Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Licensing and Hearings Committee
Public Input Meeting
Minutes

Tuesday, March 29, 2016
7:00 p.m.
Regional Council Chamber
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario


Members absent: J. Nowak and S. Shantz

Opening Remarks

Chair J. Mitchell provided opening remarks regarding the purpose of the meeting. She noted that no decisions will be made at this meeting and reminded the audience of the rules regarding conduct in the Council Chamber.

Declarations of Pecuniary Interest Under The Municipal Conflict of Interest Act

None declared.

Delegations

1. Eljko Zeljko
E. Zeljko was not present when called.

2. Andrei Cosereanu
Andrei Cosereanu declined to present.
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3. Adrian Cosereanu

Adrian Cosereanu declined to present.

4. Terry Kirby

Chair J. Mitchell noted that T. Kirby contacted the Regional Clerk’s office prior to the meeting and registered to appear at the meeting scheduled for April 5, 2016.

5. Victor Amorim

V. Amorim recommended that the Region regulate all taxi companies including ridesharing companies. He stated that existing taxi companies cannot compete with ridesharing companies due to their pricing models. He advised the Region to continue to limit the number of licenses and to require all taxi services to provide accessible services.

V. Amorim submitted additional written comments that are appended to the original minutes.

6. Tracey Langbein

T. Langbein provided a presentation outlining her concerns with Uber and other ridesharing companies. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes. She expressed concerns for public safety if ridesharing companies are not regulated and stated that taxi companies will be able to compete with Uber if meters are deregulated.

7. Sourov De

S. De appeared before the Committee to express his support for ridesharing companies as a consumer. He stated that consumers are tired of the old way of doing things and that Uber’s rates are fair and the rides are safe. He believes that people are using Uber because they see it as a better experience.

8. Tom Slee

T. Slee provided a presentation outlining his concerns with ridesharing and the sharing economy. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes. He stated that Uber’s business model should not be welcomed in Waterloo Region. He advised the Committee that Uber does not provide adequate insurance for their drivers which puts passengers at risk. T. Slee also stated that Uber does not pay taxes on their share of the fee. He encouraged the Committee to not accept Uber’s statements at face value.
In response to a question from the Committee, T. Slee stated that Alberta has been pushing heavily for greater insurance protection for ridesharing.

9. Donovan Moser

D. Moser provided a presentation outlining his concerns as a driver. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes. He stated that he believes that all drivers should be required to be licensed by the Region; and that all taxis should be identified on the inside and outside of the car. D. Moser advised the Committee that if the system is deregulated all taxis will eventually become auxiliary taxis to allow for surge pricing. He noted that Uber has circulated an email encouraging people to complete the Region’s survey and advising what answers should be given. A copy of the email is appended to the original minutes.

10. Michael Larocke

Chair J. Mitchell noted that M. Larocke had submitted written comments. A copy of the submission is appended to the original minutes.

Call for Delegations

Chair J. Mitchell called for delegations from the floor.

1. Mladen Maric

M. Maric provided a presentation outlining his concerns with Uber. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes. He stated that it is not responsible to allow a company to operate when it is not adhering to the existing rules. He encouraged the Region to take responsibility for the situation and to not hide behind public opinion.

2. Andrei Cosereanu

Andrei Cosereanu stated that he was confused about the limits on presentations when he declined his opportunity to speak earlier in the meeting and requested the opportunity to present. The Committee agreed to allow the presentation.

Andrei Cosereanu provided a presentation encouraging the Region to not allow Uber to operate. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes. He stated that he believes that Uber does not provide their drivers with basic labour protections and that the surge pricing is dangerous for customers.

3. Adrian Cosereanu

Adrian Cosereanu provided a presentation outlining his views on revising the taxi by-law. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes. He stated that he
supports the Region’s limit on the number of licenses issued based on the population. He noted that he believes that Uber needs to pay its share of taxes and questioned what will be done if Uber does not comply with a new by-law.

4. Doug Bowden

D. Bowden expressed his concerns with the amount of insurance coverage provided by Uber. He encouraged the Region to maintain the traditional model in the new by-law and stated that fees should continue to be regulated for consumer protection.

Other Business

In response to a question from the Committee, J. Mitchell confirmed that a representative from Uber has registered as a delegation for the next meeting.

Adjourn

Moved by K. Seiling

Seconded by L. Armstrong

That the meeting adjourn at 7:54 p.m.

