CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

----- X

October 6, 2014 Start: 1:05 p.m. Recess: 3:51 p.m.

HELD AT: Council Chambers - City Hall

B E F O R E: YDANIS A. RODRIGUEZ

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Daniel R. Garodnick

James Vacca

Margaret S. Chin Stephen T. Levin Deborah L. Rose

James G. Van Bramer

Mark S. Weprin

David G. Greenfield

Costa G. Constantinides

Carlos Menchaca I. Daneek Miller Antonio Reynoso

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Craig Stewart,
Chief Officer of Capital Programs
NYC Metropolitan Transit Authority

Steve Berrang
Director of Capital Programs
NYC Metropolitan Transit Authority

Stephanie DeLisle Director of Capital Funding NYC Metropolitan Transit Authority

Josh Goldwitz Deputy Director, Capital Program Management NYC Metropolitan Transit Authority

David Henly Chief Budget Officer New York City Transit

Lois Tendler, Vice President Government and Community Relations NYC Metropolitan Transit Authority

Richard T. Anderson, President New York Building Congress

William Henderson, Executive Director Citizens Advisory Committee to the MTA

Corey Bearak, Policy and Political Director Amalgamated Transportation Union Local 1056

Varun Sanyal, Project Manager Staten Island Economic Development Corp.

Linda Barron, President and CEO

Staten Island Chamber of Commerce

Veronica Vanderpool, Executive Director Tri-State Transportation Campaign

John Raskin, Executive Director Riders Alliance

Joan Byron, Policy Director Pratt Center for Community Development

Cate Contino, Organizer Straphangers Campaign

Chris Coco Transportation Alternatives [gavel]

3 SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Quiet, please.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to today's hearing of the City Council Transportation Committee. My name is Ydanis Rodriguez, and I serve as Chair of this Committee. First, let me recognize my colleagues who are here today. Council Member Garodnick, Vacca, Weprin, Chin and Constantinides. We have a busy day ahead of us on the committee, so let's get started. Before we begin our Oversight Hearing on the MTA Capital Plan, the committee will first vote on two bills that highlight the divers and important work that we are doing this session.

Proposed Intro No. 295-A introduced by

Council Member Dan Garodnick requires a company with

20 or more full-time workers to offer transportation

community benefits to their employees. This will

allow more than 400,000 New Yorkers the opportunity

to pay for their Metro Cards, and other public

transit expenses with pre-tax dollars, saving both

time and the employee money. Thank you, Council

Member Garodnick.

2.2

Proposed Intro No. 246-A introduced by
Council Member Greenfield and myself, impacts an even
larger number of New Yorkers. This bill will lower
the citywide speed limit from 30 miles an hour to 25
miles an hour starting November 7. This reduction in
the speed limit will help us protect our city's most
precious commodity, the lives of our children.
Traffic incidents cause the death of more children in
New York City than any other kind of injury. And the
number one factor is auto crashes, the driver's
speed. I know is important that we keep the city
moving, but I cannot think of a more compelling
reason to slow down than the fact that we know that
this bill will help save lives.

Today, we tell New Yorkers that in order to have a safer city we must entirely shift our outlook regarding our roadways. In order to achieve this shift we know we must first start with our drivers. By decreasing the speed limit, drivers will know we expect them to not only drive slower but safer. I now would like to invite the sponsor of this bill first, Council Member Garodnick.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for bringing Intro No.

- 2 | 295 to a vote today. I appreciate it very much, and
- 3 I know that the transit riders of New York City
- 4 appreciate it, too. As employees of the City of New
- 5 York, we here at the Council have the option to
- 6 purchase our Metro Cards using pre-tax dollars.
- 7 Which allows us to save \$443 a year on monthly Metro
- 8 Cards. This is possible through a federal tax
- 9 program, but not all New Yorkers have access to that
- 10 | tax break because the employers do not offer it to
- 11 them.

- 12 Intro 295-A will bring this tax break to
- 13 | 450,000 more New Yorkers. It will require employers
- 14 | with 20 or more full-time employees to give their
- 15 staff the opportunity to use pre-tax earnings for
- 16 | transportation. And I should note that Transit
- 17 | Benefits Bill expansion does not just save money for
- 18 | employees. Employers can save money, too, because
- 19 the dollars come out before the payroll tax
- 20 | obligation to an employer.
- 21 The intent of this bill is to bring this
- 22 tax break to more New Yorkers, not to penalize
- 23 | businesses. So we took pains to ensure that the bill
- 24 was more likely to help than to hurt those small
- 25 businesses. We limited fines. We allowed for a 90-

2.2

day cure period. We made the applicability date

January 1, 2016 giving plenty of time to make any
necessary administrative adjustments. It is hard to
live in this city, and many of us feel like the MTA
constantly charges more for less service. Helping
New Yorkers take advantage of this federal tax break
is an important way that we can put a little more
cash in their pockets at the end of the day while
also promoting mass transit at the same time.

I want to thank the Riders Alliance for their incredibly advocacy on this piece of legislation. I also want to thank the Straphangers Campaign, and for all of the people who have come out consistently in support of this bill. As well as my 40, I believe, co-sponsors from the Council who are also supporting this bill. So, Mr. Chairman, we very much appreciate this vote today.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: [off mic] I now call for a vote on proposed Intro No. 295-A and proposed Intro No. 466-A, and I will ask the clerk to please call the roll. I recommend yes on both bills.

our bus services have been cut over the last couple

25

2.2

of years, which makes it even harder for people to use mass transportation. The layout of my district and everything else makes it very hard for people to use public transportation. So guess what? A lot of them drive? I live in a neighborhood that has a lot of drivers. And it has frustrated me because I've been a big advocate for public transportation.

I really would like to see the MTA, and with the help of my advocates from the City, to try to not just focus on where usage is high, but to say here's a neighborhood that needs extra public transportation. Because if people were to drive less that would be a good thing in my mind. But, unfortunately, that's not the case at the moment. A lot of people drive. I support the idea of lowering the speed limit to 25 because I think it will make the city safer, and in the end that's the most important priority here. Council Member Greenfield joins us. My concern is this, and I raised it at the hearing the other day, and the Commissioner seemed to agree with me, and we've had conversations after that.

Is that there are some streets in my neighborhood where as much as people would like to

2.2

say, oh, it's easy to drive 25 and go really slowly, it is not the common practice out there. Nor is it as big a safety concern as it is in other areas. I have some parts of my district that have major streets, and Northern Boulevard and parts of Eastern Queens. And Union Turnpike and parts of Eastern Queens have no homes, no stores, nothing on either side of the street. So I have asked the Commissioner to try to look into the idea of trying to limit—pick certain sites. And she says she will, and they plan on picking certain areas where it is heavily trafficked. I mean where cars are able to move fast safely.

So I just want to make sure it's not one size fits all. Because there are neighborhoods in this city where you couldn't drive 25 if you wanted to. That's not the case in some of the streets in my area. And I just don't want to penalize every one of my constituents who happen to drive slightly over the speed limit when it isn't a safety concern. I know people who say, Oh, you're jeopardizing lives. I'm not jeopardizing lives. I believe in these things. I believe in a lot of the safety plans we've put in under Vision Zero. I just want to have it rational

you very much, Mr. Chair.

2.2

where it's fair because not every street in this city is the same. And not everyone has the same risks involved. And I just want to make sure that people realize that, that every neighborhood is a little different. So I'm going to vote yes on both of these, but I just wanted that on the record. Thank

CLERK: Greenfield.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: May I explain my vote?

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: [off mic]

Mr. Chairman. So first the big picture. This is actually a very important piece of legislation specifically the legislation lowering the default speed limit to 25 miles per hour. And just to be clear, I would like to respond to Council Member Weprin's very salient points. The default limit is 25 miles an hour. So, it's certainly possible and, in fact, will be the case that in other parts of the city, the speed limit will be faster. Whether it's 30, 35 or 40 depending on the appropriate stretch. But the reason that we have worked for years, and myself personally introduced this legislation in

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 2011, to actually lower the speed limit, is because we're ending up with a weird situation New York City.

Where we're on track that within a couple of years if we do nothing we actually will have more people killed in traffic collisions that people killed in homicides. And that's just quite frankly bizarre when you think about that when you have an increase of people getting killed in traffic collisions while happily homicides have been going down, you haven't really done much to lower the rate of folks who are killed in traffic collisions. as part of the effort that has been started the last couple years on Vision Zero, the idea is to try to reduce fatalities to zero. Which quite frankly is impossible, but certainly we will work on that goal to get to that place. And the single largest contributing factor that actually causes death and accidents speed unfortunately.

And, in fact, the odds of someone getting killed at the difference of literally five miles an hour, between 25 miles and 30 miles an hour, literally doubles the chances of a person getting killed in the accident. Not to mention serious injuries. Not to mention that it actually causes the

2.2

accidents to begin with where you actually have a situation that because people are speeding that's why you have accidents. Now, people always tell me, well, you know, some people are not going to follow the law. Well, that's true everywhere. I mean, there is always the one percent who are going to ignore anything, and they are going to keep on speeding. And those people are the people who are reckless.

But most New Yorkers are law abiding citizens, and I think they will follow the law. And I think part of what we are trying to explain is that if you follow the law and, in fact, you drive a little bit more slowly -- it's only five miles an hour slower -- you will, in fact, save a life. And it's traumatic. I'll tell you. In fact, in speaking to a constituent recently who unfortunately hit a pedestrian who was crossing against a light-- It wasn't the person's fault. He was going at the speed limit. She was an elderly woman. He was driving 30 miles an hour, and she died. It's a very situation not just for the people who have died, but also for the person who is in the accident.

2.2

23

all.

2 Because they don't want to kill somebody. 3 If you're a law abiding citizen, you don't want to 4 accidentally kill someone. It's a rough situation. So this is a law that common sense. It's a law that's literally been four years in the making. 6 7 really want to thank our Speaker for her leadership on this. I've said it before, and I'll say it again 8 because it bears repeating. When I introduced this 9 legislation, not only could I not get a hearing, 10 people laughed at me. And right now, we're making 11 12 progress, and that's because of our Speaker and our 13 wonderful Transportation Chair, Chair Rodriguez, who 14 has gone up to Albany and I've been with him 15 together. We went up to advocate and to lobby on 16 this, and I think that literally we're doing 17 something special today with passing legislation 18 that's actually going to save lives. So I encourage 19 my colleagues to vote aye. And with that, I vote aye 20 on all. Constantinides. 21 CLERK:

24 CLERK: Menchaca.

25 COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Aye on all.

COUNCIL MEMBER CONSTANTINIDES:

Aye on

2.2

CLERK: By a vote of 9 in the affirmative, 0 in the negative and no abstentions, both items have been adopted.

[Pause]

CLERK: Miller.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: [off mic] Aye.

CLERK: The vote stands at 10 in the affirmative.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. So I would like to say congratulations for her representation [sic] to Council Member Rose.

Welcome. Happy to have you back here, and we and we missed you during that period of time. Thank you.

Now we will proceed to our Oversight
Hearing on the MTA's new Five-Year Capital Plan.
Thank you everyone for coming to join us. Our
transit system is the life blood of our city and our
surrounding regions. Nowhere else in the country and
in a few places around the world both citizens rely
on mass transit like New York City. In addition to a
large number of them, over 50 million tourists that
arrive in our city each year. Over 50% of our
citizens use our subways and buses daily to navigate
our driving metropolis.

2.2

Today, our city is increasingly focused on affordability and environmentalism. Its younger residents largely use public transportation proving that New York's culture will only increasingly rely on our transportation network in the future. It is for those reasons, and others that we cannot downplay our infrastructure. Council Member, can you — Thank you.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Let me interrupt so I can recognize Council Member Vacca.

I want to correct the record, Council Member

Greenfield, and I'm sure it wasn't intentional. As

Chair of the Transportation Committee, I gave you a

bill for 25 miles an hour hearing. It wasn't the

committee that did not do it. It was at that time

the Speaker and the Mayor decided not to move on it.

There were technical difficulties, and at the end of

the year, in December of last year, you asked that

your bill not move forward at that time. So I want

to correct the record.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Okay. Thank you Council Member.

2.2

2 CLERK: Council Member Van Bramer to vote.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: I vote aye.

CLERK: The vote stands at 11 in the affirmative.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Let me start from the beginning. Our transportation system is the life blood of our city and our surrounding regions. I would like to ask every colleague to be please quiet and--

[Pause]

System is the life blood of our city and our surrounding regions. Nowhere else in the country and a few places around the world do citizens rely on mass transit like New York City. In addition to a large number of over 50 million tourists that arrive in our city each year, over 50% of our citizens use our subways and buses daily to navigate our driving metropolis. Today, our city is increasing focused on affordability and environmentalism. Its younger residents largely use public transportation proving that New York's culture will only increasingly rely on our transportation network in the future.

It is for those reasons and others that
we cannot downplay our infrastructure. But rather,
must make a heavy investment in our city's future,
and those of our transit network. We on this
committee have very much been looking forward to
today's hearing to discuss the future of this vital
system. It is imperative that we first recognize the
remarkable progress that brings us to where we are
today. The improvement we have seen since the start
of the modern capital plan process in the 1980s is
truly astonishing. We have gone from existing on the
brink of collapse to a system that is not only safer
and more reliable but increasingly modern. However,
we cannot be complacent. Although we have come a
way. We have a New York transit system that still
lags behind other cities internationally. We need a
smart planning and investment strategies and frankly
a lot of money to achieve our ambitious goal to
become the international leader in transit.

That's what we are here to discuss today. The proposed 2015-19 MTA Plan-- Capital Plan we will discuss today is estimated at \$32 billion. The funding breakdown is as follows:

2.2

The MTA has identified \$16.8 billion in funding sources with an anticipated City contribution of \$125 million. \$6.7 billion is expected from federal government sources; \$200 million from private sources; \$600 million from MTA access sales and leases. And \$8.6 billion from other MTA sources including over \$6 billion in borrowing. This all leaves an estimated gap of \$15 billion.

