1	JOINT HEARING BEFORE THE NEW YORK STATE				
2	SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND				
3	SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE AND CAPITAL INVESTMENT				
4					
5	PUBLIC HEARING:				
6	METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MTA) BUDGET AND FINANCES				
7	TO EXAMINE THE CHANGES NECESSARY TO PREVENT ANNUAL OPERATING DEFICITS, STOP THE CONTINUING CYCLE OF				
8	INCREASED FARES AND DECREASED SERVICES, AND DISCUSS FUNDING OPTIONS FOR THE CAPITAL PLAN				
9					
10					
11	Legislative Office Building Hearing Room A				
12	181 State Street Albany, New York 12247				
13	March 2, 2015				
14	10:30 a.m. to -1:30 p.m.				
15	PRESIDING:				
16					
17	Senator Joseph E. Robach, Chairman NYS Senate Standing Committee on Transportation				
18	Senator Carl L. Marcellino Chairman, NYS Standing Committee on Infrastructure				
19	and Capital Investment;				
20	Vice Chairman, NYS Senate Standing Committee on Transportation				
21					
22	PRESENT:				
23	Senator John J. Bonacic				
24	Senator Thomas Croci				
25	Senator Martin Malavé Dilan				

```
1
        PRESENT (continued):
 2
           Senator Simcha Felder
 3
           Senator Martin J. Golden
 4
           Senator Brad Hoylman
 5
           Senator Jack Martins
 6
           Senator Terrence P. Murphy
 7
           Senator Bill Perkins
 8
           Senator Daniel L. Squadron
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

			3
1	SPEAKERS:	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2		1.0	0.4
3	Thomas F. Prendergast Chairman and Chief Executive Officer Robert Foran	10	24
4	Chief Financial Officer Craig Stewart		
5	Senior Director for Capital Programs Metropolitan Transportation Authority		
6			
7	Carman Bianco President MTA - New York City Transit	10	24
8	Darryl Irick	10	24
9	President MTA - Bus Company	10	24
10		1.0	0.4
11	Joseph Giulietti President Metro-North Railroad	10	24
12		1.0	•
13	James Ferrara President MTA - Bridges and Tunnels	10	24
14	William Wandanaan	100	1 2 2
15	William Henderson Executive Director Ellyn Shannon	109	122
16	Associate Director Permanent Citizens Advisory Committee		
17	to Metropolitan Transportation Authority		
18	LaTonya Crisp-Sauray	138	151
19	Recording Secretary Transport Workers Union, Local 100	130	131
20	_		
21	Dr. James Melius Administrator New York State Laborers	138	151
22	New Tolk beate habolers		
23	George Trickio Business Manager	138	151
24	New York State Laborers, Local 1298		
25			

			4
1	SPEAKERS (continued):	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2	Nadine Lemmon	154	174
3	NY and Federal Policy Coordinator Tri-State Transportation Campaign		
4	Alex Matthiessen	154	174
5	Campaign Director Move NY	177	177
6			
7	00		
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

SENATOR MARCELLINO: I'm just going to give the members about two minutes more because travel is somewhat delayed.

We will be on hold for two more minutes, and then we'll start.

[Pause in the proceeding.]

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Thank you.

This is a hearing of the Senate

Infrastructure and Capital Investment, and the

Transportation, Committee.

I'm Chair of the Infrastructure Committee.

Senator Robach is Chair of the Transportation Committee. I am his Vice Chair.

The purposes of this hearing is to examine changes, any changes, that may be necessary to prevent annual operating deficits in the MTA and stop the continuing cycle of increased fares and decreased services.

The MTA provides public transportation in and around the New York City area, stretching into seven counties in New York State and two counties in Connecticut.

The system includes the Long Island Railroad, the Metro-North Railroad, Staten Island Railway, the Long Island Bus, MTA Bus, New York City Transit, and

the bridges and tunnels into New York City.

The MTA has an operating budget of about 14.4 billion.

In deference to "Mr. Spock" passing away, I'm going to say, 14.467.92, approximately.

We won't do that.

But, with over 69,000 employees for 2015, with a predicted operating-budget deficit of 322 million in 2018.

Chairman Prendergast, if you would correct me if I'm wrong, when you -- in your comments, if I've made any errors in the numbers.

The proposed 32.1 billion capital program for 2015 to 2019 has a projected funding gap of 15.2 billion, almost half of the total costs.

This hearing is to get some answers as to what steps will be needed to take to have a fiscally strong and in-the-black MTA.

One of the things that our Conference in

the -- I'm sure the Senate as a whole, but,

specifically, I'll speak for the Republican

Conference in the Senate, is we are about to get rid

of the MTA payroll tax.

We've done away with a good portion of it. We want to do away with the rest of it.

So we're going to ask for a plan that you may come up with that would help us to accomplish that task and keep, and I stress, keep the MTA on solid fiscal footing.

As fees and fares are increased, it is imperative that the funds support improvements to the transportation network where the fares and fees are raised.

Fare increases on the Long Island Railroad, for example, should not, and I stress the word "not" support the rest of the MTA system.

Where possible they should support themselves, if this is possible.

If it's not, we'd love to know why, and an explanation, and maybe we can work something out.

This hearing is being broadcast on the NewYorkSenate.gov website, and will be archived on the Transportation Committee page.

I am joined this morning by, to my left,
Senator Martins; to the far right, Senator Dilan,
past chairman of the Transportation Committee; next
to him, Senator Bonacic, Senator Croci, and
Senator Golden.

I'm going to step back a second, instead of leading the questions, because Senator Bonacic has a

press conference that he's going to have to deal 1 2 with this morning. It was on, John. 3 SENATOR BONACIC: Yes. 4 5 SENATOR MARCELLINO: They're all on. 6 don't have to push it. 7 SENATOR BONACIC: Excellent. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 8 9 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Let him ask questions before opening, gentlemen, because he's got to move. 10 11 Okay? 12 Thank you. 13 SENATOR BONACIC: First of all, good morning. 14 Quite an impressive table of representatives. 15 Thank you for the job that you do. 16 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Debbie, can he be heard? 17 SENATOR BONACIC: It's not an easy job. 18 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Sean [ph.], can you push that button? 19 20 Just push it once. 21 That's it. 22 SENATOR BONACIC: I'm going to be quick. 23 I represent, predominantly, Orange County. 24 I think, quite frankly, they get the least 25 back, in terms of services, for the money that they

generate.

I'm going to ask you -- I'm going to give you some numbers and then ask you the question.

If my numbers are wrong, I'd like you to tell me.

I show that the current MTA capital plan for the Long Island Railroad is 3.1 billion, for Metro-North it's 2.6 billion.

The ridership is pretty much equal. Close. There's parity there.

The revenue generated from Metro-North is about 717 million.

That from Long Island ridership is 702.

These are the numbers that I pulled from your report.

So, I would ask you to give consideration to some parity of investment in Orange County so we can have more service.

And what am I talking about?

I'm talking about, number one, to establish a rail yard in Orange County, where we could have more trains and a rail yard that would allow for more service and passing sightings.

Roughly, about 100 million apiece, I'd ask you to give consideration to that.

And I thank you for being here. 1 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2 3 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Thank you, Senator. I'd ask -- for normal procedure, we've got 4 5 opening statements. I would ask that people who are testifying, 6 7 you don't necessarily have to read every word to your presentation. We have copies. 8 9 The faster we go through that, the quicker we can get to questions, and then we can move on to 10 11 resolving the problem. We've been joined by Senator Murphy, to my 12 left. 13 14 SENATOR MURPHY: Good morning. 15 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Mr. Prendergast. 16 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Good morning, 17 Chairmen Marcellino and Robach, and other members of the committees. 18 19 Thank you for holding this hearing and asking 20 me to testify. 21 I'm joined by all the MTA's agency 22 presidents, with the exception of Pat Nowakowski who 23 was unable to attend due to personal issues at home. 24 Carmen Bianco is seated to my right, 25 president of New York City Transit;

Darryl Irick is seated to my left, president of MTA Bus;

Joe Giulietti is seated, too, to my left, president of Metro-North Railroad;

And, Jim Ferrera, president of Bridges and Tunnels, to the city, to my right;

Our chief financial officer is Bob Foran, at the far end of the table to my right;

And, Craig Stewart is the senior director of Capital Programs, at the end of the table to my left.

In the broadest terms, Senators, and all of us, you and we, are here today because the MTA is essential, not only to the 8.7 million customers we serve every day, but also to New York's daily life and the statewide economy and growth, so investing in this operation and its capital needs is essential.

Governor Cuomo recently released the proposed 2015-16 executive budget, and we're pleased that we once again see increased State aid.

Total funding for the MTA increased by almost 141 million over the State's 2014-15 enacted budget.

This increase includes an almost \$37 million boost to our operating budget, and more than

104 million being transferred to the MTA capital program.

It also provides more than 1 billion in new funding for the 2015-19 capital program.

In addition, the MTA's 2015 budget and financial plan, approved by our board in January, presents a fully transparent view of our current and 4-year financial outlook.

This strongly reaffirms our organization-wide commitment to cost-cutting, and it shows that we've already cut more than \$1 billion out of our annual operating budget.

Here are just two examples.

We've consolidated all of our headquarters into 2 Broadway in Lower Manhattan, and through this move we not only reduced operating costs, but we will monetize the former headquarters at 341, 345, 347 Madison Avenue and generate hundreds of millions of dollars for our capital program.

We also issued 479 million of refunding bonds, and completed associated restructurings of existing escrows, for a total savings of over 110 million.

But when it comes to running more efficiently we're not finished.

New savings initiatives are being identified in the areas of prompt-payment discounts, workers' comp, energy-management consolidations, purchasing, inventory, and employee benefits.

These initiatives will raise our total annual savings target to 1.6 billion a year by 2018.

This is an effort we started after the financial crisis in 2009 and we continue to maintain it.

It's the most aggressive cost-cutting in the MTA's history, and we're realizing savings through improved operations in three critical and important ways:

First of all, without these savings, we could not have reduced our projected fare and toll increases from about 7.5 percent every other year, to 4 percent every other year; or, roughly, 2 percent a year.

Secondly, these savings have allowed us to add 157 million back into service and quality enhancements since 2002; services that were cut, and services restored, and additional quality enhancements made for our customers.

They have helped us to put \$290 million a year into a pay-as-you-go capital account that will

generate up to 5.4 billion for the 2015-19 program, which, for the MTA, is the most important topic today.

The capital program, as you know, is a series of 5-year investments, beginning in 1982, that allow us to renew, enhance, and expand our 5,000-square-mile network.

And over the past 30 years, we have invested some 150 billion through that program in the vital infrastructure that keeps New York moving, and we could not have done that without the State Legislature and their support.

Yet, these investments have revitalized and maintained our transit system, and they have revitalized our region, enabling improvements that have brought customers back to our system in droves, while creating jobs in the thousands.

Today's ridership is at all-time-high levels.

Before October 2013, we had never recorded 6 million subway riders in a day. But we exceeded that number on 29 days in the last four months of last year and set an all-time high for monthly subway ridership last October.

Metro-North's ridership has almost doubled since its founding in 1983, to 83 million last year,

and the Long Island Railroad's ridership of more than 83 million, make them the two most heavily traveled commuter railroads in the country.

Until recently, most of the ridership growth was from reverse commutes traveled between suburban destinations and during off-peak hours, evenings, and weekends.

But, today, we're seeing that ridership growth in all of these areas; and more importantly, during peak hours.

We're seeing more and more customers who need to wait two, three, and even four trains before they can board during rush hours.

Our network is stretched almost to its capacity.

Trains are more crowded than ever and commutes are more difficult. A minor delay on one train at rush hour can have a massive ripple effect, leading to overcrowding on the platform, doors being held open at every station, and spiraling delays for every train that follows.

If that happened on a regular basis, the impact would be severe for millions of riders, their employers, and the region's economy.

These ridership trends show no signs of

abating in the foreseeable future, and with the future in mind, we convened a panel of experts to inform the development of our current capital program, especially with respect to two important areas: climate change and changing demographics.

This transportation-reinvention commission stated some very simple truths in their report:

More than 2 million additional people are expected to live in the MTA region by 2040, putting increasing pressure on a system that's already largely at capacity;

Demographic shifts are driving new and evolving customer expectations, service needs, and accessibility requirements, and the current system is simply not fully equipped to meet these changing needs.

With these challenges in mind, the MTA board this fall approved the proposed 2015-19 capital program that will allow us to build capacity, meet growing needs and those expectations, and, most importantly, renew our system to keep it safe and reliable, because capacity is by no means our only challenge.

Maintaining a system as large and as old as ours is unavoidably expensive.

If we want the system to continue operating safely and reliably, we must continue to invest heavily in what we call "a state of good repair."

Senators, I ask you to keep this fact in mind.

Safety and reliability projects, including track replacement, structural repairs, signal-system improvements, and replacement fleets, comprise fully two-thirds of the annexed capital program.

These expenditures are not for anything fancy. They are simply essential, and the reason why is simple: safe and reliable service is our number-one job every day.

Here are a few examples of the kinds of maintenance and good-repair spending we must not postpone:

196 million to complete the installation of positive train control.

The best and safest commuter-railroad system in -- of around in -- at both Metro-North and Long Island Railroad, for a total cost of just under a billion dollars.

We'll also begin modern new signal system on the E, F, M, and R lines in Queens, and the B, F, M lines in Manhattan.

This system, which is fully in place on the L Line, and under construction on the 7, allows us to run more trains, move more people, ease crowding, and provide better, safer service. It will allow us to replace signals from the 1930s that could jeopardize safety and reliability if they remain in our system much longer.

And remember, the foundation of our subway system was built more than 110 years ago, making modern signals the best and only way we can significantly add capacity.

We'll replace 86 miles of subway track, and we'll continue to invest 1,000 signal components, most of our components you'll never see: electrical substations, pumps, and tunnel lighting.

These projects may not be glamorous, but together with normal replacement of our trains and buses, they are key to moving our people safely and reliably.

The 2015-19 program will allow us to expand our systems to better accommodate current ridership levels, and prepare for the even more growth that we're already seeing in the system.

And in a region with new understanding of natural hazards, the system expansion will protect

us from making our transit system and network ever more redundant.

We will finish phase one of the Second Avenue subway to build capacity and ease congestion on the most crowded line in the country, the Lexington Avenue Line.

And, through the 2015-19 program, we will begin construction on the second phase of the Second Avenue subway, from the Upper East Side into East Harlem.

We will continue to advance the East Side access project, easing the commute of some 160,000 Long Island Railroad customers every day.

We will complete the Long Island Railroad double-track project, which will improve service and reliability by adding a second track to the railroad's Ronkonkoma branch, or, main line.

And, we will begin development of Penn

Access, a project that will add four new Metro-North

stations in the Bronx, and open a new Metro

[unintelligible] point directly into Penn Station.

Through this project we will provide critical system resiliency to the over 270,000 Metro-North riders. And for the first time ever, customers in Co-Op City, Morris Park, Parkchester, and

Hunts Point will have a one-seat rail ride directly to the heart of Manhattan.

Dramatically improving our transit network is hardly the benefit of a fully funded 2015-19 program.

The MTA's capital program and the jobs it creates are an integral part of our region's economy and economic growth.

Just last month, the Urban Land Institute of New York and the Permanent Citizens Advisory

Committee to the MTA published a report, examining the intrinsic connection between a healthy transit system and a healthy, vibrant economy.

According to this report, since 1982, the MTA capital program has transformed the region's public economic -- transportation system into a truly economic -- crucial economic asset, helping New York achieve global economic preeminence that few could have imagined in the economic crises of the '70s.

Investments in the MTA have generated economic benefits for communities across

New York State, with major vendors opening plants to both fulfill the transportation needs locally and across North America.

Indeed, the capital-program investments

create hundreds of thousands of jobs throughout

New York State and nationally, and a new study by

KPMG proves it.

We commissioned KPMG to look at how many jobs will be created by the 2015-19 capital program, and the results also published last month are staggering.

KPMG found that, in the tradition of the MTA's previous capital program, a fully funded 2015-19 program will create more than 400,000 New York State jobs and generate nearly 52 billion in economic output. These jobs, the study found, will be created in every corner of New York State.

In 2013, our board approved a nearly \$2 billion contract with Kawasaki to build new rail -- commuter rail trains. This order alone is expected to generate 1500 jobs at the Kawasaki plant in Yonkers and to suppliers upstate.

The plant makes railcars and parts for the transit systems around the world, in Boston, Virginia, Maryland, and Taipei, while creating high-tech-paying jobs.

But you can bet it wouldn't be in Yonkers, New York, without the MTA. We've already also purchased more than 2,000 of the 3,000 railcars built at Bombardier's 100,000-square-foot facility in Plattsburgh, including a new rail fleet for MTA commuter railroads in 2007.

In October we submitted the 2015-19 capital program to the capital-program review board so we could begin a dialogue.

One concern shared by all parties is the funding.

We have identified sources for half of the money needed to fund the program.

All three levels government must understand the importance of the system, the necessity of capital investment in infrastructure, and, if necessary, new sources of that support.

All of us have a stake in ensuring that New York's economic engine continues at full strength.

We must keep a critically important fact in mind: If we are to build the MTA's network of trains, buses, bridges, and millions of other assets today, it would cost nearly \$1 trillion.

\$1 trillion.

It takes 11-1/2 days to get 1 million

seconds.

It takes 32 years to get a billion seconds.

It takes 32,000 years to get a trillion seconds.

A trillion dollars is a large asset.

That means our previous \$24 billion capital program represented a reinvestment back into our system of less than 1/2 percent of the system's total value.

We can talk about the strengths and challenges of upstate and downstate, Senators, but I think the state of New York has one economy, and the MTA's 12-county regional transportation system is essential to that economy.

It makes a huge pool of employees available to New York businesses.

It allows our region to comfortably accommodate millions more people.

It makes it possible for people to live wherever they want within our region regardless of where they work.

It allows employees to bring home paychecks that support local schools and government services and consumer spending, creating jobs wherever they live.

It enables and supports job development across our entire region, giving employers a system that employees can count on in creating 400,000 jobs into vendor companies that deliver the capital improvements.

Every major world city today -- London,

Paris, Hong Kong, and others -- is investing in

transit to improve the quality of life for their

residents, to maintain their status as a global

financial and business center, and to make them even

more competitive in the world economy.

New York must do the same because the past is not prologued. We must continue to invest.

Chairmen Marcellino and Robach, we appreciate the support you've given the MTA in the past, and your continuing support, and look forward to working with you to continue the MTA's improved efficiency, safety, reliability, and growth.