Carried

Committee Chair, J. Mitchell

Committee Clerk, T. Brubacher
From: Vic Amorim  
Sent: Saturday, March 26, 2016 2:41 PM  
To: Jane Mitchell; Geoff Lorentz; Regional Clerk; Angelo Apfelbaum; Kris Fletcher  
Subject: Taxi-by law

To Regional Clerk and standing committee members

I'm writing this letter to get my thoughts on paper for meeting on March 29, 2016. I believe that I won't be able to sum up everything in 5 minutes. After reading the white paper on Modernizing Regulation in The Canadian Taxi Industry by the Canadian Competition Bureau. I find that they didn't properly investigate the taxi industry. First only talking about the industry in Toronto and Ottawa. Where they don't operate as efficient as in Waterloo Region. Where most taxi brokers are still on voice dispatch system. In the region all taxi companies are computer dispatch using radio or cellular technology. The regional taxi companies for years have been using cutting technology for years. Apps, emails and of course the telephone. We've even got back-up systems to operate in condition if the internet goes down and power. The paper also says "severely restrict competition" that I can say is not true. Here in the region 5 companies fight for every customer out there. We must provide a great services to the consumers. Better cars, better trained drivers and better staff at the office. We must compete constantly to keep and grow our customer base.

Canadian Competition Bureau doesn't know the true cost of operating in the region or anywhere else. If price drops then taxi companies or owner/operators will have to cut quality of vehicles, quality of service (examples: walking elderly to the door or helping them into the vehicle, loading and unloading groceries/parcels and supply disability vehicles) or just leave the taxi industry.

What the Canadian Competition Bureau should be looking at Uber's predatory pricing. They would find that they are in fact breaking the law. Like everything else they do. Even Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) is looking into them.

Just remember the consumers' believe that Uber has insurance on all cars. When in fact they never did. No true vehicle inspection or criminal check. They don't even check driver's abstract or work history. Here in Ontario, it's the Driver's responsibility to make sure they have proper insurance. Uber does not check anymore. How irresponsible for a company that claims to watch out for their customers. Knowing right now drivers are out there driving without insurance! That's right no insurance. Do to insurance companies will revoke insurance policy of any for-hire cars.
It's only one of many reasons for regulations into the taxi industry. Uber is a taxi service. It's like calling taxi companies a transportation network company (TNC). Which they are in definition and they do it better than Uber or any other company that just uses a app.

I like to thank all who have taken the time read this letter. Just one more thought. The taxi owner/operators and drivers have been hurt by this corrupt corporation. Jobs are on the line. Staff and drivers. There is talk about all companies amalgamate to fight Uber any other illegal taxi service. This would be one way to reduce expense for owner/operators. Close down offices, reduce staff and eliminate other expenses. In the long run the Region would lose jobs and taxes. Consumers would also lose. Less choice! The region can not stop that from happening. If Taxi companies have to survive they will do what it takes to fight these illegal bandit taxi services.

Victor Amorim
Waterloo taxi - Car owner 34
Taxi driver of 23 years
Taxi owner of 12 years

Thank you!
Good Evening

The Taxi By-Law was primarily put in place for public and driver safety. Uber may operate a different business model than taxis but that model does not make them safer. There have been sexual assault charges recently in Guelph and Toronto and many incidents around the world. Uber encourages drivers to offer water, gum or mints to customers to boost their driver rating. Uber states that all the rides are booked via cell app but that is simply not true. Many Uber drivers operate like taxis drivers do and sit in line when patrons are leaving entertainment venues. Fake Uber drivers are now being reported in many cities. All a person would need is a cellphone and a clean car (even a rental car) and an intoxicated patron. Frosh Week, NYE, StPatrick’s Day, Okoberfest, Blues, Jazz and Country Music Fest, Uber drivers from other cities could drive here and operate. Without regulations and enforcement of those regulations public safety is at risk. There is also the potential for liability on the part of the Region for allowing a company to provide public transportation by an unregulated operator, should something unfortunate happen with an Uber trip.

The Taxi By-law does require revision. I strongly believe that Uber should be required to follow the By-Law and that enforcement should be strict. While it is termed “Ride Sharing” it is not. The Uber driver fulfills no different role than a Taxi driver does and should be checked and licensed the same as current taxi drivers. To not do so implies that Uber drivers are safer than taxi drivers, otherwise why would taxi drivers need more detailed scrutiny?

Uber cars need to be inspected at the same rate and to the same degree as taxis, to ensure safety for passengers, drivers and the public.

Proper insurance, identification and cameras must be regulated, again for safety.

I feel that the local taxi industry can and will successfully compete with Uber if the Region enforces licensing, inspection, insurance and cameras and removes meter regulation. Local taxis companies offer more than Uber, we have cellphone apps now, we accept more types of payment than Uber, we are easier to locate with our top signs and decals and we have built business reputations in our community. We cannot however offer our customers lower rates under the current meter system. The region should deregulate fares and leave the pricing to our companies.

