SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Good afternoon, everyone. The Transportation Public Hearing will commence. We will begin very shortly into our public hearing and our bills for review. We will start off with our public officials in the first hour. It’s a fairly short list so hopefully the hour will be sufficient and then we will run into the public testimony.

Prior to the start, just for safety's sake, we have the two doors on either side. If there's an emergency, just pay attention to any comments by the Capitol Police and listen to instructions on how to exit the building.

With that said, we will begin very quickly. There are members still en route either to the committee or in other public hearings so don’t despair. You’ll see legislators coming and going and any of your public or written testimony will be put into the record.
So with that said, my ranking member, if you have any quick comments for the opening of the meeting, Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): I do not, Senator.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you very much. So with that, we will begin. Our first public official is from Department of Motor Vehicles, Ms. Judeen Wrinn. Please come on up. It’s lovely to see you and please begin at your convenience.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Good afternoon, Senator Leone, Representative Devlin, and members of the Transportation Committee. My name is Judeen Wrinn and I am the interim commissioner of the Department of Motor Vehicles. And we thank you for inviting us here today to give testimony regarding Senate Bill 7 -- 924.

This is DMV's omnibus bill through which it makes changes that enhance and simplify customer service, streamline processes and clarify language that appears in Title 14 of the Connecticut General Statutes.

I am going to review the sections within this proposal that provide the reasons behind some of the changes that we want to make.

The first one is in Section 1 and the focus is on improving customer service. Today, customers receive their registration renewal notices in the mail and they receive them whether or not they are prepared to complete that registration process.

For example, if someone has compliance issues like not having paid their property taxes or not having completed their emissions compliance, what happens
is they receive the bill, there is language on top of the bill that tells them they need to do that before they remit payment, but many customers do not notice those messages and what happens is they submit their payment.

We cannot process their payment in full because they have not complied. There is correspondence back and forth and people can end up driving without properly being registered and that is not a good thing.

And so our proposal says rather than send them something that looks like a bill, we should send them a letter that identifies what the compliance issues are. So it's very clear this is not the time to send a payment. This is the time to complete the compliance requirements and once you do that, we will then send you your registration certificate. That is the reason for the change in to Section 1.

Section 3, is a simple update to put us into compliance with a change made by the International Registration Plan of which Connecticut is a member jurisdiction. The International Registration Plan is a facility that collects fees for interstate traffic -- intrastate traffic of commercial vehicles.

The International Registration Plan amended their plan to include a requirement to accept a registration document in an electronic format. This language simply indicates that Connecticut should also comply with that requirement to accept that registration document in an electronic format.

Sections 5 and 9 simplify the process to keep state regulations in sync with federal regulations when we are required to do so.
Basically, any person who applies for a class C license with an endorsement or a commercial driver’s license is required to meet the physical standards that are in federal regulations.

Connecticut is required to apply the federal standards for CDL holders and already adopted the federal standards for endorsement holders through state regulations which under the current statutory structure is required.

This proposal eliminates the requirement that DMV adopt regulations and establishes the federal standard within the statute itself. Therefore it avoids the duplication of effort if the federal regulations change.

Sections 6 and 7 strengthen compliance in the important area of carriers transporting students. Carriers are legally required to review a list on a monthly basis, twice a month, in order to see whether there is any drivers who have been downgrade or who have suspend licenses.

DMV provides access to that list to every carrier and it is provided through a secured portal. DMV cannot ensure that they are reviewing the report even if they are accessing the portal.

What we are requesting is that these carriers are required to register with DMV this reporting requirement and to establish penalties if they do not do so. It provides DMV with a way to track whether or not all carriers are using the portal.

The penalty for not reviewing the list is enhanced to include the requirements that they must register with the DMV. If they don’t register, or they don’t
review, the penalty is $1,000 for the first violation and $2500 for any subsequent violation.

Section 8 clarifies some language that is currently ambiguous in the section related to ignition interlock devices. The focus is on a person who is required to install and maintain an ignition interlock device as a condition for reinstatement of a license who fails to install the IID and who operates a motor vehicle.

Currently the statute is clear for someone who installs an IID but is operating a vehicle without one but is ambiguous if a person never installs the device. This makes that adjustment.

And section 10 addresses a need DMV has to fill openings on its medical advisory board more quickly. Currently, the statute requires the commissioner to appoint nominees submitted by the Connecticut State Medical Society or other medical associations or organizations comprised of physician assistants, or advanced practice nurses, practiced registered nurses. Sorry about that.

The change adds flexibility for DMV in that it permits these organizations to make recommendations to the commissioner for his or her consideration but it doesn’t limit appointments to medical professionals from those organizations.

The challenge today is that DMV often struggles with obtaining nominations from the listed organizations. They're busy, this may not be their top priority when we need their help. This proposal provides other options to identify new members beyond where the existing statute allows.
Thank you for considering the comments today and we hope that you will be in favor of Senate Bill 924 and we are requesting your support for its passage.

In addition, DMV also submitted other testimony for some of the other bills that impact DMV and if you have any questions about that today, either I or my colleagues are happy to try to respond.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Madame Commissioner, for your testimony on these sections and also you answered one of the questions I was going to have about weighing in on other issues relative to DMV.

That is very helpful to know that you will be available as we proceed through the session as different issues come up and we might not always have the questions at this particular moment, but know they will be coming.

And then we will work with your great liaison, Jim there, to help us with the flow of information so I thank you for that.

As I’m going through your quick testimony, I just may have one or two questions and then I will open it up to the rest of the committee if they have some as well. I won’t get into some of the other issues.

In Section 1, with the letter for the compliance, you would want -- is there any way that this letter to streamline the complications that is currently ongoing to be online as well or is -- I guess I’m trying to figure out where is the confusion if you are already sending out information on a document but it seems to be overlooked. And so you want to send out a separate letter to -- so -- to help clarify it.
These days we call that the snail mail, the old way of doing business which still is very effective, but can it also be done online so to expedite the process for those that are technologically capable?

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: We could certainly look at that as an option. I think some of the challenge today is the registration certificate, the invitation they get is the same certificate you are going to put in your car.

And so it’s a busy document and contains information that is necessary. And people overlook even though we may bold the information, they overlook those notices. So that’s why -- that’s the issue.

But we can certainly look into that although we know that not all customers would respond. We don’t have everyone’s email. They wouldn’t be able to respond to it.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): No, and I think that’s a fair point but for those that could it would just be nice knowing that instead of having to use only the letter as a document of correspondence, waiting for it to be in effect or to become effective, that if it can be done electronically, quickly and you print out your conformation pages, then you can put the --

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Absolutely.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): -- updated document in your vehicle and not be breaking the -- any rules or regulations. So I think that would be helpful. We can figure that out.

In Section 3, with the international registration thing you said that it’s for interstate traffic? Can you just elaborate on that?
MS. JUDEEN WRINN: So the International Registration Plans is basically of the truckers who travel across the country who travel between states and that IRP is a facility that collects the fees that get paid to the various states for those trucks to have traveled on our highways.

They have made a requirement to accept the registration document in an electronic form for all of the jurisdictions that utilize them and so this basically indicates that we will be in compliance with them.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So I guess in my previous point, you were actually doing, you’re going into an electronic format to expedite the process with this language?

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Yes.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Okay. And Section 6 in terms of the number of carriers to register and penalties if they don’t. And I can understand the standpoint but I worry that your, they would have to register just to prevent themselves from getting a fine. So will it in fact ensure that they do what they need to do? If they just register and still don’t follow through --

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: It doesn’t change our process today. So the registration what it does is make certain we know who they all are. Because as new entities come into the business, we may not know right away. So this makes a requirement you have to register to do this. That’s number one.

Number two, you have to access that portal a couple times a month and review those -- review the list. We have still the responsibility to make certain
that you’re doing that and we have an electronic way -- well, we have half of the electronic way to do that and we are working on the second half.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So they should be doing this with or without this added --

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Absolutely.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): -- insurance, right?

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Yes.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): But you’re just trying --

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: But this improves the compliance.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Improves the compliance.

Last question on this point. How many carriers are there that you have to manage or be aware of?

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: It's about 350.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So that’s a lot. So by making sure they register, you have a better sense of who is out there and what needs to happen.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: That’s right.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): And does that number fluctuate drastically?

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: It can.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): I mean, does -- can it drop, increase, I mean, how does it work?

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: So it can drop. It can increase. That’s one of the reasons we want them to register is it can change and we don’t know about it until potentially well after.
SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Okay. Thank you for that. In Section 8 in terms of the ignition interlock device, which I really don’t have too much of a problem with, but in the off session and your, with the liaison I had an issue that was an interesting topic with reciprocity within states.

So I guess the situation was such that a person had a DUI in Connecticut but then moved to Florida, remained in Florida, was trying to get -- got a license there but then needed to reapply when the time was due. And in that timeframe Connecticut issued that they were out of compliance with the interlock device.

The person got the office but then did everything in Florida to Florida’s satisfaction. But nonetheless, Connecticut couldn’t authorize it because they didn’t comply with Connecticut law. So in Connecticut’s eyes they're still outstanding under a DUI here in Connecticut although they went through the DUI process in Florida.

So I guess the question is there -- how is reciprocity done not with just one state but with other states when we are dealing with this sort of stuff? Or is it just a state by state basis we are prevented from assisting the person in Florida?

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: I’m not certain of that answer but I’m going to turn to my colleague.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): And that -- and I only mention that, this is probably a little bit more complicated to do an exchange here, but I just wanted to, it’s something I do want to follow up on because if it’s happened one, the potential does, it can happen twice.
The person has connections here. As far as I know is not coming back there but they're in this limbo state trying to figure out how to get their license satisfied down there when they have to get some form of communication here.

MS. SHARON GAUNUACOS: Good afternoon, Senator Leone.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. Hit the mic.

MS. SHARON GAUNUACOS: Good afternoon. I think maybe I can shed some light on this. We live in a really mobile society so people with IID's are constantly moving. And one of the things that happens in states with mandatory IID programs is if you move to another state, you aren’t automatically let off the hook in the state that you moved from.

But there are vendors, IID vendors that are all over the country and what Connecticut does is if you are with one of those vendors, that vendor can simply continue to report on you when you move to Florida.

So in other words, you move to Florida, Florida under -- contacts Connecticut to try to get an idea of what the requirements are. They allow you to have a restricted license but the underlying IID requirements are the ones that were imposed by Connecticut. And that vendor will continue to report to us.

So there are very frequent cases of people who move, who continue to follow the IID requirements in this state.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So in this scenario that I laid out, the person in Florida has to go through
the process with this sanctioned Connecticut vendor down in Florida?

MS. SHARON GAUNUCOS: Right. If they have a vendor that is operating in both states and there are as I said vendors that operate throughout the country. They can continue with that, pick up that vendor in Connecticut, continue with that vendor in Florida and have a seamless transition into the new state.

But the underlying requirements for the IID are Connecticut’s requirements. Conversely if someone moves from Florida into Connecticut, the same arrangement can be made but its Florida IID requirements that have to stay on that person’s license. We would not impose our own because the underlying offense occurred in the state of Florida.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. Thanks for that. I’m sure we can follow up off line on the specific issue but that is very helpful. It’s good to know. Thank you.

With that, I know there is other, there might be some other questions and as we go through other bits of legislation we will reach out to you.

There was one in our last public hearing on an issue with towers and some -- a request for nonconsensual fee increase. I know there is a DMV process for this. They came to us asking for a legislative fix. That’s something we are going to follow upon. I don’t know if you are aware of it since it was only a few days ago.

If you’re wanting to comment it now that would be great. If you still don’t have enough information it is something we want to follow up with you. So not sure if you had a chance to her that testimony?
MS. JUDEEN WRINN: I did not hear that testimony.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Okay.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: No.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So we will get back to you on that.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Okay.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So I, you know, I’m not trying to put you on the spot but it is an issue we will have to talk thought.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Okay.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So with that let me open it up. Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for being here today and for your testimony. Very crystal clear, loved it. And it sounds like all of the things that you are seeking to do are sort of streamlining and efficiency and all of that. But I just have a couple questions for clarification.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Sure.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): So back to Section 1 for a minute. Is the process now right that to when your license or your registration is due for renewal you receive the letter with the fee of however much it is these days. We submit that and then our registration is sent to us.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Yes.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Correct?
MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Well, no. Your registration is sent to you with that notice.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Oh, it's attached to the bottom.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: It’s attached.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): That’s right. You keep that and send in the payment.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Yes, yes.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Okay. So I -- and so what you are proposing is that if, is there currently notice if the individual has a --

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Yes.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Outstanding issue?

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Yes.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Okay. But you’re concerned that it’s being ignored. So in lieu of that, you would like to send another communication.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: A different communication. So don’t send them that registration renewal notice at that time. If we know they have to satisfy those requirements, why send them a bill that could -- they could end up paying but they haven’t satisfied the compliance. We are going back and forth with them. Time could elapse, they could be not registered.

Instead, let’s be really clear up front. Don’t confuse them with two things. Basically we were being efficient by giving them one registration renewal and giving them the information of what was wrong but they’re not, it’s -- can be confusing.
So rather if we know there is an issue, send them a letter instead. Tell them what is wrong. Tell them what they need to do. Then as soon as they do it, we will send them their registration certificate.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): So some of those out of compliance issues might be local property taxes?

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Sure.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Correct?

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Yes.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): So is there a lag between when you would know if they actually did satisfy that? Or would you say send a receipt that you’ve paid? How --

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: If they know that they -- as soon as they know they have done it, and they’ve done it with the local tax payer, those, that information is electronically submitted to us.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Okay. So you have that in real time.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: So we will know. We will know. We receive electronic fees on these various compliance things right way. So there really shouldn’t be any time lag.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Right. And do they respond back through snail mail or can they call, can they go online?

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: They can go online.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): How do they --

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: And in fact, for those customers who typically go online today, they will see they
have a compliance issue. It will prevent them from doing it. They can go and take care of their issue, go back, go online and get registered.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Great, great. My only suggestion then, it makes sense to me is that when that letter gets developed that it is done for a lay person who doesn’t work in the DMV.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Yes.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): And would be able to understand it easily.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: We agree.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Okay.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: And may I just mention that one of the things that we are working on right now is an enhancement to our mobile and online capability such that that potentially could be one and one.

That the vendor that we are talking to is one that could work with the local towns that the customer could actually pay the overdue property tax and then register the car. That is our goal is to try to get to one and done so that they don’t have to go two different places and do two different thing.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Sure.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: We are not there yet --

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Yes.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: But that’s where, that is where we are focused.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Okay, good. And when you were here before, you talked a lot about the developments underway in the DMV. I was reading something this
morning about the governor, you know, was talking about and reinforcing his plans to try to bring things online and modernize our government so that includes I’m sure those initiatives.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Yes.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Do include the DMV. Okay, good. Section 6, just a little bit of clarification. I totally get what you are trying to do. I just wonder how practical or feasible it is or how the DMV would even track if people are, if these companies are using the portal.

Is there an alternative way for companies to be able to sort of sign an affidavit that they have done it? Like are you actually going to have somebody go and see how many times did they enter and how is that going to work?

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: So this is a requirement today that we monitor them. And so for those who are accessing our portal and those that we know about, so we went through a huge manual effort identifying the carriers out there.

We can't say with 100 percent certainty we have got them tall. So we have the ones that we know about which is about 350.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Right.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: And we do an exercise of making certain that they're accessing the portal that they're pulling down the list. We can do that.

The problem and what this does for us, by putting an onus on them, you have to register with us so we know you exist. It doesn’t mean they are all going to do it but if they don’t do it, there is a
consequence if they don’t register. Today there is no consequence.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): So is that, the violation that you were talking about, is that a violation for not registering or is that the violation if they're caught with a suspended or revoked driver?

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: So we are talking about the carrier's responsibility.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Yes.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: So the carriers today, the legislation says if you don’t check that report, like you’re supposed to, you get that violation of $1,000 the first time and $2500 subsequent.

This proposal says yes, that’s true. What we also want to say if you don’t register with DMV so that we know you should be doing this, it's $1,000 the first time and $2500 subsequent.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Wow, okay. Thank you for that. And just a quick question following on the Senator's questions regarding Section 8. How many situations are there where somebody would have one of these IID's and not, never install it?

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Do you know a number? We don’t really have a number. We can go back and see if we can find something.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Okay. All right, thank you very much --

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: You’re welcome

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): -- for your answers. Thank you.
SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Representative. Are there any other questions? Oh, you’re up. Didn’t see your hand, Representative Haines. Don’t, definitely don’t want to overlook you. Please go forward.

