



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
GOVERNOR DANIEL P. MALLOY

Governor’s Transportation Finance Panel Draft Meeting Minutes
 April 28, 2015

Members in Attendance: Cameron Staples (Chair), Beth Osborne, William Bonvillian, Joan Carty, Bert Hunter, Oz Griebel, Paul Timpanelli, Stanley Mickus, Emil Frankel

Other Participants: Garrett Eucalitto (OPM), Secretary Ben Barnes (OPM), Commissioner James Redeker (DOT), Wally Lugli (DOT), Robert Card (DOT), Thomas Harley (DOT), Allyson Bruce (DMV), Eric Weinstein (DRS), Brian Tassinari (OPM)

Item	Topic	Discussion
I.	Call to Order	The meeting was called to order at 9:36 a.m. Cameron Staples welcomed members of the panel.
II.	Governor’s Welcome and Comments	Governor Malloy welcomed members and expressed thanks for their services.
III.	Welcome and Comments by Cameron Staples, Chair	None.
IV.	Introductions of Panel Members and Staff	Members introduced themselves.
V.	CT Department of Transportation (DOT) Presentation	<p>DOT Commissioner James Redeker provided a presentation on <i>Connecticut’s Bold vision and Call to Action for a Transportation Future.</i></p> <p>Oz Griebel asked if there has been an economic study of the projects included in the Vision, to which Cmsr. Redeker stated that the DOT is in the process of preparing one and will provide this in detail once it is completed.</p> <p>Mr. Staples asked how the DOT anticipates the fluctuations of interest rates with regard to the \$100b.</p> <p>Beth Osborne asked what other measurements were looked at with regard to safety and repair.</p> <p>Emil Frankel asked to what degree has the DOT tried to incorporate resilience but also long-lasting innovations related to technology/business practices, into the long-term plan.</p> <p>Mr. Hunter stated that regarding the \$100b, the panel will want to explore in more detail the order of prioritization.</p> <p>Joan Carty asked for more detail about farebox receipts.</p> <p>Paul Timpanelli kicked off a discussion about ROI.</p> <p>Mr. Griebel asked if there was anything that could be asked of the delegation with regard to privatization of rest areas, and so forth. Cmsr. Redeker responded that the delegation is aware of the vision and the needs at the federal level.</p>

VI.	Break	The meeting recessed at 11:20 a.m. and reconvened at 11:41 a.m.														
VII	CT Office of Policy and Management (OPM) Presentation	<p>OPM Secretary Ben Barnes provided a presentation overview of the Special Transportation Fund (STF), current projections on the long-term financial condition of the STF, projections, and potential revenue options for discussion/consideration by the panel. Secretary Barnes stated that the presentation is focused on a 10 year horizon. Secretary Barnes thanked OPM staff, Garrett Eucalitto and Brian Tassinari for their efforts. The meeting opened for q&a.</p> <p>Secretary Barnes offered to provide more detailed modeling of potential revenue options. Mr. Frankel asked for clarification regarding forecast charts on pg. 40 of the presentation (surplus deficit/what is the difference between the deficit line and the additional revenue line).</p> <p>Ms. Osborne expressed interest in seeing the VMT and also projections/trends over the last decade, also asset sales. Secretary Barnes stated that there has been some effort and he will look into this.</p> <p>Mr. Griebel asked for clarification whether the 10 year horizon includes the 5 year ramp-up. Secretary Barnes responded that it does.</p> <p>Members discussed the 10 year forecast at length. Mr. Staples stated that the group would create a list of questions with regard to the forecast.</p>														
VII	Discussion of Panel Processes and Procedures	<p>Mr. Staples offered each member the opportunity to recap their items of interest.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="493 873 1511 1955"> <tr> <td data-bbox="493 873 691 1119">Cameron Staples</td> <td data-bbox="691 873 1511 1119"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What other states have done around transportation funding (possible models to examine); • Issue-run state assets – provide any evaluations/analysis that has been done in the transportation arena. • Any sort of modeling / benchmarks around economic trends; and • What is reasonable ROI over time </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="493 1119 691 1325">Bill Bonvillian</td> <td data-bbox="691 1119 1511 1325"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next 10 years projections with caveats; and • Any information/analysis done on investments. <p>Mr. Eucalitto introduced Tom Maziarz of the DOT who discussed congestion levels and investments in rail versus highway improvements.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="493 1325 691 1394">Emil Frankel</td> <td data-bbox="691 1325 1511 1394"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reiterated granularity of investments, i.e., which programs have potential to generate revenue. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="493 1394 691 1604">Beth Osborne</td> <td data-bbox="691 1394 1511 1604"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The flexibility in the scope of the projects; • More information on exactly what ROI analysis is going to be done; • BMP analysis; and • Assets management, i.e. how many parking lots are owned by the State. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="493 1604 691 1814">Oz Griebel</td> <td data-bbox="691 1604 1511 1814"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short-term impact on jobs; • Recommended having DECD commissioner discuss context of this; • Virtual employee impact; and • Information on Oregon issue with Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) fee. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="493 1814 691 1883">Stanley Mickus</td> <td data-bbox="691 1814 1511 1883"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on state partnerships </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="493 1883 691 1955">Joan Carty</td> <td data-bbox="691 1883 1511 1955"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More detail on assets, air rights & easements; and • Better understanding around the debt coverage. </td> </tr> </table>	Cameron Staples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What other states have done around transportation funding (possible models to examine); • Issue-run state assets – provide any evaluations/analysis that has been done in the transportation arena. • Any sort of modeling / benchmarks around economic trends; and • What is reasonable ROI over time 	Bill Bonvillian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next 10 years projections with caveats; and • Any information/analysis done on investments. <p>Mr. Eucalitto introduced Tom Maziarz of the DOT who discussed congestion levels and investments in rail versus highway improvements.</p>	Emil Frankel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reiterated granularity of investments, i.e., which programs have potential to generate revenue. 	Beth Osborne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The flexibility in the scope of the projects; • More information on exactly what ROI analysis is going to be done; • BMP analysis; and • Assets management, i.e. how many parking lots are owned by the State. 	Oz Griebel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short-term impact on jobs; • Recommended having DECD commissioner discuss context of this; • Virtual employee impact; and • Information on Oregon issue with Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) fee. 	Stanley Mickus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on state partnerships 	Joan Carty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More detail on assets, air rights & easements; and • Better understanding around the debt coverage.
Cameron Staples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What other states have done around transportation funding (possible models to examine); • Issue-run state assets – provide any evaluations/analysis that has been done in the transportation arena. • Any sort of modeling / benchmarks around economic trends; and • What is reasonable ROI over time 															
Bill Bonvillian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next 10 years projections with caveats; and • Any information/analysis done on investments. <p>Mr. Eucalitto introduced Tom Maziarz of the DOT who discussed congestion levels and investments in rail versus highway improvements.</p>															
Emil Frankel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reiterated granularity of investments, i.e., which programs have potential to generate revenue. 															
Beth Osborne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The flexibility in the scope of the projects; • More information on exactly what ROI analysis is going to be done; • BMP analysis; and • Assets management, i.e. how many parking lots are owned by the State. 															
Oz Griebel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short-term impact on jobs; • Recommended having DECD commissioner discuss context of this; • Virtual employee impact; and • Information on Oregon issue with Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) fee. 															
Stanley Mickus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on state partnerships 															
Joan Carty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More detail on assets, air rights & easements; and • Better understanding around the debt coverage. 															