Accessible Transit should be regulated by the Region, but not as a percentage of taxis fleets. Customer demand should determine the amount and schedule of vans.

Considering the low number of incidents, current dashboard cameras capturing both the road ahead and interior of car, GPS tracking and 2way radios, I feel CCTV is unnecessary.
(Tom Slee, local author of What's Yours is Mine: Against the Sharing Economy, as quoted from Waterloo Chronicle Mar 10 2016)
Right now, sharing economy stuff appeals to us in our roles as consumers, but we're also citizens and most of us are employees too, and I think they're bad for us in these roles.

I agree with Mr Slee.
It's easy to understand that customers, especially students, want to use the most cost efficient mode of transit and they all embrace the cellphone "app" - I do not fault them for using Uber. Nor do I think most Uber drivers are doing anything more than earning some extra money.

However the business model that Uber presents, undermines the profitability of small legitimate local business, which in turn affects families and the entire local economy. Our taxis companies have many drivers supporting families. We pay taxes for our offices and we pay staff. We use local business to advertise, to decal our cars, to support our daily business needs. We contribute to local charities and support community events. All of this leads to a healthy local economy. Uber benefits a small number of local drivers and puts a little extra cash into the customer's hand but the bulk of the profit goes to Uber and never comes back to our community, it is shuffled around the electronic globe until only a small percentage of tax is every paid, in the Netherlands.

As a taxi driver my immediate personal concern is with Uber, however I could just as easily own a licensed regulated Bed and Breakfast Accommodation and be standing here making the same argument to enforce local by-laws for AirBnB as I am for Uber. Same business concept different users and suppliers, still illegal.

The point I would like to make here is that this is bigger than Uber and the local Taxi Industry. Regional decisions regarding banning or regulating Underground or Sharing Economy companies operating here will impact the quality of life for everyone in the region overtime.

Thank you for your time and for your careful consideration of the points being made here this evening.
INTRODUCTION
Thank you for the opportunity to present on this important question. I have been studying the Sharing Economy for some time: I have written a book out about it, I have been invited to conferences on the subject, and my work has been referenced in some major outlets including The New York Times, Der Spiegel, The Guardian.

I have worked for over 20 years in the software industry here in Waterloo, so I am not anti-technology. I do believe technology can bring tremendous value to our lives, but I also believe that we have choices about how we integrate it into our society, and that Uber's business model is not one we should welcome.

I want to address questions 2 and 3 in the discussion document, and to raise some challenges that were neglected in the Competition Bureau whitepaper "Modernizing Regulation in the Canadian Taxi Industry".

The short version is that Uber has quickly built a very large business by avoiding costs at every stage, and that we can and must require Uber to take responsibility for the rides on its platform. Uber has some excellent software engineering driving its service, but this is not just a technology story; it's also a deregulation story. Some very wealthy investors have billions of dollars at stake in changing the rules of cities around the world. I would like to highlight some criteria that seem to me minimum standards for a big company to operate in Waterloo region.

INSURANCE
Uber's insurance policy is secondary or contingent insurance, which means that it take effect after drivers' insurance coverage. As the Government of Alberta has pointed out, this is inadequate. Many drivers on the platform do not have valid insurance, and so will avoid making a claim at all costs. The insurance industry now offers policies for drivers, but this does not solve the problem so long as Uber pushes responsibility for primary insurance onto its drivers, and does not even monitor their insurance status. I attended a driver recruitment meeting at the Delta hotel and the company representatives made it clear that insurance is between the driver and their insurer.

For a major company to offer an important service in our region, Uber needs to have primary insurance for passengers, and it needs to guarantee that rides on its platforms are properly insured. This is not too much to ask of a company with a market capitalization greater than General Motors.

Uber Challenges

Tom Slee, March 2016
TAXES

Nobody likes paying taxes, but paying taxes is a part of belonging to the community. Every taxi ride in Waterloo region includes 13% HST, but what about the taxes on Uber’s rides? The question is split into two parts.

Uber takes about one third of every fare: 25% on every trip, plus a $1.50 booking fee.¹ The company has designed an elaborate shell game to make sure it does not pay taxes on revenue it earns in Canada or other countries outside the USA.² When an Uber ride is booked in Waterloo, the payment does not go to Uber Canada, it goes to Uber B.V., a Dutch subsidiary. The transaction is not a Canadian transaction and Uber pays no sales tax in Canada. Uber then routes money through a second subsidiary based in Bermuda to avoid paying taxes in the Netherlands.