Thank you for your time today, and now we're happy to answer any questions you might have for us.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Thank you, Chairman Prendergast.

Let me just clarify what we will be doing for the rest of the hearing.

We will, in the interests of time and moving

the process along, because we have a number of people here --

And Senator Brad Hoylman has joined us, and Senator Bill Perkins has joined us as well.

-- we're going to allow two questions per Senator, to start.

We'll move on to the next Senator after two questions, and then we'll get another round if we have to, in going around.

This way, we can move things along and keep things going.

I just have one to start, and that's about safety.

I talk to a lot of people, Syosset, where
I live; Huntington, which I also represent; two
major areas for Long Island Railroad stations, big
commuter systems, big commuter use.

People are scared, to a certain extent.

They have been reading in the papers recently about serious accidents that have occurred on the railroads.

[Unintelligible] with the curve and going a little too quick. [Unintelligible], we don't know for sure. There might be a question about whether the operator was fully awake and alert at the time.

We have a recent one, where the lady was caught on the track, the train hit her. Tragic accident. Fire, flame, third rail entering and penetrating the cars. 400 -- I believe something like 400 feet of third rail was taken up at that time. I had never heard of that before. We've had a couple of incidents of crossing accidents. Again, beyond that, not as serious, but more.

Gentlemen, what are we doing to alleviate the concerns of the riding public?

I have never heard the kind of concern before that I'm hearing now from my constituents about the safety of the Long Island Railroad and the MTA system.

What are we doing to alleviate their concerns, and to make sure these kinds of accidents, broken rails, don't occur?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Safety is our highest priority; safety and reliability of the system.

Those are the underpinnings of the capital program.

Metro-North had a series of problems starting over two years ago.

They had the derailment at Bridgeport. They

had another one near Spuyten Duyvil. And then they had the derailment at Spuyten Duyvil.

The derailment at Spuyten Duyvil was an overspeed condition, that's clear. And it's also pretty clear, although we need to do more, the locomotive engineer had a condition: sleep apnea.

We've got a pilot program underway at

Metro-North, that we're going to share the results

with across all the agencies, not just Long Island

Railroad, but New York City Transit as well, in

terms of the importance of us being able to identify

employees who have conditions like that, because so

much, in terms of the operation of our bus and rail

system, is dependent upon a person who is fully

cognizant, fully awake, and fully capable of

carrying out their duties.

In the area of Bridgeport where we had a derailment, it was very clear that we had a series of maintenance activities that weren't being performed properly.

We brought in -- in addition to the NTSB coming in and investigating that incident, we brought in outside experts from the Association of American Railroads to review the track programs and the maintenance programs. And we've got efforts

underway to deal with all of those.

We've actually shared that information across all three agencies.

You will see in the capital program for 2015-19, very large commitments of money for the maintenance and upkeep of the track infrastructure on the railroads. Probably one of the largest asset categories. Over a billion dollars in New York City Transit, Long Island Railroad, and I think a little over half a billion dollars at Metro-North.

In terms of grade-crossing safety, the two largest railroads in the country are Metro-North and Long Island Railroad.

Long Island has just under 300 grade crossings. Metro-North has about 150, I believe. And they are one of the highest hazard-exposure categories we have.

We have instituted, along with New York State DOT, some of the highest levels of protection at those grade crossings, in the forms of flashing lights and gates and sound alarms.

And where possible, we've also expended money to eliminate those grade crossings: one at Herricks Road on Long Island Railroad, and New Hyde Park Road.

And those are very costly, but where you have a very high frequency of high-speed train movement and traffic movement, those are the type of expenditures you need to make.

We're going to launch an outreach effort to try to raise the level of awareness of all the people who traverse over grade crossings, in the form of motorists, to make sure they're aware of the hazards associated with driving upon and over a grade crossing.

It will be an ongoing effort.

We understand the importance of making sure that our actual safety numbers are not only right, but the perception of the public is the safety that we're providing on all of the systems we operate as high.

And so I take those comments very seriously because, if people start to doubt the safety of the system, we've already started to lose ground.

And we need to do whatever we can to, as

I said, address the actual issue of safety, but also
the perceptual issues of safety.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: The gates that drop down, I see the crossings. In Syosset, there's one by Robbins Lane. There's another one in several

different places throughout the system.

To my mind, it's just too easy to go between and around them.

Is there a possibility of perhaps making those gates longer, physically, so that there is -- you just can't go a quick turn and out? Because right now you can.

Making it more difficult to go around them?

Because you, literally, almost have to go on the track.

We don't want them to do that, obviously, but to discourage that kind of crossing capability?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: There are standards that we follow that are standards developed on a national level, so that when people approach grade crossings, what they see in one state is similar to what they see in another state.

And we need to remain within those standards.

Where there are locations where there is a high frequency of people driving around gates, normally, the decision is made to put in what they call "four-quad gates."

And, so, instead of just a gate on the leading edge of the lane approaching, you would also have them on the opposite lane to make sure people

couldn't drive around the gate.

They're also used when you want to go into a -- when somebody's asking for a grade crossing without having the locomotive engineering sound the train horn, but you have to go through an elaborate process.

And so, generally, those are the types of approaches that are used for people at locations where people are driving around gates.

And in addition to that, we can use the local police jurisdiction or the MTA police to be able to have a higher level of enforcement to make sure people don't do that.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Thank you, Tom.

It's not an easy topic, I understand.

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: No.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: This is difficult.

People are going to make efforts to do that.

We've been joined by Senator Dan Squadron, and by Chairman of the Transportation Committee, Senator Robach.

In deference to Senator Robach, who I know has another --

SENATOR ROBACH: I'm good.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: You're good? Okay.

I'd like to move to Senator Golden.

SENATOR GOLDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, MTA, for being here today, and all the different heads of the different agencies.

The -- since we're limited in questions that we're going to ask, I'm not going to get into the \$15 billion budget that's -- capital budget at this point, but we will, obviously, if the meeting continues.

But I'm going to be very local in my approach here, and I'm going to start with buses, and then I'm going to back up to the second question which will be on trains.

But on the buses, the X27 headways or disaster, you guys are going to do a study. We -- I don't know if you did that study.

I know you said you did reinvestment into services.

And I'd look to know where we are with the 27, the X28 on the weekends, and the -- the X37 -- not the X37 --

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: B37.

SENATOR GOLDEN: -- the B37, getting into Court Street, because of the senior population that we have in our community.

And, we still have no elevator at 86th Street for the seniors to be able to access the train system.

And, how does Vision Zero play into this?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Well, B37, I believe the transit authority committed to continue looking at the issue of the extension into downtown

So that's the basic question on the buses.

I don't know the status of the further studies on the X27 or 28.

Do you know, Darryl?

DARRYL IRICK: No.

Brooklyn.

Currently, right now, you know, as a matter of course, operations planning will -- as always, is looking at all of our routes, particularly on the express side.

As you may be aware, the X17 comes into Brooklyn from Staten Island to -- as a supplemental replacement service.

So we continuously look at that.

We have no updates in terms of, you know, what we're going to do different in that particular part of Brooklyn at this point.

SENATOR GOLDEN: Well, it's the furthest

point in Brooklyn, so you've got to look at it.

And we have to -- I know you guys were underway in a study, and I wanted to know what happened to that study as to the headways, and the reinvestments into the buses, and the Vision Zero.

How's Vision Zero playing into this?

DARRYL IRICK: I'll take it.

So we work very closely, we align ourselves very closely, with Vision Zero.

Vision Zero is sort symbiotic with our safety culture at Buses.

So, currently, right now, on a number of initiatives, we're working with the City, in terms of crosswalks, in terms of speed -- bus speeds, and a number of issues, inclusive of technology, inclusive of making our bus operators more aware of pedestrian behavior and conditions on the road.

So we're very closely aligned with Vision Zero.

SENATOR GOLDEN: Locking up bus drivers, do you think that's a little step too far?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: A decision was made, and a resolution was passed by the city council, in support of Vision Zero, that they were going to place a higher priority on incidents involving a

motor vehicle striking someone in the crosswalk.

And in the course of that discussion, a decision was made that they would arrest, with the exception, I think, people who were driving City vehicles.

So, so far, since the implementation of that program, there have been a number of bus drivers that have been arrested.

What I can assure you is that,

John Samuelsen, the president of the Transport

Workers Union, myself, and Polly Trottenberg, the

commissioner of the DOT, are committed to the goals

of Vision Zero, which is trying to reduce -
significantly reduce or eliminate those collisions

that strike people in crosswalks. And that's where

the focus needs to be.

We do have a dialogue, and in terms of, to what extent it makes sense to arrest bus operators. But I want to get it to the level where we're focused on the issue at hand, which is trying to reduce.

In some cases, we may need to change the location of the turning of the bus, right or left, to a different location where there's less likelihood of striking somebody.

Or change the location of the crosswalk to a mid-block crossing.

I --

SENATOR GOLDEN: Which makes all the sense in the world.

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: I drove a bus for 30 days, only 30 days.

Darryl drove a lot longer than that.

But I can tell you, a left turn or a right turn, where the radius of the turn is 25 feet behind you, is problematic, because you need to be able to -- you need to be able to keep track of what's going on in front of you at the same time with the sweep of the bus.

And if somebody runs to catch up to -they're not really running to catch up to the bus.
They're running across the intersection, and they
run into the action of the bus turning.

It's an extremely difficult situation for the bus operator to see.

SENATOR GOLDEN: You're not the only one.

DOT, sanitation, all these people being arrested, I think it's absurd. I think that's up to the -- we have to do something about that. And, hopefully, in the near future we do address that

situation.

It's up to the police department to make reports.

It's up to the police department to make arrests if the person is faulted, and drugs, alcohol.

But to make decisions at the scene, and to make arrests of City workers, or, anybody, as a matter of fact, I think is -- if the guy acted inappropriately and he was reckless, the answer is, yes. But the -- they have to prove recklessness.

I mean, that's the summons. It's not an arrestable situation. They give them a summons. They don't arrest them at the scene.

Last question: The trains.

I have, obviously, the same situation of the train; the headways to the R train.

We are at the further point out by the Verrazano Bridge in the southeast and southwest parts of Brooklyn.

We have no opportunities, except for the express buses and those trains, to get us into Manhattan and keep the clientele and the people working, and the constituency working, in the city of New York.

We have terrible headways when it comes to our R train.

 $\label{eq:wenned} \mbox{We need an additional double R, or something,} \\ \mbox{to help us with this R train.}$

And, we need that handicapped-accessible train on the R train to get the people in and out of Manhattan. And that's just one line.

I have the N, the D, the F...you name it, I've got them all.

So I need -- that's my biggest headache, is the R train.

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: One of the things

I noted in my testimony is the million more people
we're going to see in the city by 2035.

We're already starting to see it along the Fourth Avenue in Brooklyn, from downtown Brooklyn, all the way out to Bay Ridge, and locations in and around stations where buildings are being taken down and replaced, a 2-unit building is being replaced with a 6- or a 12-unit building.

So we're seeing ridership grow in advance of that million that we're going to see by 2035.

And, so -- and the R train, once we rebuilt the Montague Street 2, people have come back, you know, in droves, as is happening in other places in

the system.

So the issue of going -- doing constant ridership checks and trying to balance the delivery of service with the demand created by customers is one that's ongoing. And that's one of the areas we're looking at, Senator.

SENATOR GOLDEN: Thank you very much.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Senator Martins.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

My question is with respect to the capital plan, and the \$32 billion reflected therein.

I know there's a portion there that deals with bridges and tunnels.

But just the scope of the plan itself, is the a plan, that all \$32 billion be borrowed?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: No. And I'll let Bob go through the details of it, but -- and we'll break it down into details.

And, you're right, Senator, the -- 3 billion is for bridges and tunnels, and their capital needs. And in some ways, that is self-funded out their own revenue that they collect.

And the remainder of the money is spread across the remainder of the agencies. Order of magnitude: \$22 billion for state of good repair.

About 4, 4 1/2 million for what we call "enhanced." 1 And the remainder for expansion. 2 3 Bob, if you go would go through the... ROBERT FORAN: Thank you. 4 5 The current financial plan on the table has about \$6.2 billion that comes from federal funds. 6 Then it does have MTA bonds for the commuter 7 and transit program, of about 3.9 billion. 8 It also includes 2.3 billion for bridges and 9 tunnels that are there, but it still has a 10 11 significant amount of pay-as-you-go capital; 12 together, about 1.6, 1.7. 13 Asset sales and leases, the disposition of 14 our headquarters buildings, and also excess real 15 estate, generates about 600 million. 16 City of New York capital funds, we have about 17 \$650 million in the budget. Federal new-start funds, we're estimating 18 could be north of 500 million. 19 20 Private-developer contributions of about 21 200 million. 22 And then other MTA sources, about 760 million. 23

So the total amount of bonding, out of the

\$32 billion that we're talking about, is around

24

1 \$7 billion. SENATOR MARTINS: 7 billion? 2 ROBERT FORAN: Yes. 3 SENATOR MARTINS: With respect to the types 4 of projects that are included in this capital plan, 5 6 a lot of it is for what is, apparently, maintenance. 7 Day-to-day operations maintenance. You used the 8 term "state of good repair." 9 What portion of the MTA's significant annual 10 budget goes towards these items already? 11 And why is it necessary to borrow and bond 12 for these? Wouldn't that be better covered under your 13 14 annual operating budget? 15 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: There are specific 16 definitions for what is called "out-of-face 17 replacement" of an asset, and it would be 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

replacement" of an asset, and it would be capitalized, versus the maintenance and repair of an asset to keep it useful during its useful life.

Useful life of a current is now 40 years?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [No video pan.]

Yes.

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: It used to be 35, but we have been able to stretch it to 40 years because of stainless-steel car bodies and wise decisions in

terms of the manufacturer.

As that product reaches the end of its useful life, the car-body structure is starting to fail, the major assemblies and components are failing.

And if you were to do it on a maintenance level, you were to do it actually replacing component by component, it would cost you more.

So according to accounting principles, what you do is, you basically replace that asset with one that's new and you start that useful life over again.

And the idea is, asset-by-asset category -cars, signals, track, line equipment, line
structures -- you try to squeeze the useful life out
of the asset.

A curved track, probably 20 years or less, depending on the radius of the curve.

Tangent track, probably 30 years.

Track in and around what we call "special work" with switches, et cetera, even less than that.

And so you actually have to replace the asset.

The asset has got so much wear on it you can no longer do maintenance on it.

Side-rail wear, the wear of the rail itself,

the wear of the rail flange itself, it gets to a point where you have to replace it.

And so, historically, from an accounting standpoint, even the Class 1 railroads capitalize those replacement costs, rather than put them in the operating budget, in terms of maintenance.

And that's what we do.

SENATOR MARTINS: No, I appreciate that, but, are you borrowing for that for the useful period?

For example, are we paying for a switch that may have a useful life of, I guess you just said, about 10 years, or 20 years, or so; right?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Depending upon the switch.

SENATOR MARTINS: Are we paying that over a longer period of time? Or are there controls that make sure that we're not bonding for something well beyond its useful life?

ROBERT FORAN: In fact, we are bonding significantly less than the economic useful life of most of our assets.

I would give as an example, what we're doing for East Side access, or what we might be doing for Second Avenue, or some of these other projects, those are projects that, frankly, are

7500-year-lived assets, but we've been borrowing at a 30-year bonding, which has an average life of about 20 years.

So we are borrowing with an average life of 20 years, which effectively says that's how we're paying it off; and, yet, we're doing that for some 7-year assets, we're doing it for some 10-year assets, we're doing it for 20-year, 30-year, 50-year, 75-, 100-year assets.

So I think we're very prudent right now in how we are bonding. We are not bonding at a level that is really inappropriate and mismatching asset and liabilities.

SENATOR MARTINS: And just to clarify: Out of the 32 billion, 3 billion are for bridges and tunnels, leaving about 28 or 29 billion dollars specifically for MTA-related state of good repair, purchasing of new equipment, cars, as well as expansion of the Second Avenue subway and East Side access.

And out of all of that, the MTA will be paying for approximately 21 out of the 28 billion dollars on a pay-as-you-go basis, through capital, reserves, or whatnot, or sale of assets, and bonding for only \$7 billion.

Is that what I heard? 1 ROBERT FORAN: Including federal monies, 2 3 including city money. SENATOR MARTINS: 4 Sure. ROBERT FORAN: Yeah. 5 6 SENATOR MARTINS: Okay, thank you. 7 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: And one of the points we want to make is, is that the Legislature been 8 great to the MTA since 1992. 9 In order to get this gap funded, we need 10 11 support from four parties, because people quickly 12 say, What about Albany? What about the Governor? 13 What about the Legislature? 14 We need support from the federal government. 15 We need support from the city government, 16 state. And, also, direct and indirect benefiters of 17 the system, like the real-estate industry. 18 The funding of the Number 7 Line through 19 20 real-estate taxes, to be approved over a period of 21 time, is another way you can fund expansions. 22 SENATOR MARTINS: No, I appreciate it. 23 I do have more questions. I'll be back on the second turnaround. 24

SENATOR MARCELLINO: On the second round.

Senator Croci, please.

SENATOR CROCI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman, thank you for being here today.

Just a quick -- couple of quick questions with regard to service on Long Island Railroad.

I look forward to meeting with President Nowakowski when he has the opportunity.

I agree with you, safety has to be paramount, and I appreciate your words to that regard.

In that vein, two projects I know LIRR is working on; one in Ronkonkoma, with the expansion of the rail yard. And I some see familiar faces here in the community who have been doing a lot of work in that regard.

I think what the community is really looking for there is a commitment to some of the safety improvements that they would like to see, some of the quality-of-life improvements that they would like to see, as this project goes forward.

It's, I think, a small investment,

particularly with, as you said, a \$1 trillion asset,

to make sure that, with this improved service, with

this expanded capability, that we're not losing the

quality and character of the community, and to

ensure that pedestrians have the ability to travel

safely by foot and other means around the improvements.

So I'd like to just get your quick thoughts on that, as well as, I saw you mentioned natural hazards.

I looked to the system as critical infrastructure, and I look at it in an all-hazard approach to our security. So that includes both natural hazards, as well as terrorist threats, and that kind of security.

So, with the natural-hazard area, I think that the eastern end of my district, on the William Floyd Parkway, there is only one crossing from the Shirley Mastic Beach area at grade.

In the case of a "Superstorm Sandy" and a mass evacuation, that would be a very big problem.

I'd like to hear your thoughts on that one as well, sir.

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: As you know, I was president of the railroad for a little bit under six years in the '90s, '94 through 2000.

