and combative manager who aims to win-at-all costs and inspires fierce loyalty in his inner circle.

In its earlier years, the company employed cutthroat tactics against its competitor Lyft. At one point, Uber employees would summon Lyft drivers and then cancel rides. Kalanick once bragged about a feature, called “God View,” which it used to track a journalist and other noteworthy individuals. He has charged into legal battles with transportation regulators and taxi drivers in cities across the world.

Until recently, Uber emerged from its many controversies relatively unscathed. It had been on a rocket-ship trajectory, raising more than \$12 billion in venture capital, poaching executive talent from Google, and setting up shop in hundreds of cities.


But a series of crises this year have rocked the company and shaken Kalanick to his core, according to people who know him.

In February, a female engineer wrote a blog post about a traumatizing experience of sexual harassment and retaliation from the company’s human resources department. After the post went viral, Kalanick apologized and hired former Attorney General Eric Holder to investigate the allegations.

The crises continued when, later that month, Kalanick was videotaped verbally attacking an Uber driver who complained about the company’s wages. The videotape also went viral, and was followed by more negative press and a slew of executive departures.

Also in February, the company was slammed with a massive trade secrets lawsuit from its competitor in self-driving cars, Waymo. Waymo, which is the self-driving car division of Google’s parent company, charged Uber and a former Google employee of stealing 14,000 documents detailing Waymo’s proprietary technology. Waymo has requested that a judge temporarily block Uber’s self-driving program for the duration of the lawsuit.

Kalanick seemed to acknowledge the gravity of the growing crisis in a recent letter to the staff. “I must fundamentally change as a leader and grow up,” he wrote. “This is the first time I’ve been willing to admit that I need leadership help and I intend to get it.”

Elizabeth Dvoskin is The Washington Post's Silicon Valley Correspondent.  Follow @lizzadvoskin

Craig Timberg is a national technology reporter for The Post.  Follow @craigtimberg

Uber admits to underpaying New York City drivers millions

BY DAN RIVOLI CHRISTOPHER BRENNAN

NEW YORK DAILY NEWS Updated: Tuesday, May 23, 2017, 7:16 PM



Uber admitted Tuesday that it had shorted New York City drivers to the tune of \$45 million, according to one estimate. (MARK RALSTON/AFP/GETTY IMAGES)

Uber is set to pay tens of millions of dollars to city drivers after cheating them on wages since 2014.

The San Francisco-based e-hail company said Tuesday that it had miscalculated the commission it took from the drivers, taking its 25% cut before accounting for sales tax and a fee for a workers compensation fund.

It is not immediately clear how much money Uber will be shelling out for the error.

Tens of thousands of drivers, including those who are no longer active, will receive an average of about \$900.

The Independent Drivers Guild says that it represents 50,000 members for different rideshare companies meaning it could total reach \$45 million.

Without disclosing the total amount, Uber said it is "committed to making it right by paying every driver every penny they are owed — plus interest — as quickly as possible," regional manager Rachel Holt said in a statement to the Daily News.

"We are working hard to regain driver trust, and that means being transparent, sticking to our word, and making the Uber experience better from end to end."

© 2016 New York Daily News



Uber's Terms and Conditions: *How a ride could cost you more than just a fare.*

(Based on Uber's terms and conditions last updated on April 8, 2015)

When it comes to Uber's safety promises, it's a game of great illusion!

Uber regularly trumpets its concern about passenger safety. But in reality this multi-billion-dollar corporation does everything it can to avoid responsibility when it comes to the wellbeing of its passengers. What most riders don't know is that they unknowingly absolve Uber of any and all wrongdoing before they even step into a car.

Uber's terms and conditions (which passengers agree to by using the app) detail its refusal to accept accountability for all incidents that may occur. Uber's fine print states:

"... YOU AGREE THAT UBER HAS NO RESPONSIBILITY OR LIABILITY TO YOU RELATED TO ANY TRANSPORTATION, GOODS OR LOGISTICS SERVICES PROVIDED TO YOU BY THIRD PARTY PROVIDERS..."

Despite this abdication of responsibility, Uber continues to announce "safety" measures, intending to quell public concern the company's business practices are substandard. Uber's efforts to dodge all legal ramifications continue in another section:

"UBER DOES NOT GUARANTEE THE QUALITY, SUITABILITY, SAFETY OR ABILITY OF THIRD PARTY PROVIDERS."

