

CHAIRPERSONS: Senator Will Haskell,  
Representative Roland Lemar

SENATORS: Cassano, Somers, Daugherty-  
Abrams, Lopes, Needleman,  
Osten, Martin, Kissel

REPRESENTATIVES: Carney, Berger-Girvalo,  
Blumenthal, Chafee,  
Concepcion, Conley,  
Dauphinis, Devlin, Goupil,  
Haines, Harrison, Labriola,  
McCarty Vahey, Meskers,  
Michel, Morrin Bello, O'Dea,  
Rebimbas, Reyes, Rosario,  
Simms, Smith, Steinberg,  
Thomas, Zawistowski, Zupkus

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the Transportation Committee's Public Hearing for March 3rd. This is the third of our four scheduled Public Hearings before the Transportation Committee. We have again a robust agenda before us with about 50 folks who have signed up to testify. We are joined by the Commissioner of Department of Transportation and a number of Deputy Commissioners, they will be kicking off our Public Hearing today. We will proceed for about, up to an hour with that group and then we will turn to the public on the number of issues before our Committee today. With that being said, is there any comments, Representative Carney, or Senator Somers that you would like to make at the beginning?

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Nope, just looking forward to a good Public Hearing today. We obviously have a lot of various issues on the agenda so, looking forward to hearing from the public.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): I'm not seeing, I know a number of folks are Public Hearing, the Judiciary Committee, and other Committee's across the Building

today, so as folks come in you will see them on the screen. All of the materials that we have for the Public Hearing today, either the video recording on YouTube, or the submitted materials via email or the Public Hearing testimony that we will receive will be available to all members moving forward after the Hearing. With that, Mr. Clerk, I see Commissioner Giulietti and Deputy Commissioner Rolfe, and Deputy Commissioner Ecuallitto, and is that Pam in there or Ann, I can't see in the bottom corner but I think we have a lot of folks who are in the room, I don't know if there is anyone else from the Commissioner's team that is either waiting to sign-in.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: All set.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): The Commissioner is all set, so Commissioner we are going to start off with you today. Welcome to the Transportation Committee. Good to see you again. Thank you for bringing your team with you. We have a number of issues on our agenda today that we'll like to get your input on namely the Bill offered by the Department of Transportation for review. So thank you, Commissioner for joining us.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Thank you. And if it's okay can I read my opening statement?

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Of course.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Very good. Good morning to the Chairman Cassano, Chairman Lemar, Ranking Members Somers and Carney and Members of the Transportation Committee. Can you hear me okay? Okay. I am Joe Giulietti, Commissioner of the Department of Transportation. I would like to thank the Committee for raising three Bills on behalf of the DOT, House Bill 6484, which is AN ACT CONCERNING RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, House Bill 6486 AN ACT CONCERNING AUTOMATED DRIVING SYSTEM EQUIPPED VEHICLES and Senate Bill 920, AN ACT CONCERNING PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS. We have

submitted written comments so I will briefly share some highlights.

First on House Bill 6484. In terms of safety, the traveling public is our number one priority which is why the Department is again proposing Legislation to require the use of rear seatbelts. Rear seatbelts reduce fatalities and according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, backseat 3-point seatbelts are 54 percent effective in reducing fatalities in all crashes when compared to unrestrained backseat occupants.

Sections 7 and 8 of the Bill will assist the Department in modernizing our current bus contracting process and address a recent court rule. The Department is permitted under 13b-34 to contract for bus service, but under 13b-80 private operators can operate bus routes under routes specific certificates. For more than 40 years the Department contracted from all six route bus services in Connecticut whether they were covered by a certificate or not in order to subsidize the shortfall in revenue as private bus companies could no longer operate those routes at a profit. A recent court ruling determined that each bus company which enters into a contract with the Department under 12b-34 must obtain a certificate under 13b-80.

The court's ruling would require the Department to issue a certificates. for each of the approximately 200 routes operated under contract with the Department. The Agency has proposed this amendment to allow the Department to continue its past practice of the last four years. The contract subsidized groups without added regulatory burden of having to issue certificates under 13b-80. The requirement that a contractor obtain a certificate which requires the contractor to demonstrate the need for service is duplicative of the Commissioner's determination of the need for contracted service under the 13b-34. Private carriers who possesses certificates will not be

affected by this proposal since they currently operate under contract with the Department and are paid a management fee in addition to all their expenses. They are not compensated based on ridership. The Department welcomes any private carrier who possesses a certificate to provide bus service for the citizens of the State without a Department subsidy.

Finally the Department is always looking for ways to create efficiencies to provide to find a better way of conducting business internally and a number of our proposals in House Bill 6484 reflect this ongoing effort. Section 1 will increase the minimum value requiring State Property Review Board approval from \$5,000 dollars to \$10,000 dollars which will decrease the Department's project delivery time and time a property owner must wait to be paid after an agreement is agreed on acquisition.

Section 5 and 6 will improve consultants selection process by making the consultant evaluations yearly and providing an additional month for prequalification review by the Department.

And on the regulatory front, Section 10 will reduce or eliminate the waiting period for new taxi applications. Section 11 will streamline the process of revoking stagnant livery permits. And Section 12 will streamline the application process and remove barriers to enter the household goods carriers industry.

Section 18 will modernize two existing highway sign programs to one combined program that will provide more opportunity for business to advertise at more locations on limited access highways under a simplified program.

And Section 19 streamlines the program administration under the Freight Rail Material Program by establishing a materials pickup location.

House Bill 6486 speaks to update Connecticut's existing automated vehicle statute to better reflect national Best Practices implemented in other states for the safe testing and operation of automated driving systems on public highways. The changes proposed will remove barriers to the automated driving industry and provide a more flexible framework for the industry to do business in Connecticut.

And lastly Senate Bill 920, Amends the current P3 Statue to enhance the State's ability to utilize P3 agreements in designing, developing, financing, constructing, operating, and maintaining projects. Thank you for your time and the team and I will gladly take any questions you may have.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Commissioner for your time and for bringing a number of these issues before the Committee. Some of them that you brought before the Committee in the past and some that we're, have the opportunity to discuss again moving forward. I'd be remiss if I didn't, before we get started ask one of your members there, it looks to be, his name is Briceno, Mr. Leone maybe you would like to expound upon the Department's position on tolls, this year? [Laughter]

CAROLO LEONE: I'm sure we can [Crosstalk] the Committee, we can move it forward. [Laughter].

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. So I do appreciate the number of comments that our Committee Members will have about a number of the issues you have before you.

Like you mentioned we've seen a number of these issues before. We are now dealing with an increase in traffic fatalities across the State and country and I know a number of issues that you are talking about we are also talking about as a Committee as well. A number of the initiatives that the Department has taken over the last months and year

to move our State forward. So I appreciate all of the work that you have done. We've talked about this before. I really am impressed by the way that you've handled the Covid challenges for the Department, for your workers, your staff but also securing the federal dollars necessary to keep so much of our Departments operational, so I really appreciate it.

Phil could you do a quick mute. I think I have it, hold on. There we go. With that I have a number of questions from Committee Members. We will start first with Representative Carney.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Commissioner for your testimony. I think, you know, this is a very comprehensive Bill and I pretty much, as of right now, seem to agree with most of it. The only, I guess, it's not so much a question but if you could just explain Sections 7 and 8 and why you need it or why you are requesting it, and maybe the history behind it. To me this issue has been quite confusing and I know that the private bus companies are going to have a different view on this than you, so if could just explain that Section in a little more detail, why you're requesting it and maybe some of the history behind it?

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Sure and before I turn it over to Rich Andreski, who is actually been involved with the court process on this, I did testify on this last year. You know, it's a situation, we are the only state in the country that is still using certificates. We haven't really used them. They are old. They are outdated and we basically been told by the courts, you know, it's our own fault that were in the situation that were in. But Rich do you want to give a little bit of the history and were we are with it, the court case?

RICH ANDRESKI: Sure, good morning. Rich Andreski, Deputy Bureau Chief for Public Transportation. I'll

try to be as clear as I can about this. It is a confusing arrangement.

The 13b-80 Statute was in place long before public transportation. These bus routes in Connecticut were considered public transportation. They are private routes, they were franchises so to speak at the time and they were wholly operated and funded by the private sector. Sometime in the 70's and early 1980's there was a transition from contract, or not contracts, there was a transition for routes and bus services being operated as a private enterprise to services being contracted and operated with taxpayer funding. And at the time, hindsight is 20-20, at the time those certificates should have been retired just to clean up the, any potential for confusion.

We have been doing business under 13b-34, the Commissioners Authority to contract for service and the bus routes that operate today with exception across the State of Connecticut branded as CT Transit and CT Transit Express and CT Fasttrack are provided under 13b-34 contract. Those contracts, you heard in the Commissioner's testimony, cover 100 percent of the operating costs. The revenue is collected from riders and deposited into a State account and then the State DOT reimburses the providers of service.

We have been tied up in court for some time over these Legacy Certificates that still exist. What we've done is gone through an exhaustive review of the certificates with, through the court process and looked at the routes being operated today versus the routes in the certificates and the routes don't match. So the first part of this is the routes that are in these historic certificates don't actually match the routes being operated today. New streets, new turns, new highways have been built and so these documents over the years should have been, if the supposition of the private carriers are that these certificates give them unique rights, you know, the

certificates should have been updated throughout the years but they haven't been.

And further the court, what the court decided in 2019 is that the certificates themselves are not exclusive, meaning the DOT can issue, we have the authority to issue certificates to any provider of a bus service. So if other carriers come forward including our contractors come forward and ask for a certificate we can issue that certificate for the same route. What we're concerned about here and what we're trying to clarify these two Statutes the 13b-80 and the 13b-34 Statute is that we, all things being equal, if we have to move forward on issuing new certificates, we have 180 bus routes in the State. With each of those bus routes having multiple, you know, variations, and very frequently bus routes change due to detours or new markets that we're serving. This will become a very, very cumbersome administrative burden for the Department. They are not necessary.

The court has said we need to do certificates because the Statutes are unclear and they've been interpreted, the two Statutes together, so unless the Legislature acts to clarify the relationship between the two Statutes, we are going to be faced with just this ongoing administrative burden to administer the certificates. We are very concerned about that. We are concerned about our ability to keep pace with those requests. We are also concerned about creating potential avenues for future litigation. We issue these certificates going forward to may providers across the State we are going to have to keep track and we're concerned about that down the road being faced with other new novel complaints or litigation.

So I don't know if I did my job there to explain that, but we just want to be clear that when the State is fully funding a service through a contract that a certificate is not necessary. And I'll just clarify that should any provider come forward and

say they can do it at no cost to the State, we would immediately step away and allow that provider to operate that service at their own expense and at their own, with their own financial resources.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Rich, the only thing I want to add to what you're saying right now, you mentioned that the operating costs are covered under our agreement. It's not only the operating costs, it's the capital costs, it's the maintenance cost, it's the overhead. We pay everything for these operations. Now these all used to be borne by the private companies. When they all went into, what I'll problems over being able to make it. That's when it came that they started getting subsidies. The problem is that when we went to subsidies which everybody went to, that's not uncommon, that's all over, but we kept this thing on the books.

I know we have these certificates that were very, very well delineated, turn by turn, to where the bus was supposed to go. They are ineffective, we wouldn't even be able to change a route based on demand under those certificates without issuing another certificate. So in effect the courts are telling us it's our own situation that we bought into by not eliminating these certificates and besides the other thing I would add is that if a company, and you mentioned we would gladly welcome it, it goes beyond gladly welcoming it, we could not, we could not operate a system if a private carrier said that they could go and do it without a public assistance on it. They have the rights to go and do that and we cannot expend any federal funds on it because we are precluded from doing that because of the way that the federal rules are set up on it. So I said anything wrong, now is the chance to go and correct me, Rich.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): You're muted so you got to say, yeah, you're okay. [Laughter]

RICH ANDRESKI: No, all good Commissioner. Thank you.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Well I appreciate that Rich and Commissioner Giulietti for that explanation. You know it is certainly somewhat of a confusion issues, so you have clarified a lot of things for me and hopefully for the Committee as well. So, with that I don't have any further questions. So thank you again.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: And thank you for the question because I appreciate an opportunity to clarify it because, you know, there is a lot of misperception out there and what we're trying to do right now is keep the open competition from bidding and everything else there on the table and be able to go and do it that way and modify routes as it makes sense to go and do it.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): All right, thank you very much, Commissioner.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Senator Kessel followed by Representative Michel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Giulietti and Pam Sucato, it's not a question. I just want to say, thank you for all that you've done here in North Central Connecticut lately especially in Windsor Locks and with the really good news that we're going to get a train platform here in Enfield, Connecticut. That seems to have been expedited and your Department of Transportation took that on and for a while it looked like it wasn't going anywhere but now it seems like it's on a fast-track, no pun intended but I just want to say thank you.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: It's been a great partnership, Senator. I appreciate you sending that out but from the minute that they first went to approach us with it, obviously we're trying to do

everything we can including going after federal funds for it. So thank you for the acknowledgement on it.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH): You bet, Commissioner. You're doing a great job. Thank you, sir.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Senator Kissel. And I'll just highlight that's a great example of a community working well with the Department of Transportation trying to identify what the real needs of the community are, real opportunities are, like the local officials in Enfield did an extraordinary job working with the DOT on that. We're in a really good spot there because of that collaboration. And I appreciate the Department's leadership on that. Representative Michel, followed by Representative Chaffee.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you to the Department of Transportation team, nice to you. I have some questions, I have a ton of questions around 20 but for the sake of time and respect my colleagues, I'll just keep, I'll try to keep a few basic questions. Regarding the right of the public private partnership language and the fact that it I think it was 2012, how many P3 projects have been cemented by the State of Connecticut?

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: I missed the end Did you say how many P3 projects has the state had, cause?

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Yes.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: What I'll start with is the most successful one that we have is what is going on, on the highways with the plaza. That was a public private partnership long before I came here and its extremely successful There is some that are modeling themselves and may be an opportunity going forward such as some of the work that has been done in New Haven, you know, where we both had an

opportunity put property into it and have a P3 go forward.

Beyond that if anybody online that wants to turn around and mentioned whether or not we have any others that we would point to at all and say that, you know, it's, I would call it that's its relatively in it's infancy in terms of the number of P3 and what we're trying to do is set it up that it can be easier to do going forward. Anybody want to add on that?

PAM SUCATO: No, but Mark does.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Mark go ahead.

MARK ROLFE: Commissioner, yeah I did want to. This is Mark Rolfe, Deputy Commissioner just a point of clarification, the survey part of the work was done several years ago. To the best of my knowledge it was not done under the PC3 Statute which was under different statutory authority but it does operate very similar to what you would envision a P3.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, that answers the question. I don't believe it has any P3 projects since we put it into law. I think the language mentions something maximum of five and we haven't used one yet.

MARK ROLFE: Not only haven't we used one, Representative but we, there hasn't been a single proposal, so it's a big goose egg.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Right, so then I have, current statutory language was intended to protect taxpayers and public employees so if you support the Bill why would you believe that it needs to be changed where it hasn't been like any impediments in any P3 funding? I guess that just answers itself, I'll just keep moving, I apologize for that.

For instance toll entry are considered P3 project. It has to be nothing but an upside for the private people. The company has nothing at risk to operate Connecticut toll systems, so what protection regards these could be pretty based as if SB 920 was formed became a law which would ensure that the taxpayers would be treated by the private help operating all systems.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Mark, do you want to explain how we give up nothing in terms of our responsibilities under this language?

MARK ROLFE: Sure, thank you Commissioner. So the scenario you described using toll revenues, that is the most common form of a P3 where there is a revenue generating operation and a toll concession or a concession agreement that provides for the installation, operation, and maintenance of it. What the changes we're proposing into this Bill well other forms of P3 arrangements by eliminating the 25 percent maximum state investment we allow other funding arrangements such as availability payments. So we could do other types of projects like what Pennsylvania has done where they bundled hundreds of bridges and created availability payments structure in order to deliver those projects. Again, Pennsylvania and what we are proposing not transferring ownership, we're not transferring any of the state's rights of privileges, it's really just a mechanism to guarantee a payment to a concessionaire going forward for using that P3 legislation.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Are there any P3 that the state is actually considering doing right now?

MARK ROLFE: There's no projects under active consideration. What we're looking at is the possibility of some major federal funding that could be put in the pipeline. We have expanded our capabilities with respect to alternative contracting, we've done construction manager at risk

projects successfully. We've done several design build projects successfully. P3 legislation that can work for DOT would be another tool in our toolbox and another way to expedite project delivery if there are significant federal funds that come forward.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Okay, thank you for that. And then one last one for the sake of time, so the contracting agency is not required to do a cost benefit analysis on this case just by partnership? What would be the safeguard and taxpayer protection that our administration put in place to ensure there is no waste, fraud or abuse in the P3 projects? And thank you, Mr. Chair.

MARK ROLFE: Yes, I can respond to that. So you know, I read some of the testimony here and there were objections to the fact, you know, some of the provisions from the original language were carved out of this update. I think I would offer that there are significant protections within the legislation as it exists. There not related to the contracting standards or what's it's a much more, I would argue even a more robust process, much more public. There is Section 256 provides for robust analysis of any P3, it'll be subject to public hearing at the legislature, Governor approval and annual reporting requirements. There are prescribed terms within the legislation for any P3 language, audits that are required.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Sorry, I missed that.

MARK ROLFE: Section 256, so it's at line 54.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Yes, Section 256, Section 4-256. Thank you.

MARK ROLFE: Yep, yep. If you look down to Subsection (d) it talks about the detailed analysis. If you go to Numeral V, it talks about a cost benefit analysis, that is at line 81. So these are

all things that the Department would be required to provide but instead of providing it to the Contracting Standards Board as was specified in the earlier version, we're providing it directly to the legislature, directly to the Governor. It will be subject to Public Hearing and public scrutiny. The public hearing is down at line 99 and 100.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): All right, Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll stop now.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Representative Chafee followed by Senator Lopes.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Commissioner for speaking with us today. Representative Michel had similar questions to me, so I'm not going to repeat anything.

One thing I had, I read enough of public private partnership across the country where municipalities and states basically sold out by the companies and then locked into very long-term contracts and after signing into these agreements, the state or municipality actually has to pay the private company when they either want to use or say shutdown a lane of the highway. I have concerns over that, that we would get locked into one of these deals that is actually going to cost taxpayers more money in the long run.

And then just another concern of mine, I believe there is a toll Bill in Indiana that actually went bankrupt and they used a P3 model and the taxpayers were on the hook for the long-term cost, the toll revenues never really panned out to what the investment was. So I guess I'm just wondering, you know, what are we going to do to ensure that we don't get locked into these bad deals or the taxpayers in Connecticut aren't left picking up the cost of projects that fail.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Representative, I'm going to respond from the standpoint that everything that we're trying to do here is to make this entire process as transparent as it can possibly be, coming back to the legislature and as you know every time we have these Public Hearings every one of these issues comes up.

I am aware of the Indianan situation was greatly changed over time. Florida went to a similar thing that was so successful that they now added that to the public private partnership onto their turnpike as well as on their highways and it's been a very, very lucrative process for them to the point where they were able to pay off things sooner and they were able to drawdown more federal money. So my answer to you would be that if you follow the way that we're trying to do this, it's to make sure that everything is out in the open including the Public Hearings that would turn around and bring forward these arguments and there is nothing that would come forward to you without bringing you all the information on how this is different than anything that is going on in the past. And like said, we're not in a position to go and tell you have success stories right now, but we do know what has gone on in other states and what is successful and we would be very, very I would say diligent in choosing projects that we would look to come forward to the legislature with.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Are there any specific projects under consideration right now for this type of agreement?

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Mark has already responded to that. We don't have anything that is under consideration. We would like to see what's going to happen with the federal money and whether or not we can bundle a bunch of projects on bridges and everything else that would make sense. Other than that, no, there is nothing sitting there right now that says that. I also mentioned that when we made

the agreement that we made with New Haven. We're both looking into whether or not we can put, you know, parcels of land together that would entice the private sector to come in. But other than that, no there is nothing that I would say is on the table right now. Mark, you agree with that?

MARK ROLFE: Yes, Commissioner. I think you're right on. Nothing under active consideration.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Thank you for your time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Senator Lopes followed by Representative Meskers.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): Thank you. Hello Commissioner. A week or so ago when the Appropriations Committee on Transportation asked you about DOT's applications for various federal grants specifically noted a million dollar grant Structure to Rebuild America, you had told me the DOT was applying for every piece of federal money they could. I'd ask if you could give me some specifics since the time we met in Transportation. Do you have anything for me? Especially pertaining to.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: I'm going to let Pam play the response to you on this.

PAN SUCATO: Senator Lopes we're putting everything together and you'll have it next week before the Subcommittee meets with the DOT.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): Okay because I see that applications, but I bring up that particular grant, the application is due March 19th, it's not that far away.

GARRETT ECUALITTO: Senator Lopes, this is Garrett Eucalitto, Deputy Commissioner. So that grant only provided states and cities with only four weeks' notice before the closing so it's been a scramble at

the state, all across the country to identify projects that are appropriate and meet the new standards that we never say before so we are finalizing the details and ensuring that the project that we would like to submit meets the criteria.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): What is the project?

GARRETT ECUALITTO: We are still trying to finalize that.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): Okay when you know I hope you're reporting.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: We're trying.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): I have a couple more questions. In terms of rail lines, I just wonder if that's somewhere in New Britton -Waterbury corridor, have there been any changes lately that we should be aware of or anything of note New Britton to Waterbury?

GARRETT ECUALITTO: I believe, Commissioner Giulietti is this owned by Pan Am and will be a part of the purchase or is this the CSX Line, maybe Rich Andreski knows that?

RICH ANDRESKI: Yes. Yes, the Pan Am, so CSX Railroad is acquiring Pan Am in Connecticut and elsewhere and we have been in active communication with the CSX leadership. They have been discussing how they will be moving forward in terms of operating the Connecticut assets. We do have some concerns about investment the Pan Am Railroad between New Britton and Waterbury is in rough shape including gate crossing improvements are needed and the track condition is very difficult to say the least, so. We're talking to CSX right now to make sure that they're committed to maintaining freight service here in Connecticut.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): Any plans for expansion or improvement in that line to get better use out of it?

RICH ANDRESKI: When you say better use, is that passenger or freight?

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): Anything more than one train a week that seems to go through it.

RICH ANDRESKI: Well, I will tell you that we've got a great team that spends quite a bit of time talking with the freight operators. If there is a market to be served, we will do whatever we can to support that. I just, I want to point out that that particular line is not owned by the State of Connecticut so, we would encourage but I'm not sure what authority we would have to.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): It's just one of the things I look at when I look at my federal grant programs. We can work with a project, you guys are talking about private public partnerships, why can't we be working with some of these companies to improve rail lines. And I have to be clear, and I'm going to be a little blunt and harsh here, I don't believe the sins of the father, this is a previous commissioners and previous things that have happened in the legislature but my memory still burns from years ago when we were deciding whether or not we should build the New Britton Hartford busway and quite a few of us were pushing for light rail and I'll never, ever forget the day at a Public Hearing when we asked the then commissioner how much would it cost to do that in rail as opposed to doing a busway.

And the plan eventually having a railway that would go from Hartford down to Bristol, through New Britton, down to Waterbury, go to Bridgeport and then go to New York which would make sense. And at that time they really wanted the busway and we were told by the DOT commissioner that we can't possibly do it with light rail because it would cost a

billion dollars. And we talked to some rail experts who were working up in Massachusetts and they came back to us and said, no it would probably cost \$250 million dollars.

