1		E NEW YORK STATE SENATE FINANCE BLY WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEES	
2		OINT LEGISLATIVE HEARING	
4	_	In the Matter of the	
5	2	015-2016 EXECUTIVE BUDGET ON TRANSPORTATION	
6			
7			
8		Hearing Room B Legislative Office Building Albany, New York	J
9			
LO		January 29, 2015 9:32 a.m.	
11			
12	PRESIDING	:	
13		Senator John A. DeFrancisco Chair, Senate Finance Committee	
L4 L5		Assemblyman Herman D. Farrell, Jr. Chair, Assembly Ways & Means Committee	
16	PRESENT:	,	
L7		Senator Liz Krueger Senate Finance Committee (RM)	
18		Assemblyman Robert Oaks	
19		Assembly Ways & Means Committee (RM)	
20		Assemblyman David Gantt	
21		Chair, Assembly Committee on Transportation	1
22		Assemblyman James F. Brennan Chair, Assembly Committee on Corporations,	
23		Authorities & Commissions	
24		Assemblyman Michael Cusick	

1	2015-2016 Executive Budget Transportation
2	
3	PRESENT: (Continued)
4	Senator Diane Savino
5	Assemblyman James Skoufis
6	Assemblyman Clifford Crouch
7	Senator Timothy Kennedy
8	Assemblyman Steven Otis
9	Assemblyman Thomas J. Abinanti
10	Senator Martin Malave Dilan
11	Assemblyman Félix Ortiz
12	Senator Patricia A. Ritchie
13	Assemblyman David G. McDonough
14	Senator Marc Panepinto
15	Assemblyman Samuel D. Roberts
16	Assemblyman Erik Dilan
17	Senator Velmanette Montgomery
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	2015-2016 Executive Budget		
2	Transportation 1-29-15		
3	LIST OF SPEAKERS		
4		STATEMENT	QUESTIONS
5	Robert Megna Acting Executive Director		
6	NYS State Thruway Authority and NYS Canal Corporation	6	10
7	Joan M. McDonald		
8	Commissioner New York State Department		
9	of Transportation	66	72
10	J. David Sampson Exec. Deputy Commissioner		
11	New York State Department of Motor Vehicles	189	194
12		103	131
13	Thomas F. Prendergast Chairman & CEO		
14	Metropolitan Transportation Authority	210	221
15	Frank Kobliski Executive Director		
16	Central NY Regional Transportation Authority	307	312
17	Scott Wigger		
18	Executive Director Railroads of New York	314	
19	Nadine Lemmon	011	
20	NY & Federal Policy Coordinator Tri-State Transportation Campaign	320	
21		020	
22	William Bonds President	220	225
23	Empire Safety Council	329	335
24			

1	2015-2016 Executive Budget Transportation 1-29-15		
3	LIST OF SPEAKERS,	Continued	
4		STATEMENT	QUESTIONS
5	Russ Page President		
6	NYS Association of Town	240	240
7	Superintendents of Highways Tracy Eldridge 1st Vice President	340	349
8	NYS County Highway Superintendents Association		
9	Michael Giardino		
10	President		
11	New York Aviation Management Association	352	
12	Denise Richardson Executive Director		
13	General Contractors Association of New York	361	
14	- W 1' 1		
15	James Meerdink Project Coordinator	265	
16	Parks & Trails New York	365	
17	Adam Prizio Manager, Government Affairs Center for Disability Rights	372	
18	Center for Disability Rights	572	
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

1	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Good morning.
2	Today we begin the second in a series
3	of hearings conducted by the joint fiscal
4	committees of the Legislature regarding the
5	Governor's proposed budget for the fiscal
6	year 2015-2016. The hearings are conducted
7	pursuant to Article 7, Section 3 of the
8	Constitution and Article 2, Sections 31 and
9	32A of the Legislative Law.
10	Today the Assembly Ways and Means
11	Committee and the Senate Finance Committees
12	will hear testimony concerning the budget
13	proposal for transportation.
14	I will now introduce members from the
15	Assembly that are with us: Assemblyman
16	Cusick, Assemblyman Skoufis, Assemblyman
17	Brennan, chair, and Assemblyman Oaks, who
18	will tell us his members.
19	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Assemblyman
20	McDonough is with us as well.
21	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: And I also have
22	Assemblyman Otis with us.
23	Senator DeFrancisco?
24	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: And for the

1	Senate we have ranker Liz Krueger, Tim
2	Kennedy, and Diane Savino, all Senators.
3	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: The first person to
4	testify is Acting Executive Director Robert
5	Megna, New York State Thruway Authority and
6	Canal Corp.
7	Welcome, and good morning. Or is it
8	good morning and welcome?
9	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Thank you,
10	Assemblyman Chairman.
11	Chairman DeFrancisco, Chairman
12	Farrell, and members of the Senate and
13	Assembly fiscal and Transportation
14	Committees, thank you for having me here
15	today. I am Bob Megna, acting executive
16	director of the New York State Thruway
17	Authority and the New York State Canal
18	Corporation.
19	This is, as you all know, a very
20	significant year for the Thruway Authority as
21	represented in the Executive Budget. The
22	Executive Budget proposes a capital
23	appropriation of nearly \$1.3 billion for the
24	Thruway Stabilization Program. We are

1	extremely grateful to the Governor for this
2	infusion of capital from the more than
3	\$5 billion in settlements with banks and
4	financial institutions that became available
5	this year.

Some of these funds will be used to eliminate the need for a toll increase this year. Some will be used to support capital projects throughout the Thruway system. Of course, a significant portion will be invested in the New NY Bridge project, which will help keep tolls at the Tappan Zee as low as possible for as long as possible.

Design-build contractor Tappan Zee

Constructors, LLC, has now driven 77 percent
of the piles that make up the foundation of
this 100-year Hudson River crossing between

Westchester and Rockland counties. The first
vertical pier columns rose above the Hudson
in September 2014. The pile caps that will
support the iconic open towers of the new
twin-span bridge are also already in place.

In October, Governor Cuomo welcomed the I Lift NY super crane to the project

1	site. One of the world's largest floating
2	cranes, I Lift NY is one of the keys to
3	helping save more than \$1 billion on the
4	project compared to early cost estimates, in
5	part by allowing large sections of the new
6	cable-stayed bridge to be prefabricated
7	off-site in a safer, more efficient manner
8	and brought in by barge.

The Executive Budget also proposes to authorize the Thruway Authority and the New York State Department of Transportation to enter into agreements to provide mutual aid through the sharing of employees, services and resources when and where appropriate, which will help us maximize every opportunity for operational efficiencies and cost savings.

As you know, our operations include the state canal system, which spans 524 miles and includes the Erie, Champlain, Oswego and Cayuga-Seneca Canals. The canals and the Erie Canalway bike and pedestrian trail are increasingly popular recreational destinations for New Yorkers and other

visitors. The canal system generates an
estimated \$380 million in annual tourism
spending, and commercial and residential
development along the canals is increasing

The canals are also still used for commercial shipping, and a 2014 report found that the canal system supports over \$6.2 billion annually in non-tourism economic activity across the state by providing water for local drinking water as well as agricultural, industrial and power-generation uses.

One final note, an important one: We could not do any of what we do without our employees across the state, and I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge their hard work, dedication and ongoing commitment to the highest standards of safety and reliability in every area of our operations. I got to see that in my first few days on the job, with the latest storm, how quickly, effectively and efficiently they moved equipment around the state to help with the storm downstate.

Τ	Again, let me thank you for your time.
2	I'd be happy to respond to any of your
3	questions. And let me thank the chairmen for
4	accommodating my schedule today. I have a
5	board meeting, and they moved me first on the
6	list, and I want to thank them for that
7	convenience.
8	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
9	much.
10	To begin, Assemblyman Brennan, chair
11	of Corporations.
12	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Thank you,
13	Mr. Farrell.
14	Good morning, Mr. Megna.
15	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Good
16	morning.
17	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: I'm hoping
18	you're well.
19	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Thank you.
20	Doing okay.
21	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Good to see you
22	actually testifying.
23	Anyway, the Executive proposal, as you
24	just mentioned, includes \$1.285 billion for

1	Thruway Authority capital. Of this amount,
2	how much will be used for the replacement of
3	the Tappan Zee Bridge?
4	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: You know,
5	we're still working with folks who run the
6	numbers on, you know, what the most effective
7	use of financing for the bridge should be. I
8	would say at this point, you know, a big
9	chunk, a vast majority of the money will be
10	used for bridge financing. I don't have an
11	exact number to tell you today, but I think
12	the vast majority of that amount would be
13	dedicated to bridge financing.
14	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Okay, that's
15	perfectly understandable.
16	How much will be used to prevent a
17	toll increase?
18	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well,
19	again, I think and I'm glad you asked that
20	question, because there's been a lot of
21	discussion about, or at least some
22	conversations I've had with folks that we
23	were going to use the remainder of the money
24	maybe for operating expenses to keep tolls

I don't think that's our intention at

all. I think actually that would be a

mistake. The Thruway Authority has a

significant amount of capital expenditures on

an annual basis. So I think what we'd like

to do with what's not used for the bridge is

use that money for capital investment, repair

and maintenance on the rest of the system.

And we think a combination of doing those capital investments in a smart way and getting our budget under control, our operating expenses under control separately, will allow us to go through 2015 without a toll increase. And I think that's what the Governor has talked about, going through 2015 without a toll increase.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: So at this time you are saying that this \$1.285 billion will be used for capital and will not be used to subsidize the day-to-day operations of the Thruway Authority in 2015. And into the future?

24 ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: You know,

1	my folks from my old job, Assemblyman, would
2	bang me over the head if I used one-time
3	money for operating expenses. And I think it
4	would be, you know, a bad use of those
5	resources.
6	I think we have, as I get more and
7	more into the Thruway Authority budget and
8	I'm not going to pretend, after a week, to be
9	an expert it's clear we have significant
10	annual capital expenses on the non-bridge
11	part of the Thruway that we will have plenty
12	of opportunity to invest this money to
13	improve the capital infrastructure of the
14	Thruway.
15	And so we do not want to subsidize
16	operating expenses with this money.
17	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: All right. And
18	that gets me to another point here.
19	According to the information I have, you have
20	a \$2.29 billion 2015-to-2019 capital program
21	without the Tappan Zee bridge. Do you
22	anticipate being able to handle that capital

program with respect to your current funding

23

24

situation?

Τ	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well, I
2	think it's another good question,
3	Assemblyman. I think one of the things I'm
4	looking at is what our capital outlays are
5	planned to be over time, how we can merge in
6	whatever we don't use on the bridge to
7	supplement that capital program, and how we
8	maybe can prioritize a little bit to save
9	money where it's possible on that capital
10	program. So I'm kind of right in the middle
11	of that process right now.
12	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: All right. Do
13	you have a a completion date for the
14	Tappan Zee Bridge?
15	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Right now
16	we believe that we're on time, on budget, on
17	schedule. I couldn't give you the exact
18	dates. I'm sure I could get them to you.
19	But nothing has changed from the original
20	schedule.
21	Of course, this is, as you all know,
22	the largest infrastructure or one of the
23	largest public infrastructure projects in the
24	country. And so it is a challenge to keep it

1	on schedule, but we are determined to do
2	that. And as of today, you know, we're
3	pushing to remain on time, on budget.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: There is
5	Article 7 legislation to increase toll
6	evasion penalties and other enforcement
7	mechanisms. Do you have a projection on how
8	much additional revenue that might make for
9	the Thruway Authority?
10	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Again,
11	with the Thruway Authority I think the issue
12	is the Tappan Zee Bridge and construction
13	that's going to take place around the toll
14	plaza. And because of that construction, it
15	is possible that we're going to go to full
16	E-ZPass during that period of time because of
17	the construction.
18	And so one of the things that would be
19	good is if we could, you know, get that
20	Article 7 legislation passed
21	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: I'm not
22	suggesting that it's a bad idea. In fact,
23	we've been trying to work with the
24	administration for several years on a

1	proposal, and we're you know, I think we
2	should try to get it done. But you don't
3	know how much money
4	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: No, I can
5	get you an estimate. I think I don't want
6	to give an estimate for the off-Thruway part
7	of the system because I'm not exactly sure
8	what that is. But we'll get you that number,
9	Assemblyman.
10	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: All right.
11	Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
13	Senator?
14	Oh, just one second. I've been joined
15	by Assemblyman Roberts and Assemblyman Ortiz.
16	And Assemblyman Gantt.
17	Yes, sir?
18	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: And we've been
19	joined by Senator Dilan.
20	And the next questioner would be
21	Senator Savino.
22	SENATOR SAVINO: Thank you. Thank
23	you, Senator DeFrancisco.
24	Good morning, Commissioner. It's good

1	to see you again. I actually got confused
2	when I walked in the room. I said, why is
3	Bob Megna here, completely forgetting your
4	new role at the Thruway Authority.

I'm going to be brief; I won't use the whole seven minutes. I do want to pick up on some of the questions that Assemblyman

Brennan made, because I am not a budgetary expert. But I listened to your testimony and I listened to the Governor's presentation where he talked about using a portion of the settlement from the bank settlements for the Thruway Authority. And the language is, so correct me if I'm misinterpreting this, "We are grateful to the Governor for this infusion of capital from the more than \$5 billion in bank and financial settlements. Some of these funds will be used to eliminate the need for a toll increase."

Now, I heard you say and I was happy to hear you say that that would be wrong to take this one-time money and use it for operational expenses, but I don't know how to interpret it any other way than the way you

1	wrote it in your testimony. So exactly how
2	are we going to do that without taking this
3	one-time money and using it for operational
4	expenses?
5	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well, it

ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well, it's a -- thank you, Senator. It's a good question. And I think the testimony maybe is a little confusing.

What I have learned so far in looking at the Thruway Authority budget is that it's a very, very capital-intensive budget. And so I think it's perfectly clear that we can use whatever money is not invested in the bridge on capital improvements on the rest of the system that will, to a certain extent, lower our net need to go out to the market to borrow money to do those kinds of investments. That will save us money both in the short run and in the long run.

But to keep tolls down, it's not going to be just that. Those monies will be used for capital, but we're also going to have to look at the operating expenses of the Thruway Authority, and we're going to have to try to

1 make some savings	s.
---------------------	----

2 So again, our intention is that all \$1.3 billion will be used for capital 3 4 purposes. Again, this is not a \$1.3 billion 5 check, as I understand it, that's going to be 6 written to the Thruway Authority. It's going 7 to be held off to the side by my former workforce, and they are going to make that 8 money available for capital purposes, not for 9 10 subsidizing operating. 11 So I'm sorry for any confusion, but 12 we're not going to, you know, subsidize tolls with capital money. We're going to use 13 14 capital money for capital purposes. That 15 will actually save us money, which will help 16 us keep tolls down, but we're still going to have to make operating savings within the 17

And again, we're talking about 2015.

Thruway Authority to make sure that's true.

20 SENATOR SAVINO: Thank you for 21 clarifying that.

22 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.

23 Assemblyman McDonough.

18

19

24 ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: No, no. Pass.

1	Not right now.
2	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Assemblyman Oaks.
3	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Thank you,
4	Mr. Megna.
5	A couple of things. I know you are on
6	short time, but I have a couple of questions
7	about the bridge and then a little bit about
8	the canal as well.
9	I know that there was an attempt
10	earlier on to get you some environmental
11	funding, whatever, that was rejected. At
12	that point it was said that there would be a
13	status of, you know, challenging that.
14	Just checking to see how we're doing
15	with that. Is that in place? Have we had a
16	reaction from that?
17	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well,
18	again, Assemblyman, thank you. I have talked
19	to folks about it. I don't pretend to have
20	all the details. We are challenging the
21	position that we can't use the EFC money for
22	that purpose. I think the EFC chair would be
23	better positioned to talk about the details

of that.

1	But again, we've always felt that that
2	was, based on what EFC recommended to us, a
3	proper use of those funds. And my
4	understanding is we continue to challenge the
5	fact that we cannot use those resources.
6	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Thank you.
7	There is, in this year's Executive
8	Budget, some opportunity for some shared
9	services between DOT and the Thruway. Again,
10	knowing you're just recently on the job,
11	efforts toward that, both in the short term
12	and the long term, do you see those? And,
13	you know, are we are those opportunities
14	already being taken advantage of?
15	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: I mean, I
16	think I saw them a little bit just two days
17	ago. I think there was an effort even within
18	this latest storm to you know, DOT handles
19	a much larger and vaster road network than
20	the Thruway. And so when a major storm hits,
21	they have a lot of roads to plow and a lot of
22	things to do.
23	I think there's plenty of opportunity,
24	a lot of opportunity for us to share

1	resources in a better way to make sure that
2	we can efficiently operate in a storm
3	situation. But I think even beyond storm
4	situations, there's plenty of opportunities:
5	Engineering, IT, human resources. There are
6	plenty of areas where I think there is room
7	for efficiencies and savings if we could get
8	together a little bit better.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Next year,
10	hopefully, when we do this we can have a
11	greater discussion on that.
12	Moving to the canal, I know the trail
13	along the canal is something that we've made
14	great progress on over the last number of
15	years, but we're kind of at a standstill. I
16	there anything in this budget that would wor
17	toward the ultimate completion of that? And
18	do you know about where we are
19	percentage-wise of the trail, how many miles
20	out of the
21	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA:
22	Assemblyman, I'd have to get back to you on
23	the percentage.
24	I don't think there's anything

1	specifically on the canal. I have I know
2	Brian has and I know he's worked with you
3	and with all the members on the canal, and
4	he's a tremendous advocate for the canal
5	system has a lot of ideas of how we might
6	even bring in outside funding to help finish,
7	you know, the portions of the canal that
8	aren't you know, the byways and things
9	that aren't quite done yet. So I'm working
10	with him to try to educate myself on how we
11	might do that.
12	But I'll get back to you with the
13	exact percentage.
14	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: I think that and,
15	you know, working with you know, certainly
16	I would be and I'm sure others would be
17	the last piece that was done in my district
18	had some, you know, local participation in
19	that and helped make that piece of the trail
20	happen.
21	I think looking for other
22	opportunities, certainly being creative, I

think that may -- if that is the way, you

know, hopefully we can be successful in doing

23

24

1	that. I look forward to working with you.
2	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: I think
3	with the canal you've hit it exactly right,
4	Assemblyman. We have to be very creative, I
5	think, and look for innovative opportunities
6	to take advantage of a wonderful system that
7	right now, you know, we're not taking
8	advantage of as much as we probably should.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
11	Senator?
12	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: We've been
13	joined by Senator Marc Panepinto, a new
14	Senator, and Senator Montgomery is back.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: We've also been
16	joined by Assemblyman Crouch.
17	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: And we've been
18	joined by Assemblyman Abinanti.
19	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: And the next
20	questioner will be Senator Kennedy.
21	SENATOR KENNEDY: Good morning.
22	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Good
23	morning.
24	SENATOR KENNEDY: Congratulations on

1	your new position. We all know that your
2	budgetary expertise is essential these days
3	at the Thruway Authority, and we're very
4	happy to have you in your new position.
5	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Thank you.
6	SENATOR KENNEDY: So back to your
7	point, I understand the proposal to use the
8	settlement funds this year to close the
9	deficit, prevent toll hikes for at least a
10	year. I know that there are a lot of folks,
11	residents and businesses alike, that are
12	thrilled to hear that the tolls will not be
13	increased this year.
14	What assurances do we have moving
15	forward that there won't be a toll hike in
16	outyears? What sort of formulas are you
17	looking at implementing?
18	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well,
19	again, Senator, that's what I'm trying to
20	actually work on now, which is how do you
21	best use this \$1.3 billion, how do we invest
22	in capital. One of the again, I know I'm
23	making the same point over and over, but I
24	think it's an important one. I think we can

1	control operating expenses, and I think I'm
2	going to spend a lot of time trying to do
3	that. Then the next question is what the
4	real question is on the Thruway all the
5	time how do you invest capital, how do you
6	maintain the road? It's the most-used
7	commercial roadway in the country. And that
8	means that a lot of trucks use it and a lot
9	of trucks wear it out. And so, you know, we
10	have a very, very large capital expenditure
11	every year.

So I'm going through that now. We're trying to figure out the best way to allocate that money to make sure the system is in good shape but that we're also investing our capital wisely and in the right places and we're going out and borrowing money in the right way. I think we've had some issues with, you know, how we've gone to the market in the past, and we're trying to rectify those.

As we work through that process, I think we'll see what our needs are in the future. But again, I would hesitate to give

1	you a plan for tolls, you know, for future
2	years beyond 2015 because I couldn't give you
3	an educated answer to that. I would say I
4	think we can manage the system, given the
5	\$1.3 billion, pretty efficiently and
6	effectively without significant toll
7	increases over a period of time on the rest
8	of the Thruway. That doesn't mean no toll
9	increases, but I think it means that we can
10	minimize toll increases over the future.
11	But I'd like to get a chance to look
12	at the capital budget and the kind of
13	projects we have in place before I give you a
14	definitive answer to that.
15	SENATOR KENNEDY: All right. Thank
16	you.
17	I'm sure you're aware of the epic
18	snowstorm that we had this past November. It
19	was a historic snowfall, up to 7 feet or more
20	in Western New York. My district was
21	particularly hit very hard. The City of
22	Buffalo, the Town of Cheektowaga, the City of
23	Lackawanna. The Thruway, the 90 and the 190

traverse my district; they were shut down.

1	I believe that the Thruway Authority
2	has learned a lot over the years in fighting
3	these epic snowstorms out in Western
4	New York. I know Governor Cuomo hit the
5	ground out in our community for almost an
6	entire week straight. At every single level
7	we had government responding to the needs of
8	our community.
9	I'm curious to know what the Thruway

I'm curious to know what the Thruway
Authority learned from the experience, what
policies and procedures that you're looking
at and have looked at to implement future
responses to natural disasters out in our
community and anywhere else in New York
State.

ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: No, it's a great question. We've put a team together.

And as you know, we're trying to come up with a set of recommendations based on what we learned in that storm.

Again, one of the things we've done already is accelerated getting GPS on all of our plows, especially the ones in Western

New York, so we can see where they are all

1	the time and have real-time kind of
2	positioning so we don't fall into some of the
3	same traps that we fell into during that
4	storm.
5	So again I don't want to kind of

So again, I don't want to kind of prejudge, because this group is coming back with recommendations based on what we learned on that storm. But what we are trying to do is work with local officials, work with -- because it wasn't just, you know, an issue for us, it was an issue for the locals as well. So we're trying to work with the locals to know what they saw that we did maybe not as efficiently or effectively as we could, or how they could have helped us more or we helped them in a little bit more in the process.

SENATOR KENNEDY: So this is an ongoing analysis?

ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well, it is, but I think we're going to get a set of recommendations based on that. And when we get those recommendations, I'll make them available to you.

1	SENATOR KENNEDY: And do you have a
2	timeline on that?
3	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: I don't
4	have an exact date, but I'll get back to you.
5	But I think this is something that's
6	relatively, you know, short term. Soon.
7	SENATOR KENNEDY: Thank you.
8	Thank you, that's all.
9	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Assemblyman Otis.
10	ASSEMBLYMAN OTIS: It's great to see
11	you. And I have to compliment the Governor
12	because if we're trying to solve a financial
13	problem at an important agency like the
14	Thruway Authority, how better to do it than
15	to have the budget director go solve the
16	problem.
17	I understand that you don't have all
18	the answers yet on what is going on. But do
19	you have any sense of how long in the making
20	the financial problems of the Thruway
21	Authority how long those problems have
22	been? Or is this something recent?
23	And to the extent that you're going
24	to, a few weeks or months from now, figure

rather, you know, on a timely basis then, that we know what the solutions are and when	1	all this out, would there be a mechanism to
that we know what the solutions are and what the cause of the problems were? So I'll i	2	share that information with this committee
5 the cause of the problems were? So I'll r	3	rather, you know, on a timely basis then, so
	4	that we know what the solutions are and what
6 that offer.	5	the cause of the problems were? So I'll make
	6	that offer.

Maybe you could share a little more about where you are so far after a week and a few days.

10 ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Not that
11 far, Assemblyman.

But I think what I have asked people to do is we need to relook at our expense budget, our operating budget. Almost all of the members have mentioned that as part of their questioning to me. We need to get our operating expenses under better control. I think we can do that. And I can do that without jeopardizing safety or without jeopardizing snowplowing. I think there's some opportunities I've seen already for some savings.

I think the other piece we need to look at -- and again, I'm sounding like a

1	broken record is how we're investing our
2	capital, where we're investing our capital,
3	are we doing the right projects, are we doing
4	them at the right time, and are we doing them
5	in the right locations around the state. And
6	those are the kinds of things that the
7	Thruway Authority folks are presenting to me
8	now.
9	And this is a great workforce.
10	They're very good. The engineers are
11	fantastic. I'm very happy with the folks
12	that I've met at the Thruway Authority. So I
13	don't think it's a question of the workforce.
14	I think it's a question of focusing on the
15	right things and on the right priorities.
16	And I think we have plenty of opportunities
17	to get the finances of the Thruway Authority
18	under control.
19	ASSEMBLYMAN OTIS: Thank you very
20	much. Good luck.
21	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Senator
22	Panepinto.
23	SENATOR PANEPINTO: Yes, over here.
24	Good morning.

1	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Hello,
2	Senator.
3	SENATOR PANEPINTO: I wanted to follow
4	up on Senator Kennedy's question regarding
5	the Thruway Authority and the Snow-vember
6	event in Western New York. We had, you know,
7	hundreds of motorists stuck on the Thruway
8	for, you know, over 24 hours.
9	And I know you're doing a study and
10	interacting with local officials on this, but
11	it seems to me what were the processes in
12	place at the time which led to this situation
13	and may have led to you being in this job
14	right now? I mean, it seems to me that, you
15	know, we've had these occurrences before on
16	the New York State Thruway in the Buffalo
17	area. Snow is not new in upstate New York.
18	And to have, you know, people stuck on the
19	Thruway for 30 hours was it was
20	life-threatening, it was embarrassing.
21	So what procedures were in place at
22	the time of that event that didn't work?
23	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Senator,
24	I'm actually going through that now and

1	trying to learn more about what happened in
2	November. I'm not going to sit here and make
3	excuses for it. I'm still trying to learn
4	what happened and what really went wrong.
5	There were issues, obviously, with the
6	weather forecast and how quickly the snow
7	hit, and I think it caught people off-guard,
8	from what I understand. And three hours of
9	being off-guard at 4 inches an hour or
10	8 inches an hour of snowfall really put them
11	behind the curve. And we really didn't know
12	where all the vehicles were. We really
13	didn't know, you know, how to mobilize to get
L 4	to areas we really needed to get to faster.
15	Those are all things this group is working
16	on.
17	Also, I don't think coordination with
18	the locals was very good or as good as it
19	could have been. And those are all things I
20	think we're going to emphasize that we have
21	to improve.
22	SENATOR PANEPINTO: Who's part of this
23	local working group that you've got right

now?

1	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: I'll get
2	you the names of the folks on it.
3	SENATOR PANEPINTO: Okay. And my
4	follow-up question is the canal system. I
5	realize you're new in the job. What are your
6	long-term thoughts on the viability of the
7	canal system, maintaining it as part of the
8	Thruway Authority?
9	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well,
10	that's a great question, Senator, and I think
11	it's one that requires some a significant
12	amend of exploration. You know, it's still a
13	significant commercial waterway within
14	New York State which, quite honestly, I
15	didn't realize how much commercial traffic
16	still goes across the canal system. And also
17	it is a significant recreational area.
18	I am in the process of going through
19	that with my staff right now. You know,
20	there is a significant subsidy that goes to
21	the canal system. I'm not sure, now putting
22	on the hat from my old job, where that
23	subsidy today could be better handled in
24	state government. I'm not sure there's a

1	good	answer	to	that	question.

What we have to do is improve the

viability of the system so we reduce the

subsidy. And then I think a lot of options

become available for, you know, the long-term

viability of the canal system.

SENATOR PANEPINTO: I mean, it's certainly part of New York State history. I mean, you know, we were the terminus of the Erie Canal. And, you know, we need to have that as part of our cultural history. But we're subsiding it right now to the tune of \$85 million a year. What is the canal system generating at this time?

ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: I'll get you the exact numbers, but not very much on an annual basis.

Again, you know, you are talking about a system that's old. You're talking about a system that needs capital improvement but still serves a significant, you know, commercial sector. But again, the revenue we're bringing in from that commercial sector is not very significant. I'll get you the

1	exact numbers, but is not very significant.
2	So it is a significant subsidy. But
3	again, I don't know yet if we've taken full
4	advantage of the possible opportunities. And
5	again, Brian Stratton is a great advocate for
6	the system. I think he has some ideas for
7	how the system can be improved and generate
8	more revenue.
9	Is it possible to privatize a little
10	bit more of the system to get more
11	recreational activities or improve
12	recreational activities on the system? These
13	are all things that I'm looking at right now.
14	SENATOR PANEPINTO: Thank you.
15	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
16	I've been joined by Assemblyman Steck.
17	Next to testify, Assemblyman Abinanti.
18	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Thank you,
19	Mr. Chairman.
20	Thank you for joining us this morning,
21	sir.
22	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Thank you.
23	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Let me start
24	off by saying I have a very great interest in

1	the Tappan Zee Bridge. I represent the
2	Westchester side. My Assembly office is the
3	building immediately next to the plaza, so I
4	get to see the construction progress every
5	day. And I was a county legislator for
6	almost 20 years, so I was at the first
7	planning meeting when the idea of replacing
8	the Tappan Zee Bridge was originated. And
9	I've been to so many meetings in fact, I
10	make an offer. I have a file cabinet full of
11	information. If you can't find something,
12	I'll be glad to share it with you.
13	I first of all applaud your attitude
14	and the way you're coming into this. And I
15	think that change in attitude is important
16	for the way the Thruway Authority is run.
17	And I'm hopeful that we will see some
18	improvements and some changes.
19	There's three points I'd like to
20	discuss with you. I kind of facetiously but
21	seriously said I'd be glad to share
22	information with you
23	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Sure.
24	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: but we're

1	finding it very difficult to have the Thruway
2	Authority share information with us. And I'm
3	hopeful that that can be changed. And I
4	would like to see some kind of an out.
5	There's been a very expensive outreach
6	to the community. The authority has hired
7	outside consultants, we have dog-and-pony
8	shows, but in fact the community doesn't feel
9	part of what's going on.
10	So I hope that the sharing of
11	information and the sharing of approach and
12	the sharing of planning takes hold. And I
13	would hope you'd be able to do something
14	about that. I'd be pleased to meet with
15	you but not just alone, I'd like to bring
16	the mayors of the communities around the
17	Tappan Zee Bridge to sit down with you and
18	let you gain from their experience as to
19	what's been happening on the ground. I guess
20	basically I'm talking about
21	community-friendly planning.
22	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Sure, I'd
23	be happy to do that.
24	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Okay. because

1	we have some very good mayors who have been
2	there for a long, long time and have done a
3	very good job with their communities, and now
4	everything is disrupted because of the
5	bridge. And it goes from having parking
6	facilities just pop up in their community,
7	traffic being rerouted, and also changes on
8	the river that are really not
9	boater-friendly.
10	So I'd like to continue that
11	conversation if we could.
12	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA:
13	Absolutely.
14	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Now, not to
15	beat a dead horse, but I would now like to go
16	to the question of tolls on the Tappan Zee
17	Bridge.
18	We have managed to glean some
19	information, and we have come to the
20	conclusion that over the years maybe not
21	recently, because of all of the work that's
22	going around on the Tappan Zee Bridge but
23	over the years the Tappan Zee Bridge has
24	subsidized the entire Thruway system. And so

1	we have proposed three different approaches
2	which we believe can keep the Tappan Zee
3	Bridge tolls perhaps \$2 more.
4	One is to separate the bridge into an
5	island account. Take all of the tolls from
6	the bridge and let it meet all of the
7	expenses of the bridge.
8	Number two is to take your newly
9	designed downstate region and make that an
10	island account, and take all of the tolls and
11	the revenues from the downstate region and
12	let it pay for all of the expenses downstate.
13	The third would be to take the present
14	formula not pile all of the costs on the
15	users of the Tappan Zee Bridge, but take the
16	present formula and spread it out over the
17	entire Thruway.
18	Any one of those, according to our
19	numbers, increases the tolls at the Tappan
20	Zee Bridge a minimal amount.
21	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well,
22	certainly I'd like to look at the analysis,
23	because that's what we're doing now,
24	especially with the infusion of the extra

1 money proposed in the Executive Budget by the 2 Governor.

I think one of the things we've been reluctant, as I think all the members know, to talk about the tolling policy is because, again, the financing has been an open issue. You know, we had the federal loan that had to come through, we had the EFC issue that some of the members have already raised, and then we had the settlement money, which we didn't expect.

I think as part of that process, we have put together a pretty good team of people not just within the Thruway but, you know, a kind of multidisciplinary group within government to kind of look at the toll structure and how we might proceed.

So we'd love to look at the stuff that you have and see how we could go forward.

But again, the intent was to, you know, build a bridge with a significant infrastructure cost but to do that in a way that we minimize tolls. So that's certainly a priority for us.

1	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: I appreciate
2	that. One of the concerns that I have is
3	your toll structure will shift traffic in
4	various directions. And if the toll is too
5	high, then we start to impact the next bridge
6	up
7	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Local
8	roads.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: and the
10	local roads. And so again, that's a
11	community-friendly planning issue.
12	Just lastly, the last minute I have,
13	is several of us in the Assembly and the
14	Senate have put in legislation to impose
15	various types of discounts, like resident
16	discounts, et cetera. And I would hope that
17	you would consider that. Because this is a
18	national roadway, and frankly I believe that
19	the residents who suffer the inconvenience of
20	the traffic should get the benefit of a lower
21	toll, while those who are using this for
22	nationwide transport could bear the higher
23	cost.
24	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well, I

1	can assure you that we're looking all of
2	the plans that we're looking at, or some of
3	them, at least, would absolutely include that
4	factor.
5	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: The last thing,
6	back to the community-friendly planning, the
7	other thing is I would hope that your
8	planners would take a look at the impact on
9	local roads and exits of what it is that
10	you're doing at various times. Because we
11	have some very the next exits coming off
12	the Tappan Zee Bridge on the Westchester side
13	are really very small roads, and the traffic
14	is starting to back up on the exits and
15	impact the traffic on 287 coming off the
16	Tappan Zee Bridge, which defeats the whole
17	purpose of trying to move the traffic through
18	faster.
19	I look forward to further discussion
20	with you. Thank you for coming this morning.
21	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Oh, it's a
22	pleasure to be here.
23	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: (Laughing.)
24	I'm sure.

1	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: No,
2	listen, I look forward to working with you on
3	it.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Very good.
5	Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
7	Senator?
8	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Senator
9	Krueger.
10	SENATOR KRUEGER: Good morning.
11	Congratulations on your new job. I feel like
12	I want to ask you about the 82 other sections
13	of the budget, not the New York State Thruway
14	Authority, because I figure you know the
15	answers to those sections also. But probably
16	someone will say I'm not allowed to do that.
17	But maybe after the hearing.
18	So obviously you've gotten a whole
19	series of questions around what did the
20	Governor mean when he said some of the
21	settlement money going to the Thruway
22	Authority might be used for avoiding toll
23	increases. And I'm not sure I'm satisfied
24	with the answer, but I'm not going to ask you

1	again.	I'm	goin	g to	take	а	different
2	approach	to	the	same	quest	cic	on.

So in 2014 the projected increase in toll revenue needed for 2015 was higher than you're saying in 2015 it will be. So you're saying you don't need as much toll -- you don't have as large a hole in toll revenue as you thought you would be at a year ago.

What changed? You're talking about efficiencies. I'm curious, where are you making more money that your toll revenue shortfall is not as big a deal as a year ago your predecessor thought it was going to be?

ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well, I think several places. I think traffic did a little bit better than we thought because the economy is improving, so we did a little bit better on toll revenue, but I think -- you know, rolling in so the base is a little bit higher.

But no, look, we still have some tough decision-making to do. We still have a hole on the operating side that we have to close.

And we're going to have to close that -- and

1	again, I'm assuring the committee members
2	that we're going to do that without using the
3	\$1.3 billion, because that's not the intent
4	of the \$1.3 billion. So we have to find some
5	operating efficiencies within the department.

We also have to operate our capital budget more efficiently and more effectively. It continues to grow over time, and that's important because maintenance of the Thruway and keeping it in good condition is obviously important. It's a vital commercial artery. But I don't know that we've been investing our capital in the most efficient, most effective way. I don't know that we've been borrowing money in the most efficient and most effective way. And I think there are opportunities for us to improve our capital structure and, within doing that, significantly reducing our costs, which will help us in 2015.