Uber expects the driver to pay HST on their part of the fare, but it knows that many of its drivers will avoid paying. We know there is a grey economy for small contractors, but major companies should not be allowed to take this grey economy to a global scale. Once again, it is building a business model that erodes communities by taking money out of them rather than contributing, and it undercuts competitors by avoiding the costs that others have to shoulder.

If Uber is to operate in Waterloo Region, it should pay taxes on the rides it provides like any other business.

TREATMENT OF DRIVERS

Uber likes to consider its drivers not to be employees. It makes a great deal of the fact that drivers choose their own times of operating, but that is not sufficient to make drivers not employees. Uber drivers "don’t set their own fares or freely choose their own customers, their performance is measured and controlled by Uber, their driving is essential to Uber’s business, and the economic reality is that they are not independent businesses but small cogs in Uber’s powerful multinational business."³

Despite some high-profile claims around high wages a year ago, many Uber drivers now report earning less than minimum wage, and the company is known to squeeze harder once it becomes established in a city. Is technology simply a way to avoid paying a decent wage? We cannot let this be the path of the future.

The much-vaulted reputation system does not work effectively. It is an avenue to arbitrary dismissal and its use as a disciplinary device may violate Canadian human rights laws, as it opens the door for racial and other forms of discrimination. US standards for labour practices are different to Canadian ones, and we do not have to let them be eroded.

Surge pricing is part of the company's employment model, but it is not simply a matter of "getting more drivers on the road" as the company and its supporters claim. Even within the Economics 101 model that they promote, another part of the equation is that surge pricing cuts into demand: its success relies on leaving customers unable to afford a ride. Beyond that, in some situations it is against our community norms. To take one example: during winter storms Canadians look to community motivations to help each other out, and surge pricing undermines those motivations by appealing instead to monetary incentives.

Uber should recognize its drivers as employees, and drivers should have an effective mechanism for negotiating with the company they work for and for appealing mistreatment.

WHEN THINGS GO WRONG
While Uber makes the right noises around problems such as complaints, accessibility, discrimination, and problems when things go wrong on the platform, when push comes to shove it continually seeks to avoid its responsibilities.

California regulations demand that Uber provide information on complaints and on ride statistics, and this is a basic starting point. Even there, Uber has been fined for missing reporting deadlines. Uber recently also lost a case for misrepresenting its safety standards, and its "safety fee", and is facing lawsuits from disabled groups in the USA. We have seen through examples such as the recent reporting of "rape" claims on Uber's customer support system that the company actively hides problems with the service's operation. We know that safety is a problem in all kinds of industries, including taxis, but at least we have a mechanism for identifying and addressing them. Uber has a history of misrepresenting the safety of its platform, and regulators should not trust the company's claims and assurances in this matter.

Extensive data collection is a starting point for making Uber accountable, but it is only a start. Right now, the company pushes blame onto its drivers and avoids liability when things go wrong. This is not sufficient for a company that seeks to be a major part of our social infrastructure. Accountability for failures is part of the job, and Uber must be expected to play its part.

SUMMARY
We all play different roles in our communities. We are consumers, we are workers, we are neighbours, and we are citizens. Uber appeals to us as consumers, but it is bad for us as workers, and has failed to be a good partner in building communities.

Uber Challenges

Tom Slee, March 2016
Uber plays hard, and it plays to win. We know, better than most, that technology companies can rise and fall. Once Uber is established it has no more incentive to negotiate. It pushes for a quick decision, but cities around the world from Munich to Seoul and beyond are taking a second look. Let's not be pressured into making long-term decisions without proper consideration.
Good Evening. My name is Donovan Moser and I have been taxi driver for 28 years. I would like to address some of your bylaw proposals.

Starting with the licensing process, all auxiliary drivers should attend the licensing office in person. It is not as cumbersome and time consuming as an app taxi has told you.

For the last 28 years I have spent 15 mins of every year at the licensing office with my license form, criminal record check and proof of proper insurance. This is a necessity for regulating auxiliary taxi’s if you want to keep any amount of control.

Auxiliary taxi’s need identification on the inside AND the outside of their vehicles. You can not regulate taxi’s that you can not see.

The bylaw should also state that if any broker ban’s you from using their app, they can lose their broker status.

If you accept 20 hours a week of rideshare insurance, I trust you realize that this will be impossible to regulate. It should be full insurance, plain and simple.

So far the Region has issued 60 warnings and nothing has changed.

The taxi industries main issue is that regulations have now become recommendations.

The current taxi’s in this Region have grown with the population and with that growth has come 20 years of accessible, on-demand taxi service, and technology upgrades. We provide the same features as app companies and we don’t discriminate against any economically challenged ridership. without credit or tech devices

The expenses of starting a taxi company with any new licenses are very high with the need for proper insurance, cameras, computer dispatch, and accessible vans.