And whenever we do work, I mean, we're a part of the community.

The railroad may have been there first.

It doesn't make sense arguing who was there

first.

We are part of the community; an integral part of the community.

When we did construction projects, when we raised all the platforms and created the new diesel yards, you know, we learned from some of those.

Some of those went very well, some of those didn't go very well. High-mast lighting, and things of that nature.

The ability for the yard to be located in a place to have minimum impact, the ability for it to be part of the community.

And, so, those are lessons learned that we have carried forward through just about everything we do at the Long Island Railroad.

And I know that people that are here today could give you examples of that.

In terms of the importance of addressing,

I like to define "safety" as freedom from accidental
injury or hazard, and, "security freedom" from
deliberate injury.

The approaches to each one of those, while they're both important, the approaches to each one of those are different, because what you have to do, where you have to spend your money, and what you

need to protect against are different.

And we do have commitments to what we do in the area of security, because we consider ourselves to be a high-level target. And we go through the entire system and do a-threat level assessment from a standpoint, is what's the likelihood of someone choosing that to be a target? And then we address its hazards.

And that's the approach we take.

So it's a commitment we have always had, it's a commitment we will maintain, and we'll carry it forward.

SENATOR CROCI: Thank you.

And with those specific projects mentioned, both the Ronkonkoma expansion of the yard and the double track, as well as Shirley, the crossing, if -- I look forward to my conversations with President Nowakowski about it, and, hopefully, we can get some commitment, so that we can relay that to the community that, you know, the partnership continues.

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: I mean, I'm trying to visualize Mastic Shirley [sic], and I think I can, but I haven't been out there in a while, but, as the traffic on the railroad increases and goes further

east, as the highway traffic increases, from a vehicular standpoint, we do, at times, have to come back and add additional protection at crossings and treat it more as a true highway crossing, rather than as a local residential street.

So, certainly, as the railroad continues to grow further east and population increases, the issue of what we need to do in terms of grade-crossing safety is something we will address.

SENATOR CROCI: And there are additional venues at which an additional crossing would be possible.

That's something that the team may want to consider: Instead of that one crossing and one narrow choke point, in the event of an evacuation, perhaps an additional crossing.

But that's -- I leave it to the team to come back to us with your suggestions.

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Okay.

Thank you.

SENATOR CROCI: Thank you very much.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Thank you.

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR PERKINS: Thank you.

SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you.

SENATOR PERKINS: Did you say Perkins? 1 2 SENATOR MARCELLINO: No, I said Murphy. 3 SENATOR PERKINS: Oh, Murphy. SENATOR MARCELLINO: They're so close to each 4 5 other. [Laughter.] 6 7 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. SENATOR MARCELLINO: In case somebody hadn't 8 noticed, I'm going from one side to the other. I'm 9 just looking and going down in sequence. 10 11 That's all. 12 SENATOR MURPHY: You know, unfortunately, 13 like the Chairman said, it's a sensitive topic. 14 We've had the worst tragedy in history on the 15 Harlem Line that, literally, runs right through the 16 heart of my district. 17 And, you know, security has been brought up here. 18 19 I know you just said in the hearings today, 20 you've identified 150 crossings, roughly, up on the 21 Metro-North, Joe. 22 Are we doing anything to identify those 23 crossings as a primary, secondary, and tertiary possibility of fixing these crossings at all? 24

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: I believe that the

federal government actually rates the crossings in terms of hazard severity, and then puts a value with it.

And we take note of that, and we make sure that we're meeting more than just the minimum standard required at those crossings.

Do you want to take it further, Joe, in terms of what we may be doing in the future?

JOSEPH GIULIETTI: The only thing I would say is, that you've heard the chairman already talk about what we're going to do with Operation Lifesaver, which will be awareness, which has to be the number-one priority in terms of making people aware of what a crossing is and what they should be doing at it, because it seems that our biggest problem is, that a flashing red light, which is a stop signal, and for people not to go through.

Those are the types of things we have to look at. And, also, taking a full evaluation of that crossing.

You know, you've heard already other systems that are in place, like four-quadrant gate.

We're looking at all of that as we're going through it right now.

SENATOR MURPHY: All right, if you need any

assistance from me, please chirp up. Secondly, you've indicated that, this year, in four months, you've had 6 million riders in one day. Correct? THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: On the subway system, yes. SENATOR MURPHY: Yeah, that's pretty incredible. And you expect, in 2031, an additional 1 million riders, possibly.

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: In my testimony,

I talked about a million more residents in

New York City by 2035, and an additional million in
the region by 2035, so some fraction thereof would
use our network, so the number would grow.

But the growth in the New York City subway is even above that.

So, we had never before recorded 6 million people a day until October 24, 2013, and we had 29 days in 2014.

The growth we had thought was primarily due to metro card and value pricing, people riding in the middle of the day, weekends, and nights.

Now we're seeing increased ridership during rush hour, and that's why it's taking people three,

1 four trains to get on before they can get to their destination. 2 It used to be the first or second train they 3 could get on. 4 SENATOR MURPHY: So it would be an awful lot 5 6 of riders? 7 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Absolutely. SENATOR MURPHY: So, does there come a point 8 9 at any time during this that you guys actually make 10 a profit --11 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: No. 12 SENATOR MURPHY: -- as a small -- so you will 13 never make a profit? THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: I've been in this 14 15 business my whole career. 16 I graduated the University of Illinois in 17 1974. 18 And, no, we've never been in --19 SENATOR MURPHY: So if you had 10 million 20 riders, you would still not make a profit? 21 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Well, at some point 22 maybe you would, but you'd have loading standards 23 far in excess of what -- every one of our services

The lowest subsidized ride in the MTA network

is subsidized.

24

1 is New York City subway. We call "fare-box recovery ratio," for every 2 3 dollar it costs to operate, how much comes out of fare box? 4 It's 70 percent for New York City Transit 5 6 Subway; 7 It's about 40 percent for New York City Bus; It's about 60 percent for Metro-North; 8 9 And about 50 percent for Long Island 10 Railroad. 11 So, no, they're all heavily subsidized to 12 enable people to be able to afford riding public 13 transportation, and, the tremendous -- I mean, the 14 most sustainable system in the country in terms of 15 measured carbon footprint. 16 People think of the Pacific Northwest and how 17 green it is, or whatever. The lowest carbon footprint per capita is 18 19 right here in New York City, because more people use 20 public transit. 21 SENATOR MURPHY: Public transportation.

SENATOR MORPHI: Public classportation.

22

23

24

25

So, no matter how many riders, it would never kind of facilitate and sustain itself?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: If you raised the fare to the cost of what the fare would be, yes.

But, no, generally not.

SENATOR MURPHY: All right, I just -- I'm done.

Thank you.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Senator Dilan.

SENATOR DILAN: Yes, good morning.

Your November financial plan proposes to realize a \$500 million savings up to the year 2018.

Where will these cuts come from?

Will it be from service cuts, or will you have to let employees go?

ROBERT FORAN: The -- we are not anticipating any service cuts.

I think it's been very clear by the board, that it was so painful when we did the service cuts in 2010, that no one wants to address those again.

So what we're trying to do is figure out how to reduce our costs in areas that, frankly, in the past, were considered uncontrollable costs. And with that I mean, things like pensions and health care that were growing at a very, very rapid rate.

We are trying to reduce our unfunded liabilities on some of our pension plans when we receive a one-shot windfall from things like

real-estate revenues.

We do not want to put ourselves back in a situation where we were building a budget based upon real estate one-time transactional revenues that came in.

You all recall that's really how we got in trouble back in 2009, when we had seen real-estate revenues go from a billion seven, down to less than \$400 million in two years.

And that was the reason that we were presented with and we accepted the PMT.

So what we're trying to do is figure out, how do we take one-shot revenues and apply them to reduce ongoing costs?

We're doing that in health care. We're doing that in our pensions.

We've also gone through and reduced administrative headcount.

If you recall, we did a 15 percent reduction of administrative headcount throughout the agencies. We did a 20 percent reduction at headquarters.

We went four years without any cost-of-living raises at headquarters, and that saved us about \$60 million.

Between the two of them, about \$160 million.

58 We're trying to be more efficient in terms of 1 2 our procurement. 3 We're looking at our energy management. We're looking at our workers' compensation. 4 We're consolidating. 5 We have just consolidated our information 6 7 technology from all of the agencies, now, two headquarters. 8 9 We're consolidating treasury. We're consolidating certain procurement 10 11 functions. 12 You are well aware that we have our business 13 service center where we've reduced our costs. 14 So, that's what we're trying to do. 15 Also, in para-transit, we feel that we have a 16 commitment in para-transit to meet, you know, the 17 requirements of the law to provide for those of our 18 customers who need it, but we're trying to reduce 19 unit costs by being smarter. And we have done a 20 significant job of reducing unit cost. 21 So, that's the way that we plan on hitting 22 this \$1.6 billion annually-recurring savings target 23 by 2018, not through service reductions.

Okay --

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: For the past

SENATOR DILAN:

24

two years, I'll just add on, we showed the budget to the board in November. We vote on it in December.

And then at the mid-year mark, in July, we take a look at how well we're performing against budget.

And for, I think, each of the last three years, we've had some money that we've been able to put into either new services or restoration of services that were cut.

SENATOR DILAN: Okay, thank you.

With regard to your capital budget, you proposed a \$32 billion-plus budget, and, apparently, there's a \$15 billion gap there.

What do you expect the ultimate number to be once a final plan is put together?

And also in your testimony, you did provide some economic information in terms of the number of jobs that it creates in the entire system.

Could you also perhaps, maybe later on, give us more specifics in terms of, regionally, how many jobs it creates statewide; and, especially, outside of the MTA network area?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Yes

I think we started with the last program,

Senator, where we showed where the money that flowed into the program flowed back into the state in other

parts, and much of it outside the service area 1 itself. 2 3 I mean, the North Country, in terms of Bombardier and bus making -- bus manufacturing 4 5 facilities, get a significant portion of that money. But we can share that information with you. 6 7 SENATOR DILAN: Okay, thank you. I'll have questions in the second round. 8 9 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Thank you. Senator Perkins. 10 11 SENATOR PERKINS: Thank you very much. 12 Good morning. 13 So, I have a few questions that -- first 14 I want to -- you know, you've -- we've closed down 15 some stations, so to speak, where we -- I don't want 16 to say closed them down, but we took out the --17 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Token-booth clerks. SENATOR PERKINS: The, what? 18 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Token-booth clerks. 19 20 Station agents. 21 SENATOR PERKINS: -- token-booth clerks, 22 yeah. 23 And -- so now they're abandoned, and they are 24 hazardous to people, because there are folks who

hang out in them, and who, I guess, do things that

are illegal. And they -- they're there during the rush hour when folks are going to work, and they're there in the evening when folks are coming home from work.

And, so, I don't know how that impacts the capital budget, by turning -- by taking out the token-booth clerks, or whatever impacts it has on the capital budget.

Can you explain why that is happening, and how that has improved the situation?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: I'll start, and then
I'll let Carmen take it further.

Back in 2009, when we found ourselves in the situation we were, where we had some serious financial problems, one of the areas we looked at was the issue of closing token booths where the selling of fare media was exceptionally low.

The original reason a token-booth clerk was created back in the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century was to be able to sell tokens for people to gain entrance to the system.

And then there were money-handling situations, with respect to, they needed to be secure and stay inside that booth.

So, we closed those booths because of the

fact that there were other means for people to buy the fare media.

What we're trying to do, Senator, is move to a day where we actually are utilizing employees in ways that are rewarding for them, in terms of having more value, in their mind, in terms of what they can do; but, also, provide a more needed service for us in the form of a customer-service agent that would be able to be out and about the station.

We do not want customer-service agents or token-booth clerks to provide security. That's the responsibility of the transit bureau or the New York City Police Department.

But, certainly, I think we all could understand and agree that a visible presence of someone on the platform, observing and seeing something going on and reporting on it, is of value to the system.

And that's the direction we'd like to move.

Carmen, do you want to add more to that?

CARMEN BIANCO: The only other thing I would add to that, Senator, is that, back in the time frame of 2010, we did, in fact, remove a number of those vacant booths so that they would not become a security issue.

The booths that we have, that we have at least one full-time booth in every single station, there may be others out there that will open on special occasions, but, those booths are monitored.

The employees that work in those booths have the ability to stay in -- 100 percent in touch with our control center, so they have immediate -- if there's an immediate need for assistance, they can -- they could respond, or have NYPD respond.

SENATOR PERKINS: You know, that's really kind of ridiculous because, generally, what's happening is, that one person is either on the downtown side in the booth or the uptown side, so they're seeing from across the tracks, if anything at all, what's going on.

So that side where that person is not, is, for all intents and purposes, a very serious danger zone for your customers.

You know, we love your workers. We want them to be safe and secure and well-paid, et al., but our wives and our children and our neighbors deserve to be better treated than that.

To have those places abandoned so that the vagrants can sell rides with their metro cards, or bag, or intimidate, I don't think that's a safe,

64 1 right way to run the system, especially in my neighborhood, and other neighborhoods as well. 2 So, I think we have to rethink that. 3 I use the system as much, if not more, than 4 most of your customers. And I think that, when you 5 subject our neighbors, especially the females, to 6 that kind of environment, you're not serving your 7 8 purpose. It's a very bad decision that was made. 9 10 There's no security there. 11 And those who prey know that, and they take 12 advantage of that, and it intimidates folks. 13 It makes people feel as if they're not 14 respected. 15 We have nobody down here, they say. Why is 16 that? 17 Has your wife -- do your wives go to these 18 stations? 19 Would you want your wife to have to go 20 through that kind of a situation? Your daughters? 21 Your children? I don't think so. 22 23 How much are we saving?

> Did you quantify the amount that we're saving [unintelligible] --

24

1 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: We'll get you the 2 numbers. SENATOR PERKINS: -- by doing that? 3 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: The focus -- the 4 5 crime in the subway is at its lowest level ever, 6 from the transit bureau. 7 SENATOR PERKINS: I'm not asking you about the crime in the system. 8 9 I'm telling you about very specific areas where you have taken --10 11 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: If we had infinite 12 resources, we could deploy resources that way. But 13 we don't, I'm sorry. 14 SENATOR PERKINS: So how much are you saving? 15 is what I'm asking. 16 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: I'll get you the 17 number. I don't know the number off the top of my 18 head. But in order to deal with the problems we had 19 20 in 2009, in order to deal with the fiscal problems 21 we had, we had to make decisions [unintelligible] --22 SENATOR PERKINS: Are you telling me that those stations are safe? 23 24 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Yes, they're safe. SENATOR PERKINS: They're not safe. 25

How can you have addicts in the station, with no security, no police, during rush hour and throughout the day, and consider that people -- how do you say that's safe?

What is your definition of "safe"?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Well, I guess we probably should have started there, because I can find similar conditions on the street, I can find similar conditions --

SENATOR PERKINS: You don't patrol the street. That's not your job.

I'm talking about your job, which is in the subway system.

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Responsibility for safety and -- responsibility for security in the New York City subway is the transit bureau and New York City Police Department's responsibility.

SENATOR PERKINS: But I'm telling you there's no safety in those places.

Now, what are you going to do to fix that?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: We focus our efforts through the use of the transit bureau and the New York City Police Department.

SENATOR PERKINS: You're not going to do anything, is what you're telling me?

1 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: I'm not going to put 2 employees in harm's way to perform police work. 3 SENATOR PERKINS: What about my constituents in harm's way? 4 What about our children in harm's way? 5 6 What about our families in harm's way? 7 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [No video pan.] Senator, there's --8 SENATOR PERKINS: Your employees get paid to 9 run the system and protect the system. 10 11 How come there are no employees in those 12 stations protecting those customers? 13 Why should people feel they have to go to 14 work, do whatever they do with the system, under those kind of conditions? 15 16 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Senator, I couldn't 17 agree with you more, that leaving the system -leaving the thing unprotected or without staff could 18 19 create, and probably does create, a serious problem. 20 I think you have made your point. 21 SENATOR PERKINS: The most important aspect 22 of that problem is the emotional, psychological 23 [unintelligible] --24 SENATOR MARCELLINO: I hear you. 25 SENATOR PERKINS: -- that people have about

the system.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: I hear you.

That's a subject that we will bring up further, because what you're talking about I think relates, as Chairman Prendergast points out, with the New York City Police Department as well, and that's an issue that we're going to have to take issue with, because I agree with you, there is a safety concern there.

I don't know that a token-booth operator assigned to an individual station, sitting in a booth, is going to provide the kind of safety you're looking for.

SENATOR PERKINS: They have a phone.

If things go on, they report it to the police.

Now it's totally abandoned.

I don't want to go any further. I think
I made my point.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Yes, I believe you did.

SENATOR PERKINS: And we need to revisit that decision. It's a bad decision.

And if we have to prove it, in terms of bringing people to your office, and help you understand what their concerns are, we'll do that.

But I don't think you want your wife going down there. I don't think you want your children going down there.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Do you have another question, Bill?

SENATOR PERKINS: Yeah, I do.

You know, when the system goes down, like, you're not going to have any service, how do we get to know that that's happening?

CARMEN BIANCO: You know, Senator, there are a number of ways that we do that.

One is, that we -- within our control center, we have direct access to the media outlets. We have direct access to Transcom, which is a regional system that puts out messages via the radio.

We also, internally, will immediately post that on our website. If our customers are signed up for text messages, they will get text messages that there's a situation, and what lines are not running.

So what we try to do is to be immediate, to be very accurate, to get this information out through as many outlets as we possibly can.

To make station announcements on the platforms so that we can, you know, really direct messages on the platform, so that we can help our

customers understand what the problem is, and how they could best get around that situation.

SENATOR PERKINS: Well, my experience is, that some of that is being done very often. Folks are bewildered about what's going on.

Have you ever -- have you noticed that at all?

Have you been informed about that type of bewilderment, that type of concern, that your customers have?

CARMEN BIANCO: No, Senator.

All I would add to your comment is that, our transit system is very large.

As our chairman's mentioned, we've had days now where we experience 6 million customers.

We operate just under 8,000 trains a day on a 24-hour, 365-day basis.

So when you have that kind of complexity -- and we have strategic teams all over the entire system, so that as a problem's encountered, we're able to immediately address it.