And we asked them how they knew that, well because we just built a rail line and that's what it cost. We brought that back to the then commissioner and asked him where he got his number of a billion dollars and his flippant answer was, "Well we kind of made it up." Ten years later I'm still made about that. I'd like to see a further emphasis on improving our rail lines and what we can do about that. And you understand what I'm getting at right?

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: I do and I will tell you that not only do I not want to step in and try to defend a decision that was made in the past or how commissioner.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): Nor do you.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: But from the standpoint that, you know, I've had to deal with this a number of times and I'm going to tell you that I am tremendously impressed with the busway. What it does allow for you, is once you've established a busway you can easily convert a busway into a light rail system. But I will tell you that when I was looking at the same thing that some of the other properties, you know, I happen to be in charge of in the past, at that time anytime you were looking at a commuter rail you were looking at a cost of ten to \$25 million dollars a mile.

When you're looking at a light rail system you are up in the \$75 million dollars a mile range to go and do, if you had right of way. Okay and then if you talk about heavy rail like the subway system and everything else, they started coming in at \$250 million dollars a mile, Miami being the last example on that. So I would tell you that what you haven't lost in all of this is the ability that if you get

the line and that's why at some point, I'm hoping that we have opportunities to talk about where it makes sense to go and purchase a line, in this case here I don't want to spend a lot of time talking about this line because we're actually at the mercy of this freight company to make sure that they're going to make the right investment so it's worth it to them to upgrade this system and then we got to talk to them about can we upgrade beyond that as we look at what are some of other potentials that are there and if we can get the federal money to go and do that.

So I haven't lost sight of it, and I won't say that I apologize for spreading this information you may have gotten in the past but I can assure you, you will not get any misinformation. We will be very open, candid, and transparent with you on what are the opportunities there.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): I appreciate that, Commissioner. I know where you come from professionally and that's why I hesitate to get into a rail argument with you.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Well, it's better you know where I come from that to say I know where you live, okay.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): So additionally I'm not going to go into great detail about Senate Bill 920 the Public Private Partnership and of course, you know, again those of us with legislative history have had nightmares with privatization and the DOT mostly back the I84 debacle and in the Cheshire Waterbury area. You know, I understand what you guys are trying to do, you understand, you know, labor and various concerns about this, legislators that have gone through this over this privatization, DOT which has usually be a catastrophe in Connecticut. We're very cautious moving forward on this. You guys have to understand how slowly I'd like to move on this, understanding completely before moving forward.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Which is why we bought Senator Leone and make sure he's given us the other side of the argument.

CARLO LEONE: We'll make sure it's fully transparent and DOT has full control.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): We'll still move forward, you still have to understand, I'm sorry to be so critical but I am usually very positive. Lastly, it's the bus certificates. Honestly, it's becoming a Groundhog Day for me. Every year I've been here this has come up, every year for ten years this certificate Bills come up and every year we kill it. You know, a lot of us here would really love to see you guys and the bus companies come to some sort of compromise that doesn't create a fight and doesn't make us have to make a decision whose side we're going to fall on. And I know, I haven't heard from you side much, I hear from then a lot.

They seem to think they are more willing to come to the table and negotiate than you guys are. I would like to see if there could be a couple of more meetings to discuss this issue so that it stops coming back every single year.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Senator, I will tell you that.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): Legislators that are new on this Committee, every single year for more than ten years, this Bill in one form or another has come up and we always kill it. It's gone to court and it still really hasn't been resolved, so I would like to see a compromise.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: All the discussion that were coming to you with are coming from the court system, okay. The court is basically telling us, you know, what you're doing is, you know, I don't want to paint it with the pejorative terms but there is

nowhere else that they're using certificates, we're being beaten by our own legislation right now and the truth of the matter is though there is a lot of speculation out there as to, you know, what we are trying to do on this, that's why I'm saying everything we're trying to do on this is similar to the other thing is to be open, transparent and provide as much opportunity for the private sector because right now none of them could do it on their own.

They all have to do it through a subsidy coming from the state. So what we're trying to do is level that out so that way there we can keep this thing going without having to turn back to a system that doesn't exist anymore which is certificates that if we follow that every single time, if you came to me and said, you know, oh we want to change the route over here because we know we've got a new business going in, I'd have to issue a new certificate which is almost meaningless because everything that is there.

That is why I want to make it clear, every dime that goes in covers all of their expenses, capital, operating, maintenance expenses, and profit and overhead are all paid to all these carriers, okay. And the certificates are nothing more than a system that is outdated and the courts are telling us, you know, you got to work with your legislature.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): Understood, thank you for your answers and good luck in the future.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Representative Meskers followed by Representative Thomas.

REP. MESKERS (150TH): Thank you, Chairman. I want to welcome Senator Leone, I think this is the first time we've spoken since you joined there. I want to thank the Commissioner and the Department of Transportation for all their efforts in relation to

I95 work. I know we had you on the grill. I appreciate your input. We will be coming back to with, you know, discussions on the plan. On the private public partnerships having worked in the private sector for 35 years, I think and knowing what the balance sheet of the state looks like, I think where we can get leverage with federal funding and the private sector do jump start the economy to get the infrastructure upgraded and done is very important so I salute you on that.

On some of the major projects you may be looking at or begin to see on the infrastructure I would also encourage going back to commentaries I made in the past on when we were considering tolling and fiber optics, etc. You know, I'm not trying to revise that discussion but when we look at major infrastructure projects I wanted to make sure we're talking to the telecommunications giants, our utility industries for both leasing and creation of rights of ways so we get revenue streams from that type of an operation.

I've had commentaries and conversations, I believe with the attorney general's office and yourselves in relation to the concessions on the, on the interstates, the concessions basically for service plazas. I think the service plazas worked out to be a tremendous success. One of the caveats I'd give you is that we end up in 30 year contract, you know, some people suggested concerns about long dated contracts. I'm less concerned about the long dated contracts than, okay, sorry about that. I just want to make a suggestion as we, in the private public partnerships where we may need to issues those types of 20 and 30 year contracts for the adequate return of capital that the private participant is. That we look at the oversight of any of the transfers of ownership or operating contracts and this arose in my conversation on the service plazas.

You know, it's completely outside the scope of what we did when we did the service plazas and I think we

did a good job but I've gone down that rabbit hole of the zone pricing and gasoline and we haven't been able to find a solution to zone pricing. The only asset that the state owns that we put the concession out in those service plazas with gasoline stations is at those locations. And so I was hoping at some point if there were transfers to those operating licenses at those service plazas that we look at is there some way to encourage those plazas to use a market based pricing model for gasoline so that we can begin to make inroads and breakdown what I think is an egregious practice which is these 30 and 40 cent zone pricing in the gasoline markets in the State of Connecticut.

I mean they have been challenged, they apparently have their proprietary algorithms, my only way around that is to find a competitor and maybe if we're looking at transfers on those plazas at some point to see if we can't make some of that contingent on maybe opening up the gasoline markets on the plazas which would then spillover into the neighborhoods. I mean that's a pretty much of a, I'm down a rabbit hole so I apologize but the corollary is are any of the other projects that I think you want both maybe DECD and potentially someone like Roland or someone from our Committee in the review of transfers or extensions of licenses on those types of contracts.

I don't want to just within the bureaucracy if they come in and they say we're selling the holdings of this operating contract, the 30 year contract on a private public partnership that we just look at it proforma versus the scope of their activities to see if there is something that we want to extract before we allow them to on-sell their investment cause a lot of these projects get invested structured and then on-sold to a pension fund somewhere in the world that wants a long-dated asset for 30 years. So if those transfers are coming I'd like to maybe look to see what kind of leeway we have to potentially not break the contract instead maybe

enhance it for the residents of the state. Sorry about the length of that but that's where I stand, okay. Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Thomas followed by Representative O'Dea.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you, Commissioner, and team. I'm sorry I'm in another meeting so I will try not be duplicative. I was, I think I heard some of my questions were answered. I'm first going to go to HB 6486 and I just had a question with regard to the taskforce and I guess in the prior statute Public Act 1769, and I was unclear is that taskforce ongoing with this new legislation or is it being replaced?

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Okay, Peter is here. Come on in Peter.

PETER CALCATERRA: Good Morning, my name is Peter Calcaterra, a Representative from the Department Taskforce. The Taskforce is still going forward and would still be relevant as far as this legislation.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Okay, great. Thank you. And my understanding, I know, I think there was a line saying that anyone on that taskforce could be a member of the legislature which is fine and it allowed for pretty broad representation but give the area, it seems like it might be missing someone in, I don't even know, what it's called, maybe automotive engineering or someone who would be more familiar with the technology side and I wondered if it's ever been discussed to add someone like that to the taskforce?

PETER CALCATERRA: We do have members of the taskforce that represent the auto industry, Uber and Aurora and the automated developers that are on it and we also have Friends of the Taskforce that participate. The group is pretty open so although a position might be legislatively established

previously we're open to others participating in discussions, so we've been inviting others to participate. So unspecific recommendations of who we should engage be happy to take a look and that and include that in part of the group.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Okay, great. Thank you for that Peter, helpful. It was unclear who was on the taskforce. And then just one other clarifying question, it seems that in the prior version of the statute, the municipalities had some control over, you know, how these vehicles could be used in their towns whether it were hours of operation, during the study phase. So is this change because we feel we've learned everything we could from this study and is the feeling that the municipal level no further sort of control if you will if needed? Can you talk through that a little?

PETER CALCATERRA: Sure, the Bill 6046 still requires that the automated driving system equipped vehicles adhere to any local ordinances as well as any other applicable, you know, laws of the General Statute so in terms of, you know, local influence or, you know, applying the rules of the road, it's still there.

The previous, I should say the current Statute 13(2) 260 puts an emphases on municipalities as the applicant for a pilot program and we learned over the last few years that was pretty difficult for municipalities to be the applicant, they were not really equipped with the resources to take on that responsibility and most other states that we looked at pretty much every state we looked at that had pilot programs did not put the onus on municipalities the real attention is on industry to be the applicant and making sure that the vehicle adhere to the rules of that state or the rules of the road whatever localities there are. So it's really about refocusing who the applicant is or really focusing on who the entity is that is being legislated as opposed to putting the burden on a

municipalities to be an applicant were they don't really have the resources to really develop these types of projects or initiatives. So it's to streamline and simplify what other states already have and to kind of adhere to National Best Practices as opposed to, you know, creating additional requirements that other states don't really have.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Got it. That makes sense. I like streamline. Thank you, that's all I had on that Bill. And I do apologize, I'm new to this Committee so sometimes I feel like I joined the conversation in the middle of a long journey. I'll go to 6484. I just had a couple of quick questions. In Section 6, and you eluded to it Commissioner, change from a six month review to an annual review and I was just curious why, I didn't know what the average length of these consultant contracts typically tends to be. But you could address that?

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Yeah, and I'm going to turn. Mark do you want to explain because we put the additional month in and you can also tell her how many applications we get and that's why we're looking for the additional time. So Mark, can you join?

MARK ROLFE: Sure, yes I'm here, Commissioner. So with respect to the specific question on the consultant evaluations, this is really just an administrative process. Right now we do them every six months. This is an administrative burden for our staff. Consultant agreements typically span years and not months so we're doing these fairly frequently on consultants and the performance doesn't change that much from month to month and the thought is we will capture the same level of information in detail to be able to utilize it just as effectively by doing these evaluations on an annual basis as opposed to semiannually. It's just an administrative burden for our project managers, requires then to take time away from delivering

projects to evaluate performance, which they are doing on a daily basis but, you know, preparing the reports, doing them annually is what we request.

The second part of it of our Bill in this section refers to the annual prequalification process.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Everyone is in double meetings right now [Laughter].

MARK ROLFE: It sounds that way. Yeah, the prequalification process, we just want to move the timeline back from the end of the year to a month earlier. It's a particularly busy time of the year for our senior staff here, we're developing our capital plan, we're working on budget proposals, and just bringing it back that one month gives us a little bit of a free run to make that happen on a timely basis.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): I suspected as much. Thank you. In terms of performance review, it just raised the question for me if there ever were an annual contract I would like to preserve this six month review, so I don't know if it makes sense to work in that technicality or if you literally never have a one year contract but it just raised a red flag. And the only think question on that Bill, sorry. For Section 9, the termination date was originally January 2022 and we just, it was pushed back. All right it was removed and I don't think a date was given so I'm just curious why total removal versus not extending it to 2025 or something similar.

MARK ROLFE: So this is the section on alternative project delivery. Initially this was viewed as a piloting process and we've now completed two design build projects, a construction manager at risk and another variation of construct manager at risk and we've got others in the pipeline. We've begun to institutionalize our procedures here. Our administrative process, our procurement rules. We feel like we want to make this part of our toolbox

on an ongoing basis and having the sunset provision sort of called into question our level of commitment to design build and these other alternative project delivery systems.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Okay, thank you for that. And on 920 this is where I will try not to be duplicative, let's see. I think I heard Representative Michel address some of this. In terms of the removal of the restrictions that used to be present about where the private public partnerships would be or what they would be restricted to, I just want to understand the thinking behind that removal. Is the thought of the agency that nothing should be off the table, that any type of like, nothing should be exempted or it just seems so broad compared to what used to be there?

MARK ROLFE: Yeah, so this legislation is written very broadly. You know, we're speaking to how it pertains to DOT and we do expect that there could be an opportunity if these revisions to the legislation are incorporated but it could be applied to other state agencies and we didn't want to foreclose any opportunities there for another state agency to utilize the same legislation. I can speak to the transportation piece of it but I'll leave it to others to get the other.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Absolutely. I have another question which is why this Bill was in Transportation but that's a different subject. [Laughter]. Sorry, so yes, so I know it used to be limited to transportation systems, TOD and related infrastructure so is there, just to give me peace of mind, is there any transportation related scenario that you think should not be part of a private public partnership?

MARK ROLFE: Um, nothing comes to mind. There are certainly areas where P3s are most applicable. Projects with a high risk profile from project

delivery are well suited for P3s. But in terms of providing say, ongoing services, those are perhaps less well suited for it. The standard run of the mill projects are less well suited for it. We have tools in our toolbox where we can already do that. It's the high profile projects with an uncertain funding stream where we're looking to leverage private capital and bring that into the, you know, the funding mix. I think those are the projects that we'd be looking at for P3s.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): And have you ever gotten any interest in, under the current Statute, in from any private entities interested in something that perhaps the commission said, to your point, like no, this doesn't seem appropriate for a private intervention? Has anything like that come up?

MARK ROLFE: The most we've ever had is inquiries. We've never had a proposal put in front of us. There have been other things related to the POD Statute where there have been some proposals made but nothing specific with P3s.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Okay and if the inquiries, I guess, I would ask then what restricted the inquiries from moving to proposals, you know, was it something like no that's not allowed in current Statute, or it doesn't sound like a good idea, to us?

MARK ROLFE: I can only speak anecdotally but if the limitation for 25 percent state investment, the limitation on the term of investment and some of the other administrative burdens that were place in the existing legislation, they were perceived as an obstacle or a barrier to investment and the few firms that we might have been looking at this, never came to fruition. There was never a proposal made.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): And they thought the terms were too short, I assume.

MARK ROLFE: It's return on investment, right. So they needed adequate time to recover investment, you know, I can't speak to the details because we never heard them.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Got it. Got it. And I think I hear Representative Chaffee ask about the term in this Bill. I thought 50 years sounded like a very long time mainly because I think what we learned during this pandemic and even prior is that society seems to be changing, like we seem to be in a period of a lot of things changing whether it's a specific industries or technological advances, etc. Like here we are looking at ADS vehicles. So by removing the 50 year limit to an unlimited timeframe, that feels very potentially pennywise pound foolish to me and I think I heard you address this earlier, briefly. I guess the lack of safeguards are terrible to me, the lack of I don't know, reexamining what might be best for the coffers of the state with some regularity would seem more prudent. Can you talk about what the thinking is around removing that?

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: No, I'll jump in on this one Representative Thomas and the idea when we were explaining this before nothing is changed in terms of responsibility and what we would have to bring to the legislature to go and show what our RLI would be, what the return is going to be, what the amount of time is going to be and we lose nothing of that. What we're trying to do is open up the window to get some more in there that as we look at what we can potentially do with some federal match coming in, that's what we're trying to go after.

We are not looking to go and eliminate any of the safeguards that are there and there is nothing that can go forward without the legislature and the office of the Governor being involved in it. Even though it opens it up, it doesn't change what we have to come to you with in terms of showing you why this would be good and if we were to actually get

one. And as you've already heard up until this point we haven't had anybody that was willing to go an approach it.

We're trying to open it up that we think there may be some possibility of doing this particularly in light of what we can do with some of the bridges and everything else. But we are fully aware and you know, I will tell you that, yes 50 years sounds like a longtime, a lot of municipalities even want to go to 99 years just because it all depends on how big the project is and how long it is going to take to get a return on investment. But that again would be something that we would come to the legislature with and right now we don't have anything that approaches ten years let alone 50 or 99 years but that would be stuff that would come back to the legislature to go and discuss.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Okay and yeah, it could be a factor. Because of my age 50 sounds like a very long time. But yeah, I don't know. I think I would like to think through like what triggers what. It just not having any cap feels problematic to me because I don't, yeah, anyways.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: You're, I actually had to go through it myself. When you're talking about something for example when they are building housing, okay and it's going to be, you know, like for example even the Empire State Building, those types of buildings. They look for 99 year lease, okay so that way there they know they can get the return on. Obviously, some of the projects that we're looking at won't come anywhere near that. But I threw it out there so that you would know within the industry there are some that go well beyond 50 years, well beyond ten years. We're not even in a position to go and discuss that until we actually have something in front of us that we can come talk to you about. And that's why everything we put in there is for transparency. It requires so to come

back to you, discuss it, discuss it with the Governor's office.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Great, I appreciate that. Thank you. Similarly I know the CAP of five was removed and again apologies if someone did ask already and I was just curious, you know, going from five projects to an unlimited number just seems very wide ranging and I was just curious why not a more measured approach. I don't know what that number is, but I'm just curious. If so, I don't know what the thinking was when that Statue was written but I trust that some group like this one had a good reason for capping it at five. So why not adopt another number whether it is 20 or, you know, between five and unlimited?

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: I think the main reason and Mark has dealt with this before, is we watched what happened with some other states when they were able to do multiple bridge programs with one contract going out there. So it allowed, you know, if we put it down that it could only be five, it would be limiting us to those five. So, you know, I think what we're trying to do is be as flexible as possible without taking any of the safeguards out. So I can't come to you and just say, oh we've decided that we're going to do 50 projects right now, all right, so again I'd be sitting down in front of this Transportation Committee trying to justify why it make sense to look at this the way it way. So we've just trying to keep it into, if you look at it from the standpoint of it's been unsuccessful to this point. We're trying to make opportunities for success on it but not give up any of the rights.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Okay and my last.

MARK ROLFE: Commissioner would you. I'll just add the fact that it got opened up to other agencies beyond Transportation was a factor in it. We had no

way of knowing how frequently they would be using this Statute.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Thank you for that, that's helpful Jotting a note. And my last question there is a Line that reads something about, you know, the Governor can, won't approve unless it results in job creation and economic growth and that just causes concerns because I think there are other goals that the state should pursue whether it's equitable goals or making sure its high paying jobs versus low paying jobs are just a couple of things I can think of off the top of my head. So I just want to make sure or what is your opinion about the safeguards around that piece of it or lack thereof? It just seems like a very low standard basically.

MARK ROLFE: So Representative, I would point you to Section 4-256 of the Bill and it talks about, I think there's ten different parameters or criteria that a P3 project would need to meet, cost benefit analysis, economic and financial feasibility, the benefits to the agency, to the public as a whole so and then the advantages and disadvantages of a private public partnership as opposed to having the state agency perform the function of P3. So there is a whole range of criteria that a potential P3 project needs to meet. It's not just, you know, discretionary determination of the Governor. The Governor obviously has final say but there is a whole series of bars that a P3 project needs to cross.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Thank you for that. I will definitely look at that Section and those are all of my questions for now. I would just add that the statement that I just want to make sure we have ample safeguards in place so that sort of the pursuit of the almighty dollar is not the only goal that we are pursuing. Thank you all for your insight and thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair and this opportunity to interrogate Senator, I mean [Laughter] on a number of things. It's always good to see you Mr. Leone. I appreciate your attendance here. Commissioner, just a couple of question on the certificates. Senator Lopes had pointed out, you know, it seems like "Groundhog Day" I think was his quote and I agree. And listening to the comments, and I understand both side of the argument and both sides have merit, in my humble opinion. I understand the court has issued an Injunction in one case and ruled in another that the certificates are property and therefore this is the reason why you need this fixed. Am I accurately representing the two cases.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: You know, Representative O'Dea, I'm going to have Rich Andreski who has been involved with this from beginning with each one of court cases and the decisions up to this point. So Rich can you clarify for the Representative?

RICH ANDRESKI: Sure, I'd be happy to yeah. So wasn't as clear as I ought to have been earlier. We in the past, our legislative remedy was trying to seek approval to take certificates by eminent domain. We are not seeking to do that, that is not our intention. What we're simply doing here in this proposal is saying that if the DOT is contracting for that service that a certificate will not be necessary. So we're not taking the certificates from the bus carriers. They will still retain that historical right but if they have a contract with the Department they will simply be doing that under a contract not under a certificate.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Well I appreciate that. It's not that you're deciding not to take them by right, the courts told you you couldn't, right, correct, eminent domain?

RICH ANDRESKI: Well yes, that's correct, yep. We are operating under, we currently have an injunction that says we can't contract with other parties. So in effect what has happened is there is a monopoly that exists for these routes. Many routes are not covered by certificates and so those are open to other contractors. These routes were currently prohibited although we are working, we feel good about having that injunction lifted as the next step in litigation.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): And out of the 180, I believe you said there are about 180 bus routes that DOT has contract with. Is that correct?

RICH ANDRESKI: There is 180 bus routes, that's correct. Yes.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Out of those how many involve these certificates?

RICH ANDRESKI: A small number, I don't want to quote the number here but a less than ten percent of those routes.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Okay and the companies involved in the litigation that, the Britton Transit and Collins they are the ones that have those less than ten percent of the routes that are disputing the validity of the certificates?

RICH ANDRESKI: Yes, there are three plaintiffs in the case. We have a total of six companies that contract with the Department.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Okay. When you said it's become administratively burdensome to handle the ten percent or approximate of the bus routes that have these certificates, what do you mean by that?

RICH ANDRESKI: Yeah as we understand the court ruling we will have to issue certificates for all

routes, so all 180 routes is what I was referring to and each of those routes will have a rather cumbersome process in terms of the application review, preparation of maps and potentially having to have a public hearing on some of them.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): I clearly, as someone who wants to figure out a way for DOT to operate bus routes cheaply, I certainly don't want that. But I guess my, when the Torrington Line was operated by Kelly, they went bankrupt. Is that correct?

RICH ANDRESKI: Nason? The Nason Bus Company, yes.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): I'm sorry, yeah. Okay and was that part, was part of the reason why they went belly-up because of this litigation do you know, is there any reason that they?