Current companies have learned how to absorb the cost of accessible vans. With the two business models that are being presented, the interest in new taxi licenses will shrink with potential buyers knowing that the taxi cap system will disappear and there could be 100 new taxi’s in the near future.

With the current caps, the companies have taken your licenses and the on-demand, accessible van numbers have grown. A taxi license cap removal will stagnate the accessible van numbers to where they are now.

With your 2 business models offered and no taxi caps, in my opinion, taxi’s will eventually adapt our companies to auxiliary taxi’s. We would not need accessible vans, we could surge
price anytime, we could close our HST numbers, we would not need camera’s, and we would enjoy regulatory freedom as app taxi’s do right now.

Every Region needs certain elements to thrive. Taxi’s ARE one of those elements. We have been available 24/7 on very slow days, days with weather events, party nights and to service GRT riders when there are large bus schedule changes. We don’t surge price and we are fine with that.

This Region does not have the taxi problems that big cities have. We have family people professionally driving anyone that needs a ride, on a dependable, full time basis. This is OUR career.

Not surprisingly, in San Francisco, where an app taxi started 5 years ago, drivers are returning to the taxi business as they cannot make an appropriate income to live after paying their fees and operating costs.

Are you aware that the app company Uber has sent all of their customers and drivers a link to your survey and indicated what choices they suggest. I have a copy of that email in front of you.

Anyone can answer your survey from anywhere in the world. Your survey answers have been compromised. They are not a true reflection of public opinion.

This has been a dream region for the app company. This Region is being used as a chess pawn in the regulatory battle in Canada.

In your survey you ask the question “How should the Region govern and require accessible taxi’s”

The third possible answer is “Review and modify the current rate/ratio of accessible and require that non-traditional operation pay a fee in lieu of providing accessible service?”

The answer offered creates many questions. I would like to ask the Council some of those questions now. You can answer when I am done if you wish.

1. Why were traditional taxis not included in this opportunity for the public’s opinion and is the Council concerned that other business owners may ask to pay the Region some money in order to be exempt from regulations for them?

2. Is the Council concerned that Accessibility advocates will read this and feel that the Region is selling off accessibility exemptions for profit?
3. Is the Council concerned that residents of Waterloo Region may question the integrity of the council if they accept money from a business to be exempt from regulations?

As a tax paying resident of Waterloo Region, all 3 of these questions concerns me.

In conclusion, councillors need to think more about the proposed changes. Regulation and safety is the duty of elected officials. Any new company entering this region should be required to adapt THEIR business model to reflect the rules and regulations of this region.

Council needs to stop catering regulations to app companies that may or may not exist in the future.

Thank you for listening.

Please let me know if you have any questions or indicate that I am done.
From: Uber <email@et.uber.com>
Date: 2016-03-23 3:54 PM (GMT-05:00)
support ridesharing in Waterloo Region!

UBER

LET'S KEEP K-W MOVING

SUPPORT SMART RIDESHARING REGULATIONS IN WATERLOO REGION

The Region of Waterloo has released another survey to get your feedback on proposed regulations for ridesharing.

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=1074a8626a&view=pt&search=inbox&msg=1... 3/29/2016
• Requiring the use of cameras in ridesharing vehicles is unnecessary where trips are pre-booked through the Uber app and riders know who is driving them, the trip is GPS logged, with feedback and ratings after every trip.

Thanks for your ongoing support,
Uber Canada

Uber B.V.
Vijzelstraat 68, 1017 HL Amsterdam

View Online Unsubscribe
From: michael larocke  
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2016 7:47 PM  
To: Regional Clerk  
Subject:  

Good morning city council,

My name is Michael Larocke, age 62, born and raise Kitchener / Waterloo, and wow our city changes wow more beautiful, So I now no longer work as hard work steel blue collar and was professional, welder /fitter and old company closed for 20 years, so had other job for 9 years and now no longer work, laid off after 9 years because of my age, so
Then I suggestion I still have good driver record that my license, as been good record, and I feel like to become as School Bus Driver, I happened saw on big sign on said Wanted Free "B" for training School Bus Driver, and I did went in and application it and was told to get my health check out, which I went and to visited my Doctor, told for test health on driving, and passed my health record and send letter to Ministry of Transport waqs told again check out my earing test and went to hearing test was told that I failed with MTO, that my hearing is 100% deafness and not allow to drive as school Bus Driver and either Shuttle with handicapped, all above cannot allow me to become as "Driver' that my record of Good Driving record?" same with taxi driver, not allow me to become a taxi driver because I cannot speak on speaker,
So I am looking forward this coming month going to Toronto Human Rights claim about not allowing me as School Bus or Shuttle driver,?
I now happy that I am UBER X Driver, since Jan, 22, 2016, with new Nissan Altima 2015, for to become as UBER Driver, and very please with my new job, UBER as opportunity for me and thank them for that they has check out my Record of Driving and check out for criminal record which I passed above, and now I have over 650, FIVE STARS and people loves UBER, Council, please allow me to keep my new job I already did travel my Chinese client to Niagara Falls, and others clients to Person Airports twice and hugs farther I UBER my client to Woodbridge, Ont, so yes and very good driver record and very good with my clients, they very good to me, so again please let me keep my new job and thank you for read this, Michael Larocke,
Thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak today on this Uber vs. Taxi debate, especially since we, the taxi drivers, have been blocked from the media to express our opinion and reasons why we are not in favour of Uber.