Again, as I mentioned to one of the Senators before, I think, you know, on an ongoing basis we have to then look at what we think is possible, but to do something within

1	a reasonable, practical level that people
2	would support when people come back here next
3	year to talk about 2016 and people talk about
4	2017, that we have a rational plan that makes
5	sense given what we've invested.
6	I think we can get there without, you
7	know, significant increases in tolls beyond
8	2015.
9	SENATOR KRUEGER: And you said already
10	that much of what the Thruway Authority does
11	and is responsible for are capital needs, and
12	I agree.
13	So you've reached approximately
14	\$8 billion wait a second. The Thruway's
15	outstanding debt is projected to reach nearly
16	\$8 billion, roughly eight times its annual
17	revenues, including Tappan Zee Bridge. One,
18	how much more can you borrow within your own
19	limits, or how much are you expecting to
20	borrow? And two, what are your concerns
21	about further potential credit rating
22	downgrades?
23	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well, I

have concerns about both. I think we have

1	not done a great job of structuring our debt
2	at the Thruway Authority. And I think it
3	and, Senator, it's a good question. It has,
4	I think, limited our ability to go to the
5	market. That's why I think we have to
6	carefully look at this \$1.3 billion and see
7	how we use it in a way that helps us improve
8	the capital structure of the Thruway
9	Authority so that we can start to go back to
10	the market a little bit more confidently to
11	borrow the money for the capital needs we do
12	have.

Then, quite honestly, I think we have to have a more realistic capital structure.

We can't -- you know, again, I haven't been there long enough to know, you know, what our exact needs are on the capital side. What I can tell you is I think we can be much more efficient in our use of capital dollars and still maintain and improve the Thruway system.

To your other question, we are going to have -- and again, we're going to have issues with the rating because of past

1	borrowing practices. And I believe, given
2	the 1.3, given our ability to control
3	operating expenses which I think we have,
4	given our ability, I hope, to restructure our
5	capital spending, we will be able to maintain
6	the rating. But it is not going to be easy.
7	And I think a lot of it is just, quite
8	honestly, bad prior practice.
9	SENATOR KRUEGER: The Governor in May
10	announced the Authority and the State
11	Department of Transportation would collocate
12	to a new transportation resource center to be
13	built on the site of the current Thruway
14	headquarters in Albany. Are you going
15	forward with this plan? How does it help you
16	with your goals for efficiencies and saving
17	money at the Thruway Authority?
18	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: It's a
19	great question. And it's one of the first
20	things that I've gotten involved in. They're
21	going through an RFP process now to
22	determine, you know, the kind of scope and
23	scale of the building. It's a good project
24	if there are synergies in the future that

T	save us money. It's a bad project if there
2	aren't. I'm not there yet on whether it's a
3	good or a bad project from that point of
4	view.
5	We are continuing to do it because we
6	think that there is the possibility of
7	significant synergies. Why should the
8	engineers for the Thruway Authority and DOT
9	be in separate buildings? Why shouldn't they
10	be working side by side? Why shouldn't the
11	guys that are planning snow removal in
12	Buffalo, like the questions we've had today,
13	be sitting right next to each other talking
14	about where those resources are and how they
15	could be used more effectively?
16	If we can do that, this building makes
17	a lot of sense and will save the state money
18	over time. And that's what we're looking at
19	right now.
20	SENATOR KRUEGER: I'm out of time.
21	Thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
23	Assemblyman McDonough.
24	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Thank you,

_	- 1	,		
/	And	acod	morning	again.
	11110	9000	IIIO I II I II I	agarii.

One point that was just briefly
mentioned just now, and something in your
testimony about shared services. And I think
that the shared services will absolutely
definitely increase efficiency, but cost
reduction could help remediate the need for
higher toll increases on the Tappan Zee
Bridge.

My concern is, will that be one of your early priorities, to look at the shared services? It's proven in the past with other agencies and in private industry that the shared services can save a tremendous amount of money.

ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well, it will be, by definition, given Senator

Krueger's question. One of the first things on our plate is the building. And the question is if the building provides a real, real opportunity for shared services. It includes opportunities for shared services on engineering, on human resources, on IT, on

1	all of the things that the private sector and
2	what we've tried to do in government would
3	provide significant savings.

opportunity for that, but we have to make sure that we're going to lock those savings in. Because we don't want to invest significant money in infrastructure that we could be using to fix roadways and keep tolls down unless we really think we're going to get the efficiencies. I do think those efficiencies are possible, and this is a project that could be very helpful.

But even before that, there are things we can do. The Executive Budget proposes that we look for opportunities for those kinds of shared services now, right away.

And I think those opportunities exist.

Again, one of the things I've learned in a very short amount of the time, many of the chief staff people that work at the Thruway Authority have DOT experience. Many of the DOT people have Thruway experience. The fact that we're not kind of taking advantage of

1	that to share services and figure out to do
2	things jointly, is really a missed
3	opportunity.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Well, while
5	the commonality of some of the people, as you
6	just mentioned, who have dual experience and
7	stuff like that, working together, you said a
8	moment ago but in the long run, the shared
9	services would reduce the need for that
10	number of employees; right?
11	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Correct.
12	Absolutely.
13	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: It's attrition
14	and
15	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: And beyond
16	that, it allows us to focus on things that we
17	really do want to do, like not only keeping
18	tolls down, but having enough snowplow
19	drivers and having enough snowplows. And,
20	you know, the other pieces of investing in
21	capital. So it's not just saving money, it's
22	then reinvesting that in the kinds of things
23	that make sense.

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Well, I think

1	your background as budget director will
2	probably help, and I hope that becomes a
3	priority. So thank you very much.
4	Thank you, Chairman.
5	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: I have a few
6	questions, just to put this capital operating
7	cost issue to bed.
8	You've said several times you intend
9	to use whatever money comes out of the budget
10	process for capital only. Would it be
11	appropriate, so there's no further
12	misunderstanding, in the 30-day amendments
13	for the Governor to say that specifically?
14	Because it doesn't say that now.
15	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: You know,
16	Senator, I'll go back and look at the
17	language from my old job. I think we were
18	trying to be pretty clear that, you know,
19	this money was for capital purposes, not for
20	operating purposes. I'll go back and talk to
21	them about that.
22	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: But how for
23	capital purposes does it affect the operating
24	budget, if it's money that

1	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well,
2	capital purposes you know, again, there's
3	the thing with something like the Thruway,
4	because a significant part of the Thruway's
5	budget is, you know, ongoing capital.
6	I will go back and talk to folks. It
7	is not
8	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: All right,
9	just to
10	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: our
11	intent to spend
12	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay
13	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: to use
14	the \$1.3 billion to subsidize operating
15	within the Thruway Authority.
16	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay. Number
17	two, you mentioned that the canal part of the
18	Thruway Authority is in dire need of, I
19	forgot the exact words, of capital as well.
20	And if you do get this type of money,
21	I would strongly urge you to consider using
22	some of it for the tourism that we are
23	generating in upstate New York through the
24	canal part of the Thruway Authority. Because

1	you	did	say	it	gener	rate	es \$380	million	or
2	some	ethin	ıg li	lke	that	in	tourism	n income.	,

And that will help me come to a point where I can realize that we have -- I advocate for it, but I want to realize the fact that this \$5.4 billion -- that's been spent six times now, I think, and we're only in the second hearing -- but that that money is distributed equitably upstate, downstate or regionally. So that would be a way to help your Thruway Authority and also assuage the fears of some of these people like me.

The other thing, the Governor had said when the Tappan Zee Bridge was starting, that he was going to appoint a committee that was going to come up with a financial plan, et cetera, et cetera. Well, there's no committee as yet that I know of, and it keeps going up. Is it the Thruway Authority, since the Thruway is building this, is it their responsibility to provide a financial plan, as opposed to the Governor?

ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Well,
Senator, we are going to have to provide a

1	financial plan for the bridge and the rest of
2	the Thruway. And we do that on an ongoing
3	basis.

I think what the Governor has said and 4 5 I think what Thruway has said in the past and has been true over the past six to eight 6 7 months, is -- what we've tried to do is say, 8 look, we don't want to get too specific about a tolling plan until we know all the possible 9 10 financing sources, until we had nailed down 11 the federal piece, the EFC piece that I think 12 we all know about, and then the settlement funds, which kind of thankfully was manna 13 from heaven, which a piece of that could be 14 15 invested in this very important 16 infrastructure project.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I think as all of those pieces fall in place, we'll be able to come forward with a financial plan that I think will make sense to everybody.

CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Well, somehow I think you as budget director, if I came in and said part of the Senate budget should be a plan to build a new section to the LOB,

1	I've got a feeling you'd say "How are you
2	going to finance it?" before you said yes.
3	Is that fair to say?
4	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: It might
5	cross my mind, Senator.
6	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: All right. So
7	now let me see if this might cross your mind
8	as well. So now we're well into the project,
9	it would seem to me that now that you're
10	chairman of the Thruway Authority, at least
11	acting chairman, it would be a perfect time
12	to try to say as of this point, this is how
13	we're going to finance it.
14	Things change, obviously, on any
15	project. But
16	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: No, and I
17	think no, Senator, it's a good question.
18	And I think now that we have the
19	settlement
20	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Excuse me one
21	minute.
22	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Sure.
23	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: You've

complimented many people on a good question.

1	Let's assume my questions are good, so you
2	don't have to say it.
3	(Laughter.)
4	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: I'm always
5	happy to answer good questions from all of
6	the Senators and Assembly people.
7	Of course we need to provide a
8	financial plan on the bridge. We again are
9	working through what the implications of the
10	\$1.3 billion will be on what our options
11	are how much should be allocated to the
12	bridge; once that's allocated to the bridge,
13	what effect would that have on the total
14	financial package and what effect would that
15	have on the rest of the Thruway.
16	I think as we get to that point and I
17	have a chance to go through that with the
18	folks and the outside folks that are looking
19	at that, and the impacts that that will have,
20	you know, we can get back to you with what we
21	think the impact will be.
22	But I think we're closer to being to
23	that point once we know how this 1.3 gets

allocated.

1	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
3	To close, Assemblyman Brennan.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Yes, thank you,
5	Mr. Farrell.
6	And forgive me for coming back a
7	second time.
8	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: That's
9	okay.
10	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: No.
11	(Laughter.)
12	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: This is more of
13	an admonition. Up until we gave the Thruway
14	Authority the \$85 million a couple of years
15	ago to avoid a toll hike by picking up the
16	expense of the State Police, the Thruway
17	Authority had been self-funded the whole 60
18	years. And that's been great for the
19	taxpayers and the people of the State of New
20	York.
21	And you've indicated that the
22	\$1.3 billion is not just for the Tappan Zee,
23	it's also for other ongoing capital projects
2.4	so that you don't have to be row the money

and then pay interest on that debt, and that

extra cost is certainly a factor in why toll

increases might otherwise be needed. And so

that's -- you know, that's what's happening.

And so now that the Thruway Authority is going to start getting lots of money from the General Fund, I think it's very important for you to provide the Legislature with as much detail about these plans as possible.

And certainly I don't suggest that the Thruway Authority is suddenly becoming a ward of the state. And I don't -- and, you know, we write taxpayer checks to the MTA for billions, so subsidizing operations of public authorities is something that has been known to happen. And I don't object.

But I think it's very important for us to start getting into details of how the Thruway Authority is going to spend this money and what the impact on the tolls is going to be going forward, because we may be providing substantial financial assistance to the Thruway Authority from the General Fund for some years. And I think it's important

1	to kind of change what kind of information is
2	being made available.
3	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: I'm not
4	going to say good question, Assemblyman.
5	(Laughter.)
6	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: That, in
7	my old job, and I know for all of you, was a
8	very hard decision to make about providing
9	General Fund assistance to a public authority
10	and the Thruway. So I absolutely understand
11	that and, you know, hope we can work to
12	provide the kind of information you want,
13	because that was a significant move by the
14	state to provide, you know, funding to the
15	Thruway.
16	And I think the Thruway needs to show
17	that we're being as efficient, effective,
18	budgetarily conscious, using the \$1.3 billion
19	in the most efficient, effective way so that
20	you feel you're not wasting your money.
21	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: One question, and
23	then close.
24	Did you say that you're going to do

1	the E-ZPass or something with the toll on the
2	Tappan Zee Bridge?
3	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: I
4	probably I'm sorry.
5	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: No, and does that
6	mean you're not are you going to do what
7	the MTA has done, which is they're going to
8	mail you a letter if you run through it and
9	you don't have E-ZPass, like I don't do?
10	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: I don't
11	want to talk too much about stuff that I'm
12	just getting briefed on. But my
13	understanding is that there may be
14	construction issues with the toll plaza that
15	might lead to a period of time where they
16	have just kind of an E-ZPass process.
17	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: And only E-ZPass.
18	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Yes.
19	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: And if you don't
20	have E-ZPass, you're going to mail it to
21	them?
22	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: I think
23	that's the case.
24	Now, again, I need to and I

1	understand when I heard about this, I
2	said, "Well, I understand from my former life
3	that this is going to raise some issues with
4	folks that we need to be able to talk to them
5	about." So I'm still trying to work through
6	that.
7	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Yeah. Yeah,
8	because on the entrance to the Thruway when
9	you go toll portion, the way you have it set
10	up there is perfect. You know, you go around
11	and then you those of us that don't use
12	E-ZPass, and I want them to follow me, not
13	make it easy, you can go through and pick up
14	a ticket.
15	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: All right, thank
17	you very much. Appreciate it.
18	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Thank you very
19	much.
20	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: No, thank
21	you all.
22	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Have a good day.
23	ACTING EX. DIRECTOR MEGNA: You too.
24	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Joan McDonald,

1	commissioner, New York State Department of
2	Transportation.
3	I want to thank the commissioner for
4	allowing us to put Robert first, because he
5	had an important appointment he had to go to
6	in another 10 minutes.
7	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: We've been
8	joined by Senator Ritchie.
9	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Are we ready?
10	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Yes, whenever
11	you're ready.
12	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Okay.
13	Chairman DeFrancisco, Chairman Farrell,
14	Chairman Gantt, members of the legislative
15	fiscal and Transportation Committees, thank
16	you for this opportunity to discuss Governor
17	Cuomo's Executive Budget for 2015-2016 as it
18	pertains to the Department of Transportation
19	I'm Joan McDonald, the Commissioner of DOT.
20	One of the primary functions of state
21	government is to ensure the safety of its
22	residents. Each and every day, DOT and our
23	8,200 employees play an integral role in
24	assuring the safety of the traveling public,

1	from bridge inspections to traffic signal
2	maintenance to winter snow and ice control
3	Snow and ice control is one of the more
4	challenging aspects due to the
5	unpredictability and volatility of weather
6	patterns.

years of extreme weather events, this winter season started early with the November lake effect snowstorm in Western New York. That storm resulted in the largest winter deployment of personnel and equipment in the department's history. At its peak, nearly 1,000 DOT staff and more than 600 pieces of heavy equipment were mobilized from as far away as Long Island to assist impacted towns, counties and cities with the response and recovery efforts.

Earlier this week, a winter storm and blizzard inundated parts of Long Island with more than two feet of snow. In preparation for this major event, the department deployed approximately 300 pieces of heavy equipment and more than 580 staff from regions outside

L the	impacted	areas.
-------	----------	--------

To enhance DOT's capacity to respond to these extreme weather events, the Budget provides \$50 million for versatile emergency vehicles, including additional snowplows.

This funding will also support equipping the department's existing snow and ice control fleet with a state-of-the-art GPS system that will track assets in real time and aid with emergency deployments.

Last week, Governor Cuomo detailed a six-point infrastructure plan that outlines his vision to strengthen and modernize

New York's infrastructure. The plan recognizes that the demands of the

21st-century economy require that New York

State not only renew its investments in transportation systems, but that we need to build better, faster and stronger to compete.

The Executive Budget makes new state investments to improve the transportation system, enhance the system's resiliency, create jobs, and deliver operating aid for transit systems. The Executive Budget

1	includes more than \$3.5 billion in new
2	capital program funding during state fiscal
3	year 2015-16. Of that amount, more than
4	\$2.5 billion in new funding is provided to
5	support the department's highway and bridge
6	program.
7	Building upon the Governor's support
8	for sustained investment in roads and
9	bridges, DOT's budget utilizes the first
10	\$150 million of a new \$750 million five-year
11	bridge initiative. This initiative will
12	strategically accelerate the rehabilitation,
13	reconstruction or replacement of more than
14	100 bridges statewide serving critical
15	freight, agriculture and commerce corridors.
16	DOT's budget also provides
17	\$438 million in additional funding for local
18	highway and bridge projects under the
19	Consolidated Highway Improvement Program,
20	CHIPS; \$39.7 million for the local matching
21	share of federally aided projects under the
22	Marchiselli program; and more than
23	\$4.9 billion to support the operation of
24	local transit systems.

1	Prior to the enactment of the
2	Infrastructure Investment Act of 2011, DOT
3	delivered all of its construction projects
4	through a traditional design-bid-build
5	process. By combining the design and
6	construction phases of a project into one
7	design-build contract, project delivery is
8	faster and more efficient and project
9	benefits are delivered to the public sooner.
10	Since being signed into law in 2011,
11	DOT has awarded 10 design-build contracts
12	valued in excess of \$811 million, including
13	the department's largest ever single
14	contract, the \$550 million Kosciuszko Bridge
15	These projects are underway throughout the
16	state, and the results are overwhelmingly
17	positive. Projects are being delivered
18	sooner, on-budget, and jobs are being
19	created.
20	In addition to these 10 contracts,
21	there are currently 13 more under
22	procurement, totaling an additional
23	\$290 million. The act's benefits are clear,
24	and design-build authority should be made

2	After a series of tragic accidents in
3	Quebec, North Dakota, and Alabama
4	demonstrated the volatile nature of crude
5	oil, New York State DOT, New York State DEC
6	and the Department of Homeland Security
7	worked with Governor Cuomo to push the
8	federal government for closer regulation of
9	the crude oil transportation industry. To
10	better prepare the state, Executive Order 125
11	was issued, which directed a crude oil
12	interagency workgroup to comprehensively
13	assess emergency response preparedness,
14	implement aggressive enforcement and
15	inspection initiatives, and work with partner
16	railroads to coordinate preparedness
17	activities.
18	During calendar year 2014, DOT
19	inspectors and their federal partners have
20	conducted an aggressive, targeted track and
21	railcar inspection program. During the
22	course of the year, we have inspected 7,368
23	railcars and 2,659 miles of track. We've

24 uncovered and required corrective action for

1	840 defects, and we've issued 12 hazardous
2	materials violations. The defects that we
3	have found prove that efforts to increase
4	inspections are working to identify the
5	problems and help reduce the risk of
6	transporting crude oil in New York State.
7	In closing, the investments being made
8	in the state's transportation system will
9	move New York forward so that it will meet
10	the demands of the 21st-century economy.
11	Thank you very much for having me
12	testify, and I'm happy to answer any
13	questions that you might have.
14	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
15	much.
16	First to question, Assemblyman Gantt,
17	chairman of the Transportation Committee.
18	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Thank you very
19	much, Chairman Farrell.
20	I welcome you here this morning,
21	Commissioner. You know you and I have had a
22	lot of fun all summer talking about whether
23	or not you will give me the authority to
24	recommend to you, on the rail station in

1	Rochester, whether a pillar should go and the
2	rod should be stuck in. So I don't want you
3	to forget that deal, and I don't want anybody
4	to think we have some secret, because we
5	don't.
6	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Right.
7	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: I want to make
8	sure that station is built correctly as when
9	I was a kid.
10	But given that, I'm concerned really
11	about deficient roads and bridges, as we have
12	for some time now had our roads and bridges
13	very deficient in this state. Can you tell
14	me whether or not we've improved on the
15	condition of the bridges and roads in this
16	state? And when can we expect that we will
17	have that done or make some improvement
18	thereof?
19	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes. First of
20	all, we do have some great projects that we
21	saw in Rochester this year, between the
22	Rochester station, which is one of our
23	design-build contracts moving forward. So

we're very excited about that.

1	But as it regards the condition of our
2	assets overall, New York State is responsible
3	for the oversight of 16,000 state and local
4	bridges. Approximately we've held
5	constant on good and excellent, and year over
6	year, approximately 66 percent of them are
7	either good or excellent.
8	What we instituted back in 2011, when
9	I became commissioner, was a very rigorous
10	capital planning asset management process so
11	that we would make sure that those bridges
12	that are good and excellent don't slip into
13	fair and poor, and then address the fair with
14	lower-cost treatments. So we are continuing
15	to make those investments and will continue
16	to do so.
17	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: So we are making
18	improvements over the last few years?
19	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes, we are.
20	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: There's no
21	slippage.
22	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: There's no
23	slippage. Absolutely not.
24	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Okay. You and I

Τ	have had conversacions, or at least your
2	staff and I have had conversations about a
3	subject that's important to me, and that's
4	summer youth jobs. We had a particular one
5	at Edison Tech there in Rochester, where
6	those young people learned how to build
7	houses and {unintelligible} to provide for
8	the capital investments that they had.
9	We seem to have lost that. Even
10	though in a conversation that the Assembly
11	and the Board of Regents had sometime, and I
12	informed them that there are some young
13	people who will never go to college.
14	However, if we can prepare those young people
15	with jobs such as BOCES but unfortunately,
16	Rochester doesn't have a BOCES. And somehow,
17	somewhere, we need to find some money to try
18	and do that.
19	Can you tell me where we are with that
20	particular investment in young people?
21	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I'm not
22	exactly sure where that contract is, but I'll
23	be happy to get back to you.
24	But I couldn't agree with you more

1	chat as the workforce ages, thivestments in
2	our future workforce, both on the engineering
3	side and the technical side in construction
4	and construction inspection, is more
5	critical.
6	So I'm happy to continue to partner
7	with you, and I will
8	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: I'm sure that the
9	Regents will be glad to have you invest some
10	of that money so that they could do some of
11	the kinds of things that some of us think is
12	necessary in order for young people,
13	particularly in urban areas, to make it.
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Exactly.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Okay. Your
16	position on design-build is one even
17	though you agreed to give me the pieces on
18	the train station there, you know you and I
19	don't necessarily agree on design-build.
20	It's a position that I've had over the years,
21	and hopefully we can continue to talk about
22	that because I don't think it's something
23	that's good for taxpayers of this great state
2.4	of ours

1	The other concern I have is the one
2	about fifty-fifty in terms of engineers
3	inside and outside. And I would like to know
4	where we are with that particular part of the
5	program.
6	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Sure. We
7	don't set an actual target for in-house
8	resources versus consulting engineers for our
9	designing
10	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: You don't set a
11	target.
12	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We don't set a
13	target. But it equates
14	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: You know that we
15	have, over the years, asked that that be set.
16	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Right, I do
17	know that. But it equates to approximately a
18	fifty-fifty split, about half in-house and
19	half through consultant services.
20	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Do we fulfill
21	that, or do we not? Because my understanding
22	from particularly the union officials from
23	your shop is that we do not fulfill that.
24	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: No, we fulfill

1	it. And I'm happy to get the exact trend
2	analysis to you.
3	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: I would like to
4	know that, and if you could get it to the
5	rest of these persons who sit here.
6	Now, the Governor has agreed that he
7	was giving Buffalo a billion dollars. My
8	question is, how much of that is coming out
9	of your shop?
10	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: It's the
11	additional
12	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: The billion
13	dollars that the Governor has agreed that he
L 4	will give to Buffalo. Does that include the
15	roads and bridges there?
16	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Oh, I don't
17	think the additional billion, the Buffalo
18	Billion you're talking about?
19	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: That does not
21	include the roads and bridges.
22	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: So how much are
23	you giving the Buffalo area?
24	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I don't have

Τ	that humber in from or me, but we if get
2	that number for you.
3	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Can you get that
4	for me?
5	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yup.
6	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: And plus the other
7	regions included, so I can have some
8	reference points.
9	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: For Rochester
10	as you move forward?
11	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Rochester, Hudson
12	Valley and
13	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yeah. Happy
14	to do that.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Because I'd just
16	like to know how much of that because as
17	you know, most of us in this state today are
18	straining.
19	I guess the CHIPS is going to be the
20	same, Marchiselli is going to be the same.
21	Is that correct?
22	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: CHIPS and
23	Marchiselli are the same level that they were
2.4	last year correct

1	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: When are we going
2	to have another five-year program? You know,
3	two years ago we did a two-year program. I
4	don't see us doing a program this year. When
5	are we going to do a five-year program again?
6	Or are we planning on doing a five-year
7	program?
8	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We're happy to
9	continue those discussions, through our
10	budget division, with the legislative Ways
11	and Means and Senate Finance Committees as
12	far as a five-year program. And of course it
13	has to be done in the confines of the fiscal
14	picture. So we're happy to continue that.
15	We continue to plan our projects right
16	now within the funding envelope that we have,
17	and invest those funds very wisely.
18	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: High-speed rail,
19	could you tell us where that is?
20	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes. We
21	completed the public hearings after the draft
22	environmental impact statement. Those took
23	place last spring, and we're collecting all
24	the comments, working with the Federal

1	Railway Administration. Of course the
2	investments to institute high-speed rail in
3	New York State range from \$5 billion to
4	\$16 billion, so the funding envelope for
5	high-speed rail is a tough one.
6	But we continue to make strong
7	investments through President Obama's
8	high-speed rail initiative. We have close to
9	\$200 million worth of projects underway,
10	including the Rochester station, including
11	some additional track work between Albany and
12	Schenectady and some signaling work. But
13	it's going to depending on which
14	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Is it Rochester,
15	Commissioner? That's outside of Rochester,
16	isn't it, more like Batavia? I just don't
17	want these people in this room to think
18	you're doing me any special favors.
19	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: No, I would
20	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: I don't think
21	Rochester is involved in that deal
22	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I would never
23	do that.
24	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: according to

1	information I have.
2	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes.
3	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Okay. But I think
4	that's somewhere else and not necessarily in
5	the Rochester area. It's nearer to Buffalo.
6	Is that correct?
7	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: That the
8	high-speed
9	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: The high-speed
10	piece that people keep talking about
11	Rochester is not a Rochester project.
12	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: No, it's part
13	of the high-speed rail initiative. The
L 4	Rochester station
15	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Which is nearer to
16	Batavia than it is to Rochester.
17	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: It is. It is.
18	And the Depew Station is part of that also.
19	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: I just want to
20	make sure we're on the same wavelength.
21	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We are on the
22	same wavelength.
23	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Commissioner, let
24	me first of all, thank you for answering

Τ	these lew questions I have. I may come back
2	with some others as we sit here. But thank
3	you for doing a great job for us.
4	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Thank you.
5	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: And hopefully we
6	can get a piece of Rochester for high-speed
7	rail, because we could use the jobs.
8	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Thank you.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Thank you very
10	much.
11	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Senator?
12	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Senator
13	Ritchie.
14	SENATOR RITCHIE: Commissioner,
15	welcome. I just have a couple of questions.
16	First, I would like to say that your
17	DOT staff in the counties that I represent
18	really do a phenomenal job clearing the
19	roads. And as you know, that on any given
20	day we could have a foot to, you know,
21	10 feet of snow. So that is a real issue,
22	especially on 81.
23	So as we go forward, we've had
24	conversations between myself and your office

1	back and forth about possible closure gates
2	on 81. The issue that last year we had over
3	a hundred vehicles that were stranded in the
4	Village of Adams that couldn't make their way
5	out, 200 people who had to stay in a fire
6	department and some homes there in the
7	village.

And so I guess I would just like you to give me maybe your views on why you think the closure gates -- not on every entrance to 81, but in that small area that gets the lake effect snow -- wouldn't be beneficial.

COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Sure. Thank you, first of all, for your compliments about the DOT staff. Because yes, that part of the state does get hit pretty hard on a regular basis.

What we've used in the last few storms on the I-81 corridor and on the parallel Route 11 corridor is, first and foremost, we reduced the speed limit. And we have found that that has had very beneficial results to tractor-trailers, because what happens sometimes is there's one incident, one

1	jackknife, and it can cause delays and
2	pileups for extended miles. So I think that
3	that is one of the tools that we've started
4	to use much more regularly, and that seems to
5	be working pretty well.

As far as the gates, I haven't seen the data on kind of where we would put them, but I'm happy to sit down with you and do a field visit and take a look at where that might be beneficial.

SENATOR RITCHIE: Okay, that's great.

Another issue that we're having in the district is with the storm sewer and the catch basins. And I understand, in response from your letter, that prior to 1971 that the state doesn't maintain those.

But I guess I would like to hear your views again on the fact that in two of these municipalities right now that have this problem, it's going to be a huge cost. And it's on the state highway in the village itself, and on Route 37, which of course is a main highway through St. Lawrence and Jefferson County.

1	So it's kind of hard for me to go back
2	to my constituents and tell them that the
3	state shouldn't be responsible when they're
4	not allowed to dig on a state highway but
ō	they are responsible for the cost for the
6	storm sewers.

think what we've discovered through these
many major weather events, whether it's
Sandy, Irene, Lee, the winter storms, is just
how, I guess for lack of a better word,
discombobulated some of the laws and
regulations are as to who does what between
the state and municipalities across the
state.

So I think what we should be doing, and we're doing it in a big way under the Governor's Renew New York initiative, is take a look at those. And where it doesn't make sense for the state to do something and the locality should do it, or vice versa, we need to be open to that. And through our municipal assistance agreements, we can figure out a way to make some of those things

1	work.
2	So I'm happy to continue that
3	conversation with you also and our folks in
4	Region 7 about those catch basins.
5	SENATOR RITCHIE: And I certainly
6	appreciate you're willing to look at that,
7	because it is something that's going to be a
8	major cost to some of these small
9	municipalities that they don't have the
10	resources for.
11	And then the last issue, of course, is
12	the Town of Orleans salt issue. And I would
13	just like to say, for the record, that we're
14	getting closer. We just have a small gap
15	now, and appreciate Diane has been involved.
16	And as we move forward, we're pretty close to
17	getting that water contamination problem
18	solved. And would hope that you would
19	continue to help us find our way to a
20	solution.
21	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes. Yes,

I've been briefed on that issue also. So
yeah, I know that that's been a long road,
but we're almost there.

1	SENATOR RITCHIE: Right. Thank you.
2	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: You're
3	welcome.
4	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
5	Assemblyman McDonough.
6	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Thank you,
7	Chairman.
8	And good morning, Commissioner. Good
9	to see you again.
10	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Good to see
11	you.
12	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: A couple of
13	things.
L 4	You talked in your testimony about the
15	bridge repair and stuff like that. You're
16	scheduled in the first year to do a hundred
17	bridges, I think you said, right?
18	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Correct.
19	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: How are they
20	selected? Are they selected by those that
21	are in the worst condition, or are they
22	selected geographically or
23	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: You know, when
24	I mentioned the 16,000 bridges that are in

1	the state, that includes both state and local
2	system. And what we do is we have our bridge
3	inspection programs and our condition ratings
4	that we do every two years.

And then when we look at -- so we have our core program, and we keep moving that along. And then when additional revenue sources become available, we look at what the type of revenue it is and what bridges fit best.

For the hundred bridges that we're talking about in the additional funding, we have identified corridors that are freight corridors, agriculture corridors, and commerce corridors, and the bridges on those routes. But we would absolutely also look at current condition and what would need to be invested to make those bridges more resilient.

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: And there's some local share of investment in that repair work, right, depending on the bridge and -COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Depending on the bridge, it would be either 100 percent

1	state if it's a state bridge, it would be
2	our responsibility. If it's a local bridge,
3	it would be a shared responsibility.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: But the
5	inspection process is done by the state to
6	make sure, right, on all of them, whether
7	it's local or
8	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Correct.
9	Correct. On all the bridges, yes.
10	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Okay. And as
11	I understand it from previous years, that
12	there's a rating system of bridges, and I
13	think it's 1 through 7, is it?
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: One through 7.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: And you said
16	before that 66 percent of the bridges are
17	considered acceptable or
18	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Are considered
19	good or excellent.
20	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Okay. If you
21	could say good or excellent on the scale of 1
22	to 7, where would "good" become? Would it be
23	4 or more?
24	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Five.

1	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Five?
2	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Five.
3	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Okay. And as
4	I understand it, 3.5 is where it begins to go
5	down?
6	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Three and a
7	half is that tipping point, yes.
8	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Okay. And
9	then worse than that is unacceptable.
10	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes.
11	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: So you would
12	actually cease the operation of a bridge if
13	one was that?
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We a bridge
15	that is in poor condition does not
16	necessarily mean it is unsafe. When we
17	inspect bridges, if it is unsafe, what we do
18	is we either load-post for lower weights, or
19	in extreme situations, we would shut it down
20	and then do what we call emergency bridge
21	repairs. But and that's how we do it.
22	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Okay, thank
23	you. In previous testimony by Bob Megna,
24	who's now just getting into the job, I asked

1	the question would he make the
2	shared-services thing a priority, because I
3	think it would create early-on savings which
4	could be very significant. You'll be working
5	on that with that department. Is that going
6	to be a priority with you, an early priority?
7	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Absolutely.
8	Absolutely.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Okay. I think
10	we could save money there right off the bat
11	that would help other things.
12	Something in the Executive Budget
13	concerned me, and it was the statement and
14	I just want to read what we wrote that DOT
15	would be authorized to collect a new \$100 fee
16	from for-profit passenger carriers to pay for
17	the safety inspections of privately operated
18	for-profit passenger carriers.
19	Now, let's define a for-profit
20	passenger carrier. In Nassau County, as
21	you're aware, back in 2012 they initiated a
22	public/private partnership with Veolia
23	Transdev, which is now called the NICE Bus
24	system. And they are a private company, and

Τ	they're a for-profit company, but they're
2	under contract to a governmental authority.
3	Would this \$100 fee apply to them?
4	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: No, it would
5	not. I didn't think so; I just wanted to
6	confirm. It would not.
7	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: That's good
8	news, because that will save some money.
9	And also, the whole downstate
10	transportation budget is flat. There's no
11	increase, not even a 2 percent increase, in
12	most of the downstate operating systems.
13	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: In the public
14	transit, right.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Right, public
16	transit, right.
17	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: It is flat.
18	And as you know, the public transit systems
19	in the downstate region putting the MTA
20	aside for a minute. But in, you know,
21	Westchester, Rockland and on the Island,
22	they're covered by both some General Fund
23	state dollars and also by various taxes and
24	fees.

1	so they are flat. But it is the
2	state contribution is flat.
3	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Well, it
4	looks if it remains that way through the
5	budget negotiations, it looks like it's a
6	definite thing for a fare increase,
7	especially in Long Island and Nassau County,
8	where I am. And that fare increase could be
9	very significant, because that bus service
10	serves middle- and lower-income people
11	mostly, it would have a tremendous impact on
12	them. And they service over 100,000
13	passengers per day.
14	So 25 cents doesn't sound like much,
15	but you add it up and it is. So I'm hopeful
16	that we can get that aid increased to
17	eliminate that.
18	I know there's going to be a rate
19	increase on MTA. It's the sharing of that
20	that's still under discussion of what the
21	Long Island bus service would get.
22	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: It will be
23	under budget discussions, sure.
24	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Okay. Thank

1	you, commissioner. Thank you very much.
2	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Senator?
4	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Senator Dilan.
5	SENATOR DILAN: Yes, thank you very
6	much.
7	Hi, Commissioner.
8	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Good morning,
9	Senator.
10	SENATOR DILAN: I have questions with
11	respect to can you enlighten us a little
12	bit about the capital plan? As you know, we
13	have to come up with a new five-year plan
14	both for DOT and for the MTA. If you can
15	give us some highlights of what you
16	anticipate in that plan. And well, I have
17	other questions; first, answer that one.
18	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Sure. As I
19	mentioned earlier, you know, we work within
20	the confines of the annual appropriation, and
21	we do approximately \$2.3 billion every year.
22	And that includes the construction of
23	\$1.8 billion plus associated costs for
24	engineering, inspection, any right of way,

1	environmental issues that need to be
2	addressed.
3	And that has traditionally been what
4	DOT's program has been. We are adhering to
5	the parameters of the MOU that was signed
6	between the Legislature and the Governor as
7	part of the 2013-2014 budget. And we
8	continue to look forward to assessing what
9	those needs are and moving the program
10	forward.
11	SENATOR DILAN: And what do you
12	anticipate the costs or or the dollar
13	amount?
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We you
15	know, our capital program is about like I
16	said, it's about \$2.3 billion a year. And
17	that's what we've been that's the
18	assumption that we've been working under,
19	because we know how important it is to stay
20	within the Governor's 2 percent cap.
21	We take advantage of additional
22	funding that becomes available. We received
23	an additional \$1.3 billion as part of the

Governor's NY Works initiative in the 2012

1	budget. All of that \$1.2 billion has been
2	committed. We also are taking advantage of
3	the FEMA money that's available. We've got
4	\$518 million there that we're investing in
5	bridges.
6	So my perspective is we continue to
7	look for those resources that don't put an
8	additional burden on the taxpayers of the
9	State of New York and make wise investments
10	with those dollars that we have.
11	SENATOR DILAN: Well, as you know, the
12	MTA came out with its capital plan, and I
13	believe it was about \$32 billion for five
14	years.
15	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Correct.
16	SENATOR DILAN: And you vetoed it as a
17	member of the MTA Review Board. Why?
18	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes, I am the
19	chair of the MTA Capital Program Review
20	Board. They have a statutory requirement to
21	submit a five-year plan to the board, and we
22	are reviewing that right now.
23	SENATOR DILAN: But why did you vote
24	against it, or why did you veto it?