REP. HAINES (34TH): Thank you very much. Just a quick question regards to Section 1. Is this also a system that you are going to put in place for license renewals as well or is it only for registration renewals?

Because I do find that as I said before I work at AAA and I watch people come in all day long to renew their licenses because that’s what AAA does for them or for you guys.

And there are countless times where somebody comes up from Stanford and Greenwich and all kind, because I work in the old Old Saybrook office and they show up after an hour and a half drive and they have a parking ticket or they’ve got some other unpaid ticket or taxes or whatever. I mean, there is all kinds or reasons why people don’t get their license renewed. Or can we do the same thing for that as well because then that will obviously help.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: So I think we will take that back. The focus on this was on the registration but you raise a good point so let us take that.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): You shocked me when I heard someone from Stanford is driving to old Saybrook to renew their license. (Laughter)

REP. HAINES (34TH): It happens every day.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Wow. All right. We need to rectify that so that they can do it in Stanford.
(Laughter) But I know we have an office so that, we will have to figure that one out. In any case, any other questions for our good commissioner? If not, thank you.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): We will be in touch.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Okay.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): On these issues as well as all the other bills. Today is more or less a lot of proposed legislation that has some measure of effect on DMV.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Right.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So as you hear some of the ongoing testimony, we will be asking for your written either support pro or con in terms of the proposed legislation from an agency standpoint which will help us with our decision making.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Understood.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So we look forward to that.

MS. JUDEEN WRINN: Thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. Next up is Representative Jay Case. Representative.

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): Good afternoon. It’s so fun to be here with the Transportation Committee second time for this year. And, Chairman Leone, Lamar, Ranking Members Martin, Devlin and distinguished members of the transportation committee. I won't read my testimony. I’ll just go over what I proposed for you.
In working in the nonprofit world for many years and
now in the corporate world, the nonprofit world is
rally having difficult with getting vehicles
registered with DMV and inspections done.

What I was looking to do with this project to help
out the nonprofits of any profit with a fleet of
five or more vehicles or any business with a fleet
of five or more to try to have some designation or a
more streamlined way for them to go and get their
vehicles taken care of.

Just to give you a short instance of what happens, I
am on the board of an arc in Litchfield County and,
you know, we go to DMV to get one of the vans
registered and inspected. One headlight is out.
Please go have the headlight fixed, go back to the
back of the line and start over. That takes a lot
of time out of the nonprofit world and today we are
trying to save dollars and help our nonprofits.

We are moving a lot of DDS stuff and DSS stuff out
to the nonprofit world and I think we, if we could
do justice to try to help them to save a few dollars
because it takes every penny to run those agencies
as it is.

And then working through the corporate world, I’m
not -- past November working with a constituent who
had to register 18 trucks. They were told when they
went to the local office you have to come one at a
time. And it’s a new addition to the company.

I was able to contact and because of being a
legislator, I contacted the liaison, we worked
through it, we found somebody and we were able to
get them to register. But to have some sort of a
streamlined way to be friendly to business that want to bring in new vehicles and have them registered.

I just think it would be the right thing to do and a way that we could help streamline things. I don’t know if it's online, if there can be a designated person.

I do have to say the agency has been great once I made the contact to try to get this done and help these not only nonprofits but the small -- and that's why I put it for any business or nonprofit with five vehicles or more so just to open it up to everybody. I mean, we can tweak that if we want but I’m up to any questions, just trying to help out the little guy out there.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Representative, thank you for the testimony and it’s an interesting -- it’s interesting that I’m not sure we were all aware that this is how it works.

So just to clarify, if you were -- you as a nonprofit were today without any change in legislation, if you were to go to the DMV to register these vehicles, these five and you got up into line, you can only do one at a time and then in order to do two, three and four you have to go back to the end of the line to get back into the que?

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): Basically --

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So you have to do that five times? You just can’t be in front of the person and go through the process of registering each vehicle and only dealing with an issue if they come up?

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): Correct. Well, in the nonprofit world, the vehicles need to be inspected
once a year. So they have to go in front of DMV, do their registration and their inspection.

In other areas, these vehicles sometimes fall under DOT but these happened to fall under DMV for registration purposes to the wheelchair vans, the other things that they use.

In this particular case where I got the phone call on it was a headlight that was out that went through inspection on registration and I don’t know if this just happens because it was on a local level at a local DMV. They were asked to go and get the headlight fixed and then go back and start over at the back of the line.

I did call, I tried to get it straightened out at DMV and the manager at that DMV office says that’s how we do it.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Okay. So registration number one, you walk up, has a headlight or a taillight problem and you have to fix it in order to come back.

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): Correct.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): That I understand.

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): Yes.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): But could you then not process the other four if there were no issues?

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): One or maybe two at a time depending on how many people are in the building.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So you had to fix the one to do the other four.
REP. JAY CASE (63RD): You had to come back with the other one but you can only bring one or two at a time.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Got it. Okay. Have you -- and so is DMV since you said you worked with the local office, are -- have they been open to is there another solution out there other than a legislative fix or is this the only option we have got to go through?

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): They have worked with me on the corporate level one where we were able to get the 18 trucks registered at one time by working with Ms. Graves. She was wonderful and took care of everything.

But on the nonprofits, I haven’t seen a resolution, haven’t been able to work through it. I've been trying to -- I know that the Connecticut nonprofits wrote testimony on this because they've reached out and I do a lot of work with the arcs around this building. And when I presented this with them, they all say they have the issue going on. I didn’t take the deep dive but I thought I would bring it in front of you and see if we can get some more concrete.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, thank you. So just to put it to bed if there is no taillight issue, everything paperwork wise is in order, you would like to be able to process however many in one shot so you don’t have to go back to the end of the line.

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): Correct. Because the way, you know, DOT does this with school buses and I just know this when you -- a school bus company has to be
inspected once a year. So DOT makes an appointment with that school bus company and goes and does all their buses on one day and then goes to another location so they have appointments.

So if you have five or more in the nonprofit or the business and DMV side, can they have one person that’s designated where they can make an appointment and say hey, we are coming with these registrations and we are coming with these vehicles can we do it in a, with an appointment wise?

It does take a lot of time and a lot of dollars out of the nonprofits to go back multiple times and to be honest with you, the nonprofits don’t run the newest vehicles out there.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Fair enough. Okay. We will look into it and I would hope you continue to work with DMV and --

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): Absolutely.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): -- we can come to a mutual agreement that would even be more beneficial. Let me open it up for some questions. Senator Martin, Representative Devlin? Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Thank you. It’s not really a question, but something similar with one of my constituents and I believe that the last public hearing we had I made a comment or a reference to my constituent about the difficulty he has in the commercial end of it registering vehicles, trucks in particular for him.

And I did receive an email from one of the DMV staff members, thank you so much. I did speak with him today and he is expecting your phone call. All
right. So thank you for following up. I do appreciate that.

But it is seems like there is a little, a few hiccups here and maybe we can straighten it all out. Okay. Thank you.

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Representative Case, always good to have you here. And thank you for bringing this to the committee as well.

I just want to understand one aspect of this. You’ve talked us through how it works when somebody comes, they can probably bring one or two vehicles at a time. Is your proposal that they can bring them all at the time or that somebody from DMV would go to them where maybe vehicles are located in a central place? Just did you have a thought on that?

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): That’s -- I did not have an eye on how we could do that. Whether there was an appointment set up as to where this Wednesday of every month is nonprofit registration time at certain locations.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Or a curtain window or something.

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): Correct. Because some stuff has to be done in person for inspections. But when it’s just a registration renewal, I mean, they worked with the on the corporate side it was great. Just we FedEx'd everything, the company FedEx’d
everything down. Everything was taken care of and, you know, we moved on and the company was happy.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Right.

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): It takes -- I just -- it takes so much time out of nonprofits I don’t know, you know, with a trucking company which, you know, we have multiple of them up in the northwest corner as Senator Martin spoke about.

You know, I have one guy who has got 76 trucks on the road and, you know, he is always at that DMV office. But which is a good thing because he is always buying new vehicles and always registering new vehicles which is padding to our tax rolls which is doing a lot of good stuff but I think we need a little help to get the businesses so that we don’t have so much time.

And I understand, there is a lot of complications at DMV. I have to give them accolades, I mean, I sat there and registered or got my license renewed. I saw there and watched them do a special needs person and boy, I went up and thanked that worker for how they handled them. They have some great people that work in these offices but there are some of these little hiccups that I think we can work out and with the commissioner, new different commissioner now. It’s great. Maybe things can change.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Awesome. So again I think you for bringing this before us because it sounds like something that potentially could be a win win that would help our nonprofits more efficiently. It might also be of benefit to the DMV to not have people circulating back and forth.
And I have found so far that the DMV seems to be very open and creative in terms of finding ways to streamline and be more customers friendly. So maybe we can work something out, move this forward or perhaps wasn’t even needed a legislative fix but thank you.

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): Beautiful. I would love to have the discussion and if they are still here I will chat with them.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Good, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative O’Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Representative Case. I just had a five hour interview so I'm ready for a bunch of questions on your bill. (Laughter)

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): If I knew you were going to be here today I would have brought some for you.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): And just for the record, these are sugar free so they’re not going to be subject to any state tax, sales tax.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Representative, we may have to institute a time limit but we will let you go. (Laughter)

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Please, no I want to thank you for bringing this to our attention and encourage you to talk to DMV and I’m wondering if you’ve heard of any opposite to this bill. I couldn’t see any online?

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): No.
REP. O'DEA (125TH): Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Well, thank you, Representative. That was very quick. That five hour interview really does work. (Laughter)

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): That’s the least he has spoken since I have been here in eight years. (Laughter)

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. Are there any other questions? Thank you, Representative, for your helpful testimony.

REP. JAY CASE (63RD): Thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Representative Meskers, I see him in the audience. Please come on down.

REP. MESKERS (150TH): Thank you, Representative Lamar and Senator Leone. I am here to testify in front of a bill I brought before you, 6771 I believe is the number. I have with me some representatives from the industry.

I am neither a trucker nor do I drive a manual shift but being in the building, being exposed to a number of the different industry groups I was approached and asked to help resolve an issue again with the DMV.

I’ll let the DMV speak for themselves but as I understand it, if you go in for fresh registration on a truck, you -- the maximum number they will process is two or three or three at a time. So the issue becomes an issue of efficiency and processing that is very important that we are able to process these things online if possible.
There is a special issue that’s outstanding with the DMV and it’s a matter of submission of documentation. And from what I understand, they can't accept all the documentation, part of it being a DOT number which is from the federal Department of Transportation. So the electronic processing sometimes is stalled out.

When it’s stalled out, if you have to in and register 15 vehicles, you are going to pay somebody to get online. They are going to register two to three vehicles. Then they are going to get it back to the back of the line and then continue the registration process.

So it’s an issue in processing, it’s an issue of online straight through processing. I would like to introduce Mr. Rizzo and Mr. Tejeda who represent one of the dealers here in West Hartford and I would ask to let them speak on my -- on behalf of the bill.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Okay. Sure, come on up. Just make the comments brief so that we can open up for a line of questioning.

MR. JIM RIZZO: Good afternoon, my name is Jim Rizzo. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Transportation Committee for allowing me to present testimony.

I am here to speak in favor of House Bill 6771 and what it relates to is online registrations that dealers are able to process right at our locations. I think you have my written testimony.

One of the things I would like to mention that is not mentioned in my written testimony is the few bumps that we have in the road that Representative
just mentioned regarding information that's already in the system or missing from the system.

And as an example, we pull up a customer’s name via the Secretary of State’s records, everything populates. If the customer does not have a DOT number, we can't process the registration. For us to get a DOT number entered into the system we have to send a fax to DMV and sometimes that might take an hour or two hours. I have had it happen to, it didn’t happen till the next day.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Okay let me ask you a quick question with your testimony. You’re saying the person who is requesting this information that you’re doing on their behalf does not have a DOT number? Why would they not have that?

MR. JIM RIZZO: No, no. They do have a DOT number but if it’s not in the system, okay, we have to send a fax to motor vehicle department to have -- with the DOT number on the fax and ask them to enter it into the system.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Would that be an out of state DOT I would assume?

MR. JIM RIZZO: Well, it’s a federal number. It’s a federal DOT number. If you see on the side of a truck it says U.S. DOT number

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Yes.

MR. JIM RIZZO: That’s a federal number that’s issued by the federal DOT. But it has to be in the registration system for us to process the registration.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Well, that raises up different questions because why would a federal DOT
number not be in a nationwide data base that I would think DOT -- DMV should have access to.

MR. JIM RIZZO: Well, it is. But there are occasions when a company has a DOT number but it’s no in the system. So what we do is we send the fax to DMV with the company name, we request them to add the DOT number to the company name. They enter it into the system and then we process the registration.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Okay, I want to stop you there. Why is it your responsibility and not their responsibility to make sur their DOT number is in the system?

MR. JIM RIZZO: That’s a good question that I can't answer. I don’t know where DMV gets their information from so I don’t know where --

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Right.

MR. JIM RIZZO: -- what the process.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): But if I’m going to get a DOT number, I’m a trucking industry representative and I have a truck with a DOT number it should be my responsibility to make sure it’s in the system. It shouldn’t be for you who then has to try and help register it to then ask DMV to find a fix is where I’m going.

Mr. JIM RIZZO: My assumption is is that it’s recorded in the federal system. We are the state of Connecticut and Dealer Track which is the company that administers the registration system, where they get the information, I don’t know. All I know is that I cannot process the registration without the proper information.
That’s just one item of a couple of the bumps in the process. One is another one there is multiple, there could be multiple addresses for lien holders, insurance information.

What I’m getting at is if the information is not in the system, we have to send a fax to motor vehicle to have them enter it into the system. And that’s all it takes is a fax but sometimes that’s time consuming.

The other part of my testimony is we are currently allowed to register vehicles non CDL, noncommercial driver licenses vehicles up to 26,000 pounds. On our end, the dealership end, the documentation for a vehicle up to 80,000 pounds is the same. Certificate of origin, the applications, insurance, et cetera.

What we are asking is to have dealers allow, be allowed to register vehicles up to 80,000 pounds that are involved in intrastate transportation which would be within the state of Connecticut. And anything that's involved in interstate as mentioned earlier has to go through the IRP, the IPR system.

And as an example it was mentioned that we are only allowed, dealers are only allowed three transactions at DMV. We have a sister company that is a full maintenance leasing company so our dealership sells to our leasing company.

We have a representative, sometimes we will do five or six trucks in one sale. We will have a representative that will go to DMV and he is only allowed to register three vehicles and then go back and have to do, you know, the balance.
If we are allowed to go up to the 80,000 pound limit and a lot of cases, many of our trucks and our customer’s trucks are involved in only an intrastate within the state of Connecticut transportation. And by allowing us to go up to the 80,000 pound limit, is going to cut down the lines, it's going to, you know, just cut down on the whole process and streamline.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. It seems like but that also puts a huge burden on DMV in terms of capacity to do all this. So we would have to understand the current process and where some improvements to the process can be. So I’m, I think it is something that we need to do a little bit more of a deeper dive into so we will look into that. And have you had ongoing conversations with DMV to work up?

MR. JIM RIZZO: We have not. We have not.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So this is the first they are hearing about it?

MR. JIM RIZZO: As far as I know, yes.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Okay.

MR. JIM RIZZO: So the process is the same from our end, the dealership, as far as documentation to go above the 26,000 pound limit. So I think it might be just an adjustment of the system. All the documentation is the same.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Well, maybe this is a case where legislation is not needed and it’s just working with DMV but we will look into both scenarios to see if there is effects. Do you have
-- before I open it up to question, did you have any comments, sir?

MR. LUIS TEJEDA: Thank you for the time, Luis Tejeda with Freightliner Hartford, based out of East Hartford Connecticut.

In order to expand as to what Mr. Rizzo had bought up to you, you know, to clarify the DOT numbers are held or issued by the Highway Safety Board. So it is a federal so whether a customer even does not have it, I could physically go online and obtain that number which is registered to access it.

There is no reason why there should be a streamlined within the DMV for records to match or reconcile to each other on an active account.

I heard the testimony of the director yet just a little while ago and they're I guess what they are trying to do which is always streamlining the process.

The Connecticut online service, I mean, online registration system, it’s in place already and it's administered by certain vendors. We used to participate in that up to 2015. The problem with that is that the bulk of our business is on vehicles over 26,000 GVW and we cannot justify just having a system that we cannot use.

