

CHAIRPERSON: Representative Roland Lemar

SENATORS: Leone, Kasser, Martin, Haskell, Needleman, Osten, Kissel, Kwang.

REPRESENTATIVES: Simms, Devlin, Altobello, Concepcion, Conley, Garibay, Hall, Lopes, Vahey, Morin, Perone, Reyes, Rosario, Serra, Steinberg, Ziogas, O'Dea, Carney, Haines, Labriola, Lavielle, MacLachian, McGorty, Zawistowski, Farnen.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Folks are making their way in. We have a few other public hearings happening in the building today, so folks will be coming through over the course of the afternoon but all the testimonies have been submitted on-line and presented to the committee this morning in accordance where the joint rules will be presented to every member. Even if they're not here to hear you in person, please know that they are able to receive and review your testimony in-kind. So, we'll get started in about three minutes.

Good morning everyone, we're going to get started. I'd like to welcome everyone to the public hearing for Monday, March 2, 2020. We have seven bills on our agenda that we will be receiving public hearing testimony on. We reserve this first hour for public

## PUBLIC HEARING

officials, and then started at noon, we go right to the public. We will sort of volley back and forth between public officials and the public at that point. It should not be a long afternoon, based upon sign-ups earlier this morning. If you have a testimony, you'd like to provide testimony to the committee but you have not signed up in advance, we'll ask you to see the clerk and we'll put your name at the end of the list. Is there any comments from Chairs or ranking members? Seeing none, let's get started. The first person on our list today is Kevin Dillon from the Connecticut Airport Authority. Kevin your up first.

KEVIN DILLON: Good morning Senator Leone, Rep. Lemar, Senator Martin and Rep. Devlin and members of the committee. My name is Kevin Dillon, I'm the Executive Director of the Connecticut Airport Authority. I'm here today to testify in support of House Bill 5191, AN ACT CONCERNING THE DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION BY THE CONNECTICUT AIRPORT AUTHORITY UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT, SECURITY SERVICES OF BRADLEY INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AND A STUDY OF STRUCTURES TO BE ERECTED PROXIMATE TO GENERAL AVIATION AIRPORTS. I think, as most of you know, since the airport authority was created back in 2011, we've had a number of successes certainly at Bradley Airport and our general aviation airports as well. We've added a number of new airlines and new routes and certainly as a result of that 2019 saw seven consecutive years of passenger growth at the airport. Also, last year we increased cargo by 24.5 percent year-over-year.

We have much major customer service improvements at the airport, and in fact, we've been ranked in the top five of US airports now for three consecutive

## PUBLIC HEARING

years by [inaudible 00:06:52]. We also started on an ambitious \$1.3 billion dollar capital program at Bradley airport and that started with the construction of our new \$210 million dollar ground transportation center. But despite a lot of these successes, we're still faced with some challenges and I do believe House Bill 5191 will help us with some of those challenges. Very briefly because we did submit written testimony on this, I'll just go through some of the sections and what they mean. Sections one and two deals with the FOIA issue that we have been in front of this committee before on. There seems to be a misunderstanding about what this would do. Simply this section would allow the CAA to make its own determinations regarding security release of information that's requested under FOIA. Today, those determinations are made on our behalf by the Department of Administrative Services, and our concern there is we are the ones, meaning the CAA, entering into agreements with organization such as the Transportation Security Administration to declare certain pieces of information security sensitive and we would not be allowed to release them under our protocol, but I think it's very important to point out with this section, it does not mean that our determinations cannot be challenged. Simply all this does is put the CAA in the place of the DAS. If DAS makes a determination today on behalf of the airport, that can still be challenged by the FOIA Commission, right, so the same thing would apply if the CAA is making these determinations, and I think it's also important to point out that we do have the support of the Freedom of Information Commission on this item, so, hopefully this will be clarified this year and we'll get it through.

## PUBLIC HEARING

Sections three and four deals with our relationship with the State Police. I think as you're aware, we are required to provide law enforcement services under our Federal certification. That's a responsibility that the Connecticut Airport Authority has, it's no longer a State responsibility but we choose to carry out our responsibility by contracting with the State Police. The auditors of public account recently had an audit finding regarding the airport authority saying that we need to formalize that arrangement with the State Police certainly put ourselves in the position that the DOT was in the past. But to outline what the contractual provisions are of the relationship between the CAA and the State Police, so simply this does codify that. Section five of the bill would actually repeal the statute that we believe was inadvertently amended last year to us in the place of the DOT. We think it's not appropriate for the DOT also to follow through with what the statute called for, and essentially what it was asking for is that a study be undertaken of the heights of structures around general aviation airports, and the reason why we think it's inappropriate for us to follow through on a study like that, is that's actually a Federal purview. We come under FAA regulations that would cover this particular area of determining what are the appropriate heights of structures when their proposed for construction. So we think it's, as I said, was inadvertently amended last year when it should have been repealed last year.

And the last thing I wanted to bring up is we're also asking the committee to consider JAFS language to address a recent issue that was raised by the

National Transportation Safety Board. They recently came out and asked for the state to call for marking and lighting of weather towers that are located throughout the state. In most cases, these weather towers are temporary in nature and they fall below the 200 foot guideline that the FAA currently has. So the fact that they're temporary in nature, a lot of times pilots believe their familiar with terrain in a particular area but if one of these temporary towers is installed and its marked and lighted it represents a safety consideration. So this is something that was recently raised by the National Transportation Safety Board and we asked the committee to consider that JFS language. So, with that, I'd be happy to handle any questions that you might have.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you Mr. Dillon for your testimony today, for highlighting these issues. Some of them we've seen before but thank you for your study leadership of the CAA for the last number of years. A tremendous crew, their national recognition that we have received is due in large part to your steady hand and leadership and it is greatly appreciated on behalf of the citizens of Connecticut, so thank you. Are there questions for Mr. Dillon and his testimony? Representative Devlin followed by Representative Zawistowski.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you Kevin for being here and for your testimony. Just a couple of things. Where you were speaking related to section one and two. In your testimony, honestly I thought that we had addressed that. What's the push-back or what's the issue here, particularly if FOIA has said we don't have an issue?

## PUBLIC HEARING

KEVIN DILLON: Right, this has come up before and it was addressed 50 percent. We asked for two things last time. Last time we asked that we be allowed to withhold our responses to RFP's that we are responding to until business negotiations were completed. That actually passed last year but the other piece of it related to the security determination did not, and as I said, we're a little confused as to why that wouldn't go through. As I said, it is as simple as us simply putting ourselves in the position of DAS and we feel we're in a much better position to make these determinations because we were dealing with these airport security issues all the time. DAS is not necessarily up to speed on what the latest issues are and certainly is not party to the agreement that we have with the Transportation Security Administration. So, it really is as simple as that. I think the thing that we have to highlight to folks as this legislation makes its way through is that any determination we make is still subject to review by the FOIA Commission if someone wants to challenge it.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Has DAS weighed in on this or did they have a point of view?

KEVIN DILLON: I have not spoken to the current DAS Commissioner, but I can tell you in the years that we've gone after that DAS has been on board. I think they're also uncomfortable making these determinations when they don't have that particular knowledge.

REP. DEVILIN (134TH): Sure, and the other thing I wanted to ask you about is in sort of the end of your testimony related to the skyrocketing fringe benefit costs for unclassified nonunion employees at

## PUBLIC HEARING

CAA airport, and that your advocacy for the ability to have unclassified employees opt out of the state retirement system, that adds a burden in many dimensions. What's the - what's the barrier there?

KEVIN DILLON: Well as you know, we're in a very competitive business. We are competing with Boston and New York. We compete with TF Green and even Albany airport to a certain extent. Um, so we are very cost conscious as to what we're charging back to the airlines. The airlines are paying about 60 percent of the bills at the airport. This is something that they repeatedly raised to us in terms of our costs being so out of step with what they experienced for employee benefits at other locations, and again, just briefly for our nonpublic safety employees, the benefit load is about 96 percent of base salary. To compare that to an airport like TF Green, for example, the cost of their retirement plan there is about eight percent. If you look at the 96 percent that were paying for benefits for our employees, about 65 percent of that 96 percent is related solely to retirement. So it is an issue that really sticks out for the airlines. We have asked in the past that we be allowed to simply give our non-unionized employees, and I think that's important to point out. We're not talking about unionized employees, we're talking about our nonunionized employees to opt out. Current employees would have the ability to stay in the state retirement system but new employees we would require to be put into a 401 plan. If all of our management employees opted into this 401 plan, we would immediately have a \$2 million dollar savings. We also believe that we can offer a better benefit

## PUBLIC HEARING

than the state system is actually offering to employees right now.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): So, I appreciate you giving us information on the competitive side but what I'm curious about in terms of barriers is what's preventing you from being able to do that?

KEVIN DILLON: We haven't been able to develop the interest in the legislature to take this up. It is in our legislation that all CAA employees with the exception of the Executive Director has to be in the state retirement system.

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

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Zawistowski followed by Chairman Leone.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I actually along the same lines as Representative Devlin's remarks, I'm glad that you have brought this up even though it's not in the current legislation as far as the fringe benefit costs. I know that you've tried to introduce legislation in the past to try to deal with this and it does put you at a competitive disadvantage to a lot of other airports and I do hope that in the future that it might be more favorably looked at. Um, but I mostly wanted to just thank you for being here today and also thank you for - my district includes Bradley airport or a portion of it. I just wanted to say that you've been an excellent neighbor and it's great to see all the improvements going on there and I'm really looking forward to seeing what the new transportation looks like, but anyway, I thank you for being here and also specifically, I do

## PUBLIC HEARING

hope that in the future we can work on the fringe benefit's issue. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Chairman Leone.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): Thank you Mr. Chairman, and good morning Kevin. Good to see you.

KEVIN DILLON: Good morning.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): Of course, thank you for all that you do with always making Bradley a better airport and raising the profile. When I had a chance to visit, I was impressed with how smooth things seemed to be going and the fact that your expanding is a good sign, so, thank you for all that. Couple quick questions on the proposal [inaudible 00:18:00]. In terms of section three and four about the law enforcement aspect, and I see DAS has submitted some testimony and their not in support, and I just wanted to get clarification on if legislation were to go forward, what does that exactly mean. Right now you have to partner with the state troopers but if this legislation goes forward, would you have to incorporate your own law enforcement and would they have their training, and maybe I have it wrong and I just wanted to give you a chance maybe clarify that.

KEVIN DILLON: Sure, no, it's - we have no intention of creating a police department at Bradley airport. I've been involved in other airports that have their own police departments and it's a very, very difficult item to manage. We are very appreciative of the ability to contract with the state police, and the fact that they continue to show an interest in providing the police services for Bradley is extremely helpful to us. This is simply to

formalize the relationship that exist. I think a lot of folks have to realize, you know, we inherited some of the relationships from the DOT. It was much different when the airport was being operated by the DOT because you had the state police as an entity of state government and you had the DOT as an entity of state government. So, simply it was essentially the state providing that service. Now because the CAA is not a state entity, we're a quasi-public agency of the state but were not a state entity. That relationship needs to be formalized because we are paying for the services, it's an actual contract between us and the state police. I would venture to say that I suspect the state police is concerned that, you know, does this somehow give us the ability to not utilize their services in the future. Well, I would say today we already have the ability not to utilize their services. We can simply stop paying the state police for the service and pay someone else for it. As I said, we do have the requirement, it's a requirement of the CAA, not the state, to provide law enforcement services at the airport but this is how we chose to do it and how we certainly want to do it in the future is by utilizing the state police. They provide a great level of service to us. It's an expensive service but it's also related to that retirement overhead issue that we just talked about but they provide great service, they have great experience at the airport and we have no intention of going in a different direction. This is simply to answer an audit finding that came out from the audits of Public Accounts saying that you need to formalize this relationship.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): Um, okay. So, if we - just to go a step further though, if we were to formalize it but yet you found that they couldn't provide the level of service you need, say due to manpower or other, you know, they're other responsibilities, you would then have to look for additional law enforcement elsewhere, and if that were the case, do you have an idea of how you would go about that and what kind of training would those extra personnel requirement, [Crosstalk] and how would they go through, so that's kind of where - it may be we don't - we're not there yet, but those are the kind of things I would like to be prepared for if it ever comes to that.

KEVIN DILLON: Sure, right know, we would have to have state legislation giving us the ability to create Law Enforcement Department, and then we would have to comply with all of the state standards that exist in terms of training. That's why I'm saying, it's a very onerous task to be able to do that. The only other way that the airport could provide law enforcement services today is to find another law enforcement entity that has jurisdiction at the airport. Now, the thing that you have to keep in mind there is there are four jurisdictions that the airport sits in. So, you'd also have to have an agreement among those four jurisdictions to allow one police department from those four entities to provide the service. So that's what I'm saying, it makes all the sense in the world for us to just stay with the state police service. Yes, I wish the cost were lower but, you know, that's just a fact of life where the costs are, and that's why we would like to formalize this relationship and establish that it is a contractual relationship with them.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): Okay. Thank you, thank you for that. Let me move on to the tower issue. I'm trying to under - and you mentioned temporary towers. So it was an inadvertent change in the language that we now need to revisit. So what other federal requirements in terms of towers, what's the maximum height you can go, what's required if a tower is put in place and then maybe explain how these temporary towers are popping up and why they are temporary towers.

KEVIN DILLON: Sure. Today the FAA governs the height of structures but they only look at structures that exceed 200 feet. Okay, so when somebody proposes to either build a tower or even a building that exceeds 200 feet, they have to apply for approval through FAA and the FAA does an analysis of though tower structures or the height of a building to make sure that it's not going to be a hazard to aviation, and either approves it or denies it. What the NTSB is concerned about is there has been a couple of accidents around the country where aircraft have hit towers that are below this 200 foot threshold, and what they have found is those accidents have involved these temporary weather towers, right, and why they believe it's an issue is pilots become familiar with terrain in a particular area but then next thing you know, a temporary weather tower has been erected in that location and it represents a potential hazard. These towers are usually used to gauge weather conditions in a particular area, sometimes they're used to sight wind forms, for example, that's how you might use one of these towers.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): So when those temporary towers are erected, I mean, wouldn't the normal safety

concerns be part of the erection of those towers, meaning like the lights are there, maps are updated, pilots get a memo for airport that these new items are up. How does that work or do they - are they just fabricated and no one knows until they come upon them.

KEVIN DILLON: That's unfortunately what happens because under 200 feet today, it's not regulated. You know, the NTSB is pushing the FAA on this issue as well but they do believe that the FAA process is a very lengthy and bureaucratic process. They have to go through a lengthy rule making process. Here they're reaching out directly to the states because they believe we can do it much faster. Simply what this calls for is that when someone would erect one of these towers, they're required to mark it and light it for obstruction purposes. And, simply were asking for that because it's not regulated today. Someone could just go out and install a tower at 195 feet and it's not regulated.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): With no safety precautions imbedded. And it's not just a tower it could be a building too, right or not - may not a full building but -

KEVIN DILLON: Well, in this case, they're only asking us to take a look at these weather towers because they're temporary in nature. Usually when a building is constructed there's usually broader awareness that a building is being built, and quite frankly we also do have purview to take a look at, you know, buildings that are within five miles of an airport as well.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): Last question on that - this topic. Who oversees these weather towers? What

agency installs them? Is it an agency or just a private firm, the weather channel, who [laughing]?

KEVIN DILLON: To my knowledge it's really any private entity that needs to get an understanding of weather conditions at particular area can install these.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): And are they - are they outside the property of Bradley that would be under your authority?

KEVIN DILLON: Yeah, they could be anywhere in the state.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): Okay, all right. Good to know. Good to know. One other question that's not in your testimony, and it's just out of curiosity, and if you don't have the information that's okay, but in our last public hearing, we heard an issue about rental sharing for motor vehicles such as not really an Uber or Lyft topic but owners that rent out their own personal vehicle through an app and the main one is called Turo and I guess some of the testimony indicated that they, you know, that's utilized at airports and some airports were having concerns, and I just wanted to get your perspective. Are you aware, do you have any input on that or you don't have enough information at the moment, what would be your take?

KEVIN DILLON: No, I believe what your referring to is peer-to-peer vehicle leasing and renting. Yes, we're very concerned about that. Anybody that conducts commercial activity at the airport, we should be on these to pay their fair share for the upkeep of the airport because we're generating the market that's supplying them revenue. That was true

of Uber and Lyft and that's why we pursued Uber and Lyft to enter into agreements with the airport and they did comply. So we would expect that these companies will also enter into these agreements and pay their fair share of costs. You know, we are - when you look at the revenue sources of the airport rental car revenue, I believe it is our third or fourth largest single source of revenue at the airport, so it is something that we certainly need to protect. So, we certainly have an interest and we do have a policy in the CAA that anyone who conducts commercial activity, and we consider that commercial activity, on our airports is required to enter into an agreement. So if they're operating there today, they're operating not in compliance with our policies and procedures, and we have actually notified the company that you referenced that they're operating illegally, if they're operating at Bradley.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): Great, thank you. As we dive a little bit into that and over the next few months or more as we're trying to collect data, any information that you could provide the committee in terms of either what's going on or what your suggestions are or what the hurdles are, that would be helpful for the overall discussion.

KEVIN DILLON: Absolutely.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Representative Lavielle followed by Representative Altobello.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Good morning.

KEVIN DILLON: Good morning.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD): Thank you for being here. Just a quick sort of remark and follow one question. Um, back to - back to the fringe benefits issue, which we've discussed many times. You are talking strictly about unclassified nonunion employees and as your testimony says, and of course, we hear arguments all the time in the legislature about why we can't do this and why we can't do that and everything is contractual, and while I don't agree with the arguments that I hear on - when it comes to union contracts and so on, I expect them and I'm accustomed to them, but when we're talking about unclassified nonunion employees, I have to admit I don't understand the legislatures rationale for not wanting to go forward with that. I've haven't - do you have any insight into that?

KEVIN DILLON: I'm at the same loss that you are. I think that just makes perfect sense for operation here in state that has to compete with other operations that we, you know, follow similar standards. So, I am hopeful at some point we can convince the legislature to take a serious look at this but we have not been able to gain that interest. I think this is probably the fifth or sixth year that we have submitted this request.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD): But I would, for one, I would certain support language in this bill to allow that option and requirements for new employees to go into a TAA 401K. I just don't see the argument against it. So, if that opportunity is there, I would hope we could proceed with it. Thank you very much.

KEVIN DILLON: Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Altobello.

REP. ALTOBELLO (82ND): Thank you Mr. Chairman.  
Good morning.

KEVIN DILLON: Morning.

REP. ALTOBELLO (82ND): Back to weather towers. You are not aware of any permits that are necessary prior to putting up a weather tower. Whether or not there's local permits that are required, I couldn't speak to that issue but as it relates to aviation approvals, no there are no requirements today for that.

REP. ALTOBELLO (82ND): So would an appropriate agency like the Siting Council be perhaps the one to take the lead on this?

KEVIN DILLON: I would think that would be great if the Siting Council agreed to take that on, absolutely.

REP. ALTOBELLO (82ND): They currently do [Crosstalk] cell towers and all sorts of other activities in that area.

KEVIN DILLON: Absolutely and they are very good about advising us when things like that are being planned in certain areas when it falls under that 200 foot purview that I spoke about earlier, and then we have the opportunity to push the issue of people filing what's called a 7460 filing with the FAA to get the FAA's determination. As you know, the FAA has complete purview over airspace issues. The airport itself can't regulate that but, you know, in this particular case the fact that the FAA is not taking any ownership of heights below 200 feet, I do think it would be appropriate for the

Siting Council to take a look at that. But whether or not, you know, the question I think remains if these are temporary structures. I'm not too sure that state statute would require them to go to the Siting Council to install these.

REP. ALTOBELLO (82ND): And, the section regarding the changing of memorandum of understanding to a contract you said was recommended by the auditors, could you forward our clerk the language that the auditor's used and their recommendation? I know as you start to sort this out because right now we seem to be at loggerheads on language.

KEVIN DILLON: Yeah, I mean, again, just to the point that I think you may be referencing, I don't really care if it's called MOU or a contract, it just needs to be formalized what the relationship is. We are sending well over \$6 million dollars a year to the state police. I have to answer to the FAA and the airlines for that, and the fact that there is no agreement that outlines how those services are provided, what level of service is provided, what the cost of the services are, that's what we're getting, trying to get clarified here and that's what the auditors are asking but, again, I don't care if it's called a contract or a MOU, there needs to be a written understanding between us and the state police.

REP. ALTOBELLO (82ND): So the current language in the statute says for the DOT, not airport authority because they preceded you.

KEVIN DILLON: That's correct.

REP. ALTOBELLO (82ND): To enter into an MOU with another entity, do you currently have an MOU?

KEVIN DILLON: No.

REP. ALTOBELLO (82ND): You have nothing.

KEVIN DILLON: No.

REP. ALTOBELLO (82ND): Aw, I can see why the auditors might express some interest in that. Thank you sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Representative Garibay.

REP. GARIBAY (60TH): Thank you. Um, I just want to welcome you all so, um, and thank you for coming in. You are a large part of Windsor Locks in my district, and Bradley is a gem of airports and most people I speak to, it is their favorite and they travel all over, so job well done, and I like all the future things that are coming down with the Kiosk, etc. But just out of curiosity, do you frequently get requests for information on the security of Bradley airport, the infrastructure?

KEVIN DILLON: We do, um, a lot of times, for example, if there are trip and falls at the airport, we'll get requests from insurance companies for camera/video footage that we maintain at the airport and that's an area of significant concern for us. For example, we don't want the general public to understand what we can and what we can't see at the airport. So once you start putting video footage like that out in the public domain, it starts to, you know, deteriorate that security posture that were trying to maintain.

REP. GARIBAY (60TH): Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you again. More questions? Senator Martin.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Thank you. Hi Kevin.

KEVIN DILLON: Hi Senator.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Thank you for coming here today. Kevin can you just, it's off topic a little bit, but regarding Tweed and Sikorsky, can you give us an update on where we are with those?

KEVIN DILLON: Sure, I think, as you know, the Governor, as part of his original transportation plan, felt very strongly that a second airport in the southern part of the state should be developed for economic development purposes, and I certainly agree that there is the potential for some limited commercial service to be developed at another airport. Our concern becomes when that development is done in an unconstrained manner. Right, you can't, the market that were trying to serve here is too small to have two airports within the state competing for that very small market and, you know, you can do a lot of damage overall to Bradley and Bradley could do a lot of damage to another airport that's spending money to develop for commercial service, if that's not coordinated. So I have said, you know, all along I believe the coordination piece of this is very important. We in the past have supported the development of either Sikorsky or Tweed airport. When it came to Tweed airport, our support though was largely based upon the fact that Tweed and the City of New Haven had asked the CAA to step in and either manage the airport or acquire the airport. Recently, we've been advised that they are not looking to go in that direction, so I would express some serious reservations about Tweed being

developed as a commercial service airport simply because its proximity to Bradley. I think if you're going to develop a second airport in the state, probably the airport that should be looked at is Sikorsky because I think that overlap issue in terms of market is far less than the overlap between Bradley and Tweed. Again, I think it is a significant issue that has to be understood in terms of what that means to the overall market, but, you know, I think the final comment on that, that I would say is whether it is Tweed or whether it is Sikorsky, the development of those airports has to be coordinated with the continuing development of Bradley. Otherwise, you can do a lot of damage to this aviation market.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): So, regarding Sikorsky or probably either one, are there any type of environmental studies or any type of studies that need to take place in order to select one over the other?

KEVIN DILLON: Yeah, I think that the Governor's plan was to actually do an independent study to bring someone from the outside in to take a look at both airports. We as the CAA have done a limited review of both airports, and we've looked at a variety of factors but when you boil it all down, it comes down to really three factors. You know, first and foremost that market issue, what does it mean to the overall market to develop another airport, what is the cost of the development at the respective location, and what is the political and community support for the development of a second airport? So, we have taken a look at that. We've come to some conclusions on our own. As to, you know, what that analysis would point to but I do think the

Governor's office, if they do move forward with this wants to do an independent review and probably look at a lot of the same things that we've looked at.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Out of the two airports are - is there one community that is more supportive than the other, and if so, which one is it?

KEVIN DILON: Well I think, um, I think anytime you look to develop commercial service at any airport you're going to always have some level of opposition to it. I do believe, you know, as we've gone out and spoke to folks, for quite some time there has been significant political opposition to the development of both of those airports. I think recently though, as it relates to Bridgeport and the relationship with Stratford, I think that has changed quite a bit. I certainly don't want to speak for any of those municipalities but I think the opposition that we saw a number of years ago doesn't seem to be there today or strong as it is or as strong as it was a few years ago. I think certainly as you look at Tweed, there seems to be significant opposition against the development of the airport.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Thank you, and regarding your coordination and urinalysis of selecting one over the other and the impact, how long do you think that would take to get your arms around and develop that overall plan particularly if you know, let's say, if Tweed is selected and the impact that it may or well - would have on Bradley, how long does that all take and what's the process?

KEVIN DILLON: Well I think, you know, the Governor's office had outlined a process of trying to make a determination as to which airport should

be developed within one years' time. But I think what folks need to understand whether it is Tweed or whether its Sikorsky, there is a pretty complex federal process that has to be undertaken before either one of those airports would be given the ability to extend the runway. Because, there are significant environment impacts that have to be looked at. You know, not only wetland impacts but noise impacts. Any time you extend a runway, if that - if we look to extend a runway at Bradley, we would have to go through that same process as well. Just like familiarity with a process like that after working to get the approval to extend the runway at TF Green airport over in Rhode Island, that was about a five year process for us to go through.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Five years. [Crosstalk]

KEVIN DILLON: There is a considerable that has to be undertaken any time you move forward with this and that's why, you know, I think folks at Tweed for example have indicated that it easier for them to extend a runway because they're simply looking to pave safety overruns that are in place today. But anytime an airport extends a surface like that and takes federal money to do it, which in the case of both airports would have to occur, they would have to be utilizing federal dollars to undertake these programs. You have to comply with the then current FAA standards. So even at Tweed, it's not as simple as just paving a safety overrun. They're going to be required to comply with runway and taxiway separation standards. That means the existing parallel taxiway has to be pushed away from the runway, that would push that into wetland, right. So now you have a wetland complication. At Sikorsky you have significant wetland issues that have to be

dealt with as well to extend the main runway at Sikorsky. So, in both cases, there is going to be a very, very comprehensive environmental review that's going to have to be undertaken before those runways can be extended.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Would Sikorsky take more time?

KEVIN DILLON: I don't - I wouldn't say the process would take more time. I do believe the construction could potentially take more time, and keep in mind that Sikorsky you would have to also build a terminal facility, where at Tweed you already have an existing terminal facility. Although there is discussion about potentially relocating the terminal at Tweed, which would then, you know put you in the same position where you have to build a new terminal building but right now, if Tweed was to develop, it would be my recommendation you continue to use the existing terminal until you meet certain thresholds of growth that would, number one provide you with the revenue to build a new terminal and it makes sense to build a new terminal. So, you know, there are comprehensive plans that would be laid out for each airport depending on, you know, which airport was selected that would then derive that timeline. So you have the review process and you have then the construction process because you can't start any level of construction until you complete that FAA review, so I'll use TF Green again as the example. It took five years to get the approval to start construction and then construction was a three year time period at TF Green.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): And that's so, were looking minimum at eight years possibly before we even start generating some type of revenue, so to speak?