1	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We vetoed it
2	without prejudice because we needed more time
3	to take a look at because the statute says
4	we must take an action within a very limited
5	time period. And we made the decision, the
6	members of the review board, to deny it
7	without prejudice so that we could continue
8	to look at the needs and look at the various
9	ways of funding it.
10	SENATOR DILAN: Another subject. In
11	terms of the \$50 million for new plows, I
12	believe, GPS, are those replacements of
13	existing plows? Or will new staff be hired
14	for that?
15	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: That would be
16	beyond our normal replacements.
17	It would be you know, as I was
18	explaining in my testimony, depending on
19	where a storm hits if it hits Buffalo, for
20	example, it takes if we need to redeploy
21	resources, both equipment and people, from
22	Long Island, it takes approximately 12 hours
23	to drive a heavy plow across the State of New
24	York.

1	So the plan would be to purchase some
2	additional equipment and have them
3	strategically located across the state so
4	that the equipment could quickly get to the
5	event and then we could more easily transport
6	people to man that equipment. So that is the
7	plan.
8	SENATOR DILAN: But is it replacement
9	or
10	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: No, it is not
11	replacement, it is beyond we will
12	SENATOR DILAN: So therefore you need
13	new staff for it?
L 4	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: No, what we
15	would do is, like I said, when they would
16	be strategically located across the state.
17	So that rather than deploying equipment from
18	Long Island to Buffalo, we would just
19	transport some of the operators for that
20	particular event, because the equipment would
21	be there.
22	SENATOR DILAN: All right, thank you.
23	Thank you, Commissioner.
24	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.

1	Just one minute, Commissioner.
2	New York State Department of Motor
3	Vehicles, Executive Deputy Commissioner David
4	Sampson, are you in the room?
5	(No response.)
6	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Okay. He hasn't
7	turned in his papers yet.
8	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Maybe he's been
9	appointed to something else.
10	(Laughter.)
11	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Assemblyman Cusick.
12	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Thank you. Thank
13	you, Mr. Chair.
14	Commissioner, it's always great to see
15	you. Thanks for being here.
16	I just want to start off also by
17	saying I want to thank you, your staff, both
18	up here in Albany and the regional staff down
19	in New York City are great and they're always
20	accessible for myself and my colleagues. And
21	I just want to get that on record because I
22	know
23	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Thank you.
24	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: I know staff

1	isn't always recognized.
2	I have what might come off as a
3	selfish question, but I'm just kind of sick
4	of hearing my colleagues ask me what's going
5	on with the Staten Island Expressway. So I
6	just want to see if you could give me an
7	update, so I can answer my colleagues who
8	travel down from Albany and go through
9	Staten Island to get home, what the timeline
10	is on that project.
11	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Sure. The HOV
12	bus lane will be three-plus, 24/7, from
13	Victory Boulevard to the Verrazano Bridge
14	upon completion of the SIE construction,
15	which is on schedule for December 2015.
16	And it's currently two-plus during
17	peak hours. And we have been coordinating
18	all of our efforts with the MTA and their
19	project on the Verrazano approaches.
20	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Okay.
21	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: December 2015,
22	we'll both be there for the ribbon cutting.

24 ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Yes. Yes,

how's that?

1	December '15.
2	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: And we'll let
3	Senator Savino come too.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Yeah. Well, I'm
5	sure she'll be there.
6	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yup.
7	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Commissioner, I
8	want to also ask, in your testimony you had
9	mentioned some of the funding that's in the
10	budget for transportation. And there was
11	\$4.9 billion to support the operation of
12	local transit. I was wondering, how does
13	that break down and how are those local
14	transit projects chosen by DOT?
15	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: The majority
16	of the funding in the budget is for the MTA.
17	But approximately there's approximately
18	\$180.7 million for upstate transit systems,
19	\$290.4 million for the downstate suburban
20	transit systems, and \$4.482 billion for the
21	MTA.
22	And following up on some of the prior
23	questions, the local revenue sources are
24	different depending on where you are.

1	Downstate imposes revenues and rees,
2	including a supplemental sales tax, corporate
3	franchise tax and insurance and bank tax
4	surcharge.
5	All of the upstate transit systems,
6	it's the petroleum business tax which
7	primarily funds them.
8	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Now, with the
9	money that goes to the MTA, does the MTA have
10	to provide to State DOT what they're going to
11	allocate that money for before they get the
12	money from State DOT?
13	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Through the
14	STOA fund, the State Transportation Operating
15	Assistance fund. Yes, they do.
16	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Okay. And just
17	one more question. Last budget hearing last
18	year, I had mentioned the West Shore Rail
19	Line.
20	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes.
21	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: And I see you
22	smiling, which I'm going to take as a good
23	thing.
24	But I had asked last year for the

1	consideration of a \$5 million study. And I
2	know that this will be a combination between
3	the State DOT and probably the MTA, but it
4	will be on the West Shore, whether it's going
5	to be a rail line right now or, for now, a
6	bus rapid transit until we get to the point
7	that we're ready for rail.
8	Could you tell me, is there any
9	progress on or possibly, that's why I was
10	asking about the local money, if we could get
11	a study done this year?
12	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I don't know
13	the answer to that, but I'm happy to look
14	into that, the West Shore.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Okay. And I'll
16	be calling on it.
17	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: And I know
18	there are a lot of right-of-way issues, so
19	that's what complicates it.
20	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Yes. Yes. And
21	we're in talks with your folks now on that,
22	yes.
23	Okay, thank you. Thank you,
24	Commissioner. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Thank you,
2	Assemblyman.
3	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Senator
4	Kennedy.
5	SENATOR KENNEDY: Good morning,
6	Commissioner.
7	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Good morning,
8	Senator.
9	SENATOR KENNEDY: First of all, let me
10	start by thanking you for your efforts on
11	behalf of the DOT and the state, in November.
12	I know you were on the ground out in
13	Western New York.
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes, I was
15	there for nine days. Nine days, yup.
16	SENATOR KENNEDY: Thank you very much.
17	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: You're
18	welcome.
19	SENATOR KENNEDY: So I want to switch
20	gears from the MTA out to Western New York,
21	the NFTA. The NFTA, as we know we've been
22	talking about this for a number of years
23	they receive less State Transit Operating
24	Assistance per passenger trip or revenue mile

1	than other major upstate agencies, despite
2	the fact that we have the light rail, which I
3	want to get into some of those issues as
4	well.

And last year we had an increase of about \$1.3 million. We were very pleased with that. But according to the NFTA's own numbers, they remain underfunded by about \$8 million when looking at the formula and taking into the account the light rail system, with 6.5 million riders, that is not weighed in on the formula.

And so it really puts this financial strain on the NFTA that we would like to rectify so in future years we don't have to continue to come back having this same discussion about being underfunded.

So what can we do differently this upcoming year in this budget for the NFTA, for those individuals, the families that utilize this service to get to and from work, to go through the community? How can we recalibrate these outdated and what some would consider, including myself, these

1	unfair formulas for determining that funding?
2	And should we consider a separate funding
3	source for the upstate agencies that are
4	providing public transportation?
5	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Well, I think
6	any discussion should start with the analysis
7	of like you're saying, you know, what are the
8	ridership projections, what are the fare
9	structures, what are the existing revenues
10	as I mentioned, the upstate systems are
11	funded primarily through the petroleum
12	business tax and are there other ways to
13	fund it, other additional ways to ensure
14	efficiencies.
15	And I think the whole the whole
16	like you said, the whole formula should be
17	looked at. And we're happy to participate in
18	that discussion with you.
19	SENATOR KENNEDY: So can we count on
20	the DOT, then, helping to drive this forward,
21	driving the formula change forward? Because
22	I think it's critical to the future of the
23	NFTA.
24	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Well, I think

1	the answer to that is we're willing to
2	work again, within the confines of the
3	Governor's budget discuss with the Budget
4	Division and the appropriate legislative
5	fiscal staff on different opportunities, and
6	we're happy to take the lead and work with
7	DOB on that.
8	SENATOR KENNEDY: That's great. Thank
9	you.
10	I want to stick with the NFTA. I want
11	to talk about the capital improvements that
12	are necessary. The NFTA, the light rail
13	system built in 1984 so over 30 years
14	ago this system is in dire need of
15	improvement and substantial investment, I
16	know you're aware of this, just to hit a
17	level of functioning that taxpayers can be
18	proud of.
19	You know, upgrades to the light rail
20	infrastructure are necessary, overhead power,
21	underground and aboveground track
22	improvements, escalator rebuild projects,
23	completing the light car rebuild I could
24	keep going on. The bottom line is we're

1	looking at about \$50 million or more from
2	estimates, I'm told, from the NFTA of capital
3	funding specifically just to upgrade the
4	system to a level, again, that it can
5	function appropriately.
6	Is there a multiyear state funding
7	appropriation for capital that we can look at
8	similar to the MTA, a capital program, a
9	five-year long-term outlook where we can
10	count on funding coming in for capital?
11	Again, so we don't extend this where we're
12	playing roulette with the entire system.
13	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: That is
14	that is the premise behind any capital
15	budget, is you have some type of two-year,
16	three-year, five-year certainty so that you
17	can plan accordingly and make those
18	investments accordingly.
19	So I don't know how specifically
20	how the NFTA does their capital planning and
21	budgeting. But again, happy to make that
22	part of the discussion when we look at the
23	overall financial situation.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Great. And again on

1	the NFTA, the NY Works program put funding
2	forward. Will some of that money be released
3	for NFTA projects funding?
4	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I've been
5	advised that there's \$5 million in this
6	year's budget for that specifically. So
7	we'll take a look at that.
8	SENATOR KENNEDY: Excellent.
9	On another note, back to design-build,
10	I have a question regarding the Article 7
11	language. With the Executive Budget proposal
12	making the design-build permanent, expanding
13	it to all state agencies and authorities,
14	including SUNY and CUNY, what measures are
15	being taken to ensure that the upstate
16	contractors, local residents, are getting the
17	work?
18	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: You know,
19	it's as I mentioned in my testimony, we
20	have awarded 10 contracts. We have
21	13 underway. We have been seeing much more
22	participation by the upstate contractors in
23	the work that we're doing in the upstate
24	regions.

1	I know when the legislation was first
2	enacted, there was some concern that all of
3	the work would go to outside-of-the-state
4	contractors, and that has not been the case,
5	particularly in the upstate work.
6	So I'm happy to provide you a list of
7	what those contracts are and who the
8	contractors are that both participated in the
9	process and were successful in getting the
10	work.
11	SENATOR KENNEDY: And I have one more
12	question, just turning to the Skyway out in
13	Western New York. It may not be the question
14	you think is coming. This has to do with the
15	on-ramps and off-ramps, the gates.
16	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: The gates,
17	yes.
18	SENATOR KENNEDY: First of all, thank
19	you for your assistance, and the DOT, in
20	helping us to begin the process of putting in
21	gates that you know, it's simple, a
22	solution where Buffalo police officers
23	would actually have to be taken off of the
24	streets otherwise, during inclement weather,

1	when	the	Skyw	ay is	clo	sed,	to	pre	event	cars
2	from	gain	ing	acces	s to	tha	t S}	cywa	ıy.	
3		An	d we	woul	d li	ke t	o jı	ıst	conti	lnue

that process of implementing these gates.

I'd like to know what your thoughts are on it and if the DOT can be counted on to continue this implementation of these gates where we can put the police officers back on the streets, back into the neighborhoods where they belong and the taxpayers deserve them to be.

know, each storm that we have, we learn more lessons. And, you know, the Governor has made it clear that when these events happen, we're one state. It's not the City of New York, it's not Erie County, it's not the City of Buffalo. It hit the Buffalo region, and how do we best address the needs at the time.

And gates are something that we have utilized on the Skyway. The Thruway utilizes them; I had the discussion with Senator Ritchie. So that will continue to be

1	something that we discuss. Because when we
2	assess, it's where are the resources, both
3	equipment and personnel, best utilized. And
4	in some instances it's gates, in some
5	instances it's the National Guard, depending
6	on what we want to do with each individual
7	event. But we'll keep that Skyway discussion
8	going.
9	SENATOR KENNEDY: I look forward to
10	working with you on that project. Thank you,
11	Commissioner.
12	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Good. Thank
13	you.
14	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
15	We've been joined by Assemblyman
16	Dilan.
17	And next is Assemblyman Ortiz.
18	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Thank you,
19	Mr. Chairman.
20	Good morning, Commissioner. I have a
21	few questions, and one of them has to do with
22	the as you know, with the expansion of the
23	Panama Canal and the New York Port Authority
24	and New Jersey. The port and rail volumes at

1	the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
2	are up by 5 percent over the last year, and
3	the rail freight traffic nationwide is up
4	4.5 percent over 2013, the highest values
5	since 2007.
6	As a result of this, we will see the
7	distribution of product from across the
8	country coming to increase cargo through the
9	Port of New York and through the highways and
10	so on and so forth. My question to you is,
11	New York has begun to prepare itself and to
12	develop a plan as a result of what is
13	happening with the Panama Canal?
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We work very
15	closely with the Port Authority, who as you
16	know controls the ports in the downstate
17	area. But we make investments in our
18	facilities to complement their investments,
19	to make sure that our freight traffic,
20	particularly for those goods that are
21	manufactured not only in New York State but
22	manufactured throughout the country, come in
23	and out as expeditiously as we can.
24	And making those investments in ports,

1	the Governor's budget includes a \$65 million
2	port initiative for the upstate regions
3	Ogdensburg, Albany and Oswego because that
4	is vital to making sure goods from the
5	downstate region come upstate, and vice
6	versa. And we will continue to do that.
7	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: I have introduced
8	a bill to address some of this and to be
9	helpful a little bit on these matters. I
10	would like for you and your staff probably to
11	look at it and give me some feedback on the
12	bill.
13	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Absolutely.
14	Absolutely.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: The second
16	question is, as you probably know, some of
17	the legislators sitting here from New York
18	City, we represent the BQE. And the BQE,
19	when you {unintelligible} the first thing at
20	5:30 in the morning, it says to don't take
21	the BQE, go through local streets, because
22	it's always jammed. And, you know, we've
23	been having this problem for many, many

years. It's not a problem that is going to

1	be	solved	overnight.

But one of the issues here is that we have a lot of construction going on. And to some extent I will say, you know, we thank your staff to some extent because when we call, sometimes they've been responsive.

But the bottom line is that we have community boards in New York City, we have 59 community boards. We have community boards that the BQE crosses by. It's Community Board 10, Community Board 7, Community Board 6. And this goes from Bay Ridge, Sunset Park and through Park Slope. And I represent those communities, and the BQE mainly is in the heart of my district.

So therefore, I would like to know, you know, do you have any update about the BQE, what is happening with the BQE, number one, reconstruction.

And number two, I would like to propose to you personally that I would like to have a town hall meeting with you folks, I mean if you can be present. But the community board has been very active reaching

1	out to the commissioner's office, and we
2	haven't gotten nowhere, the opposite of my
3	colleague from Staten Island. And it's been
4	months, it's not just a phone call for one
5	day.

So I will be very happy that if we can call a town hall meeting to include the community boards in my community as well as to give them a real update of what has happened with the Gowanus, what has happened with the BQE, what is happening also as a result that you have so many repairs under that BQE. And these contractors leave everything behind. I have a bunch of pictures that I took on a Sunday and a Saturday because they leave everything out all over the place.

Again, you folks have been very responsive, to some extent, by calling the contractor. One day I happened to be there before Christmas because they could not -- nobody can come out to clean up the whole thing. So I have my staff coming over with myself to do it, which is very unresponsive.

1	So, you know, the first question is
2	about the update on the Gowanus. Second,
3	hopefully we can follow up to have a town
4	hall meeting. And number three, to have a
5	better oversight about these contractors who
6	think they can do whatever they want, they
7	don't have to listen to nobody, and they
8	continue to leave everything behind without
9	picking all the garbage that they leave at
10	the end of the day.

COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Well, I'll start with your last one first, because the -- if the contractors are leaving the worksite in a way that is not acceptable, there are penalties that we can impose. And that is not acceptable. So we are happy to follow up on that one specifically.

Number two, happy to participate in a meeting with the various community boards on both the BQE and the Gowanus. The Gowanus is -- its last contract is going to be awarded shortly, and then all of the work on the Gowanus will be complete. So if you look at the Staten Island Expressway across the

1	Verrazano, the Gowanus right to the BBT, that
2	work will be complete from the state
3	standpoint.
4	It's primarily replacement work on the
5	Gowanus, replacing the deck. But that will
6	be the last project will be started this
7	year, and then the network will be completed
8	and the three-plus bus lane will be in effect
9	during the commuting hours.
10	But I'm happy to come and give an
11	update on the BQE and more specifics on the
12	Gowanus.
13	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: I will follow up,
14	Commissioner. Thank you.
15	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Okay.
16	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Thank you,
17	Mr. Chairman.
18	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Senator Savino,
19	please.
20	SENATOR SAVINO: Thank you,
21	Mr. Chairman.
22	Thank you, Commissioner McDonald.
23	And following up on the extension of

the work, I'm not going to ask you to

1	reiterate the answers you gave to Assemblyman
2	Cusick and Assemblyman Ortiz on the two main
3	road areas of the Gowanus and the Staten
4	Island Expressway.

First I want to say thank you. On the Staten Island Expressway, your department really has done amazing work, and your staff down there has been great. You know, Charlie has been amazing in keeping us up-to-date.

And I just want to say thank you for that.

Also, a couple of years ago

Assemblyman Cusick and I raised the issue

with you about creating the idea of a

transportation tzar, someone who would

oversee and coordinate projects. It was

rejected by the administration, but what has

happened -- and I will be the first to say,

there has been coordination between your

agency with City DOT so we don't have a

situation where you have you working above,

City DOT shutting down the roads underneath

and just crippling the region. So for that,

again, I want to say thank you. Thank you.

On the Gowanus Expressway, though,

1	it's interesting, I think it's a project that
2	started before I was born and it will
3	probably not be completed until after I am
4	long gone and dead. It is a perpetual
5	project. And the only concern I have about
6	this project is we seem to be just patching
7	it. You know, and that's what we've been
8	doing for a very long time.
9	But unlike the Staten Island
10	Expressway project, we're not adding capacity
11	on the Gowanus. So what I see, no matter
12	what happens and I'm sure Assemblyman
13	Ortiz can agree with me, and anybody else
14	from Brooklyn Senator Dilan, Senator

And I would hope that if we're going to continue to invest tremendous amounts of money in the BQE that we look at the possibility of expansion in some way, shape or form. Otherwise, an 11-mile -- it's 11 miles from my house at the foot of the

Montgomery -- we're just going to have the

same bottlenecks. You may have a smoother

surface, but we're not going to move the

traffic any further.

1	Verrazano Bridge to the Battery Tunnel. It's
2	all of 11 miles actually, through the
3	Battery Tunnel it's 11 miles. Depending on
4	the time of day, it can take me eight minutes
5	or it can take me two hours.

So if we don't address capacity and just continue to patch the roadway, we're not going to improve the transit flow through the area and we're going to continue to cripple local streets and roads.

COMMISSIONER McDONALD: And I know that roadway network very well. I don't disagree with you. And we're happy to continue that capacity discussion. We do believe that when all the work is completed in Staten Island and on the Gowanus, that the three-plus HOV lane will improve.

But, you know, congestion is good and bad. Congestion means that the economy is moving and things are moving, and that's a heavy truck route. But we do -- we're happy to continue that discussion and share the numbers from the HOV lane once it -- HOV three-plus. We believe that will improve

1	traffic flow.
2	SENATOR SAVINO: With that, though,
3	comes enforcement.
4	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Absolutely.
5	Absolutely.
6	SENATOR SAVINO: Right now there is no
7	enforcement in the HOV lane. People use
8	it you can see it, you know, any day,
9	there are single riders going down the HOV
10	lane. They get down to the Battery Tunnel
11	and nobody even stops them there.
12	So that's got to be part and parcel of
13	it. Otherwise, we're just creating an
14	express lane for people who are willing to
15	violate the law.
16	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: To abuse it,
17	exactly. And you mentioned the coordination
18	between State DOT and City DOT. And for that
19	piece of it, we have to bring NYPD Traffic
20	Enforcement into the mix.
21	SENATOR SAVINO: There's another
22	project that's been proposed for a different
23	section of Brooklyn, the Ocean Parkway,

24 redesign of Ocean Parkway. Do you have an

1	update of where they are? They made the
2	proposal recently to the community board,
3	talking about changing the flow of traffic on
4	Ocean Parkway and where people can turn.
5	It's going to disrupt, in some ways, where,
6	you know, people are not even going to be
7	able to turn off their own street, they're
8	going to have to go three blocks out of their
9	way.
10	So I'm just wondering if you have an
11	update. If you don't, if you could get that
12	to me, I'd appreciate that.
13	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I don't have
14	it in front of me, and I will get it to you
15	right away.
16	SENATOR SAVINO: And finally, on
17	design-build, back to the issue of
18	design-build.
19	Last year when we were trying to
20	extend design-build, we broke down over the
21	threshold of the projects. There was a
22	dispute as to whether \$5 million downstate
23	and \$15 million upstate or whatever the
24	thresholds were would trigger a PLA. I

Τ.	noticed in the Governor's ranguage, though,
2	they've completely walked away from that
3	idea. It's design-build, making it
4	permanent, and I believe there's a discussion
5	of if a project is \$50 million or more, it
6	would require a PLA study. What exactly is
7	your understanding of what that means?
8	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes. Any
9	project that is \$50 million or greater would
10	require a due diligence study and then
11	identify what the potential savings are from
12	a project labor agreement. And if the
13	savings are there, include a project labor
14	agreement as part of the design-build
15	contract.
16	SENATOR SAVINO: So what if the
17	project was \$49 million? We wouldn't even
18	examine it?
19	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: It sets the
20	threshold in the statute. It doesn't mean
21	that we can't do it anyway if it's around
22	that price range. There's nothing that
23	prohibits DOT or any other agency from doing
24	that. It just sets the threshold in statute

1	that it must be done.
2	SENATOR SAVINO: Would the work be
3	postponed until after the analysis was done
4	as to whether or not a PLA would provide
5	savings?
6	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: No. I mean,
7	we did a due diligence study, for example,
8	for the Gowanus. And we did that as we were
9	moving the project through the procurement
10	process. We didn't slow anything down for
11	that.
12	SENATOR SAVINO: Maybe I'm
13	misunderstanding this, but is it possible we
14	could do all of these projects without a
15	project labor agreement?
16	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Without a
17	project labor agreement? We could.
18	SENATOR SAVINO: Well, that would be
19	distressing, I would think. I would think -
20	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: But I think
21	the due diligence study, you know, labor
22	comes to the table, the Contractors
23	Association comes to the table and says what
24	are the ways that we could generate savings,

1	generate time. And if it saves money,
2	that you know, as Bob Megna was saying,
3	you save money on one project, you reinvest
4	it into another project.
5	SENATOR SAVINO: Well, project labor
6	agreements provide disruption protection.
7	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes, they do.
8	SENATOR SAVINO: I'm a bigger fan of
9	that than I am of the idea of the open shop,
10	where you may have a union contractor you
11	know, part union, part not union. That's
12	much more disruptive to a job.
13	And I would think that we would be
14	looking to utilize PLAs whenever we possibly
15	can. It's good for the employer, it's good
16	for the state, it's good for the contractor,
17	it's good for the taxpayer.
18	Thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
20	Assemblyman Skoufis.
21	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: Thank you,
22	Chair.
23	And thank you, Commissioner. It's
24	good to see you again.

1	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Good to see
2	you.
3	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: And like many of
4	my colleagues, I want to first thank your
5	staff. Region 8, Lower Hudson Valley,
6	they've always been very responsive, and they
7	do a great job.
8	I want to ask one sort of general
9	question before I get to my more specific
10	local question. You know, I've seen, over
11	the past couple of years I've been in office,
12	certainly, you know, you've got the budget
13	and everything is appropriated for DOT in the
14	state budget, but then there are sort of
15	these ad hoc announcements throughout the
16	year of different appropriations for various
17	projects throughout the state.
18	You know, last year I just pulled up
19	on my phone, for instance, \$100 million to a
20	large stretch of Long Island to repave there.
21	And, you know, so there are these
22	announcements all over the place.
23	And I guess my question is, can you
24	walk me through the evolution of how these

1	announcements are made? Which projects are
2	decided on? Do they bubble up completely
3	from staff? You know, do you get a call from
4	the Governor's office and get direction from
5	his staff? Who makes the ultimate decision?
6	You know, do you sign off on them? Can you
7	walk me through that sort of decision?
8	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Sure.
9	When you look at our capital program,
10	by necessity it has to be fluid. And you
11	mentioned the additional money for
12	Long Island when we did some additional
13	paving projects, we also did additional
14	paving projects throughout the state.
15	Last winter was particularly harsh,
16	and we saw what the winter did to the
17	pavement. And so when we we have regular
18	capital program meetings, and we're always
19	looking at the timetable of contract
20	lettings. And we reallocated some of the
21	funds within our existing program, projects
22	that weren't going to get awarded, and made
23	the decision to do the additional paving
24	projects both on Long Island and across the

1	state. So that s
2	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: And who
3	specifically is "we"? You know, are you
4	involved in those
5	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Oh, of course.
6	We, the department, primarily. We take input
7	from state elected officials, input from the
8	localities, input from various advocates,
9	whether it's AAA, Tri-State, others, where
10	the needs are. And that's how we assess our
11	investment decisions.
12	And like I said, it has to be fluid so
13	that we can address any of these issues that
14	come up. And just a capital program, by its
15	nature, projects sometimes slip an
16	unforeseen utility issue, for example, comes
17	up and a project that we thought was going to
18	happen in 2015 slips to 2016.
19	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: Okay, thank you.
20	And so I guess, you know, that directs
21	me to my more specific question. And if you
22	remember our conversation last year, you
23	probably are anticipating what I'm going to

24 ask. The Exit 131 interchange --

1	COMMISSIONER	McDONALD:	Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: -- in front of Woodbury Common, it was -- Phase 1 was supposed to start in 2013. It was delayed, as you well know, until, at least as of now, 2017 at the earliest. I believe it's the most important project in the Hudson Valley west of the Hudson. You know, perhaps you can share your insight on whether you agree with that, first.

But my concern continues from last year. My first question, has there been any progress in trying to secure the funding for that project?

commissioner McDonald: It is still scheduled for 2017. And, you know, it is one of the projects that I am going to discuss with Bob Megna because it's right at the juxtaposition of Route 17 and the Thruway, right there. Woodbury Common is doing a major expansion of their development. And we've had discussions with the developer and the local governments regarding various ways to fund it in addition to state dollars.

1	So we will continue that discussion.
2	But right now, it is still on target for
3	2017.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: And are there
5	any discussions about accelerating the
6	project in light of the casino that's been
7	sited in Sullivan County up the road? You
8	know, again, one of the you know, sort of
9	the concerns are accumulating at this point.
10	You know, we're going to be seeing thousands
11	of additional cars moving through that
12	interchange because of the casino daily,
13	millions probably annually as a result of the
14	casino. And it's already a bottleneck even
15	without the casino there, largely because of
16	Woodbury Common.
17	So is there any discussion right now
18	about accelerating and beginning Phase 1
19	prior to 2017?
20	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: There is not.
21	But we will be happy to sit down with the
22	selected developers and see what additional
23	traffic we actually, as part of the input
24	into the selection process, DOT looked at the

1	individual traffic models. I'm not sure
2	quite sure how far east that Sullivan County
3	traffic analysis went, but we'll take a look
4	at it and see if it bears changing the
5	schedule.
6	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: Would you agree
7	with the assessment that it is one of the
8	I'm sure, you know, you're not going to sort
9	of off-the-cuff rank projects, but would this
10	be at the top of your list as far as
11	Hudson Valley capital projects go?
12	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I'm not going
13	to at the risk of offending some of your
14	colleagues in other parts of the state, I'm
15	not going to address it.
16	It is an important project, but I
17	don't think it makes a lot of sense to say
18	the top one, the top two, the top three.
19	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: You know, I just
20	hope you know, my first more general
21	question, it jibes with what I'm asking now.
22	And I hope that during these conversations
23	that DOT has, as you described, this does
24	become part of the conversation accelerating

1	that date. You know, Phase 1, \$30 million,
2	you know, in the grand scheme of a, I think
3	you said, \$2.3 billion capital budget, works
4	out to about 1 percent of your capital
5	budget, Phase 1. You know, I happen to think
6	this is an important enough project where
7	it's worth considering accelerating.
8	So I appreciate any further
9	conversations we can have to that effect.
10	Thank you.
11	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We can do
12	that.
13	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
14	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Senator
15	Panepinto.
16	SENATOR PANEPINTO: Good morning.
17	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Good morning
18	Senator.
19	SENATOR PANEPINTO: First of all, I
20	wanted to thank you for the DOT's help in
21	upstate New York. I've spoken to the
22	supervisors of the towns that are affected in
23	my district, and they're very complimentary
24	of all the work that the DOT did in removing

1	that, you know, 7 feet of snow from the
2	southern part of the district. So we really
3	do appreciate that.
4	My question is on there's Region 5
5	funding issues, and there's great concern in
6	Western New York amongst the contractors and
7	the building trades unions that I've
8	discussed that there was an error in the
9	formula-based allocation in state capital aid
10	of about \$167 million a few years ago. Do
11	you know how that's been handled or if it's
12	been resolved, that funding issue for
13	Region 5?
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: What we have
15	been adhering to is the MOU which was signed
16	by the legislative leaders and the executive
17	branch in 2013-2014. And that MOU is what
18	has been guiding our capital program
19	investments for the last two years. It's an
20	MOU which outlines those projects across the
21	state, and that's what we adhere to.
22	SENATOR PANEPINTO: So there's been no
23	real investigation on that miscalculation,
24	then?

1	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: No.
2	SENATOR PANEPINTO: Okay. Let me ask
3	you, just changing gears a little bit, does
4	the capital program that's laid out in the
5	Governor's budget, does it contain any
6	dedicated funding for bicycle or pedestrian
7	capital projects?
8	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: It doesn't
9	contain dedicated. But I just want to I
10	don't want to quote the wrong number, so I
11	want to get the correct number here.
12	Under the Governor's direction, State
13	DOT, since January 2013, has invested more
14	than \$160 million in funding to support
15	bicycle and pedestrian-related projects:
16	October 2014, \$70 million; January of 2014,
17	\$67 million; and January 2013, \$26.5 million
18	We have been very aggressively making
19	investments in bicycle and pedestrian
20	projects across the state.
21	SENATOR PANEPINTO: And I'm not
22	questioning your historical commitment to it
23	My question is in this budget allocation, is
24	any of that money earmarked for bicycle or

1	pedestrian
2	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Not going
3	forward. And this wasn't earmarked either.
4	This was part of, as I was saying, the fluid
5	budget discussions and capitalizing on
6	federal dollars that we received and putting
7	them together and putting it out on the
8	street.
9	SENATOR PANEPINTO: So I guess what
10	you're saying is we're going to rely on your
11	historical commitment moving forward.
12	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes.
13	SENATOR PANEPINTO: Okay.
14	A question regarding sort of the DOT
15	specifically from a manpower or a people
16	power standpoint. The Professional Employees
17	Federation observes that the state has lost
18	850 engineering jobs since 2000 in the DOT.
19	How has this loss of engineering work been
20	covered in the last 14 years?
21	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Well, in any
22	state department and in any agency and in any
23	organization, there's a churn. And as people
24	retire, we rehire.

1	Before 2010 there were you know,
2	through the Great Recession there were hiring
3	freezes. We have been filling positions.
4	You weren't here last year, but for the first
5	time in five years, Civil Service conducted
6	the Junior Engineering exam, which has
7	brought new talent to our agency. And we
8	continue to attract engineering positions,
9	architects. And we meet the demands of the
10	department and the needs that we have to.
11	SENATOR PANEPINTO: Do you know what
12	the allocation for outside consulting
13	services and engineering services has been in
14	the last 10 years to replace these static
15	engineering costs that used to be performed
16	by, you know, state employees?
17	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We don't do an
18	assessment of replacement. What we have is
19	approximately and this has been pretty
20	long-standing is approximately 50 percent
21	of our engineering work is done by in-house
22	forces and approximately 50 percent is done
23	by consultants.
24	SENATOR PANEPINTO: And what's the

1	benefit to the state in that? I mean, aren't
2	we paying more for outside engineering costs
3	than we would be for having engineers
4	in-house?
5	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We have not
6	seen an increase in our capital project and
7	capital program delivery as a result of that.
8	SENATOR PANEPINTO: And what's the
9	plan going forward? I mean, are we going to
10	continue to let engineers fall by the wayside
11	through attrition, or are you going to expand
12	the existing engineer workforce that the DOT
13	has?
13	has?  COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We absolutely
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We absolutely
14 15	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We absolutely are not going to let them fall by the
14 15 16	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We absolutely are not going to let them fall by the wayside. As I said, it's very important that
14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We absolutely are not going to let them fall by the wayside. As I said, it's very important that we continue to hire and to have a robust
14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We absolutely are not going to let them fall by the wayside. As I said, it's very important that we continue to hire and to have a robust workforce to meet the demands of our program.
14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We absolutely are not going to let them fall by the wayside. As I said, it's very important that we continue to hire and to have a robust workforce to meet the demands of our program.  SENATOR PANEPINTO: Do you know what
14 15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We absolutely are not going to let them fall by the wayside. As I said, it's very important that we continue to hire and to have a robust workforce to meet the demands of our program.  SENATOR PANEPINTO: Do you know what your planned, you know, people power is for
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We absolutely are not going to let them fall by the wayside. As I said, it's very important that we continue to hire and to have a robust workforce to meet the demands of our program.  SENATOR PANEPINTO: Do you know what your planned, you know, people power is for this year as compared to, you know, 10 years

1	that is the right number.
2	SENATOR PANEPINTO: How many have you
3	lost in the last 10 years?
4	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I can't give
5	you that number. I can check and get back to
6	you.
7	SENATOR PANEPINTO: Thank you.
8	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yup.
9	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
10	Assemblyman Abinanti.
11	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Thank you,
12	Mr. Chairman.
13	Thank you for joining us,
14	Commissioner.
15	First let me start with a general
16	comment. I know several years ago you and I
17	met, I guess, when we were both coming into
18	office. And my experience from local
19	government formed the basis for my comment to
20	you that DOT was a department that everybody
21	loved to hate.
22	I will compliment you that I think
23	you've done a lot of work to change that
24	image.

1	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Thank you.
2	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: I find your
3	office very responsive and cooperative.
4	Doesn't mean we get the stuff done, but at
5	least we're working together. And I think
6	that's a good first step.
7	There are three items I'd like to
8	cover quickly. First, capital budget
9	projects. I wasn't here when you started
10	because I was out checking my facts, but I'm
11	understanding that our staff has not yet
12	gotten the project list. And would it be
13	possible to get that project list as soon as
14	possible so that we can take a look at what's
15	on there?
16	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Sure. Yup,
17	we'll make sure you have it.
18	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: One of the
19	things we've been cooperating on, as you
20	know, is the 9A bypass in Elmsford
21	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Exactly.
22	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: and I wanted
23	to see if it was on that list. But we don't
2.4	have the list to see if itle there

1	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: And we have
2	been making great strides in that project,
3	and it's a real cooperation. So we'll get
4	you that list.
5	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Okay, thank
6	you. You can't tell me if it's on there or
7	not, can you?
8	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I don't know
9	off the top of my head, and I don't want to
10	give you misinformation.
11	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: I thought that
12	would be your answer.
13	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: But we'll get
14	you the list right away.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: But if our
16	staff could get the list, that would be
17	helpful.
18	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes. Yes.
19	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: The second
20	thing is again something that we've been
21	working together on but we don't seem to have
22	come to a final solution. And that is
23	sometimes in environmental impacts in a
24	neighboring area intersect with roadway

1		
1	right-of	-ways.

We have the situation with the Saw
Mill River Parkway that goes from one end of
Westchester to the other end of Westchester,
running along the Saw Mill River, obviously,
and the Saw Mill River just constantly
floods. It's not the fault of DOT, it's not
the fault of DEC that it floods, but I do
think we need some effort to resolve it.