A question I have raised before is “what would the licensing office do if I put a car wash sign on my garage with an excuse that I have an ‘Ubero Car Wash’ app?” Would you call the Waterloo car wash association to present them a new bylaw proposal about car washes, allowing for the app to exist with minimum requirements? Clearly, this would result in making it tough for existing, regular, law abiding, car wash business owners.

Would you call me to the same meeting to present sneaky interpretations about the car wash app, how it is only an app connecting people with car wash garages using evolving technologies and call me a brave guy as you called the Uber guys?

Every company will then be able to do this. Every company will become a platform and just say ‘oh the laws don’t apply to us’ and ‘I am just connecting an app with a service’. Sadly, some city councilors don’t see the risks of this.

The risks are allowing unlicensed drivers on the road, with no insurance, paying no HST, following no safety codes – putting passengers and everybody else on the road at risk.

You would not let me stay in the car wash business with no license, with no insurance, with not paying HST, with no safety codes – so why are you letting Uber? As a pretend car wash owner would you refuse to issue any fine to me, as you are doing now with Uber drivers?

There are so many apps to invent and so many businesses to be jeopardized because of the precedent Uber is setting by not obeying laws, rules and regulations.

Would you morally, if not criminally, be held responsible if something happens with Uber customers in the case of an accident? In time, as you continue to refuse to take legal action to stop them from working with no insurance, license, safety checks done on cars etc. - as elected representatives, you have a duty and legal obligation that you are not fulfilling.

If you tried to hide behind public opinion about Uber, it could have been covered by the news that Uber was offering free rides just to buy votes.

Would you support people’s wish to be picked up from bus stops, ION stops, with taxi vehicles for the fare that they pay to the GRT, up to the desired bus, GRT, ION stop and so on route and call it Ubero, GRT, Taxi, or ION app?

What I cannot understand yet is that you still try to open doors for underground businesses and Uber continues to disregard the law under your watch. I don’t know how many times you met with Uber reps, but I know it was many and you still didn’t manage to reach any law obeying deal with them. This raises big concerns in my mind and begs the question why the elected officials are neglecting their moral responsibilities and legal obligations to protect the public and regular businesses.
Please reconsider your decision and opinions before you open Pandora’s box. Don’t destroy small businesses. Let’s play a fair game. We need the taxi industry, we need people working in the taxi industry who are driving for a living and devoted to their business and customers. If you open the door for Uber, how can a regular taxi compete with them? With the latest insurance increases of 20% (min $6500 to $7500/year) for the owners with no existing claims or demerit points and all other expenses (office, tax, maintenance, gas, repairs and purchase of cars younger than 8 years to meet school board requirements) who will be able to control Uber with their yo-yo insurance of 20 hours a week when they are clear in their statement not allowing you to see driver’s log book. Do you wait for an Uber explanation – what happened in California when Uber driver killed a young girl on the crosswalk and Uber defended themselves by saying how the driver was not on the call, he was only available and waiting for a call and cruising around. Do they count time that insurance is valid only with the customers in the car? Isn’t that a disgusting explanation? One more time: thank you for your time and please protect legal businesses and their customers.

Sincerely,

Mladen Maric,

Mladenmaric12@gmail.com
REPERCUSSIONS

Why Uber will destroy The Region Of Waterloo
WHY NOT UBER?

- Surge Pricing
- Modern Day Slavery
- Climate Change
- Kidnapping! Rape! Murder!
SURGE PRICING

- If Demand is High, Price is High!
- Massive Surge Pricing Every Day in the Waterloo Region
- People Get tricked by the APP and Driver
- On New Year’s People Got Charged THOUSANDS of Dollars for a $50 ride
MODERN DAY SLAVERY!
CLIMATE CHANGE

• Higher Emissions If Unlimited Number of Vehicles Are Allowed On The Road!