Whether that problem's a customer that's sick, whether that problem is an equipment problem, whether it's a police issue...whatever it is, we spend an awful lot of time trying to understand how

1 to deal with issues like that, and in terms of what is the mitigation level that we need to put in place 2 immediately to fix that problem. 3 So, this is not something we look for an 4 incident to occur. 5 We -- we -- you know, again, very old system, 6 lots of activity all day long, but we try to stay 7 every bit ahead of these situations so we can 8 9 immediately get into action as the problem arises. SENATOR PERKINS: So, two other quick 10 11 concerns. 12 One is rodents, and rats all over the system 13 still. 14 Does this capital money translate into any 15 rodent-abatement-type programs? 16 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [No video pan.] 17 Not capital program. That would be covered off in the operating 18 budget. 19 20 Do you want to talk about the program? 21 CARMEN BIANCO: That is covered off under the 22 operating program. 23 And in our normal operations, we bait all the 24 time on the system.

We do our level best to remove rubbish on the

platforms, rubbish that is generated in the station.

As a matter of fact, we will remove approximately 40 tons of refuse each and every day, and we do that in the middle of the night when most of our customers are not on the system.

We have trains and/or trucks that go to each station.

But as that material is gathered during the day, it's put in a secure room. That room is built so that rodents can't penetrate it, to the extent we can.

And, so, that's one program that we have.

And we do bait on an ongoing regular basis throughout the system.

We are also, as you're aware, involved in another situation.

I'm trying to think of the name of the organization, but, it was that project, or the research, to actually take and sterilize the female rat population so that they could no longer produce. And that is still ongoing.

SENATOR PERKINS: Thank you very much.

The sterilization must not be working, because they seem to be exploding.

I appreciate the opportunity you've given me

1 to say something, but I want to make sure that you understand that we have a rodent problem, a very 2 serious rodent problem, that is more visible to me 3 than ever before. 4 5 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Thank you. 6 Chairman Prendergast, you mentioned before, 7 reports that are coming, that -- studies that are 8 being done on various issues. 9 Would it be possible for us to get copies of 10 these reports as they come to you --11 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Sure. SENATOR MARCELLINO: -- for the Committee, so 12 13 we can make a file? 14 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Absolutely. 15 We'll make them available to you, sir. 16 SENATOR MARCELLINO: I appreciate that. 17 Senator Hoylman. 18 SENATOR HOYLMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for 19 organizing this. 20 And thank you to the MTA for being here 21 today. 22 You know, I echo some of Senator Perkins' 23 concerns, which I think go to the issue of returning

the state to its legacy of support for the MTA,

which is -- one of our transportation-advocate

24

25

organizations is going to be saying later, and really not putting as much pressure on fares and tolls. And I know that's what you're trying to accomplish, and I know you've got a \$15 billion gap to close.

In that respect, I'm concerned that we are not exploring all of the revenue options that we could be in order to close that gap.

And, I'm also concerned that, in terms of our state's, you know, one-shot budget surplus that we have this year, that you're not getting enough of it.

And I think -- I think the MTA's reporting that you're getting 37 million, is that correct, out of the -- out of the \$104 million surplus in operating revenue toward capital projects?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: There's money we're getting in the operating budget, and there's money we may be getting out of the 5 billion.

Bob?

ROBERT FORAN: Yes, with the 104 that you referred to, that's actually going to capital.

It's 37 more in total than we were expecting to get.

So, effectively, that 37 will be additive.

We will get an additional capital program.

The rest will just be replacement monies for what would otherwise have been operating.

However, in the Governor's budget -- proposed budget, he has \$750 million for our core program, and then there's \$250 million for Penn Access.

So, there's a billion dollars in that proposal.

And of the billion dollars, there's also,
250 of that, the Penn Access, is money from the
strategic fund, which is, I believe, using some of
the one-shot monies. And then there's 150 for
certain transit-oriented development projects.

SENATOR HOYLMAN: So in terms of the bank-settlement funds, I've been reading here that there's about \$850 million of those funds unallocated.

Any chance or any suggestion that the MTA will try to acquire some of those funds?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: I'm sure we'll be part of the dialogue.

I mean, the first thing we wanted to do when we presented the capital program is make sure people understood the 32 billion: 32 billion, with 3 billion for bridges and tunnels, and the remainder

for the other agencies.

I think it's essential that we have a discussion with respect to the size of that program, and then you define what the gap is.

That's the board's recommendation, strong recommendation.

That's what we feel we need to not only address state of good repair, but enhance, in terms of the level and quality of service, and provide for expansion to meet those 2 million more people that are going to be in the region by 2035.

So, we have always thought, from the time we submitted the plan, it was essential that we had a dialogue about the size of the ask, because some people may say you're faced -- the Legislature is faced with issues that are beyond us, in terms of a lot of needs and confined resources.

So if someone -- we need to have a dialogue in terms of the size of that ask.

And once that's defined, then we start to decide, what are the different funding alternatives we need to have from the federal, state, local governments, and the people that benefit directly and indirectly from the system, to identify the means to resolve that gap?

So we would be part of that dialogue, in answer to your question.

SENATOR HOYLMAN: So, an issue's come to light about the surcharge placed on taxi rides.

I think it's 50 cents per ride that is dedicated to the MTA.

And, in recent months, and years, we've seen a drop in taxi ridership, mostly due to car-sharing services, like Uber and Lift, and others.

These car-share services don't have that dedicated surcharge.

Has that impacted your bottom line?

ROBERT FORAN: I think we're still

anticipating receiving about \$90 million on the

50-cent surcharge.

The only time we're getting money from Uber or Lift is if the Uber or Lift driver happens to be a medallion driver. In that case, they have the mechanism to collect.

Again, it will be up to our legislative leaders to determine what, you know, could be applied to liberty-car services, black-car services, to non-medallion Uber or Lift or sharing services.

Certainly, there's an argument that could be made for equity, but we would leave it to, you know,

those who legislate to come up with the appropriate, fair approach.

But as of right now, we're still planning on about \$90 million, I think, coming in.

SENATOR HOYLMAN: So you're not advocating a position on that?

ROBERT FORAN: We'll leave that for the discussion.

SENATOR HOYLMAN: Now, if I could just zero in on a more local issue, I represent the west and east side of Manhattan, Grand Central Station, and the neighborhood around Penn Station.

I have a small business owner in

Grand Central Station, a wine retailer, who's been
there for about, I think, over 15 years, called

"Grand Harvest Wines."

Are you familiar with it?

ROBERT FORAN: Yes.

SENATOR HOYLMAN: And the gentleman -- it's a family-owned business, very successful. I think something like 400 transactions a day. Really has established itself as a high-end retailer and a go-to place for commuters, but also locals alike.

They are in a Kafkaesque situation with the MTA, in terms of their bidding to renew their lease.

As I understand it, they won two RFPs, but then were told, after the second, that a new RFP was going to be issued, which they subsequently lost to another bidder who hadn't bid on the first two; in that, they were willing to pay something like 40 percent more than their current lease.

And I just want to raise that to your attention because, you know, we think of Grand Central as, certainly, the crossroads for the city, and the world, but there are a lot of small businesses there that the local community relies on.

And I would urge you to look at this matter closely, and consider; consider the service that this business has brought, the success, and the family-owned nature and independence of it, when you move forward with this RFP.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Senator Squadron.

SENATOR SQUADRON: Thank you very much.

And thank you all.

Thank you, to both Chairs, for this, and we're represented by the entire MTA region [unintelligible] centers, which I think says a lot.

Thank you.

And I actually was becoming a little bit confused, just listening to some of the most recent

1 answers. I just want to be clear here. 2 I'm a subway rider myself. 3 Certainly, my district is massively dependent 4 on it. 5 6 But, really, my city, and my region, is 7 massively dependent on it, as the Chair said. And it seems to me that we have a \$15 billion 8 9 funding gap, and we've got a lot going on in this 10 legislative session, and a lot that's important. 11 But, I feel like I might be the most nervous 12 person in this room about the \$15 billion funding 13 gap. 14 I just want to make sure that my 15 understanding of this policy concern and yours are 16 aligned. 17 That's a big problem; right? THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Absolutely. 18 19 I've been 40 years in the business. 20 Absolutely, sir. And I say that 21 respectfully. 22 SENATOR SQUADRON: Oh, good, so we share it. 23 What are the consequences if we don't fund 24 it? 25 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Well, first, I'll

start with external parties.

I'll start with the reinvention commission, the Urban Land Institute; people who have looked at the worth and value of the MTA network to the economy.

This is the second-largest economy in the world, second only to Tokyo.

It has been an historic part of New York's growth from World War II.

We're seeing record ridership levels.

You have things here that no other system in the world has.

Nobody has 468 stations.

You know, 71 percent of the city's population lives within one-half mile of a subway station.

I think it's 61 percent of the Long Island Railroad customer lives within two miles of a station.

51 percent of a Metro-North customer lives within two miles of a station.

SENATOR SQUADRON: And with due respect, and out of respect for time I have, the importance of the system is clear.

What are the consequences if we don't find it?

Because, you know, I've got to tell you, I'm in Albany. Sometimes my wife gets home late for the babysitter, on that F Train, and that's a consequence.

And that's a much smaller consequence in my life and many of my constituents' lives.

Tell me the consequences if we don't fund this thing, for riders.

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: If you start at the 32 billion, take off 3 billion for bridges and tunnels, you're down to 29 billion, as we start to lose dollars off that.

If the consensus of the region and the decision-makers at large say, "We can't afford \$29 billion," it will first come out of expansion. Second Avenue subway, the next phase, would be the first.

It will then -- it's arguable as to what extent it would affect East Side access because, if you stall that project, you may have to refund money.

Then you go into what we call "enhanced."

So things like countdown clocks, things like features and elements of the system that maybe the millennials depend on and consider to be

entitlements would have to be sacrificed.

SENATOR SQUADRON: So let me ask you this -
THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Before we have to

protect a state of good repair.

SENATOR SQUADRON: -- I get a lot of angry calls about the countdown clocks on the lettered lines, because they're not there.

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: They're not there.

SENATOR SQUADRON: We're not going to get
them if we don't fund this thing?

SENATOR MARCELLINO: At some point you have to get an alignment between the money we have to fund the program and the projects that get funded with that level.

And so, in a hierarchal fashion, the thing we're going protect is state of good repair.

It may not be that interesting to somebody if they don't see a substation or they don't see cables going to a third rail, but if we don't maintain that, and that's a safety and reliability issue, then we could have a safety and reliability problem so.

And, so, we have to protect that core of \$22 billion.

SENATOR SQUADRON: Let me ask you about that,

because I was just on a B Train that, from

34th Street to West 4th Street, got beaten by two
F trains, shockingly. The express was not just
slow. It was like slow and [unintelligible].

It seemed that the cars on the B were older, the ones on the F were newer.

I was proud with the MTA to create the full-line reviews a few years ago, that have been very effective. In fact, the first one was on the F Line.

One of the things it recommended was, that there should be sort of an alignment of cars, and actually newer cars for the F Line.

I notice we're not seeing that with the same consistency we used to.

I also notice that it seems that the delays on the F Line have picked up.

I want to ask, is there a relationship between how new the cars are, whether there are consistent cars on each line, and delays on that line?

And is that something that's impacted by the capital plan?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: There's some relationship, but the overall level of mean distance

between failure, feet-wide and car-class-wide, has 1 gotten to the point where it's not necessarily an 2 issue of car reliability. 3 There may be other factors that affect the 4 performance of a line. 5 And that's the importance of doing a line 6 7 review, so you can identify what those factors are, and apply resources -- dollars, personnel, 8 9 et cetera -- to try to address those. 10 SENATOR SQUADRON: What's the dollar 11 amount --SENATOR MARCELLINO: Senator Squadron --12 13 SENATOR SQUADRON: Just very briefly --14 SENATOR MARCELLINO: -- one more question, 15 that's it --16 SENATOR SQUADRON: Thank you. 17 SENATOR MARCELLINO: -- okay? Because we 18 have to move on. 19 SENATOR SQUADRON: One question, two parts. 20 What's the dollar amount that we need --21 [Laughter.] 22 SENATOR SQUADRON: And please let me complete 23 it. What's the dollar amount that we need to 24 25 maintain a state of good repair, which means we're

not going to see anymore delays; which means, whether it's my wife or any rider who depends on the on-time train for their job, doesn't have to wait four trains to get on?

What is the dollar amount under which we are in crisis?

And, secondly, one of the full-line reviews going on right now, the C Line, we're very excited for it.

When is that going to be completed?

And, can we count on the fact that, as you committed at your nomination, they're going to continue throughout the system?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: We saved \$22 billion for state of good repair, but it's not a firm line of demarcation, and I'll explain to you why.

A communication-based train-control system replaces an out-of-date or end-of-useful-life wayside block-signal system, so that's state of good repair; but it provides an increased level of safety and reliability, so it's an enhancement.

So it's an order-of-magnitude cost of \$22 billion.

But, there are favorite projects in the enhancement portion that wouldn't get funded if you

dropped as low as \$22 billion. 1 When is the line review for the C done, 2 3 Carmen? I'm sorry. CARMEN BIANCO: Yeah, the C Line, I'm hoping 4 to see that data come to me within the next month. 5 6 We will share that with the chairman, and 7 then certainly share that with --Oh, I'm sorry. 8 The C is the end of the year, that's right. 9 SENATOR SQUADRON: I liked your first answer 10 11 better. 12 [Laughter.] 13 CARMEN BIANCO: But the C will be later on in 14 the year. SENATOR SQUADRON: Well, right, a little more 15 16 depth on that would be great, but I'll give time 17 back to the Chair. 18 Thank you. SENATOR GOLDEN: One quick question, because 19 20 I have to get going. 21 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Senator Golden, quickly. 22 SENATOR GOLDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 23 According to the -- Senator Murphy, missed 24 it, the -- we put the lockbox into place. 25 If they didn't put the lockbox into place,

1 they'd just keep on sweeping the funds. We still don't have a complete lockbox that -- to stop 2 3 sweeping the funds so that you can continue to keep that money in the system. 4 We're going to continue to work with that. 5 6 I didn't get an answer on the last 7 question -- my first question about the study on the express buses and the R Train. 8 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: I don't think we 9 committed to a study, but we'll take a look at that. 10 11 SENATOR GOLDEN: You did, you did, you did. 12 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: We'll take a look at 13 it and we'll get you an answer. 14 SENATOR GOLDEN: Okay. 15 The New York City Mayor, did they cut their 16 funding to the capital program? 17 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Historically -- I'll let Bob answer that question. 18 19 Bob? 20 ROBERT FORAN: The level of funding that they 21 have in the current budget is \$40 million a year. 22 We expect that there could be continued 23 discussions with them, but that is lower than what

SENATOR GOLDEN: What did they give, 136

they had in the last --

24

25

last -- what was last year's? 1 ROBERT FORAN: Last year was, like, 2 \$100 million, excluding the Number 7 extension. 3 I should point that out. 4 5 So just the regular recurring, it was around 6 \$100 million. 7 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: In our plan, we're proposing 125. 8 9 ROBERT FORAN: 125. SENATOR GOLDEN: You're asking my colleagues 10 11 here to put money in. 12 You've got to make sure the City of New York 13 is putting its fair share --14 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: That's why I said 15 "four." 16 It's federal, state, local, and also people 17 who benefit directly and indirectly. 18 SENATOR GOLDEN: I think my colleagues were a little shocked to hear it's only \$36 million. 19 20 The change that you're going to make with 21 the -- on the buses -- the express buses, or 22 anticipated changes, are they going to be 23 community-board approval? Or, because of safety, 24 are they -- as of right, on the changing the 25 crosswalks and putting the --

1 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: We normally go 2 through a community-board process, along with 3 New York City DOT, especially for SBS routes, but other routes as well, and we try to get their 4 5 approval. 6 We don't always get their approval. 7 SENATOR GOLDEN: No, but then you're going to go through the community board --8 9 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Yes. SENATOR GOLDEN: -- you anticipate. 10 11 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Yes. 12 SENATOR GOLDEN: So there's a study underway 13 for these crosswalk changes and removal of the 14 crosswalks, and you're going to come back very shortly with a plan. 15 16 Yes? No? 17 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: I'm not sure where that's coming from, but --18 19 SENATOR GOLDEN: Well, I'm asking. 20 You said you were going to change the 21 crosswalks --22 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: No, no. 23 I said, where there's agreement between the commissioner of DOT, John Samuelsen, and myself,

we're going to look at issues where there's a high

24

25

likelihood or frequency of turning accidents where someone gets struck in a crosswalk.

The first thing is, what can we do to eliminate the turn at that location?

If we can't, then we'll talk about the idea of moving the crosswalk away from the intersection where it's a safer location where there are no turns.

SENATOR GOLDEN: Okay, last question, Mr. Chairman.

The -- no, I thank you for being here, all of you, again.

I have to go to another meeting with the Governor, and that's why I'm going to have to leave, but, this question is important. It goes to the tolls on the Verrazano Bridge, and others: \$16.

At this rate, in the next few years, it will be over \$20.

People can't afford, and I perfectly understand Staten Island can't get off of that island, so I understand their issues. And they deserve the fairness that they do get from the MTA and from the City and State, but, we, too, can't get on that island.

So we have another issue going, and we need

to be able to get relief on that.

Port Authority obviously has a program that works, where they give it, if you're over that bridge three times, it's a 58 percent reduction.

Obviously, I would strongly suggest that the MTA look at that as well, for the people that work and live and do business on Staten Island, so that we can not impact a family.

It's a -- what do you call it? Pass -- EZ-Pass.

It's \$16.

If you are on EZ-Pass, it's \$10.66.

A 58 percent reduction would bring it down to \$6.70, and that's, you know, not interrupting the \$5 charge that the Staten Islanders get for their benefits, which we believe they are entitled to, which we keep.

But that's something I'd like to see happen, going forward.

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: I understand.

SENATOR GOLDEN: Thank you.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Just one quick question from me.

We talk a lot -- this is almost a follow-up on what Senator Golden was talking about -- there

are some bridges that are not tolled at this point in time. The 59th Street Bridge, for example.

If these untolled bridges were tolled, could we reduce the toll on the other bridges, overall, so that there's no net loss, and not necessarily just to increase funding, but just to stop bridge-shopping, so to speak, which a lot of people do?

It creates congestion in certain areas.

And we might be able to lower the tolls on some of these other bridges if we tolled, and figured out so that you're held harmless, so to speak, with the money.

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: That's certainly what Move NY says is the case.

I think we need to review the details to make sure that the net impact is what you say it is, which is neutral, but that's the proposal they have.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: What is your consideration?

Have you considered this? Are you looking at this?

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: We have been in dialogue with them throughout the entire process.

We're concerned about the issue of whether or

not the net impact is neutral or generates the revenue they say it does.

We need to look at it from a standpoint of just due diligence.

The issue of how much is set aside to maintain the bridges that are currently maintained by somebody else is key.

I think when anybody inherits the responsibility of maintenance of an asset, you've got to know exactly what the nature of that asset is.