Your department has valiantly, every few years, come out and repaved the road, tried to raise the road to try to keep it above flood level, but we all admit that's a temporary solution. I have to believe that this is a problem my colleagues have in other parts of the state. Is there any way to set up some kind of a program to work with DEC and the other departments to evaluate where environmental work, combined with DOT work, could resolve these problems once and for all?

COMMISSIONER McDONALD: You know, I don't have any of the specifics, but DOT has been working very closely with DEC on these

1	issues, and it really came to the forefront
2	after Irene and Lee and then even further
3	after Sandy, when we've seen, you know
4	when a roadway floods or a bridge is washed
5	out due to water, it's generally not the
6	bridge's fault, it's the water.
7	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: It's the
8	waterway.
9	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: And many
10	programs have been announced where DEC is
11	shoring up those waterways, and it's all done
12	very, very closely with us. We're doing a
13	lot of work in the Mohawk Valley. I don't
14	know if we've had a specific conversation
15	with them about the Saw Mill, but I know that
16	that is
17	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Can we put that
18	on the list?
19	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I will put
20	that on the list.
21	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: And I would
22	really like to see, perhaps on a statewide
23	basis I don't know if you set up a joint
24	task force between the two of you or

1	something, because we're spending a lot of
2	money repairing roadways and we could be
3	using that money in just fixing the
4	environment in the first place.

In the Saw Mill River situation, I'm understanding from the Army Corps of Engineers that they've already done a study, they're willing to do another study, they're willing to put money in to fix it if we could only get the state and local match. And the locals say they'll put some money into it but they don't have enough to really do the match, so they need the state input. And from what I'm understanding from DEC, there's no money in their budget for this. And I'm not hearing anything from you that says there's money in your budget for this.

So how to we get everybody together, rather than having you come out every five years and spend money on raising the road and not solving the problem? Because all that does is funnel the water further downstream, and people downstream are now underwater.

24 COMMISSIONER McDONALD: And like I

1	said, we have you know, in those areas
2	that were affected by Irene, Lee and Sandy,
3	we've had some great success. But that's not
4	a statewide, that's very
5	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: That's an
6	emergency response.
7	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Right,
8	that's no, it's also it's recovery, but
9	it's also making investments in long-term
10	resiliency. And, you know, we did it on Long
11	Island with Ocean Parkway, we've done it in
12	some of the Mohawk Valley areas. I need to
13	look at the Saw Mill specifically to see what
14	we can do there.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Right. It has
16	a major impact. I mean, part of Elmsford is
17	underwater every time there's a major rain.
18	It's not just the size of Sandy
19	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Agreed.
20	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: So I would
21	appreciate it if we could set up some kind of
22	a formal structure so that we're not just
23	doing an ad hoc process.
24	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Okay.

1	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: The last thing
2	is I'd like to pick up on what the Senator
3	asked you about, which was the balance of
4	engineering in and out. I would just ask
5	that perhaps your department take a serious
6	look, a study, on which is the more efficient
7	way to do it. We went through this when I
8	was on the Westchester Board of Legislators
9	and there was a move to go to outside
10	consultants. And for a period of time, we
11	diminished our engineering staff and did go
12	to outside consultants. And eventually we
13	reversed that because we realized it was
14	costing us more. Even with the benefits and
15	all of the other things that you have for
16	public employees, we were actually better off
17	having the expertise in-house and keeping it
18	in-house rather than going to the outside.
19	So I would ask that your department do
20	a serious study of that to see if, in the
21	long run, it's not better to keep the
22	expertise in-house.
23	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Okay.
24	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Thank you.

1	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Senator?
2	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Yes. Senator
3	Montgomery.
4	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Thank you.
5	Good afternoon.
6	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Good
7	afternoon, almost.
8	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Commissioner,
9	thank you for your patience.
10	I just want to comment and ask a
11	question on the other part of the BQE that
12	Senator Savino and Assemblyman Ortiz
13	mentioned, and that is I see in your report
14	to us that you have one of your largest
15	bridge projects is the Kosciuszko. Are you
16	talking about our
17	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: That is the
18	Kosciuszko, yes.
19	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: I just want to
20	make sure I'm asking you
21	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes.
22	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: So that being the
23	case, obviously the Kosciuszko Bridge is
24	extremely critical to traffic moving

Τ	between from wherever south of it 1 m
2	always confused about direction over there,
3	but into Manhattan, into Queens
4	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Long Island.
5	Brooklyn, Queens, Long Island, yes.
6	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Long Island,
7	exactly. And it poses an extreme bottleneck
8	problem, always. There's always a traffic
9	jam there.
10	I'm just wondering, one, where are you
11	with that bridge? And also just sort of
12	related to an update on where it is, how
13	that's planned to relieve some of that
14	bottleneck. And also what is your MWBE
15	target, and how close are you to reaching it?
16	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: The project,
17	the contract was awarded in August. It is a
18	joint venture. It's a design-build contract.
19	It is a joint venture of New York firms
20	Skanska, ECCO III. And it is well underway,
21	construction has begun. You will start to
22	see much more aggressive construction as we
23	get into the spring.
24	The goal of the project is to do two

1	things, primarily. Number one, the if you
2	know the current bridge well, the steep grade
3	creates fender benders, which oftentimes
4	leads to the congestion because there are no
5	shoulders for a disabled vehicle to come off
6	the road.

So the new bridge will have wider
lanes, it will have shoulders. So it will
relieve that congestion between Brooklyn and
Queens. The grade will be less steep but it
will still accommodate, hopefully, a lot of
vessel traffic on Newtown Creek. And one of
the other issues is the weave to get onto the
LIE once you get in Queens, and that will be
straightened out as well.

So we are very proud of that project, we are excited about it. It straddles

Brooklyn and Queens. And I don't know the community boards, but they have been actively involved in the planning of that project and are part of the stakeholders committee during the construction of that project.

And there will be additional park facilities that will be built. There will be

1	a bicycle/pedestrian lane on the bridge. And
2	it is a signature project for the department.
3	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: And the MWBE?
4	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I don't know
5	what that number is off the top of my head.
6	And we'll get it to you. But the contracting
7	team is very committed to meeting or
8	exceeding the goal. We have monthly
9	partnering meetings, and they are very
10	aggressively pursuing the MWBE portion.
11	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Great. Thank
12	you.
13	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: You're
14	welcome.
15	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Assemblyman
16	Brennan.
17	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Commissioner
18	McDonald, hello.
19	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Hello,
20	Assemblyman.
21	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: I want to talk
22	about upstate and downstate non-MTA mass
23	transit systems.
24	So they're not happy with the budget

l proposal	, the		those	systems.
------------	-------	--	-------	----------

2 COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I think
3 they're scheduled to testify a little later
4 today.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Yes, they will probably express that point of view in a moment.

So the upstate transit systems get no operating aid increase and no new capital funding, although there was some from last year which was rolled over. And the downstate non-MTA systems get no new operating aid, and then they get this peculiar \$17 million additional funds for capital, which they have to spend on capital.

So last year the upstate systems were expressing the concern that because their source of funding is the petroleum business tax, which has been flat or declining for a number of years for various reasons, that they were asking the Legislature and the Governor and the department to come up with a change in formula to assist them. And then we didn't do that other than to add this

1	General Fund amount and then set that cost of
2	living from this account from the General
3	Fund starting at \$3 million. So the extra
4	cost of living adjustment for this year is
5	70,000 bucks.
6	You know, so these systems a lot of
7	poor people ride these buses in the urban and
8	suburban areas, college students. Their
9	costs of service continue to rise. Their
10	ridership in many cases is actually rising.
11	There are more people using these bus
12	systems.
13	So why can't you propose some kind of
14	policy to assist these transit systems? You
15	know, why isn't there any proposal to help
16	these systems out? I mean, okay, yes, you're
17	going to give them some more capital. But,
18	you know, they need capital, they need
19	operating aid increases. The problems were
20	discussed extensively last year. And there's
21	nothing.
22	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: You raise a
23	very good point with the increase in

ridership. You know, what demographic

1	trends are showing is that as urban centers,
2	whether they're the City of New York, the
3	City of Rochester, Syracuse
4	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: The Buffalo
5	Billion, yes. Mm-hmm, right.
6	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: or smaller
7	cities such as Ithaca and others, people want
8	to have the choice of transit. And I don't
9	disagree with you that we haven't taken a
10	fresh look at how we look at our transit
11	systems, particularly in these areas where
12	ridership is growing and what the right mix
13	is.
14	But it's a complicated issue because
15	there's fair policy, there's operating costs,
16	there's investment decisions in the capital.
17	And it's not an there's not an easy
18	solution.
19	I don't have the answer. I think it
20	does need to be part of a broader discussion
21	because as population grows, which we hope it
22	does, and as people choose to take transit,
23	which we hope it does, we can't use, you

know, the formula literally and figuratively

1	from the 1970s. It's time to take a fresh
2	look at all of that. And we have not done
3	it, but are happy to put it on the agenda.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
6	Senator?
7	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Senator
8	Krueger.
9	SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you,
10	Commissioner.
11	A lot of the questions you've gotten
12	for quite a while now seem to be specific to
13	individual projects. And I don't have those
14	kinds of questions. I'm not going to ask the
15	question I've asked you in the past, tell me
16	what the projects you plan on funding in this
17	year's budget are, because you always tell me
18	"We don't know yet." So just shake your
19	head. We don't know yet, so you can't tell
20	me the projects for your capital master list
21	going forward?
22	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We have our
23	list going forward because we're starting to
24	put projects out on the street.

1	SENATOR KRUEGER: Okay, so can you get
2	us a list of your projects going forward?
3	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We can. We
4	can.
5	SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.
6	We're ending the 2010-2014 capital
7	program. Can you get me a list of all the
8	projects funded through that capital plan and
9	what status they're at? So whether they are
10	completed, whether they are continuing.
11	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes, we can.
12	SENATOR KRUEGER: Will you need money
13	from the going-forward capital plan to
14	complete projects that are underway from your
15	2010-2014 plan?
16	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: All of the
17	projects that were in that plan, except for
18	some that as I mentioned, sometimes projects
19	get deferred if we substituted all of
20	those projects have been funded and have been
21	advancing through the process, either through
22	construction or about to be let by March 31st
23	of this year.
24	Just as every year, you know, we have

1	a one-year capital appropriation. But we
2	can't wait till April 1st, because that's
3	really the start of the construction season,
4	so we get the projects teed up and ready to
5	go.
6	But all of the projects that were
7	included, assuming there was no reason that
8	was outside of our control for it to be
9	delayed, are in process.
10	SENATOR KRUEGER: So that's 2010
11	through 2014. Are there still projects from
12	the 2005-2009 plan in process uncompleted?
13	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I don't know
14	the answer to that. But we will look and
15	find out.
16	SENATOR KRUEGER: Great. And the
17	reason I'm asking is because obviously
18	capital projects don't get done on a 12-month
19	period, so trying to hold things up in a
20	budget year versus a continuing story of what
21	is or is not on a list, what is or is not in
22	a process
23	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Right.
24	SENATOR KRUEGER: or even what

1	might have actually got done and we didn't
2	know it that's why all three of those will
3	be valuable to look at together.
4	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes.
5	SENATOR KRUEGER: And in that context,
6	because it's always very hard to figure out
7	where there are funding gaps and where there
8	aren't when it comes to capital because it
9	doesn't match up with one-year periods, are
10	we transferring money from General Fund to
11	fill shortfalls in the Dedicated Highway and
12	Bridge Trust Fund, or are we doing the
13	reverse? What's happening there?
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I believe each
15	year in the last two or three years there has
16	been a General Fund transfer. Because as
17	vehicles have become more efficient, the
18	dedicated fund has not been as robust. But
19	money from the dedicated fund has not gone to
20	the General Fund. And we will get you the
21	specifics of those also.
22	SENATOR KRUEGER: And does Dedicated
23	Highway and Bridge Trust Fund money you

1	Does it go to pay for things besides highways
2	or bridges, such as DMV, or has that stopped?
3	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: They have a
4	portion of the dedicated fund. But again, I
5	don't want to give you the specific
6	breakdowns incorrectly. But we'll get you
7	that.
8	SENATOR KRUEGER: Those are my
9	questions. Thank you very much for your
10	help.
11	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
12	much.
13	Assemblyman Gantt, to close on this
14	side.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Thank you very
16	much, Commissioner.
17	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Thank you.
18	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: I was going to as
19	all these personal questions, but I thought 1
20	better let everybody else get their stuff in
21	before I did.
22	One, as you know on was it Monday
23	night we had the nor'easter?
24	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We did.

1	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Based on that, my
2	CEO of my local bus company, RGRTA, could not
3	stay, he had to get back home to make sure
4	that people could get to work the following
5	morning, and to school. So he did exactly
6	that, and he told me to ask certain questions
7	for him.

COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: So I'm asking those questions, and I assume those questions are also for me. And that is that they need -- as Jim Brennan discussed earlier, quite often we get answers. He was going to be here to ask them himself, but we get those questions from them.

And so I've been asked to ask a direct question, and that's whether or not you guys can afford to come up with \$6 million of operating expenses that he needs. You don't have to give an answer now. The guy right back there, I know that guy is going to send me -- you're going to give me the answer. So I expect that answer soon. And I will tell my CEO that you have it coming. So I expect

1	that	I	wil	l ha	ave i	t by	7 N	Monday	7, 6	and	Ι	can	tell
2	him	on	my	way	back	s dow	m	here	to	Alk	ar	ny.	

The other thing I have, and you and I

have agreed that we have a right to disagree

over this design-build stuff.

COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Mm-hmm.

ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: I'd like to know exactly how many contractors we have under contract to do this stuff and how many we have across the state. I mean, because it just boggles me that we would even be over that way. So if I could get that from -- you're going to do that again? Lookit, you're writing already. So you're going to send it to me.

Sam Roberts was -- oh, he's here now.

But I have a list of stuff because I have to
go through the same thing, Commissioner. And
the issue is whether or not -- where we are
with I-81. Because every time my friends
come over to my house from Syracuse, they ask
the same darn question: When are you going
to get I-81 solved? So to make sure, they're
probably going to look at this over the news

1	that you're going to tell us when we're going
2	to get I-81 solved. So, Sam, I may get beat
3	up. If I get beat up, Sam has to protect me.

commissioner McDonald: The I-81 project is an exciting project. We are in the final stages of what's called the public scoping process. We are adhering -- because we will use some portion of federal funds on whichever alternative is selected, we are adhering to NEPA, the National Environmental Protection Act. We work very closely with our partners at Federal Highway.

The public scoping process requires us to have an aggressive public input. That public input process closed on September 2nd of 2014. We received over a thousand comments. Response to those comments are being finalized right now. And we expect very soon to release the final public scoping document.

There were 17 alternatives that were proposed, plus some additional ones that came in through that public comment period. We are narrowing those down. And then we will

1	get into the full-scale environmental review
2	process to look at things such as
3	construction, impact on the environment,
4	environmental justice.
5	One of the things that the
6	connectivity is a big issue for this project
7	because it is an interstate, so that's
8	something that we have to very carefully
9	consider. And we're also working closely
10	with the city and the county and the
11	surrounding counties so that it fits into
12	their land-use plans, et cetera.
13	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Commissioner, I
14	hate to say to you, to your face, I don't
15	believe you. And I say that only and
16	nobody get excited about that. The only
17	reason I say that is every time I see those
18	darn people from Syracuse, they ask me the
19	same question: What's being done about I-813
20	Now, I don't understand how you got
21	this big beautiful thing out in front of me
22	now and you're explaining to me what you've
23	done and how you're going to do it, and I

keep getting the same thing from the public

1	officials. Not Sam, but from those public
2	officials from Syracuse.
3	So please, get whatever information
4	it is, please get it to them for me so I can
5	stop having to answer questions I can't
6	answer. Okay, if you'd just do me that
7	little favor on this, I'll thank you forever.
8	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Okay, I will
9	do that.
10	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: And the last
11	comment I have is in terms of the surplus.
12	Is it \$5 billion that the Governor has in his
13	pocket?
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I
15	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: You can't answer
16	that.
17	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I can't answer
18	that.
19	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: I thought you
20	couldn't.
21	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I can't answer
22	that.

ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: That's why I sent

him and my speaker, Sheldon Silver, a letter

23

1	saying I don't know, since we missed out on
2	the money from before, why we aren't putting
3	money into transportation. Could you by any
4	chance get that answer for me, why we're not
5	putting that additional
6	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I will convey
7	it to the new budget director, Mary Beth
8	Labate.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Okay. And you
10	will have him send it to me?
11	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes, I'll have
12	Ron make sure that happens.
13	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: He's going to send
L 4	it to me?
15	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yup.
16	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Ron what's your
17	last name?
18	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Epstein.
19	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Epstein?
20	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yup. He's
21	my
22	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: I expect to see
23	this on Monday.
24	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We'll make

1	sure you have it on Monday.
2	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Thanks very much,
3	Commissioner. He smiles, so that means he's
4	going to send it to me on Monday.
5	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Okay.
6	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Thank you again on
7	our at least my behalf. Thanks very much
8	for coming in and making your comments.
9	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Thank you.
10	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: And thank you for
11	doing the good job that you do on behalf of
12	all of us in the state.
13	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Senator?
14	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Commissioner.
15	You know I'm one of those darn legislators.
16	And, you know, we've been going around and
17	around on this project for a long time. And
18	it's important to Syracuse. Just so
19	Assemblyman Gantt knows what we're talking
20	about, it's an interstate, 81, going through
21	the center of the city. And the question is
22	how that's going to be redone, because it's
23	either got to come down or be fixed. And
24	it's a huge, huge issue.

1	So when is your next report coming
2	out, that I thought was supposed to be
3	January of 2015, that would outline the final
4	list of possibilities and which you'll
5	investigate further?
6	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: It will be
7	done this quarter, first quarter of 2015.
8	There were some issues we've had to work
9	through with Federal Highway on the
10	connectivity side.
11	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: This quarter.
12	Didn't you at one time say January? Or am I
13	dreaming?
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I don't know
15	if I said January at one point. Maybe I did.
16	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: All right. In
17	any event, whenever it comes out, the process
18	from there is that the final recommendations
19	that you have, or the final conclusions you
20	have, there will be a much more in-depth
21	study as to the feasibility of each and
22	what's the recommendation.
23	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Correct.
24	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: All right. You

1	mentioned you have some issues with the
2	federal people. How much have the since
3	you've got to get money from the feds,
4	because we probably won't have a big
5	settlement for some time now
6	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We need that
7	big bank settlement in 2017 to start
8	construction.
9	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay. But if
10	we don't get it, you need substantial federal
11	money.
12	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We do.
13	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay. Have you
14	been dealing with the federal legislators
15	that represent the area that this goes over?
16	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I've had
17	conversations with the new Congressman,
18	Congressman Katko. I've had we've had
19	discussions and meetings with Senator Schumer
20	on the project. You know, Congressman Hanna
21	is on the T&I committee. We have not talked
22	specifically about this project of late, but
23	he has been a strong advocate and a good
24	partner on transportation funding.

1	So I think between Congressman Hanna
2	and Congressman Katko, we have two strong
3	advocates who are both on the T&I committee.
4	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay. And so
5	obviously probably anybody you talk to has
6	a different idea as to how this should be
7	done; that's part of the problem. But
8	wouldn't it be important that in order to get
9	federal funding, that those individuals weigh
10	in on what they think would be best, which
11	would be the best it may not be the ideal
12	solution for anybody, but it would be the
13	best chance of getting substantial funding,
14	which is absolutely necessary. Is that a
15	fair statement?
16	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes. Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay. And you
18	intend to do that
19	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: On an ongoing
20	basis, yup.
21	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay. All
22	right. Now, with respect to and I won't
23	get into the specifics because it's too
24	boring for anybody to listen to. But I want

1	to get into some more general issues with
2	respect to the budget.
3	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Okay.
4	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: How much new
5	capital money from whatever part of the
6	budget, it doesn't matter total new
7	capital money from the Governor's budget?
8	Approximately.
9	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Okay. Our
10	capital budget, all in, is approximately
11	3.5 billion. And on top of that, there is
12	the proposed \$750 million, of which
13	\$150 million will be this year. Which is we
L 4	are proposing to do a hundred bridges in
15	those key corridors. There's an additional
16	\$60 million for ports. And that's basically
17	what the capital budget is for State DOT.
18	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay. And
19	obviously your backlog is probably in the
20	billions, is that fair to say, as far as
21	things that have to be done?
22	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We have a
23	large backlog, and we keep chipping away at
24	it.

1	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay. Now,
2	with respect to that, do you know if any of
3	that money that's being directed, additional
4	money being directed to DOT comes from this
5	bank settlement?
6	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We the
7	\$750 million is from additional bond cap
8	within the capital program. The \$60 million
9	for the ports is from the settlement. And
10	those are the two pieces that come directly
11	to DOT.
12	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: From the
13	settlement.
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Right.
15	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: 750 plus 60.
16	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: No, the 750 is
17	not the settlement, it's additional bond cap.
18	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: All right. But
19	as far as directly from the fund, the
20	settlement, you expect \$60 million if the
21	budget passes as proposed?
22	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Correct.
23	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: All right. I
24	happen to be someone who believes strongly

1	that this should be used for infrastructure,
2	infrastructure, infrastructure. You say
3	you're doing a hundred bridges right now.
4	And how much are you dedicating money for it?
5	How much will that cost, the hundred bridges?
6	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Well, that
7	the hundred bridges will be paid for out of
8	the \$750 million in bond cap.
9	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Oh, I see.
10	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yeah. Yeah.
11	And that's in addition to our core program.
12	That's in addition to the 115 bridges that
13	we're doing from FEMA. And some of the
14	additional, you know, work that we're doing.
15	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Don't you think
16	it would be a great idea to take since the
17	Thruway Authority is getting over a billion
18	dollars for one project one project
19	don't you think it would be a good idea for
20	regional balance to take another billion
21	dollars from that fund and chip away at
22	your do it per capita as far as the number
23	of people in the area, you kind of divide it
24	up by population, and chip away quicker at

1	your list? wouldn't that be a great idea?
2	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I leave that
3	up to all of you as part of the budget
4	negotiations.
5	SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: But you're
6	guiding us, as the Commissioner of
7	Transportation. I just think it would be a
8	terrific idea. Would you mind if I propose
9	that as we go through?
10	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I think that
11	you have to propose what you want to propose.
12	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay. But you
13	would not you would accept the money if it
14	happened.
15	(Laughter.)
16	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Oh, that's a
17	tough one.
18	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: All right.
19	okay. I mean, if you don't say yes to that,
20	then all right. But seriously, that I
21	think is a good use of the money.
22	In any event, do you have a five-year
23	capital spending plan right now in existence?
24	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We look at

1	various different alternatives. And right
2	now we have a program that fits into the
3	Governor's proposed budget.
4	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Do you have a
5	five-year capital spending plan in existence
6	right now?
7	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Our five-year
8	capital spending plan assumes the
9	\$2.3 billion in each year.
10	SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: So you have a
11	written plan in existence right now?
12	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We do.
13	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: And is that
14	available to the public?
15	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I think we can
16	make it available. You know, we're
17	fine-tuning it, but I'm sure we can get that
18	to you.
19	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: How long would
20	that take? And I guess you might probably
21	know why I'm asking that.
22	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I do know why
23	you're asking. I will go back to the office
24	and check and we will get back to you

1	quickly.
2	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: All right,
3	thank you. Now I guess my time is up. And
4	Senator Dilan has another question. Oh, wait
5	a minute, I'm sorry
6	SENATOR DILAN: But if I can follow up
7	on his question, what is the amount of your
8	five-year capital plan?
9	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Our what we
10	plan for is what's in the five-year Executive
11	Budget, which is
12	SENATOR DILAN: I want a dollar
13	amount.
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Which is
15	basically just
16	SENATOR DILAN: A dollar amount,
17	please.
18	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Which is
19	approximately
20	SENATOR DILAN: A dollar amount.
21	COMMISSIONER McDONALD:
22	\$2.3 billion a year.
23	SENATOR DILAN: For five years? Okay.

COMMISSIONER McDONALD: For each year,

1	yes.
2	SENATOR DILAN: For each year. Okay,
3	I just have two points. I wanted to follow
4	up again on the Capital Review Board, because
5	I don't know that your answer was sufficient
6	previously.
7	I know that when the MTA came out with
8	its capital plan, you actually have 90 days
9	to review it. And I think you rejected it
10	immediately. And I still want to know how
11	can you reject it without reviewing it?
12	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Because we
13	didn't think 90 days was sufficient. And
14	that's why we disapproved it without
15	prejudice.
16	SENATOR DILAN: But that means you did
17	not review it.
18	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We we at
19	the time we decided, in consultation with the
20	other members of the Capital Program Review
21	Board, that
22	SENATOR DILAN: Well I think you did
23	not consult with

COMMISSIONER McDONALD: -- 90 days --

1	SENATOR DILAN: members, you
2	rejected on your own.
3	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: No, I did not.
4	I rejected it
5	SENATOR DILAN: You have a veto vote.
6	I'm on the Capital Review Board also, but
7	just one member rejecting it
8	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: One member can
9	reject it.
10	SENATOR DILAN: Yeah. So but I
11	think you rejected it probably before even it
12	came out, I believe.
13	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: No, I did not
14	reject it before it came out. I rejected it
15	shortly after it came out because we did not
16	believe that 90 days was sufficient time to
17	assess
18	SENATOR DILAN: But you had 90 days to
19	review it, and you did not exercise that, you
20	rejected it immediately. And I don't know
21	what basis you had to do that. I mean, there
22	is a gap in that plan, I agree with you on
23	that.

COMMISSIONER McDONALD: There's a huge

1	gap. And we did not believe that 90 days
2	I did not believe that 90 days was sufficient
3	to make that assessment. And that's why I
4	rejected it without prejudice.
5	SENATOR DILAN: Well, I just feel that
6	someone who makes a decision like the one you
7	made has to be held accountable for it, and I
8	think that you owe the public
9	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I don't
10	disagree with that. And I've given you my
11	reason. I did not think the 90 days was
12	sufficient.
13	SENATOR DILAN: An accountability I
14	don't think acceptable, but that's your
15	opinion.
16	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yup.
17	SENATOR DILAN: But secondly, we'll
18	move on. In this year's Opportunity Agenda,
19	it's proposed shared resources between your
20	department and the New York State Thruway
21	Authority. Can you elaborate on that for us
22	and let us know what that's about?
23	And secondly, I would like to know
24	what employee protections are within that,

1	since two different agencies are involved.
2	One is a state agency, and one is an
3	authority.
4	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Sure. We've
5	just begun the discussion. You know, as you
6	know, there's a new acting executive director
7	of the Thruway Authority. And we just think
8	it makes sense that between our pool of
9	engineers, his pool of engineers, that we can
10	share design services.
11	We have not looked at the employee
12	protection issues yet, but we will make sure
13	that as we look at shared services, that is a
14	factor that we look at. But it just makes a
15	lot of sense that we've got a lot of
16	engineering expertise between our two
17	agencies, we've got a lot of architecture
18	expertise between our two agencies, that
19	folks have the opportunity to work on
20	different projects and make that happen.
21	SENATOR DILAN: Do we anticipate any
22	savings as a result of this?
23	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We have not

quantified those yet.

1	SENATOR DILAN: So what are the
2	benefits?
3	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: The benefits
4	are I think a lot of the benefits are
5	directly to the employees. They get the
6	opportunity to work on different projects
7	that if they were just working on, say, a
8	Thruway project, they might not.
9	And we believe there will be a
10	savings, and when they're quantified, we're
11	happy to share them with you.
12	SENATOR DILAN: Thank you,
13	Commissioner.
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: You're
15	welcome.
16	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
17	Assemblyman Oaks.
18	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Thank you,
19	Commissioner.
20	I just wanted to go back to the
21	five-year bridge plan, or the 150 that would
22	be targeted for a hundred bridges. Have
23	those bridges been selected? Do we know how
24	many of those will be state bridges, how many

1	local bridges?
2	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I don't know
3	off the top of my head what the breakdown is
4	across the state.
5	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Or what percentage
6	of the dollars will go
7	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Again, if I
8	give a percentage, then if it's not
9	correct I don't want to do that. But as
10	they become final, we'll share them with you.
11	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: But clearly we're
12	going to be ahead of where we would have been
13	if we weren't doing that.
14	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: If we weren't
15	doing those hundred bridges, absolutely.
16	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Chairman
17	DeFrancisco spoke some about, you know, how
18	we focus the dollars and both for this and
19	the others. I do think that the CHIPS
20	formula has been one that has driven dollars,
21	you know, across the state. And certainly
22	last year with the winter recovery money,
23	doing that along those lines, I think that
24	was a smart decision. I might you know, I

Τ.	would check oil you can get my support,
2	Senator DeFrancisco, for that.
3	And hopefully budget negotiations
4	might lead us to driving whether it's some
5	additional dollars you know, we see local
6	governments pressured, obviously, by the tax
7	cap and others. And for many especially
8	small communities, those dollars, highway
9	dollars, make a large portion of especially
10	small community budgets. And certainly
11	anything we can do along these lines are
12	helpful.
13	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yes, and
14	that's why we don't just use vehicle counts
15	when we factor in. And these corridors,
16	whether they're agriculture, freight,
17	commerce, they may not have necessarily the
18	highest traffic volumes, but they're an
19	important economic consideration for that
20	community.
21	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
23	Senator?

CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: I'm going to

1	close with a few more questions on a
2	different topic.
3	Assemblyman Brennan had talked about
4	upstate transit. And do you know the numbers
5	as far as comparing it to downstate transit
6	dollars by the State of New York?
7	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I don't have
8	it broken down in front of me by upstate
9	transit system. The total number for the
10	upstate transit systems which is Albany,
11	Utica and Syracuse, which are combined, is
12	\$180.7 million. And I'll get you the
13	breakdown by locality.
14	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: I don't need
15	the breakdown, but do you have an idea how
16	much new money for operating expenses the
17	upstate transit got in this budget?
18	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: That is, I
19	believe, flat.
20	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Flat. So
21	nothing was provided.
22	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Nothing
23	additional.
24	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Now, how about

1	in capital assistance:
2	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Downstate got
3	capital, upstate did not.
4	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: So operating,
5	upstate got nada. Capital, upstate got nada;
6	correct? Now tell me what downstate got in
7	operating and capital.
8	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Downstate,
9	operating, the downstate suburban transit
10	systems got \$290.4 million. And \$17 million
11	capital.
12	He's got a good stage whisper, doesn't
13	he?
14	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: No, he's good,
15	I've been watching. He's got good
16	information.
17	So did you present a budget to the
18	Governor before he made his overall budget?
19	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: We submit our
20	budget through the Budget Division.
21	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay. And my
22	question is when you submitted a budget
23	I'm not going to ask you what you asked for
24	or whatever did you consider this

1	disparity as something that might be
2	something that should be addressed?
3	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Well, we live
4	within the overall 2 percent cap. And so we
5	all have to make some hard decisions. As
6	I've said on, you know, a couple of occasions
7	when we talked about NFTA, we talked about
8	upstate transit aid overall, I'm happy to
9	continue the conversation about what the
10	formula should be, but my budget lives within
11	the 2 percent cap.
12	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: I understand
13	that. But zero operating, zero capital
14	upstate. And then the increase that you just
15	mentioned.
16	So I think Assemblyman Brennan hit it
17	right on the head. What's needed, and we
18	tried to do it last year, is a new formula.
19	Because the formula isn't driving what it
20	used to drive to upstate, and they're getting
21	deeper and deeper in the hole.
22	The only one I know clearly about is
23	Centro in Syracuse. They're going to start

cutting routes, and we're going to hear that.

Τ	That's a preview to the upstate transit
2	making their presentation in a little while.
3	So I just wanted to bring it out on
4	the table. And if you enter into or are
5	asked your opinion or are getting involved,
6	the key is another formula so that each year
7	we don't go deeper and deeper in the hole.
8	I don't deny downstate their needs.
9	But zero is not good when there's increases
10	downstate.
11	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: And as I said
12	in response to Assemblyman Brennan, and I'll
13	reiterate, a 1970s formula doesn't work in
14	2015. And we do have to address it.
15	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: And if you
16	could come up with one, that would be
17	terrific.
18	(Laughter.)
19	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I will do my
20	best.
21	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: All right,
22	great.
23	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Would you also, a
24	you start to talk about that, talk with the

1	RGRTA?
2	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Absolutely.
3	Yeah, it's all of the upstate transit
4	systems.
5	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Who seems to have
6	a system who seems to have a system that
7	works much better than anybody else's in this
8	state.
9	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Yup. And I
10	think that's part of it, best practices.
11	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: The level is a
12	dollar a trip. So I think that makes a whole
13	lot of sense. Rather than having a system
14	that we simply ask that you give us more
15	money. I think efficiency should also count.
16	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
17	much.
18	(Cross-talk.)
19	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: We
20	Syracuse no, no, I've got to respond.
21	Syracuse charges or Centro charges a dollar
22	per ride as well.
23	But number two, if Rochester is in
24	such great shape, maybe you can send your

1	money over to the other transit.
2	(Laughter.)
3	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: I will leave
4	that to the two of you.
5	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Senator, you don't
6	want to start one with me. Okay, you'd
7	better not start that.
8	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
9	much.
10	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Thank you.
11	SENATOR DILAN: And, Commissioner, I
12	think you're doing a great job, I really do.
13	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Thank you,
14	Senator.
15	SENATOR DILAN: And I want to thank
16	Senator Montgomery for bringing up the
17	Kosciuszko Bridge.
18	COMMISSIONER McDONALD: Thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: We will now do the
20	11 o'clock person. New York State Department
21	of Motor Vehicles, J. David Sampson,
22	executive deputy commissioner.
23	Good afternoon.

EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: Good

1	afternoon.
2	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: We were looking for
3	you earlier this morning.
4	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: I'm
5	sorry if I held you up.
6	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: No, you didn't, we
7	were just getting nervous.
8	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON:
9	Would you like me to begin, sir?
10	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Yes, begin.
11	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON:
12	Thank you.
13	Good afternoon. Thank you,
14	Chairperson DeFrancisco, Chairperson Farrell,
15	and other members of the Legislature for
16	inviting me here today. I am J. David
17	Sampson, the executive deputy commissioner of
18	the Department of Motor Vehicles. I am
19	pleased to have the opportunity to address
20	you and answer any questions you may have
21	regarding the fiscal year 2015-2016 Executive
22	Budget as it applies to our agency.
23	Governor Cuomo's Executive Budget plan
2.4	allows DMV to continue to build upon the

1	innovations and efficiencies achieved over
2	the past four years. It provides
3	\$325 million for DMV, which will enable us to
4	continue our efforts to improve overall
5	customer service, promote traffic safety and
6	protect consumers.
7	For fiscal year 2015-2016, revenue
8	collections from all transactions are
9	projected to total more than \$1.7 billion.
10	We will perform more than 28 million
11	transactions, including over 5.5 million
12	Internet transactions, many completed through
13	MyDMV, DMV's personalized web portal.
14	The Executive Budget includes
15	legislation to amend the Vehicle and Traffic
16	Law to facilitate New York State's compliance
17	with federal requirements relating to the
18	issuance of commercial learner's permits and
19	the disqualification of commercial driver's
20	licenses and commercial learner's permits.
21	In addition, the budget includes
22	legislation to amend the Vehicle and Traffic
23	Law to allow an overweight vehicle permit
24	issued by DOT to serve as sufficient

1	documentation without having to also receive
2	an updated registration from DMV, as is
3	currently required.

Through the Governor's Traffic Safety

Committee, DMV will continue its outstanding

traffic safety initiatives that have made

New York's roadways among the safest in the

nation. DMV distributes approximately \$30

million in federal funding annually to

support traffic safety initiatives, including

enforcement efforts by state and local law

enforcement agencies to combat drunk driving

and distracted driving as well as other

dangerous driving behaviors.

Over the past two years, DMV has been involved in an agency-wide Customer Service Initiative, which consisted of 10 separate projects that added new technologies, upgraded equipment, and instituted best practices in customer service in our call center and 27 state-operated DMV offices.

One of the principal goals of the Customer Service Initiative was to decrease average office wait times from 60 minutes in 2013 to

1	30 minutes. I am pleased to report that we
2	were successful in doing so and that in 2014,
3	the average office wait time in
4	state-operated DMV offices was reduced to
5	25 minutes.

Several of the projects in the

Customer Service Initiative were designed to

meet the requests of our customers that we

offer more online transactions and become

more efficient in our offices. Here are some

examples of the projects that we have now

successfully implemented:

A new modern, dynamic, and easy-to-use website that is also optimized for use on mobile devices, including smartphones and tablets. DMV's website now receives more than 28 million site visits per year and 5.5 million transactions, a 10 percent increase over its prior usage.