• Harm Is Caused To People With Breathing Problems

• Hundreds of Vehicles Idling In Front Of Bars And Points Of Interest

• Smog! Smog! Smog!

• Taxi Companies In The Waterloo Region Have The Largest Fleet of Hybrid Environmentally Friendly Vehicles
KIDNAPPING! RAPE! MURDER!

- Seven-Year-Old San Francisco Girl Struck and Killed by Uber Driver; Uber Denies Responsibility (5/7/14)
- San Francisco Passenger Struck In Head with Hammer by UberX Driver (9/30/14)
- Guleph, Ontario, Uber driver charged with sexual assault (3/14/16)
- Philadelphia Woman Says She Was Raped and Kidnapped by an UberX Driver (3/24/15)
- Uber Driver Accused of DUI, Resisting Arrest After Crashing into a Party Bus in San Diego (3/3/16)
- Toronto Police Warn Uber Users After Report of Imposters Attempting to Lure a Woman Into Their Vehicle (2/17/16)
- False Uber Driver Sexually Assaults Passenger in Manhattan (5/11/15)
- Uber Driver Shoots and Kills Six People and Wounded Two Others in Kalamazoo, Michigan (2/22/16)
MURDER
Hello Ladies and Gentlemen! Hello to all our extended family! First of all I'd like to thank to our Region of Waterloo's officials for organizing this public meeting and for their desire to listen to us.

I sent to all of you two messages, very detailed ones about the by law you proposed to us with my remarks and I am pretty sure that you got my messages.

1. I read the bylaw project delivered few weeks ago by Region. I was shocked to see that in the new bylaw project, Region of Waterloo asked people 7 questions and in the same time, Region of Waterloo answered to these questions with so called "preferred answers". This mechanism and answers work for Uber and not for our community.

I don't think that is normal in a capitalist system that any public entity to develop a bylaw in order to influence the profit of private entities. Doesn't work in capitalist system and it is against any fundamental economic law of the system. The public entities must work and build a business environment, to create the honest environment for business to be developed. No public entity should influence the private entities profits and treat private entities with double standard and give an advantage to some private companies and disadvantage to others. Uber will try to influence you with kind of petition they promote in our Region but there are two aspects. First, we have to understand that any tech company can help Uber to fake this petition and create specific software to get many approvals without the people knowledge. Their petition doesn't mean anything for you and for people from our Region. Second, this petition is totally wrong because Uber didn't ask you and didn't collaborate with you to build a set of questions specifically for taxi business in our area. Uber defies any rule and any collaboration with any official from our Region and they want to follow their own rules...

2. Years ago, Region of Waterloo decided to put a quota on the numbers of taxis in Region of Waterloo.

Question: When the councilors were wrong, when they think about a quota of taxis for our Region and promote it or they are wrong now when they want to deregulate the taxi business and allow to everybody and Uber specifically to have cabs and create the chaos in our community? The actual bylaw is to increase the number of taxis in the Region with one taxi for an increase with 1,600 people in population in our Region, which traditional taxi companies saw like normal and agreed with Region of Waterloo. Why now we change our minds?

3. I have in front of me two papers with two different takes for Regional Councilors. I'd like the councilors to sign one of them till next meeting. In the first one, government should recognize that Uber has been legal and will be legal till the new bylaw will get in place and the second one is that Regional councilors should recognize and sign it that Uber has been illegal in town and will be illegal till we have a new bylaw in place or
Uber is going to be illegal forever in case we don't deregulate the taxi business and keep the actual bylaw.

In my opinion this bylaw project had to be proposed by traditional taxi companies and not by Region of Waterloo and after that this traditional taxi companies should have sent the project to Region of Waterloo to check if all the proposals are inside of the legal frame. It is the way the capitalism should work and in respect for both entities.

We know, like traditional taxi drivers that we depend on this business and we have been building this business for tens of years in town beside with our customers. We want to continue a good relation with our community (family) members, including Region of Waterloo and build step by step new opportunities for the people from our Region.

4. Question for Region:
   a. What kind of power Uber has in our Region and who gave them power to be active in Region before you pass the new bylaw?
   b. Who are behind Uber and what they want? Behind Uber are venture capitalist investors and they don't care about our community, they care about money. Most of them don't know where Kitchener Waterloo is, but we know that they are on Wall Street, in California, New York or in Washington. They care about money and they will take the money away from our community and use it for speculations.
   c. Do we have a law or have you created a paragraph in new bylaw that you can use it to ban Uber from our cities in case they are not going to be necessary or for other reasons or in case they don't comply with the rules in the Region? As long as we don't have these set of rules Uber will run the Region as they want and in their advantage and they will prevail by free market economy and "sharing economy" which is by far "sharing poverty".