Just the fact, I don’t know if any of you have been on the, at the DMV, but I tend to go personally from time to time when it is the third try. There are some inconsistencies as to when you go to a window as to what is required or looked upon. Where you may have all of the information that you think is required to register a vehicle and something is asked of you and you come with that and you get a
different person or you got a different office and something else is asked.

I think the system by being streamlined, meaning online, where you have to fill every box will standardize the procedure which now it isn’t. It’s to the interpretation as to how trained that person behind the counter, behind the window is or not.

The fact that you go in there and you get in line just to even enter the public room, and you are sitting there for 45 minutes just to get a ticket number for another two hours sitting in line waiting for maybe another 12 to 15 of our colleagues trying to register three different sections at a time with maybe one or two windows open, now you would start adding time where somebody in terms of man power is concerned on our end where somebody, it is an excursion. Somebody leaves at 8 clock, doesn't return till 1 o’clock with possible one transaction completed out of three during that day.

So my point is is if we can streamline or find a way to streamline the system where we have the ability to do everything online that we could, under 26, there is absolutely no additional information that is required to either be scanned or added to the system, at on the current form.

If you think about how those hours will compound during the course of a week that that particular personnel could dedicate to the public room now instead of a dealer window. It’s basically what our concern is. There is no -- the system in place right now even though it has its few kinks or that needs to be worked out, works fine under 26. They should not and it makes no difference to go to 80,000 pounds.
SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. That’s helpful and I think both sides, I think we are all trying to get to the streamlined end of the business and I know DMV has been working on that so it looks like we have got a little bit more to go.

But it also seems like the capacity standpoint and a process standpoint that we will look into. So let me leave it at that and I know we have some questions. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Thank you, Mr. Chair. The -- what is your average length of time to register a truck? In no -- with no glitches?

MR. JIM RIZZO: Oh online or?

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Yes.

MR. JIM RIZZO: 15 minutes, 20 minutes.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Okay. And on the side, I know you guys didn’t testify to this but how much to when somebody trades in a vehicle or truck and there is a loan and you have got to work out the details of paying off that loan and getting title, et cetera, what is the average time on that?

MR. JIM RIZZO: As far as the again, online registration? Basically the same amount of time because all of that documentation is already done.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So with the lender you’re --

MR. JIM RIZZO: Correct.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): 15 to 29 minutes.

MR. JIM RIZZO: All the documentation is done ahead of time.
SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): And now there seems to be this -- you’re testifying that, you know, you can only process two and then you have to sort of get at the start all over again and I think that’s what the previous Representative Case was implying as well that, you know, they're shackled a little bit about this. You know, the limitation here.

Someone from the DMV could you tell us why that is? So that we here sort of got an understanding of, you know, I’m sure there’s a reason behind that.

MR. JIM CARSON: Hi, Jim Carson. So we had done some analysis and what was happening with the business only window, people were coming up with multiple registrations to do at the same time and then the person behind them also had multiple registrations. That we actually found that if that folks that were waiting to do all of those business transactions were in the general line, or mailed them in ahead of time that they would actually get serviced faster.

So we took that business window, we opened it up to the general population and we found that we were moving customers quicker. So the folks that were able to mail in those registrations, we would then process them and then mail them back.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So is there a limit then?

MR. JIM CARSON: So currently in the general line there is a limit of three.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Of three. And how about the business line?
MR. JIM CARSON: Yes. The business line was eliminated and we use that window space to open it up to the general line.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So it's just, everything is a general line now.

MR. JIM CARSON: So if you --

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So you’re actually so you’re only limited to two then.

MR. JIM CARSON: And sometimes, some companies come in with two employees and they do six.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): At one time? Or three and three.

MR. JIM CARSON: They get -- they each get a number.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): But so still there is a limitation of three, up three?

MR. JIM CARSON: Correct.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Okay.

MR. JIM RIZZO: Excuse me. This is one of the reasons why we are looking to increase the weight limit allowing us to register heavier trucks up to 80,000 pounds online because we are only limited to 26,000 and that will help eliminate a lot of the transactions at DMV.

MR. Luis TEJEDA: The main issue is when it comes down to it is yes, now we have to send two of our employees that we are paying for on a four hour trek to try to accomplish what we could easily do from our desk through our title clerk within which it is there to do a certain function within the company.
The issue that I have is that they are limiting the two but that’s all great that we can mail it and so on and so forth, but let’s say that you make a commitment to me and we are about to deliver a vehicle and I tell you, Mr. Customer, I can't deliver your truck for two days or your personal vehicle for two days because we are waiting for the registration to come in the mail.

So it's either if we are going to do that by mail, maybe we have to institute some kind of temporary tag that we can provide to that vehicle to that customer within a certain amount of time in order for the original tags to come back or allow us to do it online where we can do it like it is now where you can actually physically go when you go pick up your personal vehicle when you do purchase it, you go out there with your new plates.

There is no reason why we couldn’t do that with anything over 80 because it's the same process. It’s basically the point of an online service.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So you’re able to process up to 26,000 pounds but anything --

MR. LUIS TEJEDA: Exactly.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): -- after that between 26 to 80,000 --

MR. LUIS TEJEDA: We are not allowed to.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): We have, you have to or you have to go down.

MR. LUIS TEJEDA: We have to physically go to the DMV and transact.
SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So, Jim, turning to you now, sorry. But why is that?

MR. JIM CARSON: Okay. So there is some detailed testimony that you have in front of you that was put together. And basically for the large commercial vehicles, those registrations are only done at the DMV because they are very complicated, there are some requirements that need to be checked with DOT.

There is possibly some tax issues, tax collection that has to happen for the IRS and so we do those complicated transactions at the branch offices.

If we were to open up the dealer online system, we have 900 dealers that use it right now. Those are basically for smaller vehicles and they're a lot more simpler and straightforward. It would entail a lot of system changes and training and also shifting a lot of responsibility onto those 900 dealerships. Because they would then be responsible for collecting the tax for the IRS and be responsible for handling some of the requirements that DOT has on those big trucks.

MR. LUIS TEJEDA: There are no taxes on vehicles over 26,000 GVW so we wouldn’t be collecting taxes for that. We collect in taxes on the online registration system under 26 so we are already with the burden. So they are not alleviating anything otherwise.

There is no difference in the process. It’s just that we are not allowed to do it. So we have to still submit the same federal inspection. The technician requirement form, the limits of liability which is the only difference.
We have to do that from those vehicles from 17 to 26 anyway. So we are not -- I don’t see any other additional paperwork that is required.

MR. JIM RIZZO: If there is delinquent taxes, for instance property tax, the system will not let us process the registration.

MR. JIM CARSON: You have your checks and balances so we can, so those will be adjusted at that time as well.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Thank you, gentlemen. Mr. Chair, I thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. Are there any other questions? If not, thank you. We will take the bill into consideration. Thank you, Representative Meskers.

REP. MESKERS (150TH): Thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Next up is Mike Pinto. Yes and then we will go into the public. And after mike we will go into the public testimony and back and forth if we need to.

MR. MIKE PINTO: Good afternoon, Representative Lamar, Senator Leone and members of the committee. The -- my name is Michael Pinto. I am here as the Deputy Director for the Transportation Department for the city of New Haven.

There are a number of bills in front of you before you that we would like to briefly comment on. You have our written testimony, I will just give you quick couple of highlights from that.

Regarding raised bill H.B. 74 -- 7141, AN ACT REGULATING ELECTRIC FOOT SCOOTERS. We are in
support of, we would urge you to support the bill. This is an exciting new and dynamic effectively personal mobility transportation and transit option.

However, by enacting 7141, it will give the city the opportunity and municipalities across the state to embrace the economy but also be out in front of it and be able to regulate it as necessary.

One of the things we have sort of noted, I mean, this technology is coming and we have basically seen it, you know, flood other cities and we would simply like to have the tools in place where it has been successful and where it has been successfully integrated quickly and smoothly, those places have ben of those cities and towns have been able to regulate it.

And we would just like to be in a position to do so as it, you know, as these vehicles or not vehicles, but as these, this personal transportation devices are -- come online.

As to H.B. 6509, AN ACT CONCERNING SPEED LIMITS IN MUNICIPALITIES. Again, we urge to support the allowing cities to -- municipalities to regulate the speeds.

We have gone to set speed, performing set speed limits across the city. We in New haven have as I think we have mentioned before, of the top 10 cities in the, in New England, we have the highest per capita or highest number of and percentage of walkers we have and pedestrians.

We know from studies that reducing speed limits and being able to set speed limits appropriately can reduce pedestrian fatalities. And by doing that we have also in, we have sought to incorporate and
increase the number of bicyclists and simply as much as we want to remove and eliminate the, you know, car or vehicle on pedestrian or bicycle impacts.

When they do occur and we know that they will, by reducing -- by being able to reduce speeds we can reduce injury and fatality.

And finally for now, regarding H.B. 7205, AN ACT CONCERNING THE ACCESSIBILITY OF ELECTRIC VEHICLES IN CONNECTICUT. We encourage you to support this as well.

The city has -- the city of New Haven has enacted a Green Park Program. We have had it for over 10 years and every year we see an increase in the number of people who participate in it and pay the fee, pay the modest fee to as an incentive to not have to feed the parking meters.

Creating these incentives as 7205 would do, would dramatically increase the -- would dramatically increase -- these types of incentives work and we know they do.

It would increase the number of electric vehicles on the road and the percentage and hopefully the percentage of electric vehicles on the road which will be whatever it is for congestion, will certainly help our sustainability of air quality going forward and making green -- and greenhouse gas emission. Thank you very much.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Mr. Pinto, for your testimony. You touched on a few bills. I believe we are waiting on some of the, some of your testimony so will review that as soon as we get our hands on it.
The one question that I will have and I know I’m sure my good chairman may have a few questions and a few others as well, you mentioned about the what was it, the scooters and the line bikes coming to town which is another new innovative mobility platform.

And I’m glad to hear that you’re willing to participate. I know it’s sort of new for the state of Connecticut but there’s also as I have been sort of trying keep an eye on this new phenomenon out west anyway, where it’s really proliferated, there has also been some concerns.

And so have you been paying attention to some of those concerns and issues so that if your town does fully embrace it and implement it that you don’t fall into the same traps and the same issues. So are you able to present some of the ongoing issues so that we don’t have to come back for another fix down the road?

MR. MIKE PINTO: I think part of this bill will actually help us address some of these issues going forward. So that we -- again, yes, we have looked at, you know, some of the issues of, you know, you have more scooters on the road, you have more opportunity for, you know, car on scooter impacts or whatever.

But we -- so I think by this bill will actually help us to address that and put in place the regulatory issue, regulatory framework that will help us embrace the technology or not, I mean, you know, but, I mean, we anticipate embracing it and to do so in a safe -- and do so safely.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): And just out of curiosity are you also looking at where these locations are? Are
you mapping that out now as to where the potential top offs are?

MR. MIKE PINTO: We are.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): And parking of these things?

MR. MIKE PINTO: We are. And we have already started looking because and obviously we have a large number of disabled people. And we have been working with our persons with disabilities department to try to avoid those land mines of how do you, you know, trying to keep these vehicles or the scooters, electric scooters in the street where they are not clogging up sidewalks where and interfering with wheelchair, the wheelchair population.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thanks. It’s a new thing, you know, I’m always open to new things but I just always worry about something that is going to happen that then we are going to get a phone call to fix.

But we can't have that stop us from moving forward on a potential good idea so I’ll leave it at that. I think it’s a good concept and but I’m very supportive of trying to make it work. So with that, Mr. Chairman.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you and thank you Mr. Pinto for your testimony here today.

MR. MIKE PINTO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): As you recognized, this is something where the ambiguity is potentially challenging, more challenging for our localities and the state if we don’t erect some sort of established regulations that we can point to and ensure compliance on the corporate side.
I’m also recognizing that there may be additional considerations that municipalities might need to consider and if there is ideas or concepts or thoughts you think that we are missing in this legislation, please continue to reach out to us.

Again, as an emerging technology we are seeing issues across the country develop. We see local ordinances being developed. We don’t want to preclude any of the considerations you might have in New haven may be different from the considerations that may occur in a rural or suburban area and so maybe there needs to be some flexibility or a special considerations.

And I think as a committee, we want to be pen to the idea that maybe a one size fit all approach isn’t best. But we do need to have some kind of state regulation in place.

MR. MIKE PINTO: And we are certainly open to flexibility. We are, I mean, as a one of the large cities in the state, we, you know, I mean, I certainly recognize that, you know, although we are a regional hub, you know, we have our first wing suburbs and then outlying suburbs have and the rural areas have different needs that we do.

And we are open to any flexibility that would need to be worked in to account for to our, for our partners there that are not directly in the city as well, you know.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Inherent in some of this is, you know, a lack of understanding of some of the background issues. And so we established in it a 100 pound maximum for e-scooters and I’m being told that that might be too large of a device and that
like the most common size for these things currently is about 35 to 50 and 100 pound electric scooter starts to resemble something different than a bike.

And the most likely location for these would be inside of bike lanes traveling, maybe in many cases in excess of 10, 12, 15 miles per hour. And should there be some limits on the size and speed we allow similar to how we do with e-bikes and?

MR. MIKE PINTO: We are certainly open to limits on the size and we certainly don’t envision these being any larger than what we classified as a moped. You know, under -- if it had an - if it had an internal combustion engine.

And we also fully anticipate and we would actually are looking forward to creating because we are looking at these multi modal type lanes, maybe we are talking about as we move forward not just bike lanes but slow vehicle lanes where we -- where an operator would have to cap the speeds on allowable speed at say 15 miles an hour. And then we would designate these as low speed lanes where the vehicle traffic would recognize it but it would be segregated from regular vehicle traffic.

And then you wouldn’t have the same conflicts of a higher speed electric scooter zooming through a bike lane but rather they would be affectively comparable speeds.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you. And I know you ended up testifying about four bills, this is one I think is probably the most complex. It’s new and unique. We are seeing problems across the country with states that didn’t adopt some regulations.

MR. MIKE PINTO: Right.
REP. LAMAR (96TH): So this is our first draft in trying to get us a baseline standard in place so we don’t see the problems that they are experiencing in other states.

You know, again, you testified inherent in this bill is also a change to the vulnerable user statute which would cover e-scooters as a protected class of vulnerable users.

But we are also shifting the definition of serious physical injury to great bodily harm. And I don’t know if you have experience with how the vulnerable user’s law was -- has been utilized in New Haven where we are seeing people hit in crosswalks but that original definitions didn’t apply.

MR. MIKE PINTO: Right.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): And so we want to change that to ensure that our folks are protected who are crossing streets and getting hit by --

MR. MIKE PINTO: Yes, we fully welcome that.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Okay. And thank you. For lowering speed limits, that one became controversial up here. The Office of State Traffic Administration currently reviews any application to lower speed limits in a jurisdiction.

And we are trying to figure out a way where a local traffic authority who has oversight over local roads can lower a speed limit below that which is established by the State Traffic Authority. The mechanism we settled on was we could go 15 miles below what the State Traffic Authority recommends. Do you feel that that is sufficient consideration for lowering --
MR. MIKE PINTO: I think so, yes.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Sure. Thank you so much, Mr. Pinto, for your testimony here today.

MR. MIKE PINTO: Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): I think there are few more questions, hold on.

MR. MIKE PINTO: Oh, I’m sorry.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28TH): Thank you. I recognize I’m in the uker seats but all the way down here. So good afternoon.

MR. MIKE PINTO: Good afternoon, sir.

REP. MORIN (28TH): I just, I want to follow up on what the, Mr. Chairman just discussed about the speed limits.

Is it -- obviously in your city and other cities it can be a problem and I think I’m reading where it’s really for a way to help pedestrians and bicyclists and stuff be safer. Is that your intent?

MR. MIKE PINTO: That’s our intent, yes.

REP. MORIN (28TH): So right now if there’s a problem, city of New Haven, most in the -- right in the downtown area is the speed limit set at like 30?

MR. MIKE PINTO: Its effectively 25 city wide.

REP. MORIN (28TH): Okay.

MR. MIKE PINTO: Unless the -- unless it is otherwise posted. I mean, some places that is 35 miles an hour. But if we were able to allow like a 15 mile deviation from that, that would bring us to
20 miles an hour which we think is -- and we think that, you know, between 20 and 25 miles, 20 or 25 is going to be effectively safe for most of the city.

REP. MORIN (28TH): So if it’s -- it’s a safety issue, I mean, are there any ways to appeal because I mean, this is -- I get the intent but doesn’t this lead us to a slippery slope? I mean, isn’t municipalities can start doing things they want? I mean typically the speed limits are designed by engineers that take a whole host of things into account I’m sure. You know, stop times, width of the road. What’s -- and it -- I’m just going to ask you.