Twenty-five self-service kiosks in 19 of our state-operated DMV offices enable customers to perform many transactions that previously could only be conducted by a DMV employee. Customers are now performing more

1	than 2	,000	transa	actior	ns per	day	at	kiosks
2	locate	d in	state	DMV c	offices	S .		

A new office queuing system that includes an option for customers to make online reservations for a day and time that is convenient for them. Our reservation system has proven very popular, with more than 350,000 reservations made since April 2014.

A new call center technology to improve services to our phone customers.

This new solution routes calls more efficiently, enabling us to answer nearly

4.5 million calls annually and reduce on-hold wait times. A call-back option allows customers to leave a name and number, and receive a call back to avoid waiting on hold.

Improved internal processing of other operations, including applications for new auto dealers, inspection station or repair shop licenses, and applying for a title or driver permit. On average, as a result of these projects, we were able to reduce our processing time by 53 percent.

1	In total, these projects have also
2	helped us move closer to achieving another
3	long-term goal, with 50 percent of our
4	customers using self-service alternatives,
5	including the web, mail and kiosks, to
6	perform their transaction. This budget will
7	allow DMV to continue to build upon the
8	innovations and efficiencies achieved over
9	the past four years.
10	Once again, thank you for this
11	opportunity to speak with you today. I
12	welcome any questions you might have about
13	DMV and our plans for serving the people of
14	New York.
15	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
16	much.
17	Assemblyman Gantt.
18	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: I've just got one
19	question I'd like to ask, and that's an issue
20	over commercial driver's licenses by, I
21	believe, the hearing-impaired.
22	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: I'm
23	not familiar. If you could tell me more,
24	Assemblyman.

1	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: You're not
2	familiar with it? Well, they are, they send
3	a ton of information to my office concerning
4	hearing-impaired people receiving commercial
5	driver's license. You have no information
6	about that?
7	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: I'm
8	not familiar with that correspondence, but I
9	will be glad to look at that and get back to
10	you, Assemblyman.
11	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Well, we'll make
12	sure Anthony Orfey {ph} from my office will
13	get you that information, and you can get us
14	an answer for it. Because I'd like to have
15	an answer, or at least your thoughts on that
16	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: Yes
17	we will certainly do that.
18	ASSEMBLYMAN GANTT: Okay? Thank you
19	very much.
20	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Senator?
21	SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.
22	Senator Marty Dilan.
23	SENATOR DILAN: Yes, Commissioner,
24	I've always been trying to figure out this

1	issue between DMV and the Bridge and Highway
2	Trust Fund. Every year it comes out that the
3	trust fund is subsidizing DMV. I believe in
4	this year's budget we're talking about
5	\$200 million.
6	However, I would like to know from
7	you your agency is a revenue-producing
8	agency, I think to the tune of maybe
9	\$1.7 billion a year that goes towards the
10	General Fund. So can you explain the
11	relationship between your agency and that
12	trust fund?
13	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: Yes,
14	I'll be glad to, Senator.
15	As I understand it, of the
16	\$1.7 billion in revenue that DMV will
17	generate, \$800 million of that will go to the
18	Dedicated Highway/Bridge/Traffic Fund. The
19	General Fund will receive approximately
20	\$211 million, and the remainder of that
21	\$1.7 billion goes to various other sources.
22	SENATOR DILAN: I just bring this up
23	because, you know, every year we have a
24	debate on the Senate floor where the bridge

1	fund is funding your agency, and I just got a
2	little confused, considering that your agency
3	is a revenue-producing agency.
4	And I just wanted to clarify that for
5	the record. Thank you.
6	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON:
7	You're welcome.
8	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Mr. McDonough.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Thank you.
10	How are you, and welcome, welcome
11	today. Thank you for being here.
12	A little different question. DMV
13	still provides the Motor Voter registration
14	service?
15	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON:
16	That's correct, sir.
17	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: And what does
18	an applicant have to show at that point? I
19	mean, to get a driver's license is one thing.
20	But in order to register to vote through DMV,
21	what does that person have to show DMV?
22	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: It
23	is a part of the application for a license.
24	It is also part of the application when you

1	renew your license that you can check off if
2	you are interested in registering to vote.
3	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: That's right.
4	I've seen that, and it says "Are you a
5	citizen of the United States?" And you say
6	yes, but there's no proof that that person is
7	a citizen. There's no passport, as I
8	understand it, or birth certificate or
9	anything like that.
10	So once somebody goes to get a
11	driver's license and they say "I am a citizen
12	of the United States" on that form, then they
13	say, okay, they will register you to vote.
14	Am I correct?
15	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: Yes.
16	When they are coming to get an original
17	license? I'm confused by your question, sir.
18	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Well, they
19	come to get a license and they show, I think,
20	a Social Security card or something like
21	that. Right?
22	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: Yes,
23	they have to show six points of
24	identification to establish

1	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: I don't think
2	anybody shows actual proof of United States
3	citizenship.
4	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: It
5	will show proof through their birth
6	certificate, which is also required at the
7	time that they apply for a license. They
8	have to prove that as well.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Oh, I wasn't
10	aware. The birth certificate is required?
11	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: Yes.
12	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Okay. So that
13	would be checking also to see where they were
14	born, if they are a citizen too.
15	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON:
16	Correct.
17	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Okay. Then I
18	might be misinformed. Thank you very much.
19	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON:
20	You're welcome.
21	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Senator?
22	SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you. Good
23	afternoon.
24	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: Good

	1	afternoon,	Senator.
--	---	------------	----------

left on hold.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 SENATOR KRUEGER: Now, you talked 3 about your improvements in your technology and your modernization. But we occasionally 4 5 hear complaints about the customer service hotline having particularly long wait times 6 7 for customers. Do you evaluate that? Do you have any data you can share with us? 8 EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: We 9 10 do. And, Senator, that was one reason we were very anxious to put in our new call 11 12 center technology to replace the old 13 switching operations that we had. Because we 14 had no way to know how many people were

And now as we implement this new system, it gives us the ability not only to handle more calls, as I mentioned, but it will also give us the ability to monitor the wait times more accurately. And it also provides people with the option, if they don't want to remain on hold, you can simply leave us your name and your telephone number.

getting frozen out of calling in or being

Τ	And it's programmed that it will call you
2	back immediately as soon as one of our
3	operators is available, and then you can
4	complete your call that way.
5	SENATOR KRUEGER: And that whole
6	system is now up and running?
7	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: Yes,
8	it is.
9	SENATOR KRUEGER: So have you been
10	able to track whether you've seen
11	improvements from the beginning of the
12	exercise through today?
13	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: We
14	are seeing improvements. The total system
15	went into effect in December, so we're still
16	gathering some of the metrics on that at this
17	point. But our initial results show that our
18	wait times are developing closer to our goal.
19	So far, much better downstate than upstate,
20	but we're hoping to improve both as the
21	months proceed.
22	SENATOR KRUEGER: And that's for the
23	phone system. Are you also improving access
24	via the Internet for people to be able to do

1	certain transactions via Internet rather than
2	having to come into offices or through the
3	mail?
4	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: Yes.
5	We are continuing to expand our use of the
6	Internet for transactions as we are able to.
7	And that is one other reason that
8	we've also installed the kiosks in our
9	offices, because many of the Internet
10	transactions can be performed on the kiosk.
11	And for those individuals that don't have
12	ready access to a computer, they can come
13	into a DMV office and, instead of waiting in
L 4	line for one of our motor vehicle
15	representatives, they can quickly go to a
16	kiosk, complete their transaction and leave.
17	SENATOR KRUEGER: You project 46
18	we're losing 46 more full-time positions this
19	year, I think, in the budget. So those
20	positions are no longer needed because why?
21	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON:
22	Primarily as a result of the new technologies
23	that we've been able to implement over the
24	last four years, and of course the other

1	projects that we have performed internally to
2	become more efficient and innovative in how
3	we handle things.
4	So as employees leave the agency, we
5	can continue to offer the same level of
6	service because the technology allows us to.
7	SENATOR KRUEGER: So these are
8	attrition, you're not replacing people, as
9	opposed to laying off?
10	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: No,
11	we are not laying off anyone. This is solely
12	through attrition.
13	SENATOR KRUEGER: And so this loss of
14	46 jobs are more in the direct-service arena
15	of DMV rather than the management of DMV?
16	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON:
17	Well, through attrition we can't necessarily
18	dictate where that will occur. But by and
19	large, most of the technology improvements
20	have taken place in our offices' operations.
21	So in that area, we are able to handle more
22	attritions, and then we can allocate the
23	employees that we have to the offices that
24	need them more effectively as we monitor

1	things such as office wait times.
2	SENATOR KRUEGER: I'm embarrassed
3	because it could be a year, it could be three
4	years; my brain doesn't keep track. The DMV
5	had started a pilot of some longer hours on
6	weekdays to allow working people to be able
7	to get to the DMV after work. How has that
8	program gone, and how many places do you have
9	that now?
10	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: We
11	have continued the expanded office program in
12	three offices since the pilot ended. And
13	those offices are open from 8:00 in the
14	morning till 6 o'clock at night. And what we
15	have done is to continue that because
16	customers found that very convenient,
17	especially between the hours of 4:00 and 6:00
18	when we otherwise would have been closed.
19	SENATOR KRUEGER: If it's been

EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: Then it comes down to managing our budget and what we're able to do. And what we tried to

successful, why don't you do it in more than

just three offices?

1	select were offices located in each of the
2	localities for example, in Yonkers, and
3	Massapequa is the other, so that we're
4	hitting areas outside the City of New York as
5	well, so that people have a location they car
6	go to if they want to go to an office after
7	hours.
8	And the volumes of customers have been
9	at a comfortable level that we don't see an
10	indication that there is a huge pent-up
11	demand that we expand that to additional
12	offices at this time.
13	SENATOR KRUEGER: So where is the
14	third? You said Yonkers, Massapequa
15	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: In
16	our Midtown office.
17	SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.
18	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON:
19	Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
21	Assemblyman Ortiz.
22	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Thank you,
23	Mr. Chairman.
24	Thank you, Commissioner, and good

1	
	afternoon.

My first question has to do with the Lauren's Law -- you know, the organ donor law. And my question is very simple. It's about how that law has been implemented and how it also has been promoted to make sure that people know that they have the option to register to donate their organs.

EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON:

Well, like the voter registration that I

mentioned earlier, on the original license

application as well the license renewal

application, there is also the check-off area

for someone if they wish to be an organ

donor. And as a result of Lauren's Law, that

was expanded to specifically ask them if they

wished to do so.

And it's my understanding, through statistics provided to us by the Department of Health, that 90 percent of people who do sign up to be organ donors, 90 percent do so through a DMV. So we feel that we have a very large role in helping to promote that, and we do the best that we can within our

1			_1 _	
1	offices	τo	ao	so.

2	And we partner with our county clerks,
3	who operate DMV offices in 51 counties, that
4	they similarly do what they can to help
5	promote organ donation when people come into
6	their offices.

ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Do you also partner with the legislators? Like, for example, if you have information that we can have in our offices to promote it as well?

EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question.

ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Do you also have a partnership with the Legislature, the members of the Legislature, where we can get information from your office to make sure that it may be able to be on our website or we can have information? And also my question goes about in what language do you have the information available about organ donors? It's just in English or is --

EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON: My understanding is we have it in both English and Spanish. And we would be glad to provide

1	you with the documents that we use in our
2	offices so that you can also help promote
3	this.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Thank you very
5	much.
6	And my second question and my last
7	question is, as you probably know, there's a
8	trend throughout the country and different
9	states are beginning to pass to allow
10	non-citizens to have driver's licenses. The
11	Department of Motor Vehicles, is it going to
12	be prepared in order to issue this kind of
13	licensing for noncitizens?
L 4	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON:
15	Licenses for undocumented immigrants is not a
16	part of the Governor's budget proposal. We
17	are aware that in the Legislature there are
18	proposals, and we are certainly willing to
19	sit down and discuss those at the appropriate
20	time.
21	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Thank you very
22	much, Commissioner.
23	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
24	Senator?

1	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: I just
2	wanted I have no questions. Your
3	testimony was fine. I just want to tell you,
4	you have a tough act to follow. Barbara did
5	wonderful work over at the DMV, all the
6	innovations, all the customer service
7	capabilities, the efficiencies. We have
8	virtually no calls to the office about
9	complaints about the DMV, which was the
LO	opposite before her term. She did a
11	wonderful job with the customer in mind, and
12	I'm sure you'll do just as well. I'm waiting
13	for your first innovation.
14	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON:
15	Thank you, Senator. She provided great
16	leadership to our agency.
17	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
18	Assemblyman McDonough.
19	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Thank you very
20	much.
21	One additional question. This is not
22	a budgetary question, but it's something I
23	advertise through my media communications.
24	How successful do you find the organ donor

1	program going with the driver's license
2	registration? You know, you can check there
3	each time you renew. Do you know, offhand?
4	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON:
5	Well, what we hear from the organ donation
6	groups is that it has proven to be very
7	successful, and they assist us in ways to
8	help promote it and market it. So far it's
9	working very well.
10	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Okay. Thank
11	you.
12	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Any further?
13	Thank you very much.
14	EXEC. DEP. COMMISSIONER SAMPSON:
15	Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thomas Prendergast,
17	chairman and CEO, Metropolitan Transportation
18	Authority. That's the 11:30.
19	Good morning no, good afternoon.
20	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Good
21	afternoon, sirs.
22	Senator DeFrancisco, Assemblyman
23	Farrell, and members of the Senate and
24	Assembly, good afternoon. Thank you for

1	holding	this	hearing	g and	inviting	me	to
2	discuss	the N	MTA's f	inance	2S -		

Last week, as you know, Governor Cuomo released the state's 2015-2016 Executive Budget, and we're pleased that once again we'll see increased state aid. Total funding to the MTA increased by almost \$141 million over the state's 2014-2015 enacted budget. This increase includes an almost \$37 million boost to our operating budget, and more than \$104 million being transferred to the MTA capital program. It also provides more than \$1 billion in new funding for the 2015-2019 capital program.

In addition, the MTA's 2015 budget and financial plan, approved by our board last month, presents a fully transparent view of our current and four-year financial outlook. It strongly reaffirms our organization-wide commitment to cost-cutting, and it shows that we've already cut more than a billion dollars out of our annual operating budget. But we're not finished.

24 And I want to tell you just some of

1	the ways the MTA became more efficient and
2	better-managed than ever before in 2014.
3	By incorporating modern strategies for
4	office space, we were able to move our entire
5	headquarters to 2 Broadway in Lower
6	Manhattan. Through this move, we will
7	monetize our former headquarters at 341, 345,
8	and 347 Madison Avenue, generating hundreds
9	of millions of dollars for our capital
10	program.
11	We issued \$479 million of refunding
12	bonds and completed associated restructurings
13	of existing escrows, for a total savings of
14	approximately \$110 million.
15	And we successfully concluded labor
16	settlements with most of our represented
17	workforce. Thanks to our cost-cutting
18	efforts, we were able to fund these
19	settlements without additional fare and toll
20	increases or service reductions.
21	New savings initiatives are being
22	identified in the areas of prompt payment
23	discounts, worker's compensation, energy

management, consolidations, purchasing,

1	inventory, and employee benefits. These
2	initiatives are increasing our total annual
3	savings target to \$1.6 billion a year by
4	2018. And the savings we've realized have
5	improved our operations in three critically
6	important ways. These are the most
7	aggressive cost-cutting activities in MTA's
8	history.
9	Firstly, without these savings, we
10	would not have been able to reduce projected
11	fare and toll increases from the about
12	7.5 percent every other year to about 4
13	percent every other year, or roughly
14	2 percent per year.
15	Second, these savings have allowed us
16	to add \$157 million back into service and
17	service quality enhancements since 2012.
18	And third, they've helped us put
19	\$290 million a year into a pay-as-you-go
20	account, beginning this year, that could
21	generate up to \$5.4 billion for the 2015-2019
22	capital program. That's a lot of money, but
23	we're still well short of our extensive
24	capital needs.

1	Before I discuss that, though, I want
2	to tell you about a few important cost-saving
3	and efficiency initiatives. One I'm
4	particularly proud of working with is the
5	undertaking with our partners in the
6	construction industry to not only reduce
7	costs but to make it easier to do business
8	with the MTA, because we know that lower
9	costs will be passed on to us and to the
10	public at large.

Asset management is another area we're tackling head-on. Through a system we call Enterprise Asset Management, we will better understand the value and useful life of our assets and get as much of that useful life out of them as possible.

And for a system that has a combined value of almost \$1 trillion in assets, better asset management has the potential to quietly revolutionize the way we do business, saving us hundreds of millions of dollars and making sure that we can pass off these in terms better processes, technologies, and training. These savings can then be put right back into

our	system	through	strategic	initiatives	and
the	MTA's	indispens	sable capit	tal program.	

This program, as you all know, is a series of five-year investments through which we regularly maintain and improve our entire network. It started in 1982, and today, more than 30 years and \$100 billion later, the capital program has given our nearly 9 million daily customers a system they can depend on, while delivering real value to millions more.

This program revitalized our transit system and our region, enabling improvements that have brought customers back to our system in droves. Today's ridership is at all-time highs. Before October 2013, we had never recorded 6 million daily subway riders on the system. Last year, we exceeded that number five times in September, seven times in October, and nine times in December. In October 2014, total monthly subway ridership was the highest it's been in the entire history of the system.

Metro-North's ridership of more than

1	83 million has almost doubled since its
2	founding in 1983. And the Long Island Rail
3	Road's ridership of another more than
4	83 million as well make them the two most
5	heavily traveled commuter railroads in the
6	nation.
7	We're looking closely at where our
8	ridership growth is coming from. Until
9	recently, it was mostly from reverse
10	commutes, travel between suburban
11	destinations, and during off-peak hours,
12	evenings and weekends. Today we're seeing

We're seeing more and more customers
who need to wait two, three, even four trains
before they can board during rush hour. This
means our network is almost stretched to
capacity, trains are more crowded than ever,
and commutes are more difficult. A minor
delay on one train at rush hour can have a
massive ripple effect, leading to
overcrowding on the platform, doors being
held open at every station, and

ridership growth in all of those areas as

well as during peak hours.

1	ever-increasing delays for the trains that
2	follow. If that happens on a regular basis,
3	the impact would be severe for millions of
4	riders, their employers, and our region's
5	economy.

These ridership trends show no signs of abating in the foreseeable future. And with the future in mind, Governor Cuomo asked that I convene a panel of experts to inform the development of our next capital program, especially with respect to two important areas, one with respect to global climate change and the other with respect to changing demographics.

This Transportation Reinvention

Commission stated some very simple truths in their report. More than 2 million additional people are expected to live in the MTA region by 2040, a million in New York City and million outside of New York City in the region.

The MTA needs to adapt to fundamental demographic shifts that lead to new and evolving expectations, service needs, and

accessibility requirements for those who use our system who are somewhat disabled. The current system is simply not fully equipped to meet any of these changing needs.

Additionally, the Urban Land Institute and the Permanent Citizens Advisory Committee to the MTA are working on another report that examines the intrinsic connection between a healthy transit system and a healthy, vibrant economy. Early drafts of their efforts included the fact that since 1982, the MTA capital program has transformed the region's public transportation system into a crucial economic asset, helping New York achieve a global economic preeminence that few could have imagined during the economic crises of the 1970s.

Investments in the MTA have generated economic benefits for communities across all of New York State, with major vendors opening plants to both fulfill the transportation needs locally and across North America.

Indeed, capital program investments create hundreds of thousands of jobs throughout

1	New York State. According to the New York
2	Building Congress, the MTA alone accounts for
3	about 25 percent of New York City's
4	construction industry in some years.
5	But the program's impact reaches far
6	beyond downstate. It has a profound effect
7	on economic development in every corner of
8	the Empire State.
9	Capital program investments are
10	powerful job creators, but they can't create
11	jobs, can't power our economy, can't keep
12	New York globally competitive, and can't keep
13	our transit system safe and reliable if we
14	don't make them.
15	This past fall, the MTA submitted a
16	capital program to address our extensive
17	needs. That plan was vetoed without
18	prejudice by the Capital Plan Review Board.
19	One concern shared by all parties is funding.
20	We have identified half of the money needed
21	to fund this plan, and discussions on this

topic are critical. We need to bring all

federal, state, local partners as well as

parties to the table -- those are our

22

23

Τ	stakeholders who benefit from the system.
2	All have a stake in ensuring that New York's
3	economic engine continues at full strength.
4	The State of New York has one economy
5	and the MTA's 12-county regional
6	transportation system is one we must never
7	take for granted. We move nearly 9 million
8	people a day, enabling a \$1.4 trillion
9	economy, second in the world only to Tokyo.
10	Our network's expansiveness gives
11	people options, makes a huge pool of
12	employees available to New York businesses,
13	and allows our region to comfortably
14	accommodate millions more people. It makes
15	it possible for people to live wherever they
16	want within our region, regardless of where
17	they work. It allows employees to bring hom
18	paychecks that support local schools and
19	other services, creating jobs wherever they
20	live. It enables and supports job
21	development across our entire region, giving
22	employers a system that their own employees
23	can count on.
24	Every major world city London,

1	Paris, Hong Kong, and others is making
2	significant investments in transit to improve
3	the quality of life for their residents and
4	to maintain their status as a global
5	financial and business center. New York
6	needs to do the same, because the past is not
7	prologue. We must continue to invest.
8	Chairmen DeFrancisco and Farrell, we
9	appreciate the support you've given the MTA
10	in the past and your continuing support, and
11	we look forward to working with you regarding
12	funding for our capital program. It's that
13	important to us and that important to you as
14	representatives of the great State of
15	New York.
16	Thank you for taking the time to hear
17	from me today, and now I'm happy to answer
18	any questions that you may have.
19	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
20	much.
21	To begin with, Assemblyman Ortiz.
22	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Thank you,
23	Mr. Chairman.
24	Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. Thank

1	you for being here with us. And first of
2	all, I would like to really thank your team,
3	you know, for the work that you guys have
4	done on reconstructing 9th Avenue and Smith
5	Street, as well as the partial restoration of
6	B37.

I represent the areas of Red Hook,

Sunset Park and a piece of Bay Ridge and Park

Slope and Carroll Gardens. So as a result of

the partial restoration, you know, I'm going

to ask you that we hope that we can get a

full restoration for B37. And as well as,

you know, you mentioned something very

interesting in your speech about job

creation, business developments in areas.

So we do have an area that is booming very quick, and it's called Red Hook, in Brooklyn. This area really has only two buses that go through Red Hook. It's the B67, if I'm not mistaken, and also B61 and B57. And we need to make sure that while the Governor is talking about enhancement and more development and more extensions about the trains and more mobility, that we will

1	not forget the people of Red Hook, especially
2	that community is moving very fast. We do
3	need more transportation and transportation
4	that can be more reliable. We need people to
5	make sure that they can move from the back of
6	Red Hook through to West Smith Street and
7	9th.

If we can have at least some kind of transportation that is express for the people in that particular site where they can stop in one area and go directly and keep the other two buses running, that will be very helpful for the people of Red Hook. Because right now we have a lot of people that are -- I've been on 9th Street and Smith, and I've been standing right there and I can see how many people normally go and have to walk all the way to the back to work, and also I see how many people are coming out of Red Hook to work in the city.

So if some consideration to that can be taken, I would appreciate it.

The other thing I would like to add is Carroll Gardens, Union Avenue -- Union Street

1	in Carroll Gardens. We did cut the B75.
2	That B75 used to go from New York City Tech
3	all the way to Red Hook. That was a very
4	good road to take because the people in
ō	Carroll Gardens could go to Fairway. So now
ń	they don't have access to Fairway.

And we have a lot of seniors. I will tell you that I knocked on a lot of doors this summer, and I saw a lot of seniors that were requesting, more than middle-aged people, that this bus get restored. So if something to that extent can be taken into consideration also, I would appreciate it.

And the B77 that was Fifth Avenue all the way to Red Hook, that cross-section was so helpful for the people that have to go to Methodist Hospital. So, you know, this kind of accessibility is very critical, not just for the folks in Red Hook, Carroll Gardens, Park Slope, as well as hopefully the station to Atlantic Avenue for the B37 for the people of Bay Ridge.

So if any of these items can be taken into consideration, we would really

1	appreciate it as we continue to have the
2	budget negotiation and we continue to expand
3	and enhance from JFK/LaGuardia down to the
4	city, you know, this is we're talking
5	about economics, we're talking about impact,
6	we're talking about job creation, and we're
7	talking about mobility of children going to a
8	school. So this is a community that I hope
9	can be taken into consideration to be looked
10	at it very close that they can have the means
11	and the medium of transportation that they
12	need in order to commute.

Thank you.

MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: We will do
that. I can tell you that after we came out
of the dire situation we were in in 2009-2010
where we cut a lot of service and we started
to come back financially, we've looked at
every point at the half-point in the year
with respect to how are we looking from a
budget standpoint and where can we either add
back service that we cut or more importantly,
in some cases, add new service.

With the changing demographics in

1	New York City, it's essential we do that. If
2	we're going to see a million more people in
3	the city, we need to work closely with the
4	city in terms of where that commercial and
5	where the residential development occur so
6	that we can have a transportation system that
7	can service that community, and hopefully do
8	it in a coordinated way so that we don't have
9	to build a lot of new facilities.
10	But certainly Red Hook and a lot of
11	the areas along the water in Brooklyn and in
12	Queens are areas that are focus areas for us,
13	and we'll make sure we do that.
14	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: And I'm looking
15	forward to continue working with you. You
16	have a great team and they've been very
17	helpful to me and my office, so I hope that
18	we can continue to keep that together.
19	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Thank you.
20	ASSEMBLYMAN ORTIZ: Thank you.
21	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
23	Senator?
24	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Senator Dilan.

1	SENATOR DILAN: Hi, how are you.
2	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Good
3	afternoon.
4	SENATOR DILAN: I'm not going to ask
5	you to as to why you shut down the subways;
6	that's the subject of another hearing.
7	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Your microphone
8	isn't on.
9	(off-the-record discussion.)
10	SENATOR DILAN: I said I was not going
11	to ask you as to why you shut down the
12	subways; that's the subject of another
13	hearing. But I wanted to talk to you about
14	the capital your capital plan which was
15	rejected by the Capital Review Board and the
16	15-plus-billion-dollar gap there.
17	But I also want to know as to the
18	sweeps, the first \$20 million \$30 million
19	last year, and I believe another \$20 million
20	this year and what impact that would have
21	on your bonding authority in the future.
22	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: In terms of
23	the sweeps and the detail level, I can't
24	answer it. My chief financial officer, maybe

1	he can. But we have seen an increased level
2	of funding each year based upon what we
3	expected to get from the state. And by and
4	large, we have not had any issues with
5	respect to our ability to use the funding
6	that we have to be able to get done what we
7	need to get done.
8	The capital program is a separate
9	story. But in terms of the annual
10	appropriations and the money we get from the
11	state and from the Executive Budget, we've
12	been able to work within those.
13	SENATOR DILAN: Now, I believe in the
14	proposed budget there is money for Penn
15	access, I believe \$750 million. And that, I
16	believe, goes along with the East Side
17	Access. And East Side Access is not believed
18	to be completed till 2023. So why is there a
19	need to put the \$750 million in the five-year
20	capital plan this time around if it's not
21	within range?
22	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: The
23	principle for Penn access for Metro-North
24	would involve creating four stations in the

1	southeast Bronx that do not exist now. It's
2	an area of the city that there have been
3	promises made for decades with respect to an
4	extension off the 2nd Avenue subway that has
5	yet to be built. And the process of
6	environmental review, design and construction
7	are such that, you know, 2023 is eight years
8	away. That's about a general time frame to
9	be able to get there. So from a
10	standpoint
11	SENATOR DILAN: So my whole point is,
12	why do we need to put \$750 million into our
13	five-year plan now when we don't have to?
14	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Because if
15	it's eight years, it would if we rolled it
16	over into the next plan, we wouldn't be able
17	to have it ready at the time East Side Access
18	would enable the new
19	SENATOR DILAN: So we'll just have the
20	money sitting there?
21	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Pardon me?
22	SENATOR DILAN: We'll have the money
23	sitting there for five years for no reason?
24	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: No, we

Ţ	would be we would be doing going past
2	environmental review, doing design and doing
3	construction. So, you know, those monies
4	would be expended probably in the latter
5	parts of the five-year program. But to be
6	ready to have them done so that when East
7	Side Access gets done and those slots at
8	Penn Station get open, we can provide that
9	service.
10	SENATOR DILAN: Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Assemblyman
12	Brennan.
13	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Thank you,
14	Mr. Farrell.
15	Welcome, Mr. Prendergast.
16	The MTA is one of the most
17	extraordinary transit operations in the
18	world, I'm sure. And the economic vitality
19	of the downstate metropolitan area, which
20	appears to be increasing, you know, is
21	directly linked to the ability of the transit
22	system to move millions and millions of
23	people around. So that agency is pretty
24	important.

1	And let's get into the capital plan.
2	And I know that many issues associated with
3	the operating budget intertwine with
4	ultimately how much money is available to the
5	capital plan, and vice versa, you know.
6	So when you submitted the \$32 billion
7	proposal in October, you had identified
8	\$17 billion where you had identified funds of
9	that amount available to cover that part of
10	the \$32 billion, with a leaving a
11	\$15 billion shortfall; is that correct?
12	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: That's
13	about yeah, that's correct.
14	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: And so the plan
15	was vetoed. The Governor called it bloated.
16	But I would assume that when you made a
17	decision that \$32 billion was the amount or
18	the cost of the assets that the agency needed
19	to continue delivering adequate service and
20	complete the expansion projects, you were not
21	deliberately inflating those costs; correct?
22	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: No. We
23	were not.
24	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: All right. So

1	you	didn't	view	it	that	way.

So the Governor has provided a billion dollars in this budget to get you \$1 billion towards the \$15 billion shortfall that the MTA had identified in October. Have you identified additional efficiencies in acquiring these assets such that you think you could acquire these assets for \$31 billion or \$30 billion or anything to that effect? MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: In my

MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: In my

testimony I referred to an enterprise asset

management system. Large organizations that

we compare ourselves to, especially on the

rail side of the organization, Class 1

railroads, where they don't go to some other

party to get money for their capital program,

they generate their own money -- so from

their standpoint, they're incentivized to

make sure that they're getting as much useful

life out of the assets that they have.

If you have -- cars usually go 35, 40 years. If you retire that car and replace it, as much as people would like it and it

1	may have higher reliability, but it still has
2	three or four years of useful life, one could
3	say that you're wasting an asset and you're
4	having to spend money.
5	So the idea with enterprise asset
6	management is after 30 years of having a
7	capital program where we're trying to
8	determine how much useful life is left, we
9	start to apply the science of that technology
10	and that application to our system.
11	So in answer to your question, yes.
12	And we're much better than we were five
13	capital programs ago. But when you start
14	coming to the Legislature and you start
15	coming to the Executive and you start talking
16	about \$30 billion I was born and raised in
17	Illinois, and my senator was Dirksen. You
18	remember the phrase "a million here, a
19	million there, sooner or later you're talking
20	real money"?
21	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: real money,
22	yes.
23	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: So we have
24	an obligation to make sure that we're

1	squeezing as much useful life out of the
2	asset without crossing the line of affecting
3	safety and reliability.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: So you're taking
5	a look at the life cycle of the system, the
6	various the subway and rail and so on and
7	seeing if there's any potential savings
8	there.
9	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Yes. Yes.
10	That's correct.
11	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Okay. There's
12	been a lot of discussion about real estate
13	value capture as a potential source of
14	funding, meaning that so, for instance,
15	the Hudson Yards Infrastructure Corporation
16	issued bonds based on prospective real estate
17	development in the far west side of
18	Manhattan. Or there's this East Midtown
19	zoning proposal where there's possibly many
20	new large residential or commercial
21	buildings or even just general growth in
22	real estate value.
23	Do you have a proposal? Or is the MTA

working on a proposal, perhaps in

1	consultation with the City of New York and
2	the Governor's office, to enable us to review
3	something that could provide additional
4	funding for the MTA?
5	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: We
6	certainly have a proven a way of doing
7	that. That was 7 West, and that's how it was
8	funded for the extension of the No. 7 Line.
9	The Transportation and Reinvention
10	Commission, which were 24 international
11	experts, both from the United States and
12	around the world, looked to see what other
13	funding sources were available for these
14	types of transportation systems and, under
15	the heading of value capture, where an
16	investment is being made in a transit system
17	that will increase the value of real estate
18	around that asset, sharing some of that
19	uptick.
20	So, you know, certainly the
21	Transportation Reinvention Commission
22	identified it as one of the areas to look at,
23	because it's not just one that we think could
24	bear fruit here, it's been proven other

1	places. And there was a focus from a
2	standpoint of that's one of the areas that we
3	would have a dialogue started if we needed to
4	look for new funding sources.
5	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: All right. Now,
6	one thing that I would like to ask the agency
7	to do to help us help you in these next
8	couple of months is so I know that in this
9	\$17 billion you are proposing to borrow some
10	additional money backed by the fare, backed
11	by your revenues. And that may lead you to
12	reach your existing bonding cap. Is that
13	correct?
14	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Yes.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Okay. And so I
16	know that the Legislature would have to
17	increase the bonding cap if you were to
18	borrow more, at least down the road. But
19	could you provide an analysis to us of what
20	it would mean for the fare and for the system
21	if you were to borrow certain sums of money
22	beyond what you're currently proposing?
23	Because and the reason I'm asking

for it is because when it becomes clear that

1	you're borrowing even more money, the impact
2	on the fare becomes ever greater, so that
3	instead of 4 percent every two years increase
4	in the fare, which is the current model
5	which is certainly better than 7.5 percent
6	every two years if we see well, if you
7	have to borrow more money than you're
8	currently planning to do, we're going to have
9	to go back to 7.5 percent or 10 percent every
10	two years or some other problem like that
11	that's going to make mass transit very
12	difficult to afford for the ordinary person,
13	you know, it gives us more information about
14	the necessity of finding additional sources
15	of funds for you.
16	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: We can do
17	that.
18	I do think one of the things that
19	needs to be part of the dialogue is the size
20	of the ask. The MTA board has approved a
21	plan at that size. I think if we're coming
22	to you and you have questions as to do you
23	really need that much money, we have to start

the dialogue do we really need that much

We believe we do; that's why the board approved it. But that provides the framed discussion in terms of what that gap is and how you need to find ways to fill that gap. So we can do that. We can give you that information. But I think in a vacuum without that other dialogue going on in terms of what's the size of the ask -- because you've got competing priorities, I assume, across your entire spectrum. There's got to be some dialogue at that level, you know.