We know what our assets are that Bridges and Tunnels owns, and we don't give a dollar away and fund other parts of the system as we do until we are assured that that asset is fully maintained, and it's being replaced, and its assets are being replaced.

Right now, we're making hundreds of millions of dollars of expenditures to extend the useful life of the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge for another 50 years, I believe.

And, Jimmy, did you want to add?

JAMES FERRARA: That is correct, Senator.

One thing, we're secure in our knowledge, the assets that we maintain and control are in a very,

very good state of good repair.

And most importantly, to support mass transit over the last 2 years, funding from collection of tolls totaled about \$2 billion.

So we know what our assets are. We know the condition they're in. We know the revenue collected, and where the revenue goes.

When you start discussing, potentially, tolling East River bridges, there are many situations that have to be vetted, to determine what the asset will give you back in return, minus costs: minus repair, minus operating costs and capital costs.

There are many things to be discussed -- SENATOR MARCELLINO: What I'm suggesting is, discuss them.

Let's not just talk about it. Let's do it.

I mean, if there's a potential out there to ease this --

THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: We've had discussions with them, and we will continue the discussions.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: I know, but, I mean, it's got to come to a conclusion.

I understand discussions, but it's got to come to a conclusion at some point in time, that we

do this.

I do know people do shop for -- a lot of people will come to an area where it's not tolled. They want to save the 15, 16 dollars.

I don't blame them.

But that adds to traffic congestion in those neighborhoods and air pollution in those neighborhoods, and a whole bunch of other things that happen in those areas, that might be alleviated if we moved along.

I understand there's additional costs that has to be taken into consideration.

I understand all that.

And I understand repair and maintenance, and subtracting costs, with potential [unintelligible].

But let's get those studies done.

How much time does it take to do a study on numbers?

Let's work it out, okay, gentlemen?

Second round, last round, with this Panel,

please, because we have a time problem, and we have
three other panels.

Senator Martins, and then Senator Dilan.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

Let's take up where we left off, shall we?

\$32 billion in this 5-year capital plan: 1 3 billion for bridges and tunnels, for \$29 billion. 2 You said \$7 billion would be what we were 3 going to borrow, but we have a \$15 billion 4 shortfall, don't we? 5 6 ROBERT FORAN: Yes. 7 SENATOR MARTINS: So how does that get made up, and how does that factor into your "\$7 billion" 8 figure? 9 ROBERT FORAN: Well, as I said, the current 10 11 12 is \$15 billion short. 13

financial plan, which is the one that we presented,

So of the funding that we have for you, \$16 billion, \$7 billion of that was bonding.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It's an ongoing discussion that you clearly will be very much a part of, in terms of coming up with how we're going to close that.

To the extent that the State came up with more money, that would reduce the net deficit.

To the extent the feds came up with more money, that's going to reduce the deficit.

To the extent that the City, that will reduce the deficit.

We're also, again, pushing very hard to see what we can get from the private sector.

So all I know right now, is the deficit looks 1 to be about \$15 billion. 2 How that's made up with, I don't know, but we 3 did not put additional bonding on the table. 4 SENATOR MARTINS: I understand. 5 So, \$7 billion, plus the \$15 billion, for a 6 7 total of 22 billion, right now, since there doesn't appear to be another funding source until we're able 8 9 to reach consensus on something. 10 What is the current level of the MTA 11 outstanding debt? 12 ROBERT FORAN: 34 billion. 13 SENATOR MARTINS: 34 billion. 14 In the history of the MTA, it's 34 billion, 15 and you're conceptually asking for 22 billion for 16 the next 5 years? 17 ROBERT FORAN: I'm not asking for 22. 18 SENATOR MARTINS: Okay. 19 You've got 7 billion against the \$29 billion 20 proposal --21 ROBERT FORAN: Right. 22 SENATOR MARTINS: -- so there's a \$22 billion 23 gap. 24 ROBERT FORAN: There is a \$15 billion gap. 25 There's \$22 billion -- it's 15 gap, and we

have 7, that was your 22.

SENATOR MARTINS: That's my point.

ROBERT FORAN: I'm just saying that there's a \$15 billion gap.

SENATOR MARTINS: Plus the 7 billion that you're already borrowing as against the other --

ROBERT FORAN: The amount of money that we have put into this plan for borrowing, the 7 billion, that's -- a significant portion of that we've already set monies aside for.

You heard us talk earlier about the pay-as-you go?

Every time we did a refunding, and we have probably generated, on a present-value basis, the amount of money that we've saved with refundings over the last 4 years is about, I'd say, close to a billion three.

Every time we saved money on our refundings, when interest rates were lower and we replaced high-interest debt with low-interest debt, we have been banking that money for this capital program of '15 to '19.

When we've saved money by reducing costs, we either put it to reducing the fares or we also set it aside for the debt service.

So, effectively, we think that this \$290 million that we still have set aside every year, beginning this year, 2015, will support about \$5.4 billion of either debt and pay-as-you-go.

So the commitment we're making, is every time we can save money, we're trying to figure out, if it was capital, capitally derived, can we put it aside for the next capital program?

And that's what we're trying to do.

SENATOR MARTINS: No, I understand.

This is the equivalent of somebody refinancing their house, saving a portion of that money, and then deciding, with that portion that they saved in their monthly mortgage payment, that they can then take out an equity loan and afford a certain amount as against that.

ROBERT FORAN: Yeah, if they were going to -it would make perfect sense if you're going to use
that for a needed addition on your house or to
reroof it.

So that's what we're doing.

SENATOR MARTINS: Two more questions, Mr. Chairman.

One is, very quickly, MTA payroll tax.

Back when it was passed, I understood that

there was a downturn in the economy, and significant losses in revenues to the MTA that came through things like mortgage tax, the real-estate industry was in a different place.

But, can you speak to those revenue streams, and how they have come back over the last five, six years, and whether or not we're back in a position where those funding streams are restored such that the MTA payroll tax is redundant?

ROBERT FORAN: At its height, we were about a billion seven. That was the total amount of real-estate revenues that we received.

I think we have something -- if you hold one second, I'll tell you what we have coming in.

In the 2015 budget, we're talking about the urban tax, which is a real-estate tax; it's some mortgage recording; and it's also the real-property transfer. It's 675 million.

And our mortgage-recording tax -- excuse me.

And the mortgage-recording tax is about

365 million.

So we're a little bit over a billion dollars.

So we're still 600, 700 million dollars short of where we were at the peak.

And during that time our costs have continued

to go.

SENATOR MARTINS: Sure.

And just to highlight, or to piggyback on a point that Senator Golden and Senator Marcellino made, I understand, and I see this figure a lot, this \$1 trillion asset that we have that is the MTA, and I appreciate it. I truly do.

You know, I thank God that this was done 100-plus years ago, where we didn't to have pay for it today, and we, literally, have the benefit of this great investment that was made privately over 100 years ago.

But when you come right down to it, it comes down to people's ability to use mass transit.

And, so, if a peaked ticket from Mineola to Penn Station cost me \$20, if I don't -- if I buy it on the train, at some point there's a cost that is just -- it's impractical for a family to travel using the train, and we're being pushed into cars.

And, so, when we consider the trillion-dollar figure, I get it, but, we also have to make sure that people can continue to use these trains. And it's becoming evermore expensive.

And, certainly, we've discussed this in the past. These fare increases on top of fare increases

are significant.

And though we have to maintain it, and maintain this system, I would just encourage you to take into consideration the actual cost to the users today.

Not everybody's going into the city to work.

Other people need to get into the city
sporadically.

They don't have the opportunity to buy these monthly passes.

The idea is, mass transit should be cheaper than the alternative. And when it's not, there's a real problem.

And, folks, I would suggest to you that we're reaching the point where it's no longer cost-effective for a family to travel using mass transit into the city.

Thank you.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Thank you.

Senator Dilan.

SENATOR DILAN: Yes.

This year's executive budget proposes to repropose \$104 million of surplus operating revenues into capital projects; however, the executive also reports that you will only realize \$37 million this

year.

Where did the other \$67 million go?

Is it being swept?

ROBERT FORAN: No. No, that's not a sweep.

What they did is, of the monies that we received from the Metropolitan Mass Transit operating assistance account, we call it "MTOA," \$104 million is being recharacterized as capital for us.

We were expecting about \$68 million of that to come to us as operating.

There was actually \$37 million more than we had anticipated receiving.

So in one sense, we already had pay-as-you-go capital in our budget. So, the \$68 million that they have identified for capital, we'll just reduce our pay-as-you-go capital by that amount so that that money can go for operations.

But the net effect of it is, they are giving us \$37 million more than we had expected, and that's been earmarked, designated, for capital.

SENATOR DILAN: Okay. Thank you.

Since safety has also been an issue here today, I know the costs, for many years, subway entrances throughout the New York City subway system

1 have been closed. Can you get us a list of those closed 2 3 entrances? And, for example, in my district, we have at 4 least 10 stations that are closed. 5 6 And, in view of the increased ridership, 7 would it be appropriate to reevaluate those closed 8 entrances? And it's something I would like to work with 9 10 you on. 11 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: We'll get you a list 12 of the closures, and we'll take a look at them in 13 terms of reevaluation in terms of their opening. SENATOR DILAN: So we'll follow up? 14 15 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Yes. 16 SENATOR DILAN: Thank you. 17 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Senator Hoylman. Thank you, Senator. 18 19 SENATOR SQUADRON: Senator Hoylman's not 20 here. 21 I'll take the second round. 22 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Senator Squadron. 23 SENATOR SQUADRON: Thank you. Let me come at this just slightly 24 differently. 25

1 We know the absolute minimum before the 2 system starts to really fall apart, and we know that that'll happen quickly if it does. 3 \$32 billion was passed by the board, as you 4 5 pointed out. In that \$32 billion, do you see any wasted 6 7 expenditures? 8 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: No. SENATOR SQUADRON: None? 9 10 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Not at all. 11 If you take a look at the Urban Land 12 Institute report, and you take a look at others that 13 are third parties, compare it against a trillion-dollar asset, the size of the ask should be 14 closer to \$40 billion. 15 16 There's a limit with respect to how much we 17 could ramp up. "\$32 billion" is a number that the board 18 19 agreed upon, as submitted by the staff, in terms of 20 this balanced approach to state of good repair, 21 enhance, and expand. 22 SENATOR SQUADRON: Great. 23 And so -- and when we hear about expand,

we're talking not talking about some skyway to, you

know, I don't even know.

24

25

We're talking about Second Avenue subway that 1 2 we've already invested a huge amount in, East Side access, 7 Train extension --3 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: 7 Train extension is 4 already funded. 5 It's Penn Access for Metro-North. 6 7 SENATOR SQUADRON: So we're talking -okay --8 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Yes. 9 10 SENATOR SQUADRON: -- for Metro-North? 11 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Yes. SENATOR SQUADRON: And we're talking things 12 13 like about countdown clocks, so that people can make 14 smart, informed decisions about which subway to get 15 on? 16 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: That's more in the 17 enhanced part of the program: improve the level and 18 quality of service. 19 SENATOR SQUADRON: Great. 20 And, we're talking making sure that we don't 21 have cars and switches and third rails that break 22 down? That's something that --23 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: That's in the state 24 of good repair. 25 SENATOR SQUADRON: Great.

So I just want to be very clear: We cut that 1 2 \$32 billion, we're going to be cutting something 3 that, in your 40-year experience, you think is valuable and important for the system? 4 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Yes. 5 6 SENATOR SQUADRON: Thank you very much. 7 I also just want to say, briefly, I think we all know that, as the Chair talked about, 8 route-shopping is going on like crazy. 9 It goes on across my district. And 10 11 Broome Street goes on through my district in 12 Brooklyn Heights. And so I think we do know that's 13 a huge problem that we need to --14 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Route-shopping, or 15 bridge-shopping? 16 SENATOR SQUADRON: Bridge-shopping. 17 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Okay. 18 SENATOR SQUADRON: Thank you. 19 SENATOR GOLDEN: Thank you, gentlemen. 20 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Gentlemen, I appreciate 21 your time. 22 That's last question for this Panel, and 23 thank you very much for coming. 24 Tom, look forward to hearing from those --25 those reports, if you could send them to us, we

1 would appreciate that. THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: Yes. 2 And we'll bring Pat out to meet with you. 3 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Thank you. 4 THOMAS F. PRENDERGAST: He really wanted to 5 be here today. 6 7 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Send him our best wishes. 8 9 The next panel is William Henderson and Ellyn Shannon. 10 11 Thank you very much for your willingness to 12 attend. 13 You are part of the Public Citizen Advisory 14 Council [sic]. And your mission, I guess, is to --15 and if I'm incorrect in this, you can correct me, 16 please -- is to provide uses of the MTA subway, bus, 17 and commuter-rail services, and give a voice in the 18 formulation and implementation of MTA policy, and hold the MTA board and the MTA management 19 20 accountable to the riders? 21 WILLIAM HENDERSON: That's essentially 22 correct, Senator. 23 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Okay. 24 You're on. 25 WILLIAM HENDERSON: Okay, we appreciate the

opportunity to testify this morning.

The last eight years have been a difficult period for the MTA.

It's hard to conceive that riding high in the revenue is from dedicated real-estate taxes.

The MTA, in 2005 and 2006, was able to offer riders a holiday bonus that included half fare on weekends, bonus days, metro cards, free off-peak tickets on commuter rail -- and free off-peak tickets on commuter railroads.

Soon after, the economy crashed, and the good times ended.

Since 2008, MTA has struggled mightily.

The MTA's efforts to budget the balance have been outlined by the chairman, including \$1.1 billion in annual cost-saving measures.

Unfortunately, they also included a package of service cuts approved in 2010 that produced a great deal of hardship for many riders.

Improvements in the general economy have allowed the MTA to put back some of the those service cuts and improve service, starting in 2012, but fare increases agreed upon in connection with the MTA rescue package have really taken their toll on riders.

A series of fare increases that were put in effect since 2009 have severely impacted household budgets; at the same time, many riders are coping with stagnant or falling incomes.

As a result of the upcoming fare increase, a family of two commuters from Wassaic on

Metro-North's Harlem Line, who use New York City

transit to complete their journeys, will pay over

\$1250 per month in monthly commuting costs, and

that's before taking into account the additional

cost of transportation to their home station.

This is an extreme example, but it's not an isolated one.

The situation is the same on Long Island.

The situation is the same in the northern parts of the Metro-North area.

People are hurting because of commuting costs.

The PCAC and its councils don't believe riders should be held harmless from increasing costs that the MTA faces.

It's long been our position that riders, like all who benefit from the system, must pay their fair share of the cost of operating the system.

Our concern, is that MTA riders already pay

the highest percentage of operating expenditures of any public-transit users in the nation.

In 2012, this figure was 53.2 percent, compared with 33.2 percent for systems nationally.

Subway and bus riders pay 52.6 percent of expenditures.

Subway riders alone pay 73.2 percent.

The fare hikes in 2013 and 2015 have the effect of increasing the proportional costs that's borne by riders.

The primary factor exerting pressure on MTA's finances, and, consequently, on the fare, is the authority's immense bond obligation for capital expenditures.

We continue to be concerned about the MTA's debt load, which, as of the end of last year, as the chairman said, tops \$34 billion.

The MTA expects its annual debt-service expenses to rise, from 2.3 billion in 2014, to 2.9 billion in 2018.

To put in it perspective, the 2018 debt service that the MTA has to pay will amount to over 49 percent of the fares that it collects.

Increasing the burden without new revenues to meet debt-service needs is not a viable option.

The challenges facing the MTA system demand a balanced approach, but one thing that's out of balance is the authority's spending on capital investments.

The MTA's spending on capital investments is programmed through a series of 5-year capital programs.

The system has been in place since 1982 and it served the MTA system well.

It's directed about \$150 billion, in 2014 dollars, to maintenance, improvement, and expansion, and it's enabled dramatic increases in service quality and quantity.

Unfortunately, as you know, there's no approved capital program in place.

The need for capital investment is ongoing, and we believe that the State has a responsibility to adequately provide for the MTA's capital needs so that vital work to maintain and improve bus, commuter rail, and subway service will not be delayed.

There's a lot to do.

Although infrastructure has been stabilized and reliability has improved greatly from the '70s and '80s, the MTA system requires constant

infrastructural replacement and renewal and maintenance to support this improved service.

Rails and stations have to be renewed. New buses, railcars, and locomotives must be purchased, and signal systems must be replaced and updated.

The capital needs of the MTA go beyond maintaining the system in a state of good repair.

This region faces great challenges in adapting to new weather patterns, and the MTA's assets must be hardened against more frequent and severe storms.

Further, the ridership of the system is changing and expanding, as the chairman noted.

We're seeing increasing demands on the MTA service. Ridership is at levels not seen since the '40s and '50s, and not recorded at all.

There has to be more capacity in the system to provide for these demands.

The MTA needs modernized signal systems that include more trains to travel over the same tracks, and new fare systems that allow it to efficiently collect fares and speed bus boarding.

It has to continue with development of better information systems, like the countdown clocks, the bus-time information system, help-point intercoms,

and these make travel more secure and efficient.

The MTA has to follow through on the commitment that it and the City made to providing Rapid Bus service, and expanding and improving the bus network.

It needs to provide new commuter-rail facilities and equipment to respond to changing population and development patterns on Long Island and the five MTA counties north of New York City, and to ensure that the ally RR and Metro-North service meets federal mandates and is as safe as possible.

This isn't possible without a robust MTA capital program and the funding to carry that out.

As the chairman noted, the PCAC, in cooperation with the Urban Land Institute of New York, recently released a study of the impact of investment in the MTA's capital stock on the economy of the area, and we have seen some notable conclusions from that.

The findings are available online at KeepNYontrack.org, and we encourage people to take a look at those.

For all the good that the capital program has done and all the promise it holds for the future,

there remain some serious issues in addition to the lack of a program.

The first, is that the MTA investment and its capital assets is stunningly low.

And you might think \$32 billion is an awful lot of money, but the replacement value of the MTA's asset base is about a trillion dollars, as the chairman again noted.

A more conservative figure that considers depreciation and other factors in a way consistent with the financials of major corporations is \$485 billion.

Even if we look at this lower figure, the MTA invests in its capital assets at a rate of

1.1 percent per year, which is dramatically lower than private freight railroads that invest at rates between 6 and 7 percent.

The MTA's relative investment rates is even lower when compared to regional utility companies and other firms in the transportation industry, like UPS and FedEx.

Planning for investment in the MTA's asset base means nothing if the resources available are -- necessary to achieve plans are unavailable.