If you take a -- you have a 25 mile per hour speed limit now in New Haven, you drop it to 10 miles an hour, I mean, if we give you that latitude, wouldn't -- that might acutely cause more problem than -- that’s not the intent? I see somebody shaking his head.

I’m just confused as to what’s the basis going to be to make a change in the speed limit that is designed by engineers for public safety?

MR. MIKE PINTO: See, all of our, I mean, all of our traffic safety, I mean, our department is a traffic safety. We handle all the locally administered traffic signals and we actually recognize we need to move people through -- move vehicles through the city.

We are not trying to -- we are not actually trying to, you know, create gridlock. We want, actually want, I mean, it is not good because that is actually not good for pollution problems. I mean, we want to move, you know, we are actually, you
know, working with, you now, much of -- with CMAC money to move vehicles through at a steady, at a slower rate overall but a more steady rate. And, you know, work on our traffic signals so that we actually continue to move them.

But then and when you have these lower speed limits overall, that we have if we do have the impacts that they're -- where vehicles hit pedestrians then they’re not fatal or their injuries are lower.

I mean, we are in the process of trying to balance, increase safety while also maintaining, you know, a road system that actually works.

REP. MORIN (28TH): And please don’t interpret my comments as being against -- I’m just trying to understand. Because I know that speed limits are put in place and they're designed for a reason with a whole host of things in place.

So if you -- in municipalities just would -- what would their process be? If we give you that ability then would you have to go through a design review or is it just something --

MR. MIKE PINTO: Oh, our process would include, you know, because it would -- you would talk about now have to retime lights and figure out how to actually continue to move that, move those vehicles through at that same, at that although say a lower speed limit but at a steadier rate.

Because we do recognize that if you have cuing problems at traffic signals and we have 250 signalized intersections in the city, I mean, we are acutely aware of the concerns.
REP. MORIN (28TH): And I have been through your city many times and I do understand heavy pedestrian traffic and you are compared to many places cutting age at trying to get people on alternate modes of transportation.

I don’t know if our chairman has anything to do with that but it's, you know, I get it. I’m just trying to get it in my mind as to how it's going to work but I --

MR. MIKE PINTO: Okay.

REP. MORIN (28TH): -- I appreciate your answers.

MR. MIKE PINTO: Thank you.

REP. MORIN (28TH): And again my intent was not to say that I disagree or anything. I’m just trying to figure it out. Thanks.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you. And, Mr. Pinto, if I might provide some clarification on that matter. The proposed bill outlines a process only for speed limits of 35 miles per hour or lower that has been approved by the Office of State Traffic Administration.

So the lowest you could actually lower it to would be 20 miles an hour using that 35 mile an hour baseline. So you could go to 25 -- to 20 miles per hour.

And again you would have to have approval of your local traffic authority and a public hearing in which the public gives notice. So there would be protections both by the local officials who sign off on the plans which are traffic engineers and police and you would also have a public hearing which the
public would have a chance to offer comments. Thank you. Mr. Chairman?

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Yes. Thank you. And just to follow up on that, I would -- I want to because of the line of questions is part of some of the concerns and the understanding of what this concept was or was not, I just wanted to make sure that as we progress if you were to move in that direction, drop the mileage, after going through the process, but then subsequently the public is up in arms because they don’t like it and it didn’t go according to plan that we incorporate some type of appeals process to that it can be fleshed out.

So I would just, you know, I just went to make sure that we leave room for a tail end to the process to make sure that there, the public does have an ability to weigh in if necessary.

So I’ll just leave it at that and are there any other questions? With that, thank you, Mr. Pinto.

MR. MIKE PINTO: Thank you very much. I appreciate your time. Thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): With that we are going to move into the public side. First up is Jeff Gross then followed with Rep. Candelaria if he is here. If not then on deck would be Pat Shortell.

MR. JEFF GROSS: So co-chairs Leone, Lamar and the entire committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify in favor of 7205. My name is Jeff Gross from Mansfield. I am the lead for the Clean Transportation for All Initiative of the Connecticut Sierra Club. And I have just a couple of amplifications on our written testimony. But first
would like to grant a minute to our state director, Samantha Donowsky.

MS. SAMANTHA DONOWSKY: Thank you. It’s good to see you all again and thank you of the opportunity to testify today. The Sierra Club of Connecticut places the highest priority on addressing the issue of climate change.

Two reports last year really highlighted the urgency to deal with climate change. In Connecticut we have a pretty strong greenhouse gas emission reduction target of 80 percent below 2001 levels by 2030.

And our transportation sector is responsible for more than 35 percent of our greenhouse gas emissions. So the bill before you today, we looked through that lens and know that this can really help us address the issue of climate change.

So 7025, will set new standards for the state fleet to adopt electric vehicles both light duty and transit buses. And it will help secure and sustain funding for the CHEAPR program which is the program, an incentive program for electric vehicles.

MR. JEFF GROSS: Thank you. And I would just like to highlight some of the advantages that will accrue to the state.

So first of all, I consider climate change separate and distinct from just good old pollution and the some of the state operations, particular diesel buses are in fact, you know, disruptive and polluting in local environments. They tend to be the urban areas, they tend to be the areas that are already just disadvantaged in terms of clean air. So this would be a clear win if buses are adopted.
And also I would like to kind of point out that having the state lead by example would not only apply to the case where electric vehicles are more and more common and, you know, state workers enjoy them at work, but also some of the regional transit districts are frankly waiting to see what the state is going to do with electric buses.

We would like to see them proved out and this would just be another example where the, you know, the larger collection of technical expertise in the larger program would help some of the more rural districts.

The other major initiative in this bill, my mind is changes to the CHEAPR program. I forget what that stands for. But it's, it has been well administered by DEET. It has been innovative, it's had input from various stakeholders including the Retailers Association. But the funding has been episodic and it's been, you know, kind of catch as catch can.

The payouts, the number, the rate of the amount of rebates has fluctuated based on the available dollars so I would like to see that provided with a stable funding foundation. And, you know, the various, one source is an increase in the registration that would be more or less not dedicated but would actually go through the general fund.

But we would like to request, you know, $3 million a year for a limited time period, 2020 to 2025 with -- so that's a fiscally conservative approach we think. And also with good luck that will be around the time that the need for rebates will really start to abate because we do expect to see an inflection point pretty soon where the electric vehicles will stand
SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Anything else?

MR. JEFF GROSS: So that concludes our, my comments.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. Thank you for all the great work that you and the club does, Sierra Club has been on the forefront of many important issues and climate change is probably one of the biggest ones we are facing so thank you for that input.

I don’t have any questions because your straight -- your testimony was pretty straightforward. Any other questions for the committee? Mr. Chairman.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you both of your testimony today and for seeing you again for the second time this week. I think you did a great job indicating how much the transportation sector plays in the air quality issues that we have in the state of Connecticut, specifically in our urban areas where we are running a lot of large scale utility vehicles and transit vehicles and the amount of damage that happens internal to our public health and our schools, educational outcomes are just tied to inferior air quality, specifically referencing Hartford, New Haven and Bridgeport which have some of the worst air quality in our country. So much of it attributable to particulate matter, diesel fumes and the role that transit plays in that substandard air quality.

So I appreciate that. But specifically we are asking that the state take a lead in this role and committing state dollars to purchasing electric
vehicles as we move forward. And I think that’s an ambitious goal and I am proud to support it and I think it would be great for our state to do so.

I don’t know if either one of you have sense though of what the cost we might be undertaking is? What does it mean to go to an electric version of a zero emission vehicle versus a conventional bus?

Zero emission bus versus a regular traditional bus that we may be buying in the future. Like those are the sorts of questions we were going to try flesh out here so we have a firm understanding of what it may cost in the long term.

MS. SAM DONOWSKY: Yes. So the state invests in vehicles right now so this is exchanging the purchase of internal combustion engine vehicles or diesel vehicles with electric vehicles.

I can share with you and I will after today some specific modeling around electric transit buses and the long term costs. The costs of the buses themselves is higher but over the long term, with the fuel reduction that you see and the maintenance reduction, we have models specifically for Connecticut and our temperatures that we experience, what would be expected. And the savings is significant on each transit bus.

So, you know, but there’s that trade off that it costs a little more upfront and so that needs to be worked through.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): And thank you and that’s sort of what I was referencing. It appears and we wouldn’t be the first state to go down this road and looking at California and other states that have tried to go down this it looks like they modeled out a payback
period well within that of the capital costs expenditure at the beginning.

So I think being able to evidence how this could ultimately yield financial savings in addition to improved air quality would be central to a lot of the arguments that this committee will have to make to our colleagues who are asking about that capital outlay challenge.

So thank you both for both your experience and the economic announcements that you’ve brought to bear and hopefully your willingness to engage with us as we move forward on this issue. Thank you.

MS. SAM DONOWSKY: Thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you both for being here and for your testimony which is outlined extreme clearly and very helpful, thank you.

I think it has been about 10 years since I had the chance to be at a sister school of a local school in Fairfield in She'an, China. And regrettably for the students there, right next door was a porcelain factory with an enormous smoke stack that constantly let out smoke this black and utterly thick and it didn’t matter what the implications were, this elementary and middle school continued.

So our kids at least don’t have that kind of an environment and we certainly have more room to go. You’ve rightly pointed out we have some targets to meet. I kind of wish I had had your testimony this morning because we were at the Finance Committee hearing listen to our new OPM secretary discuss the
budget and it would be great to know if any of these aspects are currently factored in in the thinking of, you know, the governors planning. And also specifically related to the rebate money to ensure that that stays secure because a lot of things have been moved around, pushed back, whatever.

So I love how you did this, thank you. It’s very super clear and I just wanted to commend you on that. And we will keep an eye out and hopefully be able to advance these measures to achieve the goals we have committed to.

MS. SAM DONOWSKY: Right, thank you.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. Seeing no other -- any questions, thank you both for your testimony. Next up is Pat Shortell with Scott Mullen. On deck is Tara Leystra Ackerman.

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Good afternoon. Chairman Lamar, Chairman Leone, Ranking Members Martin and Devlin, thank you for taking time to hear me today. I’m here to talk about -- my name is Scott Mullen. I’m the Director of Expansion for Lime in the northeast and I’m here to offer testimony in full support of House Bill 7141, AN ACT REGULATING ELECTRIC FOOT SCOOTERS.

Lime is a U.S. based company and we operate dock less mobility options across the U.S. and the world in about 100 markets currently. Our vehicles include bicycles, pedal assist electric bicycle, e-scooters and we are currently piloting a free floating car show model in Seattle as well.
Locally Lime recently completed a pilot program in the city of Hartford logging nearly 50,000 trips this year.

Since launching of first bicycle in June of 2017 and then our first e-scooter in March of 2018, Lime riders have logged more than 25 million trips worldwide. Truly this micro mobility revolution as I have heard it be called is unprecedented in its scale and adoption rate.

Our vision is to revolutionize mobility in cities by employing residents with greener, more efficient and affordable transportation options. Lime works in partnership with cites to ensure our vehicles are helping to improve access to transit, enable car light life styles and to address climate change.

Today, specific mode I’m here to talk to you about is our e-scooters. As in most states, Connecticut law currently does not accurately define these light electric scooters. They’re neither expressly permitted nor forbidden and House Bill 7141 remedies this legal ambivalence with a clear definition that includes equipment size and speed parameters, where in the right of way they should be ridden and where they should be parked when they are not in use.

As these vehicles behave essentially like bicycles, this new definition simply inserted after bicycle or electric bicycle to amend the existing law.

For some context, Michigan legislatures recently passed a similar e-scooter bill which was signed into law last December. Other e-scooter bills are currently working their way through legislatures across the country including Georgia, Hawaii,
Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, up in Massachusetts where I am based and Virginia as well.

So thanks again for taking on this simple but important update to Connecticut law and I look forward to working with the members on this effort. And happy to answer any questions you may have.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Scott, appreciate your testimony. As you’re promoting your product, I know it has been in different places across the country. You mentioned Hartford, now you’re looking in other cities. How many cities are you looking into bringing your product here in Connecticut? I mean, what is the outlook?

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Oh, I would say probably a half dozen at this point active targets but they’re sort of shifting every day. You know, we go and we do some searching, some scouting, chatting with locals to see would we be welcome? We don’t come in where we are not welcome. Would we have the impact that we want to have?

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So are you able to share which communities you have reached out to that want you to come or?

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Well, we don’t have any contracts for scooters yet. But we are having conversations with -- it’s the big cites, really. These things aren’t going to work out in very small towns.

It’s places with good access to transit, it’s places where we can actually get people a viable option that’s not a car. Now maybe it’s a train and a scooter trip, train and a bike trip, that sort of thing.
SENATOR LEONE (27TH): And so at the moment, you are only in Hartford, is that correct?

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: That’s correct. We just completed a one year pilot in Hartford.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): And how did that pilot go? Because I understand that has finished and I guess you’re not there at the moment?

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Yes. We are winding down operations now. That pilot has ended. It was designed to sort of inform a larger RFP process through the capital region council of governments as sort of looking at the data, what happened, and how do we rolled this out in a regional way and that process is ongoing.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So because there have been some concerns with some of the products out there and across the country, what are some of the lessons learned that you have had in the pilot here in Hartford so that we can be aware of them as other potential cities raise their hand?

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Yes, I think the positive lesson is bring bicycles and people will ride them. You know, this I something that is really interesting. We launched on June 8 with our bicycles here. I know this is scooter discussion but we launched in June 8 with our bicycles and in 16 days had 10,000 trips. It was very well received.

You know Hartford is making strides with regional transit, the train that goes up to Springfield, down to New Haven. They have got the fast track so there is a lot to positive momentum in place and I think the city will tell you, you know, maybe infrastructure is lagging a little bit and that’s
what they’re using our data that we provided for free from this pilot because our vehicles are rolling computers. We know where they are going all the time.

They're using that date to figure out well, how are we going to reconfigure the right of way to accommodate greater non car transportation? So it was a positive experience.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So no injuries or anything?

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Not that I know of. You could check with the city on that and we only had bicycles here and yes, 400 of them.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Any other questions? Yes, Mr. chairman.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you, Scott, for coming in today and kind of outlining the role that you as a vendor play in this market and how we determine the most proper way to regulate what we recognize across the country as an emerging technology that will be on our streets in one way or the other. And it looks like states across the country have learned from some experiences where this practice was unregulated or undefined or ambiguous in its legality and have gone through the process of trying to create a framework in which we can regulate appropriately.

And so I think that is what the approach is here for us today is to try to figure out the framework in which these things can be on our roadways, causing the least disruption, establishing clear articulated regulations and procedures for parking, utilization, speeds, weights, two wheels, three wheels,
handlebars, like we are going through the process of defining these things so that it would be safe users of our roadways.

And I do appreciate your help in crafting that because it has been sort of with your guidance that we have tried to sort of find the right definitions for things that we don’t yet know what they are on our roads. So I do appreciate that help.

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: You’re very welcome.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Some of the definitions that we have used to date I’m getting feedback on may be a little too broad. For example, this 100 pound weight limit is a substantial vehicle in some people's eyes and the idea that, you know, currently on market and we are looking at 35 to 50 pounds is the number I’m being told. At 100 pounds may be a little more substantive than we might understand.

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Yes.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): And both also the speeds of these things can in many ways each excess rates that we would not normally see in a bike lane and how we might want to regulate that a little further. I don’t know if you could expand or expound upon those two issues specifically?

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Yes. So the -- with regard to the size, you mentioned the 35, that’s what our current scooter is, about 35 pounds. And I think, you know, we are not the only player in the mix. And I think that general standards of legislation that is introduced typically starts at 100 pounds but it can go, you know, up or down depending upon the, you know, the conditions in the state.
And I think part of that is future proofing. For example if we say 50 pounds and I come out with a scooter next year that’s 51 pounds, it becomes a bit of an issue. So we have to tread that line to sort of figure out and some states are doing it by actually defining micro mobility vehicles as a whole. And so that’s encompassing bicycles and these one wheel things and hover boards and all sorts of stuff.

But you do bring up a great point. This is not just about companies like mine. This is about the average consumer also riding these things on the streets. So we have to sort to figure out what that balance is but it’s certainly nothing is written in stone.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you. We are going to rely on, you know, vendors in the field, private market that we see developing, we are going to need to establish some regulations in the state to protect our residents but to also provide this as a legitimate non-vehicular road option. So I think we have -- both of us are interested in trying to figure out good regulations.