KEVIN DILLON: Well, I'd hate to put an actual number of years on it but it's a length period.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Wow, okay. Thank you so much.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Conley.

REP. CONLEY (40TH): Thank you Mr. Chair. I've just heard some quite good discussion about the other airports, which I appreciate hearing. Being from Graton, I wanted to bring up the desire for Groton-New London airport to be considered for expansion. As you well know, Groton-New London airport does have the commercial license for certification for commercial services. We did use to have commercial flights going through Groton quite a few years ago, which allowed folks traveling from EB, from the Navy base, from the other businesses and when the casinos were quite smaller than to get into the hubs, which made transportation in southeastern Connecticut a lot easier, so I would urge you to consider expansion at Groton-New London, which is ready and willing and capable to handle these things again.

KEVIN DILLON: We are working with the Eastern Chamber. We just recently concluded a survey there to collect data on businesses that are located in that part of the state, where they're flying to and what the travel budgets are, and I do think there is certainly the potential for some niche type service out of Groton-New London again.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you very much Kevin. There are a number of issues I look forward following up with you post this hearing. Thank you for your time and testimony here today.

KEVIN DILLON: Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Is Representative Zupkus here? I'm not seeing her. Senator Formica? If you have not had an opportunity to sign up in advance of the hearing and I don't have you on my list, please see the clerk so that we can add you to our list. We are 10 minutes before the public section but I will ask if there are - these people are here, we'll take you now. Joe Gilbert. Is Joe here? Joshua Glaab. Joshua come on up. If you willing, we'd certainly take you a little early today, if you don't mind. It's a rare public hearing experience if people are taken well before they are scheduled so. Joshua just need your name and address for the record and you're going to push that button right in front of you, that's it. Is that good?

JOSHUA GLAAB: I'm Joshua Glaab, even though there are two a's in there, and I live on 89 Nash Street in New Haven, Connecticut. I'm here for Bill 5324. Should I start talking about it, are we ready for that? [laughing] Um, so personally I'm deeply affected by this bill because it affected me both personally and professionally. I actually coach cross-country at Quinnipiac University. On a daily basis, it's either my athletes I'm out on the roads with or its myself. I actually try to bike to work most days if I can, which is about an eight mile ride, and for a lot of people, I think that would sound long. Just so you know, it's obviously one of the better part of my every day, like if I can do it, and I'd hope that most of you guys could get an opportunity to ride your bikes more. Personally, I feel that Connecticut as a state has encouraged both aggressive driving and an entitlement issue when it comes to being in our cars. Its honestly not safe to be on your bike or walking, in the City of New

Haven, I know for sure. I can't speak a ton on other cities but that I know is very true. A quick example this morning, I had a 15 minute bike ride to go meet with someone from Park Services in New Haven. Three times I had cars cut me off. Apparently for those people it was more important to be in a hurry on the their way to work and to save themselves the 30 seconds than to give me the appropriate amount of room while I was riding my bike. It's not a safe place to be, and this bill is a move in the right direction toward stating that as a state we value everyone who is on the road, not just drivers, and I think it's - it's like I said, it's a step in the right direction but it's not everything that needs to be done. I do believe that we are in a place where because of the amount of distracted driving that's happening, we need to be doing more and we need to start using technology to actually start to stop the running of red lights and stop the expectation that people are going to run through a stop sign. That is my expectation when I ride my bike, is that if I'm going to hit a stop sign, someone's going to go through it, they are not going to stop. And, the same is true with crosswalks. So, that's really why I'm here. I think that's - like I said, I think this is the right thing to be doing and also I think it's important that we start to put the onus more on the cities and less on the state to make this a safer place to walk, to run, to ride bikes and communicate that we value everybody that's on the road. My other quick statement is that I do live in New Haven and myself and all my friends are fans of Tweed expanding, big fans. I think it's a very, very small population that's not [laughing]. So, questions?

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you Joshua, and I particularly am thankful for that last [inaudible 00:51:26]. Are there any questions for Joshua? Senator Martin.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Thank you. I thank you for testifying today.

JOSHUA GLAAB: Your welcome.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): So you're a couch.

JOSHUA GLAAB: I am.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): What do you coach?

JOSHUA GLAAB: Cross-country. So all the little skinny runners in Hamden, their mine. [laughing]

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): So you coach in the fall or in the spring?

JOSHUA GLAAB: Pretty much we're year around other than in the summer. So we're running in the fall, as cross-country season and in the spring is for us are - an abbreviated track season, which is - so were always running.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Is this high school, I'm sorry?

JOSHUA GLAAB: College. I'm at Quinnipiac University, yes.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Oh, yeah, I'm sorry, I missed that.

JOSHUA GLAAB: No, no, it's totally okay.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): So tell me what's going on when you guys are running? Tell us what's going on specifically that's putting fear into your lives, I guess.

JOSHUA GLAAB: So, actually I will give you a really easy example. A road that we like to run on is Sherman Avenue. The speed limit on Sherman is 40 miles an hour, which one, I believe is a little bit excessive already but along with that the majority of people are exceeding that speed limit. Most people are driving upwards of 60 miles an hour on that road. Um, and so that's an example of us running through Hamden where - I mean really we come to crosswalks, it's rare that someone stops at a crosswalk for us, and quite often we have many cars driving both fast and very close to us. It's one of those things where the thought process is in almost gosh I'm driving a very dangerous piece of equipment. I'm driving a 3000 pound vehicle that is deadly. That's not the consideration that's going through driver's heads in Connecticut from what I've experience from most people. The expectation is how do I get where I need to get as fast as I can, and all my gosh everything that is happening is getting in my - in the way of me doing that.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Do you think enough attention is being paid to this issue at the driver's ed level that it's not being identified?

JOSHUA GLAAB: Definitely not. The truth is most - occasionally I'll have a car come by and, you know, side swipe me. Actually, a great example this morning, I had a car where the woman told me - that she came, cut me off, stopped right in front of me at a red light. She didn't even notice that there's a red light ahead of her where she should've - I mean giving me the right away didn't cost her any time but then she commented on why wasn't I biking in the parking spots that were to the right, which also had a car in the way. Very, very few drivers

in Connecticut understand that the law is three feet from a bicyclist, so I don't think it's happening at the driver's ed level. I don't - and I think it should be even more than that. I think it's at a place where if you walk into the DMV you should see a sign that says remember the laws for cyclist and how we protect them. I think it should be something that within our cities we are posting signs that remind drivers of how dangerous the vehicle their operating is, and even remind them of just what the speed limits are because, you know, for me I'm down - I go up and down Orange Street pretty much every day. There is not a speed limit sign there, and I use that as an example because it's not exception. It's typical for most streets within Connecticut is not seeing a street sign - a sign that says this is what the speed limit is, let me remind you that you should be driving slower especially when you just come off of a freeway and you've been driving 75-80 miles an hour, because that is what most people drive on 91 or 95, and then you get into city streets. To go 25 feels really slow and really most of the streets you should be going 15 on because you're where houses are.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): So it sounds like we should have better awareness of pedestrians along with bicycling and runners.

JOSHUA GLAAB: Absolutely.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): So, you said you were from New Haven. I live in New Haven, yes.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): You live in New Haven. So, and I don't go to New Haven a whole lot so - but are there bike lanes in New Haven, like I see here in Hartford?

JOSHUA GLAAB: There are. I'm actually part of a group in New Haven that is working to better implement complete streets. It hasn't been implemented very well in New Haven. We have bike lanes but they're rare, and they're also not always continuous. A great example again is Orange Street. You ride down Orange Street and for a mile you have a bike lane, and then it just ends randomly. As you get to right by Blue State, it's a coffee shop, and then along with that not only does that bike lane end but even when you're in the bike lane, quite often that bike lane gets cut off by one of two things, either one by people who are parking their cars illegally and just park half of their car in a bike lane or by people who have just parked their cars, who aren't paying attention and open their doors and leave them open as you're coming by on a bike, and then usually you move out of the way, they get - and you have to go into the lane of traffic to avoid that and typically you get yelled at or honked at by another driver who is upset because you just impeded their motion.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): So do you think we should get rid of bikes all together [laughing]?

JOSHUA GLAAB: Maybe we could get rid of cars? [laughing] I mean really, you think about it. Do I think we should get rid of cars, no, I think we should do - we should make it safer for both cars and for bikes. I think your life would be better Senator if you could actually ride a bike to work. I'll tell you, and I really mean that it is part of a better day for me if I get to ride my bike to work.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): I can vouch that I am in no shape to be riding a bike to work [laughing] from Bristol. You made a comment regarding what needs to be done regarding this bill, what would you change? You said it's a step in the right direction, so its speaking, changing your words up here a little bit but you mentioned that the bill is good, it's in the right - were heading into the right direction. How could we make it better?

JOSHUA GLAAB: You would make it better with adding in stop light cameras and adding in speed cameras within cities. Essentially what I'm saying is if we can take some of the enforcement away from the police and allow it to naturally happen, I think that's a better bill but I still - I'm concerned that by saying that, that this bill stays - takes longer to pass. The sooner this bill passes, I think the better we are and I think it's followed up by another bill that is stop light cameras particularly.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): So I'm going to be a devil's advocate here, just a little bit, but if we come out with cameras at lights and stop signs or wherever, you say we should have the, you know this probably would be packed with individuals that would be screaming that your infringing on our rights, personal rights. So what do you say to that? Big brother is watching over us.

JOSHUA GLAAB: Absolutely. I'm concerned that with anybody who brings up that argument simply because it - what in my mind what their saying is that again they value being able to break the law more than they value the safety of their community members. I know that I've heard arguments of - I guess - I

think the best part about it, is it's nondiscriminatory. A camera can't tell who you are, it just can tell whether or not you broke the law.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Thank you Mr. Chair.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Thank you Mr. Glaab for your testimony, and I just want to point out that your anecdotal evidence, your walks, your coaching is backed up by hard facts.

JOSHUA GLAAB: Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): And, we've had in the last two months 15 pedestrian deaths in the State of Connecticut, 15 pedestrian deaths in the State of Connecticut, this will represent a dramatic year-over-year increase if current trends continue, which would be remarkable because it comes on the heels of another dramatic year-over-year increase that we've seen in Connecticut, not just a New Haven issue, frankly not even just a Connecticut issue, it's happening nationally and I think you've greatly pointed to some of the root causes. Vehicles are much safer now but individual driver they travel at higher rates of speed more safely than they used, so the person inside of the 3000 pound vehicle feels perfectly comfortable flying down a road at 40 miles an hour without fear to what's going to happen to them. You add in the level of distracted driving that you, I and everyone us sees when are walking streets in our shared neighborhood, and when I go for a coffee here in Hartford or when I go to bring my kids to little league game, wherever you are in this state, people are driving at high rates of speed, distracted and frankly I think one of the provisions in here is to start treating distracted driving more harshly. I originally toyed with the

idea of mandated operator retraining programs if you get a second distracted driver and suspending licenses after a third. I feel, and I don't know how you feel about this, but I and my family and the constituents I present, are more at risk of a distracted driver going 45 miles down the road and takes their eyes off the road for 10 seconds to check a text. I think there more at threat from that driver than they are even from someone whose driving under the influence. And it took a long time for our Police Departments and our social consciousness to recognize the threat that DUIs proved. It wasn't uncommon after DUI laws were passed where you'd have officers pull over someone who's clearly intoxicated and the officer would pat them on the back and say all right get home safe. Now we see that as a horrific antisocial behavior, and we punish it accordingly, and I think we need to develop the same thing for distracted driving because that and speed are the reasons why you're seeing these dramatic, tragic year-over-year increases across our state. So I just wanted to let you know, that you have the antidote, you have the experiences and lived experiences but there is also hard data as well.

JOSHUA GLAAB: Thank you. Just to add to your comment, I even saw a bus driver this morning, a school bus driver texting at a stop light.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Devlin followed by Representative Garibay.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate your comments. In your testimony this morning, you mentioned that we were - that

aggressive driving was encouraged. Could you just explain what you meant or did you mean that?

JOSHUA GLAAB: I did mean that. It's encouraged two ways: One by not enforcing the law. When we don't pull over cars that running through stop signs or running through stop lights, I believe it's encouraged. The second is I do believe our infrastructure in Connecticut, at least I know, let me say in New Haven because that's what I know the best. It's actually set up to frustrate drivers. Um, the timing of lights in our city do not match out and as a response most drivers are in a position where they're frustrated and so then when they approach me on a bike, their response is how do I get around this person as fast as I can. Instead of I can wait 10 seconds, I can wait 30 seconds, I could even wait a minute, like I would at a stop light. Oh no way, I've been waiting at stop lights for, you know, on the upwards of five to six minutes, which for all of us really, if we think about, it's not that big of a deal but it's an emotional response that is encouraging drivers to be frustrated and to not act in a way that's safe.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): No I appreciate that, and I just wanted that clarification and I'm not trying to challenge your testimony in any way.

JOSHUA GLAAB: I didn't think so.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): My own son was a cross-country runner [Crosstalk] and I see the teams going around today and it's pretty startling sometimes, the drivers, and in his training for the World Ironman Championships just a couple years ago he was cut off by a car while he was driving in a bike lane going the speed limit and somebody went around him because

they were in a big hurry and then cut him off by trying to turn. So, I think and I do see some of the laws that we put in place in terms of the urban areas but, you know, this is in backroad country also and it is even more challenging. So I think the real - I think a real step in the right direction is education.

JOSHUA GLAAB: Agreed.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Because you're not going to have lights there, you're not going to have patrols there but people need to understand the safety and particularly if you talk about backroads and giving a bike three feet of space, that's halfway into one lane. So you know what, yes, you do just have to slow down and let the biker go unless you have a clear path to be able to move around them. But I appreciate your testimony today and also bringing a spotlight, you know, on this issue and this legislation that Rep. Lemar has been a very strong advocate of but I think the education component that you hit on too is one I think that's really important.

JOSHUA GLAAB: Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Garibay.

REP. GARIBAY (60TH): Thank you for coming. I totally agree with you. Let me say that first off. Education enforcement there has to be several steps in there. In my little town of Windsor or 29,000 people in the last two years we've had three major accidents. One was a car going 10 miles an hour and got side - ran a red light going, who knows how fast, flipped it on its head. Two years ago we had an employee of our local bank got hit crossing the

street with the go light. Its two years later and she is still having surgeries to recuperate and two months ago we had another citizen hit. The guy ran the red light and he hit her and he said I was looking for a McDonalds. So, and that's just in the past two years. We have a long history because - and that's why I am for towns being able to set their own speed limits because the [Crosstalk] city is different from a small town and there is more Windsor Locks, which is another part of my district, is a third of the population and has similar issues. I also have a son that works in Cambridge and he rides his bike to work. He has been hit twice, and just enough to push him off the road. They don't even stop, it's like, you know. So, it is a problem everywhere and whatever we can do here to slow down traffic and let me also say we have those blinking lights, we have the little flags you carry across the street. There has to be more and very comprehensive. So, thank you for coming today.

JOSHUA GLAAB: Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Senator Osten.

SEN. OSTEN (19TH): Thank you very much Mr. Chair. I just thought - you know, I live out in the country, what most people would perceive as the country, and I think that people should slow down but I also think that there needs to be some responsibility on the bike and the pedestrian, and so I say that because if you drive at dusk or dark or first thing in the morning before the sun has really come up, our roads are very narrow, and you don't even - people wear dark clothes. There are no - people make fun of it, but there are no street lights out there so, you know, we have no street

lights. We have no traffic lights. We have no traffic lights at all. We do have some street lights but very few and we have no traffic lights at all, so do you think that there should be a comprehensive educational component that makes people understand that safety for pedestrians is for everybody to be involved with, not just those that are driving?

JOSHUA GLAAB: I absolutely believe that pedestrians should do everything they can to be safer. Like I said, living in New Haven, if you're a pedestrian and you're not doing everything you can be seen, you're making an exceptionally dangerous choice. At the same time, I think it's very important that we continue to remember one, this bill is very simple, it's about how do we encourage people to follow the law so that we can help make people safer, right, and so that's what I think is most important and the most, the other thing with that, is remember like if I'm in a - on a bike and I hit your car because I'm doing something unsafe, okay. I hope that you never see that from me but if that were to happen, your car gets a dent. If you hit me with your car and I'm on a bike, I am lucky to be in the hospital for a little bit but I'm very likely to be in a casket instead.

SEN. OSTEN (19TH): So I get the differences in the injury levels, I just think that if someone is walking along a country road in black clothes or dark clothes, when its dark out that there - that the person driving a car may not even ever see that person, and so I just think that we need to sort of pay attention to education so that everybody is incorporated into the education piece. I've noticed like everybody else here has noticed the increase in

## PUBLIC HEARING

pedestrian deaths as a result of people in cities that are driving either through lights and I put in a red light law -- a require - a bill last year that would require red light cameras on traffic lights, I believe that. You know, I think that, that we need to pay attention to more of that but I do think that there needs to be a commiserate understanding for people to do whatever they can, whether it's to wear a vest when you're out walking at night. I want - I encourage people to go out walking at night, walking anytime. Certainly don't want to see anybody killed by a car cause that's more than likely going to happen if there is an intersection between a pedestrian and a car, and I just was trying to get to your - whether you believe that there should be some education on people that use our public roads.

JOSHUA GLAAB: Honestly in my opinion, I believe that people should try to protect their own lives. And if you're on a road, is it not common sense that if you're wearing dark clothes it's dangerous. I mean, so in my - from my perspective, I don't understand the best way to educate them and so it may be something that's requiring some significant creativity to do that.

SEN. OSTEN (19TH): I just want you to think about that. Thank you Mr. Chair.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Senator Leone.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): Thank you Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon. As I'm following the discussion and making sure that safety is paramount, education is paramount, you as a cross-country or bike enthusiast, do you wear protective clothing, reflective clothing and so forth.

JOSHUA GLAAB: Absolutely.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): And do you think all others should do that as well?

JOSHUA GLAAB: Of course. I meant - like I said, I believe that if you're outside where you're in a place where there's cars around, your goal should be to be seen because it's in your best interest.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): Right. So as we were looking to improve and move this legislation forward by making sure we put in all these parameters and what drivers should not be doing and what they should be doing in a safe manner, should we propose any kind of things that runners and bikers need to do that if they're in the dark, at dusk or dawn or they're not wearing the proper reflective clothing to make sure that they are seen, that they should have some kind of liability or infraction if they're seen as such?

JOSHUA GLAAB: I think they do because if they get hit by a car, that's the result of making that poor choice.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): Right, and I'm not sure everyone either knows that or every town has or enforces those laws and so, maybe we need to consider that going forward.

JOSHUA GLAAB: I don't know if it's necessary - it's not - it's a natural law that if you're hit by a car, there is no punishment that is worse than getting hit by a vehicle if you're a pedestrian.

SEN. LEONE (27TH): No, no, and I don't think we should wait for that punishment to occur for us to do something, so if we want to put responsibility on drivers, we should also put responsibilities on

pedestrians to make sure that both sides are doing everything they should to ensure their own safety, and maybe that includes some kind of reflective vest. You know, if a citation were to be warranted, you know, the proper people get what they, you know, get whatever citations they need to. Aside from hopefully not being hit.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you Joshua for your testimony today, and I think you do bring up a solid point, I think some of the issues raised here demand consideration but I would point out that between getting dark at about the same time every year for the last [laughing] 10,000 years, we've been dealing with people walking across the street for longer than we have with cars on the road. We understand that there are risks associated to others with all the actions that we take and the risk associated with driving a 2000-3000 pound vehicle at a high rate speed, distracted is increasing the number of people who are suffering serious injuries and fatalities across our state at a high level, and thank you so much for bringing your experience here today. As you know, it's our shared neighborhood that we're talking about but it's also the State of Connecticut that has seen this dramatic increase and I appreciate you taking the time to highlight it.

JOSHUA GLAAB: Thank you very much. Please have a good afternoon.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Zupkus followed by Joe Gilbert if he's here, then Doug Hausladen.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH): Good afternoon. I wasn't sure if it was morning or afternoon. Senator Leone, Representative Lemar, Senator Martin and Representative Devil and other distinguished members

of the committee, thank you for having us here. I would be gracious to ask if you would please let me turn my time over to a member of my community.

JIM JENKS: Thank you Representative. Thank you Mr. Chairman. Oh, sorry. My name is Jim Jenks. I'm a Town Councilor in Cheshire, as well as Executive Director of Bike Cheshire, which is a community group in Cheshire where we, you know, our mission is to really encourage more biking for recreation and transportation. I'm going to go ahead and read my statement. A lot of its going to be going over some of the same territory that Josh, you just spoke to. Josh took a lot of the shrapnel here from you guys [laughing] but I would certainly welcome any questions at the end of this. So, I'm here to speak in favor of raised Bill 5324, specifically to advocate for giving municipalities the right to lower speed limits in the municipal streets. I'm here - compelled to be here as a Town Councilor in Cheshire, and as such I'm, you know, I'm part responsible for the safety and wellbeing of my neighbors and friends and constituents. I'm also here as a representative for Bike Cheshires, I mentioned, and you know, we're working toward - well we have a community bike share, we are going to have bike to school days. We're working on a town wide network of bike friendly streets, safer and specifically complete streets are important objectives. We view safer streets as a key to building block toward foster the greater sense of community, improving health and wellbeing, supporting property values and strengthening local economies. I'm also here like many of us with a lot of firsthand experience riding a bike and driving around municipal streets. Being what we heard

earlier, a lot of you guys had stories, everyone had stories because it's basically, you know, the wild west out there. From my perspective, I can say with regard to public safety on municipal streets, you know, government is failing to delivery on one of its key responsibilities, which is protecting citizens from harm. The facts are that in the US pedestrian fatalities including cyclists has increased 53 percent from 2009 to 2018. By comparison, all traffic fatalities increased only 2 percent over that same period. The recent years in Connecticut, we have seen similar increases and so far this year, there have been 14 pedestrian fatalities or 15 as Representative Lemar mentioned earlier. At this rate, nearly 2 pedestrian fatalities per week in Connecticut this year. We've seen an increase of about 30 to 35 percent over recent years. Speeding isn't always the cause of pedestrian fatality but giving municipalities the right to lower speed limits on local neighborhood streets is a proven first step toward improving pedestrian safety, and the least we can do to try and reduce the traffic violence in our streets. At this point, I want to take a step back and just mention three broader reasons for why municipalities should have the right to lower speed limits. The first being our streets are too wide and this encourages higher speeds. Traffic engineers design expressways and interstates with about 13 foot travel lanes, this is known to improve safety at higher speeds of course. Unfortunately, traffic engineers also design local and state roads based on the same 13 foot wide standard. The problem is on local and state roads, these wide travel lanes crowd out space for other roadway users. This is largely why so few people feel safe to walk and bike around

neighborhood streets and without a variety of users on our road and with all the space - all the space 13 foot travel lanes afford, drivers feel safe driving higher speeds. This is largely why we see average speeds in 25 mile zones, being more like 35 or higher. Second point, to make our municipal streets truly safer for all users, including drivers, people on bikes, people walking, we'll need to make our municipal streets complete streets. This means people walking will have shorter distances to cross streets, people on bikes will have separate and protected bike lanes and drivers will become accustomed to narrower travel lanes and multimodal use of our streets. In a world where we have complete streets, municipalities will simply require the flexibility to modify speed limits on local streets because in a world where we have complete streets, we have multiple users of street space and streets simply won't be designed to supply private and commercial traffic traveling at higher speeds. Third point, speed kills. Municipality should have the right to modify speed limits on municipal streets because every mile per hour counts in terms of public safety and the survivability of pedestrians and cyclists struck by drivers. As you'll probably here several times today, and we already have, there are big differences in terms of the consequences for people struck by a driver going 20 miles an hour or less versus a driver going 30 mile an hours or more. A person hit by a car traveling 30 miles an hour is 7-9 times more likely to be killed than by a car traveling 20 miles an hour. Also, a person struck by a car traveling at lower speeds tends to have less serious injuries. The fact is every mild per hour counts on municipal streets especially since our private vehicles are

## PUBLIC HEARING

much more often than not heavier SUVs and trucks rather than sedans and compact cars. Our SUVs and trucks are larger and taller and deadlier due to design. I urge all committee members to support giving municipalities the right to lower speed limits on local roads. Please move this bill out of committee and I urge leadership to bring this bill to a vote in the House and Senate. Thank you for the opportunity to share my perspective and I'm happy to answer questions.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you very much Representative Zupkus and Mr. Jenks. I appreciate both the testimony that you provided today and Representative Zupkus, I appreciate your co-sponsorship of this bill last year. The many component parts, I think you sponsored every piece of that last year and I greatly appreciate that. I greatly appreciate the letter you issued at the beginning of this year, as well, when you asked us to raise this bill again, hoping to highlight that it is not just a New Haven issue or an urban issue but, in fact, an everywhere issue. I appreciate your leadership on this locally and your willingness to step forward at the state level as well, and Mr. Jenks thank you for your leadership both as a local elected official in town but also on bike and walk issues related to safety over pedestrians. Thank you, I appreciate that.

JIM JENKS: Your welcome.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Other questions? Representative Devlin followed by Senator Martin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you Mr. Chairman and thank you both for testifying today and Mr. Jenks for making the effort to come here and share your

testimony with us. Just one question for you. In your community are there any educational efforts to get to the point of bringing more attention to drivers, the importance of looking out for bikers and those, you know, individuals, pedestrians, etc., is there anything specific that your community or your committee is working on?

JIM JENKS: Well, um, Bike Cheshire does make an effort to highlight those issues. We do try and encourage people. I mean bikes are - road safety has to do with everyone trying to take down the safety of everyone on the road really. So, we try and encourage drivers, people on bikes, people walking to, you know, follow the rules of the road, you know and be as careful as possible. We also do a series of bike to school days where we - all the elementary schools in town, we will organize to have the kids ride to school themselves, their parents and we do talk about bike safety within them. Hoping to in the next year or so also roll out more of an in phys. ed class for third and fourth graders, a bike safety course but other than that, I can't think of anything were doing. The community, you know, in an organized way to encourage more, you know, more road safety issues or raise those issues.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Well thank you and I appreciate what you outlined in terms of educating bikers and I do think as well there's got to be something to - for drivers to understand that impact that, you know, they can have by either ignoring the speed limit or just not being extra cautious.