RICH ANDRESKI: I can't explain why they went belly-up. What's curious to me is that the Department pays for 100 percent of the operating expenses plus an overhead and profit. So it is a bit surprising to me although I can't speak to the details of why they went bankrupt.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): So I read the testimony of Attorney Dominic Fulco, when is, is it true that, that Dattco is owed \$4 million dollars since June of last year for operating the routes from DOT?

RICH ANDRESKI: We, we provided a new contract, an extension of their agreement. They did not want to sign the agreement and one of the key reasons that they didn't want to sign it we said, if you sign on the dotted line here, this agreement does not constitute new rights, new certificate rights and we wanted that clearly expressed in the agreement. Unfortunately, we can't process payment. So yes to answer your question yes, they are due payment but we can't issue payment unless there is an agreement between the Department and them.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): So is it true that Dattco had offered to run the Torrington Line for more cheaply than what DOT is, what it's costing DOT to run it now? I'm not saying it is, I don't know the answer to that, but is that, do you know the answer to that?

RICH ANDRESKI: So we did a request for proposals. We did receive proposals. We suspended that process due to Covid, so we had a certain expectation of ridership before Covid happened. We are now reevaluating all the routes so it's not just the Torrington area routes but all routes, what we call CT Transit Express, those commuter routes that come into Hartford.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): When was the last time there's been a meeting of the minds or a mediation so to speak between the companies and DOT higher ups. I won't put the Commissioner on the spot but hopefully the Commissioner was involved. When was the last time that was done, do you know?

RICH ANDRESKI: Commissioner, you want me to take it?

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Yeah Rich because you've actually been following the court system on this, so please explain that it's through the courts that we're going through this right now.

RICH ANDRESKI: Yea, starting late last year we went in for yet another attempt at mediation to reach agreement and we had a number of back and forths with court appointed judge that tried to facilitate some agreement between the parties. We made a bonified offer. Both parties, it looked at one point like we might be able to bridge the gap and it started to feel a little bit like we were negotiating against ourselves and that mediation came to a conclusion.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): When was that, when was that late last year? Was that like?

RICH ANDRESKI: It went through January, early February of this year. So, you know, five weeks ago.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Excellent. So are you allowed to tell me the name of the Judge do you know involved as I know most of the judges?

RICH ANDRESKI: I'm not sure. Yeah, I guess so.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Rich, if you don't know the answer to that, let us get back to the Representative because that way there will be attorneys to advise you whether or not to release the name.

RICH ANDRESKI: Thank you.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: I'm sure you can but we just don't want to step into that right now.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Understood, Commissioner. I really don't want to throw wrenches in the works. Look, I, like I said in the beginning of this, I see both sides and honestly I was talking to Commissioner Redeker when this first started and I would love, I'd love to be involved to try and work this out too. So as Senator Lopes said, I'm hopeful that you all can get together and work this out whether it's grandfathering in for these less than ten percent of the routes for a few years and then opening them up, I don't have the answer.

Certainly, smarter minds than I have been more involved in this but I got to believe reasonable people with the assistance of the right Connecticut Superior Court Judge can work this out so that the legislature doesn't have to bring the hammer down. So, in any event, thank you very much for your time

and attention Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the indulgence. Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Of course and as a quick point of clarification like this has been an issue when you were a Ranking Member. I know you were working on it closely. We've been working on it for the last four years since I've been Chair and it's a difficult one because there are these up until recently differing court processes that were playing out and we were advised not to engage in what could be considered ex parti negotiations outside of the court system by bringing them into the legislature.

I tried to convene a quick meeting to try to work it out and we were advised that was probably not the best approach and that while there was an existing court process in place they should exhaust that process before bringing it in. That being said, we had a sense that that would play out before this legislative session finished and so we certainly want to have a Public Hearing to see if we could address any agreements that could come to and, you're right it's a stuck feeling with every year. It really is Groundhog Day but it's going to happen tomorrow too if we can't figure out something soon. Representative Michel I think you have your hand raised, I don't know if that was from your fist or if you have additional questions?

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do have one more question and to continue the conversation about the Section that we keep referring to, on the 920 I think that this is the Section that said that the Governor can approve P3s to help create jobs. But the Bill, state, the other states, that contract the standard board oversight, CAPs on years or number of projects and that brings me, you know, I'm sorry working with the screen and staring into my notes as well, but you should know I can cite a couple of cases San Diego Section 125, projected cost of \$360 million became an \$843 million. I69 in Indiana toll road and partnerships

in Alabama, Texas, California declared bankruptcy after revenue funding's to finance the projects fell short of projection and caused some cases in repurchasing and superhigh toll prices.

In British Columbia, the state committed \$18.2 billion dollars in multi case contracts to finance 60 projects and the cost of this demanded a \$3.7 billion more than if it was carried out through a traditional funding. And that represents \$1,800 per household in British Columbia. Also the San Francisco Parkway Project that was converted in at P3 as a result of their state highway accountable then upwards of \$40 million a year for the next ten years and there is more to. So I'm worried. If I were to do anything to the existing language it would be more reduced from 50 years to 30 years. So I have those concerns and if you want to comment on this, I do appreciate any comments on what I just mentioned. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MARK ROLFE: This is Mark Rolfe, Commissioner I just, a couple of comments thrown out there. I'm not familiar with all of those projects that you cited, Representative. I would note though that in a couple of instances that a P3 there was a failure. The failure was on the private side specifically I'm talking about Indiana. So the toll road was built. The revenue projections didn't come to light but the failure was on the private concessionaire and the State of Indiana actually ended up with a brand-new facility which they ended up having to operate but I think they came out ahead because they ended up with a brand-new facility. There is no question that P3 national practices have evolved over time and there is quite a bit of information that is now available on the transportation side both federal highway and the ASDOT which is the Association of All State DOTs has lots and lots of materials related to evaluation of P3s to Best Practices for.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): I appreciate that, still I I think when the Bill takes off the state

contracted portion, which is already in place, I mean they do the oversight so I'm just. I, it's going to be very difficult, I can't really support the Bill as written. But I do really appreciate all the work on it and your answers and thank you for the time to add those questions. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, we'll go to Senator Martin and then Senator Cassano.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Commissioner, just to thank you to begin with very quickly to you and your entire Department regarding navigating us through Covid as well as maintaining our roads here in this I guess all the snow storms that we had this winter. And good to see you former Senator Leone. And I just have one question and it is regarding to the bus issue. You know, being, having been in business all my life, and having to deal with multiple contracts regarding construction and dealing with people who have not paid, specifically regarding this \$4 million dollars that is owed to one of your bus companies and you seem to be holding an agreement payment that is until they sign an agreement. Was the work performed for the \$4 million dollars tied to a previous contract?

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Rich, you go to go and respond to that. Rich Andreski?

RICH ANDRESKI: I'm sorry, I'm talking here with my microphone on mute. Yes, well they will be paid for the service that they've rendered but they are not operating with a contract right now and it's twofold. I mentioned earlier it was the certificate language that they have not accepted which is unfortunate but also in terms of the payment provisions, but the cost per service. We just cannot agree to their terms so therefore we do not, we do not currently have a contract with them.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): But regarding the \$4 million dollars, that is for work that is already been performed so why would you not pay them?

RICH ANDRESKI: I can't unfortunately issue a payment without a contract.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): So is that \$4 million dollar pertain to work that was not under contract?

RICH ANDRESKI: Yeah, there's an, unfortunately because of the essentialness of public transportation they've been continuing to provide that service. They are due payment. We are not arguing that. I just cannot release payment without an agreement.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Rich would you explain [Cross talking].

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): I would assume.

RICH ANDRESKI: I'm sorry.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Even under our federal rules you are required to have a contract in order to make a payment.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): I would assume that the previous contract would continue till there is a new contract in place, specifically regarding work that has been performed.

RICH ANDRESKI: Contracts, yeah, our DOT Contracts have a term and an expiration, so that prior agreement that you are speaking to expired last June. So currently there is no active contract.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Okay, I have no further questions. It just seems to me, it just seems to me that the previous contract would fall into play until the new contract, new contract was signed and that would not have an effect on the \$4 million

dollars. It seems like you guys are holding them hostage this \$4 million dollars until they come to your terms, in agreement with your terms, so. All right thank you.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Rich, do you want to turn around and explain that everything that is going on right now is getting reviewed with the judges?

RICH ANDRESKI: Yeah, I also want to clarify the agreement was provided prior to the expiration of the old agreement. So the pending agreement that has not been executed has been languishing. All of our agreements need to be run through the attorneys because of the ongoing litigation. So, you know, it's not, the ball is not entirely within the DOT court here on this. Matter of fact, we do want to see an executed agreement as soon as we can but again we just can't agree to the unilateral terms that have been offered by Dattco.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Well I'm sure they can't agree with your terms as well. But thank you for your comment here. Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Senator Cassano. Senator I believe you're muted.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): I'm unmuted.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): There you go, you're good.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): I just want to for my former colleague, Senator Leone, I have your hat here, Senator. I hope you wear that.

CARLO LEONE: Yes, I will gladly stop by.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): I want to ask the \$64,000 question, I know you probably been trying to avoid this one and you know what I'm going to ask. In a recent conversation with a Representative from New England not from Connecticut or Massachusetts they

referred to the New England Throughway Project which we call here the Larson Tunnel Project. And his conversation apparently went on that they think they can get the funding outside of the funding that comes to Connecticut. Is there any validity to that and is that a possibility and is this going to be the New England Throughway Tunnel? I know you've just been waiting for that question, Commissioner.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: I wasn't sure if you were asking me or the Senator cause I think both of us could offer the same answer, is we've got to wait and see. Just so that you are aware we have meetings set up with the entire delegation. We've already had a meeting with Representative Rosa DeLauro, we got more meetings that are being set up so as this information comes forward and we know what's sitting there, I would be happy to come in front of this Committee. I'll be happy to keep you in the loop on everything that we are discussing but you need to know that we are meeting, we have been meeting, we have requests into them.

Matter of fact, Representative DeLauro even asked me if I would take the train down on Monday with her to Washington. I'm waiting for my second shot so then I'll be more likely to be willing to go do those types of things. But we, you know, right now everything, you know, there is a lot of, I'll say discussion out there rather than use words like rumors. We have been in active discussions with Representative Larson as well. I am well aware of, you know, what some of his ideas are.

You know, we'll see what is available in terms of funding and then it will be a decision as to what can be afforded and what can go forward with it. But I have not, I will be candid with you, I have not heard that there was any sort of a move to try to and move this away from being a state project to being a regional project. I know that there is some discussion that relates to some other projects that go on simultaneously but until we actually have that

in front of us, and we know that there is funding that would be available for, that's when I will come back and have that discussion with you, Senator.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Great. Appreciate that. Thank you very much.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you and I have 30 question but you know what, I have a way to reach out to you. We will close with this portion of the Public Hearing for today. Thank you all very much for your testimony, for the breadth of your suggestions to the Committee this year on how to move the Department of Transportation forward in 2021 and beyond. I look forward to speaking closely with you and Ann and Carlo and Deputy Commissioners and Pam to try to get to positive solutions on each of the Bill you have before us to rectify a lot of the concerns our members have and try to get us to a place where we can see eye-to-eye and if we don't we'll have to blame Carlo on that one too.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: I like that, Representative, that works out very well for me.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): With that being said, thank you all very much for your time today, appreciate it.

COMMR. JOE GIULIETTI: Thank you, Representative. Appreciate the time that you've spent with us.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): We are going to move on to the public side of this for now. We went well over our one hour allotted time.

PHIL MAINIERO: Representative Lemar I think he cut off. Let's see if he gets back on.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): So I think I lost your there for a moment.

PHIL MAINIERO: Yes, I think we have the connection back now.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Okay. We have Stephen Samela followed by Travis Woodward.

PHIL MAINIERO: Mr. Chair we do not have Steve or Travis in the waiting room but the third speaker after them, Barry Kresch is available.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): All right let's go with Barry.

BARRY KRESCH: Can you see and hear me now?

REP. LEMAR (96TH): We can, Barry go ahead.

BARRY KRESCH: Good Afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Committee Members, my name is Barry Kresch. I live in Westport. I am the President of the EV Club of Connecticut. I am here to testify about HB 6485.

There were equity components adopted last week for the CHEAPR Program and it would be appropriate to assess if these are effective at reaching their target or how performance could be improved. It is important that granular tracking is implemented for all the old and new program components. I also think any research should consider environmental factors like lack of charging access, how user friendly the incentives are when operationalized and whether the incentive, the used incentive exceeds in stimulating what is currently an underdeveloped used EV market.

I also support a pilot for E-bikes. E-bikes can be a practical urban runabout and a valuable part of any plan for zero emission transportation equity. I just don't want to see the main program attenuated. I support the new equity provisions but my larger concern about CHEAPR is that it has been underperforming for the past year-and-a-half. During 2020 there were 675 rebates awarded and the program is 76 percent underspent not including overhead and dealer incentives.

While there has been a pandemic and a recession the main reason was the changes in the program parameters dating to October 2019. The 675 rebates compare to 1,832 rebates for the 12 months prior to the change. CHEAPR isn't particularly well-funded either. It may sound strange to say that the program is both underspend and underfunded but if it were more aggressively positioned then the funds would be utilized. DEEPs consultant forecasted that current funding levels are not sufficient to keep pace with the goals in the multistate ZEV Plan. There are enough funds collected in clean air fees that should be manageable and of course another possible future option is TCI.

For 2021 and the unspent funds have been rolled over and the budget is about \$5.2 million dollars, not so terrible. The new incentives will help raise the spend but I doubt by enough to matter. As I mentioned when I testified two weeks ago, Connecticut has fallen far behind in its pacing to reach the goal set forth in the ZEV Plan. This may not be the best analogy but we need to be firing on all cylinders and I'm happy to discuss these issues in more detail at any time and I thank you for allowing me to testify.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Barry it's good to see you again and thank you for your work and your understanding of the CHEAPR Program and frankly it's an issue that I've work with you and many others over the last few years to try and make it a more robust program that really helps address the structural problems we have in Connecticut in building in equity concerns and funding I think is inherent is that program is going to succeed moving forward and so I appreciate any thoughts that we'll generate today to move us in that direction.

I know that DEEP is in a similar position to help us think through ways to make the CHEAPR Program more effective but I mostly for today want to get as many thoughts and ideas on the record as possible

because, you're right, it can be true that it is both undersubscribed and underfunded at the same time and if we're going to collect these dollars, if we're going to make an investment we should make sure we're targeting them in the most appropriate ways. So thank you for your testimony today. Are there any questions for Mr. Kresch? Seeing none, thank you again. Are Stephen or Travis in Phil?

PHIL MAINIERO: No they are not however Mr. John Hall is the next speaker present on the public speaking list.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Okay, let's go with John.

PHIL MAINIERO: Mr. Hall if you could unmute and turn your camera on.

JOHN HALL: Okay, I can't see how to start my video here though.

PHIL MAINIERO: Most likely if you're on your computer look at the bottom left corner.

JOHN HALL: Oh yeah, I see it now. Yeah. Thank you Chairman Lemar and Vice-Chairs Cassano and Simms and Ranking Members Carney and Somers. I appreciate this opportunity to be here and to speak in support of proposed House Bill 5724 regarding construction of sidewalks on state roads.

I sent in a fairly detailed testimony suggesting some things that could be included in this Bill, hopefully it will be raised and written now. I won't cover those details so much here but I wanted to just direct to you and make a case for two major points of my testimony. I live in Portland but I represent the Johan Center for Earth and Art which is based in Middletown and we work with Complete Streets Committees in Middletown and Portland and we're the organization that is the public advocate for the Central Connecticut Wheel Trail which those

of you who are on the Transportation Committee in 2019 might remember.

The first point I want to make has to do with communication. Very often, let's say the communication between the Department of Transportation and advocates for Complete Streets issues in local communities is very spotty and that is not entirely the fault, in fact it's not the fault at all of the Department. The town, the municipality gets communications about DOT projects that are coming up. Sometimes the Complete Streets Committees get that information and we are able to look at the area and provide input. Sometimes the mayor or the Department of Public Works just does not tell us about that and we are oblivious to the project coming down the road.

Other times when we are informed the municipality is informed that passes on to the Complete Streets Committee. DOT just hasn't recognized that their project has bicycle and pedestrian implications. So I would like to suggest that perhaps in this Bill or maybe through some other means, maybe just reaching to the Department of Transportation Complete Streets Advocates in municipalities could be informed directly about upcoming projects within the municipality on state roads so that we have an opportunity to examine that project area and provide input. That would be very helpful.

Also, when this Bill is written not that it is raised, I certainly hope it will be I would like to suggest that the Bill be written to provide an opportunity for the Department of consider not just sidewalks but many other kinds of infrastructure that are important to pedestrians and bicyclists, I'm thinking crosswalks of course and pedestrian friendly crosswalk signals which are sometimes missing even after a project is done. Islands of refuge so that pedestrians have a place to get to when there is a very long, a very long crossing to be made. Traffic calming, bike lanes, and pull outs

for public transit drop-off and pickup. Pedestrian accidents have been increasing. We have seen that in the news and it is really the Complete Streets Advocates in the community who are really looking at the infrastructure and bicycling on the roads and looking for places where pedestrians are endanger or have inadequate means to get across a busy road in a commercial area.

So those are my concerns. I hope you will raise this Bill and it could provide a great means to communicate between all the different parties, local municipalities, Department of Transportation and the Complete Streets Advocates so that we have, don't miss the opportunities to make these improvements that have unfortunately been missed in the past. So, I'll conclude my testimony with that. Thank you very much for the opportunity.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): And thank you, Mr. Hall for your testimony today and a few weeks ago. Greatly appreciate seeing you for the Transportation Community numerous times this year. Are there any questions for Mr. Hall. No. Seeing none, thank you again for your testimony.

JOHN HALL: Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Jennifer Homendy from the National Transportation Safety Board.

JENNIFER HOMENDY: All right, I think I have tech right now. Good afternoon, how are you?

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Good to see you, Jennifer.

JENNIFER HOMENDY: Good to see you too. Thank you so much. Good Afternoon Chairman Lemar, Vice Chairs Cassano and Simms, Ranking Members Carney and Somers and Members of the Committee. My name is Jennifer Homendy and I am a board member with the National Transportation Safety Board. I am honored to appear

before you today not only as a member of the NTSB but as a native of Plainville, Connecticut.

The NISB is an independent federal agency charged by Congress with investigation significant crashes in all modes of transportation to determine their probable cause and make recommendations to improve safety, prevent future tragedies and injuries and save lives. You may recall Senator Kissel may recall that I responded to the B17 crash at Bradley Airport in 2019. The team will finalize that investigation by the end of the month and I'm happy to meet with anybody about that.

I'm appearing before you today to discuss two Bills that the Committee is considering and I want to start with rear seatbelts. Nearly 95 percent of all transportation related deaths occur on our nation's roads. House Bill 6484 will help to reduce this toll and save lives in my home state. 294 motor vehicle occupants died in crashes in Connecticut in 2018. More than 40 percent of those occupants weren't using seatbelts.

If everyone in Connecticut used a seatbelt and additional 17 lives would be saved. Seatbelts are the number one defense in motor vehicle fatalities and injuries. And Connecticut has been a true leader on seatbelt use for many years with its primary enforcement law. The seatbelt use rate was 93.7 percent in 2019 which is above the national average of 90.7 percent. Connecticut's Primary Seatbelt Law only applies to the front seat. For decades, the NTSB has strongly recommended that state's enact a comprehensive primary enforcement seatbelt law that covers all vehicle occupants in all seating positions.

Now I recognize that this still provides for secondary enforcement but it is still a critical safety step forward. While primary laws have a greater affect, both primary and secondary laws save lives and reduce injuries. Evidence shows that rear

seatbelt use is higher in states that have a law requiring their use and 84 percent compliance rate compared to 58 percent in states with no law. The NTSB believes that a significant number of lives can be saved and injuries prevented if Connecticut enacts this Bill and closed the loophole in its occupant restraint law.

Now I want to turn to House Bill 6486 which establishes a pilot program that allows developers to test fully autonomous vehicles on Connecticut highways. Technology on vehicles has tremendous potential to mitigate or prevent crashes on our roadways. But safety must be the first priority in development, testing and implementation in order to fully achieve those benefits.

In 2018 the NTSB investigated the crash of vehicle testing ADS that collided with and killed a pedestrian in Tempe, Arizona. Our investigation found that Arizona's lack of a safety focused application and approval process for ADS testing failed to safeguard the public. The lessons learned from this crash can help prevent similar tragedies from occurring in Connecticut.

It is vitally important that more specific safeguards be established in this Bill. In particular the state should consider including a requirement for applicants to submit, for review and approval, a detailed safety plan, and establish a task group of experts to evaluate that plan before beginning any testing, My written statement provides more detail on the 12 key safety elements that are recommended by NISA that should be included in those safety plans. While my focus is on rear seatbelt use today, my main focus, I'd like to offer a more detailed briefing to the Committee and the Automated Vehicle Task Force on the lessons we've learned at the NTSB from our investigations of crashes involving highly automated vehicles. This is a new area for many states and we would like to be helpful

in your efforts to ensure safety while also allowing testing of automated vehicle to move forward.

In closing, I applaud the state and this Committee for your leadership on these issues and for your consideration of these Bills. The NTSB believes the rear seatbelt in particular is one of the most important measures that you will consider this year and we encourage swift enactment. Thank you again and happy to answer any questions.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Ms. Homendy for your testimony both delivered today but also the written testimony that you have provided this Committee. It is as you mention, quite illustrative of the number of ideas and thought that have taken place across the country and I am deeply thankful for because I am probably going to rely on it quite a bit as we figure out how to craft this legislative issue and in fact I might invite you talk to our Screening Committee about some of the ideas that we might want to incorporate into this Bill moving forward. So thank you so much for your time today. There are a few questions for you, first Representative Carney.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and thank you, Jennifer for coming here today. I do recall you speaking before the Committee in the past so I appreciate all the insight you have particularly on the autonomous vehicle Bill because that is certainly, as you said, it is a new area for the state, new area for a lot of people, so any assistance that can be had for that is greatly appreciated. I just have two questions regarding the backseat seatbelt Bill, it seems like it's come up every year, I've always been a little surprised that it hasn't passed in the pass, hopefully, you know, this is the year to do it. But you mentioned the compliance rate is states that don't have these laws, any idea what the compliance rate is in Connecticut?

JENNIFER HOMENDY: The, I only know the compliance rates in daytime that was observed for front seats. But I don't have the figures for rear seats but what I'll do after this is follow up with my team and see if we can get that to the Committee. We will send it to the Chairman and then also you as well, Representative Carney.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): I appreciate that. And it's good to hear that Connecticut's compliance rate for front seat seatbelts is so high. I would imagine like me for example, before I became a legislator I didn't know that it was legal to not wear your seatbelt in the backseat. I would put it on, I thought it was the law then, so I think a lot of people probably are already doing it so it really wouldn't make much of a difference for most people if we put this into law and it would save some lives.

The other question I had, is do you know how many states, I guess how many states don't have a backseat seatbelt law?

JENNIFER HOMENDY: Yeah, so there are eight states that have no rear seat seatbelt law at all. They are four states that have primary front seat and secondary rear seats, those are Kansas, Maryland, New Jersey, and North Carolina. Twenty-two states and D.C. have both primary seatbelt laws for the front and the rear seats, but there are eight states that have no rear seatbelt either primary or secondary enforcement at all. If you would like a list of those, I can get you a full list after this as well.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Okay, that would be great. But I appreciate that. It's not a group that I think Connecticut should be a part of, so I appreciate that and letting us know that really is not a lot of states, so I think this makes sense and hopefully we can move forward on this, this year.