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Yes.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): But again this is a new technology where we are not quite sure what we are defining. And so just broadly --

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Yes

REP. LAMAR (96TH): -- I mean, you know, actually specifically. What do you think an e-scooter -- what should we think of an e-scooter as? You said like we want to broadly define micro mobility, we did e-bikes last year which kind of gave us a sense
of where we were going, what we need to get ahead of. What is an e-scooter?

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: So and I brought one with me today. It’s not in the chamber, I didn’t want to try to get it through the metal detector but if anybody wants to see it out front we can arrange that. And I can also arrange through my colleague Pat Shortell to do a demo day with the full committee as needed.

Essentially our scooters are light electric kick scooters. When you think of a scooter, a lot of people think moped. They think sit down and they think throttle. These are things that you actually have to kick it to get it going and then there is a throttle. It has got brakes front and back and fenders and lights and a bell and all that sort of stuff.

But it’s sort of a, you know the Razor kick scooters that the kids all were riding. It’s like that but with a light motor, typically 250 to 300 watt motor. So we are talking about a third of a horsepower, right.

Our scooters cap out at 15 miles per hour which is that’s a good clip in a bike lane. Its, you know, a decent speed. Most cyclists can’t really go faster than that and that’s, you know, when I commute on mine and I’m in the bike lane up in Boston and Cambridge, I’m not passing anybody and I’m not being passed, right. It’s just that sort of comfortable speed.

Anything above 19 would in most states like you have here that three tiered classifications of e-bikes, we would fit in with class one which I believe is
sub 20 or sub 19. So that’s what we are talking about here.

It's a sort of small vehicle. It is flexible, it is made to go, you know, the average trip that we are seeing worldwide is about a mile. Eight tenths to one mile. So these are short trips, connections to transit.

Some of the uses we found through Portland, Oregon did a study, and they found that nearly a third of the people using their scooter pilot were not using the either own personal vehicle a TNC like Uber and Lyft. And that really matters for congestion mitigation and air quality that you mentioned in cities like Bridgeport and New Haven.

What’s more important to note and this is Portland, Oregon. This is the Amsterdam of the U.S. in terms of cycling. 40 percent of the respondents to their survey after the scooter pilot had indicated they’d never ridden a bicycle in Portland. So you’re actually tapping a market or a segment or a constituency that before probably was in a car. Right.

And so there’s power here in terms of mode shift and that's really what we are going for. They're small, unassuming vehicles but the impact can be huge.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. And that’s exactly what I’m hearing in New Haven. Folks who were not comfortable, did not like they saw the bikes for rent and they were like yes, that’s not what I want to do. But the scooters were much more attractive to a series of different populations in our city.

New Haven seeing a rebirth of folks moving back to the city, at all age groups, particularly folks over
the age of 55 and a local bike share program in New Haven has about 12 bikes sitting in, outside of Wooster Square Park which is just four blocks from downtown.

Those bikes are sometimes popular but often times often there. And I saw a couple looking at them, thinking about it, not quite sure and I asked them like hey, what is the hesitation? They're like well, we were just in at I don’t know if it was Seattle or Portland and they had indicated that they had used the e-scooters and had an incredible time using that technology and loved that and wished that was the option because the just weren’t sure they wanted to jump on the bikes.

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Got it.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): And so I think this is a potential option for a lot of our intracity travel that people we can get out of cars, we can try to, you know, attack it through fleet purchases and get rid of air pollution and smog in our cities and p.m., particular matter --

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Yes.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): -- emissions and this is another way that we can get folks comfortable taking a non-motorized --

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: You’re speaking my language. Yes. There is a lot of power out there.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): So thank you for your effort. We are going to rely on you again and other vendors and other people and private market folks to try to figure out what the right definition is because we don’t want to see the problems that an unregulated
market has created in some other states and cities. Like we are going to try to craft responsible legislation here.

MR. SCOTT MULLEN:  Right.

REP. LAMAR (96TH):  And recognize that technology.

MR. SCOTT MULLEN:  Consider me a resource. Thank you very much.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):  Representative Reyes.

REP REYES (75TH):  Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sir, thank you very much for your testimony. I am a living proof that somebody over 55 can ride one of those things. I actually rode one in Los Angeles and had a good time driving around Los Angeles on it.

At first it, I was a little apprehensive because I haven’t been on a bike in a long time but I have to admit it was very easy to use. Absolutely not a breakneck speed at all and something that I think has plenty of merit and I want to thank you for coming here and testifying on it today. Very interesting technology. Thank you.

MR. SCOTT MULLEN:  Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):  Thank you. Senator Martin followed by Representative Altobello.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):  Thank you Mr. Chair. So this electric scooter, foot scooter, what is it, yes, you know, I have ridden a Segway and I had a lot of fun with it.

MR. SCOTT MULLEN:  Yes.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):  So how is this any different than the Segway I guess in space?  Segway is in the
larger markets, like larger cities and, you know, you can rent one and tour the city.

Is this what you are sort of proposing here is that or this pilot that you had? Is that what you had here in Hartford?

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Well, we had bicycles here in Hartford but the way we sort of roll out new cities, this, it’s important even though they’re sort of fun little scooters and they seem like they could be a toy, this is bringing a new transit option to a city. This literally is enterprise level transit if we roll it out that way.

There is very thin profile and I apologize, I don’t have it in the chamber today but about 35 pounds, very thin. You stand on it. You’ve got your throttle, you’ve got your brakes right up here and you just go, you can be in a suit, no issues with that. And so very light footprint.

I know the Segway’s they may tip -- they may be more than 100 pounds, I’m not quite sure but they're very big and they sort of have a wide footprint that’s wider than the person is. So yes, these, you can park 10 of these or even probably 15 in a normal parking spot, just lined up right next to each other. So very small.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So side by side Segway and your soother, who wins? You know?

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Oh, well of course I’m going to say mine but I’m not sure what the competition is.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Thank you.
SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Are there any other questions? Seeing none, thank you so much for your testimony today.

MR. SCOTT MULLEN: Thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Tara? After Tara we have Claire Coleman.

MS. TARA LEYSTRA ACKERMAN: Chairman Leone, Chairman Lamar, Ranking Member Martin, Ranking Member Devlin, and esteemed members of the committee on transportation. My name is Tara Leystra Ackerman and I’m testifying today on behalf of the National Safety Council.

I am here to support S.B. 925 but I just wanted to note that we are supporting an effort by the Center for Latino Progress to address transportation safety here in Hartford. And to that end, we also submitted testimony in support of H.B. 6590 and H.B. 7203.

So back to S.B. 925, this bill would require drivers with multiple traffic infractions to take a driver retraining course before license reinstatement. For the third year in a row, NSC analysis shows that over 40,000 people were killed in motor vehicle related crashes with 297 live lost here in Connecticut.

While there are a many causes of traffic fatalities, human error plays a major role outlining a clear need to provide better education to all drivers on our roads. And this is especially true for individual whose driver’s license is suspended due to repeated moving violations.
Suspending a license by itself does not necessarily change dangerous driving behavior, nor does it keep dangerous drivers off of the roads with 75 percent of people who have a suspended license continuing to drive.

And one reason is because most Americans still drive to work and when a person loses their license, they risk losing their livelihood as well.

And in order to prevent these drivers from continuing to make unsafe driving decisions and losing their license again, we fully support requiring more education for repeat offenders as called for in S.B. 925.

NSC already operates a similar program to this in Massachusetts and our data shows that 88 percent of drivers who completed the specific driver training program did not receive another traffic violation in the three years after they completed the program. And this study was included with our testimony for your review.

I also just wanted to quickly flag, I did have the opportunity to review the DMV's testimony and I wanted to quickly address their concerns.

So with this bill, this was no expectation as to be a sole source contract. We expect this to -- the DMV to put this out for RSP to identify the providers. We believe that we have a really strong course of course and we think repeat offenders need to have a more comprehensive course focused on changing behavior. But we have no say in how the DMV sort of rolls that out.

And I also wanted to note that, you know, we are happy to work with the committee and the DMV to
clarify any of the language around the provisions on when a person has to take the course and justifying timelines as needed. And with that, I’ll take questions.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. Thank you, Tara for your testimony and I appreciate the efforts. This is sort of an issue we have been trying to flush out in the proper way to make sure that it can benefit and protect people on the roadways for anyone that does fall into a situation where they get in trouble with their driving habits.

And but what we don’t want to do is exacerbate the problem by having them drive illegally as a result because there is no alternative. So having further training, I think is very important.

But the crux of it is how we put the language together so that we can accomplish the goal. And I know as we are trying to do this DMV had and you brought it up, the DMV wants to make sure that we attack that the right way.

So as we look to improve upon this I would ask that you and the proponents of the bill in connection with DMV I think it’s a, this is a worthy thing to be doing. I believe that anyone who has additional training will be a better driver.

And especially for those that have gotten to a situation where its caused a problem in the first place, I think the alternative is to force them to get retrained so that they may have forgotten what the rules of the road are, that this a way to reinstall those rules of the road and that can only make this situation better.
So I think we still have a little bit of work to do
but I look forward to working on this because I
think it is a worthy cause.

So with that, any questions? All right. Oh, yes,
here we go. So used to looking over here and
everyone was satisfied. But I know Senator Haskell
is always astute with a few questions so please,
Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH): Thank you very much, Mr.
Chairman. Thank you so much for your testimony and
within your testimony providing a study that really
I think clearly illustrates the success of the DDC
DDCADD training.

I’m wondering though, in the study it doesn’t
provide very much information about the content of
that training and I’m curious if you might be able
to illuminate for the committee what it looks like
as a participant to undergo that training and how
many hours and what the instruction is.

MS. TARA LEYSTRA ACKERMAN: So it is an eight hour
course and it’s based on behavior training. I have
sort of a cell sheet that I can share with the
committee after if that would be helpful but it
doesn’t so much focus on the rules of the road but
it sort of goes through why you make the decisions
that you are making.

And it's really it’s in person because it is
participatory, people sort of talk through why they
are doing what they are doing and so why can make
better decisions and sort of putting people in real
life circumstances where they're potentially hurting
somebody to sort of show them what the impacts of
their decisions are and helping them to hopefully make better ones in the future.

But I have, I have sort of some sample curriculum that I’m happy to share with the committee.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH): Wonderful, thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. And other questions? Thank you, appreciate the testimony.

MS. TARA LEYSTRA ACKERMAN: Thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Next up is Claire Coleman and on deck there is Paulina Muratore. I hope I said that correctly.

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: Good afternoon co-chairs Leone and Lamar, Ranking Members Devlin and Martin. My name is Claire Coleman. I’m an attorney with Connecticut Funds the Environment. I am also here on behalf of the Connecticut Electric Vehicle Coalition which we helped coordinate.

The Connecticut Electric Vehicle Coalition is a diverse group of over 30 clean energy advocates, business organizations, organized labor, environmental justice groups, all concerned about cleaning up our air and protecting our climate and using electrification of our transportation sector as a key mechanism to do that.

Hopefully you have copies of our coalition testimony which lists all 30 plus organizations in the back. We are all incredibly excited that H.B. 7205 was raised by this committee. Greatly appreciative of your leadership in paving a pathway towards more electric vehicle deployment.
You heard from my colleagues at the Sierra Club that EV deployment is a critical mitigation tool for climate change. It’s also critical to cleaning up our air pollution. Tailpipe pollution is the local pollution source that most triggers asthma attacks, lung irritants, other public health harms.

And those impact communities of color and low income communities disproportionally because they’re more likely to live closer to highways and places where there is a more traffic. So this is a key environmental justice issue as well.

Our written testimony walks through some of the economic development benefits, the consumer benefits, and the benefits to all electricity consumers regardless of whether you own an EV or not.

There is an MJ Bradley report demonstrating that if we meet our long term electrification goals, all rate payers will benefit through about $500 million of savings by 2050. Because EV's increased load will reduce costs for our utilities, you know, we have spoken with UI and Ever Source about electrification. I think they're very excited about it because of the benefits for rate payers.

So we are excited about the proposals that are in this bill. The two key proposals I do want to flag that they were also put forward by the Lamont-Bysiewicz Energy Policy Transition Committee as top 10 recommendations so we are really excited the committee is supporting them as well.

Those are institution state fleet mandates for light duty vehicle and buses and sustainable funding for our CHEAPR program and these are key policies that
across the country right now are really a focus for how EV's, you know, how we are going to ramp up EV deployment.

In terms of, Representative Lamar, your questions about cost, I did have a couple, a little more information. Electric vehicles and electric buses are more cost effective over the lifetime of their vehicle. I can talk a little bit more detail if you’d like, I’m happy to take questions as well.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Ms. Coleman, for your testimony today and for the work of the EV Coalition. And in general I think it is insufficient to say that you have done a great job of providing both evidence and thorough research behind a lot of these proposals.

You indicated in your testimony and we can see before us a figure that does a comparative life cycle costs of ownership of zero emission vehicles.

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: Exactly.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): And if you might, if you wouldn’t mind, would you go into that a little bit more and help evidence for the committee how the life cycle costs of zero emission bus is less than a zero emission transit vehicles are less than that of a traditional?

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: Sure. So right now a diesel bus is about $450,000 as compared to an electric is a range from $700 to $85,000. Though I would flag that we can reduce the upfront purchase costs by doing aggregate procurements which is something that your legislation proposes that the CHEAPR board look at which I think is a great way to bring back down costs further.
But then if you take into consideration maintenance and operation costs, you have a little chart of some analysis compiling information from the Argon National Laboratory showing that an all-electric bus over its lifetime costs about 1.2 billion versus new disease 1.4 and CNG 1.3.

So it really is a life cycle savings so what we need to think about is how do we help, you know, our transit authority make -- pull that trigger. And I think we have to acknowledge the importance of the VW settlement funds in that and that will also help offset upfront costs.

So there is a, the state of Connecticut has 455.7 million over 10 years to spend on diesel mitigation. There has been one round of funding so far where the city of New Haven took advantage of that and is getting 12 new electric buses. There will be subsequent rounds of funding. We are hoping that other local transit authorities will also take advantage of that.

And the city of Bridgeport is also taking part in a pilot with five electric buses where they’ve received substantial federal funds.

So we are in a time of innovation right now where the state should be taking advantage of all those discount opportunities to make up for that upfront cost and then benefit from the lifecycle savings.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you very much for that testimony. And those folks in New Haven are always ahead of the curve.

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: Yes. (Laughter)

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Representative Carney.
REP. CARNEY (23RD): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Claire, for your testimony. Just a couple of questions.

Do you know at the current moment how many cars, I know it says we should have hit 100 percent of such cars by 2012, I mean, this is old legislation. But do you know if we actually hit that target as a state?

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: The alternative fuel.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Alternative fuel, hybrid electric or plug in electric vehicles.

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: So we have -- we have a statute alternative fuel vehicle targets. We don't have the hybrid or plug in statute. I think the analysis you might be looking at is that the governors counsel on climate change modeled or no? Am I --

REP. CARNEY (23RD): No. I'm just wondering if we actually hit that target. Because it says by 2012 we should have that 100 percent what is it, government purchased cars and light duty trucks should have been alternative fueled hybrid electric and plug in. I'm just, I mean, I'm not sure if you know if we actually --

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: That's a great question.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): -- if we actually did hit that target.

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: I think we will follow up with our new DAS commissioner and confirm whether that alternative fuel vehicle standard has been satisfied.
REP. CARNEY (23RD): Okay. And I’m just, because it kind of goes into my next question. Do you think and based on potential evidence from other states or other cities, do you think we can realistically hit 50 percent to be zero emission vehicles and 30 percent of all buses to be zero emission vehicles by 2030?

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: I do and the transition, the energy policy transition committee which I was on looked at these numbers carefully before proposing them for the governor's team. And what we looked at was what the current fleet make up is and the rate of turnover. So and what we found was there is about 15 percent turnover and the state fleet is about 50 percent light duty vehicles, and 50 percent sedans and trucks. So we can -- that's in total of 4.5 percent turnover annually --

REP. CARNEY (23RD): okay.

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: -- just to meet the 50 percent target which is really doable. We can do it based on current electric vehicle technology even taking out SUV's and trucks but there are really exciting -- there is a, you know, an all-electric truck coming online. There are several newer models coming out that are going to make it even easier. But even based on the current available technology, it is achievable.

REP. CARNEY (40TH): Okay. That’s good to hear. Thank you very much, Claire.

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: Thanks.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Steinberg.
REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Claire for testifying today. I have to relate that I had a difficult day on Monday with this committee when we were talking to the automotive dealers in the state of Connecticut.