What happened to Uber's claims that its background checks effectively screen out harmful individuals? How can Uber reassure cities that its notoriously poor background checks protect their citizens while simultaneously accepting no obligation for passenger safety?

"YOU AGREE THAT THE ENTIRE RISK ARISING OUT OF YOUR USE OF THE SERVICES, AND ANY SERVICE OR GOOD REQUESTED IN CONNECTION THEREWITH, REMAINS SOLELY WITH YOU, TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT PERMITTED UNDER APPLICABLE LAW."

The conclusion is crystal clear: Unlike licensed, liable transportation companies, Uber and its army of lawyers are doing everything they can to lay the consequences of a dangerous ride at the feet of the passenger. In Uber's world, users acquire all of the risk, while the corporation reaps massive financial rewards. They're the great illusionists of the Transportation Network Companies. Don't be misled by the 'smoke and mirrors.'

Uber's full current terms and conditions can be read here: <https://www.uber.com/legal/usa/terms>

Fact Sheet Issued: July 2, 2015

These terms are still in effect as of February 26, 2017

'Who's Driving You?' is a public safety initiative designed to educate the public about the dangers of unlicensed transportation services. It was launched by the Taxicab, Limousine & Paratransit Association, an international non-profit trade association whose membership consists of 1,100 regulated transportation companies. For more information, visit www.WhosDrivingYou.org, follow us on Twitter (@WhosDrivingYou) and follow us on Facebook ([facebook.com/WhosDrivingYou](https://www.facebook.com/WhosDrivingYou))

Thousands of current Uber, Lyft drivers fail new background checks



CRAIG F. WALKER/GLOBE STAFF/FILE

The state said **8,206 drivers out of 70,789 were rejected** for infractions ranging from violent crimes and sexual offenses to suspended licenses.

By Adam Vaccaro | GLOBE STAFF APRIL 05, 2017

More than 8,000 drivers for ride-hailing companies including Uber and Lyft have been denied licenses to operate in Massachusetts under a new state background check process.

The most common reason for rejections were related to driver's license status: many had suspended licenses or had not been driving long enough to qualify for the ride-hailing services.

But statistics released by the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities revealed that hundreds of drivers were rejected for having serious crimes on their record, including

violent or sexual offenses, and others for driving-related offenses, such as drunk driving or reckless driving. The state said it rejected 51 applications coming from sex offenders.

Applicants who were rejected by the state cannot get a license to drive for a ride-hailing operation.

Get **Talking Points** in your

inbox:

An afternoon recap of the day's most important business news, delivered weekdays.

Enter email address

Sign Up

The new Massachusetts law regulating ride-hailing companies required drivers to undergo a two-part background check—one from the companies, and a follow-on check by the state government. Previously, the drivers were only checked by the companies.



How Uber uses psychological tricks

Uber is engaged in an extraordinary behind-the-scenes experiment in behavioral science to manipulate drivers.

Boston cabbies vent Uber frustrations

The state checks began in January, and the names of applicants were due Monday. On Wednesday, the Baker administration announced the outcome of its review, saying 8,206 drivers out of 70,789 who submitted applications were rejected.

“Under Massachusetts law, Lyft’s commercial background check provider, like all consumer reporting agencies, is legally prevented from looking back further than seven years into driver applicants’ histories,” Lyft said in a statement. “The state does not face the same limitation, which likely explains why a small percentage of our drivers failed the state’s background check while passing ours.”

Uber reacted angrily to the state’s results, saying the unlimited reach of the government’s background checks is unfair to drivers who are trying to overcome past troubles.

“Thousands of people in Massachusetts have lost access to economic opportunities as a result of a screening that includes an unfair and unjust indefinite lookback period. We have an opportunity to repair the current system in the rules process so that people who deserve to work are not denied the opportunity.”

Meanwhile, Governor Charlie Baker said in a statement that, “Massachusetts has set a national standard for driver safety and we look forward to future partnerships with Uber, Lyft and others to grow this innovative industry and support more jobs and economic opportunities for all.”