I would like to acknowledge the MTA for their hard work, creativity and vision that has gone into producing this impressive plan for maintaining, improving, and growing the subway, buses, rail, bridges and total network. Here at the Council, as representative of our communities, we aim to be vital partners in developing and refining the priorities of the Capital Program to better feed our diverse society, and take our public transportation system to the modern era as other major cities with whom we compete have done.

Although we appreciate the work done, we must address the creativity and well known concerns of New Yorkers regarding this Capital Plan. For far too long, our city has accepted endless project delays and cost overruns. This has created a

2.1

2.2

perception that the MTA is both mismanaged and financially drained. Together, we can change this perception of inefficiencies and work toward not only increasing effective communications to citizens regarding project timelines, but also work toward increased productivity.

During New York City's initial age of progressivism under Mayor LaGuardia, government projects were not only completed under budget, but also faster than normal. Under what I like to think of as a new progressivism age of our city, we must reflect on what we did right back then, and do it again as I have said, Re-imagine the role of governments in the minds of citizens. We are here at the Council dedicate ourselves to increase oversight of the MTA to ensure that projects stick to their schedules, and stay within their budget as much as possible.

With progressivism should come images of innovation and out-of-the-box thinking in the minds of New Yorkers. That's why today we call upon the MTA to not only creatively think of ways to fund and improve our system infrastructure. But also, do this out-of-the-box thinking themselves. We at the

2.2

Council want the MTA to think big like developing a rail connection to LaGuardia Airport. We cannot continue to be behind international cities like

London who already have a system to rail connection

6 to all the airports and transportation hubs.

Further, we must dedicate ourselves to improving upon the SBA's system in creating true bus rapid transit. These big ideas, although, there comes an image of high spending must be accompanied by conservatism budgeting. Currently, as everyone knows, the plan has over a \$15 billion chokehold. Although we are willing to discuss increasing our contribution from its current \$100 million to \$125 million, such a large deficit seems threatening. We at the Council will explore why capital construction costs are so high in the first place. And to find out what accounts for cost overruns like the current issues with implementation of the Second Avenue Subway.

Further, we will determine what can be done to complete this project as efficiently as possible. In the same light, we must work together to financially stabilize the MTA. We in the Council expect to partner with the MTA to find creative

2.2

funding solutions to close this gap so that our future generations are not left with debt incurred on our own behalf. In addition to serving as a resource, the Council expects to be included in the initial step forward regarding the development and implementation of this and future capital plans. Our city relies on us as Council members to be their voice when they feel they cannot be heard individually.

There are a few issues that impact the daily lives of New Yorkers more than public the transportation system. Yet, far too often we have been little more than bystanders to the planning and decisions that go into shaping our subways and bus system. I very much look forward to discussing all of that and more at today's hearing. I now ask the representatives of the MTA to join us in this conversation and begin their testimony whey they're ready.

CRAIG STEWART: Thank you, Chairman

Rodriguez, and the rest of the esteemed members of

the Transportation Committee. On behalf of the MTA I

am very pleased to be here to present the proposed

MTA 2015-19 Capital Program. To my left colleagues

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

of mine Stephanie DeLisle. She is the Director of Capital Funding; Steve Berrang is next to her. He is the Director of Capital Program Management; and Josh Goldwitz, the Deputy Director of Capital Program Management.

The Capital Program is a series of investments that will remain enhanced and expand MTA's system. Less that two weeks ago, the Capital Program was approved by our Board, and we submitted the Program to the Review Board on October 1st. program we are now presenting today is a combination of more than two and a half years of planning. started with the 20-Year Needs Assessment, which we released last October. The 20-Year Needs Finding provide a strategic road map for the projects that make it into the program. Over the past year, we have worked carefully to craft this program combining projects that renew the system for safe and reliable service with projects that enhance and expand the network to create a 21st Century system that our customers have come to expect.

Today, we will start with an overview that reflects the importance of the MTA moving forward with a reasonable economy and the benefits

2.2

delivered by the Capital Program. This is a picture of the Second Avenue Subway Phase I work that 86th Street that was undertaken in July. I will explain the different types of needs that form the building blocks of the program. After that, Steve Berrang will cover the program highlights agency by agency. And finally, Stephanie DeLisle will wrap up with a review of the funding package, which is so critical to our ability to move this program forward.

The importance of the MTA system to the regional economy cannot be overstated. New York is the second largest metropolitan economy in the world second only to Tokyo. Each year we provide 2.6 billion trips to the 15.1 million people living in the region. The MTA accounted for 25% of New York City construction industry in 2012 or 18,000 jobs. In the 2010-14 program, it was estimated that we generated nearly 350,000 jobs across the New York with an overall economic impact of \$44 billion throughout the State. Seventy-one percent of New York City's population lives within a half mile of a subway station. Ninety-seven percent live within a quarter mile of a bus stop. We have more bus riders than any other public agency in North America. Over

2.2

80% of our region's communities take our system to work. No other system in the world, in the United States has the magnitude of the population it severs, roughly one in 16 Americans. It makes the regional economy work benefitting all in the State.

In the new 2015-19 Capital Program, we built our investments around three strategic objectives: Renew, enhance and expand. Our priority is to renew the system to ensure the safety of our customers, and the reliability of our system. Our next priority is to enhance our system improving the customer experience through service and system improvements. Finally, we are investing to expand the reach of the system to support regional economic growth and respond to increasing demand.

and a significant amount of investment is required to keep it in good working order. In the development of the 2015-19 program, we used the building box approach illustrated here. The core building blocks of the programs to renew and enhance the existing network are show in blue and orange. The expansion building block increases our reach of the network and is shown in green. Starting with the core, the renew

2.2

building blocks of safety and reliability provide the foundation of our investment program. Safety projects are the basic building blocks of our operation, operating our system safe for our

6 passengers as well as our employees.

For example, safety investments include track and signal work. Not making these investments will increase near-term risks to the service.

Reliability projects are essential for maintaining the performance of the system. Our reliability investments include such projects as fleet replacement for subways, railroads and buses.

Failure to invest in new fleets will reduce the service reliability. For example, our newest subway trains are four times more reliable than the cars that will be replaced in the proposed 2015-19 Capital Program.

The upper half of the core consists of enhanced building block projects, which improve the system and the customer experience. System improvement investments help the MTA deliver better and more service. For example, a project like New Fare Payment System. Failure to invest would mean not meeting the demands of our customers or the

2.2

region, and put us further behind in implementing technology that can improve the performance as was as at a lower cost. Customer experience project improve the customer's environment, and are responsive to the change in customer expectations. This includes such innovations as countdown clocks. Foregoing these investments will compromise our ability to deliver a 21st Century transit experience to our customers. Taken together, renew and enhance building blocks total \$26.5 billion. In addition, the program includes \$5.5 billion for network expansion.

These projects allow us to address capacity constraints and meet the needs of the regional economy. The proposed program will complete East Side Access, launch phase 2 of the Second Avenue subway, and begin Penn Access. Not investing in these projects will prevent us from supporting the regional economic growth and from meeting capacity needs. In total, the building blocks come to \$32 billion of the Proposed 2015-19 Capital Program. A few statistics illustrate just how the Capital Program investments over the past 30 years has delivered benefits.

2.2

Compared to where we were in 1982, the reliability of our rail fleet has increased tremendously. For example, subway fleets have gone from an average 11,000 mean distance between failure, to 135,000 mean distance between failure. This has helped on-time performance with delays falling by 48% on Long Island Railroad; 84% on Metro-North; and 94% on the subway. And a transformed transit environment has vastly improved safety. Major felonies are down 88% on the subway. Our customers have responded to this overhaul of the MTA system. Ridership is up 61% since 1992 and growing.

In addition to all of this, our Capital Program also provides many other benefits.

Improvements like next time arrival signs, and modernized fleets provide a better customer experience while reasonable benefits range from recent growth and development along revitalized L-line to thousands of construction and manufacturing jobs that we support across the State. We will work to incorporate the ideas from industry thought leaders in the shaping of the Capital Program.

Earlier this summer our Chairman acted on a recommendation of the Governor to appoint a

2.1

2.2

commission to review the Capital Program to ensure that the Authority is ready to meet the challenges it would face in our next 100 years. The 24-person commission has been working diligently to develop their recommendations. We will be taking a close look at the Commission's recommendations, and we will identify how best to incorporate them and put them into action into our Capital Program. Now, I'm going to turn it over to Steve Berrang to talk about the agency-by-agency investments.

Craig said we have a \$32 Billion Proposed Five-Year
Capital Plan. This slide shows the distribution of
that by agencies. The distribution is based on needs
driven by our 20-year Needs Assessment. The lion's
share goes to New York City Transit with the commuter
rolls get about 17-1/2%, and expansion getting about
17-1/2% with 10% going to bridges and tunnels. I'm
going to run through the agency-by-agency look, and
what it will look back and then forward. This is a
slide of the Smith-Ninth Street Station, which opened
in the 2010-14 Capital Plan. It went through a
renewal, and what you see here are some artwork, and
the turnstiles. The turnstiles will be outfitted in

2 the 2015-19 Plan with New Fare Payment Technology,
3 which will allow us to introduce our cards and other

4 | fare media. [sic]

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

The New York City Transit Five-Year Plan has proposed \$17.1 billion. The largest area of spending was rolling stock followed by signals, stations, and track. The proposed rolling stock purchase for Transit includes 940 cars for the R211 fleet. The R211 fleet will replace the R-46 fleet on the B division. The R-46s are approaching 40 years of age, and by the time the last one rolls off the property, it will be close to 50 years of years. Which is 10 years older than our standard 40 years. In addition, we are going to be purchasing about a billion dollars worth of buses. There will be 1,100 standard buses; 275 articulated buses; and 50 express buses. New York City Transit anticipates continuing the rollout of CBTC on the Queens Boulevard Line, which will increase throughput by over 10%. And also, undertaking CBCT on the Sixth Avenue Line in Manhattan, and undertaking the design for CBTC in the Eighth Avenue line.

In addition, the New York City Transit Program for Stations, the renewal and component

2.2

effort will make repairs at over 170 stations
throughout the system. We will do a major
configuration of Time Square and Grand Central, and
will complete the rollout of New Fare Payment System
in the 2015-19 Plan. We will also purchase new
rolling stock for the Staten Island Railway. And we
will expand our existing very successful station
component effort to other areas such as structures
and pallet.

This is a photograph of Atlantic Avenue
Viaduct, which is part of the Long Island Railroad
network. This viaduct underwent a multi-capital plan
structural rehab, which was completed in 2010-14
Capital Plan. The MTA's engineering consultant views
this as a highly successful project, and says it
should serve as an example for design built projects
throughout the MTA system. All of the phases were
completed ahead of schedule and on budget, and the
railroad was open every morning-- every Monday
morning for traffic. The remaining portion of this
initiative is in the 2015-19 Plan, which is a rehab
of the Nostrand [sic] Avenue Station.

The Long Island Railroad Proposed Plan is \$3.1 billion. A large share of this will continue to

2.2

rolling stock and track capacity improvements that
will be done in the 2010-14 Plan. It will complete
the replacement of the M-3 Fleet, the Main Line
Double track, and continue Jamaica capacity permits.
To complement the nearly \$600 million of capacity
improvements of track, Long Island Railroad will also
invest \$400 million in maintaining the state of good
repair of its existing track assets bringing the
overall track investment number to a billion dollars.
We're going to continue to make investments in
communication signal infrastructure. We're going to
complete positive train control, which is a critical
safety system for us.

We're going to update critical communication signal leads, and we're going to continue Long Island Railroad's migration centralized train control. We're also going to do a lot of work at stations. We're going to make a down payment for the New Fare Payment System at Long Island. We're going to do station component work. In addition to the Nostrand Avenue rehabilitation, we're going to be doing a rehab at Babylon Station at Hunter's Point Avenue. We're going to construct a new station in Elmhurst to meet the demands of that growing

2.2

community, and we're going to begin the design
efforts for a second new station at Republic on the
main line in Suffolk County. The balance of the Long
Island Railroad Proposed Plan focuses on the
replacement of assets that at their useful life.

Rounding out the Commuter Rail Program is Metro-North. This photograph shows a Grand Central Terminal, which is the centerpiece of the Metro-North network. In the 2010-14 Program we invested nearly \$100 million in the train shed and the terminal. In the 2015-19 Program we will be making a down payment on what will be over 20 years a billion dollar investment in Grand Central, and the train shed with approximately \$250 million worth of improvements including the replacement of the big board that you see on the right hand side of this photograph.

The Metro-North Program is \$2.6 billion as proposed. 85% of this is slated for State of Good Repair Projects. Two projects dominate nearly half of the investment. One is the replacement of the M-3 Program, the M-3 rolling stock, which has reached the end of its useful life. And the final phase of Harmon Shop, which is the shop that undertakes 80% of Metro-North's shop operations of the railroad. This

2.2

proposed plan also includes significant investment in
the structural rehab of overhead underground bridges.
A custom communications system central and throughout
the system. Early investment in the New Fare Payment
System finishing off positive train control, which as
I mentioned earlier for Long Island Railroad is a
critical safety system. Signal improvements on the
Upper Hudson Line with the balance of the program
being a variety of state-of good-repair projects
including cyclical track, power investment and third
rail components.

We're now going to turn to MTA Bus, which is one of the sister agencies to New York City
Transit's Bus Operation, and complements them within the five boroughs. This photograph shows one of the express buses purchased in the 2000 to 2004 Program.
These buses are reaching the end of their useful life, and will be replaced in the Proposed 2015 to 2019 Plan. The MTA Bus Program is \$400 million. It is dominated by bus purchases, which comprise 75% of the plan. 406 new buses will be purchased including 378 high capacity express buses and 28 articulated buses. The balance of the program will invest in

2.2

depot component work, and the MTA buses share the radio system.

This is the last of our operating agencies, Bridges and Tunnels. This image looks skyward at one of the towers over Verrazano-Narrows Bridge, which is the longest suspension bridge in North America. The major 2010-14 project now entering construction is the replacement of the upper level of the suspended span of this bridge resulting in a new deck layout and a seventh lane for buses and high occupancy vehicles. The 2015-19 program will continue work on the Verrazano Narrows Bridge with work to ease the exit off the lower level onto the Gowanus for Brooklyn bound passengers.