And the MTA, and -- the MTA program -- in

terms of the MTA program, the PCAC remains

apprehensive that the resources available will not

be -- the resources necessary will not be there to

make the transportation investments that are needed.

Even at the relatively low reinvestment rate that the MTA has proposed, only about one-half of the funding is there to make these investments.

The MTA's proposed capital program has a big funding gap of \$15.2 billion, and that assumes that federal support is going to be maintained as it has in the past.

Recent history does little to quell our fears of getting an adequate capital program approved.

In 2009, to 2014, the capital program was fully funded when it was initially adopted. It was reduced to meet available funding, and was largely financed through increased debt backed by funding originally intended to provide capital funds on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The outlook this time around is, if anything, worse.

This year's executive-budget proposal is not encouraging.

While the capital program is the MTA's most critical need for the future, the executive budget

does not address MTA's capital-resource needs.

MTA is now unable to make substantial long-term commitments to capital spending, threatening the state's construction and industrial sectors and the thousands of jobs that depend upon them.

We continue to be concerned that the -- by the ongoing diversion of revenues from dedicated transit funds to uses other than those for which they were originally intended.

We've heard about the executive budget taking \$121.5 million in transit revenues from the MTOA fund and using it to fund new capital expenditures.

We also have heard last year about a diversion of dedicated funds. Use it -- found that in -- use of \$20 million per year of MTOA funds to pay off state service-contract debt. And this is scheduled to be repeated every year through 2019.

An improving economy is strengthening the MTA's financial position, but this positive development could be short-lived without adequate financial support from the State.

The system is simply not in a position where it can afford to lose revenue sources without some

kind of replacement revenue.

The MTA's adopted budget projects a closing cash balance of only \$64 million for 2015.

That's a lot of money, but it's a razor-thin margin for an organization with an annual budget of over \$13 billion, and it's less than 1/2 of 1 percent of the MTA's total expenditures.

Because the budget is so precarious, funding stability is critical.

The PCAC has, for many years, called upon our elected officials to provide the MTA with a balanced package of funding sources that, taken as a whole, are stable, reliable, and able to grow in line with the increased cost of providing the transportation sources and services that are needed.

We continue to believe that safeguards, such as a meaningful lockbox for dedicated funds, should be in place to prevent raids on MTA funding.

While there's reasons to be cautiously optimistic, changes can be quick.

Many of us remember that -- as I said before, that the MTA, in 2005-2006 had plenty of money, and that evaporated very quickly in the financial crises of 2009, and service cuts and funding cuts in 2010.

Without new debt -- without new funding, the

only way to fund the capital program will be more bonding against additional revenues.

But it's not reasonable to ask an entity that can't meet its full operating costs through the fare box, and can only, with great difficulty, produce a self sustaining-budget, to fund capital expenditures through bonds.

This strategy will only increase the MTA's debt load of \$34 billion, and further increase the annual debt service projected to reach 2.9 billion in 2018, and amount to over 49 percent of fares collected.

We believe that the State must return to its legacy of support for the MTA, and ensure that funding for the 2015-2019 capital program will not put pressure on the MTA's operating budget or on its fares and tolls.

Along with riders, those who receive advantages from the MTA system also include motorists, business, and real-estate interests, and all who depend on the economic viability made possible by the MTA system.

These persons and entities have traditionally paid their share of the cost of operating the MTA through a series of dedicated taxes and state

general-fund appropriation, and the State must now take a fresh look at funding sources that are tied to benefits that the system generates.

Creating a strong and equitable funding structure for the MTA may include consideration measures such as a rationalization of bridge and tunnel crossing charges to generate additional toll revenue, while reducing the negative impacts of bridge shopping on neighboring communities.

And you'll hear more about this, I'm sure, in Mr. Matthiessen's presentation.

Revenues could also be increases -- increased through adjustments to some of the existing revenue sources, uncapping some of the revenue sources that are currently capped.

Another possibility is capturable portion of the value created through the construction or improvement of transit system -- transit facilities through special-assessment districts or other means.

The State once before rose to the challenge of rescuing the MTA from its financial crises, and we again ask for you to rise to this challenge and create a more useable and efficient system.

The downstate region in our state would not exist in their present form without public

transportation service provided by the MTA and its operating agencies.

It's only proper that those that are benefited by the system provide for its support.

We ask our elected officials to initiate and guide a broad public discussion of the funding structure that assures long-term success of the MTA system.

Thank you.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Thank you.

Question: Does the PCAC support the MTA's policy of increasing fares and tolls every two years?

WILLIAM HENDERSON: We support the policy of the riders being one of many funding sources that meet increasing costs.

We -- what we don't like is that the riders are being asked to pay an ever-increasing proportion of costs of providing service.

Whether it's -- you know, there is some merit in doing fare increases every two years, I won't deny that.

It's better than the system that prevails, say, in New Jersey, where you don't have any fare increases for 10 years, and then you have a whopper.

A 25 percent increase, I think, the last time they did it.

That's really tough on a budget.

If your subway fares have gone up a quarter every two years, and maybe every four years, because you're alternating the passes and the cash fare, that's a little bit easier to handle on the budgetary side.

I mean, somebody's got to pay for this,

Senator. And we don't think that riders ought to be
exempt, but riders should -- by the same token,

riders shouldn't be taken advantage of. Riders
shouldn't continue to bear more and more of the

cost.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Well, the reason I raise it is because the fares and tolls, as you know, will be going up an average of 4 percent in -- which is, you know, 2 percent annually, later this month.

The previous increase took place in 2013 at 7 1/2 percent.

And the next increase is scheduled for March 2017, 4 percent.

And until the current increase, the MTA fare and toll increases over the past several years have significantly exceeded the inflation rate.

1 WILLIAM HENDERSON: That's correct. 2 SENATOR MARCELLINO: So, by that, is the -in your opinion, is the MTA doing a good job? 3 WILLIAM HENDERSON: I think the MTA is doing 4 what it has to do. 5 Unfortunately, there's only -- there's 6 7 basically only two things that the board can do to improve its financial position. 8 9 One is increase fares and tolls; the other is cut services. 10 11 In the absence of other funding -- in the 12 absence of other funding --13 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Do we reach a point 14 where we drive people out who need the service? 15 WILLIAM HENDERSON: Yes. 16 SENATOR MARCELLINO: And do we reach a point 17 where, if we keep cutting and cutting and cutting, we will drive people out --18 19 WILLIAM HENDERSON: Yes, we do. 20 SENATOR MARCELLINO: -- and put them -- we 21 don't want them back in their cars. 22 WILLIAM HENDERSON: Yes, we do. And I think 23 we drive people out who are -- you know, like you 24 say, the household that's paying \$1250 a month to

commute, you're driving those people out.

25

You are saying, you know, don't work in the city anymore because you've got to generate a \$15,000 nut, after taxed income, just to pay your commuting costs before you get dollar one to put in your family's needs.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Where I live, the average income -- and then I'll move on to another question -- but the average income is about \$60,000 a year.

Use of the Long Island Railroad to the city, and then with a subway card, because they're going to need one after that, maybe a cab, puts it over about \$5,000 annually.

WILLIAM HENDERSON: Yeah.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: That's a pretty big chunk of your money, and then you're living on the rest.

That doesn't even get to food and fuel, and heat, which is, by the way, absent in this room.

WILLIAM HENDERSON: Yeah.

[Laughter.]

WILLIAM HENDERSON: It makes it very difficult. And, you know, it's compounded by the fact that folks tend to move out farther to get more housing value for their money --

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Absolutely.

WILLIAM HENDERSON: -- which increases their transportation costs. So things that are --

SENATOR MARCELLINO: I use -- I use where I live, because it's Centre Island, basically.

WILLIAM HENDERSON: Yeah, I mean, folks who are living out in Smithtown probably are -- you know, they may enjoy the area, but they may also enjoy the fact that they can actually buy a house that they can afford out there, rather than a little bit closer in.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: I hear you.

Senator Martins.

And we've been joined by Senator Felder, and he can prepare his questions.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you both for being here.

One of the concerns I have is, as we go through this process of capital reinvestment in the MTA, and we all understand how important the MTA is as an asset and economic engine, but I always get the sense that these reinvestments, rather than just being maintenance, are upgrades.

And although upgrades are fine, if we can afford them, that, oftentimes, the same thing can be

done for far less if we're just talking about maintaining a system as it currently stands.

And we understand that people can't afford to continue to pay ever-increasing costs.

I don't live out in Smithtown.

I'm from Mineola; and, so, you know, the cost of someone traveling to the city during peak hours is significant. It is significant.

And if you add a number of people, and if a family goes in, and I made the point before, it becomes prohibitive.

So do you, as part of the PCAC, evaluate, not only the investment in infrastructure, but also, qualitatively, what types of investment they're making, and whether or not it is justified or reasonable to do it at this point?

ELLYN SHANNON: In this report that we partnered with the Urban Land Institute on, we looked at the global competitiveness.

So, what are other systems doing?
We also looked at the sustainability.

And particularly after "Sandy," the need for upgrades has become that much more important to try and make the system a much more resilient system.

And so, in light of those two things, and

then there's the third factor that they need to accommodate, is it gets very hard getting replacement parts and doing it the way it used to be done; whether you're upgrading your switches, which is a major need right now on a 100-year-old system.

And, so, those three factors make it so they're not really luxury items. They're items that are necessary in order to keep up and make it a system that functions as well as possible.

WILLIAM HENDERSON: I think I would add to that, some of these upgrades are necessary for the demands that are being put on the system. And I mean that in terms of quantity and in terms of quality.

The signalization improvements that the MTA is moving forward on are absolutely critical in putting more trains out on the same amount of track.

We're not going to -- in -- with some limited exceptions, we're not going to be building many new subways.

We have to put more -- move more people through the existing subways, and the only way you can do that is by improving signalization. You know, basically, getting more trains on that same piece of track.

The other thing is, people are conditioned to want more information.

So, you know, it used to be okay to lean over the track and look for the light down -- you know, down three or four stations down the track.

Now people want to know when the next train is coming. "How many minutes am I going have to wait?"

You know, a lot of that has to do with, you know, the information age.

But, if you look at the reaction people have had to the countdown-clock technology, it has been overwhelmingly positive, and, actually, has been one of the things that I think has improved people's view of the transit system more than any other element.

What has happened -- what happened with those countdown clocks and -- is that they were, basically, an add-on to a system of train control.

The countdown clocks, if you look at what -if you wanted to say, What would it cost us to put
countdown clocks on the system, working from whole
cloth? it would be a very high figure.

If you said, What does it cost us to add on countdown clocks under the system where we're

already putting in fiber optics and train control? it wasn't all that expensive, and it's had big dividends.

So I think it's -- it's not -- it's not a matter of -- in a sense, it's not a matter of being cheap. It's a matter of looking for value. And it's a matter of getting -- you know, if you can get something that improves people's experience, and do it in a way that's an acceptable value, you do it.

And I think they've made -- you know, they've made the right decision there.

SENATOR MARTINS: No, I understand, but, you know, in the abstract, we can all sit here and agree that we need all of these upgrades, and we need to spend this money on capital improvements. And then we sit back and we realize that it means borrowing, you know, an unimaginable amount of money.

And, we also have to consider the consequences of authorizing borrowing that kind of money on future expenses, because they have to maintain that system as well, and the complexity of the new systems that are being placed in service; as well as, you know, what's it going to cost the average rider, whether on the Long Island Railroad, Metro-North, buses, or the subway system?

How much is it going to cost at a time when people just can't afford it?

And, so, we can advocate for more, in the abstract, but, how much is it going to cost, ultimately, to put all this in place when there isn't a system to sort of absorb that cost right now?

How do we do it?

WILLIAM HENDERSON: Well, as I said before, somebody's got to pay for this, and that's -- you know, that's the bottom line.

And if the money isn't there to pay for this, you can't do it.

However, there are some -- however, a lot -- a lot of the money that's in the capital program is absolutely necessary for the system to operate. If you don't spend it, the system will begin to break down, and begin to break down fairly quickly.

You know, people look at the -- people look at what they call the "mega projects." They look at East Side access and the Second Avenue subway.

They really make up a fairly small portion of the capital program.

SENATOR MARTINS: Very small portion.

WILLIAM HENDERSON: Yeah.

Most of the money that's going in is going into maintenance, repair.

And a lot of the money that's going in, in upgrades, or in the "enhanced" portion of the capital program, as the MTA calls it, is -- is a -- expenditures on replacing things that are not available anymore.

You can't go out -- you can't go out and buy the signal system that is in place now.

At one time, the MTA had people working, rewinding relays by hand, because you can't buy the relays anymore.

You have to move forward.

It's like trying to -- you know, trying to work on a tube-type television. It's almost more expensive to try to recreate what's there than it is to move on to the next technology.

SENATOR MARTINS: Which begs the next question: How did we get here?

I mean, how did we get to such a state of disrepair when we want to reach a state of good repair?

How did we get to such a state of disrepair, where we're looking at the potential of borrowing that much money, literally, doubling the amount of

outstanding debt for the MTA that they've acquired over their entire history; doubling it in the next five years?

And has there been a lack of attention to these details over the history of the MTA, that now places it more in focus for this next 5-year plan?

WILLIAM HENDERSON: Well, one thing

I would say, is the quality of the system has been improving, from the beginning of the capital programs, up through the present time.

That doesn't change the fact that it is incredibly expensive to maintain that system.

I mean, it's -- you know, we're talking about a huge asset. A trillion -- if you want to take the chairman's view of it, a trillion dollars.

If you want to take an accountant's view of it, it's \$482 billion; half a trillion dollars.

It's still huge.

And what we're investing in maintaining that system is, at the lower number, about 1 percent of the -- about 1 percent of its value.

What the freight railroads, the Class 1's, the Union Pacific, the Norfolk Southerns, their investment is 6 to 7 percent of the value of their assets.

Now, it's not, strictly speaking, comparable. There are differences.

But you look at FedEx and UPS, they're investing upwards -- close to double-digits of the value of their assets in maintenance, repair, and improvement.

ELLYN SHANNON: I think one other area, if you want to look at it over the 30-year period and what the investment money has done so far, it has increased the capacity of the system for a million riders -- a million more riders.

And now they're expecting a million more on top of that.

The complexity that's being faced right now is, ridership patterns are changing, and, you have times of day changing too.

So where, on Long Island, you have a majority of a two-track system, and sometimes a one-track system, you have to find ways of, you know, getting more capacity out of your tracks. And the same with the subway system.

The subway system, really, on a signaling basis, the A Division has been done.

The B Division is substantially bigger, and it hasn't even -- you know, they haven't gotten to

that.

So I don't think it's a matter of that it's fallen down over the 30 years.

It's that recovering from all those years of disinvestment on a 100-year-old system is taking a long time and it costs a lot of money.

WILLIAM HENDERSON: I mean, if you look at
the -- look at it this way: If the average life of
an asset is 33 years, that means, to keep it up, you
have to spend 3 percent every year on that asset.
Either put it in a sinking fund so it can go and
replace the asset, or, put it in periodic
maintenance, improvement, renewal, so, you know, you
spend it over the life.

They're not doing that right now, you know, and we're concerned about that.

We're very concerned that there is adequate money on the capital side to address the needs that are out there.

Yeah, it's a lot of money, it's a big number, but, you know, so is the value of the system.

SENATOR MARTINS: Of course, and someone's got to pay for it in the end.

The only other thing I'll leave, and it's more of a rhetorical point than anything else:

If there's going to be a \$30 billion investment over the next 5 years, and then we can prepare for another \$30 billion investment the 5 years after that, this is not a cure-all or a fix-all. This is just another step along the way.

And, so, the commitment that needs to be made for this 5-year plan also has to be made in the context of the next 5-year plan, and the one after that, and the one after that.

And if we're in a position where we're going to be borrowing tens of billions of dollars every five years, how much can the system sustain in terms of debt load, and how much can we expect our riders to have to pick up?

If we consider that, if we make this investment, then we have to make the next one. And if we make this one, then we can't afford not to make the next one.

And it is just a self-perpetuating -frankly, self-perpetuating reality that it's going
to add cost to the bottom line and increase fares to
a level that is unsustainable.

And I'm concerned about that because we're only talking about the next five years.

But, inherent in our discussion is a much

longer commitment and much more expensive 1 commitment. 2 WILLIAM HENDERSON: I absolutely agree with 3 that. 4 5 SENATOR MARCELLINO: We are going to have to leave that as a rhetorical question. 6 We're running out of time. 7 Senator Felder? 8 9 SENATOR FELDER: No, I --10 SENATOR MARCELLINO: No, you don't have to 11 push that. 12 SENATOR FELDER: No, I know I don't have to. 13 I just wanted to say that I apologize for not 14 getting here earlier. 15 It's such an important issue, I want to thank 16 you both for all the work you are doing on this 17 issue. 18 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Thank you, Simcha. 19 I just have one quick question, and I'm not 20 looking for a lengthy answer on this. A yes or no 21 would be great. Should the City increase its contribution, 22 23 from \$100 million, to \$125 million as has been 24 proposed? 25 WILLIAM HENDERSON: Yes.

The City was contributing much more in the past, and should return to a pattern that reflects that reality.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Thank you very much for your time. Appreciate it.

WILLIAM HENDERSON: Thank you.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: The next group is

LaTonya Crisp-Sauray, from the Transit [sic] Workers

Union; Dr. James Melius, of the New York State

Laborers; and, George Trickio, from the New York

State Laborers, Local 1298.

LATONYA CRISP-SAURAY: Thank you.

Good morning.

My name is LaTonya Crisp-Sauray. I am the recording secretary of Transport Workers Union, Local 100, the largest transportation union in the nation, which represents 40,000 bus, subway, and bike-share workers throughout New York City and Westchester County.

I want to thank Senator Marcellino and
Senator Robach for giving me the opportunity to
provide testimony on the Metropolitan Transportation
Authority's budget and capital program.

The purpose of my testimony is to encourage the full funding of the MTA's 32 billion capital

plan.

As a bus operator, I have firsthand knowledge about the need for the government's full financial backing of the MTA capital program.

As you all know, it is imperative that we keep New York's economy moving forward.

Citizens rely on the MTA to get to their destinations, work, medical appointments, and places of worship.

Businesses depend on the transit system for customers, and to allow their employees to get back and forth to work safely, quickly, and efficiently.

Students rely on the MTA to get to school to further their education, and strengthen our city and state.

Let's talk about public transportation and why it's important.

The MTA's 4-year 32 billion capital plan entails critical investments to maintain 1 trillion in assets and to expand the system.

This plan will meet the needs of New York's vibrant, growing economy.

More than half of the capital program, or, approximately 17 billion, is allocated for the New York City Transit Authority and the MTA bus

company.