Because we firmly believe that in terms of renew, enhance and expand, that's the size of the ask, but we need to get concurrence before we get into detailed discussion on what that gap is.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: All right. So going back to the operating budget for just a sec, your operating aid increases by a minimal amount in the budget. It was \$9 million enacted budget to enacted budget, and you said \$37 million, which is related to your forecasts and so on. And then the other

1	100-and-some million dollars is now to go to
2	capital, meaning a very tiny operating aid
3	increase.
4	How does the MTA view those sources?
5	Does this put a crimp in your continued
6	capacities to fund your operations and the
7	capital plan? Or do you think this is
8	manageable?
9	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: It's
10	manageable. The primary pressure right now
11	is the capital program.
12	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Okay. Let me
13	ask you this. Do you think that when you
14	look at all of the options out there in
15	relation to currently available state funding
16	and your revenues, that a new revenue
17	source whether we call it a tax or not
18	is essential to enable the MTA to move
19	forward?
20	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: In my
21	testimony I refer to three areas that we have
22	to go to talk to, three plus one. It's our
23	federal partners, it's our state partners,
24	it's our city partners. For a whole host of

1	reasons, on a prorated basis we're never
2	going to get the exact amount of money that
3	we think we should get from the federal
4	government. That's part of another process.
5	And the dialogue and the pressure needs to be
6	on all of those fronts as well as other
7	stakeholders real estate development
8	because they all share in a healthy MTA
9	network and they all need to be able to take
10	part in dealing with the funding.
11	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Okay, thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Senator
13	Krueger.
14	SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you very much.
15	Good afternoon, Commissioner. You're
16	not leaving; right?
17	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: I'm not
18	what?
19	SENATOR KRUEGER: You're not leaving
20	your job?
21	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Unless you
22	know something I don't know.
23	(Laughter.)
24	SENATOR KRUEGER: No, no, you promised

⊥	you weren t reaving when we confirmed you
2	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: No, no, no,
3	I enjoy it.
4	SENATOR KRUEGER: but there's a
5	rapid turnover, and I just wanted to make
6	sure.
7	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: I enjoy it.
8	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Make him an
9	offer.
10	(Laughter.)
11	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: I enjoy my
12	job.
13	SENATOR KRUEGER: You told us you were
14	going to stay, so I'm glad to see that you
15	are. Because we went through the top of MTA
16	too quickly too frequently.
17	Second Avenue subway, scheduled to
18	complete on time, December 2016. True?
19	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Yes.
20	SENATOR KRUEGER: Phase 2, 2nd Avenue
21	subway, in your five-year capital plan?
22	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: It's in the
23	proposed five-year plan.
24	SENATOR KRUEGER: Going north or

1	south?
2	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: North.
3	SENATOR KRUEGER: What's the estimate
4	of that cost?
5	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: I should
6	know off the top of my head. One-point-five
7	billion? One-point-five billion.
8	SENATOR KRUEGER: One-point-five
9	billion?
10	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Yes.
11	SENATOR KRUEGER: How many years,
12	estimated?
13	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: I don't
14	know.
15	Do you know? (Conferring with staff.)
16	Five years for the first phase of
17	Phase 2.
18	SENATOR KRUEGER: Okay, thank you.
19	Lexington Avenue timing upgrade so you
20	can move more trains on the tracks, where is
21	that?
22	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: I believe
23	that's underway right now. Those are
24	signaling improvements. And then there's

1	also proposals with the Midtown East rezoning
2	to make improvements at Grand Central that
3	would benefit dwell time at the station, so
4	that would improve too. Because right now
5	the maximum load point is 42nd Street
6	although in our lifetime it may become
7	14th Street, because the city is changing and
8	you know that.
9	But those are high-level initiatives.
10	That's the most heavily traveled line in the
11	country. We actually schedule more trains
12	than you would normally schedule because of
13	the volume of customers. So additional dwell
14	time at stations in 10- and 15-second
15	increments make all the difference in the
16	world.
17	So that's one of the highest priority
18	areas for us to be able to do things to
19	improve the flow of trains. Five hundred
20	thousand people a day use that line.
21	SENATOR KRUEGER: You and I know that
22	that's all my district, so I'm very aware of
23	these issues.

MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Yes.

1	SENATOR KRUEGER: Bus camera lanes.
2	I've been having many I think very helpful
3	meetings with New York City Transit on bus
4	issues. Still desperate for faster bus
5	service, more buses on our lines.
6	But the bus camera pilot was a hope
7	that with the ability to give out tickets to
8	those who were parking and double-parking in
9	your bus stops and the bus lanes. Has there
10	been any kind of evaluation? And do you want
11	to expand that?
12	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: There was a
13	focus on it a few years ago. I honestly
14	don't know the latest status on that.
15	SENATOR KRUEGER: Okay. If you could
16	get back to me with that.
17	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Yes.
18	SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.
19	It's not in the Governor's budget, but
20	it's announced that the MTA and the Port
21	Authority will do a train-to-the-plane model,
22	I guess, monorail from Willets Point to
23	LaGuardia, with an estimated \$450 million
24	cost. Are you expected to pick up some or

1	all of that cost? And if, so how much?
2	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: At a speech
3	that the Governor gave to the Association of
4	Better New York last Tuesday, he talked about
5	infrastructure improvements that needed to be
6	made and the intrinsic relationship between
7	transportation infrastructure improvements
8	and the need to support New York City and the
9	economy.
10	And there were a number of things that
11	lined up with things in our capital
12	program communications-based train
13	control, replacing of the bus fleet. But the
14	one you're talking about is a rail connection
15	from one part or two parts of our network to
16	LaGuardia.
17	We do have a rail connection now from
18	both Jamaica and Howard Beach to JFK, so the
19	idea is to replicate functionally that
20	connection.
21	This is something that's been studied
22	probably 30 years. There have been a number

of different proposals. It's exceptionally

environmentally sensitive. Some of the

23

Ţ	proposals the one that we're looking at
2	right now is from the area of where the
3	World's Fair is at Mets-Willets Point in
4	between the Long Island Railroad station
5	there and the No. 7 Line, and then go
6	slightly west and up the median of the
7	Grand Central Parkway and then access
8	LaGuardia Airport. Not with a monorail,
9	though. It would be more likely the
10	technology that was used at AirTrain in
11	Jamaica.
12	SENATOR KRUEGER: And that would
13	connect with the it would be the 7 Line
14	connecting into
15	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Two
16	different the No. 7 Line would connect
17	there as well as the Port Washington Line on
18	the Long Island Railroad.
19	SENATOR KRUEGER: So for the 7 Line,
20	it's one of our older and narrower subway
21	lines. It's not particularly conducive to
22	dragging your luggage on and off, at least in
23	the Manhattan section.
24	Do you have an estimate of how many

1	people are actually going to use this new
2	line if it's built?
3	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: There are a

number of different reasons why you build a connector to the airport. You build a connector to the airport for the employees that work there, you build a connector to the airport for the business travelers, you build a connector to the airport for other passengers.

For the ones that are the most successful, they try to attack the -- not attack, they try to deal with the issue of the employees at the airport as well as business travelers. But certainly we would have to do studies with respect to, you know, what market we're trying to get and what market we think we could attract.

I will tell you that the AirTrain expectations for Jamaica have been exceeded.

But that's a different model, different issue. But that would be one of the issues that we would have to cover off to make sure that we're building and designing to a budget

1	that makes sense.
2	SENATOR KRUEGER: How many miles would
3	this line be, plus or minus?
4	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: It's a
5	little over a mile and a half. It's not that
6	great a distance. It's relatively short. If
7	you didn't have any highway impediments, I
8	think, Senator, you could almost walk it
9	right from that distance. But, but, you've
10	got highway impediments and you've got all
11	kinds of things.
12	SENATOR KRUEGER: Right. Right.
13	Right. I've actually never seen an MTA
14	proposal for a new rail line that would only
15	cost a half a billion dollars. I know to all
16	of us here a half a billion dollars is a lot
17	of money. But in subway building, train
18	building, that's actually not.
19	Do you actually think that's a
20	reasonable cost estimate?
21	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: That's
22	probably the low end of the range. I mean,
23	the range of costs is probably from half a

billion to a billion.

1	I worked at a system, SkyTrain in
2	Vancouver, where the unit costs are lower for
3	a variety of different reasons. But
4	certainly one of the things I think we need
5	to do is make sure we do the analysis you're
6	talking about in terms of what market we're
7	expecting to attract.
8	And then two things. It's a project
9	that is ideally suited for design-build, and
10	there's some economies of scale there. It's
11	also a project where you do what you call
12	design to budget and you try to put a
13	constraint on not to affect safety and
14	reliability, but put a constraint on so you
15	don't over-design and you get what you want
16	functionally without paying more for it.
17	SENATOR KRUEGER: You've moved out of
18	the building on Madison Avenue.
19	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Yes.
20	SENATOR KRUEGER: Is that for sale?
21	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Yes. It's
22	part of an RFP. 341, 345, 347 Madison
23	it's the half-block between Vanderbilt and
24	44th and 45th facing Madison. And we're

1	looking at proposals to see what we can get
2	in terms of maximum real estate value.
3	Whatever we get out of that, we'll put into
4	the capital program.
5	SENATOR KRUEGER: My time is up.
6	Maybe I'll come back to you. Thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
8	Assemblyman Cusick.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Thank you,
10	Mr. Farrell.
11	Chairman, good to see you.
12	I have a couple of questions. The
13	last toll increases, toll and fare increases,
14	you had mentioned in your testimony it was
15	4 percent rather than 7 percent, is that
16	did I hear that correctly?
17	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Prior to
18	this fare and toll increase, they were in the
19	range of 7.5 percent. Sometime last year,
20	due to a variety of different factors
21	concerned legislators like yourself, the
22	Governor's commitment to no more than a
23	2 percent increase in the state budget, and

other factors -- we made a decision that we

1	were going to limit fare and toll increases
2	to the range of 2 percent, you know, a year.
3	And that was a major departure from the 7.5.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Is there a plan
5	to have any increases in the near future?
6	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: I'm not
7	exactly sure when this happened, but it was
8	part of the whole issue of the transparency
9	of the MTA budget. We committed to have a
10	four-year financial plan. That financial
11	plan is first looked at in November of a
12	given year, then it is approved in December
13	by the board, and then in July of the
14	following year we take a look at it. So we
15	look out projected every four years.
16	And the last we always have, you
17	know, every two years on the table a fare and
18	toll increase depending upon what the
19	finances require.
20	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: So there would be
21	a possible increase in 2017, then?
22	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Yes.
23	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: But we don't know
24	any specifics on that, on how much or

1	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: I think
2	we're still committed to living within the
3	4 percent. But if we're doing better, it
4	could be less than that.
5	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: And with fare and
6	toll increases I think I've brought this
7	up before are there any economic impact
8	studies done when the decision is made to
9	make a toll or fare increase?
10	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: We're
11	required by statute to do a number of
12	different things. We have to do what they
13	call a disparate analysis in terms of impacts
14	on different levels of the economic strata.
15	We have to do some environmental reviews in
16	terms of what impact toll increases have.
17	They're different for tolls than they are for
18	fare increases, but they're all driving
19	toward the same thing in terms of what are
20	the impacts on the economy and on people.
21	And those are analyses that are required for
22	every fare and toll increase.
23	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Are those
24	analyses made public? Like I've never seen

1	any.
2	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: We can make
3	them public. There's nothing we don't have
4	that's so if you want them, we can give
5	you those.
6	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: That would be
7	great. I'd like to see the latest.
8	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Sure.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Also, the
10	question I get a lot on Staten Island is
11	"Where does my toll money go?" Is there
12	something you can tell me today, or maybe
13	your staff, as to when someone pays the toll,
L 4	where that money then goes? You know,
15	there's so many versions of where it goes
16	that money goes to pay for other MTA projects
L7	or but I'd like to be able to tell my
18	constituents, you know, specifically where
19	their money goes on this.
20	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: We can do
21	that. In a general sense, we have a number
22	of different revenue streams: Petroleum

business tax, payroll mobility tax, fare

revenue, toll revenue. They all come in and

23

1	then they're distributed out by the MTA.
2	So what you might see is a dollar
3	coming in from one source from one locale
4	here and then going out disbursed. So in the
5	case of bridge tolls, their excess, what used
6	to be called TBTA revenues and there is a
7	formula that's established in terms of how
8	that money gets distributed. It's a formula
9	that's been around for decades. The first
10	\$24 million I believe goes to New York City
11	Transit, and then the rest gets disbursed
12	50 percent between the commuter rails and
13	New York City Transit. But we can show you
L 4	all that.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Okay. I'd like
16	to follow up on that.
17	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Sure.
18	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: To change topics
19	for a second also, the North Shore BRT, could
20	you give me an update on what's happening
21	there or what's not happening there?
22	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: The North

Shore BRT, we've gone through the processes

of the initial environmental reviews. The

23

1	preferred alternative that was selected was a
2	busway. And preferred alternative doesn't
3	mean preferred alternative by a vote, it's
4	the formal process that the FTA requires us
5	to go through.

And it did not make the list in terms of what was in the capital program. But a number of people, including one of our board members, have expressed concerns about that. And in former discussions on the capital program, there's a discussion whether it should be in or not be in.

The order of magnitude cost I think is a little less than half a billion dollars.

Staten Island has some unique challenges that we must address. It is the fastest-growing part of New York City. When I lived there, I think it was a little over 300,000 or 350,000. It's approaching 500,000.

So whether it's the busway or whether it's just even taking a look at how the bus is laid out for a local express bus network, we need to really take a good look at that.

Because it's going to be critical to Staten

1	Island's	further	development.
---	----------	---------	--------------

2 ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Right. And I
3 know my colleagues are pushing already for
4 the need for the BRT, and I wanted to be on
5 record on that.

I also brought up with the State DOT commissioner earlier the West Shore Rail, which I know is not fully MTA. But I think in the long run we'll need a partnership:

MTA, DOT, possibly Port Authority. And we realize that rail may not happen immediately, but in the meantime what we'd like to do is to study that corridor on the West Shore

Expressway, that West Shore area. If it says that we cannot at this time go forward with light rail, some sort of BRT may also be fitting in that spot.

So we're requesting this budget process to have a study done. And we estimate the study would be about \$5 million.

And I would ask that the MTA work in partnership with the legislators and State DOT in seeing if we can get something done in this budget.

1	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: I think
2	that's been communicated to us already. I've
3	had some very limited discussions with Pat
4	Foye, the executive director of the Port
5	Authority, because they would be if the
6	alignment would go over the Bayonne Bridge
7	into New Jersey, they may be the more likely
8	lead agency than us. But we'll work with
9	them in either case.
10	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Right. And I
11	think we already have buses that go over the
12	Bayonne.
13	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Yes. We
14	have buses that go into New Jersey for sure.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Right. Right.
16	Well, thank you.
17	Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Senator Savino.
19	SENATOR SAVINO: Thank you,
20	Mr. Chairman.
21	Good to see you, Tom.
22	The beauty of going after Assemblyman
23	Cusick means I don't have to reiterate all of
24	the questions that he already asked you,

1	because you've answered them. As you know,
2	he and I are of like mind on issues of tolls
3	and the Verrazano Bridge and BRT on the North
4	Shore. I also understand that my other
5	colleague, Assemblyman Ortiz, already
6	addressed the issue of the B37 bus, and let
7	me just echo my support for his position on
8	that.

I want to ask you about something that happened just this week and kind of get your opinion. You know, I've lived in this city my entire life, a little more than a half a century now -- just slightly over a half a century. In my entire life I have never seen the New York City subway system shut down for weather, except for Hurricane Sandy.

And so the question that I have for you is not just what went into the decision to shut down the Iron Horse, but what can our constituents expect in the future? As you pointed out in your testimony, there are parts of the city that are growing now in areas that we never anticipated. And some of those areas are already not served

1	particularly well by the MTA because of
2	historical investments. You know, so the
3	communities I represent, not just Staten
4	Island but South Brooklyn, areas like Coney
5	Island, it already takes 90 minutes to get
6	home from Midtown Manhattan on the train.
7	You shut down the subway to Coney
8	Island, how do these people get home? You
9	shut down the subway to, you know, Southeast
10	Queens, how do people get home? And in the
11	111 years that the system was running, we
12	never had to shut it down for snow before.
13	And I can remember massive blizzards in the
14	City of New York. I remember the Blizzard of
15	'78. I remember '96. I mean, I can tick
16	them all off I'm that old now, I can
17	remember them. And never did we shut down
18	the system.
19	Shutting down service to certain areas
20	makes sense. I get that. You know, you
21	don't want to send trains out to the
22	Rockaways in the middle of a blizzard. But
23	the entire system? Was it necessary? And

24 what can our constituents expect from the

1	next storm? Should they assume that they're
2	going to stay at work or not go to work?
3	What can we say to them?
4	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: We have

MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: We have shut it down twice formally, Irene and Sandy. Those are the two. And Irene, it just -- it actually hit further upstate New York.

The decision to close the New York
City subway system is not one that we take
lightly. We have been faced with a number of
serious weather events in an ever-increasing
amount. We have had cases where we have
stranded trains. We had a stranded train on
December 26, 2010, where 300 or 400 people
were on a train for 12 hours. They boarded a
train at Howard Beach, it went a couple of
thousand feet, it stopped.

The outside portions of our system are extremely exposed to bad-weather events. We had a stranded train up at Southeast on the Metro-North network and one at Wyandanch on the Long Island Railroad network, and we had people either with medical conditions or women who were nursing, and we were really

1	anxious about the position we put them in.
2	Once we put somebody on a train, we are
3	responsible for them and we are accountable
4	for making sure that they're safe and secure.
5	With respect to going back into
6	long-time history, it's hard to know whether
7	or not whether the the system was never
8	formally shut down. With the exception of a
9	couple of blackouts, and we were totally
10	stopped.
11	SENATOR SAVINO: I remember that too.
12	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: But we need
13	to move forward from a standpoint of where we
14	stand today.
15	The events of December 26, 2011, were
16	very informative of us. I remember that
17	night clearly, I was president of the Transit
18	Authority, Carmen Bianco was the senior vice
19	president, and inside a period of about
20	45 minutes to an hour, the system was running
21	well and it all went south fast.
22	Thirty-seven trains stranded, 400 buses stuck
23	on New York City streets.
24	And we went through a paradigm shift,

1	because not only did we expose people to
2	dangerous conditions, when the snow stopped,
3	you couldn't clear tracks, you couldn't plow
4	streets until you got those vehicles removed.

This particular storm was one in which we were faced with some very daunting challenges based upon the weather predictions. First they said 18 to 24 inches of snow for New York City, and they upgraded it to 24 to 36. And they said rate of snowfall after 11 or 12 p.m. would be two to four inches per hour, and wind gusts of over 50 miles an hour. That identifies a blizzard in snow terminology. That's where the potential for trains becoming stranded and trapped occur very fast.

We knew we were going to go into what we call a Plan 4, where we lay up equipment underground. And what that does is it fills up all the express tracks. It starts to limit our ability to move trains throughout the system. And then, if something were to happen outdoors, we need to move equipment from one borough to another, we need tracks

1	to	be	cleared	to	do	that.

And we were looking at something that was going to come into the system around 11 o'clock. A lot of people were telling people: If you need to come into work Monday, come in early, go home early. said we'll accommodate you for sure until 8 o'clock, and then we made a decision that you better get off the system by 11 o'clock. It was not a decision we took lightly. Long Island is still digging out today, because the storm tracked further east but they got the full 36 inches. And they're 

just now finishing up digging out.

So we were presented with something that put us in the position where we did not want to take risks, especially at that hour, and a lot of people were left.

Now, there's always someone that will be stranded. Because if you get off work at 11:30 or 12:00 on a Monday night and the system is shut down, that person can't get home. But to take them partway home and then strand them, that may even be worse than if

1	they stay where they're at where we know for
2	sure we can take them through to their final
3	destination.

We're going to review this. We're going to take a look at it from the standpoint of is there anything we could have done better. But that was the decision-making process.

SENATOR SAVINO: Well, let me just say
I don't dispute the information that you were
all operating under. You know, we watched
the news up here too. We were, you know,
given apocalyptic declarations from the
National Weather Service that, you know, we
should all get good with God, that we were on
our way out. So I don't doubt the
information you were given.

The only question I have is, this has happened before in the past and it never, you know, precipitated an entire system closure.

And so I think what I'm really asking is, is this something that we should expect regularly going forward, that when you have, you know, reports of dangerous weather

1	patterns, that this is going to be a new
2	paradigm for the MTA that you will shut the
3	system down?
4	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: That's a
5	very good question, because we're asking
6	ourselves that question. You take a look
7	across the United States in terms of
8	highways I mean, for those of you that
9	remember some of the bad snowstorms in '78, I
10	lived in the Midwest; people died on
11	interstates because they didn't close
12	interstates.
13	And so if people are inconvenienced,
14	and we really take that into consideration
15	when we do that, that's far better, though,
16	than talking about somebody dying in a
17	vehicle or being stranded somewhere and
18	having a problem.
19	But it's a I can tell you that
20	we're going to evaluate, because we take the
21	issue of shutting the system down very
22	seriously. And at a minimum, we need to try
23	to improve the weather forecasting

techniques, see what we can do to keep

element	s (	of the	e s <u>r</u>	ystem op	erating,	, aı	nd give
people	as	much	as	advance	notice	as	possible

SENATOR SAVINO: I think that would be the most important thing. Because you're talking about resocializing the way people think about transportation in New York City. There's one thing that we always believed that we could count on, is that the subway will run no matter what, unlike other systems that have a normal shutdown time.

So if this is going to become the new normal in the MTA, I think it's going to be very difficult to translate that to the ridership who believe that the trains run no matter what. And they'll wind up being stranded somewhere.

MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: And you're absolutely right. And even the decision to close the streets -- and there was a number of states, New Jersey Transit shut down earlier than we did. Boston did; they had to. The State of Connecticut had total closures. And so -- and I honestly think those were the right decisions. But we

1	shouldn't take them lightly, we should
2	message them much better, and we have to
3	constantly evaluate is there a way we can do
4	it better.
5	SENATOR SAVINO: Thank you. I'm out
6	of time, but
7	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
8	Mr. McDonough.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Thank you.
10	And welcome, Chairman, good to see you
11	again.
12	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Good to see
13	you.
14	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: I was going to
15	ask that question about shutting down. I
16	think that I would add to what you said, that
17	I think if it was an error, it was erred on
18	the side of caution. The weather forecast
19	was very, very bad. And, you know, I know in
20	Nassau County we didn't get what they had
21	predicted. Suffolk, as you said, is still
22	digging out. But when you mention the fact
23	of people being stranded on a train for hours

and hours and hours, it's a tough call.

Δ,	Anyway, I had just two other things,
2	if I could ask you. East Side Access, what's
3	the status of that?
4	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: East Side
5	Access is scheduled to be completed in 2023.
6	The construction contracts, we're in the
7	last we're already awarding the last
8	construction contracts. The major tunneling
9	work is done, and digging. It was really a
10	mining project. We moved a lot of
11	underground
12	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: I've been down
13	there. I went down there a couple of years
14	ago.
15	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: We're now
16	in the process of doing the shells,
17	completing the shells, building out the
18	stations and the terminal underneath
19	Grand Central.
20	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: It's a city
21	down there.
22	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Yes, it's
23	phenomenal.
24	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Okay, so

1	that's you said 2020?
2	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: 2023.
3	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: 2023, okay,
4	And the other thing about the
5	Metro-North and Long Island Railroad in
6	Penn Station, about the amount of space that
7	Long Island Railroad may lose when you start
8	bringing in more Metro-North.
9	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Well, right
10	now Long Island Railroad doesn't have a
11	terminal. They have got terminals at
12	Atlantic Avenue, Long Island City for some
13	diesel trains, but mostly Penn Station. And
14	they have 37 slots into Penn Station.
15	When East Side Access gets built at
16	Grand Central, I think they originally start
17	with about 18 or 20 trains, but they'll ramp
18	up to 24 trains per hour.
19	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Long Island
20	Railroad?
21	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Long Island
22	Railroad, to their terminal at Grand Central.
23	They won't need all 37 slots. So the
24	initial proposal for Penn Station access for

1	Metro-North is eight slots. But it can't
2	possibly happen until East Side Access is
3	operational.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Which will
5	come first, Metro-North or East Side Access?
6	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: No, no,
7	East Side Access has to be completed first
8	before Metro-North goes into Penn Station.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Oh, okay.
10	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: We can't
11	right now we've got 10 pounds of grain in a
12	five-pound bag. We can't be adding more
13	trains to that. So because we're sharing
14	those 21 tracks at Penn Station with
15	New Jersey Transit and Amtrak.
16	So the first thing that has to be done
17	is Long Island Railroad starting to operate
18	into Grand Central before we can even bring
19	Metro-North trains into Penn Station.
20	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Is there going
21	to be more revitalization of the Penn Station
22	location?
23	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: There are
24	proposals that are out there by a number of

1	the real estate developers that have interest
2	in that area. And yes, there are. And
3	especially in concert with Hudson Yards
4	Development.
5	ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Okay. Thank
6	you very much.
7	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
8	Senator?
9	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Senator Krueger
10	for another round.
11	SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you.
12	So we've been discussing what happens
13	with new lines coming between Long Island to
14	New York City, then up through the west to
15	Metro-North in the future. So I keep also
16	and I know it's not MTA directly, but's all
17	interrelated.
18	So there's these two new tunnels that
19	are going to be dug between New Jersey and
20	New York under the Hudson. How does that
21	impact your system, if they ever get done?
22	And with the governor of New Jersey, I don't
23	know what that means.

MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: The largest

1	transportation complex in our country is Penn
2	Station. Between Amtrak, New Jersey Transit
3	and Long Island Railroad, the number of
4	customers is by far and train moves are by
5	far the most.

The original plans when the

Pennsylvania Railroad built Penn Station -
Conquering Gotham, if you've read the book -
were four tunnels under what they called the

North River or Hudson River, four tunnels

under the East River. For a whole host of

reasons, they never built the other two

tunnels. That's the choke point for the

system.

If they can build -- not only do they need it for additional capacity reasons, but they're going to have to take some of those tunnels out of service to do rehabilitation and repair. So under a project that has been referred to as Gateway, there are a whole host of infrastructure improvements along the Northeast Corridor, but primarily the central piece are two new tunnels under the Hudson River, and provide additional capacity at

1	Penn Station or in that area in terms of
2	track capacity.
3	SENATOR KRUEGER: How are those
4	different than the ARC tunnel that he
5	rejected?
6	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: They're
7	different in the sense that they have
8	different alignments and different issues,
9	but functionally are the same.
10	SENATOR KRUEGER: And so the MTA will
11	have no responsibility for any of the costs
12	of the tunnel, but then those trains will
13	come into Penn Station where everybody will
14	interconnect with your system. Is that fair?
15	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: If you take
16	the Gateway Project that I talked about in
17	its entirety, there's some things we will
18	have no interest in and no responsibility
19	for, there's others that we will have some
20	interest in and some responsibility for.
21	Especially when it comes to if we're going to
22	now have two tenants there, Long Island
23	Railroad and Metro-North. So we may have
24	some investments, but not for anything that

1	we're	not	getting	utility	from.

However, the west-of-Hudson service for Metro-North that comes down, and it will want to access and they're going to have to build a loop in Secaucus to access the Northeast Corridor -- if we want to provide a one-seat ride for the west-of-Hudson customers, and there's a lot of pressure to do that, we would have to pay part of that cost.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Then recently there was an announcement that was made and then pulled back that PATH trains between New York and New Jersey were going to stop certain times of the night. And I think they changed their mind and are not stopping them.

But what kind of impact would that have had? Because every time I've ever taken the PATH train to New Jersey, I've just gotten on a subway on the New York City side.

MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Well, on
the New York City side it would have meant
that people would have come to our element of
the system. But crossing the Hudson, it

1	would have impacted NJ Transit or Amtrak.
2	But from what I understand, they
3	withdrew their proposal.
4	SENATOR KRUEGER: And you don't think
5	that's coming back?
6	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: I'm not
7	sure where it's at.
8	SENATOR KRUEGER: Okay. Several years
9	ago, because of Sandy it's not that long
10	ago, it feels longer you got a large lump
11	sum of money from the federal government to
12	both fix things that went wrong and
13	strengthen your system going forward.
14	Where are you in the status of the
15	various assignments with the
16	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Well, money
17	was identified, over \$10 billion, to deal
18	with resiliency issues and recovery issues.
19	SENATOR KRUEGER: You meant billion,
20	right?
21	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Pardon me?
22	SENATOR KRUEGER: You said "million,"
23	but you meant "billion."
24	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Billion.

- 1 Billion, I'm sorry. Ten to \$13 billion.
- 2 But we've got \$1.7 billion committed
- and \$453 million spent, but we've got another
- 4 \$2.7 billion to be committed by the end of
- 5 this year.
- 6 Any of these processes that you have
- 7 to go through -- I'm not complaining about
- 8 it -- where you have to go through a process
- 9 that's going to be audited, because there was
- 10 a heavy level of audit oversight for this --
- 11 have been in place. But work is well
- 12 underway.
- The replacement of the Montague Street
- Tube, for example, outer-face replacement of
- the tunnel bench walls, was done with that
- 16 money. The Cranberry Street Tube and the
- 17 Rutgers Street Tube are underway right now.
- 18 Then it will be Clark and Joralemon, and the
- 19 last one will be Canarsie.
- 20 And we can't do all the work at one
- 21 time anyway because we can't take that many
- 22 tubes out of service. And we took Montague
- 23 out for 14 months; Cranberry and Rutgers will
- 24 be weekend closures to minimize impact on

1	customers.

2	SENATOR KRUEGER: And those continuing
3	projects, do they intersect with the
4	five-year plan that you submitted to us?
5	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Yes. I
6	mean, what we want to make sure is that we're
7	getting maximum value for not only the
8	expenditures we're making but the outages we
9	need to take to do the work. So we don't
10	want to do work one year for resiliency and
11	come back two years for a state of good
12	repair and impact. So we're trying to align
13	that work to get as much of it done as
14	possible.
15	And in some cases we're even adding to
16	our own scope of work to deal with
17	resiliency. Within our own capital program,
18	if we're going to do a state of good repair,
19	and we know for a fact the example I use
20	is we call them submarine cables, but they're
21	not like a submarine boat cable, it's a
22	submarine cable that goes underwater. All of
23	our under-river tubes now will be spec'd with

24 a submarine cable standard. Because we have

1	every reason to believe at some point in time
2	in the life of that tunnel it's going to be
3	flooded. So we make those kind of
4	expenditures.
5	But there's a high level of
6	coordination between our own capital program
7	work and the resiliency and the recovery work
8	that we're doing.
9	SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you very much,
10	Commissioner.
11	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
12	Mr. Otis.
13	ASSEMBLYMAN OTIS: Thank you,
14	Mr. Chairman.
15	And thank you, Mr. Chairman. Glad to
16	see you here.
17	I want to comment in relation to
18	Metro-North and especially the New Haven
19	Line, but all the lines. And this has now
20	been going on with the Metro-North line for a
21	couple of years, where the level of service
22	is so unsatisfactory that especially
23	rush-hour commuters, the morale is terrible
24	because the consistency of service is such

1	that so many trains do not have enough seats,
2	so many trains are basically late every
3	single day during the rush hour.

So on the seat issue, I'm just interested in -- and you probably do not have this with you. But if we could get a comparison of the number of seats on the three different Metro-North lines, the number of cars and seats that we have related to the number of monthly ticket subscribers or what your estimates are. Because it's not true on the Harlem and Hudson Lines, from what I'm hearing from people, in terms of the lack of capacity issues, where it is a constant on the New Haven Line.

There also have been news reports that on the New Haven Line there are cars that are available that aren't being used. That may or may not be true, but it's been in the press.

So if you could comment first, and then I had some other Metro-North issues.

But if you could comment first just on the capacity issue and the number of seats on

1	that New Haven Line. Because and I
2	represent a lot of the New Haven Line
3	stations, so I hear about this often. And as
4	I say, this has been going on for a couple of
5	years. Couldn't we have fixed some of this
6	by now, is sort of the question that's out
7	there.

MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Metro-North went from the railroad that was best in class in the country to a different place. And the stark occurrences of a number of incidents in terms of derailments and loss of life actually focused us to make sure that we get safety and reliability right before we have an over-focus on on-time performance.

The line that was probably the most heavily affected, and still is affected, is the New Haven Line. As the performance of the system degraded and the on-time performance was dropping, a number of things happened. We're not going to force an on-time performance number until we're sure of the safety and reliability issues. And you've heard that dialogue.

1	But what will happen in terms of the
2	selection of trains, as the running times
3	take longer because there are slow-speed
4	orders and we're doing work people will
5	start to select to take earlier trains
6	because they want to get to their destination
7	at the same time. But if they can't get that
8	on the train that they're normally riding,
9	they'll move up an interval. So you have to
10	constantly watch if there's changing
11	ridership patterns.
12	What I'd like to do is, you know, I'll
13	offer the services of have you come in or

What I'd like to do is, you know, I'll offer the services of have you come in or we'll come to your office and we'll lay out what's going on in terms of ridership, what's going on in terms of performance. And it cannot only talk about ridership and on-time performance, but also talk about reliability of the new fleet that we've got in there.

There's -- certainly the focus that

Joe Giulietti, the president of the railroad,
has is to get it back to where it was.

There's no doubt about that. But not at the
expense of safety and reliability. And we're

1	taking	it a	step	at a	ti	Lme.	And	we	need	to
2	get it	back	to wh	nere	it	was.				

ASSEMBLYMAN OTIS: Well, in terms of -- and I understand the dynamic in terms of safety and on-time. And one of the things that was done, the schedule's been adjusted slightly in some circumstances to allow, in a sense, more time for trains. But even with the adjusted schedule, we have a lot of trains that aren't making their marks even on an extended schedule.

But let me stick with the capacity issue first. And I would assume that you have an ability to switch how many trains you have -- you know, if you get a trend that more passengers are hitting an earlier train, you can make some adjustments. But do we have just a hardware capacity issue as well, where we just have that? Are we short on cars on the New Haven Line compared to the number of riders, as compared to the other two lines?

MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: No, I don't believe so. But I would defer the discussion

1 and I'll take it back and we'll set up a
2 meeting with you.

There's an intrinsic relationship

between the number of cars you run per train,

per scheduled train, and the adherence to

time schedule. Because the more you fall out

of time schedule and people start jumping

trains, you're getting higher loads on one

train than another. So what you really need

to do from a good railroad performance

standpoint is get the schedule right, adhere

to the schedule.

There's certainly enough cars in the fleet to handle the ridership we have. But there may be crowding on one train versus another train. And it's just another example of when you lose that edge, it's hard to get it back.

ASSEMBLYMAN OTIS: One of the things that has been brought up by Metro-North in past years is some of this problem is related to the unwillingness of Connecticut to spend money either on track work or on equipment in past years. But, you know, what's the time

1	frame to remedy that situation? Because, you
2	know, we're just on an extended trend here
3	that has to be addressed.
4	So these are the questions people are
5	asking me, and the level of frustration is
6	high. And I'd just say in my lifetime, the
7	New Haven Line performance is pretty much as
8	bad as it's ever been. And what you said is
9	true, it used to be the best line, probably
10	one of the best lines in the country.
11	So what's the timeline to remedy some
12	of these things?
13	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: The
L 4	timeline is to try to get back as soon as
15	possible. That's the timeline, there are
16	timelines associated with the track work that
17	needs to get done.
18	And while I will say that there are
19	some impacts that could affect the schedule
20	with respect to projects that Connecticut
21	needs to get done, we've got enough issues
22	that we need to control before I'll start

laying the blame on them, seriously.

ASSEMBLYMAN OTIS: Then lastly, there

23

1	was another incident at Grand Central today,
2	a derailment. And we've had, specifically in
3	the Metro-North system, a lot of these, some
4	of them tragic loss-of-life situations.
5	Could you talk a little about how
6	we're going to end the pattern of having
7	these incidents? Because a pretty clean
8	record up till the last couple of years, and
9	it's sort of hard to explain. But what is
10	being done to remedy that and deal with the
11	safety issue beyond slowing the trains down a
12	little, which is one of things you're doing.
13	But there are equipment and infrastructure
L 4	issues. I assume some of this is in the
15	capital plan.
16	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: That's
17	correct. I mean, it's the basic
18	bread-and-butter of state of good repair.

bread-and-butter of state of good repair.

You have to do track maintenance, you have to reinvest in the track maintenance and the physical asset. It's cars, it's tracks, it's signals, and that's where it needs to go.

And it's not rocket scientry {sic}, it's focusing on those issues.

1	ASSEMBLYMAN OTTS: SO my time, I
2	think, is up. But I'd just say I would like
3	to get a car ridership capacity comparison
4	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Sure.
5	ASSEMBLYMAN OTIS: between the
6	three Metro-North lines, and look forward to
7	meeting with your folks on this step.
8	Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: I think I'm
10	last for the Senate. I only have oh, did
11	you sign up here? I didn't know that. Oh,
12	I'm sorry, go ahead.
13	Senator Montgomery.
14	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Thank you,
15	Mr. Chairman.
16	How are you, Chairman Prendergast?
17	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Hello.
18	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: There are a
19	couple of things that I just wanted to raise
20	with you. I'm looking at your and I've
21	been watching you. So even though I wasn't
22	here, I saw your statement. And I wanted to
23	refer to a couple of things that you had
24	said.

1	One of them is looking at growth in
2	the ridership that you anticipate, and new
3	trends that you think you're going to have to
4	begin to deal with. And certainly, you know,
5	in parts of my district and by the way, I
6	just want to thank you for paying attention
7	to some of the real critical areas where I
8	represent, my part of Brooklyn. But in
9	addition, there's been a huge influx of new
10	people with new needs and expectations in
11	terms of transportation.
12	So my question is, how do we get

So my question is, how do we get ourselves to the table to participate with you as you look at serving the needs, going forward, of people?

And you talked in your statement about the train service and how overcrowded, but we also -- we really, I think, would like to see an increase in the bus transportation access; specifically, the bus rapid transit programs and so forth. So those are the areas that we are looking forward to.

And as I have said in the past, and I still continue to complain to you, those

1	double buses. It just seems to be so crazy
2	to have them running through some parts of my
3	district that are relatively small, narrow,
4	residential streets, brownstone neighborhoods
5	and so on.
6	But more consistent service, it seems
7	to me, is better than having these long wait
8	times between services, and then they come
9	with a double bus that is really not as
10	functional. So I'm hopeful that we can talk
11	to you more specifically about our needs.
12	And I don't know how that happens, how that
13	works, and would you suggest ways in which I
14	could be hopeful.
15	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Lois
16	Tendler, from our government affairs group,
17	can reach out to you and we can have a
18	dialogue.
19	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Yes.
20	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: We are
21	seeing changing demographics. More and more
22	of the people that are entering the workforce

and graduating school are waiting longer to

buy a car. They're becoming more dependent

23

1	on transit. We can show you pictures of our
2	system that you would think would be in the
3	afternoon; it's really 2 o'clock in the
4	morning.