Related

- **How Uber uses psychological tricks to push its drivers’ buttons**
- **Boston cabbies vent Uber frustrations at hackney boss**
- **Cabbies say the end is near as Uber, Lyft come to Logan**
- **Uber’s ban on app tips at odds with states barring cash gratuities**

Adam Vaccaro can be reached at adam.vaccaro@globe.com. Follow him on Twitter at [@adamtvaccaro](https://twitter.com/adamtvaccaro).

SHOW 69 COMMENTS

Stay updated, right in your news feed.  Like 467K



Treacherous Gaps Remain With TNC Insurance

June 25, 2015

When an Uber driver killed six-year-old Sofia Liu in San Francisco on New Year's Eve 2014, [the company announced it had no insurance coverage for drivers driving without passengers in the vehicle.](#)

As a result of this incident, California [passed a law](#) requiring that “ridesharing” companies provide primary insurance coverage for any time when a Transportation Network Company (TNC) driver is operating. This California law goes into effect July 1, 2015. The period when TNC drivers have their app turned on and are waiting to be hailed is known as “Period One.”

Across America, certain insurance companies have begun offering a mostly [hybrid form of insurance](#) that covers Period One. **The simple fact that insurance companies in certain states are newly providing coverage for Period One indisputably proves the Period One coverage gap remains in other states where such hybrid insurance isn't being offered. This is leaving thousands of passengers, pedestrians and drivers uncovered.**

However, mandating Period One insurance for TNCs will *still* not make Uber and Lyft's insurance coverage safe. This is because of “street hails.”

Uber and Lyft have encouraged their drivers to operate similar to taxicab drivers. **When an Uber driver picks up an individual on the street who does not hail through the app, *there is no insurance coverage in place whatsoever.*** [Uber admits this](#). This means anyone affected by this ride—passengers, drivers of other vehicles, innocent third parties—will be at risk.

Taxicab drivers possess an expensive form of insurance—primary commercial auto liability insurance coverage—that covers street hails. This type of insurance typically costs \$5,000 to \$10,000 annually per vehicle.

Street hails are a very real and serious concern. In [Colorado](#), [Texas](#) and [Ohio](#), among others, sting operations indisputably show Uber drivers providing rides for cash.

Importantly, both TNC drivers and passengers have financial incentives to do street hails. Drivers don't have to pay Uber or Lyft its financial cut. Passengers can buy a cheaper trip and avoid the threat of surge pricing.

For Uber and Lyft, street hails are an inconvenient truth. **When the first person is seriously injured or killed involving a TNC street hail, this issue will rise to national prominence.** Is it going to take another Sofia Liu moment to make consumers and leaders aware of this pressing concern?

Who's Driving You? is a public safety initiative designed to educate the public about the dangers of unlicensed transportation services. It was launched by the Taxicab, Limousine & Paratransit Association, an international non-profit trade association whose membership consists of 1,100 regulated transportation companies. For more information, visit www.WhosDrivingYou.org, follow us on Twitter (@WhosDrivingYou) and follow us on Facebook ([facebook.com/WhosDrivingYou](https://www.facebook.com/WhosDrivingYou))

Portland to investigate Uber's 'Greyball' scheme to thwart regulators



By [Elliot Njus | The Oregonian/OregonLive](#)

[Email the author](#) | [Follow on Twitter](#)

on March 06, 2017 at 1:24 PM, updated March 07, 2017 at 11:36 AM

Uber's **use of software to thwart regulators** in 2014 while it was operating illegally in Portland could come back to haunt the ride-sharing company as it seeks to expand its foothold in Oregon.

Officials in Portland are calling for an investigation into the practice, one which could make public more details of the secretive company's anti-regulation tactics.

The news comes as Uber is asking the Oregon Legislature to legalize its business model statewide, potentially overriding regulations enacted in Portland two years ago.

The New York Times reported Friday that Uber had used software it called "Greyball" to identify and reject hails from city code enforcers at a time when it was operating illegally in Portland. A video by The Oregonian/OregonLive at the time showed code officers' ride requests repeatedly canceled, thwarting their attempts to fine the company and its drivers.

Uber later suspended its premature launch while the city ironed out a pilot program to allow for its business model. It launched with the city's blessing in 2015.