It was on a broader subject of direct sales of EV's but I did ask them the question if we are going to achieve the goals that are set out by the governors climate change counsel and yet we are at less than one percent EV's in the state of Connecticut, how do we get from here to there?

And their response was well Volvo has committed to selling half their cars to EV's in a period of years. And I just didn’t feel like that was an answer that was going to get us from here to there.

And I recognize that ideally technology will help us get there. Innovations in battery storage will both increase number of miles per charge and also ideally as they’re mass produced reduce costs so we reduce the disparity between electric vehicles and internal combustion engine vehicles.

But and I, probably similarly, if we were to make a greater commitment to investing in the EV charging infrastructure necessary to give people confidence they could find charging stations and reduce the time it would take for them to get an adequate charge, that would also go a long ways.

But I just feel as if there is this large gap between the professed commitment on the part of car dealers to sell EV's and what has been demonstrated in -- on the road literally as to that commitment.

So much marketing expense apparently is built into selling cars. I see enough ads for cars all the
time in all the television that I watch. And yet I don’t see ads for EV's. I don’t see any real demonstrated commitment to electric vehicles being a larger and larger part of the mix.

I guess I’m just sort of curious. I appreciate your confidence in our ability to start meeting our goals. These are the state commitments to fleets and things of that sort.

But how are we going to get from here to there given the current state of affairs and the fact that the deadlines to these goal, milestone are sneaking up on us really pretty quickly.

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: So we have had a good news story in 2018. Connecticut went from about 4,000 EV's registered in the state to almost 10,000. That’s a huge percentage increase. I think about 78.4 percent.

And some of the -- some of your constituents from the EV Club of Connecticut worked with the DMV to get those statistics and I know we are all appreciative of your leadership on EV's. So thank you.

So I do think we are starting to see a rate of increase that if we can sustain or even maintain half of that, you know, 30 to 40 percent increases years over year we can meet our targets even though it does sound daunting to go from 10,000 to 500,000.

So I don’t want policy makers to think it is impossible but we do need these levers to really help make sure that that transition is sustained. And these rebates have shown to be incredibly effective in getting consumers to the dealers.
You know, I know I have a Nissan Leaf right now and would not have been able to consider that without the rebates.

So I, and I do think, you know, the EV Coalitions position has been we need an all hands on deck approach to EV deployment including all of our, you know, all auto manufacturers should be allowed to sell here.

I do note that CARA has been very supportive of the CHEAPR program, in fact helped develop it and then finish initiation. And I -- and, you know, I think would be supportive of programs like these. I'm hopeful, you know, to continue to provide sustainable funding for it.

So I agree that we, you know, we need to get our dealers involved and there is an EV road map process happening through DEEP right now looking at some of those education and marketing issues and other triggers.

So, you know, we need these policies. We also need the other things you have talked about. Infrastructure, education awareness, marketing. We have a lot of work to do in the state but I am optimistic that we can meet our targets.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): And I also was pleased to hear you mention that there are now electric trucks, larger electric vehicles coming on the market. You know, I have talked to some colleagues who say look, I’m never going to fit into a Leaf or a Prius or some of these other things. It’s just not, you know, they're not comfortable.
I think it would be a smart idea if manufacturers realized we need vehicles for people of all dimensions and interests.

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: Yes, well so even --

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): -- to expand the market.

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: -- there will even be a Ford F-150, the most popular truck will be an all-electric model.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): There you go. What an opportunity.

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: Which I think will be a game changer for a lot of people so.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): And one last question. There is testimony before us suggesting that we should consider propane vehicles as well for fleets. What is your opinion of including propane as a good alternative fuel for shifting away from gasoline?

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: The coalition and CFV are really focused on full electrification. We don’t feel the economics justify investments in propane at this time.

We should be going for the most cost effective that gets the most reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and pollutants. So investing in all electric is the way to go in our view.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Thank you.

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: Thank you.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you, Representative Steinberg. And well handled. He walked you as
close as he could to two very controversial issues and you adeptly pushed him away. It was great. (Laughter) Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you, Ms. Coleman.

MS. CLAIRE COLEMAN: Thank you so much.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Paulina Muratore followed by Amy Salls.

MS. PAULINA MURATORE: Good afternoon, Chairman Leone and Lamar and ranking members. My name is Paulina Murature and I am a campaign coordinator for the Clean Vehicles Program at the Union of Concerned Scientists.

USC puts rigorous independent science to work to solve some of our planets most pressing problems. Today I am here to talk about electric vehicles and in particular H.B. 7205, AN ACT CONCERNING THE ACCESSIBILITY OF ELECTRIC VEHICLES IN CONNECTICUT.

We think is a -- this bill is a critical step in the right direction for Connecticut energy policy namely, how the state will achieve wide spread deployment of electric vehicles.

As you know, the transportation sector is now the largest source of global warming pollution within the state of Connecticut and is the key sector to focus on in order to meet climate goals.

The most recent study by the Governor’s Council on Climate Change found that to meet our 2030 climate goals, 56 percent of all new vehicle sales must be electric by 2030. That is a major increase from current sales levels.

UCS recently conducted an analysis that demonstrates some of the benefits of making this transition.
Overall, we found that by moving forward aggressively with vehicle electrification and other clean vehicle technologies, Connecticut can reduce global warming emissions from transportation by 36 percent by 2030 and save Connecticut over $60 billion in reduced spending on gasoline and diesel by 2050.

But to make this transition happen, we need to do more to bring electric vehicles into the mainstream. H.B. 7205 represents a great start. It would provide three million in funding for rebates for electric vehicles and take important steps to electrify the bus fleet.

Electrifying heavy duty vehicles like buses will also have a direct positive impact on local air quality and public health across the state.

While we strongly support H.B. 7205 as a critical immediate step in the right direction, it is also important to recognize that eventually we will need a dedicated funding source. And for that, we were happy to see in December 2018 Connecticut and eight other states in the region commit to create a market based regional program to limit transportation emissions while generating a dedicated funding source that could be used on clean transportation projects.

We estimate that from this approach, Connecticut could generate over 60 million annually for clean vehicles. Thank you for your time and I’m happy to connect further about anything I mentioned.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you so much for your work and for the work of the Union of Concerned Scientists and for your organized work across the
greater New England area and trying to get states to buy in to clean air and more friendly future. I really do appreciate it. Are there questions for Paulina? Seeing none, thank you again for your testimony today.

MS. PAULINA MURATORE: Thank you.


MS. AMY MCLEAN SALLS: Good afternoon. Thank you for this opportunity. I have the pleasure of going after very smart and dedicated people who are saying just about the same thing that I want to say today, so I won’t go over it again.

I might pick up in a few things that I think I would like to highlight but in general, Acadia Center, I am from Acadia Center and we are in support of 7205 -- House Bill 7205. We support this bill because it will increase deployment of electric vehicles and reduce the air pollution in Connecticut.

I would like to say that the reducing costs for drivers, rate payers and tax payers is a critical component of this work as well. So it is one of the primary benefits of the EV's and the ZEV's and it’s the other primary benefit is the fuel savings.

Similarly, we have other maintenance costs that will go down when we use, when we switch to the electric vehicles. Consumer confidence in the EV rebates is one of the things that’s rising. We need to recognize that.

Despite the long term cost savings that result from buying the EV, initial sales prices often deter consumers from choosing EV's. Connecticut's
existing rebate program, the Connecticut Hydrogen and Electric Automobile Purchase Rebate or otherwise known as CHEAPR has successful spurred the EV purchases in the state by offering residents purchase incentives on electric -- eligible electric and fuel cell vehicles.

However the funding levels have fluctuated over time, potentially diminishing consumer confidence in the availability of the rebate funds. By institutionalizing CHEAPR funding, consumers will be able to rely on availability of incentives when making the vehicle purchase plans.

We just heard that Claire couldn’t have bought her Nissan Leaf without those funds. That’s true for another person I know as well. It happens all the time.

Additionally the governments board for the CHEAPR program established in H.B. -- established in H.B. 7205 will add accountability in terms of alignment with the states GHG reduction target, improved access to EV's by lower income groups and cost effective use of the rebate funds over five years of committed funding.

Finally, the bill proposes sustainable funding for CHEAPR though two sources. The greenhouse gas reduction fee already assessed on new vehicle registrations pursuant to Section 14 164C and settlement funds of over 19 million that have or will be deposited into the general fund as a result of the auto manufacturers fraudulently concealing diesel vehicle emissions.

We support all of those provisions to institutionalize, improve and stably fund the CHEAPR
program. Many of the other aspects of what I was going to say today have been covered so I’ll leave it there. And I'll.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you, Amy, good to see you again.

MS. AMY MCLEAN SALLS: Yes.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): And I think, I’m glad to have a you as a regular in this Transportation Committee. It is good that the Acadia Center is looking at Transportation Committee as a place to be. I appreciate that.

MS. AMY MCLEAN SALLS: Thank very much.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Are there any questions? Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Thank you Mr. Chair. Amy, thank you for testifying. You know, you are obviously aware that there are risks inherent in enshrining CHEAPR permanently given that for a state that has fiscal difficulties.

And we are aware for example that when it came to rebate programs for example a specific electric car dealer, car manufacturer who will remain nameless, had hit their numbers ceiling and is now making it somewhat more difficult for people who want to buy that particular vehicle to get access.

Is that something you’ve thought about? Should we consider caps of some nature if we are -- when we move forward with this?

MS. AMY MCLEAN SALLS: You know, I don’t have the answer to that other than to say that whatever methods we use to institutionalize incentive
programs for EV's are going to get us to the goal that we have been talking about. It’s one of those pieces of the puzzle that we have to have.

So as far as instituting caps, I think I’m generally not a fan of that because I think you do retard the investment of people. And people, there’s enough sort of I would say suspicion about if I buy an EV if I’m not going to have the place to charge it.

We want to really just focus on creating the infrastructure to allow more EV's to be utilized but also give people the opportunity to purchase them by giving them some assistance.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Now I tend to agree with you. I think I would like to believe that in a period of years we will be at the point where we don’t even need subsidies because the entire industry will have changed and costs will have come down.

But for the foreseeable future and given the huge gap between where we are today and where we need to be, I would like to make that cheaper money available for as long as possible. Thank you.

MS. AMY MCLEAN SALLS: Thank you. I think it is very important.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Any other questions? Seeing none, than you again, Amy.

MS. AMY MCLEAN SALLS: Thank you.


MS. TERESA BABON: Good afternoon, thank you for allowing me the time to testify here today. My
colleague Dave Kluczwki had just stepped out to get some water so I’m going to start. I'll introduce myself. My name is Teresa Babon, I am the Director of Assessment and Revenue for the town of Southington, Connecticut. I sit on the executive board of the Connecticut State Tax Collectors Association as vice president.

I am proposed to legislation which permits new and used car dealers to collect unpaid municipal taxes on registered motor vehicles. That would be S.B. 711.

Every motor vehicle owner in the state receives a motor vehicle tax bill in July. Every July. August 1 is the last day to pay those taxes before interest begins to accrue and those taxes are considered delinquent.

Every year, in every municipality a percentage of residents consciously or unconsciously fails to pay those taxes on time. Subsequently a much smaller proportion of those people then try to register a motor vehicle.

And as we heard earlier testimony, those people that fail to pay their taxes on time are sent a registration renewal that indicates they have a compliance issue that needs to be dealt with before they pursue that registration.

They do get delinquent notices from the tax collectors of various municipalities. They are given plenty of time to make sure that there tax situation is current before they go and register a car.

I chose to seek employment in municipal tax collector’s office. I chose to take classes and
pass the exams that were mandated by state statute. I chose to get involved and to stay current on proposed legislation and network with colleagues to be the best municipal servant that I could be. I strive to be my best every day to keep my collection rate up to help my municipality keep their mil rate down. I have a professional stake and a personal stake in collecting taxes in the town in which I work and live.

Tax collection is best left to the professionals that have proper training and whose focus and main responsibilities are to the municipality in which they serve so I urge you to please reject Senate Bill 711.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you very much. David, would you like to follow up on that?

MR. DAVID KLUCZWKI: Yes.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): And, David, for the record, just announce your name.

MR. DAVID KLUCZWKI: Sure. I’m David Kluczwki, I am the tax collector for the town of Fairfield as well as the co-chair of the legislative committee for the state tax collectors, Connecticut Tax Collectors Association. I apologize, I was caught in the hallway speaking with a Representative Devlin.

So I just wanted to also express my opposition to this bill and offer a couple other points on top of what Teresa had mentioned.

Now it does reference 14-33 which traditionally 14-33 is the most effective collection tool that tax collectors have when it comes to motor vehicle taxes. It allows -- it requires a tax collector to
report to the DMV when a motor vehicle tax bill goes delinquent.

That reporting withholds a registration from being renewed or a new registration from occurring and it’s the most effective tool that we have to get the towns revenue in terms of motor vehicle taxes.

Now, there is another section of 14-33 that states that the DMV commissioner can collect taxes on behalf of a tax collector or municipality. So I believe that’s what this bill is seeking to do. It's saying in place or not in place of but it addition to the DMV commissioner include new and used car dealers.

But what is problematic about that is to my knowledge, the DMV has never collected taxes on behalf of any municipality in the past or currently. They would not know, they do not know what a balance is on anyone’s car taxes. All they know is if someone is flagged to have delinquent taxes. And then they instruct them to call the tax office or to visit the tax office.

And so we would find that problematic because there is no precedent, there is no procedure already in place that the DMV follows so our question would be what would be a car dealerships procedure?

How would they ensure that the towns receive their revenue, the proper amount, in a timely fashion plus taxes are in arrears. So for example, if I, you know, I work in Fairfield so if the tax bill is based on last October 1 of 2017, and this individual moves from Fairfield to say Manchester, they go purchase a car in the town of Manchester, how do I know that all the way up in Manchester they're going
to pay those taxes? They are going to ensure those taxes are paid and then they're in turn going to transfer that money down to the town of Fairfield?

And then additionally, I can't speak for all towns but in the town of Fairfield as well as the town of Shelton, we have taken advantage of the increased, the new technologies that DMV has implemented in that what we do now is we are able to clear individuals, remove their holds in real time, online.

So I have offered the ability for people in a bind if they have to register their car that day I say to them okay, go online, look up your bill on our website or I'll show you how to do it, pay with a credit card and we can approve, we can -- I can see that it has been approved and we can clear you right away.

I have actually done this -- I can -- more times than I can count on my hands that I have helped people that have been sitting on the phone at their dealership. They pay over, they pay by credit card and then right way I clear them and they're able to register their car at their dealership.

So yes, it is not, you know, it is not as easy as dealerships registering or having taxes paid at their facilities but we do already have a procedure in place that seems to work.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you very much, David and Teresa, for your testimony. Are there any questions? Representative Devlin followed by Representative Carney.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for being here, it's nice to see you while
I’m not paying my taxes. And welcome to Hartford. So just a couple of clarifying questions.

Do you know how big of an issue that this is that here are situations where somebody is trying to trade in a car or whatever and there are unpaid property taxes? I don’t know how big of a problem we are talking about.

MR. DAVID KLUCZWKI: I mean, this was news to us. As far as we are concerned, it is something that pops up when, you know, for the most part people are aware that they did not pay their taxes and also for the most part, if they have forgotten, they go register their car. They understand that they need to pay their taxes. So they do what I just explained. They call up, they pay online or over the phone or they go to their local town hall and pay their taxes.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): So if somebody was turning in a vehicle, it had unpaid property taxes from that particular dealer, rather than having the dealer collect the money and be a middle man, that person could go online and make that payment direct?

MR. DAVID KLUCZWKI: Yes.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): To the town?

MR. DAVID KLUCZWKI: Yes, correct.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Okay. Are there any other situations where there is either, I learned from the DMV discussion this morning that you guys do have sort of real time communication so if somebody does have an outstanding property tax bill preventing them from registering their vehicle, they pay it, real time the DMV is informed of that. Are there
any other sort of connections if you will between tax collectors and any other entities?

MR. DAVID KLUCZWIKI: Besides the DMV or?

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Yes.

MR. DAVID KLUCZWIKI: Not any large agencies like that. I mean, tax collectors use other entities or are able to issue alias tax warrants to a state Marshall, to a town constable. They’re able to utilize attorneys but those aren’t like large agencies, its more or less just you have really old car taxes and you give them to a collection agency that’s able to, you know, to skip tracing and find them if they’ve moved out of state.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Right. Okay.