They're equally dispersed in some cases, in some neighborhoods, between bus and subway. And we need to be able to do as much as we can to be able to respond to that need.

Especially if we're going to see another 200,000 housing units in the city, we need to make sure we coordinate with the city in terms of where they go so that we don't have to build a brand-new transportation system, we can just build upon the one that we have right now.

16 SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Exactly, yes.

And let me also thank you for restoring the B37. Very critical. But it only goes to the arena. So I'm just wondering, what do we need to do to get that bus back to being transportation that links downtown with all the neighborhoods that it goes through? Because right now it doesn't really quite do the job.

1	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: I know
2	they're still looking at it, and I'll defer
3	to Carmen Bianco with New York City Transit.
4	But it was very clear that while you
5	and others were appreciative of the
6	restoration to where it got, there's still a
7	need on the parts of people saying it needs
8	to go back downtown.
9	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: So we would
10	appreciate your continuing to look at that.
11	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: We'll look
12	at it, sure.
13	SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Thank you.
14	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Assemblyman
15	Abinanti.
16	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Thank you,
17	Mr. Chairman.
18	And thank you, Mr. Chairman, for
19	joining us today.
20	I think there was a second derailment
21	today, I was just trying to find it, in the
22	Bronx or something, one of the work trains
23	also went off the tracks. Am I correct about
24	that?

1	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: In
2	Metro-North it was White Plains. It was one
3	wheel.
4	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Okay. So
5	that's not good for we got through the
6	storm and then we're having
7	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: No, not
8	good.
9	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Okay. I'd like
10	to talk a little bit about Metro-North. I've
11	been using the term "community-friendly
12	planning." And I'm a little concerned that
13	the communities along Metro-North are not in
14	as much contact with your office as we could
15	have. I know you were kind enough to meet
16	with the Assemblymembers and the Senators
17	from the region. I would really like us to
18	meet with some of the mayors as well.
19	I mean, one plan I'm reading in the
20	Governor's budget a proposal to put a parking
21	garage, allegedly to support Metro-North, in
22	Sleepy Hollow. Are you familiar with that
23	proposal?
24	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: I'm not

1	familiar with that one.
2	There are a number of different places
3	where we're doing parking garages for our
4	commuters but we're also doing it for transit
5	or rented development. But I'm not familiar
6	with that one. That's just
7	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: I'd like to
8	talk about that, because it's nowhere near
9	Metro-North. It's halfway between two
10	stations, and I'm trying to figure out how
11	this is going to be helpful
12	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: I'll get
13	somebody in contact with your office.
14	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Maybe it's part
15	of an economic development plan, because
16	there's other development going into that
17	area. But it's and neither mayor,
18	Tarrytown nor Sleepy Hollow, knows anything
19	about it. So if we could have some
20	conversations about that, that might be
21	helpful.
22	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Sure.
23	ASSEMBLYMAN ARINANTI. I'm not quite

sure whether to support it or oppose it,

1	because my mayors can't give me any advice
2	because they don't know anything about it.
3	Now, there is another issue and it
4	ties in with the Tappan Zee Bridge. There's
5	a big push for bus rapid transit. And
6	there's been some discussion as to where it
7	should end. And there are many who believe,
8	and I'm one of them, that it should go to
9	White Plains. Is that feasible? And are you
10	making any plans to facilitate that? Can you
11	handle it on the central line?
12	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: First of
13	all, it's feasible. To my knowledge, over a
L 4	period of years bus rapid transit across the
15	new Tappan Zee Bridge has been looked at.
16	One proposal brings it across into Tarrytown,
L7	which may not be the most popular. The other
18	comes across all the way to White Plains.
19	Another one comes across and then down the
20	Deegan down somewhere in the vicinity of
21	Ridge Hill, but I could be wrong. Or no, I
22	think it's Gateway Mall. It's further south.
23	And all of them are being studied.

Probably the one that -- you know,

	1	they need to be studied and they need to be
	2	looked at in terms of what do they provide in
	3	terms of benefit and total ride time for the
	4	people and the impact on the communities that
	5	would be affected.
	6	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: When do you
	7	expect you'll make some conclusions on this?
	8	Because we're trying to push this bus rapid
	9	transit. We would like to see something in
	10	place by the time the bridge is competed.
	11	And I think you're an integral part of this.
	12	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Yes. And
	13	I'm not even sure who would have the lead on
	14	it. It may be us, but I don't know at this
	15	time. I can't answer the question for you.
	16	But I will get back to you on that.
	17	But I know it's been looked at, I know
	18	those are the alternatives that have been
	19	looked at, but I'd have to refresh myself in
:	20	terms of where it stands today.
:	21	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: My
:	22	understanding is that one of the motivations
:	23	for your previous support of the Tarrytown
:	24	destination was you had some excess capacity

1	on the Hudson River Line. And I was
2	wondering if there was any progress on the
3	discussions to fill that excess capacity by
4	going further north. Right now I think you
5	end in Poughkeepsie. And there's been some
6	discussion of maybe going a little bit
7	further up the line. Is there any progress
8	on those discussions?
9	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: That's been
10	looked at a number of times over 10 years.
11	Once again, I don't know where that is at.
12	And there are a number of different
13	factors with respect to the BRT in terms of
14	where you bring it. And it's not just the
15	issue of where there's capacity, but where
16	you have a decent travel time for the people
17	that are coming over the bridge. There's a
18	number of different factors.
19	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Right. But I'd
20	also like to continue the conversations about
21	going further north, because I think there
22	are people who can be served it's not my
23	district, but I still think it's for the

health of the line and bringing more riders

1	in, we could go a little bit further north.
2	Because I hear complaints from up further
3	north that people don't want to have to jump
4	on Amtrak to get to Manhattan. And there's a
5	lot of economic development going on up
6	there.
7	So if there's some way we could be
8	supportive of your extending the line, please
9	let us know.
10	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Okay.
11	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Thank you.
12	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
14	Assemblyman Skoufis.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: Thank you,
16	Mr. Chairman.
17	Thank you. Good to see you.
18	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Good to see
19	you.
20	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: And I first want
21	to thank you again, commend you and your
22	staff. You've been both very thoughtful and
23	engaging whenever I've reached out and

discussed the Orange and Rockland County

1	issues that we have in the MTA.
2	I want to ask you and I don't
3	expect you to know exact numbers off the top
4	of your head. But do you, ballpark, have an
5	idea of what the proposed capital
6	expenditures are for the different divisions
7	in MTA in the 2015-2019 capital plan?
8	So when I say divisions I mean, you
9	know, west of Hudson, east of Hudson, LIRR,
10	New York City. Do you know what the proposed
11	expenditures were in each of those divisions
12	in the capital program?
13	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: I believe I
14	know them at the agency level. I don't know
15	if I know them in terms of
16	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: And not
17	systemwide improvements, either. I mean, you
18	know, improvements specific to each of those.
19	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: No, I'll
20	have to get those for you. I'll have to get
21	those for you.
22	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: Okay. I don't
23	have the New York City piece of it, but I
24	have some estimates here, some rough

Т	calculations. Likk, about \$3.12 billion
2	and maybe you can, you know, say if this
3	sounds about right \$3.12 billion for
4	Long Island in capital improvements in the
5	proposed plan. East of the Hudson,
6	\$1.04 billion in capital improvements. And
7	west of Hudson, Orange and Rockland counties,
8	\$70 million.
9	And, you know, again, those aren't
10	systemwide improvements, those are
11	improvements specific to each of those areas
12	in the MTA.
13	You know, I guess, first, do those
14	sound about right? And if so, are those
15	numbers concerning? Obviously, we have less
16	ridership in Orange and Rockland counties.
17	And by any measure, you know, we should have
18	less capital improvements compared to Long
19	Island, where you have many, many, many times
20	more riders into and out of New York City,
21	commuters especially.
22	But given the area's potential for
23	growth, I think most people agree that Orange
24	and Rockland has the largest potential for

1	growth if we make the proper improvements.
2	But even that aside, you know, probably on a
3	per-capita basis or per-rider basis, whatever
4	you want to say, those numbers seem pretty
5	astounding for Orange and Rockland counties.
6	Do you agree with that?
7	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: First of
8	all, the numbers don't quite sound right.
9	But we'll get you the right numbers. And so
10	I'll have the conversation from what I think
11	the right numbers are.
12	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: Sure.
13	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: When the
14	MTA tries to decide what the next capital
15	program is going to be, there's a number of
16	factors that come into consideration, the
17	first of which is state of good repair for
18	the assets that exist in the system. It's
19	the primary priority that we've got. We've
20	got to protect that which we own and have it
21	available for the future generation. So
22	that's the first thing.

Size of asset, a trillion dollars, dealing with the majority of the assets of

1 New York City Transit by far.

And then, you know, while they're carrying around the same number of customers between Long Island and Metro-North, I'm not so sure the actual size of the asset is about the same in terms of unit, of track mile, of stations and things of that nature.

And then we try to -- it is not an exact science, but we parcel it out based on that. There's also factors associated with once you get outside the state of good repair into enhance, improve the level and quality of service, there are other factors that come into play -- some of the things you say, where rider growth potential may exist.

And at the end of that process is how we decide how we're going to -- what the size to the program is going to be, what the proposal is that we put on the table, and how we apportion it out in a general sense.

And it's always, you know, a combination of puts and takes, from the standpoint of where we're putting our investments and where we're making our money.

1	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: Okay. Yeah, if
2	you wouldn't mind, or your staff at some
3	point you know, no immediate rush, but
4	when you can, see if you can break down those
5	proposed expenditures per division.
6	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Sure.
7	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: That would be
8	helpful.
9	You know, I've spoken with you
10	directly about this, improvements in the
11	capital program, Midway Yard along the
12	Port Jervis Line, double tracks in Orange and
13	Rockland counties in various areas. You
14	know, I'm hopeful that we can continue those
15	discussions. I know negotiations are ongoing
16	through the budget. And I'm hopeful that we
17	can get some of those items in there and take
18	advantage of that potential growth that I
19	spoke about.
20	The other issue I want to mention and
21	bring up, which I have also spoken with you
22	about, but I want to see if there's been any
23	movement or progress, and that is a loop at
24	Secaucus Junction to create a one-seat ride

1	for west-of-Hudson riders. It is, I guess
2	sort of informally, part of Amtrak's Gateway
3	Project.
4	The concern that I have and that I
5	know other area legislators have is that the
6	loop portion of the Gateway Project is
7	basically the very last thing in the project.
8	You know, the tunnels are built, everything
9	else is done, and then we look at doing this
10	loop.
11	And, you know, there's some
12	frustration that if this actually happens at
13	all, that this will happen in 2015, 2016,
14	2017, and that's when we might finally get a
15	one-seat ride into New York City. I know
16	there are logistical issues with tunnel
17	capacity. Have there been any conversations
18	between the MTA and New Jersey Transit, all
19	the stakeholders, to see if we can do
20	something a little sooner than the end of
21	Gateway.
22	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: The only
23	conversations that have occurred so far to

date is the issue of how we get Gateway

1	launched and how we get all the support we
2	need at the federal, states and local levels
3	for the funding of Gateway.
4	It's order of magnitude \$15 billion.
5	So it's a challenge. And the real stumbling
6	block is the two additional tunnels that were
7	discussed earlier, and some infrastructure
8	improvements at two bridges, Portal and Dock
9	on the other side of and that's their
10	liability, not ours.
11	But it's just part of the dialogue.
12	But the critical mass is getting that first
13	thing done, the two tunnels under the Hudson
14	River.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: So you don't
16	think it's possible to do one
17	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Well, we
18	could have a dialogue. But, I mean, that's
19	the first we have to get critical mass on
20	that issue first and get funding for that
21	first.
22	ASSEMBLYMAN SKOUFIS: Okay, thank you.
23	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
24	Assemblyman Brennan to close.

1	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Yes, just a
2	couple of updates on status reports on some
3	items that haven't been mentioned. The
4	federal RRIF loan for the \$3 billion for the
5	prior capital loan, what's the status of
6	that?
7	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: For the
8	PTC? The RRIF loan for PTC, positive train
9	control?
10	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: No, no. The
11	RRIF loan for the prior capital plan. There
12	was a \$3 billion
13	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Well, that
14	was primarily for East Side Access. We've
15	tabled that to pursue the PTC for Metro-North
16	and Long Island Railroad.
17	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: So you do not
18	anticipate that the RRIF loan
19	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: It's been
20	tabled. And we're really focused on getting
21	the billion-dollar RRIF loan, approximately
22	billion-dollar RRIF loan for the positive
23	train control for Metro-North and Long
24	Island.

1	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Okay. All
2	right. And then the No. 7 Line expansion,
3	what is the status of that?
4	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Oh, it's
5	we expect it to be done, you know, this year,
6	in the first half of this year, and
7	operational.
8	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Nearly complete?
9	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Yes.
10	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Okay. All
11	right, thank you.
12	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Senator?
L 4	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: I just have a
15	comment.
16	Thank you for taking this job.
17	(Laughter.)
18	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: I have been
19	here for I don't know how many years with so
20	many different chairmen. You are clear,
21	you're precise, you're knowledgeable, you
22	don't run around questions. And I know you
23	do a wonderful, wonderful job from what I've
24	heard

1	I just have one request.
2	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Sure.
3	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: That
4	mile-and-a-half train to the plane in
5	LaGuardia is \$500 million to a billion or
6	somewhere along that line, \$500 million being
7	at the low end.
8	From the experts that I've talked to,
9	it's not necessary. How about giving it to
LO	upstate transportation that are going to
11	speak next, so that they have something to
12	look forward to?
13	(Laughter.)
L 4	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay, thank you
15	very much.
16	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Thank you,
17	sir.
18	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
19	MTA CHAIRMAN PRENDERGAST: Thank you
20	very much.
21	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Next, the
22	12 o'clock person, Frank Kobliski, New York
23	Public Transit Association.
24	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Whenever you're

1	ready.
2	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Good afternoon.
3	MR. KOBLISKI: Good afternoon. Thank
4	you, Chairman DeFrancisco, Chairman Farrell,
5	and members of the Senate and the Assembly,
6	for allowing me to testify today. I'm Frank
7	Kobliski. I'm the executive director of the
8	Central New York
9	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Move that mic
10	up.
11	MR. KOBLISKI: Yes, sir. How's this?
12	Any better?
13	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Great.
14	MR. KOBLISKI: I'm the executive
15	director of the Central New York Regional
16	Transportation Authority. And I'm here today
17	to represent the citizens of four central
18	New York counties and six cities who take
19	12 million rides on our buses each year.
20	I've also been asked, in the interests
21	of the committee's time, to be, for want of a
22	better phrase, a poster child for the
23	New York Public Transit Association member

systems from Long Island to Niagara.

1	I'll get right to the point. There
2	are three principal sources of revenue which
3	together constitute over 60 percent of CNYRTA
4	annual income and over which we have no
5	control whatsoever. These are the New York
6	State Operating Assistance, STOA which
7	you've heard spoken of earlier today a
8	one-quarter percent of the mortgage-recording
9	tax levied in each member county of the
10	transit authority and, as designated by the
11	state, certain funds are required to come
12	from each CNYRTA member county as a match for
13	portions of STOA.
14	Over the past six years those revenue

Over the past six years those revenue streams in the aggregate have grown, on average, one-half of 1 percent per year collectively. Despite substantial growth in costs of many large-ticket expenditure categories such as healthcare, bus parts, a high demand for use of mandated paratransit services, the authority has managed to keep its annual budget increase to an average of 2.2 percent over that six-year period.

So in order to sustain our operations

with stagnant funding, we have among other things, cut services and staff, raised fares and the fees for sponsored services, reduced employee healthcare and retirement benefits, converted an unacceptably high level of our federal capital funds into operating funds, and have spent down authority cash reserves along with a host of other significant actions. 

We expect to make it through the end of the current fiscal year, this March 31st, by the skin of our teeth. Largely, through the aforementioned actions and a couple of one-shot infusions, as of April 1 we will hit the wall. If there is no change to our revenue stream, we will have no choice but to initiate drastic cuts in service, especially but not exclusively in Syracuse and Onandaga County.

This means, among other things, the elimination of all scheduled service and paratransit services for persons with disabilities at the following time frames:

Sundays and holidays all day; weekdays after

1	9 p.m.; and Saturdays after 7 p.m. Further,
2	in the City of Utica, the elimination of a
3	significant number of bus trips, along with
4	the elimination of certain services in our
5	Oswego and Cayuga County operations. This
6	means a serious impact on the economic and
7	personal lives of Central New Yorkers and the
8	disenfranchisement of many citizens.

Over the years, with guidance and suggestion from various sources, we as a statewide industry have suggested ways in which the structural shortcomings of transit funding may be addressed. Bluntly speaking, nothing has taken hold, and we are now out of options other than seriously reducing services to our communities. Such reductions run contrary to our sole purpose and mission and cause serious harm to our mutual consituencies and to our local economic conditions.

Unfortunately, the 2015-2016 Executive Budget proposes no growth in operating assistance for upstate and downstate transit systems alike to help us deal with deficits.

1	The New York Public Transit Association
2	recommends an increase in state operating
3	assistance to upstate transit systems of
4	\$25 million in the new budget to make up for
5	flat funding since 2009, and an increase to
6	downstate suburban systems of \$17.4 million.
7	The current structure of state funding
8	created 30 years ago cannot sustain the
9	transit services necessary to grow the
10	upstate economy. A real long-term fix to
11	upstate transit operating assistance is
12	sorely needed. There is also a lack of
13	transit capital investment in the
14	Executive Budget. Despite a state budget
15	windfall of \$5.4 billion, the
16	Executive Budget does not propose any new
17	capital funding for upstate transit.
18	As a sidebar, we in the non-MTA
19	service areas are grateful to the Senate and
20	the Assembly for their planned distribution
21	of certain capital funds from unspent bond

act monies. Certainly that will help. We

also call for development of a statewide plan

to fund the five-year infrastructure needs of

22

23

1	the MTA and all other transit systems.
2	Transit is, after all, infrastructure.
3	I'm leaving with you today, in
4	addition to copies of my remarks, a six-year
5	chart which includes the details of the
6	CNYRTA's funding numbers to which I have just
7	referred for illustrative purposes so you can
8	see what we're talking about in terms of the
9	stagnant funding situation.
10	I want to thank you all for this
11	opportunity to discuss this critical
12	condition of public transit, and I'd be happy
13	to take any questions.
14	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
15	much.
16	Any questions? Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: I'm not going
18	to ask you questions, very quickly, because
19	it's late and I've got a bet on when we're
20	going to be done tonight.
21	You have heard all the dialogue that
22	was going on, and what for at least one
23	person from upstate, I really believe we've

got to change the formula, like we tried to

1	do last year. If you can give me the
2	components that we talked about last year
3	that never got in the budget that's the
4	formula for operating aid and be more
5	regionally balanced in how we approach this
6	on the capital end as well.
7	MR. KOBLISKI: Yes, sir, Senator.
8	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: So there's a
9	lot of people that feel that way, and I hope
10	we can get something done.
11	MR. KOBLISKI: I certainly hope so,
12	and we do appreciate your attention to our
13	situation.
14	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Thank you very
15	much.
16	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
17	Yes?
18	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Just on the same
19	subject. Last year you submitted a proposal
20	to us, and it didn't get accepted. But would
21	you resubmit it? I don't know if it will
22	be just to make sure we're studying it and
23	it's in the mix. Okay?
24	MR. KOBLISKI: Certainly. And over

1	the years we've had other proposals too,
2	whether it's mortgage-recording tax or
3	long-lines tax
4	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Throw them all
5	on the table, okay?
6	MR. KOBLISKI: I'd be happy to. Thank
7	you, folks.
8	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
9	much.
10	Scott Wigger, executive director,
11	Railroads of New York.
12	Good afternoon.
13	MR. WIGGER: Good afternoon. My name
L 4	is Scott Wigger. I'm executive director for
15	Railroads of New York. I represent the
16	Freight Rail Association here in New York
17	State. And in the interests of time, I'll
18	just try and summarize my written remarks
19	there for you guys.
20	Thanks for the opportunity to testify
21	here today. RONY represents four Class 1
22	railroads here in the state CSX, Canadian
23	National, Canadian Pacific, and Norfolk

Southern -- and 33 short-line and regional

1	railroads in the state. We employ
2	approximately 3,700 individuals between our
3	member railroads combined.

We also represent a number of rail-related businesses such as surveyors, engineers, material suppliers and industrial development agencies.

With respect to the Governor's budget proposal, RONY wishes to express our support for the \$10 million that is included for freight-rail infrastructure projects and the separate \$10 million that's included for a mix of freight rail, passenger rail and port infrastructure projects.

If this funding is included, it will represent the third straight year that this essential freight-rail program has been funded after having gone the previous three years without receiving any funding. In the past two years, this has resulted in 26 important freight-rail projects being selected for funding. So on behalf of the membership, I wish to express our thanks to the Governor and Legislature for funding this

1	essential	program.

Going forward, we would like to express our request to fund this program at a level of \$50 million for the year. This will help enhance the rail network and bring it to a state of good repair. It will help statewide economic development efforts by helping to connect our customers with major U.S. and Canadian markets all across the continent, but it also helps attract new businesses to New York State who are looking for rail access as a condition of locating their facilities. 

Put in perspective, according to the 2009 NYSDOT Rail Plan, they identified a need of \$1.9 billion over a five-year period in needs of the rail system, which breaks down to about \$375 million per year. And over half of those identified needs relate solely to bringing the existing rail system into a state of good repair.

As you'll see attached to my written testimony there, we also did a survey of our members internally, looking for shovel-ready

1	freight rail projects that are ready to go
2	but need state funding in order to commence.
3	As you'll see in the attached chart, there
4	are 61 projects listed totaling over
5	\$160 million worth of projects. So just to
6	illustrate the need that is there.
7	In addition, we request that New York
8	State DOT be primarily responsible for
9	scoring these projects, and not the Regional
10	Economic Development Councils, in that
11	infrastructure projects are unique from most
12	economic development projects, especially

State DOT be primarily responsible for scoring these projects, and not the Regional Economic Development Councils, in that infrastructure projects are unique from most economic development projects, especially with freight-rail projects. The benefits of any one project are usually realized across the entire system, not necessarily in one particular region. It's not like building a factory, where it will result in X number of direct jobs being created. Instead, any sort of job creation and retention figures are often realized by our customers throughout the system.

In addition to that, we also wish to express our support for the two other infrastructure-related economic development

1	proposals contained in the Governor's budget.
2	That's the \$1.5 billion upstate
3	revitalization account, and the \$115 million
4	general infrastructure fund. We agree with
5	the position that settlement funds are best
6	spent on infrastructure capital projects, and
7	we'd like to request, of course, that
8	freight-rail projects be eligible for this
9	funding and also that New York State DOT
10	be the main entity responsible for scoring
11	the infrastructure projects as mentioned
12	before.
13	Our members have a very strong
14	commitment to safety. Freight-rail
15	transportation is safer than truck
16	transportation by all accounts. As a result,
17	federal law requires that railroads transport
18	certain hazardous materials, and not trucks,
19	to keep them off the roads. And key stats
20	have shown an incredible safety a number
21	of improvements across the board recently.
22	For example, since 2000 the rate of train
22	For example, since 2000 the rate of train accidents has dropped 42 percent overall.

1	safety benefits, freight rail also provides
2	environmental benefits when compared to
3	transporting freight by truck. As compared
4	to trucks, freight-rail transportation
5	results in less pollution, less fuel
6	consumption and less roadway congestion,
7	which also helps ease the wear and tear on
8	the roads caused by trucks.
9	Overall, just to kind of put that in
10	perspective, according again to the DOT's
11	2009 rail plan, a 1 percent shift in goods
12	from truck to rail would save approximately
13	111 million gallons of fuel annually and
14	reduce greenhouse gas emissions by
15	1.2 million tons.
16	Thank you again for the opportunity to
17	testify today, and I'd be happy to answer any
18	questions you may have.
19	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Any questions?
20	Thank you very much.
21	MR. WIGGER: Thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Nadine Lemmon,
23	policy coordinator, Tri-State Transportation
24	Campaign.

1	And the next person is William Bonds,
2	Empire Safety Council. Are you here?
3	MR. BONDS: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: All right. I just
5	wanted to make sure you're close. Thank you.
6	MS. LEMMON: Thank you, Chairman
7	DeFrancisco, Chairman Farrell, and members of
8	the Senate Finance and Assembly Ways and
9	Means Committee for giving Tri-State the
10	opportunity to present testimony.
11	My name is Nadine Lemmon, and I am the
12	New York and federal policy coordinator for
13	TSTC, a non-profit policy and advocacy
L 4	organization working for a more sustainable
15	transportation system. I'd like to address
16	statewide transit needs, the Thruway
17	Authority's budget, and NYSDOT's capital
18	plan.
19	Concerning statewide transit operating
20	and capital needs, we urge you to assure that
21	the needs of our transit systems, upstate and
22	down, are met. The Executive Budget falls
23	far short of that goal. Most importantly,
24	the Governor's budget fails to fully fund the

1	five	e-year	car	oital	plans	for	the	MTA,	nor	for
2	the	suburk	oan	and	upstate	tra	ansit	sys	tems.	

Ahead of the release of the Executive Budget, these systems identified \$33 billion in capital needs over the next five years.

Roughly half of the \$33 billion has identified revenue sources. Across the state, transit systems are dependent on the state to fill the gap.

For the MTA, the Executive Budget proposes using \$400 million of the bank settlement funds for transit infrastructure. There is an additional \$750 million General Fund transfer to the MTA for capital. And in an unprecedented and troubling move, the budget takes \$121.5 million of dedicated operating revenues from the MMTOA account and repurposes those funds for capital expenditures at a time that the suburban and county bus systems could use that money to avoid service cuts.

The final sleight of hand in this shell game is yet another diversion of dedicated funds to pay off state debt, this

1	time \$20 million from operating, and a
2	promise to repeat those diversions through
3	2019.

All totaled, this leaves a gap of roughly \$14 billion in unfunded capital needs over five years, about \$3 billion annually for the MTA, and \$141 million taken from the operating fund that should be going to downstate operating needs.

For upstate systems, the picture is equally bleak: \$5 million from the NY Works fund will go to matching federal dollars for upstate capital needs, leaving a \$95 million annual gap in their capital plan. The State Transportation Operating Assistance, STOA, is flat, as it has been discussed, despite increasing costs and despite rising ridership.

Since 2009, they have increased their use of capital funds to fill operating gaps by 45 percent, a fiscally shaky move that essentially destabilizes their future. We support the structural reforms that have been discussed earlier today.

1	And in place of addressing the nuts
2	and bolts of our transportation
3	infrastructure, the Executive Budget
4	allocates \$450 million to an AirTrain to
5	LaGuardia, a proposal that is not included in
6	the \$33 billion capital plan for the MTA.
7	This is a shortsighted proposal that siphons
8	money away from critical transit needs today
9	without having made the time-savings case
10	that this investment is warranted.
11	A new bus service launched in the
12	spring of 2014 has increased the transit
13	trips to LaGuardia by 20 percent. The price
14	of this service will likely be much less than
15	AirTrain service.
16	At a minimum, we propose that this
17	AirTrain money be used for transit capital
18	programs, upstate and down. We request that
19	the Legislature stop the diversion of MTA
20	operating funds, both the new proposed
21	\$121 million used for capital and the
22	\$20 million used for state debt, and find a
23	way to fully fund capital and operating needs

across the state.

1	Additionally, while expanded capacity
2	for Metro-North is big news, progress to
3	jump-start development opportunities around
4	the four Bronx stations is undermined by the
5	fact that the Governor's definition of
6	transit-oriented development in the suburbs
7	appears to be limited to vertical parking
8	only. While the Governor does acknowledge
9	that vertical parking structures free up land
10	for mixed-use development, he fails to note
11	the indisputable fact that providing parking
12	encourages driving, thus negating the value
13	of development near transit.

We encourage the Legislature to make sure these funds are used for true, equitable and affordable TOD. And a good example is in our Connecticut neighbor and the TOD funding programs that they've done over in Connecticut.

Concerning the Thruway Authority and the New NY bridge, as you have noted today in your questions, we still do not have a financial plan for this bridge. The lack of disclosure about how this bridge will be paid

1	for, and how high the tolls will need to be
2	to cover the costs, is a severe impediment to
3	any kind of public policy discussion about
4	the bridge.
5	The budget takes \$1.3 billion of the
6	bank settlement funds for the New York State
7	Thruway Authority and uses it to help
8	subsidize drivers' toll costs for one year.
9	What happens after that year?
10	Also noticeably absent are capital
11	funds for the seven new bus routes proposed
12	in the Mass Transit Task Force
13	recommendations for the New NY Bridge,
14	despite the promise that this bridge will
15	launch in 2018, which falls within the
16	five-year capital plan window. The budget
17	documents state that federal funds are being
18	sought, but no matching state dollars are
19	provided in the budget.
20	We ask that the Legislature assure
21	that capital funds are included in the
22	transit capital plan for this crucial bus
23	service, and for the suburban counties on

both sides of the bridge. Additionally, we

1	feel it is imperative that the Legislature
2	secure the public disclosure of the financial
3	plan before the budget deal is reached this
4	year.

Concerning NYSDOT and local roads, the MTA has a statutory date on which they must release their five-year capital plan; NYSDOT does not. With the last two-year capital plan, not even key transportation staff within the Legislature saw the 50-page memorandum of understanding before it was signed. We call on the Legislature to establish a more open budgeting process for NYSDOT's operating and capital budgets, including an established date for releasing the project list and the budget.

We have concerns about the proposed \$150 million for state and local bridges. It is not clear who will be selecting the projects that will be tackled, and it is not clear whether these dollars will be spent on the highest-need projects in the state.

Additionally, local town and county highway superintendents need the flexibility to use

1	this	additi	onal	funding	for	roads,	culverts,
2	pedes	trian	and	bicycling	inf	frastruc	cture.

In addition to the \$150 million

proposed for bridges, we ask that the

Legislature assure that there is dedicated

funding for pedestrian and bicycling

infrastructure. Twenty million annually, for

2015 and beyond, would be a solid investment

in the vibrancy of our local roads and

downtowns.

Finally, I'd like to read a paragraph of testimony that has been submitted to you from the Southern Bronx Watershed Alliance concerning the construction of direct highway access to the Hunts Point peninsula:

"This project can be a gamechanger for hundreds of thousands of residents and hundreds of businesses in the area and region as well as serve as a turning point on the path to a better, healthier and more economically vital future for residents and businesses of the South Bronx. This is a crucial moment for all parties involved and the solutions are clear. Specifically,

1	\$5 million are needed to perform the
2	environmental analysis that is necessary to
3	take the next step in making these
4	recommendations a reality. This would be a
5	good use of the settlement funds to support
6	economic development in the Bronx. The
7	businesses of the Hunts Point Food
8	Distribution Center and throughout the
9	Hunts Point peninsula have been waiting for
10	decades to get direct highway access; the
11	South Bronx community has been suffering
12	under unhealthy and dangerous conditions just
13	as long. Consensus has been achieved on the
L 4	solution, and the time is now for New York
15	State to address this issue."
16	Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
18	Questions?
19	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: Thank you. Good
20	job.
21	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
22	Next is William Bonds, and then after
23	that will be Russ Page and Tracy Eldridge.
24	Are they here? Come on down.

1	MR. BUNDS: Good afternoon. May 1
2	begin?
3	Thank you, Chairman Farrell and the
4	members. Empire Safety Council is a
5	New York-based defensive driving course
6	sponsor. We've been in business for over
7	20 years, we have 800 active instructors,
8	classroom instructors in New York State, and
9	have trained approximately 120,000 students
10	in the Defensive Driving Program last year
11	alone.
12	Empire conducts both classroom and
13	online defensive driving courses, although a
14	very small percentage of online. I am here
15	today to speak to you about the
16	administration of the online or the Internet
17	Point/Insurance Reduction Programs.
18	Empire is all about highway safety and
19	improving the skills of New York drivers.
20	That is why we are so concerned about the
21	administration of the Internet
22	Point/Insurance Reduction Program in this
23	state. The effectiveness of these programs
24	are supposed to be evaluated by a statistical

1	analysis of driver improvement. New York's
2	analysis of the Internet Point/Insurance
3	Reduction Programs is flawed and its
4	evaluations scientifically worthless.
5	The effectiveness study of the
6	Internet Point/Insurance Reduction pilot
7	conducted in December of 2013 that's a
8	five-year pilot program which sunset last
9	year has been continued for an extra year,
10	and now I see it's in the budget for one more
11	year.
12	It should be dropped from the budget.
13	There is no legislative approval for it. In
14	fact, it is outrageous that the Department of
15	Motor Vehicles is renewing the Internet
16	Point/Insurance Reduction Program based on
17	fraudulent and flawed studies, coupled with
18	failed user identity validation measures that
19	allow anyone to take the Internet course for
20	someone else just by using a telephone.
21	They've dropped the requirements for
22	biometrics. They also dropped the
23	requirements for testing. You take an
24	Internet course, you don't even have to pass

1	a test. Talk about low student involvement.
2	These effectiveness studies are titled
3	and represented as being conducted by the
4	Institute for Traffic Safety Management and
5	Research at the University at Albany, by
6	contract. I have a copy of the study right
7	here. I have never in my life seen a
8	research document, a scientific research
9	document, without an author's name. This
10	study is written by a ghostwriter in the
11	Department of Motor Vehicles for some
12	perverse incentives. Because this study
13	this program, Internet program, brings in
14	approximately \$2 million to the state budget.
15	As I said, it was a pilot program.
16	It's supposed to be passed by the
17	Legislature. The only legs that this program
18	has is that it's slipped into this budget
19	process. That's the only thing holding it
20	up. It should be discontinued immediately
21	until this program can be studied by
22	verifiable research.
23	Further, in a letter to ESC in a

response to a FOIL appeal, the vice

chancellor for policy and chief of staff for

FOIL appeals at SUNY wrote: "This evaluation

was conducted by the NYS Department of Motor

Vehicles, not the University of Albany."

Now, this research document, which I'll leave for the chairman, says that it's conducted by the Institute for Traffic Safety Research at the University of Albany, and it was not. And it was done under a contract number, C000784, for which the university received \$51,000 of state funds and never did a single thing. They denied doing this study, but they took the money anyway.

We've asked the State Comptroller to investigate that, and we have a meeting coming up with the State Comptroller hopefully soon. But again, tragically, these studies by deceptive authors are knowingly using invalid methods to perpetuate and promote a state-sponsored program being held out to the public as improving their driving skills and justifying insurance and point reduction benefits, when in fact there is no credible evidence that that is the case.

1	You know, take a defensive driving
2	course and you get a 10 percent discount. If
3	you took it online, somebody else might have
4	taken that course for you, but you still get
5	the discount even though online courses
6	are not effective.
7	So who pays for that? Everybody else
8	that has insurance pays for that. And I
9	think that's unfair to everybody else who has
10	to buy insurance. It's also unfair to
11	insurance companies, to say the least.
12	In light of the irregularities
13	involved in the New York State Department of
14	Motor Vehicles and the Institute for Traffic
15	Safety Management-contracted research, I'm
16	urging that the language be included in the
17	budget to suspend the Internet Point/
18	Insurance Reduction Program as was proposed
19	by the legislation introduced last session by
20	Senator Ruben Diaz and Assemblyman Marcus
21	Crespo.
22	A legislative review should be
23	conducted so that it can be verified as to
24	whether or not the work New York State DMV

1	had contracted was actually conducted. And I
2	can tell you, gentlemen Senator Savino
3	also that it was not. They did no work,
4	they received \$51,000 in state funds, and I
5	think you should be outraged by that.

So I'm asking that this be dropped from the budget immediately and let the legislative process — the way the program was designed, during the five years the pilot program was supposed to be studied by verifiable research, then the Legislature decides whether it's continued. Well, it's been continued past the five years, six years, and now going in to the seventh year. It must be stopped.