JIM JENKS: Right. I mean one thing I would also put forth is that a lot of people are not aware and it was mentioned earlier that - about the three feet

law. A lot of drivers don't know that, that's the case, and we have in Cheshire, we have two or three state roads that go through town that are basically are major routes through town, and there is no signage whatsoever of that law on these roads, and I don't think I've ever seen one anywhere in the State of Connecticut. I'm sure there is somewhere but there is certainly not in our area, and this is not a new law. The three feet law has been on the books for, I don't know, 15 years or something, it's been quite a while, and I don't think that signage is out there. So, if the signage isn't out there, how are we educating the public, just on that one point.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Representative Martin.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH): Thank you. I would just like to add, obviously education is a huge part of this, right, um, but, however, I know in Prospect, in Cheshire the town knows what roads are more of a hazard than other roads. We don't as legislators if we don't live in those towns, and I know towns in Prospect actually that they're so busy because of construction or whatever, kids, it's a country, tiny little road and kids can't even go outside because people go so fast and we've tried speed bumps, we've tried everything to slow cars down. So, I do think it's very important that towns get the ability to be able to lower the speed limit on certain -

I know there is a state road in Cheshire, Route 42, I've been with, all due respect to DOT, I've called them six times to do and nothing has happened, and I know that's a little different being a state road but that is a very dangerous road that the speed limit needs to be lowered on. Thank you.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you. Thank you both.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Next time you reach out to DOT copy Representative Devlin and myself as well. Senator Martin followed by Representative O'Dea.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you to the both of you for testifying here today. I'm going to continue the education proportion of this. So, in Cheshire Prospect is there anything being addressed at the driver's ed level regarding the being more aware of pedestrians walking or running or bike riders?

JIM JENKS: My daughter who is preparing for her driver's test, you're probably best to answer that question at this point, [laughing] but I believe that there, you know, in the hours and hours that they spend in driver's ed they do discuss these issues. I can't imagine they don't. The specific way it's done or what's, you know, what exactly is covered I don't know.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Do you think it's only, I guess, brushed on, just a slight brush discussion takes place and then they move on?

JIM JENKS: You know, I don't know. I think they, I mean driver's ed program, is significantly more time than it was when I prepared to drive and all, probably most of prepared to drive. So I would imagine its more than just brushed on but it's certainly worth looking into.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): I would say just from the two testimonies that we've had, I would say that education is probably the most important thing that we can do starting it in immediately when they take their driver's ed, and the impact that it will have going forward, a matter of time where more people

will be aware of their surroundings particularly bikers and walkers and runners. So I can see - I can see us maybe tackling it from that perspective along with the speed limits as well. So -

JIM JENKS: Could I comment on that?

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Sure go ahead.

JIM JENKS: I mean education, of course, is important initially and that will help. I just - I feel and I think you'll probably hear from others that in order to improve the safety of the streets, it's really a design problem. We do need to slow people down, force drivers to pay more attention, have, you know, separate space on roads for whether it's, you know, obviously cross - sidewalks and crosswalks for pedestrians but, like I said, separated or protected bike lanes. I mean, that's the - that's the way and people are - countries around the world are moving toward that standard and because it's - because there's no way to - obviously there is no way when your co-mingling cyclists and drivers that, you know, accidents are going to happen. So's there certainly the education piece but we also need to focus a lot more on the design of the streets themselves.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): What are your thoughts on if we mandate it, I hate that word, but we requested perhaps that the driver's ed portion of this that it not be talked about for five minutes but there would be a specific section, so to speak that is discussed at length, perhaps a half - at minimum a half hour?

JIM JENKS: Sure, the more the better, I say, yeah.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Going to the speed limits.

JIM JENKS: Sorry to interrupt. I'd also might suggest that people that are taking driving lessons actually if they don't bike very often, maybe consider going out and biking on the roads and actually it will make you a better driver.  
[laughing]

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Another thought. So how would that work regarding speed limits? You're giving the municipalities the ability to change speed limits, how would that process go, I guess? So, I guess, you know, currently you do not have that right. Who determines the speed limit in the municipality now?

JIM JENKS: The traffic authority in Cheshire, Police Department.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): So why would you not just simply go to them and say listen we have a 40 mile speed limit in the - on these streets, very dangerous. We've got just misses that take place, we've got bikers that are calling, walkers, runners, so why you not just simply going to the traffic authority and requesting that to be changed?

JIM JENKS: Well they don't have the authority to lower the speed limit below the state mandated minimums, and then there also - I mean there are issues of, you know, there is so much enforcement the police can do. Again, going back to the point about, to make real change we need to change the design of the streets to some extent but the police department has the - they have the traffic responsibility in our town but as far as the speed limits go, they can't lower them below the state mandated minimum.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): So, what prohibits the traffic authority to go to the state, I guess, and asking them to request a reduction in speed limit for that street?

JIM JENKS: Well, I believe it, I mean, they would go to the DOT, I presume, and the DOT just looks at what the state mandated minimum is and then that's the end of the conversation.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): And that would be the end of the conversation. So how would this statute change?

JIM JENKS: By my understanding, municipalities would hold a hearing, public hearing in their community and, I mean, first of all it wouldn't be - the town wouldn't be looking to lower speed limits throughout every local road, it would be certain, you know, sections or certain roads in town where the town would then have a public hearing about that change, and then if the community agrees and that the council, in our case, the council votes to make that change, then that would happen.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Just a thought occurred in my head. So if we give the municipalities the authority to change that, we're all sort of envisioning roads to municipalities lowering the speed limit. What would stop them for increasing them? I guess I am almost envisioning the wild west here, so to speak. Like hey, listen we've got a straight way here and speed limits 50, lets raise it to 60.

JIM JENKS: Yeah, it's a hypothetical I'm not sure. I don't think there would be much agreement from the

police department to raise speed limits. I mean, we have a hard enough time, the police have a hard enough time keeping speed limits down or keeping speeds down. So, I don't know. I don't know if that's a hypothetical that I can tackle.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Is Cheshire or Prospect doing anything regarding the street with currently to address this.

JIM JENKS: Uh, no, were not currently narrowing travel lanes at the moment.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH): Cheshire but Prospect, as I had said, we put speed bumps in because it was very dangerous. People cutting through on these side streets. I mean, I have a street that is barely wide enough for two cars and a tractor trailer came through not too long ago when I was out walking on it. So, were trying but we are limited somewhat as to what we can do. We've even put the little bumps down the center of the road, some of the side roads and everything. Um, Prospect, we don't have sidewalks and that's a whole other issue that's being tackled in town, so you are forced. I had a woman scream at me because my husband and I were walking on a country road and she stopped her car screaming. So, again, stories, you know, we all have them.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): You mean you were walking on the road?

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH): We were against traffic and she did.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): I go to - I ask that question because I know there are towns that have a minimum

## PUBLIC HEARING

32 feet wide roads and they have the sidewalks that are mandated. Developers, you know, come in and put up an argument as best as they can regarding not having to put up the sidewalks but the width of the road, some of them are 34 and 36, and it is, I agree, they are totally wide and they don't need to be that wide. So, I guess if you're arguing today to lessen or to, you know, let's narrow the roads, why would you just not as a municipality start addressing it through your municipal ordinances and addressing it now knowing that maybe, you know, this may or may not pass but, you know, just the little things, right, talking about, you know, maybe on a state level the education is not being addressed, more time is not designated to educating the drivers, our younger drivers. What stops you from not implementing that currently as part of your requirement in town, I guess, but also why are you not addressing the width of roads and narrowing them in your own city ordinances?

JIM JENKS: I mean that's certainly something that I'm in support of and in favor of. You know, in my case personally, I'm deeply in the minority in my town but it's certainly something that I'm in favor of and it also goes back to my point though, so if we get to the point where we do have - you know where we're talking about as far as complete streets, which is narrower travel lanes that would allow separated bike lanes, more walkability, then towns will have a greater need, I feel, to lower speed limits, because you'll have people thinking - drivers thinking that they can drive through what are complete streets, you know, faster than they should be perhaps. You know, hopefully the modifications will slow people down but you still,

the municipality I think will still want and need that, you know, to be allowed to lower speed limits still.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): So I guess I'm just saying or trying to point out in a way here through my questioning is that sometimes in this building things just take a long time to get done and the right answer may be found in another way or addressing it might be another way, have to be done in another way, and that's why I'm sort of sharing this with you. You are in a position as a City Councilman to take that initiative and say, you know, here's what's happening everybody, we - there's a high level of accident that are taking place, fatalities are on an increase because we have individuals that are driving - they're not very good driving and their texting, they are speeding greater than the speed limit is posted and maybe we need to do something about it - about that. Can it wait for Hartford specifically, but in the meantime we can do these things. One is, we can narrow our roads, second we address these issues with our younger drivers and ask the, and I'm thinking high school students who are taking driver's ed through their high schools, that we can talk to the teachers that are teaching those classes and say hey, can you spend a little bit more time in addressing this issue because it is a problem out here. That's, I guess what I'm trying to say.

JIM JENKS: Right, good point.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Thank you Mr. Chair.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Senator Osten.

SEN. OSTEN (19TH): Thank you very much. So, I used to be a first selectman and we had 25 roads, excuse me, we had 25 miles of road, and on almost every local road I dropped the speed limit down to 25 miles per hour. A couple of roads got 15 miles per hour and two stayed at 35 miles per hour. All out in the country, just to drop the speed down, put up additional stop signs to stop people at certain crosswalks, put in crosswalks in several areas to correctly mark where people and particularly young people were walking, and put in cameras at three way stop signs too and noticed people so that they knew that those stop signs were on camera, so that they could potentially face an increase fine should they go right through a stop sign. So I'm curious and this was a distressed community with very little resources and did it comprehensively year-by-year to do one more thing to Senator Martin's comment to finally get to the point where the streets have lower speed limits. They have crosswalks where people naturally cross to highlight that area, and as a matter-of-fact, use some of the paint on those crosswalks that reflected when people were driving by them so that you could actually pay more attention to them, put up stop signs so that people had to stop at more natural areas and put up cameras. Is that not something that Cheshire would see as reasonable way for them to spend their dollars, their own municipal dollars to do some work to start this process as Senator Martin has said. I think he said two or three times, is there a way that you can do this, and did that through the State Traffic Commission or through the DISP and use our resident trooper to provide a case why we should drop the speed limit down on roads, and we only have one resident trooper, so only their, you know,

essentially one shift out of the three shifts. So I think that there's ways that the municipality can already handle a portion of this without waiting for us to come up with the reason way, and I'm just curious, have you done any of those things, put in more crosswalks, put in cameras, lowered speed limits, put in several miles of sidewalk all through grant dollars and other things, is that part of your process in Cheshire?

JIM JENKS: Yes, we do have an ongoing project or program to continue to build out sidewalks. We do not have any cameras, I don't think it's an issue, I mean other than having school bus cameras other than any kind of traffic cameras is an issue that has been raised yet, at least not recently in our town.

SEN. OSTEN (19TH): So not really - I just want to correct it. It's not traffic cameras per se, but cameras that highlight certain areas. They also are in public areas that in order to provide some safety in public parks, the entrances of public parks so you can tell who is coming in and out, not necessarily all the way around but they don't have any vehicles driving there.

JIM JENKS: One thing I would say is the reason why I started Bike Cheshire a few years ago, is because of all of these things that we need, that your mentioning. Um, that largely people in - no one in the community is kind of taking a lead on that issue or on these issues, so that's one reason why I started Bike Cheshire and we're working toward these things. As far as lowering speed limits, there, you know, other than the state roads we have there, all of our roads, our [inaudible 01:43:09] are the state mandated minimum, the 25 miles an hour. So, there

isn't any that I'm aware of where we can lower. Well, I'm sure there are some but there isn't any that I can think of off the top of my head.

SEN. OSTEN (19TH): I put some down to 15 miles per hour. As through working with the state because there were some roads that were naturally so narrow, dead-end roads, 15 miles an hour made a lot of sense. You know, 25 miles an hour is really, you know, I don't know how much lower you want to go than that but generally if you can keep people at 25 miles an hour that's a better method, but you know, I'm just curious. I'd like to figure out and I think that if you had cameras, duly noted, that you might be able to slow people down because they don't want their vehicle caught on camera while their going through stop signs or stop lights or, you know, generally going too fast. I think it will enhance your ability to enforce this kind of activity, that's what you're looking for also is a way to enforce the activity so that you're not going to have people going too fast. It's just an idea. It worked well. [Crosstalk] Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, and I just to reiterate a point that was raised earlier. The bill does not contemplate allowing municipalities to raise the speed limits, only to lower them, and the state authority would be to lower the posted speed limit by up to 15 miles per hour by noticing and having a public hearing and then sending the results of that decision to the state traffic authority, that's how the process would work and would not allow for the increase in the speed limit. So just to point for clarification from an earlier question.

JIM JENKS: Right, thanks and appreciate it.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you both for your testimony, for spending this time with us today. We're going to go to Doug Hausladen and then Minority Leader Klarides.

DOUG HAUSLADEN: Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you committee members. I've a small testimony and then I be happy to answer any questions. Chairperson Leone, Lemar and members of the Transportation Committee, thank you for the opportunity to speak in favor of HB 5324. My name is Doug Hausladen. I'm the Director of Transportation Traffic and Parking in the City of New Haven and I've been in this role for six years. I appeared before you to respectfully request your support for the bill which will make necessary changes to our statutes to improve the safety of pedestrians and all vulnerable users. Of the 10 largest cities in New England, New Haven has the highest percentage of residents who walk or bike to work. Its greater than 15 percent. These users share the intersection space with thousands of motor vehicles every day, consequently tragedies involving pedestrians often occur at intersections and shared space with many turning movements and where traditional traffic enforcement is challenging. To give you a sense of the challenge New Haven saw, 6,997 crashes reported in 2018. Of this total, 1,936 crashes resulted in injury and 16 of these injuries resulted in a tragic and unnecessary loss of life. These numbers underscore the need and lend to the urgency to improve the safety of our roadways. The city is already undertaken many steps to advance our goal of safer streets in 2008 led by then Alderperson Lemar. The board of Alderman passed complete street

legislation that led to their completion and publication of the 2010 complete streets manual, and engineering manual that promotes a safe contact sensitive transportation network that services all users and intergrades the planning and design of complete streets that foster a livable, sustainable and economically vibrant community. In 2010, the city launched an education program named Streets Smarts, a traffic safety campaign that promotes safety in our streets, amending the language of our state statute to require motor vehicles to stop for pedestrians at the curb will greatly increase the safety of our state's needs for the most vulnerable users of the road. We anticipate that with adequate education and enforcement of this amendment, we will see decreases in injury crashes involving pedestrians at crosswalks and with the greater safety our designated pedestrian crossing will provide, we expect to see a significant increase in their use by pedestrians, otherwise, unused because they remain unsafe. Because current language in our state and statutes reflects the need to yield versus stop. There is a cognitive disconnection on the part of the driver reading this signage. By amending the statute language to stop from yield, we will increase the efficacy of enforcement by police officers as the signage stop is much clearer than the suggested yield. You will notice and this is one of my favorite things about this particular language we've been advocating for, you will notice the language on the inroad pedestrian crossing signage, outside of this building that includes the language stop, not the language yield, which will - while not consistent with current state statute, makes the signage illegal, it is also more effective. [laughing] Additionally the City of New

Haven supports amending the general statutes to permit municipalities to set reduced speed limits within municipal boundaries with the use of additional public hearing. By doing so, this will allow municipalities to address local traffic issues and plan their transit network accordingly. Studies have shown where speeds are reduced to a maximum of 20 miles per hour and [ringing] areas a decline and casualties of more than 40 percent will occur. In fact, the chance of a vulnerable user being seriously injured or killed or struck by a car is 45 percent at 35 miles an hour and its only 5 percent at 20 miles an hour. Finally, the inclusion of nonvehicular safety and traffic in the review of projects impacting the state highway network will lead to more projects accommodating non-vehicular users in responses to the office of State Traffic Administration Stafford use. This must happen in order to prevent more intersections being constructed without pedestrians or disabled individuals being considered at all. Thank you for your time today and for your efforts in helping bringing more quality of life to our cities and towns with the small changes in our statutes. Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you Mr. Hausladen for your testimony today, for your years of advocacy and work in my city, frankly but also in - on the number of bills that we've passed at the state legislature over the last decade that have dramatically changed the way we view bike lanes, pedestrian safety, vulnerable users in the walkway, and it's clear based upon what we've seen in our community in the last six weeks, which five fatalities, almost all of them in crosswalks, crossing the street. Largely

out-of-town residents who are coming in speeding or distracted and running over our residents in the crosswalk. As we attempt to provide statutory changes that will improve road safety, I know you, like I are focused on the needless and tragic situations we are facing. One last week, I happened to see the afternoon first hand, thankfully the woman was hit and is recovering at New Haven Hospital currently where she had a fractured skull and a broken hip. She is the mother of a daughter who goes to school with my daughter. She was crossing the road in a crosswalk at 5 o'clock, perfectly led out and a car, not paying attention and on the cellphone took an immediate left and crashed into her crossing the road. This was, as I mentioned earlier, the 36<sup>th</sup> incident in the City of New Haven where pedestrian and car collision has happened in the last two months. Thankfully, we've only had five deaths. So thank you for your testimony, for your passion on this issue, which I know mirrors mine and a lot of your work has gone to making this city safer even if the statistics show that drivers are not, and so I appreciate your work.

DOUGH HAUSLADEN: Thank you Mr. Chair.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Are there any questions for Mr. Hausladen? Senator Martin.

SEN. MARTIN (31ST): Thank you for your testimony here today. I'm just curious is New Haven, I'm from Bristol, just heard 36 incidents regarding some accidents that happened. So, can you give me an idea or this committee an idea of the amount of involvement that the police, you know, are they given fines out when they see something take place. You know, I know they come to the accident, but

apart from that are there other quantities or can you quantify for us these are the 36 accidents we have here today but what do we have that were close misses or police have seen fines etc.

DOUG HAUSLADEN: Thank you Senator. I'll be able to provide you from the traffic enforcement division of the New Haven Police Department some follow-up statistics with respects to enforcement citations. Citations are up in 2020 over 100 percent, I believe, or close to depending on the week that you're seeing it, and the big challenge comes in with respect to the judgement calls that are related still with the wiggle room in our statutes. I personally do not understand how you can yield to a pedestrian without making a complete stop and allowing the pedestrian cross the roadway. However, with respect to the way that the law is interpreted from our close work with the traffic and motor vehicle division of the New Haven Police Department, were told simply that the defense that I did not hit the person; therefore, I yielded to them is sufficient and necessary in the court of law to be thrown out. And so while our police officers do spend hours a day writing motor vehicle citations and remember every motor vehicle violation written does take, you know, a quantitative time of every police officer and then the follow-up in the court system as well.

Unfortunately a lot of our enforcement is not sticking to it. I know one of my earliest memories of coming to this committee and this body and testifying was with respect to automated devices going from a two-time, I think we used to have a two-strike and you're okay policy in the state where when we first initiated a ban on automated, mobile

phone usage in the car, you were allowed to have two oopsies and now we've done away with that and really the whole system as a collective, every branch of government, the administrative branch that executes the laws, your branch that writes the laws and the Judiciary that helps enforce the laws need to be a coordinated effort to make sure that when we do have enforcement, it does stick and people are held accountable. This is a driver's license after all. It is a licensure from the State of Connecticut.

\*\*\*\*\*

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So these citations, is there -- and I'm thinking of when I was first in college and I went to downtown Manchester, New Hampshire, and I was with a friend and I crossed the street and I didn't go -- I didn't cross at the crosswalk. But a police officer quickly approached me and wanted to give me a ticket for jaywalking. Do you have jaywalking, I guess, rules or laws in New Haven?

DOUG HAUSLADEN: We do. And there was recently, in 2020, and the end of 2019, an effort funded by Watch for Me CT, an effort by the local police department to educate and enforce on illegal use of the highway by pedestrians. So, there was a large effort in downtown New Haven and in other places in New Haven to get that message out. And we, as a police department, Chief Reyes, Lieutenant Sean Maher, are in full support of continuing to educate pedestrians on their abilities to make themselves as safe as possible.

And also, again, we have -- the police department is now targeting in some crosswalk enforcement stings. So, for motor vehicle drivers that are not respecting pedestrians in the right of way and the crosswalk, they'll be seeing some additional stepped up enforcement efforts that are being applied for with grant money right now.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Sure. Well, that's a two-way street, right. It's not only the responsibility of the drivers, but as well as the pedestrians not to use devices, not to cross the street where they shouldn't be. I just have another question regarding your -- you mentioned streets, a Street Smart Program.

DOUG HAUSLADEN: Definitely.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Can you just elaborate on that and that -- and I'd mentioned earlier regarding educating at the driver's ed level. Is this something similar to that? So, if you could explain that program.

DOUG HAUSLADEN: Thank you for the opportunity. The Street Smarts Program was created in 2010. It's had at -- you know, tens of millions of impressions at this point with respect of the number of people and eyeballs that we've been able to engage with on a day-by-day basis. And it's a comprehensive education program that treats drivers and cyclists and pedestrians all in a unified system of transportation to make sure all users are safe.

It's available on our website and if any city -- if any of your cities and municipalities would like to copy it we freely, gladly give it out to anybody that wants to take it. Recently, the City of

Stamford has all but plagiarized, because it's the government and we like to copy, right. And our former director of transportation is now down there and starting their own campaign. So the Street Smarts is more of a public-facing campaign.

As an employer, though, I'll tell you we have over 4,000 employees in the City of New Haven, and recently our driver's education program for defensive driving that you're required to take in order to be authorized as a driver at the City of New Haven, we've been able to work with our provider of that education service and they've instituted eight slides into their slide deck of the Bike Friendly Driver Program from the National League of American Bicyclists. And so we've been able to incorporate not only our Street Smarts Program, but also a national bike friendly driver program into training and coordination of education of our own drivers so that we can lead by example in the City of New Haven to make sure our employees are bike friendly as well.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Okay, great. All right. Thank you so much.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Seeing no other questions, Doug, I have just one quick follow up on a slightly unrelated matter and touch base with this. As the director of transportation, you may have heard of Kevin Dillon from the Connecticut Airport Authority suggest earlier that Tweed-New Haven Airport is at least eight years away from being a functional commercial service and that CEA's interest in the site dealt with managing it both from a point of limiting competition, but also ensuring that

anything that Tweed offered did not interfere with what Bradley was currently offering.

I don't know if you had any thoughts on those assertions or a different interpretation of the status of Tweed and where it stands now. Thank you.

DOUG HAUSLADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I have the privilege of serving on the governor's Transition Committee for Transportation Policy, which Kevin chaired, and at no time during that chairmanship of that committee did he bring up a challenge or a question of the need of additional air service in the State of Connecticut. I think it's disappointing and frustrating to hear an agency funded by taxpayers in the State of Connecticut that they do not believe in growth, and the fact that we can grow a pie big enough to serve -- be serviced by two commercial airports in the State of Connecticut.

The number one problem from the south central Connecticut region is sales teams and getting home to dinner if you are flying for business. And if anybody has small children that have to fly for business, God bless you, if you're operating out of south central Connecticut, because to get home is impossible. I have a family rule in my family that you do not take the last flight because you can't afford to be stranded in Philadelphia. And we need bigger runways that can handle the wind loads. As the director of transportation, we need to get more vehicles off our roadways, yes, and so we need to have better transit options to our airport service including great news about getting the FRA grant to build a train station up near Bradley. At the same time, we have to call for CT Transit Service to stop

at Tweed every time that somebody gets off the airport -- of the airline services.

So I think for the region in New Haven, constantly we're hearing the inability to, as part of the economic development team of the City of New Haven, keep companies that are growing, rapidly growing, in the region. We've been proud to keep a hold of Alexion Pharmaceuticals to the extent of their footprint in New Haven, and proud that other people that are still choosing to relocate to New Haven as a headquarters. But as they get to that sales volume growth, they need a functioning airport to actually get home so they can tuck their children in at night.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, DOUG HAUSLADEN, for that testimony and thank you for that final response, which closely mirrors my impression of the situation on the ground more so than the previous testimony. Thank you. Minority Leader Klarides, to be followed by Senator Formica and Susan Smith.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): A lot of questions on that bill, huh? A lot of questions.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Minority Leader, the floor is -- you may remember I had to demonstrate how to cross the road for about two hours last year.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): That's been the talk of the whole room that we were looking for very much to seeing it again. Very much. Now, we have to take our laughs when we can get them. Right?

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Sure, as long as they're at my expense, I guess no one's hurt.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Hey, we all take our turns. Don't worry about that. Right? Well thank you, Chairman Lemar and Chairman Leone, Ranking Members Martin and Devlin. I want to thank you for hearing H.B. 5323.

Just so we, you know, we know this upfront. This is a framework of a transportation finance plan and -- but it's got some structural changes that are included in it because we really believe that the notion of funding transportation in Connecticut is something we can all agree on and a substantial transportation investment. There's no question. But we should take this opportunity to really restructure a lot of the issues that we have had with the Special Transportation Fund, you know, with pension funds, with right-sizing government. It's a great opportunity. I think it's a once in a lifetime opportunity to restructure different aspects of government while we're investing in transportation.

We have continued to work on this alternative for several months. We've been working with LCO and I want to thank them for the quick work that they've done. And if the committee chooses to move forward with this, which, obviously, I hope you do, we will be getting you, before end of business today, the complete LCO plan that they have put together so every detail will be at your fingertips. And if you do choose to go forward with this that part of that plan can be part of a strike-all amendment in the committee process when we get to that.

You know we all agree, in this building, I believe, at least, that a strong and substantial investment in transportation is important. We've disagreed on

how we get there, but I think now that we are where we are and we've taken a pause, I think we can all take a deep breath and really start to look seriously at what alternatives might be available to us and which ones we may like when we really think about it and ask questions and sit at a table and discuss this together.

We all know that that condition of our transportation is not today, but in years to come is going to be a problem as far as our investment. But we also I think agree on what the core functions of government are. It's certainly first and foremost safety of our roads and bridges and our citizenship. Again, we can agree and disagree on how we get there, but we agree on what the purpose is and what the need and where the priority should be.

I believe that the best way we should look at this is to be smarter with the money we have, take advantage of federal bonding and take advantage of the way we spend money in a more efficient way. Prioritize that bonding in spending and then, you know, really focus on what we need, when we need it, and how we're going to get it. We've put together this plan that will very simply do a few things. We look at the Special Transportation Fund as of today, we have almost a half a billion dollars in that fund that only goes to DOT and DMV employee costs, meaning, wages, health care and pension. Not one dime of that almost half a billion dollars goes to roads, rail and bridges.

I'm sure you all get the same questions I do. All the money we pay into the Special Transportation Fund, how come we don't have enough money? Well, there is a substantial amount of money in there

today that I'm sure legislators and/or governors many years before any of us were here decided at one point, well, gee, state employees get paid out of the General Fund, so we probably want to spend more of that money, so I have an idea. We can take DOT and DMV employees' costs, wages, pension and health care, and we can shift that to the Special Transportation Fund and we can justify that because it's DOT and DMV. So then we have all this extra money to pay out of the General Fund.

What we're proposing is to say we're to take advantage of this opportunity in Connecticut. The problem we have, but this can be a very advantageous time for us. Start shifting those STF costs, the employee costs, from the STF to the General Fund. And then you will ask me where are we gonna get the money in the General Fund. And if you talk to OSA, they will tell you the same thing they've told us. They are estimating approximately 1,300 people leaving state service every year for the next many years. And those are not lay-offs. Those are not firings. Those are not changes to pension, health care or anything. They are people that are voluntarily retiring or taking other positions.