MR. DAVID KLUCZWIKI: But it's on a much smaller scale.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): If somebody was turning in their vehicle, how does the dealer know that there are property taxes due?

MS. TERESA BABON: Hi. If would not be up to the dealer to know the answer to that question. We are trying to put the onus on the party it belongs with and that is the tax payer. The tax payer knows that taxes come due every July. The tax payer knows most of the time if they have failed to pay those taxes.

And there was earlier testimony today again about another gentleman had mention that why -- oh, it as Senator Leone as a matter of fact. Why do you know need to do that, shouldn’t it be the tax payers responsibility and that’s what we are trying to assert here, is that the tax payer needs to be aware.
REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you. And I don’t necessarily disagree with that. And just so that I’m clear, because maybe I didn’t quite answer my question correctly or I’m just not getting it.

But how would if I go to sell a vehicle to a dealer, right, and there is an outstanding property tax bill, which I may or may not know about, how does the dealer know that that exists for them to actually have this proposal to want to make a payment?

MS. TERESA BABON: Well, that’s exactly one of our major opposition reasons is because there are no details. There is no suggestions as to how that would happen.

Currently there is no way that a dealer would have any idea how much, how many -- how much taxes a person would owe to a certain municipality. There is just no way they could possibly have that information.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Okay. All right. Thank you. Thank you very much for your questions. Or your answers to my questions.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Representative Carney followed by Representative Kupchick.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your testimony. I guess I have similar questions to Representative Devlin because I’m a little confused.

So if I go and let’s say I am going got a dealership and I purchase a new vehicle there. So and they’ll do all the registration for me. If I owe taxes on another vehicle, could be the one I’m trading in,
could be another vehicle I have at home. They are unable to register that vehicle because I owe taxes, is that correct?

MS. TERESA BABON: That is correct.

MR. DAVID KLUCZWKI: Correct.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Okay. So they would be able to see that I owed taxes?

MS. TERESA BABON: Yes.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Okay. So if I wanted to trade in the vehicle that had unpaid taxes, then they would also be able to see that?

MS. TERESA BABON: Yes.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Okay. So do you know then if while I’m sitting at the dealership and I go oh, I forgot. Would I then be able to go online at the dealership, pay those taxes on let’s say the town of Fairfield's website, and then would that automatically then send notification of the DMV. The DMV would be able to then say I guess release that and be -- so I could be able to register that new car I purchased?

MS. TERESA BABON: If the sale was taking place during a tax offices normal business hours.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Okay.

MS. TERESA BABON: And they notified the tax office that they were sitting at the dealership waiting for this transaction to complete so they could purchase a car and get it registered, then yes. The tax office should be able to go onto the DMV civils portal and do a clearance in real time.
REP. CARNEY (23RD): Okay.

MS. TERESA BABON: And within two minutes, almost instantaneously, the dealer would be able to go back into the system, process that registration and then it would go through.

The problem obviously would be if the transaction is at 7 o’clock at night or on a Saturday when most tax offices are not open. But that doesn’t kill a deal, it merely postpones it.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Right. I was thinking that too. Probably no deal will go down because of this so okay. Thank you very much for your responses.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Representative Kupchick.

REP. KUPCHICK (132ND): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for your testimony. While well intentioned, I think this is a solution in search of a problem. In my opinion.

So it’s easy enough. You should -- you're supposed to pay your taxes. And if you don’t, while I understand, because I have a lot of family members including my 81 year old father who still sells cars at Honda of Westport and would love to be able to make sure he doesn’t miss any deals, you can easily pay your taxes and complete the transaction.

I just can't imagine DMV taking on this responsibility in addition to everything they already have. To me this signals adding new employees to the DMV and that's something I am not in favor of.

I am actually in favor of making it easier for them to complete the tasks they already have to do. So I appreciate your testimony in highlighting the
complications involved with this piece of legislation and it’s been helpful to me as a committee member so thank you very much.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Hi, Teresa, how are you?

MS. TERESA BABON: Hi, I’m fine, how are you?

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Just one quick question. So when the flag goes up with the purchase of a vehicle at the car dealership, they have to call, they can do it online. How about if a person is -- it doesn’t apply to property taxes, right? It’s only for motor vehicle taxes here, correct?

MS. TERESA BABON: True.

MR. DAVID KLUCZWKI: That's correct.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So how about the, on the weekends what you’ve, if I could hear you correctly, that paying online is really in real time applicable because there is somebody during working hours on the weekends they would not be able to have that option.

MS. TERESA BABON: Correct.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So they went and bought a car on Saturday, gee, the flag went up. You owed some back taxes for a vehicle, you’re going to have to go and take care of this on Monday or do it online but it’s not going to be able -- we won’t see that you paid it until Monday until you guys process it.

MS. TERESA BABON: Right.
SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Correct?

MS. TERESA BABON: Correct.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Okay.

MR. DAVID KLUCZWKI: Yes, they would have to if they paid it online over the weekend, they would just have to call us first thing --

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Yes.

MR. DAVID KLUCZWKI: -- Monday morning.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): And I think that's what sort of may have started all this is that, you know, the dealers feel that they're losing sales on the weekends or after hours, they can't process it. They felt that they gee, we could expedite this and not lose that sale.

You know, so they can still do it online but only during working hours. Can do it anytime however, it won't process until regular hours. Thank you. Go ahead you wanted to say something? Go ahead.

MS. TERESA BABON: Well, I just wanted to say tax collection is not so easy even a caveman could do it, if you pardon the expression, that Diet Coke commercial.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Hey, hey, why.

MS. TERESA BABON: It -- there's schooling, there's classes, there's certification, there's exams. There's all kinds of things.

It's not as easy as looking at a bill that might be in front of you and collecting $50. There could be fees, there could be additional interest. It could be the first day of the month, there might be new
interest compared to yesterday. There is absolutely no way that those dealers would have any idea how much to collect.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Got it. Yes, absolutely. Thank you so much.

MS. TERESA BABON: You’re welcome.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Senator. Thank you both for your testimony today.

MS. TERESA BABON: Thank you.

MR. DAVID KLUCZWKI: Appreciate it.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Gannon Long followed by Mike Morrissey.

MS. GANNON LONG: Good afternoon. Thank you for having me, chairs and members of the committee. Thanks for being here. My name is Gannon Long. I am a Hartford resident. I’m an avid pedestrian. I also coordinate the Road to Zero Project which is funded by the National Safety Council and is part of the Work of Transport Hartford at the Center for Latino Progress on Park Street in Hartford.

So I’m here to talk about both bill 7203 about pedestrian safety at crosswalks as well as bill 6590 which is about speed limits in municipalities. And I have submitted written testimony on both of these so I hope folks will be able to look at that and I know you guys are good at that, so thank you.

As we talk about these bills and all, I can get a little bit more into the specifics. We have talked a lot about — but I just want to get kind of a broader lens and talk about how we are discussing transportation issues here in Connecticut. Thinking
about the environment and thinking about public safety and health and thinking about equity.

We have had a number of people testifying here today so far. They are talking mostly about how they can register their cars more simply, how they can avoid taxes on their cars and we have heard a lot of discussion about electric vehicles which I think is really important for the state to invest in that in the long term.

What you will note is that these are all issues that people who drive cars face. And in my city, over 30 percent of households do not have a car at all. In my neighborhood, like seven others in Hartford, it is over 40 percent.

So when we are talking about transportation for folks who do not own cars and sometimes don’t own bikes, and often can’t afford to ride the bus because it costs $1.75 each way, I am encouraging the folks in this committee and in this body to consider these bills from the perspective not just of someone who is driving to work for 15 minute a day each way but as the most vulnerable users of roads in our state.

And in thinking about the human impact of what it means when a pedestrian approaches a crosswalk. In some neighborhoods in our city, in many cities across the state, there is very minimal pedestrian safety infrastructure that allows people to even cross the street for as much as a mile or a half a mile in each direction.

So if somebody crosses a street in those cases and a car hits them, they're in the way of the car. I encourage you all to think about what that means
when you are stepping up to a crosswalk and cars are going in front of you at 50 miles an hour.

And should you have to step into it? Putting yourself in harm’s way? In order to cross the street? You know, if you are talking about a neighborhood like [inaudible 02:31:19] just a few blocks from here, there's many -- there's 50 percent of households do not own cars. It’s a highly residential, transit dependent, pedestrian, bicycling if folks can get a bicycle community.

And it's important to protect people because we all deserve to be able to walk safely in our own neighborhoods.

The other bill is about speed limits in municipalities. So this is introduced and I want to thank everybody who has been working on this bill. Representative Concepcion I know is in and out, he has got some things but he has been really advocating for these issues in Hartford as well as Representative McCarthy Vahey.

And when you think about the state of Connecticut, our Complete Streets Policy that this this body passed happened in 2009. In 2014, this Department of Transportation began kind of formally implementing Complete Streets Policy through their planning. So that was about a five year process. Now here we are, another five years later.

This committee, other groups in this building invest huge amounts of money in transportation and in redesigning our spaces. We know that there are a lot of job openings at DOT. We know that our cities are under resourced, are unable to, you know, have higher crash rates, lower car ownership, more car
traffic. And have lower ability to enforce speeding and other traffic violations to be able to fund our own enforcement operations.

When you think about, you know, and I kind of described in my written testimony the process that Hartford’s traffic engineer had to go through in order to lower speed limits to common sense, community approved levels. You know, there are several school zones in Hartford where they’re 30 miles an hour is the speed limit. That is unheard of when you talk to national Safety advocates.

And for our city to spend months going through tediously line by line to submit it to the state, for the state to tell them that it was on the wrong form and to resubmit it, this is a lot of work for both the city and the state.

And when we as people who live in the community were asking for better use of resources, we are asking for more crosswalks, we are asking for more safety infrastructure, and we are constantly told we don’t have resources for it. Why are we doing the same job twice?

Why is the state of Connecticut, you know, most of these changes get approved by the state. So why go through that process? Why not make that easier and especially in a space that is traditionally focused on getting cars through our neighborhoods quickly, you know, transportation engineers have divided our city, have cut off people in our city from our river and from our other neighborhoods.

And when we think about how we are making these decisions, they’re frequently made by people who do not invite the people who live in our communities to
be part of the planning process. And then we are forced to live with the decisions made by people who never visit our neighborhoods for the next 30 and 50 years.

Especially in this committee, I really implore you all and ask you and appreciate when you do invite the public and get more diverse input into the decisions you make. It’s not just about electric vehicles.

We have to make it safer for people to be able to walk in our state and in our neighborhoods. I’m not sure where I am on time but I’ll be happy to take any questions if folks have any and thank you so much for listening.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you, Gannon, for your testimony today. You’ve exceeded the time but it was all right.

MS. GANNON LONG: Okay.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): It was well received so I do appreciate the time you spent here today and in past Transportation Committee meetings.

And I think a lot of your comments to the point of how we view roads, are they the places where cars go, or are they building blocks of our community. Are they the places that, you know, separate us from our neighbors or are they places that help us cross the street to visit our neighbors.

MS. GANNON LONG: Yes.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): And I think how we construct our conversation about car traffic and who has priority and what locations should in fact start with the people who live there, not the people who are
cutting through those communities. So I do appreciate your comments in that regard.

Specifically to the idea of allow local traffic authorities to make the determination of what appropriate traffic speeds are in the neighborhoods and not a state bureaucracy who is often times just looking at some plans on a piece of paper and writing a number on them.

We can evaluate local conditions that may be unique to the city of Hartford, city of New Haven, city of Stanford, and recognizing that 35 mile per hour speed limit next to a school is not appropriate.

MS. GANNON LONG: Yes.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): And then the local community can make that determination using a local traffic engineers and local police departments. And I think that's a reality that is seen in a lot of communities in our state and I think your experience in Hartford is true to that.

I have heard from other traffic planning engineers is that they made submissions to the state and which it was immediately kicked back saying no, it doesn’t work, we think it is 40 miles per hour.

And I have heard from Jim Travers in Stanford and from Doug Houseladen in New Haven similar stories about like why does the state feel the need to determine what our appropriate speed limit is when we have a better handle on it. So your experience in Hartford is not unique to you but in fact felt broadly.

MS. GANNON LONG: Yes.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): So thank you.
MS. GANNON LONG: Yes, thank you.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Are there questions for Ms. Long? Senator Chairman.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, thanks for your testimony. I like some of the comments that you made and you're right, we sometimes don't take into consideration some of the communities because our society has sort of grown up around the vehicle and the mobility that it has afforded and sometimes that has resulted in pedestrians being lost in the mix.

So the one thing that I am -- was listening in to your comments were the fact that some of these communities that may not have been taken into consideration where a high percentage don't have vehicles is maybe something we need to be aware of.

And I'm wondering as we try to craft legislation, especially with the crosswalks, there are crosswalks where I think it isn't prudent that pedestrians be given the greater concern but then there is other places where maybe the reverse is true.

So maybe we consider it as the population if there is a high concentration of pedestrians versus a place where there is a low concentration of pedestrians so it's an idea I want to try and flush out a little bit and be happy to have your input as we go forward on that.

MS. GANNON LONG: Sure.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): But to the extent we also want to make sure pedestrians are safe but at the same time as I can tell you from experience, some pedestrians put themselves in harm's way and walk
very slowly across the intersections, don’t look up at intersections. It is frustrating for drivers that are trying -- I don’t think any driver wants to hit a pedestrian.

So especially in busy crosswalks, they should be moving quickly and in urban centers, I do see that they do not move quickly so that can cause frustrations and god forbid an accident. So I think we have to do educating on both side of the issue here.

MS. GANNON LONG: Yes, and just to the issue of pedestrians, you know, when we think about the Complete Streets and the vulnerable user and again I appreciate Representative Lamar trying to change that language and protect folks, you know, from bodily harm as opposed to serious injury I think it was you said.

When you think about pedestrians, you know, the vulnerable user statute in the state of Connecticut as well as Complete Streets framework really focus on the person who is the most vulnerable on our streets. So if we have made the -- if we make our streets safe for somebody who is in a wheelchair or for somebody who has one leg and is walking, you know, on crutches or for a baby in a stroller and a mother or an old person with a walker. If those people are safe, pretty much everyone else is going to also be safer.

However, if we only focus on the safety of drivers, those other folks are not necessarily safer because of that.

So what you’re talking about, you know, and I have more experience in an urban center, you know,
Hartford is almost 400 years old. So it was certainly not built around an automobile. You know, some of our streets are places where we have high residential, high commercial. Folks walk around and they want to be able to walk around in their neighborhood.

It might happen that the state decided to put a state highway with a 35 mile an hour speed limit right though there as in the case of 44 but to -- when pedestrians are distracted and walk through and are slow, you know, they are in their neighborhood and they’re kind of, I think that’s kind of your right to be able to walk through your neighborhood as opposed to the right of somebody to speed quickly through it.

But when a pedestrian is distracted and bumps into a car, no one in the car gets injured. When a car driver is distracted and hurts a pedestrian that’s a serious crash and a serious chance of injury. The faster cars are going, the more likely the person is to die. The risk goes up I think seven times if you’re going 30 miles an hour instead of 20.

So for the state to restrict and, you know, every month and month and month that we wait for state bureaucracies to change these speed limits, people are more at risk of dying from car crashes.

We have kids in our schools that walk up to two miles to get to school if they don’t have public transportation, less than two miles. So for 45 minutes each way, each corner, kids are exposed to speeding commuters coming through their neighborhoods on their way to work.
And I just really encourage all of us to think about how we design roads and transportation priorities around those folks with strollers and walkers and going to school, walking, taking the bus, you know, not just about how do we get tax rebates for electric cars although I think that is also important.

But, you know, I appropriate your attention and if there is something that we can do to follow up I really appreciate your time.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. I appreciate that as well and I’m sensitive to the neighborhood comments but there is a balancing act that we have to do here. We can't just eliminate vehicles to give pedestrians complete right of way when traffic does have to flow. So I think there is balancing here that we will have to find and I’m open to it.

MS. GANNON LONG: Okay. Thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Reyes.

REP REYES (75TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Madame, thank you very much for your testimony. Coming from the great city of Waterbury and dealing with a lot of issues there with pedestrians.

And you bring out a -- you raise an excellent point. The distracted driver goes a long way with distracted pedestrians. And we then we have the issue of folks that are incapable of making a proper decision anyway. They're just going about their lives just walking across the street even if the light is green.
So we have a litany of issues there and I think that you raise a great, great point in that we need to consider the most vulnerable person and that would be somebody who is -- has ADA issues and if we can solve it for them I think we can actually function.