JENNIFER HOMENDY: And could I add one thing to your previous question?

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Sure.

JENNIFER HOMENDY: I will say that there is some data on the harm to other occupants in a vehicle if you don't have a rear seat belt and I thought I'd just mention that. The increase of it increases the risk of injury or death to other occupants in the vehicle if you don't have rear seatbelts on by 40 percent. And for the driver in particular it increases the risk of fatality of the driver by 137 percent. So that is well-documented so that is significant where you could really have some dangers and even I know some people sit in the center section of a rear seat and the risk to them, a fatal injury without wearing a seatbelt is 58 percent in cars and 74 percent in SUVs, vans, and pick-ups. So there is some research out there that really shows the increase in safety from rear seatbelt use.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Great, well I appreciate that follow up and again thank you so much for coming here today to testify.

JENNIFER HOMENDY: Thank you. Hopefully, I can get home soon at some point.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you and again that data is extraordinary and I can bring it up on the House Floor this year as we pass this Bill, finally. Representative McCarthy Vahey and Senator Martin.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I say Amen to what you just said, Ms. Homendy. Thank you so much for being here today. Representative Carney actually asked one of the questions I was hoping to ask you which is about how many other states did not have this legislation and it really is a small number and I would echo what Representative Lemar said related to these numbers are just, they speak for themselves. There is just

no way to argue with the data that you are presenting us and it's hard to not pass the Bill in the face of that.

I want to go back to something that I was talking about earlier today in our Committee meeting related to some pedestrian safety legislation that we were talking about and hopefully we will be voting on and will be voting on later today but it is around education, and the opportunity to help educate and inform the public and though I know this is not specifically a part of the Bill, I just wondered if you could speak to that. I was talking earlier about the role of human behavior and changing human behavior and we often talk about education, enforcement, and infrastructure and in this case when it comes to the backseat seatbelt use what strikes me is that the consistency of message. We have a law in Connecticut that requires some people in the backseat to wear a seatbelt but not others and I wondered if you could speak to the consistency of the message and what national efforts can be partnered with state efforts to help educate people and why it is important to have the law in place in addition to the education?

JENNIFER HOMENDY: And thank you for that question. It is absolutely critical that laws be married with education efforts for the public. And it should be a consistent message for both the front seat and the backseat so everybody does use seatbelts and lives are saved. But if this Bill does pass I would encourage the state to really please, there are some, there is some federal funding that can be used for safety programs.

I would really encourage the state to develop a strong safety message and communicate to the public of the new law. Just recently, where I am right now, we had a new law on cellphone use and prohibiting hands-free cell phone and it was critical that we had tons of information along the highways, in messaging from the Department of

Transportation here in the state and others. So that is critical to get compliance and I think when you do have mixed messages on some people should be buckled up, others the public tends, others shouldn't or don't have to, the public tends to be confused and so it's good to have one consistent message on safety.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD): Thank you for that. I really appreciate your efforts and the time that you've taken to be here and if I may, Mr. Chair, one follow up question? Okay, I see the thumbs up. I appreciate that. I know there are a lot of people who want to speak today and have other questions for you. I just wanted to just follow up to about the Tesla and AV crashes that have occurred and I just wanted to see what kind of concerns that you might have on your end about that.

JENNIFER HOMENDY: Yeah, on our end we have done six investigations of Level 2 automated vehicles and we have two investigations, the one in Tempe, Arizona with a test vehicle that was an automated vehicle and one in Las Vegas, Nevada of a, essentially a people mover that was highly automated. So we've learned quite a lot on automated vehicle.

You know, the one message I would say to the state is there is a significant absence of federal oversight and federal standards on testing, developing, testing and implementation of automated vehicles and on Level 2 vehicles and that is where the Tesla's come in. In the absence of federal oversight it is incumbent on the states and we would strongly encourage the State of Connecticut to adopt standard. You have a pilot program. We have some ideas for also including safety standards so safety is a priority. In many of these testing and deployment of these vehicles, innovation seems to be the driver behind the technology but we have to make sure that safety is the priority as we roll out.

Because these technologies have a lot of potential to improve safety on our roads. But if we're also sacrificing the lives of others at the same time, then we can't fully realize those safety benefits. There are tremendous benefits that can come from this but again safety measures need to be put into place. So I'd really say in the absence of federal authority right now, it is really incumbent on the states to really set the parameters here.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD): Thank you so much. I'm hopeful that we will see more direction on the federal level with our new leadership at the DOT as well. I'm very hopeful but I think we're also fortunate here that our own DOT has been putting quite a bit of emphases on safety and I look forward to continuing to working with them to do that. Thank you again for taking the time to come home and be here with us. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

JENNIFER HOMENDY: I'm sorry. We did pedestrian safety as well, so if you ever need anything on that please let us know.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Not really any questions but just a comment. First of all thank you, Jennifer for coming and testify as well as sharing those statistics regarding the use of the rear seat seatbelts. I know it'll sway and persuade many legislators here regarding the way that they are going to vote on this. In addition, Mr. Chair, I would highly recommend tapping into Jennifer and her organization regarding the Bill regarding the automated driving system. I think with her knowledge and her experience and the information she has we could probably craft a very good piece of legislation not only with that Bill but I think also with the rear seat, the seatbelt Bill as well, so thank you. And thank you again, Jennifer.

JENNIFER HOMENDY: Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Yes, Thank you, Senator Martin. The testimony that Ms. Homendy has provided is actually like a perfect boilerplate for us to look at in crafting this language, so I'm excited to reach out to you and work with this more and I think the Bill has a good opportunity based upon your expertise and your willingness to work with us to craft it, so thank you again.

JENNIFER HOMENDY: Thank you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): With that I see no other questions, thank you for joining us again today.

JENNIFER HOMENDY: Thank you look forward to working with you.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Two members of the public, Travis Woodward followed by Shahrzad Habibi then Senator Kelly.

TRAVIS WOODWARD: Hi guys, good afternoon. Senator Cassano, Representative Lemar, everybody hear me? Yep, I'm unmuted. Senator Somers, Representative Carney, and Members of the Transportation Committee my name is Travis Woodward, I'm an engineer with the Department of Transportation and a president of CSEA SEIU Local 2001 P4 Bargaining Unit testifying against Senate Bill 920, the P3 Bill.

Private public partnerships or 3Ps are often sold to us as a way to fix crumbling infrastructure, a way to boost economic growth, or a way to shift public risk onto a private contractor. The reality is when considering public versus private public partnerships always remember it's the taxpayers pay or the taxpayers pay. Instead of contracting out an individual project as we do now, a 3P sells state assets to be administered by for profit contractors. If lose 3P language exists like the current proposed language changes would make in SB 920 private

contractors could assume quasi-governmental status and will place profits over the needs of the people. When 3P projects fail, they fail miserably and the public is left holding the bags. Often this debt is handed off to the next generation of taxpayers.

The only way private public partnerships work is with public trust and transparency. Probably the most scandalous example of 3Ps gone wrong is Texas Highway 130. This 50-year P3 was signed in 2006 and tasked with maintaining a 41 mile stretch of highway between Austin and San Antonio. Within eight years of the company's lease, the road was in disparate repair and lack of oversight has caused nearby homes to flood. Although many other companies involved made a great deal of money on the deal, the private consortium that won the project itself filed for bankruptcy \$1.6 billion dollars in debt. Throughout the bidding process they were allowed to make their own traffic projections, even after the company took control of the highway, this information was considered proprietary information and never made available to the public.

Senate Bill 920 as written strips the requirements of 4E16 an important cost analysis safeguard put in place to prevent transparency issues like the Texas Highway 130 disaster. You may ask yourself why the author of this Bill seeks to remove this important language from the statutory requirements , the only reason to remove cost comparison requirements from this Section is that 3Ps are rarely, if ever, cost effective to the public. Senate Bill 920 removes the 50 year limit as we've already discussed here. We don't want to get stuck in a shortsighted agreement and loss of public property for generations to come.

Senate Bill 920 removes the five project limit for private public partnerships. This provision has been in place from 2011 to 2020. We've had the ability to do 3Ps since then, why haven't they been performed if they're, you know? If they're the best

thing since sliced bread we should be doing them already. More can be done, more can and must be done to protect the taxpayers since projects that do fail end up being the responsibility of the public taxpayers by default. It's important that language in this Bill include requirements for administrative performance bonds, a business plan to return the infrastructure for 3P asset to public control upon failure and requirement for public posting a notice of proposed projects under this Bill with an option for a Public Hearing if written opposition is made. Before we sell off state assets to the lowest bidder, let's make sure the public is getting the better end of the deal. I urge you to vote no on Senate Bill 920.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Travis for your testimony today and for bringing a lot of information to the Committee for us to consider as we move forward. Are there any questions for Travis? Seeing none, thank you again. Next we have Shahrzad Habibi followed by Senator Kevin Kelly.

SHAHRZAD HABIBI: Thank you, so much to the Committee for having me here today. My name is Shahrzad Habibi and I am the Research and Policy Director In the Public Interest. We are a national nonprofit research and policy center focused on government contracting and responsible contracting. I am testifying today in opposition of Senate Bill 920.

A state's P3 law is very important as it clarifies a state's objective in P3 projects. It sets the ground rules for its P3 process and establishes basic requirements for contracts.

Senate Bill 920 seeks to loosen the state's basic framework for P3 projects by allowing for a greater number of projects, broadening the types of P3 projects that state can engage in, removing the 50-year contract term limit, and removing the requirement for analyses for projects with an

operations or maintenance component by the state contracting standard for it.

Moreover, the Bill does not propose new language that would ensure that the public interest is protected in any resulting P3 contract such as ensuring maximum transparency and public participation, equity based project selection, provisions that ensure broad and equitable access to public infrastructure, requirements that all construction and long-term maintenance and operation jobs provide livable wages and benefits, and provisions that require contracts to meet or exceed important state standards. All of this is detailed in my written testimony.

There is also a dangerous perception that P3s are free money or new money and this could be further from the truth. In P3s, any financing arrangement or equity contribution from the private partner must be paid back by the governmental entity with the very same sources for which all infrastructure is ultimately funded taxes, tolls, or user fees. Furthermore, the cost of capital for private investment is typically much more expensive than tax exempt bonding.

Governmental entities have run into costly problems with P3s. Recently, Denver cancelled its P3 contract for the renovation and concession management of its airport due to escalating costs and delays, which cost the airport \$183 million to settle all outstanding claims with the private partner. Last year, Maryland paid \$250 million dollars in a settlement agreement to a private partner who walked away from the state's purple line light rail P3 project, which has been plagued with severe delays. Many of these deals present significant risk to the state and the public including loss of public control, financial and budgetary risks, affordability and accessibilities, a real rosy projections that don't materialize and the loss of transparency and accountability.

Connecticut has an opportunity to mitigate these risks by clarifying its priorities, goals, and intentions, and setting ground rules in its P3 legislation that ensure that the public interest is at the heart of any potential P3 arrangement. Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Ms. Habibi for your testimony today and for your submitted testimony as well. It's a great way for us to review and analyze a lot of the things you bring before us to ensure we're working it right and we may rely on your background knowledge quite a bit as we move the Bill forward. There is a question from Representative Thomas.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): Hi, thank you so much Mr. Chair and thank you for being here, Ms. Habibi. I'm certainly aware of your organization and you do such great research, so thank you for that. I work in the nonprofit sectors so I always, and I'm a small business owner, so I'm always sensitive about free markets but I also don't think the market is a cure all for everything. So I do have some concerns about these types of partnerships and in particular if it's a singular or limited asset which creates a monopoly type of situation, I think they can run away. So just based on the work that you do, I would just love to hear if you have any further thoughts that you didn't get to address in your three minutes, any research you've seen or any, we heard a lot earlier about this Bill does encompass some safeguards if you have any recommendations about strengthening those in your experience?

SHAHRZAD HABIBI: Sure, I guess a couple of thoughts. In my written testimony in terms of strengthening safeguards I do go into a lot more detail but just didn't want to take up too much time, you know, in the verbal part. But I do go into kind of what I mean by, you know, maximum transparency and public participation, kind of what

that actually means, ensuring that there's, you know, ways for public participation at kind of every stage of intervention and really making sure, especially the community that the project is going to impact that they also have a say in the project. That there is also equity based strategic project selection and really what that means is ensuring that project priority, that projects aren't just chosen because of the opportunity or magnitude of private investment available but they are really chosen to meet the real infrastructure needs of the community.

And then of course broad and equitable access especially when we're dealing with something that does have its holding component to it ensuring that, you know, that there are provisions in the law that ensure that the infrastructure remains affordable. You know, and then again just a couple of other points around the resulting jobs, having livable wages and benefits and that's including the construction jobs, also the permanent, you know, operations and maintenance jobs and then, you know, then just other kind of public interest provisions. I know I was really happy to see in the Bill that it did keep the ban on the noncompete clauses that was really great. I would also recommend that the Bill include limitations to compensation clauses and I'll give an example. Maryland's Bill does prohibit a private entity from being compensated for projects that are already in the state's capital improvement program or their transportation program so the private entity can't come back and say, hey you need, you know, you need to give us some money, just, this kind of pinching, you know, those revenues.

The other thing I will say, that was, I did not include the link to it in my written testimony but I'm happy to send it to the Committee if it's helpful. We also have looked into, have done quite a bit of work looking into valid payment structure of P3s and we're seeing kind of more of that

structure being considered and there are some issues that are particular to that type of structure and we do kind of detail that in a brief that we have and if that is of interest to the Committee I am happy to send that along as well.

REP. THOMAS (143RD): I won't speak for everyone, but I would love to see that. Thank you. No further questions, Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Ms. Habibi.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you. Thank you again for joining us today and for lending so much of your research and time with us.

SHAHRZAD HABIBI: Thank you, so much.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Next we have Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and thank you Chairman Cassano, as well as Ranking Members Senator Somers and Representative Carney, and all the Members of the Transportation Committee for allowing me to be here this morning to testify in favor of Senate Bill 576. I would also just like to state before I start Representative Nicole Klarides-Ditria may not be able to be with us this afternoon because of the length of this Public, you know, the Public Officials testimony time Hearing and she sincerely apologizes for that, but we both represent the town of Seymour as well as I represent the City of Shelton also on the Metro North Waterbury Line.

So what this Bill seeks to do is basically expand the service on the Waterbury line. I believe strongly in the importance of improving rail service in the State of Connecticut. IN representing communities along the Waterbury Rail Line, I am committed to representing the voices of residents who utilize that line and who could greatly benefit from further expansion, improvements, and capacity growth along the line.

The Waterbury Line has been overlooked for far too long by those in power. Rail service in the Naugatuck Valley in particular must be a focus for Connecticut. There is so much more untapped potential in the Naugatuck Valley and surrounding communities, enhancing this rail service can help us nurture and develop those opportunities. Increasing rail capacity is vital to economic development and job growth in our region. Especially during this time of increased hardship, public transit and job development must be prioritized.

Connecticut has already initiated an infrastructure improvement project to install a traffic control signal system, implement Positive Train Control and construct passing sidings at four locations along the line, with investments totaling approximately \$90 million dollars. But we need to do more to ensure that the state's investment is fully leveraged. We must have a commitment to finish the work started by the DOT. Upgrading existing rail equipment, acquiring new needed equipment, and expanding service to better help our residents get where they need to go must be part of the conversation and development to generate the economic development and job growth our communities can support.

Before the pandemic, annual ridership on the Waterbury Line increased from about 178,000 in 2004 to 345,027 by 2018/2019, a 94 percent increase. After adding just one new inbound trip in the morning, ridership jumped 34%. And we can do much better than that. Limited service makes it difficult to make connections. And we need improvements to unreliable equipment and on-time performance and overall rider experience.

The pandemic has created new and unique challenges for all people. Now more than ever it is important to invest in developments that will make it easier to grow jobs and rebuild our economy.

Transportation funding is a major issue in Connecticut as we all work to identify the best course of action to move our state forward and invest more in infrastructure improvements and modernization.

I have and continue to support proposals to invest in transportation that do not ask for any more from overburdened taxpayers and I hope to see a bipartisan effort to advance our shared goals. The Waterbury Line must be part of that conversation, and it also must be prioritized within current DOT resources. Thank you all for the opportunity to share my support for rail investment and specifically taking action to improve the Waterbury Rail Line. Questions?

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Senator. Thank you for being here today and helping lead the charge on the Waterbury Rail Line. This is certainly something that the Caucus has done a great job building local support, bipartisan support at the capital and having the general public and potential business investors and property owners speak eloquently about the vision that they have for the towns and stations along the rail line and I know you're owed quite a bit of helping to lead that.

I see Representative Rebimbas as a question for you and I know if I individually call out all the legislators who contacted me about the Waterbury Rail Line, I may run out of time here, but I just want to say between Representative Rebimbas, Representative Reyes, Representative Rochelle, I've heard numerous pleas for continued support on this issue over the years. I think frankly not only has the caucus made the case and see Mayor Hess is scheduled to speak later on today as well, I only have the local first selectmen and mayors made the case and the Waterbury Caucus made the case, business owners who come before us talking about the investment they are willing to make in our state have made the case and the ridership, if you get our

Commissioner Rich Andreski, Deputy Commissioner of, Bureau Chief, sorry for Public Transportation speaking about the experience of Covid, the first thing he brings up every time is the way that the ridership on the Waterbury Rail Line has outperformed every other rail line in the state.

And that's, I think what you see in the Governor's budget proposal is respectful of what they've seen there and the Governor's budget proposal actually envisions adding millions of dollars more to improve service up and down the corridor. And I think that working the next few months, ensuring those dollars materialize for the rail line to enhance that service that we know is working, we know it's working. You don't have to, you don't have to come here asking us if you build it they will come, we know it works. We've put in some of the money and it started to work. And so I think we're in a good spot to advocate on behalf of the Waterbury Rail Line. I think you've done a great job building bipartisan support and I actually want to thank you for highlighting it today. Representative Rebimbas followed by Representative Meskers.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH): Well, Mr. Chairman I think literally you just took the words out of my mouth, you did a very eloquent job in highlighting all of the good work that has gone into this by so many different Representatives.

So just let take this opportunity to thank the leadership of this Committee both the Chairman as well as the Ranking Members for recognizing really the hard work and study that has gone into the Waterbury Rail Line not only the caucus but obviously the proposals in the sense of making sure that we truly have the services and reliability of those trains for the public as you just eloquently highlighted. The fact that the ridership throughout this pandemic is the highest of all the lines, just shows the absolute need that people, even in light of the restrictions needed to have that

transportation whether that was to get to work or visit family throughout this pandemic. I think that's, you know, certainly important. So the riders are reliable. They are there and they certainly will increase.

We had an amazing meeting on our caucus recently and certainly Senator Henry Martin, you know, he wants to keep track of those, you know, riders and just today we launched a survey and amazingly the response already of that survey that I'll look forward to sharing on behalf of the Waterbury Line Caucus with, you know, legislators moving forward that truly there is a desire and need for those improvements for a higher ridership from individuals who just causally used it but did not do on a regular basis because of the lack of service or individuals who simply it didn't fit their schedules so they didn't use it but want to use it. So that is important.

And again, to your point, Mr. Chairman thankfully for the Governor's office administration, the Department of Transportation we are very grateful that they too are supportive of this effort and actually budgeted for it. Look forward to the support of this Committee and then Senator Kelly, thank you so much for your testimony, your advocacy on this behalf certainly not only for the district that you represent but even now so as we know the impact, economic impact this can have for the State of Connecticut for the development along the rail line is a very positive one. So, thank you Senator for your leadership and continued support of these efforts and just look forward to working with everyone collaboratively. It's an amazing project this Caucus has and such a bipartisan plan proudly working together on this issue for the greater, you know, State of Connecticut and I'm proud to have my Co-Chair and serving on this Committee for the very first time, my Co-Chair Jerry Rias also on this Committee that, you know, hopefully we will also be asked if you have any other questions or information

that anyone may need, we're here for you in order to help us do what we need to do for this line. So, Senator thank you for taking the time away from your busy schedule to testify here today. And Thank you, Mr. Chairman again for eloquently literally taking the words out of my mouth and thank you for your support.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): I apologize for that, Representative Rebimbas. Representative Meskers.

REP. MESKERS (150TH): So, I'll start off by just saying "Ditto" to make it easier and less painful for all of you. I want to thank Senator Kelly, the Chairs of this Committee Rebimbas, your work on this. I think it is so important. You know, coming from the southernmost part of the state, I showed up at the last Committee meeting, I think they were looking saying "what the hell is he doing up here looking at the Danbury Waterbury Line" and I think the bottom line is that the growth of this state, the economic development of the state is a big concern for all of us particularly all those in Fairfield County because what we look at is at economic growth and the tax burden.

And anything we can do to foster further economic development up through the entire state and I think these rail lines and transportation are key to that, so you can count on my support for these efforts to connect our ridership to the jobs and the opportunities in the state. And I want to thank all of you for the effort you're doing here. This is my first time on the Committee, I'm impressed with the effort that we're trying to make to move this state into the 21st or I guess the 22nd Century, I get lost on where we are exactly. But thank you very much.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST): Well, Thank you, Representative Meskers, Representative Rebimbas and Chairman Lemar. Thank you very much for your comments. I couldn't agree more and it is the

result of a lot of collaboration I believe, it starts with the Governor, it's the DOT but it is also this Committee and the Waterbury Line Caucus and working in a very collaborative, cooperative and bipartisan manner being focused on the issue and need of our residents and I think it is exemplified here and we'd like to see this continue because if there is one thing that this has shown is that with a little bit of effort we can get a lot of opportunity in the Naugatuck Valley and that's all were asking for. So thank you very much for the opportunity to be here this afternoon.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, are there any other questions for Senator Kelly? Seeing none, thank you for your time today.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST): Thank you, take care.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Next we have Alec Slatky, followed by Charles Rothenberger. Alec, you're in, yes.

ALEC SLATKY: All right, I'm in. Good Afternoon every one, Chair, Vice-Chairs, Ranking Members and Members of the Committee, staff and members of the public that are watching. My name is Alec Slatky, Director of Public Affairs for AAA Northeast. I am here testifying on behalf of all AAA Clubs of Connecticut, the AAA Allied Group as well as AAA Northeast and we're here to support the rear seatbelt provision in HB 6484.

We strongly support this provision, it's something that AAA has long advocated for, for seatbelt use in all seats and we think the rear seatbelt Bill will do a lot to enhance traffic safety on Connecticut roadways. We've got a large coalition of over a hundred first responders, law enforcement, fire, EMS the folks you see at the aftermath of crashes as well as nurses, and doctors and hospitals and public health officials who, you know, what happens when they have to treat someone who has been injured.

There is a lot of support for this law and they know just how important it is and just how big of a difference seatbelts make in the backseat just as well as the front seat. In the backseat you are twice as likely to be killed, eight times more likely to be seriously injured if you're unbelted and to NTSB member Homendy's point earlier you are twice as likely to kill or injure someone in the front seat if you are unbelted due to kind of that backseat bullet phenomenon, if you're going to be unbelted then you're just going to keep going until you meet a force and that force is the seat in front of you.