And of those 1,300 people, if you separate out services that we believe are core government services; State Police, Corrections, 24-hour DDS, DMHS services, that kind of thing. The things that we really think the government should be doing and needs to do to protect us, keep us safe and to keep us healthy. For every four of those people that leave state service, we can refill three of those positions. Now remember, we're not refilling -- the one position we're not refilling is that a person is a position, so after these people leave, the

position that's left over. For every four that leaves, we refill three. We will then have the money to fill that spot in the General Fund and we can use the extra money in the Special Transportation Fund to serve as a revenue source for transportation funding. And lastly, we will take \$500 million dollars from the Rainy Day Fund and start paying down our pensions.

Now, I think as far as the Rainy Day Fund goes, I know we've had a lot of conversations in this building about that good, bad, indifferent, how much, how little. I couldn't agree more that we want to make sure that this state is set up going forward in the most responsible way possible. We are very fortunate that we passed a bipartisan budget in 2017 that set up this Rainy Day Fund to be as full as it is now and, God willing, continue to be fully funded as it is. So I think the question is how do we balance making sure there's enough money in that fund remaining to carry us through those rainy days or difficult times while still fulfilling what the statute says, that if the rainy day fund hits five percent or more, the legislature may take money out of it and start paying down pensions, which I think we all hear about and talk about every day as one of our biggest if not the biggest problem in the State of Connecticut.

So, those are the core parts of this plan. We've also added a few safeguards and I think -- I believe if we talk about using our money wisely in a plan going forward. One of them is a transportation strategy board, which we've all had before and we've talked about. But in our plan, the board gets recommendations from DOT in regards to what projects they think are important, but they don't -- that

doesn't have to be the end all and be all. The board should obviously be appointments from leaders and the governor, etcetera, as most boards are, would be able to say -- after they confer and discuss what the priorities of the state should be based on what they think, they can say yay or nay in regards to a lot of them.

Another thing that I think is very important is when we go towards the using our money as wisely as possible, because we have a lot of money coming in. I will give you an example, a Fastrak. Now, I don't -- I agree with using as much rail and bus in this state as is necessary to help people get off the roads, get from point A to point B as quickly as possible, but we're asking DOT to find five percent savings and efficiencies in that. We're not trying to cut their money. We're not trying to say we don't think it's important.

In fact, we're focusing on how important we think it is, because if any of us walk out that door, as we've done many a time, we see these buses going by with nobody on them or one person on them or two people on them. That may mean that there are other parts of that line that need more service. There may be other stops that are more full that may need more, as opposed to this one. So I think if we ask DOT to really do a full study on that and figure out which parts of it are working, which parts of it aren't, and make sure we focused our energy and our resources into that. I think they can find those five percent efficiencies. And we're also asking the auditors to do the job that they do so well in regards to finding -- to following up on the transportation strategy board and those different

areas to figure out where the money is being used and if it's being used wisely.

I think that this plan acknowledges our obligation to do a couple of things. Obviously, first and foremost, fund transportation in a way that we all believe is a priority and substantially. I think number two, we talk about our pension -- our unfunded pension liability, which is a huge problem if not the biggest problem we have in this state, and it at least is a start in helping pay that down and it all works within our statutory guidelines that we passed two years ago. And number three, making sure our Rainy Day Fund money is responsibly maintained, but also starting to pay down those pensions, and right-sizing government, which we talk about every day and we hear about every day.

It's in line with the governor's RFP that he put out recently in finding efficiencies in state government firing, considering the people that are leaving. It's in line with the bill we passed two years ago, the bipartisan budget. When the Fiscal Stability Commission came up with the recommendation of a million dollars -- a billion dollars, I believe, excuse me, of efficiencies we ended up agreeing that half -- \$500 million dollars would be the right number to put forth in finding efficiencies in the State of Connecticut, and to remember Governor Malloy put out the RFP for that to find an efficiency expert to come in and help us find that \$500 million dollars. People responded to that RFP and then nothing happened after that.

Now Governor Lamont has put out his own, to find those efficiencies, considering the people that are leaving state government and trying to make out

state workforce more efficient and state government more efficient. So, those are consistent with all of that. I think we all realize and we hear every day about the heavy burden taxpayers have in this state. And I think knowing we need money for this, but understanding that there is a way to do this, or there are at least alternatives that should be discussed at a table with people having these conversations on way we can accomplish all our goals, but do it in a more efficient way and make sure first and foremost that public safety and the safety of people is maintained.

REP LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Minority Leader Klarides for your testimony today and for the earnest approach that your caucus is now taking on transportation. I will take you up on the idea of having this fully flushed out in the weeks to come. Clearly, this is something, as you said; we've talked about this both on TV and radio, in the Chambers. We all agree on generally what the number is too, between \$19 and \$20 billion dollars in long-term transportation investments that our state needs in order to remain competitive and to build the transportation infrastructure that our citizens, our businesses and our guests will rely on to move effectively and efficiently through the State of Connecticut.

I think there is so much that we do agree on. We have been caught up in a disagreement that we are paused on now, but I do believe the earnestness with which every caucus in this building, the governor, every citizen in this state, every business, believe the investment means we make will carry us through and we will come up with a solution and we will address the underlying urgency that we have in our

state. We will have to and I think we all -- when we're outside the lights and the building, we all agree that the urgency needs to be met soon. And we have a lot of ideas that we need to work out and I'm hoping you, myself, leadership across the building can do that. So, I do appreciate your testimony here today.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): There are, of course, areas where we disagree just in the structure of how we use the Rainy Day balance, the level of bonding we take out. The fact that each of those circumstances I and my caucus may feel that that puts too much of a burden on future generations and that my generation, your generation, our shared generation should be paying our fair share now in how we do that. We'll save those conversations to that broader timeline a well. As we receive a more fully vetted plan on your side, I hope we can have a constructive way of conversing this. I don't think the committee structures serve this conversation particularly well yet, but hopefully we can move forward toward a better solution. So, I appreciate it.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Well, thank you. And I would just add that, you know, in regards to borrowing, I believe our GO borrowing is less than the governor's, as he's mentioned out there. You know, I feel like -- I'm glad that he put this on pause because I think we all realized that this was -- it was -- you know, obviously, we didn't support it. But whether you supported it or you didn't, this was not -- it was becoming very unproductive and it was also stopping all the other great things

in this building that are important to all of our colleagues and people in the State of Connecticut from moving forward.

But I don't believe that just coming out and saying we're gonna borrow -- we're gonna credit -- you know, have \$250 million dollars of GO bonds and so then we can avail ourselves of federal -- that's not a plan, right. I understand it's a start and it's certainly more borrowing than we have in our plan. But I think that we are missing a golden opportunity in this state to restructure how we finance transportation and what we do with our Special Transportation Fund and how it's been working. And if we can then have the added benefit of starting to pay down the pensions while maintaining our Rainy Day Fund at a very robust level, and have the added benefit of right-sizing government, which we all talk about on a regular basis, without firing, without laying off, without cutting off anybody's benefits, you know, while maintaining the core government services for public health and public safety that we all believe in, I think that that is an opportunity lost and I don't think we can lose that opportunity at this point in this state.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. And while we may disagree on a lot of that, I think we both agree on that final point. We have missed an opportunity to have a comprehensive, long-term transportation conversation that we so sorely need in this state to move us forward. And I do look forward to working with you as we move forward. Other questions for the Minority Leader? We're gonna start with Senator Leone and then move to Representative Devlin.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good afternoon, Minority Leader Klarides, good to have you here and presenting the House Republican version.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): My pleasure, Senator.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Yes, always a pleasure.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): No place I'd rather be. How sad is that.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Well, that's good. We could always have you come back more. It'd be fun. So, as we talk about infrastructure in going forward, I understand the proposal is to have DOT come up with a plan in conjunction with OPM. And you mentioned in your testimony that if this bill goes forward you'll have a little bit more details --

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): No, I'll have more details today, before you leave today.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Okay.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Yes.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Good, good. So, in those details, will you be listing the priorities that need to take effect in terms of finding efficiencies, which spending cuts we would have to address so that we stay within the limits that you're proposing?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Well, as far as DOT and OPM, as you mentioned our transportation strategy board we put together, as most boards in this building are, with appointments from each leader, from the governor, etcetera. And it would be a comprehensive group of people that would have knowledge on these

subjects and then they would work in conjunction with DOT in presenting them with their list of priorities. But then the transportation strategy board would have the final say in regards to what those projects would be in regards to that. And I think that there's also an opportunity to possibly include the legislature and add them as another check and balance in regards to the projects. Because we all have our own opinions and a lot of them are based on our districts, but that's why I think getting everybody together to have these conversations are important.

In regards to efficiencies, I used the Fastrak as an example of one of those. That would be DOT that would find those efficiencies within that particular program. They are the experts in the transportation part. I'm not gonna say that this particular part of the bus line or the rail line is better than that particular part. But what I do know is when we walk outside and we see buses going by with little too few people in them -- what I do know is in my own very non-transportation way is that that -- those stops are not being used in the most efficient way. That may mean that there's a bigger volume in other areas and we may need to add to those areas, and that may be a better use of our money.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. So, I think that's where we want to make sure that we have agreements that we -- the right efficiencies, the right spending cuts within available funding are actually valid and not just cuts for the sake of cuts.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Correct.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): And also, you know, with DOT coming up with a plan, my understanding is we ask DOT all the time to come up with plans. They've submitted plans in the past. They have priorities that have been listed and shared with the committee and the legislature. What would occur if they do come back with this proposal, but it's not what you envision? Would you then support it, not support it? How would that work?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Well, as I mentioned, DOT would come up with a proposal of priority of projects to the transportation strategy board. The transportation strategy board would have that conversation and they would be able to say yes or no at the end of the day. I'm not telling you this plan is gonna solve every single problem we have. And as I said to Representative Lemar, I am certainly open to having conversations. I think that is what has been lacking in this whole process of figuring out how we're going to fund transportation.

We've somehow chosen one way of doing it and you either agreed with that way or didn't agree with that way, but we're not taking the opportunity to figure out how transportation can work more efficiently with the money we have and making sure - - you know, I keep going back to that bus line. The places that are really being used and are necessary are being used. The places that aren't that, you know, you may have to cut back on those. And when you just look at Fastrak, it's \$25 million dollars, and \$22 million dollars are paid by taxpayers. This is taxpayer money that's being used in regards to this and so I think it's worthwhile having a look at which parts of it are more efficient than other

parts of it. And I think they would be able to find that.

Now, as far as DOT goes, I mean, we know who the boss of DOT is. So, if they're not going to give a plan that we like, that's why we have the checks and balances of that. But I think, Senator, that there is a possibility in this plan to add that the legislature has input in regards to what those priorities should be also. And that is a conversation I'm more than happy to have with you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Okay. Because in the initial drafting of this cursory bill of which you'll give us more language, that wasn't in there, it just said DOT and OPM. So I just thought -- surprised that you would put all your efforts into OPM and DOT to come up with a plan. But I'm glad --

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): I've never put all my efforts into those --

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Yes. So I'm glad that we'll have some language to that effect. Let me switch over to the Rainy Day Fund proposal. So, as you mentioned, this was a bipartisan effort to boost our Rainy Day Fund, our Budget Reserve Fund, because we've had -- we've zeroed it down in the past to fill other budgets and we wanted to make sure that we weren't in that situation. So, we crafted the language bipartisanly to make sure it was a certain percentage that we maintain, and once we reach that percentage, we then start paying down our pension benefits.

So, to suggest that we should revisit that so that we can track towards transportation, that sort of goes against the initial grain of the spirit of that

legislation, to keep it at that high level and with excess dollars going towards the pension benefit payment. So, I see that as a step backwards. Can you just explain how you may feel differently on that?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Yes. I really don't look at it that way, because first of all, we're not using Rainy Day Fund money for transportation. We're using Rainy Day Fund money when it is over five percent, as we did put in the bipartisan 2017 budget and is in statute today, to -- it's our prerogative, right, as a legislature, once it hits five percent, to use that extra money to start paying down the pension. So that's actually what it's doing. So that is in statute now and that's what the bipartisan budget said.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Right. But the -- you're proposing that this money go towards transportation and not so much the overall pension benefits, which is a decrease.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): No. I'm sorry if I was confusing. So, the half a billion dollars in the Special Transportation Fund, as of today, that doesn't go to rails, bridges or roads, but goes to wages, pension and health care of DOT and DMV employees. We are proposing starting to shift that back to the General Fund, where it originally was, finding the savings to put into -- to pay that part of it, for the employee benefits, in a 4:3, for every four people that leave state service voluntarily, we will only replace three positions. And that will cover that shift, and then taking, separately, the \$500 million dollars from the Rainy Day Fund and start to pay down pension, as per our

statutes. So they're kind of two -- there are kind of three parts that work together.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): So, in terms of taking the operating costs going back to the General Fund for personnel, you know, in the past we've taken General Fund money to prop up the Special Transportation Fund, even with the current language. So, by putting them back into the General Fund, that puts more of the costs and ownership on General Fund dollars, of which there'll be less if we start doing general bonding for transportation. We're still gonna have to deal with that situation in a more broader picture, and those costs don't go away.

So I just want to look forward to having this ongoing discussion, to see the math, to make sure we see how it adds up, because at the end of the day, the expenses have to be paid from somewhere. And without the toll proposal, where we were looking for new funding, it puts all the ownership on the State of Connecticut and Connecticut taxpayers, Connecticut constituents, as a hundred percent of the burden on the State of Connecticut. So, I think that's why we had a little bit of differences. But as you mentioned, we're on pause now, so we'll -- I look forward to the details. I look forward to looking at the math to make sure it is what you say and that hopefully we can find some consensus going forward.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Well, thank you, Senator. And I will just end our conversation for with this. Obviously, this is a series of choices. Okay. This is a series of choices as to how we use the money we already take in, the revenue we already take in without going outside and asking for more money from

our taxpayers' pockets. That's really the difference, I think, the main difference between the two of ours and a lot of our colleagues' perspective in regards to this. So, you are correct, more of the burden is on the state, but it's a burden that's already on the state.

And so if we are taking that money from the Special Transportation Fund, which has no business being in there to begin with -- people think that they are paying their driver's license fee, their registration fee, their tax on new cars, you know, their one-percent sales tax, all the money that goes into the STF, their gas taxes, etcetera, into the Special Transportation Fund to pay for roads, rails and bridges. They do not understand that half a billion dollars goes to DOT and DMV employees' benefits, health care and pensions. Now certainly, they need to be paid from somewhere. I'm not saying for a moment that we should be changing what they're getting in any way, shape or form.

But we have to make choices in this state. And we have heard day after day how important and what a priority transportation funding is in this state. And I couldn't agree more. But we -- our argument is there already is revenue. There already is burdening the taxpayers of the State of Connecticut. We are saying let's use that revenue we already have more wisely. And, you know, to my earlier point, the borrowing we have in this plan fits within our bonding cap. It is borrowing less than the governor suggested that he borrow a week ago when he made that comment.

We talked about downsizing the state workforce. The governor has put that RFP out also. So, a lot of

these are consistent with ideas from either your side of the aisle or from the governor that we've heard going along the way. It's just putting it together in a cohesive plan so we can really make changes to the State of Connecticut. I really hope we don't lose the opportunity that we have right now. Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. I hope so as well. We just want to make sure that all the services that the state has to provide are actually able to be provided. So, as we look to divert or move funds in different ways, some of those services might not be able to be provided and that's why I want to make sure we know exactly where these efficiencies or spending reductions are in lieu of any new funding resources. You mentioned it's a series of choices, and you're absolutely right, but it's choices with consequences and at some point someone may be hurt because the services might not be able to be provided.

You know, it's already been mentioned that transportation is about \$19 billion dollars if we wanted to do everything we need to do. I don't see those dollars coming in anytime soon. And again, that's why I want to see how it works out in the short term or in the long term as to where the dollars need to come from to fund not just transportation, but all the other things that we need to do as a state. So, I look forward to the ongoing discussion. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Devlin, followed by Senator Kasser, and if anyone else needs to sign up.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Representative Klarides for being here today and sharing this approach. I don't think there could be anything more productive and constructive for our state than having all four caucuses and the governor sit down with a real goal of being open minded, flexible to come with an approach to get moving on our transportation needs, which all of us agree are needed. And I think, you know, a while back, the Senate and House Republicans were endorsing the prioritized progress plan and that was mischaracterized quite frequently as resulting in cutting school construction money, cutting municipal aide, education, anything else that you could think of, and it did none of those things.

But what did happen was that, as you well know, the governor's chief of staff at the time and Senator Fassano spent a lot of time in Washington and we had a very productive and I thought creative meeting at the DOT headquarters this summer, where we learned about the federal Build America Funds that were incredibly low-cost loans, both what's referred to as the TIFIA money for highways and the RRIF money for rails. And I think there was a lot of confusion in the most recent toll proposal among the public that, you know, the -- of course any loan has to be paid back, but the RRIF money, railroad funding, didn't any require any kind of dedicated revenue stream. There is -- you need to show a demonstrated way to be able to fund back the TIFIA money. But it was a very open discussion that as a result we said, you know what? Let's not do prioritized progress that was more heavily bonding focused. Let's take

this new information and come up with a new solution.

So, I hope that we can be as open with all four caucuses to think creatively and maybe out of the box about ways to be able to address our transportation. You were absolutely correct in characterizing that STF history. That particular fund, as we know, was created to fund bonding for a ten-year transportation plan. And over time, because the General Fund was running out of money because of excess spending, costs were moved into the Special Transportation Fund, and now the fastest growing expenses. Fifty-five percent of the Special Transportation Fund money is spent on DOT operations, pensions and fringe costs and also subsidies. And it's the subsidies and the pension and fringe costs that are the fastest growing areas of expense.

So I support the notion of putting the pension and fringe costs for employees back where it came from, which was in the General Fund. But could you just explain a little bit more about how we would be able to do that without potentially compromising the status of the General Fund?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Well, thank you, Representative. What we would do basically is of that almost half a billion dollars that is in the STF today, of the pension and fringe, as you mentioned, we'd be taking about \$100 million dollars over a five-year period and starting to shift that over. So, it wouldn't be one lump sum where we'd just take this huge amount of money out of the Special Transportation Fund, plopping it in the General Fund, and have to do anything in a scorched-earth

kind of way. It would be a very reasonable, responsible way of doing it. So, it would be -- it would be about \$11 million dollars and change each year, about \$100 million dollars over a five-year period.

And we would find that money in the General Fund by the right-sizing of government, as I mentioned, for every four people that left, state service voluntarily, three of the positions, not the people, would be replaced. And that would be approximately 341 positions per year for five years, so it would be approximately 1,700 people.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): How did you settle on three out of four versus two out of four or any other ratio?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): We didn't want -- I mean, I keep going back to the scorched earth thing. I mean, we don't want -- we want this to be a responsible plan. I mean, quite frankly, any of us could say, okay, for every four people that are leaving we're only gonna hire one back. I mean, could you do that? Yeah. That would be eliminating important services we need for the state. So we recognize that off the bat; Corrections, State Police, 24-hour services, EDS, DMHS, you know, things that are really important for core government functions in public health and public safety. We excluded those from the people that we're not refilling just right off the bat.

And then the rest, if you take -- only take -- out of the four people that are leaving, if you're only hiring three back, that's a one-quarter of the entire General Fund workforce. And so we thought it would be a more reasonable way to do it. I mean,

there's -- if we want people to buy into this, if we want this to be a fair and equitable way of doing it, whether it's the Rainy Day Fund, it's not taking that much money out of that, leaving a substantial portion in there for that rainy day and for whatever may happen in the state. It is not -- it is downsizing and right-sizing government, but in a fair way that is not getting rid of important services that we need and we believe in as policy makers for the state. And it's shifting that money over in a fair and reasonable way in regards to that.

And it also includes that very important municipal funding that we talk about. About \$160 million dollars a year for town aide [Inaudible-02:34:46], for, you know, urban systems, for those programs that our towns and cities rely on very strongly. And we make sure that is funded also.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): So, to that end, does this -- so this plan does not impact municipal funding.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Correct.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Does it impact school construction?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): No.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Does it impact anything in terms of education funding of any realm?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): No.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): What about economic development?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): No. It doesn't impact any of those other areas. And obviously, we're

investing in transportation which is gonna help our economic development. I just remembered one thing as to the Senator's question in regards to making sure we're not -- we're not cutting anything. I mean, we're finding efficiencies first of all in the system. I mean, any system, whether it's our home or a business or this State of Connecticut, we know there are a lot of efficiencies to be found. And if you go back to the Reason Foundation, it talks about their annual report of highways and ranked states based on the number of measures. But one of the measures that they rank states on are the administrative costs of the state, of their transportation system. We have the highest administration costs, administrative costs, in the United States of America.

I mean, if we cannot find efficiencies in administrative costs, which don't affect rail lines and bus lines or any other place. You know, the Senator and I were talking about very important functions of government; public health, public safety, important functions. If we can't find that in the state that has the highest administrative costs, that is not affecting the people out there, the people that we are here to represent. So, I think there are -- as with any group, any organization, there are a lot of efficiencies to be found and certainly we don't want to find those efficiencies to the detriment of the state. We want to try them -- to find them to the benefit of the state so the money can be going to the most important areas where it will help each member of -- each citizen of this state.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you. Thank you for that. And in terms of, you know, finding those

efficiencies, sometimes when you do question -- because it was at one of our prior public hearings and I think we were asking the DOT directly regarding the U-Pass Program, and their openness to having a performance audit conducted by our auditors on that particular program. It said to get rid of it. But if you can't get fact-based information to support decision making, you may not be making the right decisions.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Right. I mean, even with -- you brought up the U-Pass Program. I don't think we don't -- I mean, I support the U-Pass Program. I just want to make sure it's being done in the most efficient way. Because the point is to help these kids get from point A to point B in a cost-efficient way. But the auditors are our bipartisan group of people that are there to do the job and they want to do their job. You know, they want to do it and we need to use them as much as humanly possible to make sure that every side of state government is working in the most efficient way. Because if it's not, that means somebody else is not getting the money they need.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Right. When you also spoke to efficiencies in terms of some of the filling positions, I have to say I wasn't aware that the governor and OPM just released an RFP. Do you know the timing of that? That sounds very consistent with the approach of maybe filling three out of four. It sounds like they're trying to accomplish the same thing. And I heard -- I was listening to the marijuana hearing earlier and they were actually talking about the Clean Slate Program. But the point was implementing technology that, I think, a year or two ago something would've cost \$15 million

dollars and they can do it for \$2 million dollars now. And with our new DAS commissioner, I just wonder if there isn't more opportunity here for being more efficient, more contemporary.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): I mean, I think there's opportunity at every corner we turn. And I think the opportunity in those efficiencies, particularly with administrative costs, with technological advances, those are efficiencies that we will find that will not only not limit people's access to services that they want, but will actually improve them. You know, so, I think there's a lot of opportunity for that.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): I know that, everybody, I think there's a lot of questions. I just want to hit on two other areas. Could you please describe or clarify how the transportation strategy and advisory board differs from what the governor had outlined as the council in the LCO -- what was that, 373?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): I don't know any bill numbers.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): The last proposal that -- I know, they all run together. But can you describe how that is different than what was proposed in terms of the council that the governor was talking about?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): We want to put together a board that obviously we give authority to make these decisions in regards to and they can approve or reject proposals by DOT. But what we want to really make sure, the common theme is that there's transparency in regards to this board and all of

these transportation plans and projects and priorities. So, if DOT goes to that board and says here are our lists of priorities, and the board, which once again is appointments from all the leaders, from the governor, as typically as boards typically are in this state, and then they can make the decision based on their depth of knowledge and experience.

And I would hope that all of us who appoint to that board do what we usually do and appoint people that really have a lot of experience, much more than we do, in the transportation field and what the needs are, with always the first and foremost on their mind being the public safety. Making sure that roads are safe and bridges are safe. And making sure that the priorities around the state are what the priorities statewide should be. And I think another way to do this is to add another layer of transparency and checks and balances is by adding the legislature to this mix. I mean, it could be that this transportation strategy board comes out with proposals and then we, whether it be the Transportation Committee or whether it be the legislature as a whole, whatever we believe would be the most efficient way to do this, has a part in that decision making process.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): But I think you're right. The members appointed are critical, right. There's lot of commissions and boards, but it really depends on the expertise that you bring to that table. And just -- Senator Leone was asking a little bit about this as well, but just to clarify. So, the Rainy Day Fund is essentially the Budget Reserve Fund. Correct?

## PUBLIC HEARING

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Correct.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): And what was in the bipartisan budget is that once we reach this certain threshold of this excess tax money that's being set aside that it would be used to pay off our pension debt, which is the big elephant, I think, in the room. And so this plan isn't raiding anything, but it is using a portion of that money. Is it once it reaches the threshold or before we reach the threshold and then it goes to its intended purpose, which is to pay off pensions and then that frees up the interest that we've been paying. It's like making a payment on your credit card and your interest payment goes down. And using that money for transportation, can you just clarify that?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Sure. Well, you're going back to the 2017 budget. We -- one of the parameters we put in that was once the Budget Reserve Fund reaches five percent then the legislature may, it's not shall, they may use that money to start paying down pensions, making another payment toward our unfunded pension liabilities. So we would stick with that. That would maintain -- that would maintain and stay the same. But when we pay off -- when we use that \$500 million dollars to pay off -- to start paying down the unfunded pension liabilities, that would save us \$52 million dollars a year annually in the amount we need to pay for those pension liabilities each year.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): And that \$52 million dollars would go to the Special Transportation Fund?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Well, the money -- let's remember, I mean, it's kind of a -- I know it's somewhat complicated. But there's money in the

Special Transportation Fund now, up to a half a billion dollars, not being used for roads, bridges and rail. We start shifting over to the General Fund. That opens up money in the Special Transportation Fund to be used for roads, bridges and rail. We pay it off in the General Fund by the 4:3 refill rate and then we take the \$500 million dollars, as per our statute allows us to do by lay, and start paying down pension, which will save us \$52 million dollars a year annually.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Got it. Great. Thank you for that explanation and thank you for testifying. I'm happy to give others the opportunity to ask additional questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Representative Devlin. Next up is Senator Kasser, followed by Representative O'Dea.

SENATOR KASSER (36TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Hi, Representative Klarides. So, I fully agree with the premise of this, that we need more funding for transportation and we do need to deal with the unfunded pension liabilities that are essentially a dead weight on the state and the finances of the state. But I am still unclear about the movement of money between the various funds. So, if the Rainy Day Fund -- if you're proposing that the Rainy Day Fund be used to pay down pension costs, why not just transfer money from the Rainy Day Fund -- so that then money opens up for the Special Transportation Fund, why not just the Rainy Day Fund to supplement the Special Transportation Fund? Why not just do a direct allocation?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Well, Senator, that's actually a very good question. But because by law

we can only use that when it gets over the five percent for pension -- paying down pension liabilities. Now, if you're suggesting we change the law to -- I'm just saying. I mean, these are all options that we should be talking about and we may agree or disagree with some of them. But when we did that bipartisan budget in 2017 part of that language was once it hits five percent, the legislature may decide to use that to start paying down pension liabilities. Once it reaches fifteen percent over, then the treasurer shall take that money out and start paying down either the state employee pension debt or the teachers retirement system pension debt.