At this time, no Uber driver can survive from this job and can't feed his or her family. They have a second job, but most of them collect welfare because their income from Uber goes on the cards register in another country. If Uber drivers can not survive doing this job, how could all of us survive if the pie is going to be much smaller because of the state of our economy and we will be much more drivers to divide the pie? This one is the definition of sharing poverty!

5. I ask our councilors if they know a jurisdiction, province, city or village where Uber respect the law of place. It doesn't respect authorities and it doesn't respect the community and it show that in everything it does.

They smoke in the cars, they don't help seniors with their groceries, they don't shovel away the snow from seniors' driveways at 5:am in the morning to get them to dialysis at the hospitals, they don't have enough time to get wheelchair people with foldable or non foldable wheelchairs inside the hospitals, they don't help kids with the projects or other
stuff to go to school, they don't go inside the school to the Office to get the little kids and take them home, they didn't care about community because the venture investors doesn't allow them to care about our community, they care about money, just about money and no social capital in this relation.

Does Uber help police officers to find lost people from hospitals and retire homes? Never ever, because the guys behind them need money and on Wall Street they need to sell Uber stocks.

Any time police officers ask us about something wrong in our town, we collaborate with them for a better and safer environment in our cities. Does Uber do this? For sure no, because the vulture investors don't like that.

6. Is Region of Waterloo happy to send the engineers to work for Uber, instead of working to create a certain business environment where the political managers from our Region can help people with skills to get a job?

7. MTO found out few days ago following the regular inspection that no one car from Uber complied with Ontario Safety Regulations, all of them being with mechanical problems. Meanwhile the Region officers ask us, traditional taxi drivers to provide the safety periodically for our cars.

How could these guys destroy lives being disparate for money?

8. Any relation and any project all over the world can not be developed if we don't take in consideration TRUST between the partners. Here is a big problem. We sent many messages to councilors and to licensing office but few of us got an answer.

We know that our councilors are busy and for this reason we wait and wait. The problem is that most of the guys behind me in this room think that the officials have their minds set and they will build a new bylaw in the way they think is good for Uber. I don't agree with them but is the turn of our councilors to prove them that they care about this industry and traditional taxi drivers with tens of years working in our Region.

Angelo is an amazing guy, fabulous guy and I respect him a lot. He has always his office door open and just we knock the door and he invites us inside to talk. He listens to us any time and he is very patient, but he doesn't answer and he seems to be under such a big pressure and he finally can't answer.

I want to propose to the Region to accept a certain guy who can come to the Region and talk in details about our problems and get an answer in legal time. Otherwise it is just one way collaboration, which doesn't work.
9. Uber doesn't pay one penny in Canada in Corporation Tax or Corporation Tax
Income and I provided to all our councilors the proof in the letter I sent to you. They use
many mechanisms to avoid the taxes totally, like "double dutch", "inversion tax" and
others. How could these guys worthy for our community? They are worthy for the
guys from Wall Street.

10. Our officials know very well that every day and night we have in town Uber drivers
from other cities, even from Toronto, Mississauga, Guelph, Brampton and others. How
could be worthy for our community to allow Uber drivers from other cities to be active
and make profit in our Region and spend the money they make in other places?

11. Sometimes, Region of Waterloo officials talk about creating a competition in
transportation industry in our Region. Couldn't be any competition if the competitors are
treated by Region of Waterloo with double standard. Traditional taxi drivers treat
officials from our Region with deep respect and comply with bylaw and on the other side
Uber guys who don't have any respect for our officials and for our community and even
if they know that they are illegal, they continue to work in our Region.

Can not be a competition if the traditional taxi drivers with huge experience will pay to
insurance companies in Canada, over $7,500 per year for a proper commercial
insurance and no accident in his or her record and we are overcharged to almost
$20,000 per year for one accident, and Uber drivers pay maximum $80-85 per month
for same working hours and they have a clause of forgiven for first accident. I talked in
the last message about the number of staff the traditional taxi industry hires in our
Region for our offices, which is a very important aspect at this time.

How could be a competition as long as one competitor runs with such a huge
advantage? How could our Region's official accept this kind of double standard? Is this
one a real competition?

I am sure that Region of Waterloo will continue to work with traditional taxi companies to
improve the service in our Region and we will continue to be a strong family together.
We will help each other, traditional taxi companies will pay taxes in our Region, they will
help people from our Region and they will understand that a corrupt American
corporation with shareholders on Wall Street will not help our community in the same
way the traditional taxi shareholders do.
All my respect and I am looking forward your answer

PEng. Ec. Adrian Cosereanu
Cell Phone  519 722 6382
E-mail address: cosereanuadrian@gmail.com

Sent from my iPad