These two agencies alone served more than 2.4 billion passengers in 2014, accounting for more than twice the ridership of the top 14 transit agencies in the United States.

These figures clearly demonstrate the transit system's importance in New York's economic health.

The importance of state of good repair:

First, we must invest in maintaining a state of good repair.

Our transit system is over 100 years old and regularly encounters problems due to infrastructure deterioration.

7 major asset categories are more than 20 percent backlogged in state-of good-repair investments.

These include stations, main-line signals, communications, tunnel lighting, power, ventilation, and subway shops.

As a bus operator, I know firsthand that failing to properly monitor and rehabilitate structures, equipment, and vehicles results in frustration, and often in dangerous conditions, for all.

Injuries and delays in service costs millions

of dollars in lost productivity.

Investing in a state of good repair allows us to avoid preventable breakdowns that curb economic activity and pose risks to public safety.

The role of public transportation is supporting job growth.

We must invest in system expansions in order to adapt to population shifts and ridership trends.

Workers require reliable transportation for their daily commutes.

In Sunset Park in Brooklyn, and Hunts Point, recent government funding have invested into building the waterfronts and marine terminals.

The revitalization of these projects have contributed to new emerging jobs.

Neighborhoods, such as Sunset Park in Brooklyn and Hunts Point in the Bronx are adding thousands of jobs to the economy; yet, these communities lack adequate public-transit services that help residents get to work within 40 minutes.

Proposals for bus rapid transit:

Bus rapid transit is an ideal solution to this problem.

At a fraction of the cost of new subway construction, bus rapid transit offers flexible and

fast surface transportation. The incorporation of bus-rapid-transit elements, such as dedicated lanes, priority signaling, and real-time travel information, will produce greater travel speeds, frequency of service, and capacity.

Full-featured bus rapid transit will provide

New Yorkers with direct and accessible connection to
subway services.

BRT enhancement access to jobs for lower-wage workers throughout the entire city, to health care for people with disabilities, and seniors, and to greater educational opportunities.

A true BRT network will also reduce citizens' reliance on cars, fossil fuels, and enable the city to shrink its carbon footprint.

In view of these benefits, I propose that the State support investments in brand-new bus-rapid-transit routes in the Bronx and Brooklyn.

The routes in the Bronx will connect

Pelham Bay and East Chester to East Harlem,

servicing Co-Op City, Baychester, Pelham Gardens,

Morris Park, Port Chester, Sound View, Clason Point,

Hunts Point, Port Morris, and Mott Haven.

At its southern-most terminus, this route will serve passengers using the future Second Avenue

subway at 125th Street.

The route in Brooklyn will connect

Sunset Park with John F. Kennedy International

Airport, servicing Borough Park, Windsor Terrace,

Prospect Park, Lefferts Gardens, Flatbush Ditmas

Park, East Flatbush, Brownsville, East New York,

Lindenwood, and Howard Beach.

Both of these routes would [unintelligible] residents in transit-underserved communities to major hospitals such as Jacoby Medical Center and Kings County Hospital which are key centers of employment in the health-care sector.

Bus rapid transit will significantly improve the quality of life and broaden economic opportunities for 660,000 residents living within a half mile of these routes.

Compared with local bus service, bus rapid transit in these communities will connect 27 percent more workers to jobs within a 40-minute commute, and, on average, each worker will have access to 30,000 jobs.

It should be noted that more than 60 percent of the workers who live along the proposed BRT routes earn less than \$37,000 a year.

However, enhanced funding for the BRT would

allow the average low-income worker traveling to over 20,000 jobs for which they qualify.

A good return on investment:

Together, these two bus-rapid-transit routes will cost 120 million in initial capital construction; yet, these projects will offer good return on the public's investment. The routes will create 382 new jobs, including direct jobs for downstate transit workers and upstate bus-manufacturing positions.

Also, bus rapid transit will add approximately 20 million in value to the state economy, produce over 50 million in industry activity, and result in a 2 million increase in state and local tax revenues during the year of construction.

Once the routes are operating, they will directly employ 234 transit workers, supporting another 60 jobs throughout the economy, produce almost 10 million in industry activity, and result in an 800,000 increase in state and local tax revenues.

Every dollar invested in these two projects will stimulate 1.68 in economic activity for the entire state.

Government financing of the MTA:

Adequate funding is vital to ensuring quality, affordable, safe, and accessible public transportation for the present and for the future.

Government financing of the MTA preserves the payroll mobility tax, payroll mobility tax replacement funds, and MTA to forestall fare hikes or service cuts.

Consider requiring for-hire car-sharing companies to pay a 50-cent surcharge, like Yellow taxicabs.

For example, in 2013, since Uber provided over 100,000 rides per week in New York City, a 50-cent fee on those rides would have resulted in at least 2.6 million annually.

The revenue from such a project would increase yearly.

The bottom line, is that New York can't afford to delay investments in public transportation.

Failing to act now will cost us millions in growth potential for our economy, and hundreds, if not thousands, of jobs around the state.

We must fully invest now, and sustain our commitments to continue strengthening our economy.

1 Thank you. 2 SENATOR MARTINS: Well said. 3 Thank you. DR. JAMES MELIUS: Yes, good morning. 4 My name is --5 SENATOR MARCELLINO: I just would -- I'm 6 7 looking at your lengthy --DR. JAMES MELIUS: I am going to summarize. 8 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Summarize. 9 DR. JAMES MELIUS: Definitely. 10 11 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Bless you. 12 DR. JAMES MELIUS: Okay. 13 That's what I was doing here, while I was 14 sitting, just underlining certain sections. 15 First of all, thank you both. 16 I have with me, George Trickio, from our 17 Local 1298 on Long Island. I knew that there would be two Long Island 18 Senators still here this afternoon when I testified, 19 20 so I foresaw that and brought George with me. 21 And George also is in charge of our political action committee. 22 23 Our union represents over 40,000 construction 24 workers in the state, most of them living within and

working within the area covered by the MTA.

25

We do have -- well, actually, probably, at the present time, several thousand of them working on MTA projects.

We also are MTA customers.

They and their families rely on the MTA to get to work.

They rely on it functioning 24 hours a day because many of our members work evenings and night shifts, in some ways, to make sure that traffic keeps moving, and that projects can get done in a timely fashion.

We are very supportive, obviously, of the need for an MTA capital plan. And we think that what's contained in the current capital plan is both reasonable and appropriate, given the great needs of the MTA for increased investment.

As we've already heard, many years of inadequate funding have left a large backlog of work. And we can't go back and undo what's happened before, but we certainly need to maintain investment and maintain the growth.

And, you know, the importance of that system means that we need to continue investing in a capital plan, as well as into the operational side of the program.

Right now we're at a stage where I think, in the last several years, our citizens and people throughout the state and the country understand the need for more capital investment, and for -- in our infrastructure; however, we've not really come up with an agreement and a consensus on how we're going to fund that.

I think for the past few years, we've had the recession, and that sort of held us up in terms of being able to invest in infrastructure.

But I think that we're, hopefully, past that, and we're, hopefully, at a time where we will have additional budget funding available to support this plan.

I would like to make just four key points

I think that need to be considered in looking at the funding of this plan, as well as addressing the gap.

First, I think long-term funding is extremely important.

It's important not only in terms of
maintaining the system over a long period of time,
as we've already heard, but it's also true for
within the construction industry, to maintain a good
base of contractors and trained workers for being
able to conduct that work and do that work

efficiently and appropriately.

And, so, we think it's important that that funding be maintained, and that 5-year plans and even longer-term plans are important.

Secondly, we know that federal funding is a key part of the investment in our system.

That's been very sporadic over the last few years in terms of the plan.

We eventually have gotten the money, but it's been through a series of short-term fixes to the federal budget and not really long-term funding.

So, I think one thing that we need to do as a state, and you as a legislator -- the Legislature, is to make sure that we are working hard down in Washington to get our fair share, and to continue to get long-term federal funding, because I think that's going to be key to helping us address this gap, as well as some of our other transportation-infrastructure gaps.

Second -- thirdly, we need a balanced long-term approach.

There's no single source of funding that

I think is going to fill the gap or address the gap

completely.

The 5.1 billion wouldn't do that, what was

left from the bank settlements doing that, nor would, you know, increasing the payroll tax or increasing the fare, or any single area of source of funding for this system.

We need to come up with a balanced approach.

It's not easy to do.

There are different priorities for different users, but I think that now is the time that we can address that.

You'll hear later about the Move NY plan, which I think has a lot of good components to it.

It also is still a work-in-progress, and it needs a lot of oversight and a lot of input,

I think, from the Legislature, as well as other interest groups, in terms of what needs to be done.

Our union did not support the original congestion pricing plan, because of concern of what that plan would do for our members that work in Manhattan, but, particularly, live outside of that area.

And, people that live in Long Island,
Brooklyn, Queens, and the Bronx, who would suddenly
be paying much greater tolls to get into the city
for their work, and it would take a significant
amount out of their income.

Finally, I would just add one more concern; 1 2 and that is, that there's the need for equity. We have other infrastructure needs. 3 Our roads and bridges need more investment. 4 5 Our water infrastructure, sewage treatment, 6 we have aging utility gas pipelines, electrical 7 systems, and so forth, that also need a significant amount of investment. 8 That investment is in many billions of 9 dollars. 10 11 It's not going to be, you know, obtained 12 overnight, but we need to balance what we do for the 13 MTA, what we can do for roads and bridges, and what we can do for these other infrastructure needs. 14 15 And let me end there, and I'll be glad to 16 answer any questions. 17 Thank you. 18 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Jack, any questions?

SENATOR MARCELLINO: back, any questions:

SENATOR MARTINS: No. I think your point is well made.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The MTA's critically important, but so are roads, bridges, and the need to continue to maintain the infrastructure that currently exist.

And balance; balance is extraordinarily important.

But I did appreciate the comments with 1 respect to the bus route, the transit, and the need 2 to reinvest in infrastructure for mass transit. 3 So, thank you very much. 4 Thanks for your comments. 5 6 SENATOR MARCELLINO: I think that's the 7 general concern that we all have here. That one of the purposes of this hearing is to take a look at 8 9 the Governor's proposals. In his budget, how can we, for lack of a 10 11 better word, fix. 12 I don't like that word. It implies it's 13 broken. It isn't. Should we add to it? 14 15

Should we adjust, should we realign some of the expenditures that were proposed?

I don't know.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We're looking at that now, so it's something that we need input on.

Just a quick question.

What suggestions might you offer, if you can be a little more specific, relative to that \$15 billion gap that you heard about in the MTA's proposed \$32 billion 2015-2019 capital program.

How might that be funded, if we eliminate

that?

DR. JAMES MELIUS: I think we need to look at a balance.

We need -- it's already been discussed here,
New York City needs to invest more in it.

I think, frankly, the State has.

Where the State will -- you know, what's the particular sources?

I think, you know, politically, and it's difficult with the issues like the payroll tax, as you both know.

And I know, I live in Columbia County just north, and we are not included in the district, but, areas below us are and there's concerns there about it.

We need to see where the federal funding will come from.

But I think we need an overall. We have to look at the gas tax; what can be done motor-vehicle taxes or other petroleum taxes to support our infrastructure. And I think there are sources like that.

And, frankly, at this point in time, I think we have to take a serious look at things like congestion pricing or tolling the East River

bridges, and coming up with an equitable system that 1 2 spreads the cost of the system around the entire --3 all the users, and to the extent we can. It's not easy to do, but I think it needs to 4 5 be done. SENATOR MARCELLINO: No, it's not easy 6 7 because, ultimately, we all know that the buck stops with the individual taxpayer. 8 9 DR. JAMES MELIUS: Yeah. Oh, yeah. SENATOR MARCELLINO: No matter where you get 10 11 the money, it all is going to come out of somebody's 12 pocket. It's either the right pocket, left pocket, 13 or back pocket, it's all coming out of the taxpayer's pocket. 14 15 So, that's ultimately the end of it. 16 Thank you very much for your information. Ιt 17 goes into the record. 18 We appreciate your time. 19 DR. JAMES MELIUS: Okay, thank you. 20 Thank you both. 21 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Nadine Lemmon, and,

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Nadine Lemmon, and,
Alex Matthiessen; New York and federal policy
coordinator for the Tri-State Transportation
Campaign, and, the campaign director for Move NY.

22

23

24

25

And would I suggest the same situation. If

you can summarize, it's better than reading the whole thing, because we have it from the report.

NADINE LEMMON: Sounds good.

We understand.

My name is Nadine Lemmon, and I am the New York and federal policy coordinator for Tri-State Transportation Campaign.

TSTC is a non-profit policy and advocacy organization working for a more sustainable transportation network in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

I'm also testifying on behalf of the

Empire State Transportation Alliance, a broad-based

coalition of businesses, civic, and labor groups

that came together in 1995 around the Transportation

Bond Act, to advocate for the MTA capital plan.

We support a fully funded MTA capital program, at \$32 billion, as proposed by the MTA, and that is 22 billion for state of good repair.

And, also, an additional 1 billion for the upstate capital program for transit.

We're very pleased to hear the Governor's

State of the State, that he supported several key

components of the MTA's capital program, including

the completion of Second Avenue subway, construction

of Metro-North's Penn Access project, and purchase of new railcars and buses; yet, much more remains to be done.

While the MTA capital proposal represents a significant number, it still falls far short of what is generally acknowledged by the comptroller and other transportation experts as to what is needed to keep the New York's most valuable economic asset in a state of good repair and to continue modest expansion.

It also must be considered, in the broader context, of the value of the economic health of its service region, with more than 14 million people, 7 million workers, and generating 1.4 trillion in GDP every year.

Moreover, maintaining the MTA system contributes significantly to the upstate economy given the number of suppliers and value-added services that exist in Upstate New York to support the MTA's capital plan.

As in prior years, the 2015-2019 capital plan anticipated to be funded through a combination of revenue-backed and direct capital support from federal, state, and local partners, but the MTA cannot rely exclusively on these revenue sources to

address the \$15 billion gap that we've been discussing.

With a full 17 percent of the MTA's operating budget, some 2.2 billion a year already committed to pay debt service on bonds issued for previous capital programs, further borrowing would result in [unintelligible] pressure on existing fares and tolls.

New, stable, and dedicated revenue sources must be found.

We strongly support a commitment of 1 billion to maintain and improve the transit systems in New York State.

Transit ridership is on the rise across the state, and fleets and facilities, from Albany to Buffalo, to Syracuse, need additional investment to accommodate growing demand.

For these reasons, TSTC and ESTA support a fully funded MTA capital program at a minimum of 32 billion, along with its additional billion for upstate, and there are viable funding options that exist to support these initiatives.

We urge you to identify new revenue sources to fill any funding gaps.

Now, we have attached to our testimony a

two-page memo that outlines new revenue options.

And, another potential revenue source that's not listed in this memo is the Uber-fare surcharge that has been mentioned already today, a source that could bring in \$90 million in annual revenues.

Any new revenue sources should meet the following criteria:

New revenue should be balanced among all indirect and direct beneficiaries of the system, given the affordance of the system to the region.

New revenues must not replace nor reduce existing dedicated revenue sources, including the payroll mobility tax, fuel taxes, and other dedicated revenues.

New revenues must be adequate to underwrite the 5-year capital program, and should not, whenever possible, lose purchasing power over the course of the program.

A mechanism should be created to ensure new revenues are used exclusively to finance MTA capital projects.

Road and bridge projects should be included in revenue scenarios to ensure funding equity for other regions' modes in the state.

Most, if not all, of the options listed in

1 this memo could be further leveraged by issuing bonds. 2 Almost 1 billion in bonds can be issued for 3 every 62 million in new annual recurring revenues 4 raised. 5 6 And in answer to your question, 7 Senator Marcellino, yes, the City should raise their contribution. 8 9 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Oh, you just took away 10 my question. 11 NADINE LEMMON: Sorry? 12 SENATOR MARCELLINO: You just took away my 13 question. 14 NADINE LEMMON: Thank you for the 15 opportunity. 16 There is one very good revenue option that 17 Alex will --ALEX MATTHIESSEN: And I'll mention at the 18 19 outset, that ESTA (the Empire State Transportation 20 Alliance) does also support the Move NY fair-tolling 21 plan. 22 So, thank you, Chairman Marcellino and 23 Senator Martins for hanging around. We appreciate

I am going to just read from notes. I'm not

that very much.

24

25

going to read a prepared statement, so, hopefully, it will go a little quicker.

But I will just warn you, that there's quite a lot of detail to this plan, so allow me a little bit of time.

So, my name is Alex Matthiessen. I'm the president of Blue Marble Project, which is a environmental consulting firm.

And, I'm the director of the Move NY campaign and coalition on whose behalf I'm testifying today.

Move NY is a campaign, it's a region-wide campaign, that is dedicated to coming up with a new dedicated, sustainable recurring revenue source for the MTA region, and also for the city's roads and bridges.

And we were founded in 2010 in response to the growing transportation crisis that we've seen in the form of reduced service, pothole-ridden roads and deteriorating bridges, and a lack of sustainable funding sources, going forward.

New York is facing a transportation crisis, and I don't think that we can expect to try to thrive and compete as a region, and as a state, with a system that struggles to meet the standards that other global cities have surpassed decades ago.

The \$32 billion that Chairman Prendergast and others have talked about, most experts agree that that's at the low end of what's required to not only maintain the system, but to bring it up to twenty-first-century standards.

I think we all agree that there are other cities around the world with whom we compete are way ahead of us in terms of investing in their transportation infrastructure.

So, Move NY has put forward a fair-tolling plan that would fully fill the \$15.2 billion funding gap that the MTA is currently facing with their 2015-19 capital plan.

It would slash tolls in the outer parts of the city. That's, essentially, the MTA's outer bridges, which is the Verrazano, Throgs Neck, White Stone, Tri-Borough, two Rockaway bridges, and the Henry Hudson Bridge.

So those 7 bridges would not go down by a token 25 cents or 50 cents. They would go down by nearly 50 percent.

- \$5, round-trip, off the major bridges.
- \$2, round-trip, off of the Rockaway and the Henry Hudson Bridge.

The significantly reduced traffic is another

benefit of this.

New York boasts, if you will, the second-worst traffic congestion in the country, only second to L.A., and we're constantly vying for that top spot.

And it costs an estimated \$16 billion a year to the regional economy and job creation that would come as a result of not having traffic.

And then, finally, the plan would provide \$375 million per year to put into our city's roads and bridges, which would be the first time we would actually have a dedicated fund for roads and bridges in the city of New York.