\$3.1 billion. It has a heavy emphasis on structures. In the 2010-14 Bridges and Tunnels Plan was 19% for structures, and in this program it will be 35%. Structure work includes for example the \$164 million effort to Throgs Neck approaches, and to retrofit the RFK Bridge for seismic activity and wind forces.

The largest roadway deck project is \$333 million for the new deck on the Throgs Neck Bridge, and to design initial— and to do an initial

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

reconstruction effort RFK Bridge and Manhattan Toll
Plaza. We're also going to be continuing state-ofgood repair work at both the tunnels. The program
includes some enhancements including most notably a
new ramp like the RFK Bridge to the Northbound Harlem
River Driver. This was undertaken with our partners
at New York City DOT.

This is a shot of the work underway at the 7 West Extension. This will take the 7 Line from Times Square down 11th Avenue to new station on 34th This is supported by \$2.4 billion of City funds, and this will spur growth and revitalize Far West Midtown. This is an example of how working together with our partners we can expand the reach of the MTA network. The Expansion Projects are \$5.5 billion as proposed. There are basically three: East Side Access, Second Avenue Subway Phase 2, and Penn Access. The \$2.9 billion that you see here will fully fund East Side Access through its opening in December 2022. As you know, East Side Access had to go under a public view of its schedule and budget earlier this year, and this will fully fund that.

Second Avenue Subway Phase 2. The billion and a half dollars shown here will fund the

2.2

design and planning efforts that are necessary, the real estate purchases, and utility relocations, and the tunnel boring contract necessary to run the tunnel up to 125th Street. The balance of the work included the construction of the stations, and the systems necessary to run a service will be funded in funded in future capital plans.

Penn Access. This \$743 million, as proposed, will bring Metro North to Haven Line and to Penn Station. This will fund the infrastructure needs that are necessary, the track, the signal, the power, the communication, and the construction of full stations as well as the specification of rolling stock necessary to turn the service.

I am now going to turn this over now to Stephanie who will talk about the funding.

with prior capital programs, the proposed five-year plan relies on support from a mix of sources including from federal, local, and MTA sources.

Beginning with federal, while we await congressional action in the next multi-year transportation reorganization, we keep our assumptions for FT formula and flexible funding here flat in the

July Financial Plan.

2.2

proposed program at recent levels for a total of \$6.3 billion. The proposal also included \$3.9 billion in new MTA bonding capacity. And I mention \$27 million in pay-as-you-go capital, as reflected under MTA's

Our asset sales and lease assumption reflects the projections of additional proceeds from the East-West Rail Yards, and the disposition of MTA's Madison Avenue properties as well as other sources, including properties MTA jointly owns with the City of New York. We have included \$657 million over the five-year period as the City's contribution to the Capital Program including \$125 million per year as the annual capital contribution, a 25% increase above the annual levels in 2010-14, the current Capital Program. And City matching funds for MTA bus grants.

The 2015-19 Proposal assumes \$507 million in new starts funding for Phase 2 of the Second Avenue Subway Project. Of course, subject to further discussion with the FTA. And we anticipate that about \$200 million in select station projects could be accomplished through private developer initiatives. Other MTA Sources. That's primarily

- 2 MTA bonds or pay go that could be generated in
- 3 savings due to proposed issuance of PMT backed plans.
- 4 And our proposed FRA RRIF loan for a PTC, or Positive
- 5 Train Control.

- 6 And finally, our Bridges and Tunnels
- 7 | 2015-19 program would be self-funded through a
- 8 combination of TTA Bonds and Pay-As-You-Go Capital.
- 9 But in the end, as you see, there remains a
- 10 | significant funding gap of \$15.2 billion that must be
- 11 | filled in order for the MTA to implement our proposed
- 12 2015-19 program. To meet the challenge to renew,
- 13 enhance and expand, we will work with our funding
- 14 partners to help fill the gap with contributions from
- 15 | the system's beneficiaries, including: New dedicated
- 16 revenues, private funds, or in-kind contributions.
- 17 Additional appropriations from out State, federal,
- 18 | and local government partners are, of course, MTA
- 19 debt. Craig.
- CRAIG STEWART: Okay, we wrap up the
- 21 presentation with just a scheduled here. As I said
- 22 | earlier, we submitted the plan in September, and it
- 23 went to the Board, and was approved by the Board.
- 24 And it went to the CPRB, the Capital Program Review

- 2 Board in October. This concludes our presentation.
- 3 Thank you.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Before to questions, let me call Council Member Levin to be able to-- For the Clerk to ask the Council Member to vote.

CLERK: Levin.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Aye on all.

CLERK: The vote stands at 12 in the affirmative.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. I want to start out first with a further more basic, which is given the idea where the MTA will be able to get the \$32 billion with public-private bond loans and the other sources. Does the MTA and the private contractors have the capacity to deliver the project within the project time frame?

CRAIG STEWART: We think we do. Our program is built on basically what we think we can achieve within that time frame, and that's not-- I don't say that lightly. Looking at track access is a big part of evaluating our program, and working on each line and the disruption of service. We take

2.1

2.2

2 that in mind. So we do think we can get this work
3 done within this time frame.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Is that based on the previous years where the MTA can say that with the private contractors like the capacity is there for the MTA to deliver having the men the women empowering, and the private contractor having the capacity to deliver those projects.

CRAIG STEWART: Yes, that's taken into consideration. Also, our own in-houses forces are taken into consideration. How much work they can do and where they can work, and how much they can get done within that time frame.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Okay. How can the Council play a bigger role in helping to shape the MTA plan for our City public transportation?

CRAIG STEWART: Well, I think that

partnering with us and supporting our Capital Program

is something that we look forward to. I think we

also would like to hear your ideas. I know that the

Government Affairs Office often talks to members of

the Council, and that works its way into our Program.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Okay. So, as you know, as one of the requests remains like having a

- 2 breakdown of where those projects that are proposed on this Five-Year Capital Plan would take place 3 within all Council Members.
- 5 CRAIG STEWART: I'm sorry. Yes. [laughs]

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: And that's very important because it will allow for all of us to have the opportunity to see what are the projects. And, therefore, engage the Community Board, and other CBOs in that conversation. How safe is the 1930s era of

12 CRAIG STEWART: Well, I'm--

> CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: That this is the years today, right?

15 CRAIG STEWART: Yes.

subway signal?

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: That is the one?

CRAIG STEWART: It is safe. We have a fail-safe system in our system. The reliability of an old signal system may not be what a new one is, and that's what we work to both keep it safe and reliable. I would say the biggest challenge is not necessarily keeping it safe, but keeping it reliable. Because it is built to fail safe.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: [off mic]

24

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.2

2 CRAIG STEWART: I'm sorry. I couldn't 3 hear you. Your microphone is off.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Oh, have you been in conversation with the Administration to look on where or how the City can increase their contribution on this Capital Plan?

CRAIG STEWART: We've just begun the dialogue, and I think that's a dialogue we look forward to having.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, and all the localities are served by the MTA like the Long Island Railroad that even though it's used by many New Yorkers, it is also used by the residents of Long Island. And there is need, a \$3.1 billion requirement on this capital. How much does Long Island really contribute, and what other municipality will contribute on this Capital Plan?

STEPHANIE DELISLE: We look forward to that conversation between not only with the City of New York, but also with the other localities, as you say, out on Long Island and Upstate New York to help us fill that gap. As of right now, there is no specific contribution noted here, but we look forward to working with them to help fill the gap.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Okay, and that I believe is very important because, you know, like this is— First of all, I congratulate all of you on the leadership for putting this plan together, and this is like going in the right direction.

CRAIG STEWART: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: As you know,
there is major and more discussion in this case in
London and other cities putting in the big capital
plan, and knowing transportation by another area. So
I believe that this plan will also take our city when
it comes to transportation in the right direction.
And I believe that as we as a city will be making our
contribution, other municipalities and Long Island
they should also be asked to make the contribution,
too.

CRAIG STEWART: Yes, agreed.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: What about the MTA plan to sell or lease, which is expected to provide revenue? I believe it's \$600 million. Is there other besides—— I mean we also made the request to have a breakdown of those leases and which are those properties. Is there more properties besides those that you already have included that can

2.2

provide the \$600 million of this capital that you
will or can be open to explore also?

The \$600 million we quote includes, as I mentioned, some additional parking [sic] in the East and West Rail Yards, about \$190 million, and about \$110 million in additional proceeds for the sale of the MTA's headquarters buildings on Madison Avenue. And we understand that the whole process has been made. And as we develop our projection and our list of specific locations for the remaining \$300 million, I'm sure that figure will then reflect that. [sic] As of right now, it's an estimate.

that when we explore sources of revenue for the MTA for their revenue. And I include something on the local level that I have said before, and I also express to you. I would like to see the MTA doing-including in this Five-Year Capital, the study of the potential of developing the 207 Railyard, which is 36 acres, larger than the Hudson Yard. That if a platform is built, provides greater opportunity to make a major development such as the Hudson Yard.

Can you include? Would you be open to include that?

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 46
2	CRAIG STEWART: I understand that you're-
3	- We've discussed this with the President of the
4	Agency, and we will take a look at it and evaluate
5	it.
6	CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Okay, and my last
7	question, which is basically looking at the local
8	level in Northern Manhattan, a design calling my
9	other colleagues to ask questions, is about how to
10	make one train, 168 accessible. One train and 168
11	and one train on 181st.
12	DAVID HENLY: Council Member, you're
13	talking about 168th?
14	CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: One train from
15	and from the elevator to the platform.
16	CRAIG STEWART: This is, David Henly. He

CRAIG STEWART: This is, David Henly. He is the Chief Budget Officer for New York City Transit joining us.

DAVID HENLY: Okay. Yeah, we'll take a look at that. I don't have an answer right off the top of my head, but the number one train at that station.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: That's all right.

I just wanted to-- Again, like 168 that's where we have Columbia for the city.

2.2

2 DAVID HENLY: Yes.

important in both Columbia and MTA you make like a major renovation. As also I recognize the investment also on 181st. But I believe that, and this is something that we can walk by. From the elevator and go places to the platform. We should be able to make it accessible for our communities.

DAVID HENLY: We'll get an answer back to you Council Member.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. Now,
I would like to call my colleague, Council Member
Garodnick.

much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you all for your testimony today. I wanted to probe a little further on that, on the unfunded portion of the Five-Year Capital Budget because we're more familiar with seeing budgets in which the sources are equal to the uses. And in this case, it's \$32 billion budget with a \$15 billion shortfall I guess is really the only way to explain it. How should we interpret that. Of all of the various things that you've had in your presentation, expansion programs for Long Island

2.2

Railroad or Second Avenue Subway or Penn Station. In
relation to the fact that there is \$15 billion in
money in this plan, which is not available to you?
Which programs are not going to get done as you sit
here today and plan for a Five-Year Capital Plan?

CRAIG STEWART: Well, we certainly hope that full program will get done. This isn't unusual. Our last plan had a very significant gap, too, probably about of the same proportion. And we worked through it to fund the majority of the program. And this is just the beginning of a dialogue. So we'll be talking to our funding partners about filling that gap.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay. So you don't at this moment in time have a subset of what you presented to us of what today falls in the \$16 billion and what falls in the \$15 billion?

CRAIG STEWART: No, we actually will work with our agencies to determine their priorities at a lower level, if that becomes necessary.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: The CPRB rejected this plan on Friday, and I don't know if you have an impression of the basis on which they rejected it. News reports suggested that it was on

2.2

the basis that it was under-funded. Do you have any impression as to what the reason was for that?

CRAIG STEWART: Our impression is that they weren't ready to have the dialogue, as has happened in previous years. It was kind of expected. The dialogue probably will begin sometime later on the beginning of the year, and we will be told to resubmit the program.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: As you noted, last go-around the CPRB also rejected your Capital Budget Proposal, which was a \$28 billion plan, of which about \$10 billion was unfunded. You came back. You, the MTA, came back and submitted a revised plan of about \$23.8 billion. Should we expect that as a result of starting and finishing that conversation with the CPRB that we will see a plan that is less than \$32 billion?

CRAIG STEWART: That's a possibility. We're hoping it doesn't happen, but that's a possibility.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Do you know which projects or improvements would be the first on your list that would not be achieved if you were to have to go to a lower number?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 50
2	CRAIG STEWART: No, we would Like I
3	said, we would work with the agencies to determine
4	their priorities, and decide at that point which
5	project would have to be deferred.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay. It has
7	long been anticipated that there will be a fare hike
8	in the next year of 4% in the Year 2015. Is that

in the next year of 4% in the Year 2015. something that we should perceive to be included in the funding currently projected, or the funding gap category?

STEPHANIE DELISLE: In the funding currently projected, the bonds included.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: The funding currently projected. So the money to be achieved by a fare hike is included in the \$16 billion and \$16.8 billion of funds expected to be available for 2015 to 2019?

STEPHANIE DELISLE: Yes, the July Financial Plan included those bi-annual fare adjustments and those-- That plan included the \$3.8 billion that you see there in bonds. So it's in the funded portion of the program.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: I'm sorry. You say it's listed in the bonds portion?

2.2

STEPHANIE DELISLE: Yeah, the bonds are
supported by the Financial Plan. That also included
those bi-annual fare hikes.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay, I see.

So the bonds are the result of having the additional revenue from the fare hike?

STEPHANIE DELISLE: Over the long-term. [sic]

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: What is the value of a 4% fare hike in 2015?

CRAIG STEWART: I don't know what any dollar value is. The percentage just keeps pace with inflation.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: I'm sure that there are many members of the Committee, including myself who have something to say on the subject. But today, will likely not be the day for that. Let me just ask a couple more questions out of respect for my colleagues.

On the \$1.35 billion for Phase 2 of the Second Avenue Subway, I noted-- I heard the testimony that that's going to be for design and planning, a tunnel boring contract, and for the relocation of the underground steps, something which

contract, et cetera?

2.2

we're all very familiar having just experienced it.