So, I've been working within the parameters we have in law right now to try and make that work. And it's just moving the money from place to the other, but making sure in the end -- like I mentioned to the Senator and Representative before, that this is a golden opportunity in this state, not just to fund transportation, although we all agree that that's a very important priority, but to make sure we can also start paying down our pension liability in a responsible way, start right-sizing government in a responsible way, not to the -- you know, say for every four people that leave we don't replace any of them kind of thing.

We want to do it in a way that's fair to the state. Let's make sure we maintain the services the state needs for its public safety, its public health, for our children, for our towns and cities, and making sure we are holding up our end of the bargain on all ends.

## PUBLIC HEARING

And as far as that Rainy -- just if I may, just -- that Rainy Day Fund money, there is conversation all-around of how much we should be using or not using. I will say this that I would support using more of that money if my only choice was using more of the Rainy Day Fund money versus tolls. But I think that it's part of our obligation to balance both of them, balance using Rainy Day Fund money in a way that our statute allows us to do and that was just put into statute two years ago in a bipartisan way, but while maintaining that cushion, that insurance policy. The whole point of having a Budget Reserve Fund is to make sure there is substantial amount of money. And the money we would take out still leaves a substantial amount of money in that fund. Thanks.

SENATOR KASSER (36TH): Thank you, Senator. So I agree, it is a golden opportunity to actually rethink all of our systems, all of our funding systems including the pension system. So, I just ask you, if paying down some of the pension liability doesn't -- wouldn't result in any structural change in the pension obligation. Would it?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): No. It would result in a -- I believe I said \$52 million dollars a year in savings, what we had to pay down over the long run, thirty-year term we had.

SENATOR KASSER (36TH): Right. It's not restructuring the debt or restructuring the obligation in any way that would change the obligation going forward.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Well, it's making what we have to pay less. Okay. And we have a, as you

know, we have such a huge burden in that unfunded pension liability in this state that affects every decision we make. I mean, this certainly isn't a perfect plan. I don't think any perfect plan exists in the world to do this. I mean, there's not one plan I've seen that are perfect. But having a plan and an alternative that allows you to do, to invest substantially in infrastructure of transportation to the tune of \$19 billion dollars, that allows you to start paying down, start, paying down pension liability so it will save us \$52 million dollars a year puts us ahead of the game. To start right-sizing government and hopefully for the future stop all of those costs that we -- and liabilities that we have piled up. To do all of those things and then restructuring the STF so the money that actually goes in there is used for rail, roads and bridges, which we all feel so passionately about, I think that's a pretty good start.

SENATOR KASSER (36TH): So I have a question for you about the research you cited from the Reason Foundation that the DOT has the highest administrative costs in the country. Were you saying just the DOT or are you saying the entire State of Connecticut?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): No, the DOT.

SENATOR KASSER (36TH): Just the DOT.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): And I'd be happy to get you that if you would like.

SENATOR KASSER (36TH): No. I've seen it. I've read it.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Yeah.

SENATOR KASSER (36TH): I've also read the response from the Department of Transportation, which strenuously objects to the basis for the report. And just to be clear for everybody, the Reason Foundation is a self-described, libertarian think tank, so the -- I think everyone agrees with the idea of a lean government, lean and smart government, that performs its duties effectively and efficiently. But we may have differences in opinion about what the actual facts are about costs and what the critical functions are for the DOT.

For instance, when I met with the DOT commissioner the other day, he reminded us that in Connecticut there are only two layers. There's the state and then there's municipal. In almost every other state they have a county in between, a county level that also contributes to maintaining roads, highways, etcetera. So, DOT here is absorbing all of the costs that a county structure would in other states. So it's really not an apples-to-apples comparison necessarily.

So, I just want to question the results of the Reason Foundation study a bit. But even if we put that aside and talk about the other premise of this proposed plan, which is to reduce all retiring state employees by twenty-five percent, so that you said four would retire and only three would be rehired. Do you know which agencies you would reduce from? I mean, again, I just met with somebody from DEEP today who's been in the agency for twenty-seven years and has incredible institutional knowledge, and their department has already been reduced by fifty percent in the last ten years.

So, they're already struggling to perform critical services and enforcing the laws that we have; the critical laws to protect our environment, etcetera. So, where -- what agencies do you think are -- have fat that needs to be cut?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): You know, we thought about that very seriously when we put this together and that's why right off the bat we exempted Corrections, State Police, all twenty-four hour services, whether they be DDS, DMS, any DSS, any services that we all believe are the core functions of government and fill the needs of the people of the State of Connecticut for their public health or public safety.

The answer to your question -- now, let's remember, we don't -- as legislators; don't make the decision as to where these -- this right-sizing comes from. This is an executive branch decision. But we also know that in your example of the DEEP employee, that position may be the most important position in state government. I don't know the answer to that. But I do know that when you have a list of 1,300 people that are leaving voluntarily from state service and then next -- every year for the next many years, per OFA's estimation, and you then have separated Corrections, public safety, the things that we believe are mandatory in this state that we cannot live without.

We also know there is inefficiency in state government, whether it be -- I mean, you talked about the Reason study. I'm not telling you because I am certainly no expert and I'm not telling you that it is in fact the number one. That's what they're saying. But we know it's not the most

100  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

efficient, because it's not gonna either be the most efficient or the -- and then go to the least efficient. Right? So, the point to this whole thing is there are efficiencies in government that we can find.

So, I mean, if it were me, I would take those 1,300 people that are leaving, they would all go on a list. I would go to each agency and have each agency explain to me what each one of those people that have voluntarily left do and then rank them from 1 to 1,300, right, from each agency and then rely on people that head those agencies that they are the experts in that field and figure out the ones that you brought up would be top of the list, I'm sure. And others one would be at the bottom of the list.

But again, this is about choices and that's why, to answer, I believe, Representative Devlin's question, we chose for every four we would refill three. Because I don't believe in the scorched-earth method in regards to doing this. I believe in doing it in a reasonable way.

SENATOR KASSER (36TH): Thank you. So, of the mandatory or the most critical functions, agency functions, you listed two, Corrections and Public Safety. Would you also agree that Environmental Protection? Would you also with Education? Would you agree with Consumer Protection? Would you agree with the Department of Transportation? Are those also critical government functions?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): I believe that all those agencies serve a very important function in our state or else we wouldn't have them. All right?

101  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

But when I started from the top and said, you know, when you look at our core functions of government, you look at public health and public safety and you figure out what we believe we cannot live without to start with. That's why I moved all of those out and I exempted those from the 1,300.

And then you figure out -- I mean, you know in your DEEP example that you could go into DEEP right now I'm sure and figure out every single person that works at DEEP and you could in your mind, I'm sure; I don't mean to speak for you, but I'm sure we could all do it, rank everybody in that department of the people that are the most critical to the least critical.

And if we believe as state government that our unfunded pension liabilities are too high and our taxes are too high and our fees are too high, and people are leaving the state, which we know people are leaving and there are a lot of reasons why they're going, because they're sick -- one of the reasons is they're sick and tired of having our hand stuck in their pocket. Then we have to be able to right-size government somehow and that has to a holistic approach. So, it's not saying we're gonna get rid of DEEP. It's saying let's figure out. I mean, every person from DEEP may remain in the scenario that I give you. There may be more inefficiencies in one agency than in another agency, but that is for the experts to sit down and decide. It is the same reason -- when you talk about the Reason study, we may not be the number one I administrative costs, but we're certainly not fifty. Right? So there's gotta be some efficiencies that can be found.

When you talk about a couple of years ago, the State of Connecticut, state education system, the University of Connecticut, etcetera, they said we're the highest administrative costs of any state university in the country. Now, they questioned that also, and I expect them to push back. But the answer is not -- even if they don't have the highest administrative costs, they certainly don't have the lowest, which means there's somewhere in the middle that we can all meet to find efficiencies in all these areas.

SENATOR KASSER (36TH): I certainly agree with the exercise in finding efficiencies wherever possible. And you've been in the legislature a lot longer than I have.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Don't remind me.

SENATOR KASSER (36TH): So, presumably you are -- presumably, this has been an ongoing effort to try to find efficiencies and as far as I'm aware at least some significant efficiencies have been found and thousands of state employee jobs have been eliminated and overall costs for state employees have gone down twenty-one percent in the past ten years. So, a lot of work has already been done to eliminate and find efficiencies. So I'm not arguing with the principle of finding efficiencies.

I'm just asking for specifics, because it's really easy to throw out a number and say, well, if we just cut, you know, state spending by one percent we'd have enough money to fund, you know, all of our transportation needs. That's great. But when I ask for specifics, where exactly do people want to cut? Because every single department has a critical

103  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

function, every single department does provide services that people expect and rely on. That's where the rubber meets the road, so.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): There's no question that's difficult.

SENATOR KASSER (36TH): Yeah.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): There's no question. I'm not saying it's easy. But there are -- there are a lot of choices we have to make and that have to be made by all, from top to bottom, in state government and local government. I mean, the same thing you do in your home, right. There are difficult choices to be made. And the reality we have is we have had multibillion dollar deficits in this state for the past ten years. And our reality is it's not work -- what we're doing is not working. And so, for me, this is really about those choices and I'm not saying -- they're gonna be very difficult.

But if you just look back at 2017, I mean, you weren't here then, but this was an eleven-month session where we were here day in and day out, working on a budget. We finally came to a bipartisan budget plan, which I was very proud of. Okay. Was there every single thing I wanted? No. But there were a lot of things that moved the state forward in a very fiscally responsible way with a spending cap and a borrowing cap and a volatility cap. You heard us talk about the Budget Reserve Fund in regards to the five percent to fifteen percent. I mean, these were all things that were put forward. And that's the main reason why that Budget Reserve Fund is so flush right now.

104  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

But what's frustrating to me and I'm sure it's frustrating to all of us is we're not big closers in this state. And by that I mean this. In that budget, in law, it said we had to put out an RFP to find \$500 million dollars of efficiencies in the State of Connecticut. The governor and OPM put out that RFP. People responded to that RFP, and then nothing. Okay. It's not enough to say you're gonna do it or take the first step. You have to finish it. So, we all believed in a bipartisan way that that was a responsible dollar amount to put into find efficiencies.

And I'll just remind everybody that the Fiscal Stability Commission said we should look for a billion dollars. We all agreed, okay, \$500 million dollars is more reasonable to put forward. We put it in the budget. They put the RFP out. People responded and then nothing. I mean, so, yeah, they're really tough decisions. I mean, we don't get elected, you know, to eat bonbons all day and sit here and watch TV in our office. We get elected to make tough decisions. And unfortunately, in the past ten years they've been really tough decisions with the financial situation the State of Connecticut has.

And so, we have to move and I'm very happy that Governor Lamont put out this RFP. I hope it continues to fruition and we close that deal so we can find some of those efficiencies, because his efficiencies that he's looking for are very similar to ours in regards to the people that are leaving state service voluntarily.

105  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

SENATOR KASSER (36TH): Thank you. I'll just make one last remark that the Commission on -- the bipartisan Commission on Fiscal Stability also recommended that we derive new revenue from tolls to cover these gaps. So, paying down the pensions, absolutely a priority, but also deriving new revenue from sources that are not taxpayer dollars and finding efficiencies. All of those together combined would be a comprehensive solution, in my opinion. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): And if I just may respond to that. They did recommend that. But their recommendations, let's all remember, were not piecemeal recommendations. That was a holistic plan. Now, these were business people that gave of their time and wanted to try and run the state more like a business than it is. And their recommendations, whether it be tolls, it was also getting rid of collective bargaining. It was also finding a billion dollars in efficiencies. It was also many things in a row, because they understood that the state is operated by piecemeal, saying, okay, we need this money, let's do these tolls or let's do this tax or let's increase these fees. That's not worked.

So, they did include that. And I have to tell you that if the State of Connecticut was operating in a holistically efficient way overall, those should be conversations we can have. But when we pass a budget in June that has a six-percent spending increase, a \$1.7 billion dollar increase and \$171 million dollar moving of the Special Transportation money somewhere else, but don't worry it'll be back

in the -- you know, in the out years, in the front side, and whatever, I don't care.

You know, I can't consider new revenue sources in this state if we're gonna keep spending more, taxing more, and moving money around. And so, that is the problem with that. I mean, I didn't agree with that part of it, but I did agree, if all the things were done in their plan, then that might be a conversation we could have realistically. Thank you.

SENATOR KASSER (36TH): Glad to hear it. Thanks.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Senator. In terms of that report, I think the overall point is we shouldn't be using that commission in pieces to justify a point. It's either all or nothing as you mentioned. So, if it comes up as that they recommended this and we didn't act on it, as a talking point, you have to consider the whole thing. So, as we go forward, I hope that whenever it does come up it comes up in that way and not used sparingly just to talk on one aspect of it, as has been done in this building numerous times. So -- and I think you have pretty much said the exact same thing. So, hopefully we can do that going forward.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): But, Senator, I have to say that we all, in a bipartisan way, decided when we put that budget together and voted on it that that should be part of that budget, which means it's a law on the books and we only went halfway down the road and didn't finish it. That was my point to that.

107  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Right. But you either accept all or nothing. And we just can't take pieces. Next up is Representative O'Dea, followed by Representative Lavielle and then Representative Morin.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you very much, my good leader, for your testimony. Just to kind of summarize the fiscal accountability study. They also recommended reducing dramatically the personal income tax. They also recommended eliminating the state gift tax and they did say, okay, well, we'll do all that; we'll also increase the minimum wage. But the only thing we got out of that was the increased minimum wage. Correct?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Yes, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): But in any event, I agree we shouldn't -- it was not supposed to be piecemeal, but it was when it came to minimum wage increase. But in any event.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Aha, Senator.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): No, no, no, no. I didn't mean it that -- but in any event.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): I'll weigh in on that a little bit later. So, we'll come back. We want to keep this moving so other people can question. Thank you.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Understood.

108  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): I don't need to be here all day, trust me, either. I want everybody to have their opportunity to speak.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): We're not projecting any savings from an audit that you've been talking about. Correct? This plan doesn't expect any savings. You just want the audit. Isn't that fair?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Well, you know, I think that audits should be part of this whole plan. I mean, whether it be, as we talked about, DOT and their administrative costs, let's figure out why it is what it is. Whether it's the highest or the tenth highest or the thirtieth highest, it's not low. You know, we can look at the auditors looking at the transportation strategy board in regards to what they're doing, when that starts moving along. So, I think that it should be part -- I think we should use them more than we use them now, because they're there for a reason. We don't need them to eat bonbons either.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): And to the point the good Senator was mentioning, this is not the only plan or effort to reduce positions. Correct?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Correct.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): In fact, the governor's put forth an RFP for consultants to reduce and find employee savings. Correct?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Correct.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Look, you've been up here for a while. We've been talking about this. I think we can all agree there are many different ways we can

109  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

address the transportation spending and improvements. And I do appreciate this plan. Thank you very much for your testimony.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative Lavielle, followed by Representative Morin.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Madam Leader, thank you for being here and for your testimony. It's interesting to hear the discussion because some of these matters are a little bit arcane. I know that many of them we've turned and twisted in every possible direction for years and years, but I think that you've presented this in a configuration we haven't really seen before. And just a couple of things strike me. One is that I think it's very important for people to realize that a one-time contribution to the pension fund of the magnitude that you're talking about, which is, what, half a billion dollars -- a one-time contribution like that to pay off the pensions actually reduces the obligations and the expenses of the General Fund for years, for years to come.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Correct.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD): It is not like just paying off an ongoing operational debt.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Correct.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD): It's something that's accumulated over time and as we reduce the amount of it that's left, that means that the annual actuarial contribution can be immediately reduced all the way

110  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

out. And that's extremely important. That's why we have that statute that dates from 2017 that says that if we attain a certain percentage of appropriations in the Budget Reserve Fund we can use that to pay pensions off. Not we can use it to buy something new or bond something new in a particular town because a legislator wants it, but because these are obligations that we'll decrease over the long term if we do it.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Correct.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD): And that's why this recommendation is so important. It's also important because you have tied it to that statute, which specifically allows us to do this, and in turn you've balanced it as well with still leaving enough in the Budget Reserve Fund to protect us against recessions.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): And then the large majority will be left in there.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD): Exactly. So I just thought that was important to point out. And I have a couple of questions for you. I'm particularly glad to see the audits in here. And there's some audits performance or we might call it usage of certain, you know, rail lines or bus lines that have been built, to see just exactly how much they're being used and should we operate them as much as we do, also the administrative expenses. Are you including in that as well actual design and construction expenses to monitor DOT efficiencies in those areas?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Well, in particular, we have targeted the administrative costs. But, again, this

111  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

is a conversation and this should be a conversation we continue down the road in this building to have. I am open to anybody's suggestions as to where we think we can move forward and make this better. Again, there's no such thing as a perfect plan, so there's always room for improvement. But we focused on the administrative costs because those are costs and efficiencies that will not take away services from anyone.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD): Well, and also, again, as I think you pointed out earlier, these are audits. They're not mandates to cut this or cut that. They're audits that we know more about how the money's being spent. And I think in some of the studies we've seen, that are probably not entirely accurate, but not entirely inaccurate either, there are -- there have been looks taken at how we're actually spending that operational money as well so that if -- so, you're open to including that.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Yes, of course.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD): And the other area where I think it's interesting to go into in a little more depth is, which you brought it up briefly earlier, the potential role of the legislature in participating in the choice and prioritization of infrastructure projects to pursue. Can you elaborate on that a little bit?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): So, right now, in the plan, what it contemplates is the transportation strategy board, which is -- will be appointments from all legislative leaders, governor, as we've done in the past, and as we talked about earlier, we hope that these are experts in the field that we all choose.

112  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

So, this is the top of the line group of people in transportation. The Department of Transportation would then submit to them the projects they believe are the priorities, and then the board would have that final say at this point as to what they believe should be the priority list in regard to that.

I think it may actually be very beneficial to even add the legislature, whether it be the Transportation Committee or the legislature as a whole, as yet another checks and balance in regards to that, because if it's the DOT that's making the absolute decision, then there's no real transparency in checks and balances. If it's the transportation strategy board, at least when they are in conjunction with DOT, that's two groups working together and they can kind of discuss and debate what they think and why those projects should be prioritized. And then we, as the legislators, have a role in that too. And I think that can added as yet another layer of transparency in regards to that.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD): I think that's a really good addition because they would be required to report to the legislature and also some people who have been elected would have an opportunity for input. And that was one of the -- that was one of the main reasons for objection to a lot of the toll proposals that we've seen in recent years, where there was always some entity that got to decide when there would be price increases in tolls, where they would be put, whether there would be expansion in scope. It was never anyone elected making those decisions. And so here we have an opportunity through the conversations that you and the committee chairs have

113  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

just discussed having to pursue that a little further. And I think that's an excellent direction to go in.

I'd just make one more remark, which is that we always hear, and with - you know, totally understandably, that taking money from the Budget Reserve Fund could have -- could end up putting more burdens on the future of our residents, weakening the financial situation of the state. But, in fact, on the contrary, it is a way of reducing those permanent obligations. And so I really think we cannot overestimate the importance of that. This is something we've been wanting to do for a long time and here's our opportunity to do it and in the bargain, we get to improve our transportation infrastructure.

And as far as some remarks that the last senator to speak made in closing. It's true that the Commission on Fiscal Stability and Economic Growth mentioned tolls as a new revenue source, but we have to remember, again, that asking residents to pay for something is not really a new revenue source. It's exhausting the source that is there. They also -- the commission also emphasized in great detail the importance of growing the economy by bringing new businesses and new sources of income growth to the state. And that's what we'll help to do as we improve this transportation infrastructure.

So thank you very much for your work on this and I think we have a lot to work with and a good foundation for those bipartisan conversations to come. Thank you.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Thank you, Representative.

114  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Morin, followed by Senator Martin.

REP. MORIN (28TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was gonna say good morning. Good afternoon. As long as we're not saying good evening, I guess we're both doing well.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): We're ahead of the game, yes.

REP. MORIN (28TH): And, you know, I very much look forward to reading your plan and I think it's important that we do all try to go through and have open minds on the proposals, absolutely. I heard one thing and I'm not sure, you may be able to correct me, if I heard it from Representative Devlin or from yourself, about that the pension liabilities are increasing as we go. Was the intent of that that it's the overall structure? Because I know in the last SEBAC agreement they've drastically restructured how the pensions are gonna be funded, you know, the type of pension offered and such. So, you're not -- you're just talking about the overall fund?

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Yeah. I mean, I wouldn't go so far as to say drastic, but it was restructured. I think maybe you misheard, so I'll just say it again because I said a lot of things today, so it may have been confusing. When we take the half a million dollars to pay down, to begin paying down the unfunded pension liabilities, and that is five percent -- that five percent and over which is a decision we made in the 2017 bipartisan budget, which is in statute now. That will save us \$52 million dollars a year annually.

115  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

REP. MORIN (28TH): Thank you. Thank you.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): You're welcome.

REP. MORIN (28TH): I thought -- again, I've been listening to a lot of different things and I appreciate the clarification. You know, I'm gonna offer -- I've been listening to many discussions about having us, whether it's the Transportation Committee or the legislature in general, have some sort of oversight. I would offer caution to that. While there may be some great experts on transportation issues in this building, I'm not sure that it's the right way to go. I think it would politicize, more than things are politicized today, important transportation infrastructure commitments and priorities. So, that's my two cents on that part. I just don't know that it makes sense from my thinking.

Refilling positions, because you talked about the three out of four and the process for refilling positions. Today, I mean, it's not -- and I'm sure you know. Today, when a state agency has a vacancy, it's not like they can just go and refill it. They have to go get approval. They go to DAS. They go to OPM and OPM does an analysis of whether that refill is needed. And that kind of gets me where I'm going with the three out of four. Because in theory -- and I'll keep an open mind this. But where are those people replaced?

I appreciate that you looked at Corrections, State Police, 24-hour services. You're recognizing the importance of that. But let me go -- let me whittle my way down to a technical high school. Which teacher doesn't get replaced? Which custodian that

116  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

keeps the building doesn't get replaced? That's where I go because we have -- the state's made major commitments to our technical high schools. I think we should do more, but.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): I agree.

REP. MORIN (28TH): I think we have to look carefully about that. I'd be interested in seeing numbers, though, because we don't have in front of those numbers. I know the governor has also proposed looking for ways to whittle down the workforce, and that always concerns me.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Mm-hmm. And I understand that. You know, that's -- I mean, you gave your examples. Senator Kasser gave her examples. And certainly we can all break down every agency and every employee in the state and say, well, which one do you think is more important or which one would we not refill? And those are the serious questions. There's no question about that. I can't tell you that a certain teacher's position would not be replaced or a custodian wouldn't be replaced or somebody at DEEP wouldn't be replaced. But I will say is what I said to her.

We get elected to make tough decisions. And to your point, we're in a very tough time. We've been in tough times for over ten years now. We sit there every year trying to find money, to find multibillion dollar deficit refilling, and we've had to make tough decisions to find that money. And sometimes we agree on how we do it and sometimes we don't. And that's our job, right, to have these conversations and discussions. To have these out there is very important to me. But right now, the

117  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

process by which you have to refill a position is as it should be, but that doesn't mean that more often than not the answer is, yes, refill it.

What we're saying is we have to find a way to right-size government. We started off with core government functions, public safety, public health. We started -- that's why we started out with State Police, Corrections, 24-hour services, DDS, DMHS, those kinds of things, and we eliminated those as even groups that can come from -- be on the chopping block. All right. And that number was whittled down to about 1,300 people that we have remaining. And I can only tell you -- I mean, that is an executive branch and OPM decision at that point.

But I would only tell you how I would do it if it were my decision. And I would take every one of those people, you know, put them on that list, figure out what agencies everybody's in, put them in those categories. Talk to each one of those agencies; get experts with the head of those agencies and people in regards to what the efficiency is for each position and then start ranking them, 1 to 1,300, and figure out what we believe are those core government services. What jobs -- what positions we can't live without. What positions, if eliminated, would show the State of Connecticut that we don't -- we're not supporting this area. We're not supporting that area. So that's how I would do it.

REP. MORIN (28TH): And Representative --

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): And I know that's difficult. I'm not saying it's not.

118  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

REP. MORIN (28TH): And I appreciate that. And I guess, you know, I can't argue your valuing on Corrections and 24-hour services and State Police. I share those same things. But, you know, as you go down, there's -- I think those processes are in place through the OPM process, because we've seen -- maybe for some there's still too many state employees. Maybe for others there's not enough. Somewhere in the middle there's always that discussion that we have. But I think it's there. I think that does happen and I've seen it in different agencies where, you know, where we don't have quite as many people as we used to, and maybe that's all right. Maybe that is okay. But like I said, I certainly will pay attention to what you're saying.

And the only -- I heard you mention Fastrak as an example. And I think many of our -- any of our public transportation modes are heavily subsidized, whether it's Shoreline East, whether it's Metro North, Fastrak. And I've heard a lot of proposals. I think the last hearing we had, we had people from all over the state, especially in the valley, Danbury, I think, other areas talking about how they want -- Representative O'Dea, talking about we want more trains, more access to trains, so. I mean, huge infrastructure, probably worthwhile. But again, we don't know at this point what those numbers would be and how heavily we'd be subsidizing it. And one thing I -- we're quick to kick the Fastrak down the road, but, I mean, I've --

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): I'm not kicking it down. I'm not at all. So I want to make that clear.

119  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

REP. MORIN (28TH): No, no, no, but you're making mention that it should -- there there's many times you see empty buses. And all I would argue on that is I've spoken with Mayor Stewart in New Britain, who said this is a wonderful thing. It's helped downtown development in her city. I've seen some growth in West Hartford and Newington. I know there could always be better things done, but from what I listened to, and it was Jim Redecker I believe, when he was commissioner of Transportation, who continued to talk to us; if you want to build mass transit, you have to have a consistent scheduling. And if you don't have a consistent scheduling, you're just gonna blow it up. And I think that's kind of where I am on that.

But, you know, I promise you this, I have been listening to you and I will continue to listen to you and others, because it's a real big issue that we all have and we all aren't agreeing on certain things. You know where I stood on tolls. I think I know where you stood. And it's important for us to have --

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): I have to learn to speak up more.

REP. MORIN (28TH): It's gonna be interesting. It's gonna be worthwhile having the conversation going forward. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Thank you, Representative. If I could just quickly follow up. I want to reiterate, this isn't about any of these programs are not good. I support Fastrak. I just want to

120  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

make sure it's efficient. And I don't know -- I know that when I look out that window, on any given day there are either buses or almost empty buses. And I'm saying is we have to find efficiencies in wherever we are, whether it's administrative costs in DOT, whether it's which -- and I agree with having a consistent schedule, because then nobody -- people aren't gonna get on it because they're gonna go and the bus isn't gonna be there and then they may not know when to go again. But that doesn't mean we don't figure out which stops are being used more and which are being used less, and which ones we can rearrange the schedule to be more efficient.