		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Paul Timpanelli</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked if there is flexibility to the charge/mission of the 30 year vision; • Would like to see some visionary details; what further information can be provided around how the State will look in 30 years. </td> </tr> </table> <p>Mr. Staples instructed members to email further questions or ideas to either himself or Mr. Eucalitto.</p>	Paul Timpanelli	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked if there is flexibility to the charge/mission of the 30 year vision; • Would like to see some visionary details; what further information can be provided around how the State will look in 30 years. 						
Paul Timpanelli	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked if there is flexibility to the charge/mission of the 30 year vision; • Would like to see some visionary details; what further information can be provided around how the State will look in 30 years. 									
IX.	Subject Matter for Next Meeting	<p>Members discussed the prioritization of tasks and meeting topics. A tentative month-to-month schedule of priorities was outlined as such:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>April</td> <td>Information gathering</td> </tr> <tr> <td>May</td> <td>Second meeting of panel May 18th</td> </tr> <tr> <td>June</td> <td>Public hearing in New Haven June 28th</td> </tr> <tr> <td>July</td> <td>Full discussion on tolling</td> </tr> </table> <p>Mr. Staples proposed the possibility of conducting working sessions. Mr. Frankel asked about remote participation capabilities. Mr. Eucalitto announced that remote access to meetings would be available to members.</p> <p>Mr. Mickus—reiterating a point that Mr. Griebel made on identification of revenue sources—suggested taking an immediate look at what other states have done.</p> <p>Mr. Staples thanked the members. Mr. Eucalitto asked support staff to introduce themselves. Mr. Eucalitto and Brian Tassinari will support panel members on behalf of OPM, Eric Weinstein on behalf of the Department of Revenue Services, and Allyson Bruce on behalf of the Department of Motor Vehicles.</p>	April	Information gathering	May	Second meeting of panel May 18 th	June	Public hearing in New Haven June 28 th	July	Full discussion on tolling
April	Information gathering									
May	Second meeting of panel May 18 th									
June	Public hearing in New Haven June 28 th									
July	Full discussion on tolling									
X.	Next Meeting Date/Location	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next meeting will be held on May 18th, location to be determined. • A public hearing will be held on June 28th in New Haven. 								
XI.	Other Business	None								
XII.	Adjournment	The meeting was adjourned at 1:34 p.m.								