Is that something that you are ready to execute on immediately upon the approval of this plan, or does something else have to happen here before you will start design and planning, the tunnel boring

STEVE BERRANG: The design and planning activities are ready to commence as soon as the plan is approved. We don't envision the tunnel boring activity starting until the end of 2015-19 program. So probably around the 2019 framework after the utilities are relocated, and the necessary real estate purchases are made.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: So you do expect that within the five-year period that there-we would be able to start and complete design and planning for Phase 2?

STEVE BERRANG: Well, design will be ongoing because it's-- But the tunnel boring, which is the first of a series of construction contracts, will starting 2019. But what is going to happen is it's probably two years worth of design and planning activity that needs to happen before we can start doing utility relocations.

2	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: And you expect
3	all of this to happen within this Five-Year Capital
4	Plan? Start and completion of design and planning,
5	the electrical relocation, and keying up the
6	contracts, finalizing the contracts for tunnel boring
7	to begin in the next
8	STEVE BERRANG: [interposing] And
9	awarding the contract and the start of the tunnel
10	boring effort.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay. So
12	would it be reasonable for people to perceive then
13	that phase The actual tunnel boring work would
14	start some time in 2019?
15	STEVE BERRANG: That's the plan.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay, and
17	electrical relocations would start?
18	STEVE BERRANG: It's electrical,
19	telephone, gas. It's all of the
20	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: [interposing]
21	Everything. All of the underground relocations would
22	start in your estimation?
23	STEVE BERRANG: In two to three years.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Two to three

years. There are portions underground already that

2.2

exist in Phase 2. I've even been down to some of
them. They are at or around 110th Street, if I
recall, maybe even at 120th Street. Does this, the
existence of some partial tunnels, does that mean
that the process of doing tunnel boring for Phase 2
will be easier, or does it mean perhaps that it will
be harder? This is a mechanical question about
tunnel boring, which I don't completely understand.

answer that either. I know that we will utilize those portions that were already built as part of our plan. I believe the alignment has changed slightly. So they may not be used as a tunnel piece, but they would be used. They would be repurposed.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Oh, the existing tunnels that are there in the Phase 2 may not be used for subway tunnels?

CRAIG STEWART: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Is that a determined fact?

CRAIG STEWART: No, I don't believe that fact has been determined. I think they are looking at that. They will look at that through the design process.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay, and then
the last question here is do we know that there
actually would be like a Well, actually the last
two. There would actually be tunnel boring equipment
available during that time frame during 2019, which
the MTA hopes to achieve? This is apparently a
limited good that exists in the world, the tunnel
boring operations.

STEVE BERRANG: We currently anticipate yes the equipment will be available.

estimated time frame for the completion of Phase 2 of the Second Avenue Subway through the start as you anticipate a couple of years of design. Then, underground relocations. Then tunnel boring starting in 2019. What's the completion date?

STEVE BERRANG: I don't know that we have a completion date, but I will tell you that our work will be funded in this, for this project through the next Capital Program. So through the 2020 to 2024 Capital Program. It will probably be finishing sometime after that.

- 1 2 COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: I'm sorry. 3 When you say, will be funded in your next Five-Year 4 Capital Plan--STEVE BERRANG: [interposing] Well, 5 there's station work. There's signal work. There's 6 7 track work. There's communication work? There's power work. These are all going to be funded in 8 9 subsequent capital plans. 10 COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Right, meaning to say that they're not funded here? 11 12 STEVE BERRANG: Correct. 13 COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Right. Okay, 14 so they may or may not be funded in the 2024 Capital 15 Plan. 16 STEVE BERRANG: Yes. 17 COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: But they're 18 most certainly not funded in the 2015 to 2019 Capital 19 Plan. 20 CRAIG STEWART: It's not in this program. Only the work that we can do to make sure that this 21 2.2 program is funded. But we do anticipate putting in
 - COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Understood, and the only reason I pointed it out is obviously all

our next capital program proposal.

23

24

- 2 of the phases of the Second Avenue Subway Line are
- 3 thing that we've been discussing since the 1920s. So
- 4 the idea that it might or might not be in your
- 5 documents in the next five-year plan, you know, is an
- 6 open question, but we certainly hope that it is.
- 7 Thank you, Mr. Chairman for the time. I appreciate
- 8 | it.

- 9 CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: There will be
- 10 giving five minutes for the rest of the members.
- 11 [Pause]
- 12 COUNCIL MEMBER CONSTANTINIDES: Thank
- 13 you, Mr. Chair, and I thank the MTA for being here
- 14 today. I have a couple of questions regarding
- 15 | service out in Western Queens, which I represent.
- 16 There is not an accessible subway in my district in
- 17 | its entirety. All five stops in Astoria do not have
- 18 any sort of point of accessibility. And I have
- 19 spoken to the MTA about this before. Do you
- 20 anticipate any sort of change in that stat over the
- 21 next five years. Or we can look forward-- Is it
- 22 really going to do something when we're talking about
- 23 | accessibility long into the future?
- 24 CRAIG STEWART: I'm going to have Lois
- 25 | Tendler to come up and answer that question.

2.2

2 LOIS TENDLER: The proposed plan includes
3 accessible-- Making Astoria Boulevard--

COUNCIL MEMBER CONSTANTINIDES:

5 [interposing] And that's what's in this five?

LOIS TENDLER: --MTA accessible. And it's in the neck. It's in this proposed packet.

COUNCIL MEMBER CONSTANTINIDES: It's in this five-year copy of your project?

LOIS TENDLER: Yes.

fantastic. That's good to hear as well. And, I
have-- I think I've spoken to MTA before about this,
and I'm hoping to hear good answers instead of a soft
ball. But we have a school in our district that is
very sort of interrupted by train noises on a daily
basis. The fact that the students have to do this
every two minutes, is a signal for them to stop
talking because the train noise is so loud as it goes
past their classrooms. We have discussed track
upgrades around that school to make the track
quieter. Is that in your Five-Year Capital Plan?

LOIS TENDLER: Yes, we've actually—
We're working on designing track improvements, which
includes a switch replacement. We're working on

2.2

-?

- 2 trying to accelerate the purchase of the equipment.
- 3 So yeah that's covered in the next plan.

COUNCIL MEMBER CONSTANTINIDES: That is.

I know the students of PS-85 and the students of the neighborhood in general would be very excited to hear that. So I'll definitely stay in touch with you. Do you anticipate when that work might get done or it's-

LOIS TENDLER: We're hoping to, um, accelerate it so it will be done in the first part of the plan.

COUNCIL MEMBER CONSTANTINIDES:

Fantastic. Thank you so much. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Council Member

16 Jimmy Van Bramer followed by Council Member Rose.

very much, Mr. Chair, and I have two of your bigger projects cutting right through the heart of my district. So on the 7 Train and the CBTC, what year do you have that funded through, and it's it fully funded? And what year do you have that funded through?

CRAIG STEWART: That's funded in the current program.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: So--

CRAIG STEWART: So it's completely in this program.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: The work is 6 scheduled to end?

STEVE BERRANG: 2017.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: 2017, right, and that is unchanged and on target?

CRAIG STEWART: As of now, yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: Okay, and if it were to be delayed, if it were to go beyond 2017, how do you handle that in terms of funding?

affect the funding, if there is a delay. We believe we've committed enough money to finish up. We've awarded the contract. So we have no more contracts to award on that project. So we think it wouldn't need additional funding unless additional engineering funds were needed for an extension of time or something.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: Well, it's good news to hear that the final contract has been awarded on that. And, we look forward to the completion of you CBCT install in a big way in

- 2 Western Queens. Believe it or not, somewhat more complicated is the East Side Access. And I see that 3 4 you have an enormous sum of money in this budget for East Side Access. I wonder if you could tell us what 5 6 is the total budget for East Side Access now? 7 is now the target completion date, and how are those two numbers different from when you started out? 8 how over-budget is East Side Access, and how overdue 9 is East Side Access. And where is the \$2.9 billion 10 that's in this budget in relation to the overall 11 12 numbers?
 - CRAIG STEWART: Okay. I'll start. Our current schedule is completion in December 2022, and the budget I believe, and Steve can confirm this, is \$10.1 billion, which is an increase since the last budget of \$2.8?
 - STEVE BERRANG: [off mic] I believe it's \$2.8 or \$2.7 billion.
- 20 CRAIG STEWART: \$2.7 billion.
- COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: So, you're
 overall, you said access plan now is \$10.1 billion?
- 23 CRAIG STEWART: Yes.
- 24 COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: And that's
- 25 | 2.7 since the last budget?

14

15

16

17

18

2.2

2 CRAIG STEWART: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: And when you first proposed East Side Access, though, it wasn't \$10.1 or maybe eight or was it?

STEVE BERRANG: It depends on when you say we originally proposed it. I think it was in the four to five billion dollar range when we first started to do substantive work on it. And so, it's changed a bit since then.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: Right, and do you expect to meet the December 22?

CRAIG STEWART: Yes, we did. We went through a very rigorous review. We had a third party come in, and do a risk assessment, and we do expect that that is a good date.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: Well, we look forward to that date, and I realize this is about the budget, not about our community concerns. But I do hope because your whole team is here that we will continue to be mindful of the residents of Sunnyside in particular, Sunnyside Towers as you're doing that construction on East Side Access. Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Thank you, and it's good to be back, Mr. Chair. Thank you so much.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 Staten Island is really alarmed at the omission of

3 | the Bus Rapid Transit Line for the North Shore. As

4 you know, Staten Island is the fastest growing

5 borough with the least number of transportation

6 options. We now have over a billion dollars worth of

7 | investment in Saint George in the New York-- in the

8 entire outlet at Lighthouse Point. It is all

9 centered around our transportation hub.

We currently have 34,000 residents that live just in that area in Saint George/Stapleton with an expected growth of 7% in 2015 and 15% in 2017.

And we actually have a dedicated line for BRT. We also have a study that was done in 2012 that supported this. So could you tell me why, the reasoning why the Staten Island North Shore BRT Line was left out of the project plan?

CRAIG STEWART: Our original plan was submitted as a resiliency project for resiliency funding from the FTA. And we were advised by the FTA that it was not a good candidate. So we didn't submit it in that plan. Now, what we do have is planning money that we can begin—that we can continue to evaluate and develop BRT option as an option there.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: We already did the study, an Alternative Analysis, and it was deemed that it was viable, and that we were, indeed, believed to— We were led to believe that this was going to be something that would actually happen. And it was before the resiliency funding issue came to light. So how suddenly did this— Is this no longer a priority? I'm just hard pressed to understand how it's no longer a priority.

STEVE BERRANG: But there is a mix of priorities that we're grappling with. This corridor has gone through several iterations from freight rail to light rail to BRT, and seeking consent on any number of options has been a struggle. But we look forward to continuing that planning effort, and working with the community to come up with something that works for everybody.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: I understand that there were varying degrees of support for BRT versus light rail. However, we were told basically that because of the cost that light rail was off the table. And that you were going to proceed with Bus Rapid Transit. And so, again this is an area where the right-of-way does exist. We're talking about an

2.2

because I--

area that has a dearth of transportation options. An area where economically we are seeing a renaissance, and there was an Alternative Analysis Study already done. How is it that this entire corridor where there's even been talk of a link to the West Shore Light Rail Project. Which had been hoped that that would be included, and a link to the Bayonne Bridge. I just— I'm at a loss. Yeah, Lois get on the mic

if I could answer some of your questions, and tell you where I think we are with it now. As you correctly stated, we conducted an Alternative Analysis to study the right-of-way on the North Shore and what could be done with it. The conclusion of that report in 2012 was for a BRT treatment down on the North Shore. The price tag for that project is about \$365 million.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Right, right, uh-

LOIS TENDLER: I believe that that was the preferred. The BRT was the preferred alternative not just on costs along. There were other operational issues, which dealt with why light rail

2.2

wasn't suggested to this as a preferred alternative. It wasn't just a dollar decision. That being said, the Staten Island community received the conclusion of the Alternative Analysis very lukewarmly. You know, some people's attitude was is if this the best we could do, we would like it. You know, some people were still talking to us about revisiting the light rail decision. That's on one side, right. And then these guys here were putting together the Capital Program. As you see, it's \$32 billion. It's a lot. And I think that the lack of clarity, and the lack of being embraced didn't help the project. That being

Just one more thing Councilwoman. As you know, right, the proposed plan is our starting proposal. It contains what we think we need to keep the system safe and reliable. It will also be the subject of negotiations between many people over the next several months.

said, it wasn't included in the proposed plan.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: I'm glad to hear that it will be subject to negotiations. However, this is a five-year plan, and all of our developments will be online within less than five years. If we are not a part of this planning period, when does

- 2 this happen? You know that we are grossly
- 3 underserved. And I think it's a travesty that Staten
- 4 | Island, especially the BRT Line is not included in
- 5 | this Five-Year Plan. In fact, I would like to know
- 6 if the fact that the Capital Program Review Board
- 7 rejected this plan, does that then give us the
- 8 opportunity re-negotiate and fight for inclusion in
- 9 the Five-Year Plan.
- 10 LOIS TENDLER: They rejected the plan
- 11 | just by their terminology without prejudice. That
- 12 | being said, yes. You know, the plan needs to be
- 13 approved by the members of the Capital Program Review
- 14 | Board. Yes, those representatives represent
- 15 different parts of the political spectrum. And they
- 16 | will, as we've done in past years, talk to us about
- 17 projects, both included and not included.
- 18 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: So, okay, I just--
- 19 Our representative on the MTA Board will have the
- 20 opportunity to revisit the plan, and the omission of
- 21 the BRT?
- LOIS TENDLER: Yes.
- 23 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: No problem. Thank
- 24 you.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Council Member
Weprin followed by Council Member Miller.

COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: Thank you, Mr.

Chair. As I mentioned in earlier remarks on the bill we passed before, I am a big proponent of public transportation. I think it's essential to our city to continue to grow, to modernize, to make sure we upgrade the services wherever possible. So I'm all for that. We obviously have a \$15 billion gap in order just to meet the services you have outlined here today. Forget about the services that I would like to see done in order to increase service in my area. So the Governor's panel is charged with coming up with a way to fill this \$15 billion gap? Is that what you will be doing?