An Uber spokesman said Friday that the company has not used the Greyball program in Portland since then.

Portland Commissioner Dan Saltzman said Monday that the investigation will focus on whether Uber has used Greyball, or any form of it, to obstruct the city's enforcement of its regulations.

The review would examine information the companies have already provided the city, and potentially seeking additional data from them.

"We're not going after them for what happened in 2014, but if there's been any similar events in the intervening time, then we would go after them for that, as well as seek assurance that it will not happen again," Saltzman said.

The investigation also will affect Uber's biggest competitor, Lyft, Saltzman said, though Lyft did not operate in Portland until after its business model was legalized, and there's no indication that it similarly screened regulators.

"We spent almost a year meeting with officials before we began operating, and at no point did we attempt to deceive City authorities," Lyft spokesman Scott Coriell said in a statement. "We will continue to be a collaborative and cooperative partner to the City."

Commissioner Nick Fish earlier called for a broader investigation and said the City Council should seek subpoena powers to determine the extent of Uber's "Greyball" usage.

COMMUTING

[Portland Metro Tuesday Traffic: Morrison Bridge inspection closes lanes](#)

[Portland to investigate Uber's 'Greyball' scheme to thwart regulators](#)

[Levee drilling on Marine Drive will delay traffic](#)

[Portland Metro Monday Traffic: Snow on the roads at higher elevations and south of the metro area](#)

[Portland Metro Friday Traffic: I-5 north crash cleared at 217; backup remains](#)

[All Stories](#)

"I've been on the council for eight years, and this is the most serious breach of trust that I have observed in an industry that we regulate," Fish said. "This is not just bad behavior. This is an attack on our ability as a local community to enforce community standards."

Fish has long been critical of Uber, saying the company couldn't be trusted after its unsanctioned 2014 launch in Portland. He and Commissioner Amanda Fritz voted against legalizing Uber's business model in 2015, citing concerns about minimum insurance coverage.

On Monday, he said the program's use of technology to identify regulators was akin to red-lining.

"That same technology could be harnessed to essentially weed out 'undesirable' riders," he said.

Such an investigation could dredge up more details of the company's practices after it routinely launched without sanction from cities that said its model was barred by existing taxi regulations.

The company has fiercely guarded details of its business model, in part to prevent them from reaching its biggest rival, Lyft. In 2016, both companies successfully blocked a request from The Oregonian/OregonLive **for city records** that would have revealed how many drivers were licensed in the city, among other data.

Mayor Ted Wheeler said he supported Saltzman's investigation, but said he might bring in other investigatory agencies, such as the Oregon Department of Justice.

The Justice Department is looking into the issue to determine if it has jurisdiction, said spokeswoman Kristina Edmunson.

Meanwhile, state legislators have filed **House Bill 3246**, which would put such "transportation network companies" as Uber and Lyft under state oversight and override the regulatory frameworks set up in Portland and elsewhere.

The bill lists 21 lawmakers from both parties as sponsors, among them four state senators, suggesting broad support. But any debate will come on the heels of weeks of bad PR for Uber.

"I wish they could stay out of the news," said Rep. Brian Clem, D-Salem, a chief sponsor of the bill. "We're trying to talk about a policy, not drag one company into this. To me, it's about the technology and the concept of the sharing economy."

Clem said he sponsored a bill because it's an expedient way to bring ride-hailing services to small cities not well-served by traditional taxis. He said he's an frequent user of Lyft when he travels.

Though the current version of the bill doesn't carve out an exemption for Portland, Clem said the city's regulatory framework would likely be grandfathered into a final version.

And Clem said he expects the bill will at least get a hearing, though its been assigned to a committee busy with other legislation and no hearing has been scheduled.

The Greyball report is the latest in a drumbeat of headlines about Uber's corporate behavior and culture.

Last month, a female former software engineer published accusations of sexual harassment and sexism at Uber, **prompting the company to launch an investigation.**

Last week, video emerged of chief executive **Travis Kalanick arguing with an Uber driver** over the company's falling fares. Kalanick later **apologized** and said he needs "leadership help."

And in January, Uber turned off surge pricing as New York City taxi drivers protested President Donald Trump's immigration policies. It was seen as an act of collaboration with the new administration, with which Kalanick had served on an economic advisory council.