The -- there is one point I would also wanted to talk about with the not only speeding in the municipalities but the safety of folks crossing the crosswalk.

This new phenomenon of two cars going passed every red light, I would never take my foot off the sidewalk to put my foot on a crosswalk in Waterbury, in downtown Waterbury and I don’t see that being any different in any of these inner cities.

It’s something that I think that at some point we are going to have to really address on a state level because that is really a concern. But I thank you for your advocacy and I want to have another conversation with you. Thank you for coming today.

MS. GANNON LONG: Thank you, sir.

REP. REYES (75TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you, Representative Reyes. And I think Representative brings up a point that we see throughout the state that you are highlighting is that and requiring someone to step into a crosswalk in order to trigger a car to stop places people in great vulnerability --

MS. GANNON LONG: Right.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): -- at intersections throughout our state. And similarly as you mentioned, and Office of State Traffic Administration determining
that a 35 mile an hour road turning onto another 35 mile per hour, that is an extraordinary threat --

MS. GANNON LONG: Yes.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): -- for most people who are crossing the street and who are required to step into a crosswalk to have that car triggered to stop.

And then that is not, it's not an easy movement for a car to make to have to, you know, be allowed to travel at that rate of speed on local roads and small, dense urban neighborhoods.

I think our local traffic administration can make a more accurate determination of what the most appropriate speed is. And I think we can provide instruction to a lot of drivers and their cities that you see someone standing at the curve, you stop for them. So thank you very much.

MS. GANNON LONG: Yes, and then and just a -- we did speak to some folks at DOT and we kind of talked about that and just tried to really present that human experience of what a human being does in that situation because I think there is a lot of, you know, there is a lot of cause to look at data and studies and speed studies and waiting and planning and things like that.

But this is a really urgent issue for people's safety. In Hartford last year we lost more people to car crashes then we did to homicides. We lost nine people in our city streets. So it’s a very salient issue and I appreciate everybody’s attention to it.
So and thank you, sir, I would like to follow up with you a little bit more to talk more about Waterbury. Thanks.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you very much. And I think as you know, I largely got elected to the state legislature based upon my work writing Complete Streets ordinances in the city of New Haven and this is something that I have been working on for about 15 years and I don’t know that I did it as well in New Haven as you are doing it now in Hartford. So I want to say thank you for your continued work and effort in the city.

MS. GANNON LONG: Well, that’s generous and I really appreciate your leadership so thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Mike Morrissey followed by Susan Smith.

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: Chairman, other members of your committee, good afternoon. I am Mike Morrissey, Director of Government Affairs and Business Development for the Alternate Fuels Coalition of Connecticut.

Our organization is a stakeholder in our nations Clean Cities Program and some of its local coalitions. We are here to speak in support of H.B. 7205 provided the language of the bill be expanded to include some additional alternate fuels such as propane.

In 1992, the Department of Energy identified six primary alternatives to conventional fuels, two of which were hydrogen and electricity. The other two were propane gas, natural gas and a couple of additional fuels.
The purpose of identifying these alternatives was to reduce our dependency on foreign oil and to help improve the air that we breathe in this nation.

When it comes to alternative fuels, there is no one silver bullet to get that job done. Instead, in the case of the defined alternatives, there are a bunch of silver bb's. This bill as drafted seems to only identify two bullets. And we need to see it expanded to include some of the bb's like propane gas.

Propane is the third leading transportation fuel in the world with over 27 million vehicles operating worldwide. In the United States, propane is clean burning and can save 40 to 50 percent when compared to conventional fuels.

Propane is shovel ready today to assist Connecticut in reaching its 2030 greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals.

Infrastructure cost to support the dispensing of propane are comparable to conventional fuels and because of it's portability, can be installed virtually any place in the state of Connecticut.

Electrification and hydrogen are not available today especially with medium and heavy duty vehicle applications. These latter applications account for almost 50 percent of our air pollutants in the transportation sector.

Propane is an ideal fuel which for example could be used to power our transit and paratransit vehicles in the state. Some of the -- a lot of these vehicles use 5,000 to 6,000 gallons of gasoline each per year.
Propane is a proven alternative fuel in Connecticut. Almost 500 school buses once operated on diesel fuel in our state now operate on propane. Nationwide, there are over 17,000 school buses carrying almost a million kids a day operating on propane.

And more closely to home, Nestle Waters is based in Stanford, Connecticut now operates just over 1,000 propane vehicles here in the state of Connecticut and around the nation.

So in closing, we support this bill. We feel the language needs to be expanded to include some of the alternatives to assist the state in achieving its ambitious goals as set forth for 2030. That completes my testimony. And I would be happy to answer any questions.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Mike, for your testimony today. Chairman.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Morrissey for your testimony. In your testimony as you are talking about and you mentioned that it would be easy to ramp up the infrastructure on propane. Can you elaborate on that because as I see propane now, how I visually see it anyway, its, you know, it’s like an oil truck. It drives around delivering propane to key locations.

If we were to have propane automobiles, where is the infrastructure in place for someone to pull up and, you know, fill up as they would like they do normal day vehicles? Or even like with electric vehicles, we have charging stations that over time there will be more of them but they can actually do that.

So propane can be, you know, highly flammable and combustible and it’s always another concern. So I
would be reluctant to have propane trucks driving all around to dispense propane into automobiles. So maybe you an elaborate on how the -- you said it was easy to do so can you just elaborate there?

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: Yes. I think a great question. You’ve raised a couple that I’ll answer right now. First, we are not professing that propane is a fuel for passenger vehicles. It’s a fleet fuel. Okay. And as such, portable dispensers are easily fabricated and installed at the fleet locations to allow a fleet owner to operate and fill their own vehicles. And we are doing that all over the place.

For example, the city of Waterbury has got 149 school buses. We have got an 18,000 gallon propane tank out there with two dispensers. That was installed in basically one day. Okay. It came in prefabbed and we installed it.

More closely to home here, the Pride Station that’s being built just north of Hartford is going to have hydrogen fuel, Tesla chargers, conventional chargers and propane gas all in the same site. It's unique.

So that will be publicly available to fleets who may be only operating a few different vehicles and don’t want to install a dispenser or go to that expense. But that can be done in any part of the state, Senator Leone.

And in regards to safety, propane has proven itself to be exceptionally safe. I mean, we have got right now a million kids a day on propane powered school buses that are being transported safely.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. No, and that’s good to hear on both counts.
MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: Thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Because I was envisioning automobiles, not so much fleet, so that answers that question.

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: Great.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): And you’re right, it is safe and once it is in there. Where I see the safety concern is at the actual dispensing of the liquid into the bus or whatever.

And when you mentioned having electric next to it, I, the first thing that came to mind is if there is a spark that could combust, you know, because there is a very strict protocol when making sure you’re grounded before you’re dispensing for -- to prevent static electricity and so forth.

But it sounds like those things have been addressed and I would hope they continue to be addressed. So I think you have answered my, some of my concerns with the roving propane dispensing and if it’s at a location for a fleet and you’re saying it can be installed in a day and that then is a fixed installation, correct? Not a portable one?

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: Correct. Yes.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Okay.

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: Yes, let me just comment.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): That helps me out.

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: You know, let me just comment. I mentioned worldwide there are over 27 million vehicles running on propane. When you go to countries like Italy or the Netherlands, on your island, you will have gasoline, diesel, and propane
fuel all available and that’s all self-service. We have low emission nozzles which limit a fraction of the amount of propane being released into the atmosphere.

And, you know, when it comes to fleets, the employees are properly trained so although you may have a concern for safety, it’s proven itself to be exceptionally safe.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, appreciate those comments.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Thank you for your testimony.

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: You’re welcome.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): This might be out of that area for you to comment on but I’m just curious. A propane truck so like you have a diagram in your testimony from Nestle Waters.

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: Yes.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): So those are specialty trucks with a propane engine.

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: Yes.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Is there a comparable cost to a gasoline engine truck versus a propane engine truck or are they more expensive, less expensive?

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: Okay. In the case of school buses, right now the incremental cost is about $5,000 more per vehicles. Now that has come down from originally a $12,000 premium.
In the case with Nestle Waters, I know that because of the quantity of vehicles they have purchased from Ford Motor who is the only producer of the cabin chassis that they’re using, I believe the incremental cost is now somewhere in the vicinity of about $15,000 maybe less.

I don’t know what Nestle Waters has negotiated as far as vehicle purchases. I well also tell you that Bill Artis [phonetic 02:54:49] who is the fleet manager has already publicly stated that if they adopt propane with all of their delivery vehicles they have an estimated annual savings of $34 million a year to operate their beverage trucks.

And I emphasize that because we here in the state of Connecticut can enjoy similar savings if we can just get our transit and our paratransit operators to run on propane. And it’s not a big deal.

The Department of Administrative Services has a product code available and any of the transit operators would just add this one product code and the vehicle would come in propane powered with full out Altima testing and vehicle warranty.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): So is a lot of that savings much like, you know, when we hear from proponents of electric vehicles they generally do cost more out of pocket but we look at sort of over a lifetime and you are not buying gas, there’s maybe less service required because of a different, you know, not having a gas powered engine. Is it the fuel cost and or engine maintenance that sort of delivers that savings?

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: Both.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Okay.
MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: Okay. Hands down the total cost of ownership is least expensive with propane and the reason for that is our infrastructure costs. To put in a dispenser is similar to a gasoline or diesel dispenser.

If you were to put in a natural gas filling facility, fast fill, you are looking at a cost of a million to a million four, similar to what Metro Taxi did down in your areas, Representative Lamar.

And I might add, also, Yale University in your neck of the woods is now operating 30 propane powered vehicles and they have a 1900 gallon dispenser on I believe it is Maloney? Is it Maloney? Yes, the one we have in New Haven. And they have been operating these vehicles now for the last three and a half years.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): My last question for you is propane subject to the motor fuels tax?

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: Yes, and no.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): The petroleum products versus the 25 cent gasoline tax?

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: Okay. Four years ago we worked with Michelle Cook and Jay Case and were able when the cities of Stanford and Torrington were converting their vehicles from diesel to propane, we were able to get an exception from the gross earnings tax for propane.

So to answer your question in the school bus application there is no gross receipts tax. However, in the other applications for municipalities for example, gross recites tax which
approximately be about 10 to 11 cents a gallon would apply.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much.

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: You’re welcome.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): No more questions.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Any more questions? Seeing none, thank you very much for your time today.

MR. MIKE MORRISSEY: Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Susan smith. Susan is the last person who has identified a desire to speak before the committee today. If there is anyone else after her just make yourself known or our clerk in the corner. Thank you.

MS. SUSAN SMITH: Good afternoon, co-chairs Leone and Lamar and esteemed members of the Transportation Committee. My name is Susan Smith, I’m the executive director of Bike Walk Connecticut. I am here in support of two bills. One is 6590 and the other is 7203.

So if we get started on 6590, that’s the ACT CONCERNING SPEED LIMITS IN MUNICIPALITIES. On behalf of Bike Walk Connecticut, we support this committee bill that provides municipalities more authorization on establishing lower speed limits within those municipalities.

A community is likely to know their local roads better than anyone else so they tend to be more knowledgeable about assessing the most appropriate speed limits on those local roads. The locals
experience their roads daily and are likely to establish speed limits taken into account all road users.

Even small changes to the speed traveled by motor vehicle drivers could cause reductions in risks, a five percent decrease in mean speeds typically leads to decreases in injury causing crashes by 10 percent and in fatal crashes by 20.

Bike Walk Connecticut would also like to mention that to maximize the impact of this bill, any changes in speed limits should be accompanied by appropriate enforcement, engineering, and or educational measures.

If we go on to 7203, that’s the ACT CONCERNING PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AT CROSSWALKS. Bike Walk Connecticut provided testimony on February 13 in support of proposed bill 5934 and we believe that this raised bill, 7203, shows advancement toward much improved legislative wording to protect pedestrians crossing Connecticut’s streets.

We applaud the proposal of a legal indicator that allows the pedestrian to communicate crossing intentions requiring approaching traffic to stop -- without forcing that pedestrian to step into harm’s way in front of traffic.

As drivers and pedestrians learn to follow this new definition, it will be easier to teach safer crossing habits to school children, elders and others and this legislative clarity will make law enforcement officers jobs easier too.
We think that similar wording for crossing roads at locations other than established crosswalks might be helpful to be considered as well. Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you for your testimony on those two bills. I am greatly appreciative of you being here today. If you don’t mind, I wouldn’t mind a few -- I don’t know if I’m authorized to but inside of the e-scooters bill, there is also language that modifies the vulnerable users bill.

And I know you were one of the chief architects of the original language that we after many years of trying managed to pass a few years ago. The original language was serious physical injury which local police departments have had a hard time defining and therefore finding a way to utilize.

Inside that we changed it to bodily harm, significant bodily harm and we created more of a defined term where if you hit and injure someone in the crosswalk and cause a broken arm or broken leg then you are in violation of that.

Instead of that serious physical injury where we couldn’t find a real definition, do you think this will help in the application of the original intent of the vulnerable user's bill?

MS. SUSAN SMITH: Yes.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Okay. Thank you very much. I know you were one of the chief people who were, you know, your organization was one of the chief folks behind it so I wanted to make sure you were aware of that potential change and the concept behind why we were doing that.
MS. SUSAN SMITH: Yes. Thank you. I did want to say that although Bike Walk Connecticut does not have written or I was not prepared today to speak about the e-scooter legislation, we do feel that having that legislation is really important.

However, it seems like there is still a significant amount of research that perhaps should be done to assure that it is passed in such a way it keeps folks, all folks and the general public at large safe. And Bike Walk Connecticut would be more than happy to be involved. In fact, we would like to be involved with pursuing good solid language for that legislation.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Are there any other questions? Chairman Leone.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Hi, how are you? Thank you for your testimony --

MS. SUSAN SMITH: Good.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): -- very nicely done.

MS. SUSAN SMITH: Thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): I’m -- this question is only because of how you’re titled as an organization of Bike Walk Connecticut. And from the previous, a couple of the previous testimonies were about the concentration of neighborhoods with non-drivers.

So would you have any data to identify those kinds of regions in your organization where there’s a higher concentrations of non-drivers versus drivers so that we take into account the big picture?
MS. SUSAN SMITH: That’s a really good question. I could dig into the archives of Bike Walk Connecticut to see whether or not there is documentation --

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Okay.

MS. SUSAN SMITH: -- available. I am more than happy to take that as an action item and get back to you on it.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): If it’s available that would be great. I don’t want to add more to your plate but if that’s something that you’re able to pull up that would be helpful for us or for me anyway. And I think that would help for the conversation.

MS. SUSAN SMITH: I would be happy to look into that.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Representative Carney.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Thank you very much. I’m just curious, you know, I noticed you said something about if somebody entering a crosswalk makes sort of a hand gesture or something like that, I’m just trying to figure out because I think drivers should certainly pay more attention to those walking into crosswalks.

But I’m just wondering, I mean, is that going to be sort of like a universal hand gesture? I mean, there is a lot of room for I guess interpretation there.

But I’m just concerned that, you know, how it will work I guess if there is no electronic signal indicating when it is safe to cross. So I don’t know if you have any suggestions or how we could
make this work? Because I think it should work but can it work I’m wondering?

MS. SUSAN SMITH: I think the short answer is yes it absolutely can work. I think what becomes really, really critical is that not only are the pedestrians but also the motor vehicle drivers educated in terms of what those signals would be. And once that education is shared, then everybody understands the rules and plays by those rules.

And it is the responsibility not only of the drivers to be on the lookout for pedestrians ready and with intent to cross but also that the pedestrians are doing the correct thing as well and being responsible and respectful of the rest of the road users involved.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Okay. Thank you very much for that.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you. And for point of clarification, for Representative Carney, we actually modeled this language off of other cities and so hopefully we will have greater clarity for you if you require it at some point.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Thank you.

MS. SUSAN SMITH: In December of 2018 there was a comprehensive report that was put out by attorneys in Oregon, I think Portland, Oregon actually. I do have access to that and it addresses how you define intention by the pedestrian.

And it seems like you guys perhaps had looked at that in building this latest legislation. So that’s another piece of information that you might want to look at as well.
REP. LAMAR (96TH): Terrific. Thank you again for being a consistent resource both to me and to the committee on a number of issues. I really appreciate it.

MS. SUSAN SMITH: Thank you.

REP. LAMAR (96TH): Thank you. That exhausts those who have signed up in advance this morning and those who have identified a desire to speak at the public hearing today.

Is there anyone else in attendance who wishes to speak? Seeing none, are there any comments? Okay.

The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.