CRAIG STEWART: No, not specifically.

They're charged with looking at the-- I guess the bigger view where we're going in the next hundred years looking at resiliency, looking at demographic changes. I'm sure they will also delve into the funding, but that's not specifically their challenges.

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 69
2	COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: What is the time
3	frame on when this funding has to be in place to fill
4	this \$15 billion gap? Do we have a time frame?
5	CRAIG STEWART: There is no specific time
6	frame. Traditionally it's been the program gets
7	approved some time later in the year. The last time
8	it was
9	COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: [interposing]
10	Later in the fiscal year.
11	CRAIG STEWART:June. Later in the
12	Yes, 2015 in June. Last time it was in June of 2010.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: Is the MTA
14	involved in those discretions on this panel. Do they
15	have representatives on this panel that the governor
16	put together?
17	CRAIG STEWART: No, we don't have
18	representatives on the panel or on the Commission.
19	Whatever questions they have, we are made available
20	to answer their questions. But no we don't We are

COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: All right, at my own political risk, I want to just raise the idea--You're familiar with Sam Schwartz's Fair Plan on Funding? Now, it has to do with-- You know, I was a

not represented on the panel.

21

22

23

24

big opponent of the congestion pricing plan that was
suggested a few years ago. Sam Schwartz has come up
with an idea that how do we win over the opponents in
order to provide more services for their areas? And
one of the reasons I opposed congestion pricing is
that my people take more of the burden, and got
almost none of the benefit. So I said I would be
open to the idea of increasing or coming up with a
plan to fund the MTA because we have a \$15 billion
gap, I thought it was even higher. If you provide
more services to my people, and make us pay less of
the burden, then we get more of the benefit. Has
there been discussions with Sam Schwartz's plans in
trying to increase transportation options in outer
boroughs in order to get this extra funding?
Discourage driving in Manhattan and other places, but
at the same time provide services to residents in
Eastern Queens and Staten Island, and Brooklyn and
places that aren't necessarily currently getting the
benefit?

CRAIG STEWART: We have not formally engaged in discussions with Sam Schwartz on the plan.

We're familiar with it. We support any equitable plan that would provide funding for MTA. I think

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

there are a number of options out there, and a number things have been placed on the table. So I'm sure we will be engaged when the State Legislature is ready to discuss it.

COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: Okay. Well, I'd be interested in talking about more about that. Obviously, you know, that would be the key factor. You know, if you can give me a plan that helps my people more than it hurts, then I could support that idea. And that's what I've been saying all along. Some people misinterpret that. But I think that's a great way to come up with a funding formula to fund our system way into the future. But incorporating that, and this doesn't get emphasized enough in Sam's plan, is the idea of creating new services for places like my neighborhood and some of the other people on the panel. Where they actually encourage them to take public transportation, including technology. Ι have a minute and I wanted to ask a more mundane subject. Did I still--

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: [interposing] I'm sorry Councilman. Let me connect you with the first question about--

2.2

3 CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: --on the 4 congestion.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: I was going to 6 ask the next question here.

 $\label{eq:chairperson} \mbox{CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ:} \quad \mbox{What are those} \\ \mbox{other options?}$

STEPHANIE DELISLE: Well, we're looking at a variety of options.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: What are those?

Can you like share with us like three or four other options that you have been thinking and discussing to raise this?

STEPHANIE DELISLE: At this time, no.

What we can say, and what has been said, we've begun
the dialogue with the City and with the State and we
will be looking to all of our sources that can
provide a robust and stable source of funding for the
Capital Program. We don't have that list available
for you at this time, but we will be pursuing any
means to provide that to you--

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: [interposing]

But you being in discussion exploring all the options

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

2.2

on where to go to get the \$15 billion gap that we have in the budget?

Again, as you said, as we said, conversations with the City of New York, with the State of New York.

And we expect to, you know, look to all the beneficiaries all through new and benefit fund assistance to help us fill the gap. But we don't have that specific information.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Have you and also heading toward the possibility of creating some-Adding to this plan funding for-- funding through a private-public partnership?

STEPHANIE DELISLE: Certainly. We would be looking to that as an option, one of the options on the table.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Okay. Thanks.

COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: Yes, just to follow up on that as well, this is obviously the elephant sitting in the State Capital right now, and it's going to be the big issue coming up. People need to know this isn't a question of if we're going to fund the Capital Plan, it's how. And it's going to have to be funded, and it's a lot of money. So I

work?

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

2.2

2 CRAIG STEWART: I don't know exactly how
3 it works, but-- [laughs]

COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: Not even. Oh, Lois Tendler, yeah.

LOIS TENDLER: Adam he'll show you.

COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: Well, Adam, show

me later. Don't show me now. [laughter]

LOIS TENDLER: You could from the computer or your mobile device see where the next bus is, when the next bus is going to be arriving and what stop it's at.

always thought that that was, you know, for people in my district who have to wait at a bus stop because there is no subway or trains. And then go take a bus to the subway or wherever they're going to go, it would be a lot easier eating your corn flakes knowing you have five minutes to the next bus coming. And not get there just as the bus left. That's why I was thinking of countdown clocks, but if this is a better technology that works better, you could use this as well.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

2.2

CRAIG STEWART: Well, we are putting in countdown clocks as part of this program, and in the remaining system that doesn't have it.

LOIS TENDLER: We are also-- Bus Time has been incredibly well received by all of our customers. Additionally, in Staten Island the elected officials have give us some money, and given DOT some money actually to put the countdown clocks at bus stops. And that's the technology that's being piloted, and they become sort of like a bus stop your house.

COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: Great. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Adam,

I'm happy to see that now. I'll come over to you.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Council Member—And before calling Council Member Miller, we will be calling Council Member Reynoso to vote.

CLERK: Reynoso.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: I vote aye.

CLERK: The final vote in the Committee on Transportation 13 in the affirmative, 0 in the negative and no abstentions.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Council Member Miller.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Thank you, Chair.
Good afternoon, and thank you once again for coming
out. There are a number of questions about this
plan. Obviously, it's a pretty aggressive plan, and
for the most part I think we applaud it. I know when
you were last here we talked about funding. And now
we're looking out how do we achieve closing in some
of these funding gaps. And in the past, some of the
talk was through some of the savings that you
anticipated through labor negotiations. Could you
say that you achieved what you guys anticipated and
that is in your current budget?

CRAIG STEWART: I did not state in my negotiations, but I would say yes we did achieve what we wanted. And I think that's a reflection of our plan moving forward.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Okay. I'm going to jump around a little bit. I want to talk about the deteriorating and often inadequate bus fleet. I noticed that we are anticipating about 7,500 or somewhere in there, new buses over the next two decades. What do we anticipate purchasing in this current plan?

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

2.2

1,113 standard articulated buses, 270-- I'm sorry, standard buses. 275 articulated buses, and 50 express buses in the New York City Transit Bus
Program. In addition, there are nearly 400 business being purchased. Mostly express in the MTA bus program.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: When are the schedules going to happen? When do we expect arrival on those buses.

STEVE BERRANG: Most of them are being ordered in the first two years of the 2015-19 Plan.

And we, you know, it can take a year plus to spec and build and deliver them. So they will be rolling out throughout the Five-Year Capital Plan.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: So let me say the last-- We've also debated the merit of your-- kind of your mechanism of reporting on-time performance in the past. I would submit that it was disingenuous. That being said, considering that we had a plan on the admissions. We have more buses, older buses on the street now, than we had when that admission plan was rolled out almost a decade ago. And I know that the amount of buses that's on the road is also

2.2

woefully insufficient. So there is really no time when you're leaving hundreds, thousands or people throughout the city. And I can speak as a matter of fact in my district on the street each day that they can't wait another two or three years for relief on business. Primarily and specifically when you have a district of Northern and Southeast Queens that depends directly, in fact, 100% on buses. Is there a priority in loaning out these buses when they come?

Do you have a plan, a scheduled plan for where they would be distributed. And/or are there any buses due from the current plan, more importantly?

are-- there are quite a number of buses that are anticipated to be purchased, sprinkled throughout the plan starting 2010 all the way through 2014. I am not at this time able to tell you exactly where we are in terms of the delivery schedule of each of those buses, but we can certainly get that to you.

LOIS TENDLER: I can't give you the exact number now, but we have hundreds of buses that are going to start coming in the beginning of 2015. I'll get you the exact number, but they have been buses that have been ordered that are on production.

2.2

CRAIG STEWART: Okay. I also want to add that the bus time application works well for customers, but it also works well for service management. And you'll be seeing service management improvements through that bus time app.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: I appreciate that, but I know when you don't have infrastructure, you don't have the equipment it's not magic, that's all. Let's talk about Jamaica Depot, and where are we with the new Jamaica Depot?

LOIS TENDLER: We are— As you know,

Councilman, our plan is to rebuild Jamaica Depot in

place. The proposed plan includes \$265,000 for that

project which is supplemented by about \$35 million

that's been in this plan. The \$35 million that's in

the existing plan has allowed us to begin the

acquisition property— The acquisition process

requiring the properties along Merrick Boulevard.

We've already— We're close to taking title on eight

of them, and it will be in combination on the rest of

the block. The one, and perhaps you could help us.

Our next challenge is to find a place. We've

identified some place we would like to keep the buses

that have to come out of the depot while we're

2.2

reconstructing it. The closer we keep them to

Jamaica, the more we'll keep Jamaica functioning

during the reconstruction process.

LOIS TENDLER:

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Okay, thank you.

I know we've had conversations with your colleagues.

Right.

the original plan that came out of plans for equipment was to knock down the first two properties and to use that as a parking facility. Let me just say as we go further, the community can no longer tolerate buses being parked on the street. Like literally I had a woman in a wheelchair who calls my office each week who cannot go-- She has to go out of her way to go home because she can't navigate the sidewalk because buses are parked on the street. And we don't see that anywhere else in the city>

LOIS TENDLER: Well, the York lot would be preference. I understand it's not being used for anything else, and we're reaching out to talk to CUNY and try to make that happen.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Okay, and finally, and I thank you so much for the time, Chair. To digress back to funding, and I know that we've

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Thank you Chair.

have a couple of questions. The first one is that

24

25

the piece of property that has been sold in my district, 19 Houston, is that going towards the City's commitment in this \$657 million.

LOIS TENDLER: No.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: So where does it

go?

2.2

LOIS TENDLER: That's actually in-- There was a commitment. This wasn't-- To use the word 'commitment' might be a little bit misleading. It wasn't a commitment that if we didn't raise the money by the sale of the property the City was going to give us a check for it. It was a commitment to work together to try to reach that as a goal. Included in this year's-- in the current plan, in the 2010 to the 2014 plan was \$250 million from asset sales like 19 East Houston Street. So it's going to go to our Capital Plan. But the last--

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: [interposing] But the Capital Plan. Not this--

LOIS TENDLER: [interposing] Right, the last one, and not-- And it does not reduce the City's-- What they're on the hook for contributing now.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Okay. Well, \$26 million is \$26 million. That's good. What is the time line for the countdown clocks coming to the other subway line? I mean it's great. On the lines, you know, the full five-- 1, 2, 3, but when is it coming to the A, the C, the E, the D, the E?

CRAIG STEWART: I know they're working on the design now, and I believe that the majority of the construction is funded within the current plan.

I don't know the date. We don't usually have completion dates for construction until we're through the design phase. But, it is going to be worked on during this program.

it, Councilwoman, is the lettered lines, which is what we referred to as the B Division, three to five years we hope to have something in every station. It will be somewhat different from what you see in the numbered stations. It will in some instances tell you how far away your next station is. And some by station, some by minutes, but we're working on getting something into every station. And we say that's three to five years.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Are there any possibilities— MTA is doing a lot of advertising now. Are there some possibilities of doing some advertisement on these countdown clocks to help cover some of the cost?

the B Division is not just the function of dollars to pay for it. It's technological issues unlike the numbered lines where we built an ATS system. We're not replicating that in the B Division, and doing it a different way. That being said, we are looking at advertising to finance a lot of different customer information initiatives. For instance, the On-the-Goes, they look like giant iPods that are being unveiled in stations throughout the city. That's all advertiser paid for.

CRAIG STEWART: And it delivers train arrival time also.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Okay, what about some council members like myself, we used discretionary funding to pay for the countdown clocks for buses. So when can start seeing that being implemented since we already put it in this year's capital budget?

2.2

managed by DOT. They are taking lead on it. I think that they are still working on some pilots, and you would really have to get a better time frame from them. But I know we've been in contact with them in terms of looking at locations.

right. One last question is that Low Line, the project in my district, that is the old trolley station off the Williamsburg Bridge side. I just want to see if that's on your radar in terms of working with the City and with us to turn that into a park. And also we'll be able to generate some economic activities there. Right now, it's not being used. It's just abandoned.

LOIS TENDLER: We're happy to participate in any conversation about that.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: But have you guys heard about it?

LOIS TENDLER: Yes, and we've actually—
Our Real Estate Department has met with the
proponents of the proposal. They come in and they
sort of are gone for a while, and then they come
back. But, you know, we've been speaking to DC, and

- 2 | basically you're correct. It's property we-- It's
- 3 real estate we don't use. So if we could be a
- 4 partner to, you know, returning it to the community
- 5 | in some fashion, we would be happy to.
- 6 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Okay, great. Thank
- 7 you. Thank you, Chair.
- 8 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Thank you,
- 9 Chair. So Lois, I was just asking why you just don't
- 10 | sit on the panel. [laughter] But it's okay.
- 11 | Everyone needs a workout every now and then. So I
- 12 have a couple of questions. I know that my
- 13 | colleagues we-- Don't worry, dear. I don't think
- 14 | I'm going to-- I think you're going to be all right,
- 15 maybe. A couple of my colleagues requested some
- 16 | information regarding the alternative streams of
- 17 | funding that you're looking into. And you said
- 18 | they're in the works, and you can't necessarily name
- 19 exactly what they are. And it's an informal
- 20 conversation at this point. Is there any attempt,
- 21 any idea of whether or not council members are going
- 22 | to be allowed to be a part of those conversations.
- 23 \parallel In seeing if we can be thoughtful and creative and
- 24 partnership in generating fund for them, too.