He left the position after a #DeleteUber campaign went viral, reportedly **prompting more than 200,000 customers to delete their accounts.**

-- Elliot Njus

enjus@oregonian.com

503-294-5034

There may be an app for that, but Pasco only welcomes fingerprinted for-hire drivers



Pasco City Council members have adopted a new ordinance that now welcomes both taxicab and transportation network companies, but requires fingerprinting when a for-hire driver applies for a business license. **Jae C. Hong** - AP

BY KRISTIN M. KRAEMER
kkraemer@tricityherald.com

Pasco will soon be open for business to all smartphone-based car service companies.

But don't go opening your Uber app just yet.

An ordinance approved Monday night by the Pasco City Council requires fingerprinting for drivers of both taxis and transportation network companies.

ADVERTISING

Prescribing Information

Uber refuses to work with a city that has a fingerprint requirement.

So while it's likely the San Francisco company won't be signing an agreement with Pasco any time soon, council members are hopeful other entrepreneurs will jump at the chance to fill the city's Uber void.

Mayor Matt Watkins asked staff to send out a letter to known transportation network companies in the state, including Uber and Lyft, advising them of the change in the Pasco Municipal Code and the new regulations.

In a conversation with Uber earlier Monday, a

Pasco official was reminded by a company executive that fingerprints are a deal-breaker.

That means while Uber drivers can continue to pick up passengers anywhere else in the Tri-Cities, they can only drop them off in Pasco.

People who need a ride in Pasco, whether from the airport or another location, will need to reach out to another ride-hailing service licensed in the jurisdiction.

The council voted 4-3 to greenlight transportation network companies within city limits. Up to this point, only taxicab companies were allowed to operate in Pasco, and their drivers had to be fingerprinted.

This is the fifth time in just over three months that the issue was debated by the council.

Councilman Tom Larsen, who previously voted against the motion, went in favor of the fingerprint clause this time.

The “no” votes came from Councilmen Saul Martinez, Bob Hoffmann and Chi Flores.

The trio have said repeatedly that they understand and respect the city wanting to protect community members by fingerprinting for-hire drivers.

However, they believe customers should be given the option to get a ride at a more inexpensive rate, even though the councilmen admit being disappointed in Uber for taking the hard stance.

**THE COUNCIL VOTED 4-3 TO GREENLIGHT
TRANSPORTATION NETWORK COMPANIES WITHIN
CITY LIMITS. UP TO THIS POINT, ONLY TAXICAB
COMPANIES WERE ALLOWED TO OPERATE IN PASCO
AND THEIR DRIVERS HAD TO BE FINGERPRINTED.**

“With the citizenry that we have here who has demonstrated that they really want the service, and with the impact it’s going to make on our tourism, and because we have the airport here and because Kennewick and Richland have already passed it,” Martinez said, “I think it’s going to be more of a negative impact on our community by not allowing them to come in and provide that service.”

Martinez, Hoffmann and Flores were in favor of an alternative ordinance that deleted the fingerprint requirement for transportation network company drivers and left it in place for taxi drivers.

Flores encouraged the council to revisit the issue next year in case “we’re not getting any traction with TNCs out there.”

City Manager Dave Zabell said the changes and regulations should be implemented within the next week or so. City staff will give a written report reviewing the ordinance in six months, followed by another update at the one-year mark.

“The council was very deliberate in their conversations about TNCs in Pasco,” Zabell .

said in a news release, “and their decision to allow companies like Uber to operate in the city with only a minor additional requirement helps ensure public safety.”

It is a one-time \$5 fee for drivers to get fingerprinted at the Pasco Police Department.

Chief Bob Metzger has said that since his signature will go on the business license, he wants to be able to ensure passengers are getting into a car with a driver whose identity and background is verified by police.

Councilman Al Yenney, who made the motion Monday to approve the proposed ordinance, noted that transportation network companies like Uber are not doing a good job of being corporate citizens.

“I think this is something we need, to make sure we have a little control over the drivers,” he said. “I do realize it’s a service that’s needed.”

Kristin M. Kraemer: 509-582-1531,
@KristinMKraemer



MORE BUSINESS

SUGGESTED FOR YOU