And in that efficiency we can find some savings in regards to that. Not fifty percent, not twenty-five percent, but a five percent savings I think is very fair in being efficient with those. Because if nobody's on those buses on a regular basis, there could be other places buses are full and maybe there should be more buses there, right, maybe there should be. I just want to make sure that as many people are using the opportunities of transportation we give them, but it's done in a fiscally-efficient manner.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. We'll move on to Senator Martin. And I just want to pause. It's hard to evaluate a bus success story based upon seeing an empty bus. There are many times I can look out my window at home, at 91-95 interchange, one of the most highly traversed interchanges in the entire country, and that highway will be empty for large portions of the day. And saying that the probably sixteen hours a day that there are not very many cars on the road does not mean it's not a

121  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

successful highway that doesn't deserve to take us apart.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Yeah, yeah, yeah, right. I'm not saying it's not, but I'm saying that there is benefit to analyzing that and seeing where it can be used the most.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Senator Martin and then we're gonna move on.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Thank you. I just want to clarify what part of your plan is. So, you're taking half a billion dollars out of the Budget Reserve Fund and applying it towards the payment towards unfunded liability, which is the elephant in the room and we all know that.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Why can't it be the donkey in the room, Senator?

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): That's right.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Why does it have to be the elephant all the time?

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So, by doing that, where your plan has a savings of \$52 billion dollars, which actually would go into the General Fund. So you'd be backfilling, so to speak, that income, that savings, in the General Fund by taking or moving over expenditures from the STF over to the GF side. Correct? Thus, reducing our overall expenditures in the STF.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): I think the answer is yes to what you said. But I'll just repeat it in my words so I may try -- and you tell me if I said what you

122  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

meant. So, when we're starting to shift the STF employment costs, employee costs over to the General Fund, that will move over in approximately \$100 million dollars in five years. We will find that money to pay those employee costs in the General Fund by only replacing three out of every four people that leave state service voluntarily and then we'll take the \$500 million dollars of the Budget Reserve Fund money, start to pay down the pension costs, and then, yes, we will have that savings of \$52 million dollars annually and that paid down.

And, you know, in reality, you could do two things with it. You can either say we have to pay \$52 million dollars less a year, you know, of the one some-odd billion dollars that we pay already to it, or it can be an extra payment. In our plan, it's an extra payment so we can start paying that down more every year.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you so much for your testimony today. It's been a good couple of hours and I do appreciate your earnestness with this issue. I've seen -- and I think sometimes we get stuck in our political mindset and we fail to recognize the hard spots we are in ourselves. And I've seen you, in the past, take heat for saying that you thought we still needed to invest \$19 to \$20 billion dollars per year and you've had your own constituents hit you, well, how dare you justify that number.

And I've seen you take the hard shots when you say, no. We disagree on how to get there, but I think we all agree that's probably the right number. And I

123  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

know that was a hard stance for you to take and I know all of us around this table do appreciate the earnestness with which you're approaching this issue. And I do hope we have this pause used wisely and we can come up and craft a real solution that addresses the real problems that we have. So, thank you.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH): Thank you, Representative.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Senator Formica and then Susan Smith, Rahul Shah.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH): Good afternoon. Senator Leone, Representative Lemar, Senator Martin and Representative Devlin and the esteemed members of the committee. I am here -- I am Paul Formica, the Senator of the 20th District, and here to testify in support of H.B. No. 5021, AN ACT CONCERNING REVISIONS TO THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY STATUTE.

This importantly adds the Office of the New London Mayor's as the sixteenth voting member for the board. It adds at least a member that you'd have auditing experience. It allows the governor to select the chair. Currently, that's the duty of the board. The executive director is required to adhere to applicable laws and regulations, which we would think should be obvious anyway, but it spells it out here. Specifies what written procedures the board needs to put in place and it requires the board to annually contract with a firm of public accountants.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a good start, but in and of itself it does not go far enough. I support it getting out of committee and I hope that there is additional input and the final product we can enact

124  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

all of the oversight the port authority and quasis throughout our government need. This is incredibly important as a first step as we embark on a massive undertaking led by the Connecticut Port Authority in managing the state pier, which has a key role in the rolling out of this new and emerging industry of offshore wind, which will only benefit all of the rate payers in the State of Connecticut over time. So, I thank you very much for the opportunity to share my thoughts with you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): And thank you, Senator, for stepping forward on this issue. We've had a number of public hearings associated with the port authority. We've had numerous conversations. The solutions are difficult to formulate, but I trust that you working alongside the Governor's Office, ourselves on this committee and beyond will find a proper way to address it. So, I appreciate your testimony.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH): Thank you. And I hope the opportunity for all of the controls that we have suggested and more will be able to have the opportunity to get into this bill, if not, or others that address the issues we're having with quasis, but I thank you for your comment.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Representative Devlin. Oh, sorry, Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Senator. What would you say is the top two things that you'd like added to it or the top three?

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH): Well, we have opportunities for the comptroller to have a list of salaries and

125  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

an understanding when those salaries exceed a number. In our case, we've identified it as \$200 thousand dollars for a number. Obviously, the financial disclosures which could include operational disclosures, but also contractual disclosures that, you know, may be for a short time or a long time, to kind of put some sunlight on those.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Sounds like some good commonsense measures to add to it, so I would absolutely support those. Thank you very much, Senator. And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Thank you, Senator Formica, for coming today. So, regarding -- I know we had an issue regarding the attorneys and the amount of monies that were paid to the port authority. And I think the bill addresses the rights for us as a committee here to have access to the -- have access to our information because we had asked for invoices so that we could see what those expenditures, those bills were being charged and for what reason. And, you know, they were sort of hid behind, so to speak, the client privilege, you know, the right not to share that information because of certain client privileges between the attorney and then -- so, can you explain a little bit about that if that isn't in the bill?

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH): Well, clearly that would be part of the contractual reviews that I think would be necessary. But the conversation that I think you're referring to had high-priced attorneys doing clerical type work. And I think that was part of

the indiscretions, if you will, that was happening throughout that agency. And, you know, obviously, everybody needs attorneys at some point and time, but the question is and if there was proper oversight as to the breadth of their work, whether it was indeed necessary and the most efficient use of taxpayer funds.

And I think in this case it became very clear there were a lot of abuses in many different areas from the port authority operations as it was started. And I think part of that has to do with the fact that this was identified in a budget document a few years ago and not really given the proper vetting. And I think that should be another part of quasi controls, that there is proper vetting by the Committee of Cognizance so that we have job description, flowcharts, policy procedures, bylaws, all those things established. And I think if we did, then attorneys would fall into the controls under there and I think that would certainly be an important part of what's going on.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Yeah. And I think the rationale behind that part for the bill is to let the two -- that the agency, the quasi is really an extension of us here at the legislature and if we wanted to be able to see certain documents that they shouldn't have that ability to hide behind anything, because they have to be -- we are -- they are our -- you know, they're hired by us. Not necessarily by the quasi, but they are -- but we are -- they are simply an extension of us and we should have the right to any information that we want. So, thank you.

127  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH): Thank you. And I think reporting to the legislators and the executive branch I believe is part of this.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Yeah. Thank you.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH): Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Senator Formica, for your testimony today.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH): Thank you very much for your time.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Susan Smith, followed by Rahul Shah.

MS. SMITH: Good afternoon and thank you very much, Chairman Lemar and also Chairman Leone and Transportation Committee members. My name is Susan Smith. I'm executive director of Bike Walk Connecticut and I'm here today in support on behalf of Bike Walk Connecticut of House Bill 5324.

Bike Walk Connecticut applauds the Transportation Committee for introducing this bill. It's legislation that will improve safety for all users, especially our vulnerable users, a cyclist and walkers. Now is a critical time to pass this legislation, as had we heard today in the hearing, many remarked on the number of pedestrian fatalities that we've seen here in Connecticut. And in 2020 alone, as you had heard, just in two months we had fourteen or fifteen fatalities. Well at that rate, at the end of 2020, we're talking about upwards of eighty pedestrian fatalities, comparing that to 2019, there was fifty-five.

This upward trend is heartbreaking and preventable. We need to focus on fixing this fatality trend, and this legislation will help address the issue. I just want to mention, I happen to live in Glastonbury. In the last fourteen months, two of those pedestrian fatalities had occurred in my town. One of those, on January 23rd, it was a grandmother, eighty-four years old, named Valda, and she was just going out to get her mail. Tragically, she was struck and killed and the driver took off.

Roads are designed to be shared, and collectively, the components of this bill will help make Connecticut streets safer, and more bike and walk-friendly for all users. Many of you may already be aware that Bike Walk Connecticut had held a legislative reception on January 30th, 2020, just about a month ago, and we thanked the seven legislators who had attended. We had received approximately 100 or 120 citizen advocates, bike/ped advocates who had attended that reception. I mention it because the priorities that we had talked about at the reception are very much aligned with this legislation and there was much support by those 100+ attendees at our reception.

And in addition, we did ask our attendees to provide us written notes of support for the priorities that we had identified and we had gathered at least forty-five notes of support. The various components of this bill, by the way, I just want to mention Bike Walk Connecticut has already provided testimony on. (Timer) One new one is dooring. I'll wrap it up. One is dooring, and that one's important. If you look at the physics of what happens, if a cyclist is biking along and a driver opens up their

129  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

door in their path, the physics of the situation are such that the driver can easily be spilled into traffic, which makes it extremely dangerous. So, a fine for this particular violation by a driver is very helpful to protecting our cyclists. Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Susan, for your testimony and for your leadership of Bike Walk Connecticut over the last few years. We've certainly seen your advocacy and the advocacy of so many affiliate groups across the state step forward on this issue and it is greatly appreciated. So, thank you for your testimony. Are there questions for Ms. Smith? Seeing none. Thank you, Susan, for spending your day today and for helping to generate a lot of testimony that has been submitted to this committee. And if anyone wants to go on to our committee website and click on the bill number, you'll see scores and scores of submitted testimony from people who are unable to be here today. I know you helped organize a lot of that. So, thank you.

MS. SMITH: Yes. Thank you so very much.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Dr. Shah, to be followed by Senator Fasano.

DR. SHAH: I'm sorry. What am I supposed to refute? My name is not right? So, yes, my name is Rahul Shah. I'm here to voice my support for the House Bill 5324. So good afternoon, members of the Joint Committee of Transportation. Thank you so much for your time today and your willingness to hear my testimony.

My name is Rahul Shah. I am a physician who completed my pediatric residency at Yale-New Haven

Children's Hospital and am currently a pediatric emergency medicine fellow here in Hartford at Connecticut Children's. I work with the Connecticut Children's Injury Prevention Center, which has sought to educate the public on ways to keep themselves and their children safe since its inception. It is an absolute pleasure to speak with you today on behalf of both Connecticut Children's and its Injury Prevention Center regarding my support of House Bill 5324, which allow localities to lower speed limits when appropriate and further promote pedestrian safety at crosswalks.

When I was a pediatric resident, I learned how dangerous roads kept my patients from being able to participate in physical activities that I took granted. I recall evaluating a child with obesity. When I asked his mother if it would be possible for him to walk or run or ride his bike around his neighborhood, she reacted as though this would be absurd. Anyone who has driven through our state's cities would recognize that her incredulousness was understandable.

Now, as a pediatric emergency medicine fellow here in Hartford, I see far too many children present to the emergency department with traumatic injuries sustained from being struck by a motor vehicle. Some children who come to the emergency department after such injuries may require only minor, but still invasive, testing and treatment, such as blood draws and stitches. Others, with more critical injuries, may require diagnostic imaging, which come with risks associated with ionizing radiation, more invasive emergency procedures, and surgery. Many

131  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

such incidents occur on city roads at seemingly low speeds.

My experiences in both preventative and emergency medicine have highlighted the importance of safer roads. Detractors may argue that those who choose to break the law will do so regardless of posted limits. However, recent evidence from Boston suggests otherwise. There, when lower speed limits were introduced, the percentage of motor vehicles traveling above thirty-five miles per hour decreased by over thirty percent. In the United Kingdom, the city of Bristol found that reducing its city-wide speed limit to twenty miles an hour was associated with a reduction of deadly injuries by over sixty percent.

It is true that traffic laws should be coupled with additional interventions including education and enforcement. However, allowing municipalities to make needed safety changes to the roads will be an important, critical first step in creating better streets for our cities. Nationally, pedestrian deaths are rising; 2019 marked the deadliest for our country's pedestrians in the last thirty years. Other states and municipalities have taken notice of how legislative actions can have a profound impact on child safety. I implore you to support House Bill 5324 and allow Connecticut to do the same.

I'm happy to answer any questions. If I can't answer anything specific at this time, I'll be happy to get back to you at a later time. Thank you again for your time and consideration.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Dr. Shah, for your testimony. I note there's also testimony provided

132  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

by Yale Pediatric Team, representing twelve different doctors. And so I don't know if you are a part of that as well, but.

DR. SHAH: No. I'm just part of Connecticut Children's.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): So, there is great testimony from a lot of our emergency room doctors and Yale Pediatrics as well. So, I do thank you for your willingness to come forward to spend so much of your day with us today to talk about what you see and the experiences that you're seeing. So, I appreciate that. Are there any questions for Dr. Shah? Seeing none. Thank you again so much for your time. Senator Fasano. After Senator Fasano, we have Reverend Holloway, Bill Veronesi, Representative Nolan, Kevin Blacker. And if your name is not on that list I need you to go up to our clerk and sign in, because that will exhaust our signup sheet.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): Good afternoon, members of the Transportation Commission, or committee, I should say. First of all, thank you for your patience. I had some issues that kept me from being here earlier in the day. So, I appreciate the patience. So, I'm gonna first talk about -- I'm not here to preach our plan. I'm really not. I want to have this more of a discussion tone. But what I want to talk about is different ways of achieving this goal.

So the plan that we submitted which is in Senate Bill 271, let me just explain. You have some handouts I think in front of you. All those numbers have been vetted by OFA. They have been run through whatever they do up at OFA to make sure that they

133  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

are accurate. And we've been working on this plan for a number of months. They are updated with the most recent consensus revenue numbers. So they are accurate in every way, shape or form. The bill has four parts. It's the funding part, the transportation board, the railroad part, and it also has an audit part.

So starting from the last. I think that this committee has been all over DOT with what's happening with the money; how are the projects being approved, and some questions about the actual finances, all of which are very appropriate, and we've had the conversation I think last year on this. And this requires an audit to be done and then reported to this committee so that you know where all the money is, where it is staged, and how it being used.

And then we have the transportation strategy board, a typical board, with some expertise. We'll look at it in railroad, which also include a New York component, because you can't fix the railroad unless you took 12th Street where the railroads go underground. And if you don't get together with New York on that, you're never gonna get any faster to Manhattan. And I will say that Governor Lamont, though his former chief of staff, who's still around, Ryan, had great connections to New York in opening up that dialog, and Governor Lamont has talked to Governor Cuomo about it. So I think that that type of possibility exists.

So what does this plan do? A ten-thousand-foot level, just so everyone knows. We have \$2.7 billion dollars in the Rainy Day Fund. We take \$1.5 billion

134  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

dollars out of the Rainy Day Fund and we pay down on pension liability. That means once you pay down that pension liability, your monthly pension payments are reduced. We transfer that savings to the Transportation Fund in whole, and you use that cash to put in the transportation system.

So, what this plan does is say money that's earning, you know, two percent, three percent in our savings account, we're gonna pay off debt at eight or nine percent, and we're gonna use that cash flow. Just like if you had your savings account at home with money in it, extra money in it, and you had a credit card at twenty-three percent and you're earning a half a percent, why wouldn't you take your savings, pay down on your credit card, relieving you of some monthly obligations. That's the component of this.

Now, could that \$1.5 billion dollars be a billion and your plan can work? Yes. You do a little more borrowing on the GO. So, what you do, it's like -- I don't know, like a -- as you press down on one the other side goes up. So, you could go from 1.5 billion dollars to a billion. If some critics, who are uncomfortable with \$1.5 billion dollars coming out, you could make that a billion. Could you go down to \$750 million dollars? Yeah, I actually think you can go down to \$750 million dollars and make it work, with some numbers and discussions among you guys and others.

Could you go below \$750 million dollars? I think once you start to go below \$750 million dollars, you've changed the dynamics and you've put in more of a borrowing obligation that we're never gonna get rid of and is gonna add to our future problems. So,

135  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

there is some slack, if you will, to make this happen. Here's what I think we all can agree to. Number one - we've got to fix our transportation problem. Everybody's onboard with that. Number two - getting local unions the work that this could be done is the second thing I think we all can agree to. And the third thing, if we're gonna attract more businesses to the State of Connecticut; we've got to fix some of our structural problems that are gonna plaque our state. I think we can do that.

This plan does offer that possibility. Now if the legislature, this committee, the legislature, a year from now or two years from now wants to go in a different direction, this doesn't foreclose different directions. This isn't saying once this plan is there it's etched in stone, there's nothing more you can do. But what it does do is this. We've been waiting since Governor Malloy to put in a transportation plan to fix our system, way back when. And there was a lot of talk and a lot of numbers, and I get it, it's a complicated issue. So almost two years later, we are at the same spot.

If you approve a plan that's something like this, the construction industry can start entering into contracts as soon as you approve it. We could start physical construction and get people to work right now, because it is guaranteed under the plan that we can pay for it. If we change course in the future, it's okay, those contracts will still be funded because the change of course would have to respect those contracts. But if we do doing, we've put off the inevitable, which is we gotta fix the roads and they're getting worse, and people aren't getting to work.

136  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

So, I don't say it's a stopgap measure by any stretch, but what I am saying is that this is not an irrevocable [Inaudible-03:51:18]. So when you look at it as, say, we still would -- if we did \$1.5 billion dollars, we still have the volatility cap that's gonna deposit \$318 million dollars in fiscal year '20, \$274 million dollars in '21, and \$281 million dollars in '22. It goes on. So we would bringing -- at the end of fiscal year '21, we would still be close to nine percent in our Rainy Day Fund, which is still an historic amount of money.

So I -- that's what I present in front of you as a discussion purpose. I think it gets us moving. It gets people to work. It gets transportation going. That's what we could do now. I don't think there's a huge risk here in doing it. And that's why I brought this plan forward. As they say, this bill, Senate Bill 271 or Raised Bill 271.

You know, the other thing is, if I may, RRIF and TIFIA are -- they're out there. The money is there as it's been reported. In a bipartisan spirit, I went down to Washington, D.C. with Mr. Ryan and -- or Ryan Drajewicz, I should say. We went down to D.C. I made some contacts. We set up a meeting. We had the commissioner -- deputy commissioner of Transportation there. We had Build America there. We had the person who does nothing but tolls there. There was, like, eight or nine people. It was a round table like this and Ryan and I went there and we listened.

And we were talking about tolls, what you can do and what you can't do. And then they told us about the RRIF and the TIFIA money at one percent and two

137  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

percent and we got into that conversation. And then to this administration's credit, they continued on with the conversation to peg down some of the facts. But I think that was a breakthrough because we were able to get a low-interest rate money.

So, that's where we are. This is the plan. I'm open to, obviously, some questions, Mr. Chairman. But that's essentially what it is.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Minority Leader Fasano, for your time and the energy and your willingness to engage in this issue in numerous ways over the last few years, particularly giving up so much of your summer, heading down to Washington. Chief of Staff Drajewicz talks about those trips in different terms than you. He might refer to them as gut-wrenching and difficult. But I think you ended up coming back with an idea of what's available to us and we've been -- had those briefings ourselves back in Connecticut, which Build America came up, and gave us all an understanding -- a greater understanding of what their capacity is.

And a lot of that understanding in the capacity and the framework, which we had this conversation for the last six months, was based upon you, yourself, and Ryan going down and having those early conversations. So, in so much as we may disagree quite a bit over what you're presenting today, and you may have disagreed quite a bit with what I've been presenting for the last six months, I think we can both acknowledge our earnestness and sincerely with which we are dealing with this issue. So, I do thank you.

138  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): Well, I appreciate that.  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Senator Leone.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good afternoon, Senator. It's good to see you as usual. The only thing I'll comment on the slides is they're nice and large, but I can't see because that font is so small. So, I'll have to get my reading glasses next time. But thank you for that. So, in terms of the overall plan, and I sort of alluded to this with Representative Klarides from the House Republican proposal, it seems like because the Budget Reserve Fund is doing so -- is being so successful that there's a given amount of dollars that now members in the legislature are eyeing for other potential spending, right. And everyone has an issue that they feel is important to them. Obviously, the good thing is that we all agree transportation is a high-high priority.

But I guess the question becomes, you know, because it's doing so well, we're now looking to divert some of this money just solely for transportation, that then put pressures in other capabilities for other services that need to be identified. So, I just wanted to understand the thought process on that. And in terms of where our spending and priorities and choices need to be made as we dive into this plan and the other in discussion, will you have a sense of priorities, a sense of efficiencies, that need to be -- that would be identified in terms of how to make the best bang for every dollar spent?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): So a couple of things. One, there's only -- let me strike that, and say, after

fifteen percent, any money over that number must go to pay off unfunded liabilities, unless there's some really super majority, and I forget the number. When we did the bipartisan budget, this whole thing came up. The question became, between zero and fifteen percent, do we want to say you can't touch it at all for unfunded liabilities. We know over fifteen percent it does pay off, but between zero and fifteen.

So we said, look, the only thing the Rainy Day Fund can be used for is unfunded liabilities, and therefore we said you can, if you see fit and it's economical, or makes economic sense, to take the money early. That's what the discussions were around the budget table and that's why we allow with a -- I forgot what the percentage is, but more than a majority, to take it early. And I would argue that this is -- not that we're thinking of this, per se. But we were thinking that if there came a time that we had to pay off the unfunded liabilities for some economic advantage, we didn't want to put us in a position we could never do it. And that's why we've built in this escape hatch.

But we can't do it for DSS or Education or municipal aide. We are regulated to do it, as I understand it, for unfunded liabilities. So kind of the world that we're in is the world that I'm working in, so I'm not sort of recreating the world. I'm working in the thought pattern that we had out there.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you. And I can understand some of the logic. But as we've been talking about unfunded pension obligations in the past several years, as that being the largest

expense for our growing expenses in the state, it just seems to me that instead of taking every available dollar to pay that down early so that you save on the long term, even with a short-term economic gain of taking some of that into Transportation, that prevents us from achieving that goal as soon as possible. It just ends up pushing it out a little bit further.

And there have been those that have argued that that's what got us there in the first place. So, I just wanted to make sure, as we go through this debate and the process, you know, we look at the math and we see what the short-term gains are; we see what the long-term gains are, or pitfalls are, for that matter, in either one of those scenarios. That we go in with eyes wide open. And because we don't have new funding streams other than the Budget Reserve Fund, that puts all the ownership on the State of Connecticut and Connecticut's constituents, right. We are gonna have to pay a hundred percent one way or the other in some form for all the services or we're gonna have to defer some of those services until we come up with the proper funding.

So, there's no free lunch here and we just need to make some, you know, very tough decisions coming forward. And I just want the public to know that it's not gonna be without some measure of difficulty going forward. But I appreciate the fact that you've taken the willingness to present the plan and have a discussion on your plan so that we can all figure out what the best course of action is going forward.

141  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): And Mr. Chairman, you know, the Rainy Day Fund has 2.7. We're taking 1.5, so it still leaves 1.1. So we're not taking every dollar. Number two, if -- and I believe Governor Lamont is correct when he says fixing the infrastructure plan is going to have an economic return multiple-fold. So I think this investment of taxpayer dollars in the Rainy Day Fund is a return of our capital. You know, we're putting in a capital investment for which we're gonna get a return, according to Governor Lamont and Governor Malloy, that I think is gonna dwarf our initial investment over a period of years.

If we could make our trains faster to Bridgeport, I think we'd take Bridgeport and transform it. And that's been the discussion in your neck of the woods, where in Stamford, you know, that's all people that are coming from New York City, and if we can make it easier I think we're gonna build up these places.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): On that point, I'm a hundred percent in agreement. It's just it -- as we work through these big issues, you know, when people want services and, you know, the rail lines, as an example, where everyone wants an expanded service, but we don't have the dollars to pay for it or we're gonna have to transfer money to fund it. It puts us in a pickle and we've haven't gotten the best solutions to determine that just yet. So, I'm hopeful that this is part of that discussion.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): Thank you.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you.

142  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Senator Martin, followed by Representative Devlin and Representative Steinberg.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, Mr. -- Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): Good afternoon.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Regarding the Budget Reserve, you made a comment that -- I believe you said in year '20-'21 that we would have a Budget Reserve Fund of nine percent. Is it my understanding, first of all, that the \$2.7 billion dollars that we currently have in there is about a 13.5 percent?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): That's what I understand, yes.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): And the \$1.2 billion dollars, from my conversations with some of our researchers, is that that's the highest amount that in history, the past, now, not currently. But in the past, \$1.2 billion dollars was the highest that we ever had in Connecticut history. Is that correct?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): That's correct as well.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So, if we're borrowing -- the plan here in front of us is taking \$1.5 billion dollars from the \$2.7 billion dollars, brings us down to \$1.2 billion dollars, which still leaves us at that watermark, so to speak, of the highest in Connecticut history of \$1.2 billion dollars. Is that correct?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): That's correct.

143  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So, in '20-'21, we'll be back up to nine percent?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): It's actually 8.5 percent, roughly. I apologize if I said nine.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): I'm sorry.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): No, my fault.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Okay. So --

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): I was rounding up.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So, it looks like we're replenishing the -- we're reducing it to \$1.2 billion dollars and within a short amount of years, we're going back up. How long before we replenish it back up to \$2.7 billion dollars?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): It would be -- in fiscal year '24, it would be \$2.2 billion dollars, which is eleven percent. I don't have anything after that because OFA doesn't have any numbers that go that far. So, it'd be \$2.22 billion dollars in fiscal year '24, which would be 11.18 percent.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Okay. And another question that I have is, OFA, I believe has -- what was their opinion on this? When you submitted this to OFA, what were there thoughts on the plan?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): Well, they don't give thoughts on a plan because they could get in trouble. But they don't give thoughts on the plan. I just asked them for numbers, saying if we did this, what does this yield? If we did that, what does that yield? And they're just a calculator and they just give us a bottom line number. But I don't

144  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

ask them for their opinion, nor would they ever give me their opinion, as they're nonpartisan on the plan. But I asked them for numbers in terms of staying within certain percentages, making sure that we stay within some guidelines of what should be in the Rainy Day Fund. You know, years ago, we used to have ten percent in the Rainy Day Fund and that was a goal that this legislature talked about. Then there was a push to try to get to fifteen. But ten percent was a goal of ours and that's kind of like what we use as our thumbnail approach.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Okay. Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Devlin, followed by Representative Steinberg.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Senator Fasano for going through that proposal at a high level. Just a couple of questions for you. So, to clarify, when we talk about the Rainy Day Fund, that's also the Budget Reserve Fund.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): Yes.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): And it's intended that should our state, you know, face a recession or have some issue, we have some money in reserve that we can pay for essential services to keep the state going.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): That's correct.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): And the fifteen percent threshold is \$3 billion dollars, right, and we're almost there. We're at \$2.7 billion dollars.