2.2

CRAIG STEWART: Yes, we'll take ideas from just about anyone. You know, you guys are a primary stakeholder, and we look forward to engage all of our stakeholders.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Okay, so in the past, for example, I suggested some pricing when there was an option. I think the council members were introduced to it at its selling point, and not necessarily in its development stage. And I think it would be a great idea to start involving us early on any project that can generate some funding for MTA.

CRAIG STEWART: We are in the very early stages of having that dialogue. The program was just approved by the Board, and not even two weeks ago, and we're beginning.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: So I guess this is my attempt at letting you guys know I would like to be a part of the conversation of any type regarding the MTA. I care deeply about MTA, and in my district we are going to have about 10,000 units of housing go up in the next ten years. And there is already the L line, probably your favorite line. It's at max capacity right now. I think we're having folks that like get to the station and have to wait

unless there is something else.

2.2

for three trains to run through during rush hour
before they get into the fourth train to get to
Manhattan from lower Bedford Avenue. If it's at
maximum capacity and they're waiting for three, and
we have 10,000 units Let's say an average family
Let's just say two people. So you're talking about
20,000 new residents coming in with no capacity
whatsoever regarding transportation. And this plan
that I'm seeing now doesn't look to address that

CRAIG STEWART: Actually, there is some funding in the plan to address adding more capacity to the L train, and that's going to be done through adding substations with the additional power. That's what is needed in order to add capacity on the L, and we're planning to do that.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Right now, the trains average-- They come in at every 2-1/2 to like 4 minutes right now flying through the L. You can do better than that?

CRAIG STEWART: Yes, we can.

LOIS TENDLER: As you know, Councilman, the L Line was the first line we put a CDCT on. That allowed us to increase the number of trains we could

2.2

line.

2	run on the L line, and we've been doing that
3	regularly to keep up with ridership. And I believe
1	it would be added power that Craig has just referred
5	to. There is still capacity for more trains on the

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: That's good to hear because in the past at these hearings, we've heard that the L Line was at maximum capacity. And what I'm hearing now is there is an opportunity to expand or to add capacity to the L line.

CRAIG STEWART: It was at its capacity for the amount of power that it had.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Okay.

CRAIG STEWART: We are increasing it. We recognize a need there, and there is a project in there to add sub-power substations to the line. [sic]

LOIS TENDLER: And as long as you're on the L, I think you should know that Bedford Avenue is getting a lot of work in the next plan. The station is getting renewed. Our intent is to get an elevator that's going to be ADA accessible. And it's our intention to be able to create some more street to mezzanine entrances at the station, to do the stair padding as well.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Now, the other
part of this is that in that same district, there's a
J and Z line, which doesn't get the level that the L
Train does at the moment. There are longer wait
times. The platforms are they're an elevated
train line, and I also keep speaking towards if you
improve that line or improve the capacity of that
line, I think a lot of the riders of the L would move
onto the J or an M, which I think is great. That you
guys made the M go through Manhattan now, and going
north instead of going back to Brooklyn. So, just a
you build it and they will come situation. I mean
also Hughes Train Station. I mean I don't want to
get into like local issues, but opening up the other
side. If you build it the right way, people would
want to use it. But right now, the lack of
entrances, the wait times, make it a less ideal
option when looking at the L Train that comes every
two minutes. People want to be able to get to a
place. What is the idea for that J Line?
LOIS TENDLER: The J Line I believe the

service matches the ridership, but I will go back and actually look at what headways they're running in, and what the ridership is. The issue about the back

2.2

entrance at Hughes, I've heard Chauncey. I've heard about a bunch of the stations and the J Line is one that we're trying to come up with a good solution to.

the L Line, you guys add another entrance point without any live person anywhere. And then, when it comes to the Hughes Line there is always an excuse on security or— If you can do it on the L, which is what I consider like the darling of the MTA, why can't you do it somewhere on the J Line like on Hughes. And it just gets to the point to where the investments go is where the ridership goes up. So you're saying it's at capacity or it's meeting capacity. It's because no one takes the J because its access points are hard to get to.

LOIS TENDLER: It's not necessarily stuck on the security issue. There are a bunch of regulatory issues that we're going through to see how we open up those back entrances.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: So thank you very much, and the Broad [sic] Street and Lorimer there is an underground train station situation. It would be great for economic development if we could open that up. Thank you guys.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 93
2	CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Council Member
3	Daniel Garodnick has a question and Council Member
4	Rose has one as well.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Thank you very
6	much, Mr. Chairman, and just a few follow-up question
7	for me, and forgive me if you answered this one
8	already. But the projected funding in the Capital
9	Plan through a variety of different sources including
10	city capital funds, but what was not delineated in
11	there was an explicit allocation of State capital
12	funds unless it is in one of the other categories
13	like Pay-As-You-Go. What's going on there?
14	STEPHANIE DELISLE: It's not one of the
15	line items that you see there, but it is part of our
16	gap conversation. Their contribution would be part
17	of that gap conversation.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: So, at the moment, you're anticipating in plan zero dollars from the State?

STEPHANIE DELISLE: We anticipate more, but as a line item identified to this point, it's not there.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: So you feel more secure about your ability to get money from the

2.2

2 City of New York for the Capital Program than from 3 the State of New York.

are not secure about our ability to get funding from the State, but that is part of how much. And the timing is part of the conversation we knew we would have to have to help fill that gap. And we are actively moving there.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay, but just so I understand it, you have anticipated \$657 million from the City of New York in the Capital Funds in the Capital Plan. And at the moment, there is zero in the Capital Plan from the State of New York.

STEPHANIE DELISLE: That's correct.

There is no line item there for the State of New York's contribution.

right, that's so surprising. It's surprising. Okay, let me ask another question about the tunnels in the Second Avenue Subway. From what I understood from your testimony before, and I just wanted to follow up on this. Is that the two segments between around 110th Street and 120th Street that are already built, that they might not be used for Phase 2. Can you say

1

2 a little more about why that might-- I'm sorry,

might not be used for train tunnels is what you said. 3

Why would that be? That didn't intuitively make 4

sense to me. 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CRAIG STEWART: The alignment may shift over a little bit so that it's not used, but it's not definitely. It will be used. It's just may not be--It may have to be reconfigured a little because the alignment may be changed during this process.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: And if it's not used, you said it will be--

CRAIG STEWART: It will be. It will be used.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Sorry. it's not used for tracks or as a train tunnel, you said it might be used as what?

CRAIG STEWART: Well, just speculating, it could be used for equipment rooms, and we a have large need for equipment rooms along the right-ofway, and those would -- could be repurposed for that. But that's only speculation.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Without knowing the details about how much was spent on those existing tunnels that were anticipated to be used for

2.2

trains? I would think that the most cost-effective way would be either to repurpose or to expand those existing tunnels than it would be use them for storage or other purposes. So I hope that we can continue to have that conversation.

CRAIG STEWART: Sure.

 $\label{eq:council_member_garodnick:} \mbox{Two more}$ questions. I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: [off mic]

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Am I now over five minutes?

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: No, you can ask one more question, though. That's why the time is on the second row is like one question. [sic]

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Oh, it's not a five-minute clock. Okay, I'll do my one additional question. The Controller of the State of New York issued a report in 2014, which estimated that there were 43% of our high priority subway tunnel segments that did not have adequate ventilation plants. And that ventilation would not be brought up to industry standards until after 2034. And it also noted that back in '99 the MTA had estimated that all stations would be refurbished by 2022, but that there no

2.2

longer is a date for completion. Can you tell us how concerned we should be about the first, and why there is no target date for completion on the second?

taking the second one first. We should be very happy with our new strategy. We're addressing more defective conditions than we ever have been before. The old pattern of rehabbing stations, taking every station and rebuilding everything was not a sustainable model, and we were not making progress. That was approximately 60 stations over a five-year period and now we're doing-- I think this program is 170 stations are being addressed. So we're getting more defective conditions more quickly and the riding public is going to be much safer and have a much more efficient ride because of that. You mentioned something about ventilation. I didn't hear the first part of that.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Yes, if the

Chairman will allow me. I'll just rearticulate the

question, which was that State Controller Ton

DiNapoli put out a report that said that 40% of the

higher priority subway tunnel segments don't have

adequate ventilation plants. And concluded that

2.2

ventilation will not be brought up to industry
standards at all of those locations until after 2034.

STEVE BERRANG: Okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: So the question is how concerned should we be about that, and what are you doing about it?

STEVE BERRANG: Okay. We have a very safe environment. The ventilation facilities that are in place work and function. They don't work and function to the latest NFPA standard, but they function as they work. So they serve their purpose. As we roll out and invest in new ventilation facilities, those require much larger, much more expansive, more disruptive impact on the operation. But we make those choices and we identify, prioritize segments of our tunnel system, in which to invest and we're progressing against that.

[Pause]

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Thank you. I just want clarification. You know, again, our only source of transportation on the North Shore is by bus. And, all of the new developments that are coming to State Island, which the City really pushed because they wanted this level of development. And one of the

2.1

2.2

unmitigatable circumstances was traffic. And so, if buses are our only way of getting around, the need for our right-of-way and the Bus Rapid Transit is

5 just, you know, imperative.

In 2012, \$3.5 million was done, an impact study was done. Could you tell me what the shelf life of this study was, or the Alternative Analysis Study, what the shelf life is? Would that then mean that it has to be redone, which would mean that we wasted taxpayers' money to the tune of \$3.5. And if it needs to be redone, would it have to be done quickly in order for it to be included in the Five-Year Plan? What's the time line for this study to have been done and completed? If it must be redone, and what's the shelf life of the Alternative Analysis Study that was already done? Am I clear?

think the 2012 study is a relatively recent study. I think at the very worst it would have to be updated, which shouldn't take long. I would think of a matter of months or perhaps over a period of a year or less. You know, if it was done in 2012 and finished then, it's only 2014 going into '15 and there is probably plenty there that was correct.

2.2

2 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: So, are there funds to do that?

CRAIG STEWART: Yes. Like I said, we do have planning funds allocated for studies like this and to continue all of the necessary planning that would go into providing the BRT service in Staten Island. Even if we had allocated budget money, these studies, these planning studies must progress, and it takes time.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: And would we need to have this study completed in order to be included in this five-year plan?

CRAIG STEWART: We would need to look at the timing of the conclusion of the plan, and decide whether it makes sense to fund the construction in this plan, or whether—— Because there are lots of not only planning, but there are environmental studies that need to be done. And that does take time, and we will progress those probably within this program if the decision is made to do that.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: And haven't we previously-- We did that in 2012, right?

CRAIG STEWART: We did some of it.

2.2

2 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: And should that
3 have changes substantially that we would have to have
4 another study, a comprehensive study done?

CRAIG STEWART: I don't think we would have to have another one, but we would at least have to update the existing one.

environmental and planning work that still is yet to occur prior to any construction. And when we were reviewing this as a potential candidate for FTA Resiliency Funds, it was at that time viewed that it could be five to seven years before we received funding before any construction could happen. So any construction of the North Shore BRT is quite a ways away. So what is realistic, what we fund to the Capital Plan is the activity we anticipate being able to be undertaken in that Capital Plan. And in this case, that would be design and environmental planning work. Not construction work.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Thank you. I would like to speak with you offline, and thank you, Chair, for your indulgence.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Well, I have a few questions. Two questions send by constituents by

social media. One is about what it the possibility
to bring back And one is by a constituent through
social media on the same question, which also wanted
to be asked by Council Member Greenfield, which is
what the possibility or ability to bring back the F
Express Lane?

the Council, we committed to studying an F Express proposal. We expect to have that study done by the end of the year. Additionally, as we told the Council last time we were asked about, both exists current work that's occurred on the viaduct finishing up one project and the eminent award of a contract to do nine station renewals on the Culver line in Brooklyn would delay the ability to implement an F Express, if that's the direction we're going.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: This is from Council Member Greenfield. He said that the study was done already.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: You would do it.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

2.2

LOIS TENDLER: It's gotten a little postponed. We are a little late on delivering it, but by the end of the year it will be done.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Okay, the other question that the constituency wants to ask is about what is preventing the installation of side guards on our bus fleet?

[background discussion]

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Wheel guard.

CRAIG STEWART: Yes, right.

very simplistic answer. Council Member Miller be able to help me out here. But we've looked at-- I think it's called an L Guard or an S Guard. And we've looked at it in the past, and found that it really wouldn't do very much to help prevent accidents. So we didn't think it was effective, and if you would like to hear more about that, I will have one of our safety guys to talk to you.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: All right, this is something that I would like for the MTA to consider to be included in this Capital Plan because other cities already have been doing it. And they have been proving that many accidents especially

2.2

where we are in the Vision Zero, not only would we like to ask the MTA to see if this is something you can explore. But also, we will be asking the City to look at trucks used by Sanitation, and other trucks of the City to also prove similar protection things in may accidents. We have lost life because people have been trapped under those trucks. So if this is something that at least you can explore, it would be good for us.

La Guardia Airport is going through a \$4 billion renovation bringing the capacity to 17 million people. London has all of their airports connected to trains. What can we include in this Five-Year Capital to connect La Guardia to the trains?

STEVE BERRANG: In 1998, the MTA, New
York City Transit along with the City of New York and
in cooperation with the Port Authority looked into
the possibility of rail service to La Guardia. It
was terminated. That study was terminated in 2004
due to a lack viable alternative. What we have done
instead was to develop and support a robust bus
service to La Guardia including express bus from--

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

1

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- One stops in Woodside and one stops in Jackson
 Heights, and then it goes--
- 4 COUNCIL MEMBER: [off mic]
- 5 STEVE BERRANG: I'm sorry? The Q270.
- 6 CRAIG STEWART: The Q70 bus.
 - STEVE BERRANG: The Q70 bus, but makes like two stops to La Guardia, and there are also the M60, I think, that gives express bus service to La Guardia. But there is no-- It was determined back

in 2004 that rail service was not viable because

- 12 there were no viable alternatives at that time.
- 13 CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: In that study,

 14 how much was the projection you were required to

 15 connect La Guardia with a train.
- 16 STEVE BERRANG: I don't know the answer
 17 to that. I'll have to get with--
 - CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: [interposing] I just believe at this time, we cannot be behind, and this is not. And this sometimes goes beyond us, but this is about a city that doesn't have our airport connected to the transit mass train system. And we are competing against London and other major cities. And it is nice, it is good that we have the express

buses going there even going to Harlem. I can

2.2

benefit also in my district when people are connected
with the buses in the one tray at one 123rd. [sic]

But making a \$4 billion investment where we will bring capacity to 17 million people I believe it's not— it's not a good move to leave that as part of the Five-Year Plan. To go back to the study, see if it's doable, but I believe we will benefit a lot. The use of La Guardia Airport is today is not the same that thing that was its use in the past. It is not only through the local state. Many people from the Caribbean they are also using La Guardia as a destination. So I just hope that, you know, since we are in the process of putting so many years, that we can get back and know that this is important for us to see if it is a possibility to connect La Guardia to a train.