So I am going to try to share the screen of a crash test, let's see if it works, all right, hopefully that is sharing. And I'm just going to play a couple of seconds of it and you'll see the unbelted go flying into the driver. (Playing video). So I'm stopping it there and I'll stop sharing. But you can see just how big of a difference there is in the intrusion to the driver so it just doesn't affect you if you don't wear a seatbelt, it affects the other occupants in the car and, you know, other folks driving on the road as well cause, you know, you hit into from behind, if you're a driver, you're not going to be able to control that vehicle.

And so to Representative Carney's point earlier about Connecticut, I don't have Connecticut data specific to the rate of usage in the backseat I have data about crashes and injuries and we know since 2010 there have been more than 60 fatalities, more than 2,000 injuries among Connecticut adults who were unbelted in the backseat and the point about you think if you buckle up in the front seat you'd be likely to buckle up in the backseat just as well. I think that makes sense and has a lot of logic to me. But there was a survey done by the National Highway Safety Administration of Young Drivers that found that 89 percent of them buckled up while they were driving all the time, 82 percent buckled up

when they were front seat passengers but only 57 percent buckled up when they were backseat passengers. So people do behave differently depending on which seat they're in and we like to see that sorry about that.

And we know young drivers are more likely to be killed or injured in crashes while they are unbelted in the backseat. They suffer disproportionate number of those injuries but older adults are at risk as well. I think the oldest fatality in the past decade was 89 years old in Connecticut. So we know rear seatbelt laws work, we know states that have them have higher usage rates than states that don't and we hope that 2021 is the year when we can pass this lifesaving legislation. I've submitted written testimony that has some more information but happy to answer any questions and also just to note we are also supportive of you know, the efforts of DOT and other stakeholders in the state to advance automated vehicle technology, AAA sits on the taskforce that was mentioned earlier and we're happy to, you know, continue that collaboration with the state and any other relevant stakeholders to promote continued safety. So, thank and happy to take any questions.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, for your testimony today for highlighting a number of issues that we can work through. I just have to say, before we get into some question, I see Representative Carney and Representative Meskers we are considering in our Committee meeting later today the pedestrian safety Bill that you testified a great deal on about a month ago, and I just want to thank you for a lot of the insight and input you provided at that moment. If you get a chance later on today to review it, you will see a lot of the program elements that you mentioned, we actually incorporated in the camera programs there, so it might be interesting to see how we try to take the recommendations that you made about best practices in other states and put them

into Connecticut's program. So just wanted to thank you for that before we move too forward.

ALEC SLATKY: Appreciate that and I was watching earlier and I'm definitely excited to read the Bill and excited about a lot of the provisions that are.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Meskers followed by Representative Carney. Hold on a second, what am I doing. Representative Carney followed by Representative Meskers.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): Well I would have been okay if Representative Meskers went first, but thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Alec for coming today and for your advocacy. I appreciate a lot of things you had to say regarding the lower I guess for people, you would normally think would buckle up in the front aren't doing so in the back and I was a little concerned with some of the thing you mentioned about younger drivers, so I guess my question is I know AAA puts together a pretty comprehensive driver's ed program, are younger drivers being taught about rear seatbelt safety at all?

ALEC SLATKY: I think so. I mean I can speak from our programs that I know we certainly mention you know occupant safety being important in every seat of the vehicle and I would venture to say that probably every driver education program in the state is doing the same thing. Unfortunately, the problem is when, you know, you forget those lessons when you're driving around with some friends and that peer pressure not to do it, and I will say, you know, it's the young drivers that are disproportionality killed or injured but it's certainly not exclusively the young drivers that are not wearing their seatbelts.

I have friends that I've been around and, you know, if I'm driving you're wearing a seatbelt or you're getting out of the car if you're in the backseat. I actually had a friend who I had to tell her a few

times and she got the message eventually. And later she was actually riding in a Yellow Cab in Manhattan and she was wearing her seatbelt, I guess I drove that lesson into her and, you know, she said she was not injured because of that and that showed that the number one way to get, I think this is a IAH stat, the number one way to get someone to buckle up in the back is if the driver tells them to do that, the number two way is to pass the rear seatbelt law. And so, you know, we can't control number one but we can control number two.

REP. CARNEY (23RD): All right, well again thank you so much, Alec for coming here and I'm sure we'll have additional conversations as the legislative session goes on.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Meskers.

REP. MESKERS (150TH): I assumed I was bumped on seniority and not on age cause I might have one on age I suspect. So, Alec look I thank you for the commentary. I'm new to Transportation and I'm new to insurance. So I'll pass this comment on to you and to our Chair Lemar. I think when we look at some of the issues we discuss on a broad base across all of our Committees about mandates and unfunded mandates and requirements in the state's reach, so I think in this what I'm looking at I think the traffic safety studies and the observations are pretty compelling.

I think the next step and I don't want to gum up this legislation, I think it's important between both Transportation and Insurance to look at what the potential impacts are for our residents as purchasers of insurance policies because if we're improving, you know, whether it's the traffic cameras or these speed cameras on the interstate, if we're looking at the seatbelt mandates we ought to have a serious conversation between our Transportation Committee and our Insurance Committee to ask where we can legislate and control and drive

down the cost of our insurance products which sounds colder because it's numeric but the ultimate goal is the safety of our residents if we can provide the right context we can do something really constructive in both driving down the cost of the insurance policy, improving the outcomes in the accidents, so I really support you in your effort there.

And I would encourage you as you go on the advocacy that we kind of look at that kind of impact that it may have on insurance. So I wanted to thank you for your testimony. I thought the video, I'm glad it was with dummies cause it wasn't particularly, it wasn't a good video to watch when you get the impact you imagine there are people involved. So, thank you very much.

ALEC SLATKY: Thanks and I'm happy to look into that insurance information and I agree about the video, it says it a lot better than I could for sure.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you and just a note Representative Meskers that the Insurance Association of Connecticut will be testifying before us later today so we can certainly bring up this issue with them as well. With that being said, thank you, Alec for your testimony today.

ALEC SLATKY: Talk to you soon.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Next we have Charles Rothenberger and then I have a few folks who rejoined us who are earlier in the list. So after Charles I'll go to you Mr. Clerk and you can help determine who is here now that wasn't here earlier. So, Charles, you're up.

CHARLES ROTHENBERGER: Well thank you, Chairman Lemar and good afternoon to Ranking Members Somers and Carney and the other Members of the Transportation Committee. My names is Charles Rothenberger, I am the Climate and Energy Attorney

with Save the Sound and I just want to begin by saying we really appreciate the Committee's historical support of the CHEAPR Program and interest in improving and strengthening it as requested in this Bill.

Save the Sound is happy to provide these comments on HB 6485 which directs the CHEAPR Board to explore ways to improve the equitable distribution of EV grants. And at the outset, we note that the Board has just recently in the past few weeks taken significant steps in this directions. It recently approved a revised program structure that provides enhanced rebates for low and moderate income customers, and also includes a dedicated Loan Moderate Income rebate for used EVs.

We were an advocate for both of those equitable design elements which will certainly broaden the base of customers who might consider and hopefully purchase an electric vehicle rather than a polluting conventional vehicle.

That being said, you've heard this before, the Board did fail to restore the base incentive rebate levels to their pre 2019 level which is when the program was really, really effective. And I understand the Committee did provide a dedicated source of funding for the program for the greenhouse gas mitigation fee but the program has really struggled despite that, it's only getting \$3 million dollars of that fee, not the entire thing and as noted in the LMI Program, the scope of the program really has its standards. So at the same time we have a set pot of money, we're trying to do more things with it.

And as we said before, you know, we'd love certainly to be able to get more of that greenhouse gas mitigation fee dedicated to the cheaper program. We would also suggest that the scope of the study probably should be included. You know, we support the study's structure but we think it should probably also include as a second element, looking

at what level of program funding would actually be necessary in order to place the state on track to meet our EV targets, right. Rather than taking an arbitrary number, let's sort of look at the numbers were we need to go as a climate and environmental perspective, what are targets are and what level of funding would likely support that. The most recent analysis has really been what can we do with the money available rather than how much funding do we need which is really the important and critical question. So we would recommend revising the language to include that second study component.

And just because I know you're going to hear some comments about electric bicycles, we would caution changing the language of this Bill to explicitly call them out. I understand everybody likes electric bicycles but at its core the CHEAPR Program is really a climate and emissions reduction program and we certainly have some skepticism about how effective electric bicycles are really going to be in terms of getting people out of their cars, whether that is the conventional vehicle, whether it is going to be substitute for the EV, it just doesn't seem to be that Connecticut is really a place that would be an effective solution which is not to say that, you know, there may not be a role for increasing access to electric bicycles but I'm not sure the CHEAPR Program is necessarily the right vehicle for that. But certainly that should be something that should be a part of the study contemplated in this language. I think it would be premature to dictate electric bicycles at this stage to really know if they are a climate solution. But with that, we will be submitting written comments as well to support all of these points and I'm happy to take any questions.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Charles both for advocacy on this issue over the last few year, your organization's advocacy on this issue for almost a decade now, trying to become a national leader in how we implement this program has been our goal, to

make sure that we're making this strategic investment, making sure that this program is actually delivering on its promises is I think all of our priority certainly for your organization which helped push for it and certainly for me who helped lead its passage, I want to make sure it actually lives up to what we were talking about as we were constructing this a few years ago and working towards this program I thought was a great way to ensure its longevity but I think you highlighted a lot of the concerns that members have when they look at it and I think this study will help prove out that investment, smart investments through this program would make a lot of advances in improving air quality and ensuring that folks that are wanting to help us achieve our long-term obligations meet have the financial capacity to do so and the current structure I think doesn't necessarily help those that are most concerned about afford to buy electric vehicles and so that's why the equity component of it was something I wanted to ensure was part of this and, you know, I want as many ideas as possible on the table and that's why I thought the study process was a good idea.

And another Bill, Representative Carney is actually trying to get to the same issue because we do collect a lot of money through clean-air fee that isn't necessarily dedicated in the vein as well. So, you know, I think we're looking at this from a variety of different avenues, how do we really support our clear-air goals and our electric vehicle procurement goals and make sure that we're hitting our targets and I appreciate your work on this.

CHARLES ROTHENBERGER: Yeah, well you make a lot of great points. We certainly look forward to engaging in the study process as a stakeholder in helping with that work and to your point about the other Bill that you're also considering, you know, from your seat as a legislator you know that the Connecticut public actually will support and embrace fees for things that they are about, right, but they

sometimes feel a little poorly used when those fees then get diverted to other purposes. So we appreciate you taking a look at that issue as well.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Are there any other questions for Mr. Rothenberger? Seeing none, thanks again Charles.

CHARLES ROTHENBERGER: All right, thank you. Appreciate it.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): I know you said turn over to Senator Cassano at this point? And before you do Phil you might want to highlight some of the folks who rejoined it, so we may have missed earlier in the meeting.

PHIL MAINIERO: Yeah, so I believe it's Stephen Samela and David Glidden were called earlier and we weren't able to get them, but they are in the room now. So I believe Stephen if you can hear us, you could unmute.

STEPHEN SAMELA: Well, thank you for having me back sometimes doing these testimonies are like a wildcard as far as when you're going to get picked put had to work today. So anyway, I want to come here and voice my support for SB 576 for increased service on the Waterbury Line.

I signed on just as Senator Kelly was signing off, so I'm sure this has been talked about at length but I thought I'd share just a couple of things. So when I first moved to Naugatuck I was working in South Norwalk and South Norwalk is kind of a hike, so I thought I'd take the train to work, but I didn't work a typical nine-to-five schedule and that idea quickly got shattered because I would be able to get to work but I couldn't get home on the train. So instead I had to drive every day, adding to congestion on Route 8 and I-95, increasing carbon footprint and, you know, beating up my car.

So I grew up in Milford where traveling by train was pretty commonplace but here in the Valley the conversation about trains are met with usually frustration and even dismissive laughter. So there is a clear need for increased service out of all the branch lines in Connecticut, the Waterbury line's ridership decreased the least during the pandemic in 2020 and because of inadequate transportation our region in the Naugatuck Valley has been pretty isolated from the rest of the state.

But an increase in train service would give us a great opportunity to become better connected with the Shoreline and by extension New York. It would make our own town of Naugatuck and the region more attractive for commercial and residential investment. And I'm sure you already heard by now that there are investors who have expressed a real interest in creating transit oriented development up and down the Valley. And it's certainly due in part to our proximity to rail but also we have sort of an entrepreneurial revival happening in places like Church Street in Naugatuck and Main Street in Ansonia.

In Naugatuck, the footprints of the bygone factories downtown, right next to the trainline fit perfect, are in perfect position to create a more robust business community and help shoulder the tax burdens that the old factories have left behind and left on our backs as homeowners. Naugatuck is among the most economically distressed municipalities in the state. The mill rate is crippling to many families and stifles economic progress.

So as a member of the Finance Board in Naugatuck I can tell you how anxious we are for the day Naugatuck will no longer need to rely so heavily on state assistance to fund our town and our schools and to make the tax burden on our hardworking families more bearable. So, I think it's not an exaggeration to say that the future of Naugatuck's economic future is in your hands with this Bill. I

don't know if that's too dramatic but I can leave that. So thank you for your time. Thank you for considering SB 576 and when I signed on I heard a lot of nice things about the Waterbury Rail Line so I'm confident that this is going to be a well-supported endeavor.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you for your testimony. It was interesting when Senator Kelly spoke it reminded me of probably one of my favorite movies, *Field of Dreams* the line that we all remember more than any, if you build it they will come, and the return that you've seen on the use of that line is a perfect example of that, the Waterbury Line, perfect example of you build it, they will come, a 34 percent increase is dramatic and it shows that, it shows a very simple thing that they said in that movie, invest, build it, it'll work and we have to think that way more. We're too cautious too many times with what we're doing. Questions of? Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH): Thank you, Senator, and I'll take this opportunity as well to thank you personally than virtually for raising this Bill and your support of the Waterbury Rail Line as well. No questions just really wanted to take Steve for taking the time away from his job to be able to testify here with us. I had, you know, very good conversations with Steve regarding the Waterbury Rail Line so I do know that is something he is very passionate about, so Steve, thank you obviously for taking the time to testify, for your service on the Finance Board as you said, as you said, this is crippling so, you know, I know you got a lot of budget battles here to come and certainly I think once again in that bipartisan manner which we've always done not only locally but on the state delegation working together to make sure that this Waterbury Rail Line certainly is, will be a big help in regards to development in bringing all the way up and down the Valley and then statewide in that

regard and no pressure to the Committee Members that this Naugatuck's future too.

So as Steve pointed out, you know, critically so, it's certainly the future of Naugatuck and again, you know, the whole business is one step forward to be the future plans that we have to have this actually become as passenger rail all the way up to Torrington. So lots of good things in the works and a lot of bipartisan support in working together both locally and on the state level and certainly whenever possible engaging our federal delegation as well. So Steve, thank you for taking the time and thank you so much for the opportunity to comment.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, Representative. Anyone else? Any other Members? Seeing none, thank you again for your presentation. Next up?

PHIL MAINIERO: Stephen Samela. Stephen, if you can hear us. Oh, he just finished. It should be David Glidden next.

DAVID GLIDDEN: Hello, Chairs, distinguished Members of the Transportation Committee, thanks for the second opportunity this afternoon to get in to testify. My name is Dave Glidden, I am the Executive Director of CSEA/SEAU Local 2001. Which is a labor union representing thousands of Connecticut workers both public and private sectors. I come to you today to offer testimony in opposition of Senate Bill 920 AN ACT CONCERNING PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS.

As I understand it, Senate Bill 920 seeks out to strip out from current law all of the existing limits, transparency and due diligence relating to the state's use of P3s.

Rudimentary research into P3s revealed that they can either be quiet successful or they can be costly failures with long lasting negative impact. Of course there are many factors that determine the

fate of a P3 project. But one thing is very clear, P3 projects that are not properly vetted or scrutinized, that don't have requisite government oversights are far more likely to land in that category of long lasting failure. In short, special care should always be taken to ensure that a proposed P3 contract is cost effective and is not labeled with tricky provisions that benefit the private entity and leave the public exposed, vulnerable, or generally on the short end.

Current law provides for that special care but this Bill seeks to remove it all. Currently P3 are statutorily restricted both in number and in scope. Specially their usage is limited to five projects and may only be utilized in educational, health or housing facilities, transportation systems or any other kind of facility authorized by the General Assembly. This proposed legislation looks to remove all of those limitations even through to date the state has not even done one P3 project. Legislators previously insisted on those limitations as a means to cautiously ease into the use of P3s and to monitor how they work. In considering that no such projects have been undertaken, and Connecticut has no track records whatsoever with P3s it is unwise to remove these key protections from taxpayers.

Similarly, state law restricts private public partnerships to no more than 50 years. Fifty years is a long time but not long enough for Senate Bill 920 which deletes that limitation in its entirety. If Senate Bill 920 becomes law Connecticut could be locked into P3s for an indefinite period of time. I submit to you one of the worst things the General Assembly could do is enact measures like this that could potentially harm Connecticut citizens for generations to come.

Senate Bill 920 also states that the Governor shall approve any such project unless the Governor finds that the project will result in job creation and economic growth. This is incredibly vague and

incredibly limited. What will the framework for determining that a project will result in job creating and economic growth would be? Will the Governor make the reasoning behind the determination public or will we have to take his or her word? What are the bench marks for determining a sufficient amount of job creating and economic growth? It's certainly not clear. This proposed provision has the ring of one of those statutory passages that's intended to make citizens feel comfortable but that are basically ignored when they are enacted.

Lastly and perhaps the most importantly, Senate Bill 920 eliminates the requirement that private public partnerships adhere to provisions of Section 4e-16, Chapter 62 of the General Statutes. That section is at the heart of Connecticut's Clean Contracting Law. Those provisions which require the involvement of State Contracting Standards Board are critical to protecting the public interest. Many of us remember well the darkest hours, the darkest chapter of our state's failure.

PHIL MAINIERO: I hate to interrupt you but you are right against your time limit if you could kind of wrap up your final thoughts.

DAVID GLIDDEN: I'm getting right there. Many of us remember those darkest days, it wasn't that long ago. Since those days, the state has made some key strides to improve how business is conducted by creating the State Contracting Standards Board. The General Assembly took a major step toward transparent and accountable and above all wise contracting. This proposed legislation as currently drafted would be a step-backward. We urge you to vote no on Senate Bill 920 in its current form. I've submitted written testimony that is a little bit more detailed than what I just provided. Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, David. Any questions from Members of the legislature? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony. Next up?

PHIL MAINIERO: I believe it's going to be Representative Rochelle, I think. Representative can you hear us?

REP. ROCHELLE (104TH): I can, can you hear me?

PHIL MAINIERO: Yes, we can.

REP. ROCHELLE (104TH): Thank you. Thank you so much for having me here today. I know that many of you have heard all the impassioned speeches about the Waterbury Train Line today and so I want to, not going to read my testimony directly, but I want to touch on a few points, something you may have hear or may not have heard of yet. First I want to thank Representative Lemar, Senator Cassino, Representative Simms and Senator Somers, Representative Carney and all the Members of the Transportation Committee. I know this has been a focus for you especially in recent years so thank you for your serious thoughts and consideration on that.

I'm testifying on SB 576 and merely showing support for 576 and for all of the other Bills including the Governor's proposal to increase transportation funds to the Waterbury Line, HB 5839 which is in the Finance Committee and HB 6077 which is also in this Committee. They all serve the purpose of increasing train service on the Waterbury Line and creating station improvements as some of the stations don't currently have raised platforms and other amenities that we see on other line in the State of Connecticut.

The impact on this region would be stark. Currently on the Waterbury Train Line you have the first, second, fifth and 22nd most distressed municipalities in the State of Connecticut and at

the same time you have a tremendous amount of potential for growth. I am going to share with you a piece of information that I just emailed to the Chair of the Committee that way he has it for his records. I hope that he will share it with all of you, but Naugatuck Valley Council Government recently did a transportation oriented development presentation.

They brought in a firm to really do a deep dive and analyze the economic impact of increasing service on the Waterbury Line and what they found based on average size of an apartment, average business mix, in a normal region along a trainline is that just from Shelton to Naugatuck excluding Waterbury there would be 12.3 million square feet in developable space and that is the one-half mile radius around each train station added together. You know, that would accumulate to 15,400 potential new residents in the region and 17,500 potential new jobs. That is pretty stark and I'm happy to share the details with you. This was deep dive in the office that was done. And this does not include the Waterbury proper which, as you can imagine would be millions or square feet in additional developable space.

I also want to show you a little more specifically about my region in Estonia and Derby. My region is the number one and number five in economically distressed municipalities. We have, as we speak, developers who are in various stages of adding additional apartments within walking distance of the trainline. One is pretty much across the street in Ansonia, you can see it and walk there in 30 seconds before your coffee gets cold.

And in Derby you have one that is across the street and about a block down and between the two there is about 270 apartments going into downtown Ansonia and another 80 or so going into downtown, no, Derby is 270 apartments and Ansonia is 80 apartments. And that's just essentially across the street from the station. It is also worth knowing that we have 116

acres of downtown development zone in Ansonia Brack site which is also within walking distance to the train station. And we do have developers that have shown much more interest in the past few months simply because they know that these trains are likely coming and they want to be at the forefront of redevelopment.

And so this is not a, when we talk about the development that's a potential that appears, its real, its starting and this investment will go a long way for both the Valley and for the state, long-term to change this region for the good. So I will leave it there. I know you've heard so much about the Waterbury Train Line. I do want to put one piece of information and I do hope that the final provisions will incorporate information from all the Bill proposals, the DOT has done extensive work over recent years to prepare us for this increased service.

The SB 576 Bill did have a few, I think just typos that was in it so I want to make sure we're including all the stations in the list what should be, what stations should have improvements which would include Ansonia which wasn't listed and also want to make sure that it's noted that Derby and Shelton is one, so Derby-Shelton Station, not two separate stations. Any questions?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Any questions for the Representative?

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Yes, I do, Mr. Chair. Senator Rochelle, just a couple of questions regarding the information that you have. Who did those studies, where did you get your information from?

REP. ROCHELLE (104TH): ACOM was hired by the Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments to do this study and they used traditional standards for what is an average size apartment in an inter-

transportation oriented development zone which is between 1,000 and 1,100 square feet, includes average business mix. They used national and regional standards. I did forward the YouTube link, I would be happy to forward that to all of you, this presentation is about 30 minutes long, its rather dry but about the 30 minute mark is where you will hear the that.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): If you would please, cause I know I've had information in the past as well as I just want to, I'm hoping that it provides current zoning regulations regarding the densities, sometime these numbers get skewed a little bit based on acreage and based on, you know, density allowed in certain zones and it's important we get correct and accurate information when we look at this. So thank you so much.

REP. ROCHELLE (104TH): Absolutely, thank you for hearing us out.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH): Any other questions? Seeing none, Representative Rochelle thank you very much for your testimony. Also I want to point out that you mentioned several time the Naugatuck Regional Council, they've done a magnificent job of working together and that's, it was a few years ago there were questions about whether these councils could function, I think they've probably done more to bring communities together to function as one. That's how we get things done. And so I'm really pleased to hear of their efforts because that's what we're looking for and it's nice to see it. Thank you.

REP. ROCHELLE (104TH): Thank you.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH): Phil, who's next?

PHIL MAINIERO: Next speaker should be Ed Johansen. Mr. Johansen if you can hear us, unmute, and start your camera.

ED JOHANSEN: Can you hear me okay? Can you hear me?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Yes, we can. Welcome.