Thank you for your attention to this critical public safety matter, and I think that this program -- the classroom program is good public policy, obviously. The overall effectiveness of the classroom program is 18.7 percent of people who take and complete the course have fewer accidents and almost 60 percent reduction in recidivism in repeat traffic offenses. So that program works, and

1	I'm not here about that.
2	I'm here in the most kindly way
3	regarding the Internet Point Insurance
4	Reduction Program. It does not teach. And
5	driver safety is the point, and that is the
6	point.
7	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
8	much, Mr. Bonds.
9	MR. BONDS: Questions?
10	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Any questions?
11	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Senator Savino.
12	SENATOR SAVINO: Thank you.
13	Thank you, Mr. Bonds, for your
14	testimony. As you were sitting here, I
15	reached into my pocketbook because I just
16	recently took one of the courses online. I
17	had a 10 percent on my GEICO policy that
18	expired at the end of the year; they sent me
19	a notice in the mail and said, Your
20	10 percent insurance discount is set to
21	expire, and you can they gave me a list of
22	Internet online testing companies and that I

could get a discount on the course itself, as

a GEICO member, and they recommended them.

23

1	So I took the test it's quite
2	tedious, actually online. Because, you
3	know, there's time has to elapse in
4	between the questions so that you don't skip
5	through
6	MR. BONDS: You watch television.
7	Eat.
8	SENATOR SAVINO: and there's this
9	constant you know, you have to set up this
10	whole identification process, and then every
11	so many questions it stops and they ask you
12	to dial a number and then you have to call in
13	and verify that you are who the person is.
14	But as a consumer, if I received that
15	from my insurance company with a list of
16	potential defensive driving courses that I
17	could take both in person or on the Internet,
18	should we question whether or not those are
19	good programs? Or should we assume that they
20	are?
21	Is there a place where a consumer
22	could find because not everyone has five
23	hours to go to a class. They want to sit in
24	their home and take it because you can take

1	it over several days if you do it online.
2	How would you direct people to do that?
3	MR. BONDS: Let me see if I can answer
4	that. I might be giving you some bad news.
5	It's my understanding from Assemblyman
6	Gantt's office that the Senate does not allow
7	their members or employees to take the online
8	course.
9	SENATOR SAVINO: What in the
10	Senate, but not at home. What you do in your
11	own house is your own business.
12	MR. BONDS: Okay. That's fair.
13	So is there a place where consumers
14	can look?
15	SENATOR SAVINO: Yeah, how would I
16	know?
17	MR. BONDS: It's up to this budget
18	committee right now. What was supposed to
19	happen is you had a five-year pilot program,
20	it was supposed to be studied by verifiable
21	research, and then whoever was opposed to it
22	or for it, the Legislature could continue it

as a permanent law if they wanted, but there

would be verifiable research.

1	What we've got now is the only thing
2	that's making this thing stand on its own
3	legs is this budget process. That the
4	Governor has put the Internet Point/Insurance
5	Reduction Program into the budget. That's
6	the only thing that gives this thing legs.
7	It's not effective, it doesn't work,
8	anybody did you use the telephone as the
9	user identity validation, Senator?
10	SENATOR SAVINO: Uh-huh.
11	MR. BONDS: Yes? You could have
12	handed that off to anybody else and said,
13	"Here, finish the course for me." Give them
14	a couple of passwords and validation so,
15	you know, I'm asking you today what's
16	happened here is, you know, we had an
17	Internet pilot program that was supposed to
18	have biometric measures for user identity
19	validation all been eliminated. Now it's
20	a telephone. That only lasted a few months,
21	all right?
22	In this study you have DMV telling you
23	in this budget process, in this document,
24	that they're still using biometric validation

1	measures. They aren't. Every single
2	company by the way, it's an out-of-state
3	company, companies. They're all using the
4	telephone, which is not a biometric, anybody
5	can hand it off.
6	And talk about jobs. We have
7	800 active instructors right now in New York
8	State. They tell me they're losing students,
9	their class sizes are going down, they're
10	losing jobs, they're losing incomes. These
11	are dedicated people, and we're losing jobs
12	in New York State for companies who use their
13	lobbyists to come here and eliminate the
14	crucial part of this program to have any
15	benefit to any of the drivers, and it's just
16	terrible what's happening.
17	SENATOR SAVINO: I got it. Now I
18	understand.
19	MR. BONDS: So there is no place for
20	the consumer. If any consumer is listening,
21	if you want to get a benefit from a driver
22	safety education, take a classroom course.
23	But what I'm saying to you is please
24	eliminate this program.

Ţ	SENATOR SAVINO: Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Thank you very
3	much.
4	MR. BONDS: Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
6	much.
7	Next is Russ Page and Tracy Eldridge.
8	And then after that will be Michael
9	Giardino, and then will be Denise Richardson
10	James Meerdink, and Adam Prizio. Would you
11	come down? If you're up there, come down,
12	it'll make it easier to do it.
13	Good afternoon.
14	MR. PAGE: Good afternoon. Good
15	afternoon, Chairman DeFrancisco, Chairman
16	Farrell, and members of the joint legislative
17	committee. I am Russ Page, president of the
18	New York State Association of Town
19	Superintendents of Highways and Town of
20	Leicester highway superintendent. With me
21	representing the New York State County
22	Highway Superintendents Association is First
23	Vice President Tracy Eldridge, the Hamilton
24	County highway superintendent

1	We appreciate this opportunity to
2	submit testimony for your consideration as
3	you review the 2015-2016 Executive Budget.
4	We'd like to begin by sincerely
5	thanking you, the members of the Legislature
6	for your unwavering support of local roads
7	and bridges. As you know, our collective
8	membership is responsible for ensuring the
9	safe operation of 87 percent of the state's
10	public roads, half of its bridges, and
11	plowing not only our huge system but over a
12	quarter of the New York State Department of
13	Transportation's roads. Every time there is
14	a winter weather event, the hardworking men
15	and women on our local crews ensure
16	New York's drivers get to and from work,
17	homes, schools, hospitals and other
18	destinations safely.
19	With all due respect to our DOT
20	colleagues, it was surprising to see the
21	Executive Budget include a \$50 million
22	appropriation for the agency to purchase
23	additional snowplows, since they are

responsible for plowing only a fraction of

the state's public roads.

Simultaneously, the Executive Budget eliminates last year's \$40 million appropriation of winter recovery funds, which are distributed through the CHIPs formula and which can be used by municipalities to purchase their own required snow control equipment.

Our association members were extremely optimistic when nearly all of our state's leaders spoke in support of allocating the majority of the \$5 billion that the state received in foreign bank settlement funds to infrastructure. We were discouraged to see that the budget proposal allocates the bulk of this funding to one region, the MTA and the Thruway Authority, and to read the Governor's quote that "Infrastructure today is less about roads and bridges, in my opinion, and it's more about broadband."

It is very disappointing to see that funding for programs that provide vital state aid to local highway departments to maintain these roads and bridges are held essentially

1	flat	over	the	next	five	years	in	the
2	Execu	ıtive	Budo	get.				

Working with you to guarantee the next five-year highway and bridge capital program truly meets the needs of our state's residents is our top priority. We believe it is essential that parity between the Metropolitan Transportation Authority and DOT capital programs once again be restored.

The Dedicated Highway and Bridge Trust Fund was created by Governor Mario Cuomo and the Legislature in 1991. Then, in 1993, the Mass Transit Trust Fund was created. To help fund the latter, they agreed that 34 percent of the petroleum business tax paid by drivers statewide would go to the MTA. To garner the support of upstate legislators, it was agreed that there would be ongoing parity between the DOT and MTA capital programs.

Over the next two decades, until 2010, the transit and highway capital programs' funding levels were virtually identical. In 2009, DOT Commissioner Stan Gee requested a \$25.8 billion five-year capital program and

1	the MTA submitted a \$25.9 billion capital
2	program. Ultimately, the MTA adopted a
3	\$23.8 billion program and the DOT an
4	\$18.6 billion program. The DOT's 2010-2014
5	program received over \$5 billion less than
6	the MTA.
7	Last fall, the MTA submitted its
8	proposed \$28.9 billion program for the
9	upcoming five-year program for 2015 to 2020,
10	but we haven't yet seen any capital need
11	request from the DOT, and this causes us some
12	concern.
13	In November of 2013, we conducted our
14	own needs study of the local transportation
15	system. The analysis determined that, on
16	average, local governments excluding New York
17	City should be spending \$2.32 billion
18	annually on their highways and bridges.
19	Currently these municipalities spend about
20	\$1 billion annually on these facilities,
21	leaving an annual shortfall of \$1.32 billion.
22	The New York State Comptroller's
23	studies indicate that a large number of road
24	mileage is deteriorating and many bridges in

1	the state are rated structurally deficient or
2	functionally obsolete. According to a 2014
3	Comptroller's report, 34 percent of bridges
4	are deficient and 48 percent of road
5	pavements are rated fair or poor and getting
6	worse. The Comptroller estimates that there
7	will be \$89 billion in unmet local
8	infrastructure needs over the next 20 years,
9	with much of this shortfall on the already
10	deteriorating local transportation system.
11	Our associations recently formed a
12	task force to assess these studies and to
13	formulate our funding request. We are
14	realistic that closing a \$1.32 billion annual
15	funding gap all at once would be impossible.
16	Therefore, we are urging your support to
17	fund, at a minimum, CHIPS at \$617 million and
18	Marchiselli at \$39.7 million per year for the
19	next five years. This translates into a
20	\$900 million increase over the five-year
21	period and will help us begin to address some
22	of the more critical needs of the local
23	systems.
24	This request recognizes that, even

1	with the higher CHIPS levels that we propose,
2	there remains an overwhelming number of local
3	roads, bridges and culverts that require
4	substantial rehabilitation, reconstruction or
5	full replacement that local governments
6	simply cannot finance themselves.
7	That is why we also urge the
8	establishment of a multiyear \$500 million
9	state aid to local road, bridge and culvert
10	program, again utilizing the CHIPS
11	distribution formula, to assure that all
12	New York's municipalities can fund vital
13	road, bridge and culvert projects based on
14	local need.
15	The 2015-2016 Executive Budget
16	includes a \$750 million five-year state local
17	bridge program, \$150 million per year, that
18	is supposed to repair 100 bridges over that
19	time period. There has been no list
20	calculated of which bridges are targeted, nor
21	are the members of our associations included
22	in the determination.
23	Instead of what's proposed, we request

about 67 percent of this funding, about

1	\$500 million, be reallocated by the
2	Legislature to fully fund our proposed state
3	aid to local road, bridge and culvert
4	program. The state can use the remainder
5	along with other resources available to it,
6	including substantial federal funding for
7	state-owned bridge needs.
8	We'd like to reform the way that
9	transportation is funded. The Executive and
10	Legislature need to once again make CHIPS a
11	cash-based, pay-as-you-go program. Drivers
12	on local roads contribute nearly half of the
13	gas taxes collected in this state.
14	Unfortunately, CHIPS only receives a small
15	fraction of these revenues.
16	In addition, a General Fund transfer
17	of about \$726 million to the Dedicated
18	Highway and Bridge Trust Fund will be needed
19	to keep the fund balanced again for this
20	upcoming fiscal year.
21	We suggest examining how existing
22	motor vehicle taxes and fees are currently
23	being distributed. Forty-eight percent of

the vehicle miles traveled in New York are on

1	local roads, yet less than 12 percent of the
2	taxes and fees paid to the state by these
3	drivers go back to maintaining local roads.

With the poor condition of both local and state roads and bridges, we believe it is time to consider establishing a more equitable distribution of the gas taxes and motorist fees, one that recognizes the role the local system plays in generating these revenues.

In addition, there is currently a state sales tax on motor fuels that generates \$480 million annually, none of which is dedicated to transportation. We support legislation to deposit a portion of these revenues into the Dedicated Highway and Bridge Trust Fund, to be used to maintain local roads and bridges.

In previous years, even in tough economic times, the Legislature has responded to the dire conditions of the state's transportation systems and augmented CHIPS and other local transportation funding. We are now urging similar support in the next

1	rive-year transportation capital plan with a
2	significant increase in the levels for the
3	CHIPS program to help extend the life of our
4	assets and maintain our vast system.
5	Our associations and the mutual
6	constituencies and communities we serve
7	appreciate the support of our state elected
8	officials who partner with us to ensure we
9	all get the job done when it comes to
10	providing the public with a safe and
11	functional statewide transportation system,
12	one that supports jobs and economic growth
13	for our communities. We look forward to
14	working with you and your legislative
15	colleagues to seek ways to make more state
16	funding and resources available that more
17	closely reflect the critical needs of our
18	local roads and bridges.
19	Thank you very much.
20	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
21	Mr. Oaks?
22	ASSEMBLYMAN OAKS: Yes, thank you for
23	your presentation.
24	And I don't know how much you listened

1	to earlier, but obviously questions went to
2	the commissioner about, for instance, the
3	\$150 million toward bridges how much of
4	them are local, how many of those are going
5	to be state. There's a lot of things up in
6	the air. Senator DeFrancisco's sense that we
7	ought to be taking some more money and
8	spreading it across upstate for
9	transportation I think those things and
10	getting your particular and specific
11	information about where some of the resources
12	come from, I think is helpful as we get ready
13	to have this budget negotiated.
14	So thank you for the perspective and
15	for the work that you represent across the
16	state for the county and town highways.
17	MR. PAGE: And thank you for the help
18	you guys have given us.
19	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Mr. Brennan.
20	ASSEMBLYMAN BRENNAN: I just want to
21	thank both of you for sitting there listening
22	for some long period of time, and to let you
23	know I'm a Brooklyn guy, but I do think that
24	the bonding of the CHIPs program is getting

1	more and more untenable as a policy, you
2	know, because it's going to result in the
3	Dedicated Highway and Bridge Trust Fund
4	running out of money pretty soon. So it's
5	just getting stupider and stupider for us to
6	keep doing that, and we must address the
7	local road and bridge system.
8	My mother lives on the east end of
9	Long Island, and she's involved in the
10	campaign for highway superintendent on a
11	regular basis, so I know about your
12	operations.
13	MR. PAGE: Thank you.
14	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you, Senator
15	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Thank you.
16	You were here during the
17	commissioner's testimony?
18	MR. PAGE: Some of it, yes.
19	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay. Well, I
20	kind of outlined my position, and we'll see
21	what we can do to do what's right.
22	MR. PAGE: We appreciate that very
23	much, Senator.
24	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay.

Τ,	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
2	Michael Giardino, president, New York
3	Aviation Management Association.
4	After that will be Denise Richardson.
5	MR. GIARDINO: Good afternoon.
6	Thank you, Chairman DeFrancisco,
7	Chairman Farrell and other members of the
8	committees. I am Michael Giardino, president
9	of the New York Aviation Management
10	Association, NYAMA, and director of aviation
11	for the Greater Rochester International
12	Airport. NYAMA appreciates this opportunity
13	to testify on the Executive Budget as it
14	relates to airports.
15	NYAMA represents over 13,000 members
16	and affiliate members, 120 commercial service
17	and general aviation airports, fixed based
18	operators, consultants, engineers and other
19	aviation industries and professionals who
20	believe that serious economic development
21	efforts at the state and regional level
22	necessitates strong public investment in our
23	aviation assets and facilities.
24	Airports are economic engines fueling

l	growth	in	the	communities	they	serve.
---	--------	----	-----	-------------	------	--------

2 According to a 2010 study by the State

3 Department of Transportation, the aviation

4 industry contributes over \$50 billion in

5 annual economic activity in New York State,

6 and almost 400,000 state residents work in

7 aviation or aviation-related industries.

The economic benefits of New York

State airports are impressive. As a whole,
aviation generates \$18 billion in payroll and

\$4.5 billion in state and local tax revenue
annually. However, the efficacy of this
powerful economic engine and its benefits to

New York's citizens is threatened by a

critical lack of infrastructure investment,
competition from other states, and sluggish
state and national economies.

The study, "New York State Economic Impacts of Aviation," advocated funding critical aviation-related projects. NYSDOT Commissioner Joan McDonald stated at the time: "Continued strategic investments in New York State's aviation industry will help rebuild the economy by attracting and

1	retaining businesses that depend on aviation
2	for shipping and receiving goods, while also
3	providing business and recreational travelers
4	with safe, fast and reliable Service."

Ironically, this study was released just as the five-year New York State

Transportation Bond Act came to an end and, with it, the end of a state-funded capital program for airports for the following three years. It was only in this most recent two-year capital plan, with your support, the Legislature was able to restore funds, about \$17 million total for investment through a two-year airport capital program. However, you need to be aware that this small level of funding is shared among 90 public use airports across the state.

While this funding level in the current two-year plan has provided some valuable financial assistance for vital infrastructure at airports across New York -- funding aircraft hangars, repair of existing facilities, safety enhancements and other important projects -- it represents about

1	half of what the bond act had traditionally
2	funded per year and did nothing to address
3	the three years of zero funding for airports
4	from 2010 to 2013. In fact, this spending
5	level represents nearly 0.2 percent of the
6	total two-year transportation capital plan
7	just ending.
8	On October 20th, Governor Cuomo hosted
9	Vice President Biden at an event to unveil a
10	comprehensive plan to modernize and
11	revitalize LaGuardia, John F. Kennedy
12	International, Republic and Stewart
13	International Airports, bringing them up to
14	21st-century standards for service, access
15	and amenities. The plan includes a massive
16	investment in these downstate airports.
17	At the event, the Governor was quoted
18	as saying, "The number one job of government
19	is to promote economic growth and prosperity,
20	and one of the best ways to drive commerce is
21	by investing in infrastructure that connects
22	New York with local, national and
23	international markets."
24	NYAMA couldn't agree more. We also

1	believe other airports in the state should be
2	considered for targeted investments as has
3	been proposed for the downstate sponsored
4	airports. In fact, according to a
5	proclamation issued by the Governor last year
6	promoting aviation, it was declared that the
7	State of New York has a significant interest
8	in the continued vitality of general aviation
9	and community airports and that business
10	aviation is a critical tool for companies in
11	New York to improve efficiency, save money,
12	and open up opportunities for rural areas not
13	served by commercial aviation, thereby
14	bringing new business, investment and jobs to
15	all areas of the state.
16	As you are aware, many upstate

As you are aware, many upstate airports are constantly seeking to preserve access to commercial service and connections to major cities. Over the last ten years, these smaller airports have seen their enplanements or passenger boardings decreasing at a slow, but relatively constant rate. General aviation airports that do not have scheduled airline service play a key

1	role in regional business and rely even more
2	upon state funding for revenue-producing
3	projects like hangars and fuel farms. Many
4	of these aviation facilities face a daily
5	struggle just to continue.

The financial needs of New York's airports are well documented. Based on analysis of FAA-approved documents such as airport capital improvement Plans, airport master plans and airport layout plans, the New York State Department of Transportation has estimated that the state will need \$4.3 billion to support its aviation goals for the 20-year period between 2010 and 2030, an average of \$215 million per year. This investment is necessary to properly maintain the system and allow airports to attract passenger, cargo, and general aviation services, thus supporting the Governor's economic development goals.

Although federal Airport Improvement

Program grants help, they average a total of

less than \$100 million per year and are

limited to certain types of projects, with a

1	large allocation traditionally going to the
2	two Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
3	airports. Ultimately, this leaves us with an
4	enormous funding shortfall for airport
5	development needs statewide.

For example, last year there was a total of \$33.3 million in funding applications filed for airport projects, but only \$8 million awarded under the Airport Capital Improvement Program. This helps to demonstrate the huge gap between what is needed for airport development projects and what is ultimately available through the state budget.

Lawmakers and the public can scrutinize these state-grant supported projects, as the awards are routinely publicized through the Governor's office or in many instances reported by the local media. I know you'll agree that NYAMA member airports do a good job of maximizing the benefits of these state investments to the traveling public and to the communities they serve.

Τ	consequently, in order to meet the
2	ongoing critical needs of airport
3	infrastructure improvement and development,
4	and to address these growing needs going
5	forward, NYAMA is seeking Airport Capital
6	Improvement Program funding of \$200 million
7	over the next five years, as well as a fully
8	funded State AIP program at \$8 million a year
9	to match the available federal funding under
10	the FAA Airport Improvement Program. We
11	believe the magnitude of the projected state
12	budget surplus heading into the next fiscal
13	year will help make this level of funding
14	possible.
15	NYAMA is aware of the difficulties and
16	challenges state transportation policymakers
17	face in trying to develop a new, re-occurring
18	aviation financial assistance program at a
19	time when all transportation systems are
20	under stress from age, heavy use and deferred
21	maintenance. Similarly, much of the airport
22	infrastructure remains or is becoming
23	ill-suited to spur economic activity.
24	The cost of addressing the growing

1	needs of transportation systems is great, but
2	will only increase if we delay action.
3	New York State must invest now for effective
4	aviation infrastructure programs or face much
5	higher, perhaps prohibitive, prices later
6	when decay has made the challenges far worse.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In conclusion, NYAMA and its members across New York State support your efforts to ensure that the state pursues policies that are pro-growth and pro-job creation in these tough fiscal times. Strong state investment in our airports is one of these strategies.

We look forward to continuing to working with you and other state elected officials to insure that the next five-year capital plan establishes appropriate levels of funding for a robust and permanent airport capital program and a fully-funded AIP program.

Together, we can enhance our airports and aviation assets in ways that will create new jobs, increase economic development and improve airport services so that all regions of New York can compete effectively with

1	other states for business aviation and
2	scheduled commercial services for the benefit
3	of all New Yorks citizens.
4	Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
6	much. Thank you.
7	Next, Denise Richardson, executive
8	director, General Contractors Association of
9	New York.
10	Good afternoon.
11	MS. RICHARDSON: Good afternoon.
12	Thank you for the opportunity to
13	comment today.
L 4	You have in front of you a report that
15	the GCA put out earlier this year about the
16	state of infrastructure both within New York
17	City as well as in the state, and I think the
18	title is self-explanatory. The other
19	speakers have all amply outlined the state's
20	needs so I am going to, in the interests of
21	time and your patience, truncate my testimony
22	significantly.
23	Thank you for the opportunity to

testify today about the MTA and DOT capital

1	plans. I am Denise Richardson, executive
2	director of the General Contractors
3	Association of New York. The GCA represents
4	the state's unionized heavy civil and public
5	works infrastructure contractors.
6	Our 275 members employ over 20,000
7	unionized craft and professional workers that
8	are the core of our state's middle class.
9	These workers hail from all over the state
10	and virtually every county in New York. They
11	earn an average annual wage of \$87,000 plus
12	benefits, and generate an estimated
13	S553 million in state income taxes alone.
14	The state's economy is critical to the
15	construction industry, the construction
16	industry which is supported in large measure
17	by the MTA and DOT capital plans. It's also
18	an integral part of the state's economy and
19	the construction industry, and something that
20	is not often given due process in terms of
21	its vital role in the state's overall
22	economic development.
23	And I would like to touch on one thing
24	that has not been mentioned today, that

1	historically New York's transportation
2	network has benefited from federal funding in
3	both the NYSDOT and the MTA capital programs
4	that are currently up for discussion assume
5	the same continued level of federal funding.

However, the MTA has relied on its federal funding to pay for nearly one-third of the capital program, and approximately half of NYSDOT's program has been federally funded in previous years. But the existing federal transportation bill expired in 2013, and the current extension expires in May. It is well known that the federal gas tax is no longer sufficient to fund the nation's transportation needs, and there is no consensus in Congress on a future bill. It is now February, almost, and the bill expires in May.

This means that New York must take a new look at our transportation needs and take the steps to fund our own program. We cannot cede our economic future to the whims of Congress, and it unlikely that we will have a new federal transportation bill this year.

New York must enact a fully funded
five-year capital program for both NYSDOT and
the MTA. The two systems work in tandem, not
in opposition, and truly are the fiber that
knits the state's diverse economy into the
whole. The state's economic future and
competitive advantage depend on a robust mass
transit as well as road and bridge funded
program.

Our recommendations include funding and approving the fully funded five-year capital program for both the MTA, NYSDOT, as well as the Thruway Authority. And the programs need to be sufficient to address the critical infrastructure needs. The proposed \$750 million in additional state investments for the MTA and the DOT capital plans over five years, or basically \$150 million per year, is insufficient to meet capital needs.

Second, we urge that the diversion of dedicated MTA taxes and fees for state debt payment obligations on service contract bonds that were used to support prior capital programs be stopped. It is no longer

1	appropriate for the state to take dedicated
2	funding and divert it to other commitments
3	that it had previously made to fund the
4	payback of those bonds.
5	Finally, we urge the increase of
6	revenues dedicated to transportation
7	infrastructure investments. In 2014,
8	fifteen states passed measures that increased
9	revenues for transportation investments, and
10	an additional 13 states are now considering
11	transportation funding legislation. New York
12	needs to be one of them.
13	Thank you.
13 14	Thank you.  CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
-	
14	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
14 15	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very much.
14 15 16	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very much.  James Meerdink, project coordinator,
14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very much.  James Meerdink, project coordinator,  Parks and Trails New York.
14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very much.  James Meerdink, project coordinator,  Parks and Trails New York.  MR. MEERDINK: Thank you for the
14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very much.  James Meerdink, project coordinator,  Parks and Trails New York.  MR. MEERDINK: Thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of New York's
14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very much.  James Meerdink, project coordinator,  Parks and Trails New York.  MR. MEERDINK: Thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of New York's bicyclists and walkers, and in support of the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very much.  James Meerdink, project coordinator,  Parks and Trails New York.  MR. MEERDINK: Thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of New York's bicyclists and walkers, and in support of the infrastructure that supports their active

1	James Meerdink, project coordinator at
2	Parks and Trails New York. For 30 years,
3	Parks and Trails New York has been the
4	leading advocate for parks and trails
5	throughout the state.

In 2013, we joined the New York
Bicycling Coalition, Tri-State Transportation
Campaign and other bicycle-pedestrian
advocates to form New Yorkers for Active
Transportation, a coalition dedicated to
securing equitable funding for non-motorized
transportation options. Today I will be
speaking on behalf of this coalition, whose
partners have reviewed these remarks.

For more than two decades, federal transportation bills have provided New York communities with the funds to build bicycle and pedestrian paths, sidewalks, bike lanes, and other infrastructure that encourages persons of all ages and abilities to engage in bicycling and walking. However, the future of this federal funding is uncertain as Congress considers reauthorization of the current federal transportation bill, MAP-21,

1 this spring.

may not see any dedicated funding for these projects in the next federal transportation bill. Moreover, we hear from local officials across the state that they are eager to build infrastructure that supports bicycling and walking in their communities.

Presently bicycle, pedestrian, and trail projects represent less than 2 percent of New York's transportation funding. With demand higher than ever, New York should be increasing the level of funding for these projects. We ask that pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure projects receive a continuous, dedicated funding of \$20 million annually, in fiscal year 2015-2016 and beyond. This amount will return funding levels to those enjoyed in New York before the federal government's 30 percent decrease.

1	why should the state rund active
2	transportation infrastructure? Because we
3	must ensure that all communities have
4	complete streets with bike lanes, sidewalks,
5	traffic-calming measures, crosswalks and
6	nearby multi-use trails. Everyone,
7	regardless of age or ability, should have the
8	opportunity to safely walk and bike every
9	day. However, currently 29 percent of all
10	fatalities on New York's roads involve
11	bicyclists and pedestrians. This is the
12	highest rate in the nation, and we need to
13	change this.
L 4	We also ask that the Legislature close
15	the remaining gaps in the 360-mile Erie
16	Canalway Trail. I want to thank
17	Assemblymember Oaks, Senator Ortt and
18	Senator DeFrancisco for their comments and
19	questions earlier today about the canal
20	system and the canalway trail.
21	Stretching from Buffalo to Albany, the
22	Erie Canalway Trail is the backbone of the
23	state's trail system and a significant
24	economic driver for upstate New York. We

1	estimate	that	it	results	in	\$253	milli	on	in
2	related	sales	and	support	s c	over	3,000	job	s.

With 280 miles now open to the public, the Erie Canalway Trail is more than 78 percent complete and on its way to becoming a premier tourist destination for cyclists and other outdoor enthusiasts, as well as the longest trail of its kind in the nation. It is our goal to have the remaining 80 miles of trail under construction or in design by the bicentennial of the start of construction of the Erie Canal in 2017.

I'd like to just share a few statistics with you today. Trails, bike paths and walkable, bikeable communities are key assets in helping the state and localities attract tax-paying businesses and a high-quality workforce. In the new New York, trails and walkable, bikeable communities are what companies and young professionals are seeking when deciding to relocate. Of those millennials that we all want to attract and retain, two-thirds seek walkable places and town centers, even if

1	they prefer to live in a suburb; 26 percent
2	do not have a driver's license; and
3	45 percent report making a conscious effort
4	to replace driving with alternative forms of
5	transportation.
6	Sidewalks and other places to walk,
7	such as trails, also rank as one of the top
8	priorities with homebuyers. The 2013
9	Community Preference Survey, conducted on
10	behalf of the National Association of
11	Realtors, found that 80 percent of those
12	polled considered having sidewalks and places
13	to take a walk one of their top priorities
14	when deciding where they would like to
15	live. Walkability ranked higher even than
16	high-quality public schools in this survey.
17	So while the future of federal funding
18	for active transportation is in doubt, the
19	state's ability to act has not been
20	curtailed. In addition to dedicated funding,
21	New York State can act through the Department
22	of Transportation's five-year capital plan,
23	which is currently being developed.
24	As others have earlier today, we call

1	on the Legislature to establish a more open
2	budgeting process for NYSDOT's operating and
3	capital budgets. The Metropolitan
4	Transportation Authority has a statutory date
5	on which they must release their five-year
6	capital plan. NYSDOT should have a similar
7	requirement in order to ensure ample time for
8	full consideration of their plan.

Finally, to support New York's expanding role as a leader in bicycle-related tourism, we urge the Legislature to support roll-on bicycle service on all Amtrak passenger trains. Many cyclists wish to cycle one way and take the train back to their starting location. Unfortunately, despite the fact that bicycles are allowed on trains in other parts of the country, Amtrak prohibits bikes from being rolled onto all but one of its passenger lines.

In closing, active transportation is an essential element of the state's historic commitment to a transportation system that prioritizes safety of users, economic development, and accessibility for all

1	New Yorkers. This commitment must be matched
2	by funding that enables local communities to
3	build and maintain road, sidewalk and trail
4	networks that support quality of life for
5	residents regardless of the ebb and flow of
6	federal transportation dollars. Demand for
7	this infrastructure has never been greater.
8	On behalf of the New Yorkers for
9	Active Transportation Coalition, which
10	includes the New York Bicycling Coalition and
11	Tri-State Transportation Campaign, we look
12	forward to working with the Legislature and
13	the state's transportation agencies to
14	improve the effectiveness and safety of our
15	shared transportation system.
16	Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.
18	Adam Prizio, manager of government
19	affairs, Center for Disabilities Rights.
20	MR. PRIZIO: Thank you. In the
21	interests of time, I will be brief. You have
22	my full comments.
23	Thank you to the joint committee for
24	this opportunity to speak. My name is Adam

1	Prizio.	Ι	am ·	the ma	anager	of	governme	ent
2	Affairs	at	the	Cente	er for	Dis	sability	Rights

The Center for Disability Rights is a disability-led, not-for-profit organization in Rochester, New York. We advocate for the full integration, independence, and civil rights of people with disabilities, and we provide services to assist people in exercising those rights in the context of an independent living framework.

The State of the State contained important transportation infrastructure projects and improvements. My organization and the disability community, I think, generally tend to favor these sorts of improvements because and to the extent that they include modernization and accessibility features as required under the ADA Title 2.

So the four new stations in the Bronx, the AirTrain to LaGuardia, the expansion of Penn Station -- to the extent that these things will enable people with disabilities to more fully participate in the community, we think they're good ideas, because

1	transport	ation	is	а	key	component	of	people
2	living in	the o	comm	nur	nity.	,		

More and more people with disabilities are coming out of nursing facilities and moving into the community and becoming integrated into home and community living.

Transporation is an important part of this because if we can't get to the store, if we can't get to our healthcare provider's office, we can't live. We're back at the institution.

If we can't get to work, if we can't get to parks or the sports arena or to a family or friend's health, then we're not participating in the community, we're being denied by inaccessible transportation the opportunity to participate in the community.

I want to bring to the attention of the committee two policies that are taking shape elsewhere in the state. First, the Olmstead Plan -- which is a product of the Governor's Olmstead Commission -- to improve community-living opportunities for people with disabilities.

Τ.	The Olmstead Plan Calls for the
2	Department of Health to transition 10 percent
3	of the population of long-term nursing
4	facilities into the community over five
5	years. Which is approximately 1,800 people
6	per year that will be coming into the
7	community and will need more-accessible
8	transportation.
9	This is a statewide effort. So it's
10	not just in the city, it's across the state.
11	If people can't live in the community,
12	they'll go back to the institution, in
13	violation of both their civil rights and at
14	more expense to the state.
15	The second policy I want to talk about
16	is Community First Choice, which the state is
17	expected to implement this year. Community
18	First Choice provides for additional funding
19	for home- and community-based supports.
20	My organization conducted a fiscal
21	analysis, and we believe that between
22	\$299 million and \$439 million per year can be
23	brought into the state Medicaid budget
24	through Community First Choice, depending on

1	how many people are able to successfully
2	transition out of institutions and live in
3	home and community settings.
4	

So not only is this a civil rights issue, but it's an issue for the fiscal health of the state. And if accessible transition is an obstacle to people being able to live in the communities, it's a problem for the state's fiscal health as well as a civil rights issue.

So in this context, I would point out to the committee that accessibility is not mentioned anywhere in the transportation budget, and neither is disability. And I would urge the committee to take steps to make accessibility a priority in this budget procedure.

It's nearly 25 years since the passage of the Americans With Disabilities Act, and there are still gaps in transportation.

There are still gaps -- people with disabilities are still stuck in their homes or, if they're able get out, they use paratransit, which in most parts of certainly

	11200 + 2 + 2	7 (	not	rocrocitto
1	upstate	$\pm 5$	1101.	responsive.
_	- L			

Committee?

2	It's not uncommon in Rochester,
3	New York, for a person to be on hold for
4	45 minutes to schedule a paratransit ride.
5	And paratransit operators have an incentive
6	to minimize the number of rides that they
7	offer, because the fiscal incentives are
8	against them. It costs between \$35 and
9	\$45 per trip, and they receive a fare of \$2.
10	So when paratransit is available, people will
11	often only be able to get a ride that's, say,
12	two or three hours before their doctor's
13	appointment. So you're talking about a
14	three-or-four-hour window of idleness simply
15	to go to the doctor.
16	Not in the transportation budget, but
17	worthy of the joint committee's attention,
18	there are two initiatives in the health
19	budget. The Ohmstead Mobility Pilot Project
20	is a Department of Health project to improve
21	community living outcomes by involving
22	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Are you
23	scheduled to appear before the Health

1	MR. PRIZIO: Yes.
2	SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: We don't have to
3	hear it twice. Why don't you wait until that
4	time comes.
5	MR. PRIZIO: Thank you, sir.
6	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay.
7	MR. PRIZIO: People with disabilities
8	are coming into the community in greater and
9	greater numbers. And as we get here, it's
10	important not to let a lack of accessible
11	transportation hold us back.
12	Finally, I heard earlier today that
13	funding for upstate transportation systems
L 4	may cause those systems to leave people with
15	disabilities without paratransit access
16	during Sundays and holidays. And this means
17	that people with disabilities will not be
18	able to visit their families for Sunday
19	dinner, will not be able to be with their
20	families on holidays. And in a budget this
21	size, frankly, that strikes me as indecent,
22	and I encourage the committee to do something

Thank you for your time, I'm happy to

about that.

23

1	answer any questions.
2	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Thank you.
3	How long has your organization been in
4	existence?
5	MR. PRIZIO: My organization's been
6	around for 25 years this year.
7	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: And has it
8	always had the same name, Center for
9	Disabilities Rights?
10	MR. PRIZIO: That's my belief.
11	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: Okay. The only
12	reason I'm asking, I don't think disabilities
13	have rights. People with disabilities may
14	have rights. Does that distinction make any
15	sense?
16	(No response.)
17	CHAIRMAN DeFRANCISCO: That's all. That's
18	enough. We've all had a long day, that's how I
19	get off.
20	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: A couple of
21	questions? We'll close, and you can go talk
22	to him.
23	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: I'd like to get

it on the record.

1	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: I have to get it on
2	the record?
3	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: No, no, just
4	very brief, very brief.
5	Just a couple of quick questions. Is
6	there anything in this budget that makes life
7	better for people with special needs from a
8	money point of view?
9	MR. PRIZIO: In the transportation
10	budget?
11	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Yup.
12	MR. PRIZIO: I mean, only to the
13	extent that the capital improvement projects
L 4	improve accessibility.
15	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: Okay. But
16	there is nothing directed towards the needs
17	of people with special needs in this budget?
18	MR. PRIZIO: Not that we've seen.
19	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: That's it.
20	Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: That's it?
22	ASSEMBLYMAN ABINANTI: That's it.
23	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you very
24	much.

1	MR. PRIZIO: Thank you, sir.
2	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: We are closed down
3	until Monday morning at 9:30.
4	(Whereupon, at 3:47 p.m., the budget
5	hearing concluded.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	