On page 125 of the Plan, when you look at the MTA Planning Initiatives, you talk about evaluations or regional proposals by outside groups that could lead to MTA capital investments. Examples include new airport access to proposals? What are you talking about?

CRAIG STEWART: I think that recognizes that old studies need to be updated and evaluated

repeat the question?

because unless--

2.2

buses?

2 LOIS TENDLER: No, I know what you said.
3 I don't under like an example of what you're talking
4 about. Like what community, what kind of access

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: [interposing] Has

the MTA done the study or will the MTA or can the MTA

do the study, or include in this Five-Year Plan to a

new community in our city that they are not

connected, that they are isolated from trains and

Needs Assessment that looks at a vision piece. It has a vision piece included, and looks at areas that are underserved and looks at areas in need. And I mean I think one example is we've proposed Penn Access, which puts four stations in the Bronx in an area, which we think is somewhat underserved. So we'll continue to do that.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: That's all I'm asking is to be sure that in our plan even if it's in the 20, I hope it can be included in this Five-Year Plan that for us who have eight years, what are communities, what are those that still can be benefitted. If we expand our buses over trains,

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

2 whatever it takes to connect them to the mass 3 transportation.

CRAIG STEWART: Right.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: My other question is about in the Study, and as you said, the MTA has a big responsibility because not only do they access the value that the MTA has, as you say is \$1 trillion. But also as you also shared with us, we're talking about a mass transportation where we in a region where we have a \$1.4 trillion economy. So our responsibility when we look at expanding transportation is something that is important. Everyone is looking for us to do, to always do better. The MTA admits to being a large energy consumer. How much is spent on energy, and has the MTA considered solar panels or other energy options? CRAIG STEWART: I don't know what the transit energy bill is. It is large but we are also one of the most energy saving organizations around. I mean we do have a number of our facilities that have solar panels. I believe Stillwell Avenue was at the time the largest application of solar panels in North America, and we continue to work with Con Ed and Micro to build energy efficient buildings as well

2.2

as re-equip our energy-- our shops and facilities
with energy efficient things.

Also, we look to make our cars more efficient. That's one of the design objectives in the program. For the R211, we're looking to make those as energy efficient as possible.

just hope that as the city is moving and expanding the use of solar panels that the MTA as one of the important partners that we have that we also can look and be included to the Mayor who said that he was even open to putting solar panels here on City Hall. And we announced that it's going to be expanding in the number of schools to also use solar panels. And as everyone now, especially in our city understand that climate change is real. So I just hope that we—

— I would like to see some initiative in the MTA moving into also using solar panels as the City is also looking to do all the schools and other public buildings.

CRAIG STEWART: Sure. As I said, we are one of the pioneers of that in this city. Our application at Stillwell is huge. The whole roof is

2.2

2 made out of solar panels, and we continue to use them
3 in our facilities as we're expanding.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Council Member Miller.

just want to digress for a moment. I want to go back to—— a little bit to funding and not specifically funding, but I want to go back to the issue of Jamaica Depot. And in my almost three decades of experience in universities and particularly over there, that depot has been in capital plans at least four other times. It seems to be the first to be removed. So as we talk about shortfalls, and kind of casually dismiss that. But we have been the unattended consequence of that. So we want to make sure that we have a better mechanism in place of funding these projects. So that communities that are so greatly impacted actually get the follow through that they deserve.

LOIS TENDLER: The many plans Jamaica

Depot Reconstruction has been in, what's different

time? A lot of the conversation was about trying to

find a new home for the depot. Once we made the

decision to rebuild and replace and these properties

2.2

became available, nothing is going to stop. I mean we need the plan approved for the construction dollars. But the fact that we're actually paying money would acquire the property, and have begun doing that, should be a pretty good indication that we are going to complete the project.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Okay. So I just have one other question. And this is, you know, seeing that you're there because it's more for you. And in terms of operations and planning that we are—The Express Bus Service that serves Southeast Queens whether it's Baisley Park through the interior bus, and the transit facilities that run the Express Bus Service out of Southeast Queens. They're the only place in the city I know that do not run full service. Meaning that they drop you off in the morning, and they pick you up in the afternoon. And there is certainly a need for full service day run, weekend service that is not provided.

Considering that these are locations that have absolutely no subways. It is a commute that has the longest commute into Manhattan and no one, and including the one that—— No one comes beyond 23rd Street, and I would say that two-thirds of our

of them operating regularly, and each time that they

2.2

get into a van, they don't get on a bus. They're losing a lot of revenue there from the city and the service. Is that something that we're addressing as well?

with the livery cab industry and DOT and police and enforcement to try to make sure that our customers weren't approached. I think that, and you know this right, the best way to deal with it is by putting out a service the people— For us to run buses that people can get on, and that's where we would like to put them out of business because we are just so much better.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: And before I let you go, I have a question about the fare payment. I know that you also are thinking, and for like providing opportunities for a consumer to use technology to be able to pay, pay the fare. So I assume that— Can we agree that under the new plan

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Okay, thank you.

CRAIG STEWART: Yes.

you are expanding options for ride paying online?

1 115 2 CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: And also will 3 people -- You are also looking for allowing people to be able to use their Smart Phone? 4 5 CRAIG STEWART: Yes. 6 CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: And also to

answer the question more, I'd like to hear a little bit from you. How would a one-time single ride user be accommodated?

CRAIG STEWART: We're looking at that now. Right now we are looking at options for technology usage like for open payments, your credit card, your telephone, a key fob, if it's connected. And we always consider social equity looking at fair payment. So we will, you know, make sure that everyone is accommodated with the proper tool and card.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: So thank you for these two hours, and definitely we would like to--We need to get some of the information that we required today, and that we required previous to this hearing. And we will also sending other questions that we did not ask to our committee staff. Thank you.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

[Pause]

2.2

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Now, I'm going to be calling the next panel. Richard T. Anderson, William Henderson, and Corey Bearak. Come up.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: You may begin.

RICHARD ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, let me commend you first for convening this very important hearing. This MTA

Capital Program is one of the most significant design and construction programs in the next five years for the City of New York. So it's very good that you're convening hear. And I think that the line of your questioning and that of members of the committee have been right to the issues that are very important for this program. Thank you for this opportunity to testify. I am Richard T. Anderson, President of New York Building Congress. The Building Congress is a membership organization for the design and construction organization in the city.

Last month, the MTA approved a \$32 billion Five-Year Capital Program for the next five years. The plan tackles the agency's maintenance backlog, makes much needed improvements to the

- 2 system, and continues critical expansion projects.
- 3 The Building Congress strongly endorses this plan.
- 4 Unfortunately, as you heard this afternoon this plan
- 5 is underfunded by at least \$15 billion. There is no
- 6 new federal funding source at this point in addition
- 7 to what has already been in the program, and few
- 8 existing State or local revenue sources to fill this
- 9 huge gap. Taking out more debt is no longer an
- 10 option. Only bold action by the Governor, the State
- 11 | Legislature, and New York City officials will help
- 12 close this gap.
- 13 At a time when ridership is at historic
- 14 | highs, the State needs to provide the MTA with a
- 15 stable, dedicated revenue stream for its capital
- 16 program in order to build and maintain the
- 17 | infrastructure necessary to support a healthy growing
- 18 economy. Here are a few ideas for funding the
- 19 | Capital Program. New revenues will almost certainly
- 20 have to be part of the equation. For example,
- 21 several auto related taxes and fees could be
- 22 | increased modestly to support the MTA Capital Program
- 23 | including the petroleum business tax, the gasoline
- 24 and sales tax, and vehicle registration fees. The
- 25 gasoline tax has been capped at \$2.00 or \$0.08 a

2.2

option.

gallon for nearly 20 years. And, lifting the cap and using revenue streams for amounts over \$2.00 could be dedicated exclusively to transportation. Even more flexible user fees might be a more sustainable

A recent Building Congress report, which we called How to Save New York City's Infrastructure, proposed a uniform toll policing, charging all motor vehicle drivers a level fee to access the Manhattan Central Business District. A current iteration of this idea The Move New York Plan would actually lower tolls for some commuters while raising it an estimated \$1 billion, which can be dedicated to mass transportation improvements, or underwrite billions in new capital debt.

With that said, the State much provide
the MTA with new revenues without cutting or reducing
the Payroll Mobility Tax, a cornerstone of the MTA's
revenue stream, which underwrites both operations and
capital investment. Meanwhile, support from the
City, the main beneficiary of MTA services has
actually declined substantially to its lowest level
ever. The most recent City budget allocates a mere
\$220,000 over five years to MTA capital support. The

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MTA budget already in a deep hole assumes the city will provide nearly \$130 million a year. The City must contribute more. The MTA must also be held to account for every penny it spends, and its Capital Program Management deserves your scrutiny. The MTA should be able to make the most of every dollar and control capital construction costs.

The government and the public will have to confront the unavoidable need for new revenue. applaud the Governor for jump-starting this conversation with the MTA Transportation Reinvention Commission on which I serve whose preliminary report is due out any day. And which seeks to address the challenges of providing efficient mass transit for the next century. In the meantime, Albany must come up with a funding plan for the MTA in the next several months. During this time, the Building Congress will work to convince elected officials of the importance of fully funding the MTA's Capital Plan. We hope to work closely with this Committee to thoroughly consider these and other ideas as we look for ways to prepare our mass transportation system for the future. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

NILLIAM HENDERSON: Good afternoon. My name is William Henderson. I'm the Executive Director of the Citizens Advisory Committee to the MTA. Which is a State created body that is made up of volunteer members who represent the interest of riders of New York City Transit as well as the Long Island Railroad and Metro-North Railroad.

I will just refer you to my written testimony, but I would like to make a couple of comments and highlight a couple of issues. As you know, the Capital Program that was proposed by MTA has been vetoed by the Capital Program Review Board as of last Friday. I believe that this gives a real opportunity in that it opens a period of public discussion of what's in the Capital Program and the way in which it will be funded. The needs are immense. We have a \$32 billion proposal by MTA. Many people believe that there are needs beyond that. The question is not so much can we afford to do it, but can we afford not to do it. We have to keep the system up, and make sure that it does not deteriorate. We also need to update the system. We need to bring new technologies in, and we need to

2.2

2 expand to serve growing areas, and areas that have
3 never been provided with transportation.

The question of resources is very real.

The proposed plan had half of its resources coming from unknown sources. That's unprecedented as far as the MTA Capital Program is concerned. But, the stakeholders of the system benefit a great deal.

There are 8.7 million riders per day that make use of the system. The City is a major stakeholder. And this committee and the members of the Council need to be involved in the discussion of what happens to the MTA, where the funding comes from, and what is ultimately done to improve and maintain the system.

Thank you.

[Pause]

COREY BEARAK: Thank you Council Member
Rodriguez and members of the Committee. My name is
Corey Bearak, and I serve as Policy and Political
Director for Amalgamated Transportation Union Local
1056, its President Mark Henry, and Local 1179 and
its President John Lyons, who also chairs the ATU
Legislative Conference Board. Both Locals serve
communities primarily in Queens. 1056 represents the
drivers and mechanics that work for New York City

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

2.1

2.2

Transit Bus Division. And, Local 1179 represents drivers, mechanics and some supervisor who work for the private lines, which operate out of JFK and for our operating depots.

In the interest of time, I'm going to ask that both testimonies be included in the record, but I want to emphasize a few things. We were glad about the discussion the Jamaica Depot, and the elegant interplay that Councilman Miller had before on that particular need. In addition, the Far Rockaway Depot that services 1179 drivers and mechanics and supervisors really needs similar attention. What happens now is primarily a lot of the work has to be done on the main run in Jamaica and JFK. And as a result, that means buses are out of service even more than they would be if there was service on the Rockaway Peninsula. To that population, which is already underserved as well.

In addition, and it's really important to note that there have been a lot of issues in Downtown Flushing with traffic congestion, and people complain about bus congestion. And as time goes by, with all the new developments going on, there may not be a parcel of land to address the issues with respect to

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

building a terminal like we have at Parsons/Archer
for those buses as well.

And I just want to add, though it's not with respect to my representation of the local, but within the prior life of MTA revenue proposals. [sic] And if I can be helpful to the committee, I'll be glad to help in anyway I can.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: [off mic] you're asking for other groups from the business community, to the advocate community, to the policy group so that we can go back to the MTA and help MTA, your ideas and suggestions how they can raise what they need. We believe that -- I believe that this \$32 billion capital project is like-- It's very important. It's an important investment. bringing our transportation to a time of being modern. But also, it creates-- It's also source of creating jobs. And also, I know that this is something else at the Building Congress, they have put some numbers together on how like MTA is one of the first jobs on construction in our City. just hope that working together we can end this process or this discussion with the MTA. And go to the State, to the private, to local. Not only at the 2 City level, but also as I say Long Island and some of 3 the other communities. They should also be able to

4 contribute.

2.2

Member, since you mentioned jobs, and in particular, for example, on the bus service issue, there is really not local manufactures in New York State let alone New York City that we can rely on for that.

And obviously, that would be a nice source of manufacturing jobs in this state if something along those lines were done. And maybe we would be able to get buses built and deployed on the streets a little bit more quickly. Because we won't be competing perhaps with every other public transportation authority, but some private carriers for buses.