ED JOHANSEN: My name is Ed Johansen, I'm owner of a couple of repair facilities in the Vernon area. We participate in towing for state police and local police and I am here to speak out against SB 921.

Basically, you know, they're wanting free storage for somebody's vehicle that we tow in and I just don't see how that is even fair. I mean this Bill came up last year and they considered it and it got squished but here it is again this year rearing its ugly head and you know, it seems like every year the business gets tougher and tougher and the bottom line gets trimmed every year. This, you know, during the pandemic year, I mean were down to probably 40 percent of what we used to do for business and now they want to make it so we can't charge storage on cars we tow in. I just don't see that being fair and I don't know who presented the Bill it just seems very lopsided. I got employees, I got taxes, I got a large mortgage, that's about it. I just wanted to make my voice heard that I'm in strong opposition to this Bill and that's about it.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, Mr. Johansen. Any questions Representatives or Senators? Seeing none, thanks for your testimony and we will review that Bill for you.

ED JOHANSEN: Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Next up?

PHIL MAINIERO: The next speaker should be Mayor Hess. I believe Mayor Hess is here. Wonderful.

MAYOR PETE HESS: Can you hear me?

PHIL MAINIERO: Yes, we can, begin when you're ready.

MAYOR PETE HESS: Alright, so I'm Pete Hess, Mayor of Naugatuck and I am here in support of the Waterbury Branch Line. I have listened to what has happened so far, so I'm not going to say anywhere near as much as I was before. I think the previous speakers have done a great job on the Waterbury Branch Line. Just going to emphasize a couple of points.

Now, when they talk about the very impressive ridership numbers we have to remember that they're talking about numbers calculated at a time when we didn't have a real commuter line as Steve Samela said you could go somewhere but you couldn't get back. So even though the Waterbury Branch Line is doing well, when we have a real effective commuter line, when we go from 15 to 22 and you can go somewhere and get back, it's just going to be that much more effective and better.

And secondly, you know, the untapped land that Senator Kelly was talking about, the raw land, that is what distinguished the Valley from other parts of Connecticut with rail. We have land that is raw, undeveloped, right on the rail line ready to go. You know, Kara mentioned those studies, you don't need studies. They've done ten studies before this one, all you have to do is look with your eyes and see the raw land and the projects ready to go on the Waterbury Branch Line. So I could talk about that for day, but I'm not going to.

But listening this morning another very interesting point came up that I'll just take one minute to give you some exciting news that can make all of your lives better if you want to help fund our transportation program. So Rich Andreski was talking about the CSX acquisition of Pan Am and Freight Rail. He didn't describe it right because

the whole ballgame just changed last Friday. And you have to remember that Pan Am Railroad does not include the rail line from Ayer, Mass. to Berlin and down to Naugatuck, the inland port of Naugatuck or New Haven. That rail line is controlled by Pan Am Southern. Pan Am Southern is controlled by Norfolk and Southern Rail Road who is a competitor of CSX. So last Friday in the Federal paperwork for the acquisition, Norfolk, and Southern selected G&W - Genesee and Wyoming Rail Lines to operate the Pan Am Southern Lines which includes the very lines we're talking about. So this is new and exciting for many reasons but G&W is going to create, they just announced it Friday, a new rail line called Berkshire & Eastern. So you're going to hear that name in Connecticut, Berkshire & Eastern has the ability to connect Naugatuck, Central Connecticut to anyone along their line which goes all the way up to Montreal and Montreal covers the Canadian National Line. So when I hang up this afternoon, we're meeting with G&W Railroad and we're going to try and recreate a new and better deal that we had with Pan Am and get them to commit to making improvements that are necessary from Berlin to Waterbury. Now the magnitude of this is unbelievable because.

PHIL MAINIERO: I hate to interrupt you Mr. Mayor but you're right at about the time limit if you could kind of wrap-up your final thoughts and we'll move to question and answers.

MAYOR PETE HESS: All right, I'm going to wrap it up. What I'm talking about is 100 times bigger than the other things because we have the ability to connect Asia to Naugatuck Central Connecticut and when I say that, ships from Asia go to Long Beach in Los Angeles, they will now be able to go to Port Rupert, come across the Canadian National Railroad from Montreal and come down here and create a large number of new potential customers, new developments for Connecticut so I guess what I'm saying is that I want to have a separate meeting with Chairman Lemar whoever else is involved, DOT Garrett Eucalitto,

John Andreski and the Commissioner to bring them up to speed on what's happening because it's huge and its immediate and it's like happening as we speak. Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, Mayor Hess for your testimony and for your announcement. That's quite interesting and good news for the region. Are there questions from any Members of legislature?

PHIL MAINIERO: Yes, I see hand from Representative Rebimbas and Reyes.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH): Thank you, Senator Cassano. I will make it brief. I see the good mayor has another meeting that he has to go to but Mayor thank you for taking the time to be here with us to testify but to provide that update and certainly, you know, you've said it in the past and continue to say it, you said it now, any Member of this Committee or the legislative body if you are ever interested in coming down to the Valley, we will be more than happy to show you the service we have, our plans for future service and, you know, certainly Mayor Hess to his credit has always looked at the bigger picture.

It's truly, this small investment could have, you know, as he put it, huge, huge economic boom for the State of Connecticut so certainly look forward to those future meetings in that regard and we keep talking about working a bipartisan manner here in the state level, I have to highlight and commend all of the local leaders, all of the First Selectman and Mayors up and down the Valley who have worked together for this line themselves. So it's an amazing effort that we have here, so much support. So again, Mayor Hess thank you so much. Senator Cassano, thank you very much and look forward to seeing many of you down in the Naugatuck Valley to truly see all the things that are taking place.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Absolutely. Thank you.  
Representative Reyes.

REP. REYES (75th): Thank you, Senator. Just wanted to again echo Representative Rebimbas and the Naugatuck Valley Council has done a great job to get our message out and I see that you pointed that out. It's very important, I think that the progress that has already been made and will continue to be made is because of the way the partners work together and the way the Waterbury Rail Caucus has worked together in getting this done. This is a perfect example of state projects going forward in a very positive direction, bipartisan and getting things done for the better of all our constituents, so Mayor Hess, kudos to you and Mayor O'Leary, and continued success sir. Thank you, Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you for your work.  
Senator Lopes.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): Thank you. Mayor Hess thank you for your testimony. I don't know if you were on earlier when I asked.

MAYOR PETE HESS: Well, that's why I said what I said because I was so happy you brought that up.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): I appreciate that. I appreciate you looking into it. The right answers seem to be a little bit, and I don't know how to phrase it, but not be too, they are aware of the sale of the property by the partnership [Broken audio] but are they involved in any of meetings they're having?

MAYOR PETE HESS: Well this just happened on Friday and being someone who follows it regularly and is somewhat aggressive on these things, we set up a meeting, we are having our first conference call this afternoon and it's huge. So we're going to bring everyone into the picture but it's almost

happening as we speak. The calls are just being made and this connection and this announcement happened on Friday and it creates a great case for Connecticut and we're going to have new people we're dealing with, well-healed people, you know, the Canadian National Railroad, Norfolk & Southern, G&W these are well-healed large entities that are international so we're got a lot of exciting possibilities.

And you know, I stopped talking about my first love, the Waterbury Branch Line just because of your comment because I had to jump in with that. But we need to get everyone involved, right away and, you know, bring this to a point where we can move forward and of course part of that is spending the money to improve the line from, you know, Berlin to Waterbury. There is many other parts of it but this is a great opportunity to bring all types of new international business to Connecticut. We have to take advantage of it and we will.

And anyone who wants to join the team you're all welcome. You know Rosa said it, in Naugatuck there is no red, there is no blue. We're totally, we're not even bipartisan, we're nonpartisan, we're about business and making things better. So, you know, everyone's invited. I'm going to call Garrett and John and the Commissioner and get them involved right away, your Committee, you know, whoever wants to get onboard, we're ready to go.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH): I agree with what you're doing. So yeah, DOT I imagine is listening in, I really encourage them to be part of this process, it has tremendous potential for our state's development. Thank you.

MAYOR PETE HESS: Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, Senator. Any other questions? I can't see any on the screen. Phil, any others?

PHIL MAINIERO: I see Senator Martin has just raised his hand unless it was from earlier.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): Yeah, thank you. So very quickly, Mr. Chair. Pete, thank you so much for coming and testifying. I love what I just heard about there is no blue, there is no red, there is just anyone who wants to get onboard let's get onboard. I think that is approach that we should be taking going forward with anything that we do here at the state legislature. So thank you for leading the charge regarding pushing your Waterbury line and the development of that Waterbury line area as a whole as we go forward through this whole thing.

MAYOR PETE HESS: And thank you for your support.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): You are very welcome. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, Senator Martin. Mr. Mayor, again thank you for your testimony.

MAYOR PETE HESS: Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Phil, our next speaker?

PHIL MAINIERO: Our next speaker is Senator Joan Hartley. Senator if you can hear us it would be good to unmute, we're ready for your testimony.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): That's a great follow up.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH): Good afternoon, folks can you hear me?

PHIL MAINIERO: Yes, we can.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): We can here you without the microphone.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH): {Laughter} Oh yes, probably so, Senator Cassano. Senator Cassano and distinguished Members of the Transportation Committee it is my pleasure to have an opportunity to appear before you this afternoon. For the record I'm Joan Hartley, I represent the 15th Senatorial District which encompassed discussions that you've been having most recently here, that we encompass the City of Waterbury, Naugatuck and Middlebury and I am no doubt, supporting SB 576 which is AN ACT CONCERNING THE EXPANSION OF THE PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE OF THE WATERBURY BRANCH OF NORTH-METRO COMMUTER RAILROAD.

And Mr. Chairman knowing that you have a very robust list of people signed up to speak and that many of my colleagues and Mayor Hess so articulately as well as Senator Kelly and of course Representative Rebinbas and Representative Reyes who are your Committee Members have spoken much about the Waterbury Rail Line, and for good reason. There is much to talk about there on so many levels but just being an issues that first and foremost in the State of Connecticut and that is connecting our people to their jobs, to their homes and to their communities.

Branch Line and I don't know if others mentioned it was started in 1985 when the New Haven Line was purchased and there were three lines at that time, the Waterbury Branch Line being the longest of the three branch lines, 27 miles long and please forgive me because I've been in other meetings if I am being repetitive, others may have said this, but it is a primary transportation corridor in the Naugatuck Valley. It is the connector to the New York Metropolitan area by virtue of rail. It's the longest of the three branch line and the population that it encompasses in the Naugatuck Valley upwards above one-quarter of a million people and there is just exponential growth that's in this corridor. But in addition to this new Covid area that we're living in we've seen uptick in the migration from the metropolitan area into Connecticut and

specifically into this area in large measure because of the quality of life there, because of the things that we offer in Connecticut, the housing stock, the education, and the like.

So it is the location for thousands of businesses, residential and industrial businesses and a recent report issued by the Naugatuck Valley Cog, which does a great job by the way in promoting our area, identified the fact that this is the only corridor, transportation corridor other than Route 8 and Route 8 on a daily basis has 80,000 vehicles which cross on the Route 8 and they measured this on the Commodore Hall Bridge and the truth be known anybody who travels that route will know and painfully know that in the morning it's totally backs-up between the bridge all the way back to Seymour and in the evening drivetime on the way home it's backed up from Shelton back down to the Merritt Parkway.

So it's a very congested and to be able to open up and to expand the rail would make such an expediential difference. But the COG report also identified the fact that this is pre-pandemic and hopefully we're going to all post-pandemic pretty soon but there were 14,000 people who traveled from Bridgeport-New Haven-Stamford on a daily basis from Naugatuck Valley. And so you just multiply that times two because you've got the morning drive, the evening drive, you're up to 28,000 people traveling that route. And I am sure others may have mentioned that during, even during this pandemic the Waterbury Branch Line retained most of its ridership or we retained the greatest percentage of ridership of all the branches. So people just depend on this transportation mode. It's crucial to so many of them. And as I said, it is surrounded by great housing stocks, it is positioned as Mayor Hess talked so explicitly about it positioned with exponential opportunity for economic development in view of the fact that there are.

PHIL MAINIERO: Senator, I hate to interrupt you but we're right at the end of your timeline. Thank you.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH): How could that possibly be. I just want to, I just want to conclude by saying that there is \$120 million that has been invested in this. You cannot let that get shuttered, it needs to be leveraged and that is what this Bill is about and I commend the Governor and Commissioner Giulietti who also recognizes it and has requested this also in the 2022-2023 budget document. Thank you to Chairman and all the leadership and the Transportation Committee for your indulgences and obviously I urge adoption. Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, Senator Hartley. Are there any question from any legislator for Senator Hartley? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation, very thorough as usual, appreciate it.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH): Thank you, be well.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): You too. Phil, our next speaker.

PHIL MAINIERO: Our next speaker should be a Mr. Lou Mason. Lou we have you in the room if you could unmute and begin your camera, turn on your camera. Lou can you hear us? I see him trying but, I believe we have the next speakers are Jeffrey Berger and Dimple Desai from, if we can get them on. Jeff can you hear? Dimple can you hear us?

DIMPLE DESAI: Yes, I can hear you.

PHIL MAINIERO: Wonderful. I think Jeff has joining now so just give him a few moments to get the camera on.

JEFF BERGER: It's Jeff Berger, am I on?

PHIL MAINIERO: Wonderful, okay, you may begin.

JEFF BERGER: Good afternoon, Senator Cassano, good to see you again.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): You, too.

JEFF BERGER: Good Afternoon Chairman Lemar, Senator Cassano, Ranking Member and honorable Members of the Transportation Committee. I am here to speak in opposition of certain sections of Raised Bill 6484. Again my name is Jeffrey Berger, I am a State Properties Review Board member. I am accompanied by the Board Director, Dimple Desai, and his staff person Thomas Jerram.

On behalf of Mr. Greenberg, the Board Chairman, and the Board members, I am here to express opposition to increasing the dollar threshold in Line 11 under Raised Bill 6484. One of the purposes of this Bill is to increase the dollar threshold of the proposals submitted to the Board for review and approval from \$5,000 dollars to \$10,000 dollars under Subsection (h) of Section 13a-73. Currently, the Board reviews the Department of Transportation's acquisitions and administrative settlements exceeding \$5,000 dollars.

By the way of background, the Legislature established this bipartisan independent Board in 1975 as a watchdog entity to ensure that the State's real estate acquisitions and leases would be in the State's best interest and free from "political patronage, cronyism, personal spoils systems, and friendship." This is Final Report of the Subcommittee on Leasing, Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations from January 7, 1975.

It should also be noted that Members of the Committee and public have referred to the Contracting Review Board. They would have a role in this bidding process but it should be noted that our board SPRV, can provider oversight on contracts, so there's two separate entities to perform two separate functions.

The Board opposes 6484 for the following reasons: The Board provides an independent oversight of the proposals from the Department as the legislature has intended. For example, starting from 2017 the Board has reviewed about 62 proposals that had the value between \$5,001 and \$10,000 dollars. The average review time taken by the Board per proposal for this timeframe was about less than 30 days. For about dozen proposals, the Board sought clarification from the Department to make sure that the costs and the methods were appropriate.

As far as the Department's statistics are concerned and listening to the Commissioners testimony and his staff testimony, they talked about timeframes. The average time taken by the Department from project initiation to submission to our Board was more than 100 days. So it should be noted the Committee should take note that the Boards turnaround time is less than 30 days once we receive the documents. DOT takes over 100 days, so is, you know, to dispute the Commissioner, it's not on SBRB watch that there is a delay.

Also it should be noted any fiscal impacts to the Department as it currently submits proposals for the Board review is nonexistent. The Board's review is very critical during these difficult fiscal times. It is the goal of the Board to provide an oversight, accountability, transparency, and uniformity by reviewing proposals from the Department receiving state tax payers' funds as directed by the Legislature and separate from the executive branch. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to provide the testimony on this raised Bill. And the Board opposes this change, thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you for your presentation, Jeff. Are there any questions from Members of the legislature? Seeing none, thanks again.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): I'm sorry, Mr. Chair I did raise my hand, sorry. Rep. O'Dea.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): That's all right. Representative O'Dea, I can't see you on my screen but please go ahead.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): So, thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Mr. Berger, you testify as almost like you've been here before, that was very enlightening.

JEFF BERGER: Yeah, I've been waiting to speak with this illustrious Committee for about three hours here, maybe four [Laughter].

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Well I'm sorry to indulge the Committee, I just want to say hello, to my good friend, Mr. Berger. It's good to see you and very much appreciate your testimony and hope to see you more often as things lighten up.

JEFF BERGER: Great, it's great seeing you too. You look great.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you for popping in here, it's great. Anyone else? Seeing none, thanks for your testimony, Mr. Berger, well appreciated.

JEFF BERGER: Thank you, Senator. Have a great day.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): You too. Phil, next speaker?

PHIL MAINIERO: Our next speaker is Lou Mason. Mr. Mason it looks like we have you on camera now if you are able to unmute we're ready for your testimony.

LOU MASON: Good Afternoon, this is Louie from Midtown Autobody, in Bridgeport, Connecticut. I guess there is some kind of law being proposed to stop us from getting a workorder signed for the

first 24 hours. There are quite a few problems with that. One, if it's a minor repair what is the people have to do, wait to fix their car? Is somebody going to police it if I have somebody sign their workorder in 23 hours and not 24? I kind of lost you on my screen. Do you still have me?

PHIL MAINIERO: We do.

LOU MASON: Okay and then the other issue is for people that are out-of-town. We happen to go out for a municipality police department or the State Police or something, we tow in a customer and they're happy with us and they want us to fix their car and they live in New York, now what do they have to do, come back to authorize a repair 24 hours later. Creates a lot of controversy. One thing it does do though, it gives the insurance company a little more time to talk bad about us and steal the job for one of their own shops is what really is the case. Hello? I'm all garbled here. Am I good? You trying there? You guys still hear me?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): I can hear you, and it looks like you're on a Ferris Wheel.

LOU MASON: Oh, I got you now. Well you know, in this pandemic a Ferris Wheel might be a nice place to be. So I don't know if you have any questions for me as to this proposed law.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Lou, it would be helpful, what is the current law right now?

LOU MASON: Well I believe there is none. You know, were businessmen, we tow in a customer, we meet somebody or somebody calls us because they looked us up on the internet. You know, we go out and we service them and we fix their car naturally state law says we have to get a signed workorder. So we have them sign a workorder. Now they're saying you got to wait 24 hours to sign a workorder. I don't know. It doesn't make sense. What do you do when

somebody has a flat tire, you got to sell them a tire. We tow them in, we can't touch the car till tomorrow. It's you know, there's a lot of variables here.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Any questions from Members of the legislature? Thanks for your testimony particular I see your comments on the end will be very important. I don't think I want my care to sit there with a flat tire for 24 hours, so.

LOU MASON: I know, I know. Things would definitely have to be changed if they were going to go ahead with this and hey, I appreciate the time to be able to talk to you and give you my opinion.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thanks for coming in. Take care. Mr. Clerk the next speaker.

PHIL MAINIERO: Our next speaker is Don DeVivo who should be appearing with Dominic Fulco. Don if you can hear us if you could unmute start video.

DON DE VIVO: Can you hear me okay?

PHIL MAINIERO: Yep, Don we can. You can begin whenever you're ready.

DON DE VIVO: Sure, unfortunately we lost Attorney Fulco, believe it or not he's having his Covid vaccine right now and had to jump off. He will be jumping back on as soon as he's done but I can certainly, you know, answer questions in this stead and if you have further questions, you know, we can get him on later in the Hearing. So we have submitted written testimony.

Obviously, I listened to the beginning of this meeting and there was, you know, extensive discussion about the bus certificate issue. I know you guys have a long agenda and I don't want to waste your time by reading you know, testimony that you can read yourself that is in your hands. Jean

Cronin from the Connecticut Bus Association also submitted testimony and you should have access to that as well.

You know, I think what I would like to highlight is I think there were, you know, several misstatements by the DOT this morning with regard to the situation. It is, it's really not a, you know, a clarification of the process, this Bill would change the process. The other thing I think the Commissioner said several times is that we are the only one in Connecticut that have this type of certificate. Now I haven't done a nationwide survey but I can tell you for a fact that we operate under certificate system in Massachusetts, it works well. We work with the department there, actually in the Massachusetts situation we were subsidized and they were unable to a few years ago, they were unable to continue subsidy because of lack of funding, so we applied to the Department to raise our fares and we were still operating that route without subsidy from New Bedford to Boston every day, seven days a week and that is under certificate system that is in place there.

You know, I heard a lot of discussion about private public partnerships and that is really what we're looking to do here. You know, we really want to stay relevant and stay in business and I will speak for the three operators that are involved that, you know, we've been running these routes for a hundred years in some cases and we'd like to continue to do that.

You know, we think the ultimate end if this legislation is passed is that the private operators will go away and all the service will be operated by Connecticut Transit or by Frist Transit for Connecticut Transit. I think that there is a lot than can be done and I heard Representative O'Dea talk about, talk to the Commissioner about the potential for the operators and DOT to get together. We welcome that. If there is any way you can broker

that, that would be wonderful because we haven't had any success in kind of cracking through the armor there at the DOT. So with that, I know you guys are, have a very full agenda. I'll stop and answer any questions.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Are there questions from any Members of the legislature? Seeing none.

PHIL MAINIERO: Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Representative Tom O'Dea if I may, Mr. Chairman?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, yes please proceed.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Sorry, Mr. Chair, I didn't hear you there, I apologize.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Yes, please proceed.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Thank you, I apologize. Hello, Mr. DeVivo how are you?

DON DE VIVO: I'm very well, thank you.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): I had spoken with your attorney a while back. My understanding is you heard the testimony from DOT that they, you have been involved in some mediation as recently as five weeks ago, is that maybe just your attorney or are you?

DON DE VIVO: Well I mean we did go through a mediation process which, you know, in my particular case we were supposed to, they said they were going to go and order and talk to I believe it was Collins first and NBT and us, from my perspective we never even got to a meeting. We had two meetings scheduled with DOT and they got cancelled. So as far as I'm concerned, we've never had a meaningful discussion with DOT on, you know, how to come to a final resolution on this.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): I'm sorry, when you say never, have you had a sit-down with anyone at the DOT in the last three, five years?

DON DE VIVO: Three to five years? I don't want to go back that far but certainly nothing meaningful recently, let's put it that way.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): And do you know who the Judge was that you.

DON DE VIVO: It was Judge Taylor. Well Judge Moukawasher is the Judge that is holding the trial. Judge Taylor was assigned the mediation.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): What's the status of, I know there was an injunction that was entered and the eminent domain was denied. What's the status of the litigation to your knowledge?

DON DE VIVO: Well right now, the injunction is still in place. We're waiting for a final ruling from Judge Moukawasher and I think that ruling might be subject to appeals by both sides. So right now the legislation, sorry the action in the courts is just kind of dragging along. The injunction is still in place at the moment.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): And it's my understanding the Torrington Route, can you tell us what happened with the Torrington Route?

DON DE VIVO: Sure, so with Torrington, Kelly Transit who, I guess we name Mason Partners but it's been Kelly for years operated the Torrington-Winsted routes into Hartford. Kelly filed for bankruptcy. I think the bankruptcy was more related to his charter business than his commuter work very honestly but, you know, I don't want to speak for them. And when they closed the doors, we obviously heard about it and called DOT said, hey we're ready, willing, and able to operate that route for you from

Torrington to Hartford. They said, oh no, we're all set, we're going to have Connecticut Transit do it.