So despite the fact that it is a tolling plan, this Move NY plan has the support of groups and -- quite a few groups around the region.

But particularly interesting, is it has the support of the groups that represent the -- New York's motorists and truckers best, which is the New York State Motor Truck Association that has endorsed the plan, and, AAA New York, which has also provided support and has been working very closely with us and supports the idea of the plan.

Labor unions, like TWU, 32BJ, ATU, and others are signing on.

Business associations, like the New York
Building Congress; three out of five New York City
chambers of commerce, have officially endorsed the
plan, et cetera.

And then nearly all of the region's major environmental and transit organizations.

So here's how it works:

It's, essentially, a toll swap.

And the idea -- as the chairman has pointed out earlier during this hearing, the idea is to create a more equitable and balanced tolling system.

Right now, as of March 22nd, we're going to be tolling people, they're in the outer parts of the city where there's not as much congestion. They don't have a lot of good transit options. We're going to be tolling them \$16, round trip, cash tolls, even though, again, they don't have a lot of other alternatives.

In the meantime, there's 1.1 million trips a day that go into the most congested part of the city, and they go for free.

As Sam Schwartz [ph.] has pointed out, just in the last 15 years alone, we have seen 7 toll and fare increases, again, over that 15 years, and there's only one group that's never had to

contribute anything to helping with those fares and tolls; and that's the group that goes for free right now.

So, essentially, you would be tolling the East River bridges at the same rate that you currently toll the Midtown Tunnel and the Brooklyn Battery Tunnel, and, again, across 60th Street; and, therefore, you would harmonize, essentially, the tolls entering and leaving the central business district, which is important, because then you eliminate bridge-shopping which causes increased emissions, road wear-and-tear on our old city bridges, fatalities, and then accidents, caused by vehicular crashes, et cetera.

So you greatly reduce all of those kinds of impacts.

I want to point out that the 60th Street's green-line piece of this is particularly important, and for a couple of reasons.

One, more than 50 percent of the traffic coming into the central business district is actually coming from the north. It's not coming from Long Island. Only about 40 percent comes from Long Island.

So, if you want to really tackle traffic, and

you also want to generate revenues and create a truly fair tolling system, you've got to also toll those drivers that are coming from the north, and for reasons that I just mentioned.

So, the tolling system we're proposing is all electronic.

So, it would be, like, the Henry Hudson

Bridge, where it's, basically, no toll gates, no

toll booths. You, basically, drive at speed through
and you're tolled.

85 percent of the drivers out there in the New York region -- or, 80 or 85 percent are already using EZ-Pass.

By the time this gets implemented in a couple of years, smartphone technology would probably be catching most of the remaining 15 percent.

For those who don't have either, you could just have a snapshot of your license plate taken, and you get a bill in the mail and you pay it.

That's already used at the Henry Hudson Bridge and many other place around the country.

Fixed ratio:

This is a really important one to people who live in the so-called "outer boroughs" and in the suburbs, which is: How do we know the MTA won't

turn around and jack those tolls back up once they're reduced, you know, a year or two later?

And in the legislation that we're proposing, we would fix that new ratio of the lowered tolls in the outer parts of the city and the new central business district tolls, which is a .55 ratio.

That would be fixed forever, and that way, you can't raise one without raising the other, and that just puts downward pressure on excess increases in tolls overall.

Taxi and car apps, this is a really important piece.

One of the criticisms of the last plan that was proposed by Mayor Bloomberg, is that it felt to those people who lived in the suburbs and outer the boroughs that they were shouldering the costs, they weren't getting as many of the benefits, and Manhattan was kind of getting off scot-free.

The way we addressed that, is that we add a taxi and Uber and Lift surcharge, just within

Manhattan, 96th Street South, surcharge that,

basically, acts as a proxy for the traffic that they contribute by using these for-hire vehicles.

That puts Manhattan in the number-one spot, in terms of the 12 counties, who pays what, who pays

the most. And I think it appropriately puts
Manhattan in the number-one spot as a result.

We raise \$1.5 billion a year in revenue, and that comes from both the new tolling, the fairer-tolling system, plus this taxi surcharge.

And that's even after you pay for all the toll discounts in the outer parts of the city, and you've paid for implementing this new tolling system.

So, a net 1.5 billion a year.

Unlike the Bloomberg plan, or any plan that's come before it, we say to drivers: Listen, you're being asked to help shoulder some of the costs of our regional transportation system, you need to get something back.

So drivers get a quarter of these 1.5 billion in revenue, which means better roads and bridges for drivers, they get much lower tolls in the outer parts of the city, and they're getting much faster commutes into and around the central business district.

The other three-quarters goes to the mass transit system, as I said.

If you bond that, that will actually get to exactly to your \$15 billion that the MTA needs.

So, you can have money for mass transit and roads and bridges.

Lockboxing is very important.

We do agree, I agree, with Nadine and others who have said, this is only going to work and help us modernize and maintain our transportation system if we preserve the existing dedicated taxes that are already out there.

But I think that there's inherent protections in a tolling mechanism because the tolls are collected directly by the MTA. It could be done by the New York City DOT as well.

That's to be determined by you all.

But the advantage of that, of course, is it doesn't have to go through an appropriation's process. It can't be raided by the Legislature.

The money goes directly to where it's invested.

And then, the bonding, we would have to create some kind of subsidiary of the TBTA, which allows to us get a very good credit rating on the money that's bonded, and also just to control the source of money and where it's allocated.

Investment priorities, we mainly, as I said, would help support the MTA capital plan.

There are some other things that we would want to see changed in that capital plan.

For the most part, we agree with the capital plan and its investment priorities, but, we think that a small amount of money would go a long way to filling a lot of the transit gaps that still exist in too many parts of the city.

So, we have a 5-point strategy for how to improve transit access, and improve access by making the fares more affordable.

One, is to restore more of the 2010 service cuts that happened.

Two, is to expand express bus service, and, to knock express buses down from the newly-enacted 6.50, which is what they're going to be in March -- or later this month, down to \$5, or 5.50, to give some folks some relief there.

We can help fund Mayor de Blasio's BRT, SBS, vision of 20 new buses, et cetera.

We can extend city tickets to seven days a week, which basically offers discounted fares on Metro-North, Long Island Railroad, within the city bounds, which can help fill some of those transit gaps.

And then, of course, the normal expansion

projects that have been talked about.

And then, in terms of suburban investments, we want, and I have been trying very hard to talk to various legislators and other interest groups on Long Island and in the Hudson Valley to find out what your transportation priorities are.

And I've gotten some good feedback, but there's more discussion I think that needs to happen in terms of concrete investments.

But, right now, we're talking about the kinds of investments that Tom Prendergast and others talked about to improve the service of the Long Island Railroad, Metro-North, and improve frequency of that service.

Rail-station access is an important piece of that. And I think there are some select places along Long Island and the Hudson Valley where we can benefit from improved or expanded parking-garage capacity at some of these stations.

And then other last-mile strategies, shuttle buses and others, that will help commuters get to Long Island Railroad, Metro-North, more easily; and, therefore, take advantage of that terrific service.

And then, finally, county buses.

Suffolk, Nassau, Rockland, and Westchester

have these county bus systems, but I think almost to a county, they're very underfunded.

We could use some of this revenue to help subsidize those county bus systems, and improve local bus and transportation access for people who aren't necessarily making the trip into the CBD, but need to get around Nassau and Suffolk and elsewhere for jobs, et cetera.

I'll just kind of briefly mention the alternatives, because I think it's worth talking about.

You know, we could increase the gas tax, but, we crunched the numbers, and in order to raise the kind of money that Move NY raises, you'd have to increase the gas tax, just in the 12-county MTA region, by over 50 cents a gallon.

We think that's kind of a political non-starter. It's hard to imagine how that happens. Plus, it puts pressure on suburban drivers who aren't necessarily creating the kind of congestion problems that the folks in the city are creating.

Sales tax. We could increase the sales tax around the 12-county region, but you'd have to do it by three-quarters of a percentage point in order to raise the \$1.5 billion that we generate.

And, again, that's highly regressive, very hard on poor people, working families, et cetera.

You could reinstate the commuter tax, but something tells me the two of you aren't going to be too excited about that.

Another idea is, you could more than double the payroll mobility tax. That's what you'd need to do in order to raise the money that we raise here.

I don't think that that's something that is going to be popular in the Senate these days.

And then the only other thing you could do, is you could underfund the system.

And I think we've heard earlier from various folks why that is, I think, such a bad idea. That's going to put us further behind in terms of being able to compete with other cities.

And then the other piece, which I think is the biggest threat, I think the biggest likelihood that we face, is that the easy decision will be, let's just kick the can down the road, and we'll just kind of coddle some short-term, non-recurring sources of funds together and we'll make do for the next couple of years. And then, when it really hits the fan and we really have to figure out what to do, then we'll come back to the drawing board and figure

out how to do that.

I hope we don't do that, and I especially hope we don't do that, if the answer ends up being issuing more fare- and toll-backed debt.

And that is typically what happens, is that, Oh, let's go to the riders and the current toll payers and get them to pay even more than they're already paying to help, basically, subsidize the rest of the system.

Tom DiNapoli, the comptroller of

New York State, issued a report last fall that said,

if you fill that \$15 billion MTA gap with fare- and

toll-backed debt, you're talking about 15 percent

increases in existing tolls and fares above and

beyond the 4 percent biennial increases that

Tom Prendergast talked about earlier.

So you're talking about, over the next 5 years a 24 percent increase in fares and tolls on those who are already paying a whole lot.

We don't think that's fair or appropriate.

So, just to kind of summarize:

You know, one of the things we've heard, the "\$15 billion" number bandied about.

Chairman Marcellino, it's terrific that you keep on asking the question: How are we going to

fund that \$15 billion?

We're not, unfortunately, hearing a lot of solutions, and, we feel like we've got a very good solution.

We spent, literally, five years, going around the region, talking particularly to opponents of the Bloomberg plan and other plans like it, to really get that feedback and make sure this plan represents --

SENATOR MARCELLINO: What's been the City's response?

ALEX MATTHIESSEN: Uhm, Mayor De Blasio, last week, when we went public with our final version of the plan, he said something to the effect of, We think that the plan deserves to be looked at very seriously.

Something like that.

You know, listen, he's not a decision-maker, ultimately, in this, so we don't expect him to be leading the charge, but our sense is that he's certainly open to it, he's not opposed to it. And I think he's interested to see how this will all --

SENATOR MARCELLINO: In your reading of your own plan, would the Legislature have an ongoing role?

1 ALEX MATTHIESSEN: An ongoing role?
2 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Yeah.
3 ALEX MATTHIESSEN: In what respect?
4 SENATOR MARCELLINO: In the Move NY proposal?
5 ALEX MATTHIESSEN: Well, I think the main

ALEX MATTHIESSEN: Well, I think the main thing, is that we would hope that the Legislature would pass the plan that we're proposing.

And then once it's passed, essentially, what we're proposing, is that the Legislature authorize the MTA and/or New York City DOT to impose tolls on the East River bridges, and to, essentially, manage a more balanced tolling system, and that they mandate a few features, like the fixed ratio, so you can't increase one toll without another.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: The way we read it, the Move NY proposal would remove the Legislature's ability to appropriate -- I'm reading this -- "to appropriate the annual revenues from the new tolls and congestion pricing.

"Although it's approval is necessary under the Move NY plan, the Legislature is removed from the annual appropriation process."

ALEX MATTHIESSEN: I don't think it's -- and forgive me, Chairman, because I'm not an expert on this. I'm more of an organizer type, so I'm not an

expert in terms of all of the nuances of MTA funding and financing.

But my understanding is, is all we're saying there, is that this is money that would be raised through a tolling system. And like the MTA's other tolls that they collect revenue on, the money goes directly to the MTA, and they can bond on it --

SENATOR MARCELLINO: No, it's an extension.

ALEX MATTHIESSEN: -- et cetera.

So it's not removing an authority --

SENATOR MARCELLINO: No, that's by statute.

ALEX MATTHIESSEN: What's that?

SENATOR MARCELLINO: That's done by statute.

ALEX MATTHIESSEN: Right. So --

SENATOR MARCELLINO: You're taking that out of it. You're taking our ability to appropriate, out.

ALEX MATTHIESSEN: Okay, well, then, maybe -it's possible that I'm misunderstanding that, but
I don't think so, because we've been -- I've been
talking to lawyers and all the people who really are
expert in this.

My understanding is, we're just doing exactly -- we're just simply saying, that like the revenues collected on current MTA bridges and

tunnels, this revenue also would go directly to the 1 MTA, it could be bonded by the MTA, et cetera. 2 So we're not looking to remove anything. 3 If could I just finish --4 5 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Very briefly, because 6 we've got to get out of here. 7 ALEX MATTHIESSEN: Okay. We've gotten terrific editorial endorsements 8 from "Cranes Business," "Fox 5 News," "Newsday," 9 "New York Post," "Daily News," et cetera. 10 11 We did polling on this by global-strategy 12 group. They showed a 2-to-1 in favor, support for 13 this, including in the suburbs. 14 Long Island and the Hudson Valley support 15 this plan, again, according to the poll, 57 percent, 16 even after hearing criticisms of this kind of idea. So we think it's an idea that its time has 17 18 come. 19 We expect that the idea would be to marry 20 this Move NY plan with some other resources, so that 21 we can fund a statewide transit and road and bridge 22 program. 23 Thank you very much. 24 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Jack?

SENATOR MARTINS: Mr. Matthiessen, you spoke

25

1 to a million-plus cars going into that central area in Manhattan. I guess below 60th, right, or below 2 96th? 3 ALEX MATTHIESSEN: Yes, the tolling piece of 4 this is 60th, south, to the financial --5 6 SENATOR MARTINS: 1.1 million cars, I think 7 you said? ALEX MATTHIESSEN: Yes. 8 SENATOR MARTINS: And can you identify where 9 those cars are coming from? 10 11 You said a percentage comes from Long Island, 12 another percentage comes from the north. 13 How many of those come in through, tunnel, 14 the tolled bridges? 15 How many are coming through from non-tolled 16 areas? And of those, how many of those are coming 17 from the north, and how many of them are coming from the east, or from other places? 18 19 ALEX MATTHIESSEN: I can give you very specific numbers on those. I'll have to get back to 20 21 you on the specific numbers. 22 But, I can characterize, generally. 23 SENATOR MARTINS: Get back to the Committee so we can circulate to it everybody. 24 25 ALEX MATTHIESSEN: Okay, I'll do that.

So I'll do that through Debbie, if that's 1 2 okay? SENATOR MARCELLINO: Yes. 3 ALEX MATTHIESSEN: So -- but roughly 4 speaking, of all the cars that are going into the 5 central business district on a daily basis: 6 7 About 50 percent, or a little bit more than 50 percent, come from the north; so that means 8 9 Connecticut, Hudson Valley, northern New Jersey, the Bronx, et cetera. 10 11 About 40 percent come from Long Island; so that means Suffolk, Nassau, Queens, and Brooklyn. 12 13 And then about 10 percent come from New 14 Jersey. 15 SENATOR MARTINS: Of the ones that are not 16 being currently tolled, or just generally? 17 ALEX MATTHIESSEN: No, just total. 18 SENATOR MARTINS: And of those, how many of those are not being tolled right now? 19 20 ALEX MATTHIESSEN: The 1.1 I believe is the 21 number that's not being tolled. 22 Yes, so --23 SENATOR MARTINS: And of those that are not 24 being tolled, what are the percentages and where are 25 those cars coming from?

ALEX MATTHIESSEN: I -- to be absolutely accurate, let me get back to you with those numbers.

But --

SENATOR MARTINS: Because it may not necessarily follow that same percentage, I'd like to see that.

ALEX MATTHIESSEN: That's why I want to confirm before I just apply the same 50, 10, and 40 percent.

SENATOR MARTINS: And under the plan, as it's being proposed, is there an opportunity, or is there a guarantee, that a car coming into that area will not be tolled twice?

ALEX MATTHIESSEN: Well, the way we designed it, is that we're assuming, and I think probably rightly, that most of the cars that are coming -- the passenger vehicles that are coming into the central business district are coming because, either, that's their destination, or they're just simply taking advantage of free bridges and they're passing through to New Jersey or to go somewhere else other than Manhattan.

So for those that are just passing through, we're not -- we're trying to discourage that kind of passing-through traffic, and trying to get them to

take the most direct route because they don't have to bridge-shop anymore. They can -- they'll find, you know, the most direct route will also be about the same price as everywhere else.

In terms of those who have a destination there, we're figuring that they're going in, they're doing their thing, and they're leaving; so, yes, they will only pay once -- once in, once out -- just like they would on the Queens Midtown Tunnel.

SENATOR MARTINS: And if they come back in?

ALEX MATTHIESSEN: And if they came back in again, then, yes, in theory, they would pay a second time, but we don't think the vast majority of passenger vehicles do that.

However, we don't want to do anything to discourage business activity, and that's why, for commercial vehicles, they do only pay once in and once out, even if they're making multiple trips back and forth into the central business district all day.

If you're a dry-cleaning business, if you're a carpenter and doing service calls, you may cross 60th Street a few tames in a day, or you may go over to Queens and then come back, you only pay once per day.

SENATOR MARTINS: Or if you're visiting a 1 couple of offices during a trip into the city, and 2 3 you happen to see somebody uptown, and then somebody downtown, and go back uptown again, there's a 4 5 possibility that -- so just something to think 6 about.

ALEX MATTHIESSEN: Yeah, okay.

Thank you.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Yeah, that was always the biggest problem for those of us who have businesses on Long Island that sell to people in the city with other businesses, going back and forth, or maybe making more than one trip a day to deliver produce or products.

> So it was a concern, and still is a concern. Thank you very much for your time and your

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

input. We look forward to those numbers that you submit to the Committee, because your proposal's

very interesting.

ALEX MATTHIESSEN: Thank you.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: It was interesting, and worthy of -- as I commented to our first Panel, I'm getting a little tired of constantly hearing, Oh, we're going to look at that. Oh, we are going look

at that.

It's a great answer, but nothing ever happens when they look at that.

So we want to see more looking and coming to a decision.

ALEX MATTHIESSEN: Well, we appreciate that very much.

And I would just say that we feel confident that if we could just simply have a public debate about this and people really understand what the plan is, and understand it's really not the Bloomberg plan, and how much there is in it, not just for transit riders, but for drivers; not just for city residents, but suburban residents, we think, actually, there will be a lot of support for this thing, and it will reflect the polling that we've done.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Thank you very much.

NADINE LEMMON: Thank you.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: The hearing before the Committee is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at approximately 1:38 p.m., the public hearing held before the two Senate Standing Committees concluded, and adjourned.)

---000---