145  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): Yeah, I don't know the number. I'll be honest with you. But I'll take your word for it. It's about \$3 billion dollars.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Okay. I think that's what I remember. All right. So the -- what we put in the bipartisan budget is anything over that automatically goes to fund the pension liabilities that we have. The FASTR plan proposes it be at \$1.5 billion dollars or, to your point, it could be \$750 million dollars. It would just be an accelerated term of payment going to pay down our pension liabilities.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): Yes. And I think, if I may, the reason why the thought process comes up. If interest rates were high, then you may not want to do this, right. With interest rates being low, that you're not earning. I think we make \$50 million dollars off the interest, my recollection, might be in the budget. So, if interest rate is low, then the idea of let's put the money to work for yourself as opposed to sitting there and not earning any interest. And that's how it kind of came about.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): So, when this plan was first talked about, we heard all sorts of sound bites, you know, they're gonna raid the Rainy Day Fund. It's gonna -- they're gonna tear it all apart. We're raiding it. We're raiding it. Can you just speak to that? I mean, \$1.5 billion dollars is a significant amount. It's going to its original purpose. You talked a little bit about the replenishment, but how do you address the comments that they're raiding the Rainy Day Fund?

146  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): So, if you look at the past, I can't remember, six or ten years, the most we ever took out of the Rainy Day Fund for a budget problem was around \$200 million dollars or \$250 million dollars. Like, this year we're taking out \$90 million dollars. But it's about \$200 million dollars, \$250 million dollars, the most, with one exception. And that was the recession that we had that began in '08. And we depleted the Budget Reserve Fund. For those of us who were in the legislature at the time, you had Governor Rell departing. You had a legislature that refused to react to the economy. We saw the slowdown across the country. We saw the real estate market crashing, banks having problems.

And we said we need to slow it up. And I distinctly remember arguing on the Senate Floor, and I think they did a similar argument in the House; we need to roll back our expenses. And it's was, well, let's wait for Christmas to see what the sales were. Then it was let's wait for February because that's the quarterly for the corporations. Then it was, well, we're into February, let's wait for April because the estimating the taxes are coming in. And by the time May rolled around, we had significant issues.

So, I think with prudent -- because that's the only time, even with other recessions, that you see that amount of money coming out. I think with prudent heedance to past issues, you can divert that type of draw upon the Rainy Day Fund, as we saw one time because of inaction by the legislature. That was the issue, in my view. But most of the time it's -- you put more money in, but you take out \$200-\$250 thousand dollars -- \$200 million dollars I should

147  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

say. So, I think that we can still have that historic amount in and be protected.

But if those say -- the folks who say I want a little more, I'm saying let's have a discussion. I think we could get there. I think we can get there. I think we can keep a little more in, but we've got to talk about some other things. And that's what I want to do here. It's not to say take it or leave it, here's the plan. It's here's an idea, there's some movement, let's have a conversation.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you. So, over the -- I guess it was at our last hearing, we heard a lot about rail. It certainly has been important in my neck of the woods and many of us on this committee with the Metro North Line, no doubt. And it is true and I experienced it. In making a decision about where to ultimately buy a home, it was how far you could stand the commute to New York and afford to be able to live, so it's that balance. And the commute from Fairfield to New York now is ten minutes longer than it was in 1988. But we also heard from the Waterbury caucus and, you know, I'm excited about the plan that they have and the opportunities for our state for economic development. The branch lines that are so important.

So, could you just speak a little bit -- because in our past discussions around transportation and funding and the toll debate and all of that, that was very much highway focused. Rails are a big piece of that, but the RRIF funds are really -- what I thought when you and Ryan Drajewicz came back from Washington and shared with us, the leaders of the committee and caucus leaders, the low interest

148  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

opportunity, and their enthusiasm, because they were at that meeting, the Build America folks, about us -- about Connecticut participating. Can you speak more about the RRIF opportunity and what we could do for rail?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): Sure. So, for TIFIA you need to pledge a stream of income to get the money. And you could pledge gas, petroleum, receipts that we have now. They don't care if they're in first position, second position or last position. They want a stream of income. For RRIF, you have to give security. Not a stream of income, but some sort of security. I think that Ryan Drajewicz talked about the security being a rail line, and I think that that's pretty smart. And he asked that question at the meeting, could we pledge the rail line, and they said yes. I thought that was pretty clever of Ryan.

So we would take the RRIF money. And what we've done is we've set up, different from the transportation strategy board under this proposal, a railroad strategy board, so that folks from Waterbury can come in and say, look, we may want to do something in New York, but we've got this whole other line that's been ignored. And I've heard numbers that are out there that -- and we could use RRIF money to that line. It's not -- it doesn't have to go to New York. It could go to Waterbury. And if there's an argument, and I don't know that much about it except what I've read recently, then you could use RRIF money to do that and just -- and the interest rates, by the way, on RRIF are extraordinarily low. They're lower than on TIFIA. You just have to show it's a plan that's economic and there's money there.

149  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

So I think that does open the door. I might be partial to the New York rail line because my son works in New York City and he's thinking about moving to Stamford, and he's thinking about taking the train. So maybe I'm a little partial to that. But I think that using the RRIF money for that Waterbury is definitely doable and could be built in.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Okay. Great. Thank you for clarifying that. I appreciate it. That's all I have for this particular point. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Senator.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you, Senator, for being here today. We really do appreciate all the work you put in to help us see that there were alternative paths we should at least consider, though I still am confused by how you generate the savings through taking from the Rainy Day Fund, considering that my understanding is the ADEC recalculates every two years anyway, so. Are you making --

(Crosstalk)

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Are you modeling that savings out of the delta in the interest rates? Is that pretty much the mechanism?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): And I apologize again. I missed one word as you sort of came to the close there, Representative Steinberg. The question is when we take the money from the Reserve Fund and pay down the pension liability, right. So, what you end

150  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

up doing is you save on pension contributions out of the STF, \$14.1 million dollars every year, and then you save on the General Fund \$113 million dollars every year. So, that's about \$127 million dollars.

And what I do is when you save that in the General Fund, I move fringe from the -- that's not associated with transportation, that's now being paid in the transportation. I move that over to the General Fund, move the savings of that fringe into the STF, and that comes out to about \$127 million dollars every year to fund the transportation plan. I leverage some of that money and I put cash in with some of that money.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Is it critical that you use the fringe expenses to shift back to the General Fund to make this work or is it you could use any component of the STF?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): Say that one more time.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): You said you would take the component of the STF, which are the fringe costs, and you move those back to the General Fund. Must it be the fringe expenses that are moved back to the General Fund to realize these savings?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): I suppose you could move other expenses, so I'm open to that. The reason why we move fringe is that, you know, DMV fringe comes out of this. There's other salaries that are not necessarily directly associated with transportation. What the legislature did years ago when we had a held STF and we had a problem in our budget, we took the salary in fringe and we moved it into the STF so we wouldn't have to raise taxes in the General Fund.

151  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

And I'm saying, okay, so we made the STF not pure. So, I was trying to move that money back over to make it more pure. But, I mean, that's just the idea we have. We could talk about other things, but it's \$127 million dollars.

And also, if I may, by moving the fringe over -- the fringe is going up at fourteen percent per year, so it's the highest increasing cost in the STF. So, if I move it to the GF then I'm keeping the STF solvent. Because if we don't show five years in the STF, we can't get the \$750 million dollars out of the federal government because we have to show it's solvent for five years. That's why we move that over.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Thank you. I'm gonna have to study these numbers more carefully to understand how the savings are generated. But I really want to move on to the conversation about taking money from the Rainy Day Fund itself, you know. First of all, I love the idea of paying down our future pension obligations. To your point, that's not only what's allowed, it's what we should be spending the money on. But I have to confess that I'm concerned about the timing.

If you look at matters, the stock market is down how many thousands of points. How can we even count on the kind of revenues that we expect to generate funds to go into the Rainy Day Fund under the current circumstances, not knowing -- with this great uncertainty in the world within the market place? You compound that with the fact that Europe is on the brink of recession, almost everybody says. The U.S. growth rates have been halved and we've

152  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

been having the longest extended growth for a while. We seem to be due for a recession.

There are those who would argue that recession may be right around the corner. And here we are at this time where our need may be greatest, to your point, maybe even ten percent's not gonna be enough to meet our needs. We're gonna be taking from the Rainy Day Fund and hoping that there isn't a recession in the next three years while we basic -- we replenish that fund? You know, from a fiscal responsibility standpoint, it makes me very nervous. What's your response to that?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): So, a couple of things. Obviously, I've been thinking about that myself. The stock market crash is unrelated to an economic issue. I mean, even if you look at the markets today, the stock market is up 600 or 800 points today in the United States. If you look at them overseas, in China, I don't know what the increase was, but it went up. This is a fear. It's two things. There's a market correction, which is usually thirteen percent -- fifteen percent, we're at thirteen percent. Part of it's probably some sort of reason for a market correction.

Connecticut is gonna make some serious money. When the stock market goes up, we don't make any money as a state, right. You realize that. When you sell your stocks that's when you realize that profit and that's where we're gonna pay tax. So, this stock market sell off or gains that we're gonna see in two -- next year. Not this year, because we're out of the December 31st year. So I believe that this is part a market correction, not huge, that this is a

153  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

blip in the market because something happens in the world and you're gonna have that effect. But I don't think this is the beginning, nor have I read any place that someone talks about this is a recession stock market.

There's a little bit panic, a little bit of fear with coronavirus. It's what it is. It will settle in. The markets will rebound. As we see, they'll go up and down a little bit. But I think they'll go back up. Some have that fear. As far as a recession, I think even Ryan Drajewicz would agree that the chance of having a recession wouldn't come until the second quarter of 2021, which will end our whole fiscal year. So -- and I would argue, if that's gonna happen, we'd have time to say let's pull back our budgets, let's start preparing for it. We may take some money out of the Rainy Day Fund if a recession comes in.

But do you think -- do I think we would go to one \$1.5 billion dollars in the Rainy Day Fund? No. I think we're smarter than that as a legislature. I think we'll learn from our past experiences and say we need to draw in; we need to prepare for this. And we could do it within our budgets. So, I don't have that fear. I think it's out there and we have to prepare for it, and I agree with you. I just don't see it being a real reality of wiping out \$2 billion dollars in our Rainy Day Fund.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): I take your point that the market itself's volatility may be short term and I certainly hope so.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): I hope so too.

154  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): However, we've also read a lot about genuine economic disruption, the disruption of markets, supply chains of companies to be able to stay in business if they can't get components and things of that sort. That sounds far more systemic to me than just a market correction. And I'm concerned that with Europe already trending towards recession and American growth already starting to slow, this seems inopportune.

Once you've taken out that billion and a half, you can't say I've changed my mind. So, once we find ourselves in that circumstance, we're all in. We've got to either make this work for ourselves or not. I don't see we necessarily have that much flexibility by way of trying to reverse course once we've taken that money and applied it elsewhere.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): And if I may add to that. But don't forget, by paying down on your pension obligations, you're obligation to pay debt is also going down. So, if you end up in a recession -- and by the way, having a transportation bill that's done now, if we hit a recession and we've got all these jobs out there and we've made a commitment to transportation, that's certainly gonna help Connecticut, should we hit a recession, get through because we'll be funding the jobs by using federal dollars at a low-interest rate, with very little money out of the state. That will keep us pretty healthy even during a recession. That all being said, but by reducing the monthly nut, I would argue our overhead's a little bit down. We may be able to manage a recession with that easier.

155  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): One of us is gonna be right on this, and I guess time will tell.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): Well, we both could be right.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): We both could be right. Let's hope for the happier picture. Thank you, Senator. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. And thank you, Senator, again for your testimony and presentation here today. Like I said to Minority Leader Klarides, it's clear that we've probably reached a consensus in this committee and maybe in the entire building. Maybe not yet with the entire population of Connecticut, but we're getting close on that too, which is we need to make a serious and significant investment in our transportation infrastructure if we're going to grow appropriately, if we're gonna attract the types of jobs and populations that we need moving forward.

And we are still in disagreement about the most appropriate way to pay for that infrastructure investment, but I do take your approach and your earnestness and the time that you've put into this proposal seriously, and I do look forward to working with you as we move forward.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, members of the committee.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): So on our list now we move to -- is Joe Gilbert here? No, okay. Reverend Ernestine Holloway, followed by Bill Veronesi and then Rep. Nolan.

156  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

REV. HOLLOWAY: My name is Reverend Ernestine Holloway. Good after -- I think it is good afternoon. I think we're doing good. I'm gonna be out of here by 4 o'clock. And we survived all the hearings. I want to say this. I -- when I read the bill, it was something that I can read. It was tangible. The public can understand it. It wasn't with all the hoopla. It was just simple. You could follow along. If you had questions, you could stop somebody in the hallway and say, well, what does this mean? And the public is happy with that. That other stuff, we couldn't read.

What I'm a little concerned about is transportation. I'm glad that it said rail, because I have issues with rail because I don't drive. So, when I'm here, I take the train and the bus. And I think there's a lot of flaws in the time that we get here. Some of us get here at 7:00 because there's no 8:00 train. I don't know who was the rocket scientist that came up with that idea. So, between 8:00 and 9:00, there's no Amtrak and there's no CT Rail. And if you live in Meriden, my bus stops running at 4:30. So, after 4:30 I can't get home. So, you're saying that you want to fix it. And I also lived in Waterbury. I was happy that they're gonna fix that rail system over there because I was wondering what the heck was wrong with it in the first place.

We have so many opportunities to make our state viable. We want people to come live here. They're not coming if we don't have a viable transportation system. That's what makes New York City so great. I can get a bus any time. I can get a train any time and go anywhere I want to go. I can't do that in Connecticut. And I'm also a single mom. So,

157  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

when I come home from work or whatever I'm doing, I can't go to the grocery store. You know, it's just simple logic.

We want to go buy groceries. We want to go to the city council meeting. We want to see downtown, to make it viable, to make it a happening place for us. But we can't go because there's no transportation. Waterbury did good. Theirs run at 12:00. New Haven does good. Meriden, 6:00, if I want to come to New Haven that's fine. But if I want to travel I can't. Why not do simple stuff. Run a bus up the turnpike so people can get those jobs up there. You say you want people working. When people work, tax dollars come in. You know, us girls like to shop. I find some guys do too.

So, if you want people to come into the town, you want us to shop, you want us to spend our money and not go to New York, and me not go all the way to Waterbury, make the transportation viable. If I want to come to Hartford, I can't come unless I get the express bus and there's only two a day. Now, you all give subsidy to CT Rail and to Amtrak. They're lousy. They suck. And they're racist. The 475 train on Friday is horrid. The guy didn't know who I was, but somebody behind me knew who I was, and they didn't take the (Bell) -- the train was too crowded. So they took some people and they left the rest.

So, when we got to Berlin, they dropped off people. So, forty people got off, because I counted them. You all taught me to look at the numbers, so I'm learning to look at the data and the numbers. And then when we got to Meriden, he wouldn't let anybody

158  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

on the train. When it became racist was when he said those people in Meriden - those people. So, he let them on in Berlin, but he wouldn't let them on in Meriden. So, when they were whispering I'm tired of those people, and I watched the sweetest Muslim lady that never says anything for fifteen years but hello and how are your children, cuss him out.

And she said I need to go pick up my babies in the New Haven School. They're in a charter school. If I don't, I can get arrested for not picking them up on time. He said you're not getting on this train. So then I started asking questions. Does this happen often? So, I took the train the next Friday and then the same thing happened - those people in Meriden. Then he did the same thing in -- what's the place after Meriden? Not Waterbury, but after that. And then I was looking at him, going, do you know who I am? He said no. I said I'm the community activist in Meriden. Have you lost your mind? Those ladies got to go get their babies.

And then another thing, because we have, like, meetings that people don't go home. We're here at 10:00 in the morning. Hopefully, that won't happen again. Guess what? After 11:00, the trains don't run. So, all those people that traveled here to make that hearing, the reason why they stayed, because they couldn't get the heck home. They couldn't get home. So while you're talking about building all these lovely infrastructures, you have to think logic and practical.

You have to think about us. How are we gonna get to work? What about the people that gotta go to work at night and the trains stopped running? How do

159  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

they get there? Everybody can't afford a car. And with the prices going up, guess what? They're gonna need to take trains. So, if you provide transportation, they will ride them. You have to get a viable schedule. And then another thing I hear is about the recession, recession, recession. Well, guess what? When you was thinking about tolls you didn't care about the people in recessions then, so what's the problem now? What is the problem now? So, now the people are angry and hopefully you get this right.

Because you know what, my baby will never drive because she has a brain injury, but she can take the train and a bus. And I'm teaching her to go to the supermarket so she can buy her groceries, because mama's not always gonna be here. So, I hope you get it right. Take the time and -- and this board, I hear you say all these boards. But what about the public? That's how I learned about politics. I got on a whole bunch of boards and I learned how to do a whole bunch of things that I normally thought I wouldn't do. What about involving the public? What about the people that buses?

I asked Governor Malloy this when he was in office. You put that train up there, but guess what? What about the buses so we can get along? Did you ask the public? Did you invite them on a board and say what do you think? Two people from each town, find out what we think, what we need, because it's not necessarily what you need, because you guys drive. So, ask the people that take the bus, how can we make this better? What can we do for you? That was the purpose of us putting you in office, so that you can work for us and then we can work for you.

160  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

Because there's no I in team, but if we do it together it can work. Thank you. And I know I went over the three minutes.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): That's okay, Reverend Holloway. Thank you so much for your testimony again today and for coming up and being a pretty persistent guest with us this year. So, I really do appreciate it. Are there any questions for Reverend Holloway? Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you Reverend Holloway, for your testimony. You really hit on a key point, which is the practicality, I think. So, I've heard before, you know, on the Hartford rail line, the schedule when, you know, I think colleagues that want to try to utilize that, but the schedule just wasn't practical for anybody trying to get to work. And I understand your issue on the buses too. So I think that's something that certainly we will be cognizant of and your point about involving, you know, the public in terms of discussion I think also is a good one. So, I just want to thank you for bringing forward some very constructive and positive comments on things we can do better.

REV. HOLLOWAY: Thank you, ma'am.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you again.

REV. HOLLOWAY: At least I ain't yelling today.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Bill Veronesi, followed by Representative Nolan, followed by Kevin Blacker.

MR. VERONESI: Chairman Leone, Chairman Lemar, and members of the committee. Thanks for the

161  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

opportunity to testify in support of House Bill 5324.

My name is Bill Veronesi. I'm a resident of Hartford. I've been here since '93 and a resident of the state since 1986. This is my home, really. I believe this bill 5324 is an important step in your continuing efforts to make Connecticut safer for pedestrians and cyclists and your efforts to make our state a more desirable place to live and work. So, I heard a lot of comments about attracting the workforce of the future. I think having good pedestrian and cyclist protections is part of that. I hear that a lot from my sons, my nieces and nephews, where they're moving when they can.

I support Raised Bill 5324 broadly, but I want to speak specifically towards section 9. Since it's all the way at the end, I wouldn't want it to be forgotten. It calls out the duty of vehicle occupants to use care when opening doors to avoid causing a so-called dooring accident. According to The League of American Bicyclists, forty states have a dooring law. And I was just informed that actually Virginia became the 41st, so I guess it's forty-one out of fifty have a law. We don't yet, so this will definitely move us to the right side of that count in my estimation. Several studies point to sudden vehicle door openings as the cause of more than ten percent of bicycle crashes, especially in urban areas. As a Hartford resident and cyclist, it's definitely among my top concerns and occupies much of my attention while cycling.

And interestingly, in terms of timing, it was just a little over a week ago I was cycling south on Zion

Street right here in Hartford and enjoying the relative protection offered by the bike lane there. And on my left, the motor vehicle traffic was fast and heavy, and there was a solid row of parked vehicles on my right. This is pretty common. And the parked and moving vehicles together, they confined me pretty tightly. It's not a real wide bike lane, at least that's the way it feels there on Zion Street. And I believe it was only because I was expending a lot of effort focusing a large part of my attention on parked vehicles, which is what you have to do, that when I wasn't much more than about a car length behind, I noticed an occupied vehicle and at the last minute, you know, the door starting to open. So, as I, you know, full hard braking, a primal shout, really. And luckily, the driver's attention came around and he quickly pulled that door shut. Really, until that moment of the driver suddenly coming to attention and taking quick action, is that really I was considering do I hit the door or do I take my chances in this, you know, heavy stream of traffic here. (Bell)

This isn't a rare occurrence. This episode was closer to disaster for me than any in recent memory and it seems timely in terms of the legislation you're considering. So, I wanted to bring it to your attention. As a cyclist, constantly maintaining the level of attention that you need to avoid dooring is taxing, and I know I lapse. Attention by cyclists and pedestrians will always be necessary, but I believe that vehicle occupants have a somewhat easier obligation here. And I think section 9 hopefully will help point that out.

163  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

On Zion Street, if the driver had made an effort to look back in the bike lane before opening his door, there would've been no incident, no near collision at all, and maybe I wouldn't be here today, testifying as well. But I believe the addition of section 9 to our laws will play a needed role in making us all more aware of the real dangers of opening a vehicle door without proper care and the obligations of those opening the vehicle doors.

I'd appreciate your support of 5324 broadly, as I do believe this bill will contribute to making Connecticut a better and more desirable place to live. And I appreciate your stamina too.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Bill, for your testimony today and thank you for sharing both your personal story and experiences to helping lend a voice to the need across the state, whether, again, like I said earlier, you're in my city in New Haven or Cheshire, or wherever you are. You're dealing with an increased amount of distracted driving, high rates of speed, lack of knowledge on the roadways, and there are certain things that our state owes all of its citizens and this consideration and this bill was meant to address that. And I appreciate you speaking on behalf of that.

MR. VERONESI: Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Are there any questions for Bill? Seeing none. Thank you so much for your testimony. Representative Nolan, followed by Kevin Blacker, Jim Adams, and Tony Cherolis.

REP. NOLAN (39TH): Good afternoon to the chairs, to the ranking members and members. Good to come

164  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

before you and speak in regards to H.B. 5021 and ask you to please push this through your committee so that it can be voted on, especially in regards to a lot of the wording in there that specifically says - - or talks about things that would be transparent and encouraging transparency, which would be a lot different than that it was, oversight for finance, more accountability, to look at ports, and having a higher standard with the policy and procedure.

I understand that there's a lot of movement in the port authority now that is a lot better than it was and I'm excited to see some things even improve more, moving this bill forward. Also in this bill, it helps New London be a part of decision making that has been long abandoned for New London to be able to do. Being at a seat at the table would help New London be part of the best interest of the community surrounding the state pier and services that New London would create that would be important to role in.

And I believe this would have -- help with much of the problems we recently occurred with the port authority. Where if New London was involved, I think a lot of things could've been very limited and easily taken care of, especially a discussion with the ferry system, a discussion in regards to the fisher boats that are there. I think that in some instances like that and a few other instances that if New London was a part of the seat at the table that it would've been a little easier to help those areas out. Let's see. As far as help with decision making when it comes to jobs, economic development, property taxes, to alleviate our distressed municipality, New London having a seat at the table

165  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

will be an asset to helping southeastern Connecticut move forward with the great partnership that has been built over the last year.

This is something that has been promised for a long time with the governor. For whatever reasons there was a lot of freeze on it, but we're hoping that with your push for this bill that the things that I just discussed can be a great advancement for New London, southeastern Connecticut and the State of Connecticut. Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Representative Nolan, for your testimony today and for sharing us a New London perspective on the port authority and the importance of having a voice, a local voice, to help consider some of the local impacts associated with development there. I really appreciate your time. Are there any questions for Representative Nolan? Representative Devlin. I think she has a question.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, regarding having the mayor of New London appointed as one of the members of the board for the port authority, and I understand certainly your advocacy for that, but it does beg a question, I guess, twofold. One is what we're talking about and its proximity is New London, no doubt, but we're talking about the state pier that has cognizance and the port authority has cognizance over all of our ports. So, why wouldn't somebody from Bridgeport or somebody from New Haven or somebody from Stamford be a part of that?

And I'm not necessarily suggesting that, because I don't think that's the right thing. I think that the composition of the board should be those people

166  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

who understand trade and the maritime world so that we can be successful, but it also begs the question of conflict of interest. So, would the mayor be -- have to step out of discussions if it involved New London on the basis of conflict of interest? So, I'm just not clear it's the right move, but I know you do believe it is. And if you could just comment on those points I'd appreciate it.

REP. NOLAN (39TH): If I can just make some clarity. It wouldn't be specifically for the mayor. It would be for the city of New London, so it wouldn't be a seat for the mayor. It would be a seat for the city of New London. And I think that there is just a lot of development that goes on or that will be going on with the project that New London has a great deal of wisdom to assisting and helping. And I believe that as far as the voting comes, that that would be a decision that the board makes at that time whether or not he'll vote.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Okay. So, to understand, then, your position, I think the language currently says the chief elected official. Your view is that isn't necessarily the case, but that New London should have some representation.

REP. NOLAN (39TH): Correct.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it. Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Are there any other questions? Seeing none. Thank you, Representative Nolan, for spending the afternoon here.

REP. NOLAN (39TH): You guys have a nice day.

167  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Kevin Blacker, followed by Jim Adams and Tony Cherolis. And if there's anyone who'd like to testify who has not signed up, please see the clerk towards the front, Aaron.

MR. BLACKER: My name is Kevin Blacker. I came up from Noank. I guess I'm gonna speak with some concerns about House Bill 5021. I think the Port Authority should not exist. Its structure and operation violate anti-trust laws, I believe. You just -- just, you know, now probably four hours ago, heard Kevin Dillon, the head of the airport authority which has recently become like the port authority's big brother, talk about his organization's willful manipulation of the market and exclusion of competition, talking about setting up -- Connecticut only being able to support one airport and other places not being able to have airports so that they wouldn't take away from the chosen one.

I believe that the state should not be picking winners and losers. And the port authority isn't the state unless it's at a time or in a position where it benefits them to be the state. But the law says that the port authority is a body politic and corporate, that shall not be construed to be a department, institution, or agency of the state. The law also says that that port authority quasi-public agency can sue and be sued. And I intend to challenge the port authority under antitrust laws.

And to be clear when I say anti-trust laws, anti-trust laws are put in place to prevent consumer harm in the form of higher prices, fewer choices, poorer service and less innovation. The state pier deal

168  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

that the Connecticut Port Authority made is going to result in all of those consumer harms. There are going to be very, very real costs from excluding the shipment of traditional cargo from the Port of New London and I'm happy to answer questions about that after. But I'll continue on.