So Connecticut Transit has been operating the route since and they said well we're going to put it out to bid. So they did put it out to bid, we heard nothing and then finally we FOIA'd the bid results DATCO was the low bidder and so we inquired from the Department what's going on and they said, well you know, because of Covid we're not going to award the contract right now. We have to, you know, we have to see what the ridership is.

But the reality is the route has been running exactly the same as it was since 2019. It's just Connecticut Transit operating now instead of Kelly. So I mean the logic that they didn't award it because they had to do some evaluation didn't change the service at all, it just changed who is doing it. So, you know, we felt we were low bidder, should have been awarded that route and it's never been awarded. And I think, you know, again that's them wanting to have these routes go to Connecticut Transit.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): And just briefly you heard the comments from DOT about the \$4 million dollars payment that is outstanding, that's to your company, correct?

DON DE VIVO: The \$4 million is just to my company, yeah. So the story behind that is, our contract expired in June, we felt we were under the injunction to continue service and there is actually a stipulated agreement that attaches to the injunction. DOT kind of unilaterally sent us those contracts that said, that upon execution of the contract we had to give up our certificate.

And they inserted that into the contract language and obviously our attorney saw that and said you can't sign this because once you do that, once you sign the contract you've given up your certificate.

So you know, and the sad part was they never even told us they put it in there. We had to find it. And so we went back to the judge and I think Judge Taylor was involved. They subsequently removed that language because it was pretty much in violation of the injunction and then they said, oh we can't sign the contract because we have to have you fill out a new budget.

So we filled out a new budget and said okay that budget generated a dollar amount per hour and then they said, well, you know, that's too much. We filled out your budget just like you asked us to and we still haven't. So then they came back and said, well you know, here is the number we're going to pay you which was obviously less than what we thought we should have but we said, you know what, fine, we'll take what you're offering us because we haven't been paid and subsequent to that, they said we're going to have to have a meeting to discuss this and discuss it internally.

I'm not sure what they're discussing and since then they cancelled two meetings, with us, to finalize the contract. So we're just getting stalled and delayed. And you know, our fear is that we can't stop operating, we have to keep operating, you know, we're in a situation where most of our motorcoach fleet is shutdown right now because of Covid, we're not doing charters, we're not doing field trips and you know, we just keep getting delayed but our fear is that if we were to stop operating DOT would say well, you've abandoned the routes so therefore, you know, we're just going to take them over. So we're kind of stuck between a rock and a hard place but we continue to operate with payment.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): All right. I don't have any further questions. I would just ask that between us and the Chairman and Ranking Members I'm hopeful that we can get the groups together to resolve that.

DON DE VIVO: I would love that.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): But in any event, thank you very much Mr. Chairman and thank you Mr. DeVivo for your testimony and good luck to you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Yes, Representative O'Dea.

PHIL MAINIERO: Looks like Senator Martin has a question.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST): No, no questions. I just want to thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chair, I just want to encourage that Mr. DeVivo and the DOT can come to the table and get this thing resolved. This is something as Ranking Member and staff two year previous to this year that was brought to my attention and I heard today, in some of today's comments that this is actually been going on for a while. So I agree with Representative O'Dea that hopefully this thing can get resolved very quickly here. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Yes, Senator Martin, thank you for your comments and Representative O'Dea I think you are correct. We need to maybe step-in here and try to bring this thing together and bring a legitimate end to it because it's not doing anybody any good right now. Are there any other speakers from legislature, any questions? Seeing none, Phil do you have the next speaker?

PHIL MAINIERO: Yes, the next speaker is Sal Luciano. Sal I have you in the room if you could unmute and turn on your camera.

SAL LUCIANO: Good afternoon Senator Cassano, Representative Lemar and Members of Transportation Committee. My name is Sal Luciano and I am proud to serve as the President of the Connecticut AFL-CIO, a federation of hundreds of local unions representing more than 220,000 members.

Senate Bill 920 is an alarming attempt to return us to the shadowy Rowland years in which the Governor engaged in pay-to-play contracting and procurement, awarding lucrative state contracts to those who compensated him with expensive gifts, trips, and home improvements and for his staff gold coins and envelopes full of cash. Rowland repeatedly and systematically used his office for personal gain and was ultimately convicted of corruption charges and sent to prison.

Following the Rowland scandal, the General Assembly took careful and deliberate steps to enact policies that injected transparency and oversight into state contracting and procurement protocols. A significant product of those efforts was to establish the State Contracting Standards Board, an independent Executive Branch agency charged with ensuring the effectiveness and integrity of the state contracting and procurement processes.

In 2011, the General Assembly took the same cautious approach when authorizing public-private partnerships. They were intent on establishing limits and restrictions to ensure taxpayer dollars were spent appropriately and transparently. No one wanted to create a system that would invite corruption.

Senate Bill 920 abolishes many of those carefully crafted protections. Among the safeguards removed is the limit of the number of public-private partnerships that can be authorized. The limit on the duration of a public-private partnership project. Current statute limits the term of agreement to 50 years. Under the Rowland Administration we used to, in the service plazas get eleven cents for every gallon the State of Connecticut received eleven cents for every gallon sold. The 44-year-old deal was renegotiated with the Carlisle Group and now we get one penny for every gallon of gas sold and that's a 44year project

with a four year extension at the Carlisle Group's request.

Legislative authorization for the kinds of projects that can be considered this would open it up to everything and lastly, get rid of the oversight of the State Contracting Standards Board to verify that the proposed public-private partnership cannot be completed in-house and is indeed cost-effective.

Allowing agencies to bypass the State Contracting Standards Board is reckless and shortsighted. If public private partnerships are such wonderful things for the state to embrace, they should easily be able to withstand all levels of scrutiny currently provided in statute. If we are stripping the post-Rowland protections to force through a circumspect prospect, that alone should tell us all we need to know.

We implore the Committee to preserve the thoughtful, diligent work you did to protect taxpayer dollars since the Rowland scandal. Knowing our recent past, we must be vigilant to maintain systems that keep us from repeating it. We urge the Committee to reject this Bill. Thank you

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Sal, thank you for your testimony. Are there any Members of the legislature who have questions? I see none. No questions.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Mr. Chair, I just wanted to thank Sal for iterating some concerns and explaining and always a pleasure to see you. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SAL LUCIANO: Thank you all for the work that you do.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thanks, very much. Appreciate your testimony. Next speaker Phil?

PHIL MAINIERO: Next speaker should be Joe Miano, can you hear? Joe if you can hear us, you can unmute if not, I'll have to move to the next person. The next person that is see is Joy Avallone from the Insurance Association. Joy if you can hear us you can unmute and turn your camera on.

JOY AVALLONE: Can you hear me?

PHIL MAINIERO: Yes, we can.

JOY AVALLONE: Okay thanks. Representative Lemar, Senator Cassano, all Ranking Members and Members of the Transportation Committee, I'm Joy Avallone, General Counsel of the Insurance Association of Connecticut a state-based trade association for Connecticut's insurance industry. I want to thank you for the opportunity to express our support of Senate Bill 921 and actually offered additional language for the proposals. We thank you for the protections that emerged from bad actors.

By way of background although the majority of towing and storing vendors do the right thing, there are unfortunately vendors that do not. Under current laws tows that are designated as nonconsensual tows, most often those tows resulting from motor vehicle accidents are subject to certain protections and shielding consumers from excessive and unnecessary charges. Under current law towing and storage rates along with labor allowances or other needed activities are reviewed and regulated by the state regularly. Consensual tows however are not subject to such scrutiny so charge more in connection with these towing's than they would for "non-consensual" tows.

Because of that there are auto shops when called to the scene of an accident will convince or coerce vehicle owners or drivers to sign a repair order, or another document which will convert the non-consensual tow and subsequent storage to consensual. Often times consumers are shaken and confused after

being involved in a motor vehicle accident, they're nervous, they are given a lengthy or an unfamiliar document and they are under the misconception that their signature is required in order for the vehicle to be towed when in fact no signature is required. The document they sign often has effective converting the classification of the tow or binding them to an agreement for storage or repair the cost of which exceed the cap for the non-consensual tow.

So the conversion allows the towing vendor to charge towing and storage rates far above those set by the Commissioner and tower also charge increased labor fees as well for the removal, or hazardous materials and such. Now it is not uncommon for some shops to begin repairs on a vehicle, which in many cases, is an obvious total loss. And frequently, these "repairs" include scans which for example are unnecessary. Also, when the insurer becomes involved, these shops routinely delay our members ability to inspect and/or move the vehicle, which further increases their storage charges. All these things, you know, obviously are reflected in rates and that is why we are most concerned.

The Act contains language that we believe is necessary. It prevents towers from requiring an owner or operator of a vehicle to preauthorize more than 24 hours of storage or repairs as a condition to providing towing services for the disabled vehicle. While the inclusion of this language would certainly help provide some protections to the consumers, we believe it would be much more helpful if it included additional language which aims to prohibit a tow vendor or wrecker from requesting as opposed to requiring an accident victim or vehicle from signing anything, either a consent to tow or a repair order at the scene of an accident or within 24 hours of an accident. Just to be clear, you know, our intent is obviously not to delay the repairs of cars, not to increase storage, obviously that's what we want to prevent, and again we're not alleging that all towers engage in these activities

we are really just trying to target those bad actors that are out there.

So for these reasons, you know, obviously we encourage this Committee to pass this Bill and to include additional protections as well. Happy to answer any questions you may have.

PHIL MAINIERO: Senator Cassino, you're muted.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Joy?

JOY AVALLONE: Hi, Senator.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you for your testimony, it's right on. Are there questions from Members of the legislature? Any questions?

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Senator, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you Joy for testimony, you've got Judiciary and here in Transportation.

JOY AVALLONE: Nice to see you again.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): We're both jumping back and forth. Not a question, just I wanted, I was looking through your testimony, you submitted your testimony?

JOY AVALLONE: Yeah, I did. You know, I will, I think I did but I can send it back.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): I'll make sure I get it, thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, Representative O'Dea. Any other questions?

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Senator Cassano, for some reason as a Co-Host I can't raise my hand. I apologize for just interrupting. Ms. Avallone, I appreciate your testimony. I think, you've heard the testimony earlier today that a number of the tow companies

feel that we're putting a hold on their ability to being work, or you know, they're potentially at a loss tow a car or vehicle for free back to their yard, somebody won't pay, and I get the sense that these tow operators are probably the folks who we're not concerned about.

These are the operators who have great reputations, they've done great work, they're protective of their customers and not trying to exploit anybody but you indicated that there are a few bad actors in the state who, you know, in an earlier meeting I think you discussed would force someone to sign a repair process before they towed the car, to meet somebody, you know, they get them on the phone or they, you know, try to tell them, look we won't tow your car unless you agree to allow us to begin the repair process, a few bad actors causing the bulk of the problem here, I wonder if you could highlight that example is again, cause I didn't ascertain what it was, we were most concerned about when we talk about this.

JOY AVALLONE: So, you know, our concern is when at the time when people are involved in a motor vehicle accident, you know, most of use aren't frequently involved in motor vehicle accidents. When that happens, you know, we're in a state where maybe we're confused, nervous, you know, just uncertain about what's going on. It's likely that because, you know, we aren't involved in those situation often that we're also unfamiliar with, you know, the towing and storage laws in Connecticut.

So there are occasions when towers will present to the scene and again, we're talking about non-consensual tows at this point. So there are occasions where towers will come to the scene, you know, they were called by the police for instance and the way that the documentation, and so at that point, number one like there is no documentation in this Bill be required because it's a non-consensual tow and the towers are there to tow the vehicle

safely to their facility. When consumers or vehicle owners, accident victims, you know, are presented with paperwork obviously they are unfamiliar with the paperwork, sometimes it's lengthy paperwork and they're under the misconception that this paperwork is required in order for that vehicle to be towed which isn't the case.

Often times this paperwork has the effect of converting a non-consensual tow into a consensual tow and then towers can charge whatever they want because it is non-consensual, non-consensual tows are not afforded the same protections and caps on fees that non-consensual tows are. So again obviously, you know, our intent is not to incur further delays or to increase storage times as was obviously contrary to what I'm seeking to achieve here and we are not obviously opposed to consumers reaching out to individuals to seek that repairs be done, you know. I don't know the precise language that would accomplish that goal but we're really seeking to address instances where, you know, involving that bad actor if you will. So we're not looking to hinder, you know, the work of the towers and obviously we respect the work that they do. But we have heard complaints from many of our members and, you know, this seems to be something that is very common and why we felt the need to address it.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Thank you, Joy for that and for helping me understand that a little bit better how this process plays out having never experienced it myself, I can't say I would know firsthand what a difference between a consensual and non-consensual tow in the moments after an accident so I think it is helpful to understand how this plays out on the ground and I appreciate your support. Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Questions from any other Members of the legislature? Seeing none, Joy thank you for your testimony. It's interesting that much of our legislation comes as a result of the so-called bad apples. It's sometimes two, three, four

six percent but it brings about legislation because it's the only way to stop people from being misled or whatever it might be and every year we're going to get a few Bills like this because of the few and legislation is needed to protect everyone. I glad you brought testimony forward and we will pursue this.

JOY AVALLONE: Thank you very much.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Phil, our next speaker?

PHIL MAINIERO: Yes, so next it looks like Jim Jinks has joined up. Mr. Jinks if you're able to hear us, unmute and start your camera.

JIM JINKS: Hello, can you see me now?

PHIL MAINIERO: Hold on it seems Senator Abrams. Jim could you speak again.

JIM JINKS: Yep, can you guys hear me?

PHIL MAINIERO: Yes, we can hear you perfect.

JIM JINKS: Okay great. Thank you. Thank you to Chairman Lemar and Vice-Chair Cassano, Ranking Members and a special thank you to State Representative Leslie Zupkus who is championing this Bill and also the rest of the Cheshire Legislative Delegation for supporting safer streets here in Cheshire. My name is Jim Jinks. I serve on the Cheshire Town Council and I am also on the Bike Walk CT Board and I am the Executive Director for Bike Cheshire which is a community nonprofit in Cheshire dedicated in making walking safer and more accessible in our community and beyond.

For all these we are speaking in favor of measures that make our communities and streets safer for recreation and transportation. As such we strongly support the vision of Raised Bill 6487 that would designate a portion of 68 and 70 in the Town of

Cheshire as a bikeway. So I am here to testify on 6487 in particular but before I start I just wanted to say that Bike Walk is also in favor of Raised Bill 5724 having to do with the sidewalks and also in favor of a mandate which would be 6485 having to do with the electric vehicle Bill to include purchase of E-Bikes. E-Bikes are a game changer, they will go a long way toward improving the effectiveness and efficiency of our entire transportation system.

But back to the Proposed Bill 6487, and the designation of a bikeway in Cheshire. Before going on about specifics for all legislators that may be wondering or saying to themselves I didn't realize that Cheshire, so what does this have to do with my constituents. There is a larger principle at play here and I will address that toward the end of my testimony. Route 68 and 70 is actually already identified as a bike route on the State Active Transportation Plan.

Though it is identified on paper as a bike route clearly there isn't any signage or biking infrastructure of any kind that would improve safety and encourage more travel by bike on this route. This is a significant problem and opportunity now and especially in the near future in Cheshire. Route 68 - 70 is a primary route for car and truck traffic going east and west through Cheshire. Much of the route is a two-lane State Highway with speed limit of 45 miles per hour. Traffic is often slow moving during the morning and evening rush but higher speed and more dangerous during off-peak times. Signage including Share the Road, Three Feet's the Law and bike markings, travel lane narrowing, and protected bike lanes were feasible would provide traffic calmly and encourage more bike riding for transportation through this busy travel corridor.

One section of Route 68-70 is an area where our community and town leaders are particularly

interested in improving safety and accessibility by bike and not on foot. The West Main Street Commercial District runs from about Warren Street on the eastside to Ives Row on the westside, it's about a third of a mile of modest commercial properties that are largely across the street with a very limited parking.

The neighborhood is home to restaurants an upscale salon, guitar shop and some other businesses. Farmington Canal Heritage Trail also travels north-south through the heart of the neighborhood. But the real gem of the district which will be complete over the next decade will be the Ball and Socket Arts Building. Ball and Socket is a 65,000 square foot former manufacturing facility that is being redeveloped into a complex of art galleries, performance spaces, small retail, and restaurants.

Ball and Socket will be a gathering place for the Town of Cheshire as well as a destination for visitors from throughout the region and state. Ball and Socket Arts will increase the traffic flow and foot traffic in the West Main Street Commercial District, a designated bike route with signage and other safety features running through the district would encourage more bike riding by local residents and encourage trail riders to exit the trail and explore Cheshire and patronize local, small businesses.

Making Route 68-70 a safe bike route isn't a nice to have situation necessarily, we're not asking for this designation as some additional consideration from the DOT simply to achieve an amenity or something desired by some but there would be less cars on the road and more people biking. What we're saying is this bikeway designation is an important perhaps critical step toward making the commercial area and travel corridor in our community to continue to work and support growth long-term. One thing, parking is already in short supply and as

Ball and Socket Arts Building comes online parking availability will be scarcer.

PHIL MAINIERO: I hate to cut you off but you're right about the time limit if you could kind of summarize.

JIM JINKS: I'll try and finish this up quickly. But our vision for the district is to maintain the smaller locally owned businesses in a village or town aesthetic that isn't dominated by infrastructure for motorized vehicles. So the more people can access the district by foot or on a bike the more successful the street will be in commercial and quality of life in the future.

To the larger principle I've referred to, it goes well beyond this particular street in Cheshire. As the owner of the road through this district, the state has the responsibility to operate a roadway that best suits the needs of the local community. I'm not suggesting the state DOT isn't already sensitive to those needs but it's the car and truck travels that's always been given a priority in terms of looking at safety and efficiency of the roadway. In this case and others around the state the one-size-fits all approach isn't what's best in terms of safety for all users and the local economy. The designation of Route 68 and 70 Cheshire as a bikeway can be a pilot program or test case for design of state roads, local conditions and needed. The Town of Cheshire supports Raised Bill 6487 and we ask for all the Committee Members vote in favor of voting this Bill out of Committee. Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you for your testimony. Any questions from any Members of the legislature? Seeing none.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH): I do, Senator. My hand is raised.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): I can only see six of the Members here so I can't tell who is raising their hand. Sorry, go ahead.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH): That's okay, Thank you Mr. Chair, it's Representative Zupkus and Jim I want to thank you for coming up today. You make all valid points. This is a very important piece of legislation that will help up in Cheshire because there are many bikers in Cheshire not just on the trial but all over. So thank you for coming up and testifying and I appreciate it.

JIM JINKS: Thank you again.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, Representative Zupkus. Are there any other Members of the legislature that would like to ask questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony. Appreciate it.

JIM JINKS: Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Phil, the next speaker please.

PHIL MAINIERO: I believe the next speaker is Mr. Sal Sena. Sal if you can, you're up if you could unmute and turn on your camera.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Sal welcome.

SAL SENA: Thank you. Good morning Senator Cassano, Representative Lemar, Senator Somers, Representative Carney, and the distinguished Members of the Transportation Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to provide you with testimony in strong opposition of Senate Bill 921, it's AN ACT PROHIBITING CERTAIN VEHICLE STORAGE AGREEMENTS AS A PRECONDITION TO VEHICLE TOWING. This Bill appears to be an attempt by the insurance industry to get around the anti-steering law, which permits

consumers to freely choose a vehicle repair shop of their own preference.

My name is Sal Sena and I am the President of the Towing and Recovery Professionals of Connecticut also known as the TRPC. We are composed of nearly 200 towing professionals who are licensed dealers and repair shops. The small businesses are trying to improve the quality of life in our state by keeping our roadways open when accidents, weather and other events close them. The services our members provide ensure safe motoring conditions for the public and allow traffic to keep moving with the least amount of delay.

Senate Bill 921 severely limits a towing company from contracting for the repair of a customer's vehicle unless the tow company is willing to forfeit the storage charges on the vehicle should it remain in the towing company's property for more than 24 hours. When the vehicle is at the tower's location and the owner contracts for repair of the vehicle with the vehicle owner, it is a consensual event. SB 921 appears to have been created so that the insurance companies can directly steer the repair of the vehicle to one of their own shops. This is totally in direct violation of Connecticut General Statute 38a-354 but it attempts to introduce control over the customer's rights to freely choose a repair shop of their choice. For this reason, the towing industry is against passing of this proposal. I would gladly to answer any questions.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you for your testimony. Are there question?

PHIL MAINIERO: I believe Representative O'Dea has a question.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Through you, Mr. Chair, Chairs. Appreciate it. Thank you sir for your testimony. Did you hear the testimony by Ms. Joy Avallone?

SAL SENA: I did.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Do you agree with her that there are some situations where people getting towed or locked into a contract that they didn't necessarily agree to or realize they were signing or do you think that just doesn't happen?

SAL SENA: To say it doesn't happen would be naïve on anybody's part. I think what they are trying to do, a lot of people in motor vehicle accident get towed off the scene and the driver goes above and beyond his way to get their stuff together, you feel comfortable with the person. A one-on-one interaction, he helps you. You're able to talk to the person and explain to them what the situation and how the process works.

Like I said, the face-to-face time, it understand what I'm talking about, you create a bond sometimes. People are, you know what, what do you think, can you fix my car, yep, no problems and they sign a work order with you. No one is forced, no one pushes you into it. The police call you to tow the car off the highway regardless if there is a contract signed or not. They call you to tow the vehicle. That car has to be moved so the traffic can move on. So at that time, the insurance companies will call to say we want to move the car to our repair shop, the car's aren't even in our property yet, Representative O'Dea and they are trying to move them.

Like wait a minute, you know, I just talked to the shop want them to fix it. Well you come to our and they push, and push and it's against Connecticut General Statute so they can't steer it away. So they are trying to take that ability for our industry to sell work and fix people's cars. So no, I totally disagree with the way it was portrayed that, you know, this happens on a regular basis.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): So how would you address that situation again. How can we as a legislature get the bad apples as was brought up by I thin, our good Chair? How do we address the tower who may have him sign a contract at a time where they're not at their 100 percent?

SAL SENA: That is why we have motor vehicle, the DMW. That's why we have DMV. When you do something wrong, Motor Vehicles comes knocking on your door. Okay, I shop personally. If someone is in an accident and we deal with the person, you don't want to fix it, right on top of our paperwork it says, you are not required to fill out this paper work unless you want the vehicle repaired at our facility.

It says in bold letters right across the top so there is never confusion. I've been in business 20 years at the same location, it's not a practice as it is being portrayed as an everyday event, it's not the case. Every race, religion, and creed you got your good and bad, very profession. This industry is trying to make it harder for shops that don't to this have their hands tied.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): So if somebody agrees with you say the night of an accident and then the next day they wake up and they remember they got a brother-in-law who is in the business and they say let's send, you know, I got Sal, I got a family member that's going to fix the car for me, would you let them out of that contract? What are the terms?

SAL SENA: Yeah. That happens, not every day but on the occasion. We had a gentleman that was at our shop about a month ago. He came in, he was rear-ended, wanted us to fix the car. He comes on, you know something, I totally forgot my son-in-law. I said, no problem. Not a problem. Word of mouth is the best and worse advertising we all know that already. So, yeah.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): So your position is there's really no problem with current situation and so far as anybody has a complaint they can go to DMV and DMV can address the bad apples?