RICHARD ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, we would urge you in using your good offices with this committee to emphasize the importance of considering the Capital Program a shared responsibility. Its shared among the state government, the city government and the federal government together with the private sector. We all have a huge stake in the success of this Capital Program, and we all should be contributing accordingly.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

2.2

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: And that's going to be one of our next hearings. In November, it's going to be infrastructure and transportation. So we also will continue inviting you and asking for your ideas and suggestions. Thanks.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: The next panel Joanne Barron, Chris Coco, Linda Barron, and Varun Sanyal.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Okay, so we're limiting it to two minutes each. Okay, you can begin.

VARUN SANYAL: Good morning Chair
Rodriguez, Council Member Rose, and the rest of the
Transportation Committee. My name Varun Sanyal and
I'm the Project Manager at the Staten Island Economic
Development Corporation. I am here in front of you
today to urge the City Council to support the West
Shore Light Rail and the North Shore Bus Rapid
Transit projects for inclusion in the MTA's 2015-2019
Capital Plan. So that the residents of Staten Island
can finally have a comprehensive public
transportation system. According to the U.S. Census,

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

2.2

Staten Islanders have the longest average public transit commute in the nation at 69 minutes. Most residents commute more than 90 minutes in each direction to both Manhattan and Jersey often during multi-seat trips.

In 2004 and 2009, the SIEDC contracted major planning firms to undertake studies of the feasibility of a West Shore Rapid Transit Project.

The studies concluded that a light rail system would be a valid option to connect the borough to New

Jersey and Manhattan. Estimated daily ridership would be 13,000. Along with the North Shore Rapid

Transit, which was until recently part of the 2015-2019 MTA Capital Budget, but was unfortunately deleted. The West Shore Light Rail combined with the North Shore Rapid Transit Project and the existing Staten Island Railway ridership on all three lines would be 41,000 daily, one of the highest in the nation.

The West Shore Light Rail needs \$5
million for a definitive Phase 3 Alternative
Analysis, which is a nominal amount in the grand
scheme of a multi-billion dollar budget. And it was
reaffirming today that MTA said that there is

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 planning money available. And the North Shore BRT

3 needs \$365 million for construction to begin. It is

4 | time for the MTA to fully acknowledge the

5 | transportation inequity that Staten Islanders have

6 faced for far too long. Thank you so much for an

7 | opportunity to testify.

[Pause]

Hi. My name is Linda LINDA BARRON: I'm the President and CEO of the Staten Barron. Island Chamber of Commerce. Thank you, Chair Hernandez, and Council Member Debbie Rose. I saw your article in today's Advance. It was very, very good, MTA Not Moving Our Way. I'm here today primarily because I'm very frustrated in terms of the Outer Boroughs, and them getting their fair share in terms of the MTA Capital Plan. We heard today funding is the major issue, and I think in terms of the City Council's responsibility, too. The first thing that you said when you started this hearing today was that we really need a transportation system that is competitive with London and other areas. given a \$15 billion gap, if you've watched the recent news lately when they talk about the state of repair of the subway stations and everything, we need much

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

2.2

more than that to fill the gap. To really have a safe transportation system functioning system in this city.

And I'm here today on really more because the MTA it's really very difficult to become a priority project when you're in the Outer Boroughs. And we've been working, both myself at the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce and the Staten Island Economic Development Corporation trying to get transit options for our borough because we really, really— We pay the most for express buses. We don't have it. We're the only borough that doesn't have a direct link into Manhattan via subway. So we have a free ferry, but it takes a half an hour come across on the ferry and another half an hour to get to where you're going. And if you come from anywhere else on Staten Island to get there, as well and \$8.00 in parking.

So we have all of these issues. So we've been trying to get on their radar. And I was really disappointed before when she said the lack luster of people, you know, accepting that they put out a BRT instead of a rail option. I mean the whole idea of it is that we want something. So nobody said that

they didn't want any transportation option. Yes,

there is some argument as whether it should be a BRT

or light rail. It's just like anything else. If you

5 could have a light rail, in the perfect world, that

6 | is what we would want.

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

But that being said, we have major projects happening on the North Shore Staten Island between the ferris wheel and BFC partners with the Outlet Mall and the Lighthouse Point. So we've got parking issues beginning already, and the MTA is going to take a reactive approach instead of a proactive approach. This BRT goes to the West Shore. It goes through our Corporate Park. The New York City EVC has an RFI request for-- RFEI or whatever you want to call it [laughs] for the teleport site, which is going to bring a mega project. There is also another office building being created there. People can't move on Staten Island. We have no regional connections. We can't get to Newark, the airport. We can't get to Metro Park. We can't even get to Kennedy Airport. All the other boroughs have mega buses. So we're line one of these transportation starved areas.

And the reason I am here today is really
to implore to have that conversation about how do we
get funded so that the Outer Boroughs get recognized
I went to the MTA Board meeting last week. The MTA
Board Members were distressed because they were all
talking about their own areas and not being left out
of the budget as well. So we really need to come up
with a funding mechanism that's going to work. Our
organization has looked at the Sam Schwartz Plan. I
think it's a great starting point. I think it's
something the Council should really look at. How to
get in. How to make a presentation. We really need
to figure out a way to fund this. Otherwise, we're
going to be left out in the cold forever. Thank you
very much.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: And I'm looking to continue working with my colleague Council Member Rose, and the other council members and going to Staten Island so that we can have a meeting in your borough--

LINDA BARRON: [interposing] Very good.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: --and see how it

will be helpful in advocating.

Τ	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 131
2	LINDA BARRON: I would appreciate that
3	very much.
4	CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. So
5	our next and last panel. Joan Byron, Kate Como,
6	Veronica Vanderpool, John Raskin, and Chris Coco.
7	[Pause]
8	VERONICA VANDERPOOL: Good afternoon.
9	Our apologies. We thought we had signed up online.
10	So we are testifying together in shared testimony.
11	We will be very brief. And my name is Veronica
12	Vanderpool. I'm the Executive Director of Tri-State
13	Transportation Campaign. I'm just going to go
14	through a few points and then pass it onto my
15	colleagues, who will introduce themselves. So our
16	groups have always been supportive of a fully funded
17	MTA Capital Program. We're interested in ensuring
18	CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: [interposing]
19	Sorry, Veronica. May we have another chair? Get
20	another chair. Get another chair.
21	[Pause]
22	CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Thanks.
23	VERONICA VANDERPOOL: We're interested in

State of Good Repair, expanded transit access to the

2.2

Outer Boroughs, new technology, and making sure that the next plan has enough revenue sources to continue.

JOHN RASKIN: So, we'll talk first. I'm

John Raskin representing the Riders Alliance, part of
the team testifying together. First, as a quick
aside, thank you for your action on pre-tax transit
benefits today on Intro 295-A. It's something that
we at the Tri-State Campaign and other groups think
it would make an enormous difference for riders. But
speaking on the Capital Plan, and Veronica mentioned
State of Good Repair. And that's the first thing
that we'll cover. The state of good repair, which is
a huge part of the MTA's Capital Plan is enormously
important. It's something the MTA has invested more
than \$100 billion in since 1982, and that is what has
revolutionized out subway and bus system.

In 1981, there were fewer people riding the subway system than at any time since 1917, and now in 2014, I think it's actually last year's numbers. It's more than at any time since 1947. And that is a result of investing in the subway system, and bringing it up to good repair in many ways over time, but not fully. Additionally, one component of that is in 1981 subway cars broke down every 6,500

miles, right, and trains were always being taken out of service. And now, as the MTA testified today, the MTA said it's 135,000 miles between times that cars

5 break down.

2.2

So there is much more to be done. This is the investment that has been made over many years. But there is much more to be done. We're working C Train, the cars are the oldest in the system, that it really looks like what the system used to look like. That's one thing that the MTA is going to invest in. And then, also more broadly just a lot of stuff that we don't see like signals and track and stuff that it needs so the trains keep running. And they are more likely to be on time and less likely to break down. So the State of Good Repair investments really are an essential part of what the MTA is doing. Thank you.

JOAN BYRON: I'm Joan Byron, Policy

Director at the Pratt Center for Community

Development. Thank you, Chair Rodriguez, for

convening this hearing. And thank you and your

colleagues on the Council also for your leadership

particularly on Bus Rapid Transit Select Bus Service.

We've had conversations with you about it we know.

2.2

We appreciate not only the committee's interest and support, but the way members including members along the Woodhaven Cross Bay Corridor that is now being studied by MTA and New York City DOT. They have stepped up as champions, have brought their constituents together, and have really helped folks to get down at the table and solve problems rather than hitting one constituency like drivers against another like transit riders. We all benefit from the entire system. We all rely on the entire system, and your leadership has really reinforced that. So thank you.

million allocated for expansion of Select Bus

Service. That's good. We hope that it only

represents a down payment. It is a tiny amount of

money in the context of the Capital Plan. It does

not seem to us like that's going to get us to the

citywide network of 20 BRT and SBS routes that Mayor

de Blasio has advocated for, and that the Council has

also spoken in support of. So we hope that by New

York City increasing it's contribution to the Capital

Plan, that we can have the leverage that we need to

2.2

get this as an important and really cost-effective
improvement that benefits New Yorkers.

We also want to speak up in favor of expediting Contactless Fare Payment, which is going to speed people's access and convenience in using the system. The countdown clocks on the lettered lines, as well as the real time bus arrival information.

Which has really made the system much more useful to a lot of riders. We want to commend the MTA for the format of this report, which is the most readable Capital Plan to date. So more like that.

great projects on the Capital Program. Some of them are the mega projects that we've heard a lot about. The Second Avenue Subway a continuation there. [sic] Also, Phase 2 the Second track of Long Island Railroad, which is certainly important. We learned the importance of having a strong ally on our network this summer when there was a possibility of a strike. The East Side Access Mega Project is something must continue, and we're supportive of. Additionally, the Penn Access Project. Improving and increasing access for that area of the Bronx is critical and important.

2.2

2 It's underserved so it's good to see that project moving forward.

I just want to point out that in this

Capital Program the MTA has put forth a

reconstruction of the Henry Hudson Toll Plaza to move

beyond on their all electronic tolling system from a

pilot to something more permanent. That's a great

thing, and we hope to see that expanded on that

remaining six MTA facilities. But in order for that

to really work, there needs to be state legislation

that allow the toll evasion to be better addressed

than it is right now.

And there are some things that are missing. One of those would be a TOD Fund, a Transit Oriented Development Fund. Where the MTA can provide a small amount of money to municipalities as an incentive to better develop around rail and bus stations. Connecticut does it. New Jersey does it. Having a small amount of capital funds support that would really help better merge the MTA's interest with economic development and affordable housing moving forward.

CATE CONTINO: My name is Cate Contino.

I'm an organizer with the Straphangers Campaign on

the vain of what is still missing from the 2015-19
Capital Program. Of course, the \$15.2 billion
deficit is something that we're concerned about. And
like other groups who look to financial help from the
City, State and the government as well as new revenue
services such as the value capture of real estate
sometimes in construction. In addition, there is no
increase in New York City's contribution to the
Capital Plan. In the '80s, the City funded about 10%
of the Capital Rebuilding Program. But at \$137
million a year in the 2015-19 program, that's less
than 2%. And specificity in the rolling stock of the
purchase of bus and subways is something you've
spoken here today that we would like to see in the
plan. Where are those new buses and subway cars
going? What communities are they benefitting? Where
are the new car purchases.

And lastly, a new revenue stream must be found for the next capital program while existing dedicated revenues must be protected from diversion.

Some of the most promising revenue proposals include the New York Campaign to balance tolls throughout the five boroughs, and value capture when New York development interests pay for improvements, expansion

of transit stations. The menu of funding options is small, and with a \$15.2 billion funding gap, these proposals merit more than just consideration. Thank

5 you.

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHRIS COCO: I am Chris Coco. I'm volunteer for Transportation Alternatives. I am here to speak on behalf of a pedestrian and bicycle pathway on the Verrazano Bridge. I think it's important for us to have access to that. It takes too long for State Islanders to get to anywhere especially with a bike. If I want to go from Staten Island to Bay Bridge, I would have to take the ferry. Ride over on the ferry, take the ferry, take the Brooklyn Bridge, which is overcrowded with vendors these days. And it's really hard to get on and ride along, and the go all the way down the Fourth Avenue and then let's say all the way out to Bay Bridge. And that takes literally hours, at least three hours or more. Whereas, if I go from Staten Island all the way back to the Verrazano I would be there in half an hour or so. Maybe 45 minutes at the most.

It's so important to have a bike path, and it's also important in case of an emergency for us to have other ways of access. Such as when

2.2

Hurricane Sandy hit, the ferry was closed for that week, as you recall. It was flooding over there, and nobody could even get over there. Staten Island was pretty much stranded. If we had a bike path on the Verrazano it would be so much more efficient. And I'm also in favor of the BRT on the North Shore, and also as far as getting some sort of bus or other transit to go to New York Airport from a central location.

CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: [off mic] Thank you, and as you know, like we have met before, coordinating some effort for Vision Zero and other initiatives regarding transportation. Before we provide a formal response on this plan, I will invite all the advocate groups including us all to be part of having a conversation and have more time to disclose all the ideas and suggestions that we can provide to the MTA. We agree with you. I think that this is a great plan, but we need to look on the details. So like one area that I was also looking at the plan is that I didn't see is that there is not any funding to bill us a bicycle parking close to some of the MTA stations. It is in conversation with

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION the advocate group that we will be able to get new and more ideas. So thank you, and with this I would like to end this hearing recognizing and thanking Jonathan Mazzarano, our Policy Analyst; and Gafar Gallo [sp] Policy Analyst; and Shima Obechera, Finance Analyst, and Kelly Taylor who is our counsel to the committee and Carmen Amorosa [sp?], my Chief of staff; and Lucas Acosta, who is my Media and Legislation. And with this we end this hearing on Oversight of the MTA Capital Plan 2015-2019. Thanks.

${\tt C} \ {\tt E} \ {\tt R} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt F} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt C} \ {\tt A} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt E}$

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date October 11, 2014