If this -- if the port authority does continue to exist, the mayor or a representative of the city of New London definitely deserves to be on the board because the state pier is in New London. It is a southwestern Connecticut asset, our greatest potential asset for economic development. And southeastern Connecticut and New London, I think, really deserve a strong advocate, or to at least be involved and have a say, because it's -- it may be the state's pier, but it's our -- it's southeastern Connecticut's home turf. I do not believe that the governor should be allowed to appoint the chairman of the board of directors.

The Port Authority was meant to be an organization that served the best interest of, first, the public and also the state's maritime interests. It was meant to be comprised of experts in transportation and ports. (Bell) As I understand it, after Andrew Maynard, who was also a Noank man, grew up just down the street from me, on Church Street. His father was a boat captain. After his accident, I was told that the port authority grew into the political monster that it is today. Giving the governor the ability to appoint the board chair will only strengthen that monster.

The carelessness and corruption and bad judgment at the port authority, much of it while under the

169  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

direct control of Governor Lamont, is well documented in the press, state audits, and through forums, not hearings. Mr., I believe it was, Lemar there, said there have been a number of hearings on the port authority, and to the best of my understanding, this is the first public hearing where the public is actually being able to speak about the issues of the port authority. There was a public hearing about the state pier plan where very few details at all were shared and the public was allowed to speak there.

But I question, at all, why we even have laws governing the port authority, because they've been broken so many times with absolutely no consequence. From twice failing to have the annual public hearing, laid out in lines 163 through 165 of the bill in front of you, and 98 through 100, to failing to fill vacancies as required in lines 49 through 53, or failing to even have an executive director as required by lines 62 through 77. So, I would argue that we're all wasting our time, wasting our days, wasting our dollars to bother arguing over these laws if nobody's going to enforce them. And if there's going to be no consequence for violating them.

So, I would say that if this committee wants to fix the problems at the port authority you should somehow make the law be held -- make the law be applied, make the laws be applied and hold people accountable and cause punishment when the laws are broken. Does anybody have any questions?

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Mr. Blacker, for your testimony. I know you've dedicated a lot of time

170  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

and energy into understanding the maritime industry around New London and I do appreciate, as a private citizen, the amount of effort and thought that you've put into your testimony, but also in covering and elucidating, allowing us to understand deeper insights into the port authority than we would've had had you not step forward, frankly. So, I do appreciate your role as a private citizen and as a person willing to just put your name behind a lot of the effort and thoughts that you have. I do appreciate what you've done for the State of Connecticut. Are there questions for Mr. Blacker? Representative Devlin, followed by Senator Leone.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Blacker, for being here, and I echo or support the comments that the chair made in terms of your involvement. I also agree strongly on two points that you have made, because I think a large part of the issues that we've had with the port authority, while I'm not sure about getting rid of that organization all together, is certainly the composition of the board and the ability for the board to select its chairperson, which is currently in the rules, but didn't happen last time.

And I think that not having a board with -- made up of people with relevant experience, if we go down that path again, isn't gonna necessarily help us in the long run. We did just vote last week to appoint David Kooris to continue as a board member, which I think was a real positive thing. I've been impressed with his engagement since he was appointed by Governor Lamont. But I just wanted to share my concurrence with you in terms of the ability for the board to select its chairperson and also the

171  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

composition of the board. We really need to ensure that it is comprised of people, as you pointed out, both in terms of exports and transportation, is really critical. But thank you for being here. And I don't have a specific question for you.

MR. BLACKER: May I respond?

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Sure. So, related to David Kooris. As I understand it, David Kooris is somewhat of an expert in transit-oriented development and I hear a lot of talk about transit-oriented development. I hear a lot of talk about rail. It all seems to be focused on the movement of people. And I think that this Transportation Committee and the state government needs to understand industrial transit-oriented development. That is our greatest economic -- the greatest potential for economic development is encouraging development along our ports and port-associated freight rail like the freight rail that leads to state pier that got a \$12.8 million dollar upgrade, \$10 million dollars federal, that the state pier deal is going to squander.

Now, that port is the port of export, identified in the 2017 statewide freight plan as the port of export for the entire northeast and parts of Canada. It's connected to the New England Central and the Providence and Worcester, both owned by the Genesee & Wyoming. And the potential for economic development all along those rails is going to be wasted by this deal. I've heard quite a number of people talk about bike and pedestrian safety and fatalities.

172  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

When you look at what is going to happen as a result of the state pier deal, a lot more trucks are gonna be on the road. Everything that used to come in in bulk -- take road salt, for example, 95,000 tons came in. You know, 95,000 tons, twenty-two tons on a tractor trailer. So how many tractor trailers now are gonna be on the road? How many more fatalities are there going to be? How much more road wear is there going to be? What's that's going to cost us? And those are the real costs that are a result of the bad judgment at the port authority.

And -- so, I just -- I would hope that, you know, somebody asks an expert like David Kooris to broaden his horizon and not just look at a transit-oriented development as it relates to, you know, the movement of people.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): A really great point and I appreciate you sharing that really great point. And I will ask him next time I see him. Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Senator Leone.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. Thanks for coming and providing testimony. Do you happen to have a copy of your testimony so we can have it for the record?

MR. BLACKER: I could bring --

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Because you brought up some good points and I want to make sure we capture them --

MR. BLACKER: Sure. I could -- I've got it kind of all scribbled out here. I'd be happy to -- yeah, I'd be happy to write out a legible copy for you.

173  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Sure. Yeah, that would be helpful.

MR. BLACKER: I would definitely recommend reading page 36 of the 2017 statewide freight plan, which was put out with a twenty-five-year scope and look at that. That page 36 is the port investment strategies. I don't have a copy of that, but I would definitely recommend that you look at that.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Yeah. And when you put it all on paper, mention that as well so that we can have, you know, sort of from your perspective what you would like us to look at. And then you mentioned that you wanted to bring up -- or you were going to push back on the port authority or the constitutionality of their existence. So, is that just gonna be you as the sole person or you have a group with you? Is there a consortium pushing this idea? I mean --

MR. BLACKER: Right now, the consortium is me. And I filed many months ago complaints with the Department of Justice. The complaints were received. A trial attorney, you know, the Anti-Trust Division, Agriculture, Energy and Transportation. Don Amlin (Phonetic), a trial attorney, contacted me to take information. Now, what that means, I don't know. I've also submitted complaints to the Federal Trade Commission. Been contacted by Alan Friedman. What is going to happen with that, I don't know.

I have -- as you can imagine, through this fight, I have amassed a tremendous number of contacts. There's a lot of people down in our region that were treated unfairly that are upset with how they were

174  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

treated. Now, none of them have said we're with you, but they're all watching and they're all listening. And I've got a plan, you know, basically to put them together. And the most interesting thing about these anti-trust laws, the Clayton Act, anybody that's familiar with the Tilcon deal in '96 that Blumenthal stopped, there's triple damages. You can go after triple damages as well as attorney fees.

And, you know, that's what I am -- you take some of these companies that feel like they got the short end of the stick, like Logistec or the salt company or some other people that were displaced down there. Now, Logistec has \$500 million dollars annually. They are not -- they are not -- they operate, like, seventy ports, and I hear they don't like the way they were treated down there. They don't think they were treated fairly. They see all of the other bad judgment and all the corruption and all the hiring of the buddies, and they're thinking, well, if that's the judgment that was used throughout the port authority, why wasn't -- that was probably the same judgment used in the RFP.

And I'm trying everything that I can to get them to all get together with me and hit the port authority and hit Gateway and go after them for some money. And if we can't break the state pier deal. I got an email back today from a major real estate developer and he -- pitching him on this idea we'll start our own port up the river at a facility that's for sale. And the way that I would finance that would be through this anti-trust, so. I mean, I'm going for it, like.

175  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): No, no, which is everyone's right. So, I'd be curious and interested how it progresses and that's a long road, so to speak, right. Or a long port, however you want to --

MR. BLACKER: Yeah, but this is America and anything's possible. I mean that. Anything's possible, yeah.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH): Yeah, anything's possible. So, it's gonna be a while before anything gets done, but at least the ball is moving. So, as it progresses, anything that you can share with us that is not attorney client privilege, obviously, we would like to have that information so it can become part of our thought process as we make decisions. So, that's all I would ask to the extent possible. But I do appreciate you coming and giving your perspective. It's all helpful for us. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Representative Devlin has a follow up. Yeah.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you. So, as you were speaking, I did look up the 2017 freight plan and page 3-6.

MR. BLACKER: Right.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): So, just for clarification, so I understand where you're coming from. And this outlines a whole series of what I would call economic development opportunities in terms of leveraging the port. So, is your position that we continue with the wind deal, right, but that the freight is also -- we don't eliminate the freight.

176  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

So that all of this other activity could potentially happen concurrently, and I'm not sure that it wouldn't anyway. But are you saying it's one or the other or trying to accomplish them both?

MR. BLACKER: Let's see, I'm going to --

REP. DEVLIN (134TH): Both, I mean the opportunities identified in the plan and the current plans related to the port for the wind.

MR. BLACKER: Yeah. Yeah. So, what I'm going to try to accomplish is to knock out the state pier deal, cause a complete rebid, send Gateway back to New Haven, and have an honest rebid of the state pier deal. That's what I'm going for. Now, what Gateway and the port authority are proposing is basically to set up the Port of New London for the shipment of -- pretty much for the exclusive shipment of windmill components.

Now, that's going to shut out and displace the other users. That's gonna shut out the lumber, the rebar, the copper, the salt, but it's also going to shut out uses that aren't there yet. Things like you saw mentioned in there, scrap. Now, there's a major scrap -- there's a major, major scrap dealer in southeastern Connecticut, Dave Waddington, DWT. You see his trucks all up and down the road. I passed three of them on the way up here.

Now, he has to ship, you know, out of more distant ports, but has expressed interest in having the ability to ship out of the Thames River. In that report, as you can see, it mentions shipment of overweight container on barge service to reduce congestion on I-95. Now, here you've got a guy that

177  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

owns five scrap yards and has a hundred trucks on the road, expressing interest and it, you know -- the plan that we made does not accommodate that business. It, instead, accommodates a foreign company. It identifies salt and highly captive and stable, that report does.

And, you know, it's going to knock driven enterprises, you know, who sell \$12-\$15 million dollars of salt a year, out of business. It identifies the, you know, the wood pellet market and shipment of wood pellets. Now, nobody wants to dig in deep enough to understand that Enstructure, the financial backer of Gateway, three of the top five people that started Enstructure, came from Drax Biomass.

Drax Biomass is the largest wood pellet producer, you know, of one of them, in the United States, and they just spent \$350 million dollars setting up a facility down in the southeastern United States, and that's defensive play. Nobody wants to understand this deep enough to understand what's really going on or how bad of a decision it is. Instead of helping our shell fishermen, like that report identifies, we're kicking them out. We're kicking the guy with the last Russell and the other guy with the last name Debbis (Phonetic) out of there, our shell fishermen.

And so it doesn't -- it doesn't make sense. There's a better plan that was ignore. The Milone-MacBroom report from 2015, put out at great expense, is a much better -- it's a much better plan. It's in the state's possession. It was ignored and Logistec, I'm told, was -- put in a proposal to accommodate

178  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

the existing users as well as wind, putting the wind on a flex support. So, I do not think that we should trust the judgment that we can all agree was bad at the port authority that made this -- that made this deal.

And I will say that I see a way to come out of this, if they'll cooperate with Gateway and New Haven further along. I can go one way or another. Either we can fight and we can all hurt each other real bad, and, you know, I'm fine with that, or we can, you know, kind of work together. And it remains to be seen what's gonna happen. But I'm definitely prepared, you know, to take this all the way.

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

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Thank you, Mr. Blacker, for coming in. Very quickly, how many -- how much activity currently is taking place in the harbor today? How many ships are coming in?

MR. BLACKER: None. None anymore. They told everybody they have to leave by March 31st, even though permits aren't gonna be -- even though permits aren't gonna be issued until November of next year. They're kicking Gateway out -- I mean, they're kicking -- driven out the fishermen as well as Skanska, which is the company that is doing all the construction at EB.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So, let's go back a year, then. How much activity -- before this deal was put together, how much activity was there?

179  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

MR. BLACKER: Well, I'd have to get you the report put out by the Connecticut Port Authority. This whole idea that New London was this hugely underutilized asset that's kind of a storyline that the port authority, you know, has been putting forward and taking pictures and showing all the weeds growing up through the cracks. If you actually look at the report of the tonnage that was coming in -- you know, I think it was, like, in 2017, it was nearing the peak. I'll have to get you those actual numbers.

But at one point, I think in the early 2000s, something like \$670 million dollars' worth of raw materials came in through that port. And then in 2017, it was like the tonnage of that peak year -- was approaching the peak year, but the dollar value was lower, if you understand. And the guys on the port authority say the -- on the board, a couple of them, Don Frost, you know, he says that dollars are a bad way to evaluate how your port is doing because, you know, it fluctuates and you might be, you know, bringing in -- that looking at tonnage is a better way. So, I can get you those numbers from the port authority report.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So that would be a total of each of the industries?

MR. BLACKER: I don't know. It's just -- it was -- in the report it just said, you know, the tonnage for the year. But --

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): How many different industries are we talking about that were using that port?

180  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

MR. BLACKER: That were using that port? Well, let's see, you had steel, like, lumber. And lumber's a big one. We just displaced International Forest Products as part of the craft group and also own Rand-Whitney, owns other things, river properties. It's not a very good way to treat, you know, a place with other businesses in the state, the driven enterprises, the salt, the commercial fishermen. There was [Inaudible-05:04:16] Shapiro was a construction company. Those were the main tenets. I think they used to ship, you know, paper through there.

But I would say that if the recommendations in the port investment strategies from page 3-6, you know, were followed, you could definitely, you know, build the -- use aggregate company. I just want to point out that there's an aggregate company in Putnam and Plainfield, which is Rawson Materials, recently bought Cherenzia -- recently bought Cherenzia, which is a big aggregate company, for \$14.6 million dollars. They're backed by ONG, which you might have heard of. But they're interested in shipping aggregate out of the Thames River.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So, I guess where I'm heading with this is active -- do you feel it was being used at its capacity?

MR. BLACKER: Was it being used to its capacity? Let's see. No, I think it had a lot of -- I mean, it had a lot of potential for growth. It has a lot of potential for growth. Wind would've been -- wind should've been one of many uses. You don't put all of your eggs in one basket, and I think that's what they did.

181  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Do you think a plan could've been put together to accommodate everybody?

MR. BLACKER: It absolutely could have if they had followed the law. The law has requirements. The law was set up with these requirements for public hearings, to harvest public knowledge and public wisdom. And the public was excluded. The public was willfully excluded. It absolutely could've if they had just listened to -- everything I learned, I learned from just talking to people. Everything I learned, everything I'm regurgitating to you, was from talking to people, doing the job that the government didn't do. That's all I did. And --

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you again, Kevin, for your testimony today.

MR. BLACKER: Thanks.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Jim Adam, Tony Cherolis, Aaron Goode, and that will bring us to conclusion. If you would like to testify and have not signed up, please do so at the clerk.

MR. ADAMS: Good afternoon. I'm Jim Adams from Bolton, Connecticut. I appreciate you guys' stamina for hanging in there today. And sorry about my voice, just got a little cold. I'm here to talk in support of bill 5324 and what it does to improve the future of pedestrians and cyclists. And I -- because at a high level, the main thing it does is it helps to show that Connecticut cares about pedestrians and cyclists.

182  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

And I say that because about fifteen years ago I got into cycle commuting. I started cycling from Bolton into East Hartford to Pratt & Whitney, where I worked. And I really got hooked. I loved it. It became almost a spiritual practice. It became the highlight of my day twice, once in the morning going in and once coming back. It is a wonderful thing that I would encourage anyone to get into. And you don't understand it until you get into it.

But one of the things that you also learn quickly -- I was able to actually do some cycling in other countries, in other cities, and you quickly learn of what it's like to cycle where cyclists are considered a valuable part of the community and you understand what it's like when you come home and you feel like that's not the case. Connecticut ranks very low as far as the safety of cyclists in this country. And this country ranks very low compared to many of the other countries in the world.

So, in 2017, I learned this the hard way, about how tough things were, how unsafe it was here. I was on my way to work and a driver -- and this is according to what the police officer told me because I don't remember a lot about this. But the driver completely violated the law and took a left turn right into a driveway as I was passing in front of it, and broadsided me as I was cycling into work. I took off half of his bumper as I was going over his hood. I took off his rearview mirror and landed in the road. And I came to, headed to Hartford Hospital, where I spent the rest of the day.

So, I recovered. I'm fine. I had a concussion, broken finger, lacerations. But one of the most

insulting things was that I got a hold of the police report and I read through this and learned that the driver had been given a warning. And this is a driver who had -- he had claimed that the sun was in his eyes. So, he couldn't see what he was driving into, but he went ahead and just turned anyway. He could've killed a cyclist, but he got a warning. And it really made me understand, this combined with the knowledge I had gotten about how unsafe the roads are from an infrastructure standpoint.

Obviously, the enforcement of some of these laws -- I see the speeding that goes on. It's ridiculous. It really made me feel like I don't think the state cares about pedestrians and cyclists. And this law -- this bill helps me to think that maybe that's changing. So, that's one point.

The other thing I want to mention is, about thirty years ago, I married a Canadian and we're still married, and had a couple of kids. And what's happened over the last thirty years is I've spent a lot of time in Canada with friends and relatives. And many of that -- much of that time has been spent as a pedestrian. And one of the things you quickly see up there, (Bell) is when you go to cross a road; it is light years ahead of the way it's handled in the United States. In fact, it's very much like what this law says. And they've had this in place for decades.

You walk to the side of the road, the crosswalks are broadly lit, they're well signaged. And you put your hand out like this and the cars come screeching to a halt, and the people walk across the road. Kids do this, grandparents do this. Everybody does

184  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

this and everybody just gets it. And honestly, I come back to Connecticut and that's not the way it works. So, my point is, is that I hope people see that this bill is a step in the direction to showing that Connecticut is gonna start caring about its pedestrians and its cyclists. And the bill will go a long way to do that. So, thank you. It really was just kind of a statement. I don't know if you have any questions you'd like to ask.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Mr. Adams, for your testimony today and for coming forward and to sharing those examples. I was -- if you want to be entertained by something, you can go back to the hearing last year, where I was asked, I believe, thirteen times to demonstrate how someone crosses the road. And I had to do exactly what you just did there. So, for posterity's sake, how would you signal? That's right. All right. (Laughter) So, we're just gonna remember that. In case I'm forced to demonstrate over and over again, I'm just gonna call on your testimony.

MR. ADAMS: I wish I had seen that.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): And we'll highlight it again. Thank you, Mr. Adams, for your testimony and for your passion on this issue.

MR. ADAMS: You're welcome. Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): We have a question from Representative McCarthy-Vayhey.

REP. MCCARTHY-VAYHEY (133RD): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just briefly. I want to thank you for coming and just for noting the importance of the change in the

185  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

law, not just in terms of changing culture, but also just liability. And I think that that's, you know, been an important piece. I have a spouse who has also been hit by a vehicle on his bicycle, and thankfully, is also okay.

MR. ADAMS: Glad to hear that.

REP. MCCARTHY-VAYHEY (133RD): But I also just want to note that it's not just Canada. I lived outside Seattle for many years and the culture there is very different in terms of pedestrian access and I think we can do a better job here and I'm really grateful to see you out here in support. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you for your testimony again, Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Tony Cherolis, followed by Aaron Goode.

MR. CHEROLIS: All right. My name's Tony Cherolis. First, I want to thank you for the service to our state and for your stamina. I'm here today as a Hartford resident and the Transport Hartford coordinator for the Center for Latino Progress. And I am here to speak in support of bill 5324, proposed bill. And in general, I want to speak in support for its entirety. The only technical issue, because I'm technical, a former engineer, is I would suggest that the dooring section also cover cars or just vehicles legally defined vehicles.

When opening a car door into the general traffic lane or across a designated bike lane, it should be

illegal to click it and kick it, which seems to be the Connecticut standard door opening method. And as been stated, we're one of only nine states not to have a dooring law. As a certified league cycling instructor, we include dooring as part of what to look out for. Education is part of any successful safety program, but you also have to have laws and enforcement. And putting into place where the person that's causing the most risk to others is the correct place for fines.

I would like to see traffic light camera and school zone speed camera pilots either in this bill or proposed separately. Both New York City and Providence have been able to do this with school zone speed cameras. The New York City Project from 2014-2017 has a tremendous report on its effectiveness. They are now expanding construction zone speed camera enforcement, which has also been proposed, and actually has gotten further along in things. It's actually a much smaller slice of the safety pie. Most of our motor vehicle fatalities occur on local roads and almost all of our pedestrian fatalities occur on those local roads.

So, I would like to see that coming forward, if not this year, next. We really need to keep children and families safe on their way to school and in the nearby residential neighborhoods. The city of Hartford had twenty-three crash fatalities in 2018. That was a terrible year for the city of Hartford. Nine of those were pedestrian deaths on city streets. Only three of those fatalities were on the interstates. So, when you wonder about where the risk is to human life, it -- you know, our interstates are moving fast, but they've been

187  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

designed in ways that we may have crashes and fender benders, but we don't have as many fatalities as we do on local streets. (Bell)

This carnage doesn't just affect people walking. It affects car drivers, their passengers. It affects those riding bicycles. It affects those trying to get to their bus stop. And I want to kind of second some of the things the Reverend said earlier. Those walking and biking are doing God's work to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the face of a looming climate crisis. Our state must be passing laws that increase the number of people walking and biking to nearby destinations. Many of our destinations are within one or two miles from home, but if it is unsafe we won't do it. We won't let our kids do it. And we continue this process of destroying our planet.

Those changes are already in place in other states and other countries that we've heard about. A few of those, they have very successful benefits to reducing serious crashes and fatalities. I want to thank you for your attention and for acting on this bill in 2020.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you for your testimony and for your leadership both here in Hartford and across the state. I think you hit a lot of the concerns people are generating throughout the day and have submitted in testimony. And I really appreciate you sticking here until 4:20 to help us present those ideas.

I want to just reiterate -- and I had a spectacular failure my first year elected to the State House, in which I introduced red light cameras, and proceeded

188  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

to generate -- people talk about different ideas that have come up and how unpopular they can be. I tell you, my email inbox in 2011, I've never seen anything like it. I'm still recovering a little bit, when I generated close to 14,000 negative emails about the idea of red light cameras.

And we've tried in successive years different programs, pilot programs only in, you know, a few municipalities, making sure that they're based on traffic data or incident data, limiting them to a certain number in a community, but I've failed every single time. And that's something that I've allowed to influence whether or not I introduce a bill or not. And maybe I shouldn't. Maybe I should continue to keep having that fight, but it has impacted my willingness to champion that issue, those failures. So, it's good to be reminded sometimes that people still want us to have that conversation. So I appreciate you doing that. Are there any questions for Mr. Cherolis?  
Representative McCarthy-Vayhey.

REP. MCCARTHY-VAYHEY (133RD): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And it's more a comment to thank both you and Tony for the ongoing advocacy that you've done and the leadership in the state. And I know, I've -- forgive me for not being here earlier. I was -- we had hearing in Planning and Development that I was chairing, so that's why I was not able to be here earlier. But when I first started working on these issues, people used to kind of chuckle about it. But now we understand that besides health, safety, environment, this is also economic development for the future of our, not just our cities, but our towns as well. So, thanks to both

189  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

of you for being here in support of this and hopefully we can work together and get this passed this year. Thanks.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Thank you for your testimony, Tony. Aaron Goode. And Aaron is the last individual who is signed up to testify today. If you wish to testify, please see my clerk or just wait until Aaron is done and come up and introduce yourself for the record.

MR. GOODE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. My name is Aaron Goode. I am secretary of the Downtown Worcester Square Community Management Team in New Haven as well as board member of the Farmington Canal Rail to Trail Association and the Connecticut Advisory Council of the East Coast Greenway. I want to thank the committee for raising H.B. 5324. I support all of the provisions in 5324, each of which are individually important, but which I see as mutually reinforcing.

With respect to Greenway, our organization has many members who have Greenway license plates and they're often shocked to find out that they are generating revenue for the state that does not actually support development or maintenance of Connecticut green ways. And not earmarking that revenue contributes, among other things, to a basic distrust of government, which has very far-reaching negative consequences. And this, I think, is a symbol, an obvious fix to that problem.

Pedestrian safety, you know, at risk of making a fatuous comparison between the pedestrian safety crisis and the coronavirus, I think when we look at what has happened in New Haven just in the first two

190  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

months of 2020, four times as many vehicular homicides as gun homicides. Pedestrians have been mowed down literally on the doorstep of a daycare center. I know Chairman Lemar witnessed that incident firsthand. As well as on the doorstep of the largest senior housing complex in New Haven, a woman -- a walker struck by an SUV in a crosswalk in broad daylight. You can't help but conclude this is a full-blown crisis that requires an urgent mobilization of resources and political will.

The daily headlines of carnage and tragedy sadly speak for themselves. I'm gonna just suggest one specific provision in the bill regarding traffic impact studies and a recent experience in New Haven that demonstrated to me the need for this statutory revision. Last fall, we had a large residential project proposed at 201 Munson Street in the Newhallville section of New Haven, a proposal with over 400 units and 400 parking spaces and a major traffic generator under state law. And this project received approvals from the State Traffic Commission in the city of New Haven.

While I supported this multifamily development on a brownfield site, I was shocked to look at the traffic impact study and find that even though the project is located directly adjacent to the Farmington Canal Green Way, a major recreational asset, as well as a primary transportation resource for thousands of commuters in New Haven, there was nothing in the traffic impact study about the impact the project would undoubtedly have on conditions for pedestrians and cyclists in the surrounding area.

191  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

I offered to provide the traffic consultant with granular time-stamped data from infrared sensors on the 150,000 trips taken each year on the Green Way (Bell) which extends along the entire eastern frontage of the development, but the traffic consultant wasn't interested in the data because it would not fulfill a statutory requirement. So, I was shocked.

Contrary to urban mobility and sustainable transportation goals in both city and state plans of conservation and development, 201 Munson did not have to take into consideration how introducing new, extremely dangerous at-grade crossings of a heavily-used, multiuse trail might negatively impact the user experience on what is the premiere recreational trail for the entire State of Connecticut in the designated section of the East Coast Green Way.

Traffic impact studies suggest looking at maximizing vehicle throughput at the expense of the bicycle and pedestrian environment are completely at odds with the goal of creating walkable, open environments that attract and retain millennials and optimize conditions for economic development and urban revitalization. I urge the committee to support safety for our children and for our seniors, and for more walkable and livable cities by approving H.B. 5324. Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Aaron, for your testimony, for both coming up here today, being a leader in our community both in the city of New Haven, but also for the state resources as well, as you indicated. And thank you for some of the ideas

192  
2020  
LIJ

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

March 2,  
11:00 a.m.

over the years that have helped generate a lot of what you see before us. I appreciate it.

MR. GOODE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Are there any questions for Aaron? Seeing none. Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to testify before the Transportation Committee on the public hearing items on our agenda? Seeing none. We will call this meeting to close. Thank you everyone.