SAL SENA: Correct. That's what they do.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): All right. Thank you very much, sir for your testimony. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, Representative O'Dea. Any questions any other Members of the legislature? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony.

SAL SENA: Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): And we'll move on to the next speaker. Phil?

PHIL MAINIERO: Next speaker is Kate Rozen. If you can hear us if you could unmute and begin.

KATE ROZEN: Thank you. Thank you Co-Chairs and Members of the Committee for the opportunity to provide testimony in support of HB 6485.

In 2019, I purchased an electric cargo bike with the intention of reducing my car reliance, in particular for my work commute from Woodbridge into New Haven. My E-Bike cost \$1,500 dollars. This is the average price point for an electric bike and I financed my purchase into a year of reasonable monthly payments. The average cost of a new electric vehicle is \$36,000 dollars, which places it beyond what many low to moderate income households can afford. I tracked my bike commuting last year using the CT Rides App and it was 942 miles not driven in the car, \$542 dollars and 42 gallons of gasoline saved and most importantly, 842 pounds of emissions prevented, all on a humble bicycle, riding on the same roads that cars use.

Charles Rothenberger of Save the Sound testified earlier that he didn't believe wouldn't avail themselves to switch to an E-Bike instead of a car, and so I just want to say "Hi" we exist and we're here.

Air pollution is a leading cause of asthma in children. In 2019, the cities of Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven, and Waterbury had a combined total of 7,720 hospitalizations and emergency room visits due to asthma at a cost of \$42 million dollars. In 2018, those four cities saw 8,589 hospitalizations and emergency room visits at a cost of \$43 million.

The goals of CHEAPR program are "to help Connecticut meet its clean air and energy goals." I don't believe we can achieve those goals by excluding the electric bicycle. The cost to leave out a whole mode of electric transportation is way too high for city residents suffering from the pollution of our car centric world. The electric bicycle should be held up as commensurate to the electric vehicle in our climate and health toolkit, particularly because of its lower cost of entry.

I ask this committee to work towards clearly defining E-Bikes under Connecticut State Law and require Connecticut DEEP and the CHEAPR Board to run a pilot program offering incentives for E-Bikes and E-mopeds, specifically focused on low to middle income households to ensure an equitable electric vehicle future. Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you for your testimony. And that's an incredible savings when you start to multiply that, it's worth looking at. Questions from any other Members of the legislature?

PHIL MAINIERO: Representative Lemar has a question.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Chairman Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you Kate for your testimony today and for your testimony two weeks ago as well. I think you provide the perfect example of what we should be looking at this with program. It was just a few years ago when we worked hard to resurrect the program and provide stable funding for it and it was, I feel, incumbent upon us at that time to continue to reevaluate the program to make sure it's keeping up with new technology and new trends and I think the goal of this study, and I think you've outlined exactly why we need it.

I looked at what California's done with a similar program where they've targeted investments and very specific zip codes even where they increased rates if you live in a zone where there is higher rates of asthma or there is lack of publicly available transportation, I've looked a socioeconomic levels in certain zip codes and said like this is where we really need to target this program to make sure we're maximizing its effectiveness.

And to me, like you are the perfect example of that, like we could target someone who would otherwise be driving a vehicle into downtown New Haven every day and generating, and I don't begrudge anyone who is driving to New Haven everyday but you'd be generating additional carbon pollution, particular matter pollutions but instead you're not. And if we could make an investment in another 500 people with this program to get them off the roads out of their vehicles and into clean energy vehicles I think that's the key and I appreciate your testimony because I think that was what I had in mind when we started this program a few years ago and I'm hoping we can get there with it. So thank you again.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, Chairman. Questions from any other Members of the legislature? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony and your

commitment. It's truly appreciated. Phil, next speaker?

PHIL MAINIERO: Our next speaker is Amy McLean. Amy if you can hear us if you could unmute yourself?

AMY MCLEAN: Yes, thank you.

PHIL MAINIERO: Wonderful, we can hear you.

AMY MCLEAN: Yeah, thank you. My name is Amy McLean. Thank you for having me, Honorable Chairperson Lemar, Vice-Chairs Cassano and Simms, Ranking Member Carney, and Somers and all of you Committee Members who are really hanging in there in this weird time where we have to listen via virtual or appreciate it. For those of you who don't know Acadia Center, is a clean energy nonprofit that's regional and we are advocates for equity clean energy future for Connecticut, tackling regulatory and legislative energy policy, transportation, energy efficiency, beneficial electrification, utility innovation, and renewable energy.

So that being we are here to support the HB 6485, the AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONNECTICUT HYDROGEN AND ELECTRIC AUTOMOBILE PURCHASE REBATE. The act concerning the CHEAPR study.

We actually at Acadia Center supports this and as a new member of the newly formed CHEAPR board, Acadia Center - myself is in a unique position to understand the importance and the need for the program to be made accessible to all residents of Connecticut. The board recently approved new funding levels as you heard from Barry and you heard from Charles with a framework that improves the equity elements of the rebates which is a step in the right direction it needs to be studied and monitored to ensure that the new funding levels will be successful and adequate moving forward. This is the reason Acadia Center is urging decision makers to approve this legislation.

The language is very clear in this legislation, I won't read it to you, you have it but it is very clear, it says what it wants, says what it means.

So you heard Barry earlier about tracking the performance and the or the lack thereof of tracking the performance and that is the only way this program or any program can be moved into successful future. There is a concern that in the past year to two years the program has been underperforming, you heard Barry talk about that and we are concerned.

The members of the board consists of lots of different stakeholders and we are working really hard to make sure that all of the arguments, all of the being to take, coming to bear so we can continue to raise this program up and get more people into electric vehicles. I am really happy to go after the last speaker because Acadia Central also supports E-Bike rebates. In Massachusetts there is Bill right now that we are supportive of and we've had the debate, Charles is a good friend, we've had this debate and we will continue to have it but maybe it's not this fund but we need to incentivize E-Bikes and, you know, right now in Massachusetts there are expanding the EV rebates to include \$500 dollar rebate for E-Bikes and we are supportive of that because the access to these clean energy and clean modes of transportation isn't reaching all parties.

So we need to do what we need to do. So I'm just here to say let's be brave, let's do things that might be a little out of the box, maybe that wasn't the original intent of some, but, you know, EVs are not accessible to all. So I think we need to do that and do it well. I just also want to say I purchased an E-Bike last July and I stopped driving my car and it was because first of all, I didn't have to commute anymore but I was commuting around where I needed to go. I got a bag, put it on the back, I went to the grocery store on it and I didn't

track mine through the Transportation DOT but I tracked mine through some other tracking device. I went everywhere on it and was just a revelation. So it's not something that the cargo bikes are, they are utilitarian, they are not a.

PHIL MAINIERO: Amy, I hate to interrupt you but were right at about your time limit, just so you can summarize and take questions.

AMY MCLEAN: Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you. Your enthusiasm is why you went long, I fully understand that. Representative Steinberg, you had a question.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair and Amy good to see you and thank you for testifying today. We're pleased you're supportive of this legislation. Now that you serve on the Board itself, and you have a broad perspective on the opportunity that CHEAPR represents beyond even the E-Bikes are there other things that we should be talking about to broaden access to electric vehicle of any sort particularly for those in the intercities and lower income?

AMY MCLEAN: Well part of the changes that have been made are to expand rebates into used electric vehicles which was really necessary. It's still going to be a bit of a reach for many so I think, yeah I think the E-bikes, I think Charles had some really very concrete ideas and I think that the EV Coalition folks like Barry and others this is their passion and they have really good ideas, so I think it is a process and if we can just use this study as a way to identify these other innovative ways to get more people to have the ability to have it then I think that would be a good first step.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Thank you, I missed Charles' testimony.

AMY MCLEAN: He submitted it.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): I was at a Public Health Hearing so I will look at that. Thank you very much Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you. Are there any other questions? Questions from any other Members of the legislature? Seeing none, Amy thank you very much for your testimony.

AMY MCLEAN: Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Phil, our next speaker?

ANTHONY CHEROLIS: Hello. This is Anthony Cherolis, am I the next speaker?

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Phil you are muted so anything you were telling us.

PHIL MAINIERO: Can you hear me?

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Yes, now we can.

PHIL MAINIERO: Okay, sorry about that. Yes, I believe we have Joe Miano followed by Tony Anthony Cherolis and Lawrence Fox in the room. Joe if you can hear us if you could unmute.

JOE MIANO: I'm here. Can you hear me.

PHIL MAINIERO: Yes we can, go ahead.

JOE MIANO: Okay, Good Afternoon Representative Lemar, Senator Cassano, Senator Somers, Representative Carney, the distinguished Members of the Transportation Committee, and my hometown Representative of the Town of Wethersfield Representative Amy Morrin Bello. Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to speak to you today in OPPOSITION to SB 921, AN ACT PROHIBITING CERTAIN

VEHICLE STORAGE AGREEMENTS AS A PRECONDITION OF  
VEHICLE TOWING.

My name is Giuseppe Miano, I am a resident of Wethersfield and the owner of an automotive and towing business in the City of Hartford. I am also the Past President, Past Treasurer and current Board Member of the Towing and Recovery Professionals of Connecticut as well as a Board Member of the Auto Body Association of Connecticut. Together these associations represent hundreds of small local businesses in every town in this state. The towing and recovery industry works every day, night, weekend, 24/7, regardless of the weather conditions to keep our roads open and safe for the traveling public, as well as commerce.

Together these two Associations strongly oppose Senate Bill 921. Don't be fooled by the Insurance Association of Connecticut and their member companies. This Bill does more than prohibit the owners of towing and repair business to not contract for more than 24-hours of storage.

The soul reason for asking for the introduction of this Bill is to get around Connecticut's Consumer Protection Laws that stop insurance companies from steering repair work to their preferred providers Connecticut General Statutes 38a-354 and 14-65f as in frank. The anti-steering laws are there to protect the public and give them the ability to freely choose the automotive repair location of their choice. Also, the Bill seeks to limit the storage fees that insurance companies would pay to 24-hours when often times vehicles require a longer period of time to properly repair the vehicle. Many of these repairs cannot be completed within 24-hours. If this Bill were to pass, the owner of the repair shop would not be able to recover storage fees from the insurance companies or for their insured's damaged vehicle.

Frankly, the insured, your constituents, pay their monthly premiums to the insurance company for, excuse me, these exact circumstances, when they unfortunately need to store their vehicle after an accident. Under this Bill that would be an excluded expense from their policy and the consumer would have to pay the storage fee directly, not the insurance company. If passed, this Bill will cause serious financial harm to consumers involved in an accident and local small businesses because insurance companies within that first 24-hours will steer jobs away from our local shops and to their direct repair facilities and the consumer would be required to pay additional storage fees. These direct repair facilities put insurance company profits over the safety and quality of the repair.

Also I wanted to emphasize that this legislation doesn't address the bad actors but it permits insurance companies to steer consumers away from legitimate agreements. Anti-steering is anti-consumer. This legislation is anti-towing, anti-consumer and only benefits the insurance companies. Let's face it, contracts is basically a guarantee to repair the vehicle, it's an authorization to repair. Everything in a repair contract, and I know Representative O'Dea was talking to Sal Sena, the President about that. Everything in the repair contract is nothing new, it's nothing that we, any body shop, any towing place would put in there to try to trick anybody. It's everything that comes out of the regulations from the Department of Motor Vehicles. So if you look in the regulations at the Department everything that is on a repair contract is in the Department of Motor Vehicles in their regulations. So it's nothing that we circumvented, it's there, we're not trying to hid anything. And no one is forced to sign anything. You come to the shop, you get your car towed, obviously you can't sign on the side of the highway in lieu of not paying your tow bill. So the car has to go back to the shop, the tow is finished there and then you

sign for a contract to get your car repaired, but no one, absolutely no one forces you to do that.

I ask you to reject this attempt by the Insurance Association of Connecticut and their member companies and support consumers and hundreds of small Connecticut businesses. Thank you for this opportunity to testify. I would be glad to answer any questions at this time.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, Joe. Questions of any Members of the legislature? Phil I don't see any. Do you have any Phil?

PHIL MAINIERO: No, I do not see any hands raised at this time.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): All right. Thank you for your testimony. Joe, appreciate it.

JOE MIANO: Thank you very much, appreciate it.

PHIL MAINIERO: And the next speaker I have is Lawrence Fox. Lawrence I see you in the room if you could unmute and give us a wave.

LAWRENCE FOX: I can you hear me?

PHIL MAINIERO: Yes, we can, begin whenever you're ready.

LAWRENCE FOX: Thank you so much. Thank you Chair Lemar, Vice Chair Cassano, Vice Chair Simms, Ranking Members Carney and Somers and Members of the Committee. My name is Lawrence Fox I currently and I am Chair of the State Contracting Standards Board (CSB). I am here today to testify in opposition to Raised Bill 920. AN ACT CONCERNING PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS. And I know you've heard, I've been on since the beginning of the hearing and there has been a lot of testimony on this and I have submitted some testimony.

I just would like to make a few comments. I am concerned that the way this Bill is currently being proposed, it eliminates very important accountability and transparency for these private public partnerships. It's worth noting that the current Bill which has been around, I believe since 2011, the Contracting Standards Board has never, received one request under that Bill for a private public partnership.

The elimination of the scrutiny that is provided by Section 4e-16 I think is potentially very problematic. I wish I could report that our experience on the board is that Connecticut is world class when it comes to its contracting and its procurement. But we are not close to that as you know. And we've uncovered at the board, a number of issues in contracting and procurement. Connecticut has a very decentralized procurement system. Now you have departments like the Department of Transportation which has a very sophisticated contracting and procurement operation but then you have every single agency doesn't have the kinds of resources they have and we have uncovered issues in quasi-publics, I know that the Transportation Committee Port Authority.

I think it is very, very concerning. The opening up of what was a very specific kind of definition of what projects might be eligible for private public partnerships in his proposal it's open to every single agency. Most of the agencies of the state don't even have fulltime procurement people and even the operating agencies that do run into a number of problems. I think that it threatens even more transparency and accountability which will come back to haunt us.

I'll stop there and take any questions. You have my testimony.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you for your testimony. Questions from any other Members of

the legislature? Phil, do you see any?

PHIL MAINIERO: Senator, I see no questions.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you for your testimony. It's very helpful. Thank you for coming forward.

PHIL MAINIERO: And our next speaker should be Anthony Cherolis. Anthony if you can hear us if you could turn your camera on.

ANTHONY CHEROLIS: Yep.

PHIL MAINIERO: Wonderful, we can hear you and see you so you can begin when you're ready.

ANTHONY CHEROLIS: All right, thank you very much and thank you the Transportation Committee and the Transportation Committee Chairs. I wanted to touch base on a couple of items today. The first, I'm really excited to see the Cheshire Bikeway as the proposed Bill, that's and important connection for the state and the larger northeast region and beyond that.

The other item I wanted to speak to was the proposed Bill 6485, that has to do with the equity study on the CT EV rebate program. I am also a member of, a board member of CT CHEAPR. Interestingly I don't have a car and run a bike shop. So we come at this from an entirely different perspective. Well, I live in an low income community and neighborhood in Hartford where the median household income is less than \$30,000 dollars a year, getting pretty close to the average cost of EV. So we appreciate that the Connecticut CHEAPR Board program has expanded to include LMI, low and moderate income incentives as well as used EV incentives for low to moderate income interested parties in electric vehicle and clean transportation but the reality is that low income households don't have access to electric vehicle incentives even with those LMI. They really

should be called moderate income incentives. They don't reach low income households.

So I do think this is important for the legislature to clarify that a bicycle is in fact a vehicle by state law. The argument was made while the CT CHEAPR Board was evaluating the possibility of a pilot project or E-Bike incentive that the CT CHEAPR Board could not because a bicycle is not considered a vehicle and therefore an electric bicycle is not considered a battery electric vehicle. It just sort of blew my mind as a lead cycling instructor that teaches that a bicycle in most cases should be treated like a vehicle when used on local and state roadways.

The other item I want to bring up aside from the definition of a vehicle and the interest in pilot E-Bike program potentially with the CT CHEAPR fund, it not that in other states it's been done with things like the Connecticut Green Banks Funding. There are multiple ways to go about this. We need to be innovative and address the mobility, clean mobility needs and job access needs to the low income households as well. The Cash for Clunkers Program, the transit aspect of the Cash for Clunkers Program as well as E-Bike and motorcycle aspects in California are very interesting and already in place and targeted to address low income households and clean transportation.

And the last point I wanted to make before I close and give a final thank you was that it's concerning to me that we have so many boards and commissions that don't have persons of color represented. I think there is an opportunity for the legislature to make that a requirement not just to study but there are diverse representation on these boards and commission because the definition of the board sets who is on the board, so it might make sense to ask a positioner who on this board and others that is designated by the Black and Puerto Rican Caucus because right now I don't think there are any

persons of color on the CHEAPR Board and I'm just takin a guess but I'm probably the lowest income member and I'm a pretty old white guy. So that's what I've got on CHEAPR.

I think it's a great program. I would like to see it funded to the level that it would actually meet its goals. We are at \$3 million dollars a year and that \$15,000 million dollars over five years. I think the need to meet the 2025 Regional Goals for the Multistate Agreement for electric vehicle is closer to \$80 to \$100 million dollars so \$3 million dollars for a year in the CHEAPR fund doesn't get us there with about a half of EVs getting a rebate and having significant influence on whether or not a person purchase an EV. So that's what I got. Thank you for your time.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you for your testimony, very interesting. Questions Committee Members? Chairman Lemar? No, okay. I don't see any questions.

PHIL MAINIERO: I don't see any questions.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you for your testimony. Very informative, we will clearly look at this. Next speaker?

PHIL MAINIERO: And the next speaker I have is Jeff Aiosa. Jeff if you could unmute, you can turn your camera on.

JEFF AIOSA: Good Afternoon, Chairmen Lemar and Cassano, Ranking Members Somers and Carney and Members of the Transportation Committee my name is Jeff Aiosa. I serve as the Legislative Co-Chair of the Connecticut Automotive Retailers Association also known as CARA which represents 270 new car dealers and their 14,000 employees. I am also President and Owner of Carriage House Mercedes Benz of New London, and I'm also the Director of the National Automobile Dealers Association also known

as NADA. I am here today to testify in support of House Bill 6485 AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONNECTICUT HYDROGEN AND ELECTRIC AUTOMOBILE PURCHASE REBATE also known as CHRAPR.

CARA has been proudly partnered CHEAPR Program since the inception of the program in 2015. CARA assisted the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, DEEP in creating the CHEAPR Program, program which incentivizes car buyers to go electric by offering rebates toward the purchase or lease of eligible battery electric, plug-in hybrid electric or fuel cell electric vehicles. CARA works closely with DEEP to provide updates to dealerships and to facilitate trainings for the program, and Connecticut's local dealers promote the program to the car buying public. CHEAPR has been successful over the years because it is modeled on the time proven franchise system designed to sell vehicles at the local level.

The CHEAPR program is currently in transition and we are excited to see the program grow. Soon the program will expand to include used electric vehicles, and enhanced rebates will be available for those who are low to moderate wage earners. House Bill 6485 requires the CHEAPR board to analyze ways to ensure the equitable distribution of grants to residents buying electric vehicles in Connecticut. This is so important because the only way we will see more electric cars on the road is to make sure these cars are available to a broader market.

Connecticut new car dealers are committed selling electric and we look forward to a continued partnership with DEEP and the CHEAPR program. We urge you to pass HB 6485. Thank you for your time and I'm happy to answer any questions.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, Mr. Aiosa. Are there questions from the Committee? Any Members of the Committee? Phil do you see any?

PHIL MAINIERO: I do not see any hands raised at this time, Senator.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): All right. Jeff, thank you for your testimony. Appreciate it.

JEFF AISOA: Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Are there any other speakers?

PHIL MAINIERO: Yes, our final speaker Ed Valente. Ed if you can hear us, you can turn your camera on and unmute.

ED VALENTE: Yes, can you hear me?

PHIL MAINIERO: Yes, we can.

ED VALENTE: Great. Good Afternoon, Senator Cassano, Representative Lemar, Senator Somers, Representative Carney and Members of the Committee, my name is Ed Valente I am the General Chairman of the Association of Commuter Rail Employees Local Division I, ACRE for short. We represent approximately 2,000 workers at Metro North Railroad. I'd like to offer comments in support of Bill 576 AN ACT CONCERNING THE EXPANSION OF PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE ON THE WATERBURY BRANCH OF THE METRO NORTH COMMUTER RAILROAD.

I've heard a lot of the testimony today and I've seen a lot of good points and pretty much all my thoughts on this subject, but I'll give my testimony in support as well. We stand in strong support of this legislation. This legislation will help expand passenger rail service on the Waterbury Branch of MTA Metro North Commuter Railroad by increasing the number and frequency of trains running and by adding stops in Derby, Seymour, and Ansonia. Many of our members work on this line and they can tell you firsthand that there is a great demand for its service.

A prime example of the current demand is ridership levels on the Waterbury line in 2002, during the pandemic, outperformed all other train lines in Connecticut, that's close to 43 percent of 2019 ridership levels. Simply stated people rely on this service. A popular phrase fits here that was used before but I'll use it again, "If you build they will come. Improving and expanding this line will improve Connecticut's economy and take the stress of our highway system. Our members reported to work during the pandemic each and every day even though they knew the danger of transmission of COVID-19. A number of MTA employees were infected with the virus and sadly a number passed away because of it.

Closing down the rail system was never an option as it would have dramatically effected the essential services and our economy in a negative way. With interests rate low and the possible stimulus infrastructure Bill coming from Washington now is the time to plan for the improvements needed for the Waterbury line with additional stops created in the Naugatuck Valley.

This legislation is vital to the region and the state. Thank you for the opportunity to submit this testimony.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Thank you, Ed. Any questions from Members of the Committee? Seeing none, I appreciate your testimony. Many have joined you, it makes a lot of sense to move forward and we will hear that in Committee. Thanks for coming in.

ED VALENTE. Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Phil do you see any other speakers?

PHIL MAINIERO: No, Senator I do not see any speakers at this time.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): All right, I'm going to turn it back to Chairman Lemar. Any closing comments? Words of advice, directions, meetings whatever?

REP. LEMAR (96TH): This concludes the third of our four Public Hearings. In your inbox you should see an agenda for next week's Public Hearing that we will have on next Wednesday. That should conclude the bulk of our Public Hearing processes and we'll go through the next few weeks with screening and talking to members about their Bills and trying to get a final product for final JF Day Activities. That being said, we do have to continue the Committee we started earlier this morning. I think we were about to vote in unanimous support of all of those Bills pretty quickly. So if the Clerk could send out the link back to that Committee meeting we can join everyone back over there as soon as we conclude here. Thanks.

PHIL MAINIERO: Just quickly, Mr. Chairman earlier you had mentioned that you might give a 15 or 20 minute window before restarting the Committee meeting, is that still the plan?

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Yes, I want to make sure everyone gets an opportunity to get the email, know where they are going to rejoin us and have an opportunity to get in and so if we want to reconvene at 4:20 p.m.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): That sounds good.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Representative Carney.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): We are in recess until 4:20 p.m. No, we are out of the Hearing.

REP. LEMAR (96TH): Yeh, we will close the Public Hearing and then we will reconvene the Committee meeting at 4:20 at the link provided in the CGA E-mail inbox.

146  
SP/mi

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

March 3, 2021  
10:00 A.M.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): Public Hearing is closed.