

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

PA 14-222

HB5289

House	6040-6060	21
Senate	3462, 3476, 3480-3481	4
Transportation	7, 13-14, 91-94, 123-130, 144-146, 148-155, 162- 165, 176-178, 193, 194, <u>263, 265-267A, 268-282</u>	55

H – 1198

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2014**

**VOL.57
PART 18
5882 – 6232**

So thank you, and thank you to Representative Kokoruda.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Thank you, Representative Genga.

Representative Kokoruda for the second time.

REP. KOKORUDA (101st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would just like the -- the class to stand up and for the Chamber to please recognize them.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Welcome and thank you for your work.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 152.

THE CLERK:

On page 35, Calendar Number 152, favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding. Substitute House Bill Number 5289, AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Guerra of the 29th district, you have the floor, sir.

REP. GUERRERA (29th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Good afternoon, Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

gdm/cah/cd/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

46
May 6, 2014

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

Representative Guerrero, you may proceed.

REP. GUERRERA (29th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO 5497. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment, and I be asked to summarize.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Will the Clerk please call LCO Number 5497, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A".

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 4363 --

DEPUTY DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Yeah, but --

THE CLERK:

-- designated House Amendment "A", and offered by --

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Excuse me to the Clerk. The LCO Number 5497.

THE CLERK:

Sorry, Madam Clerk. LCO Number --

A VOICE:

No, that's not the right one. This is not the right one.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Please proceed.

THE CLERK:

Madam Speaker, LCO Number 5497, designated House Amendment "A", and offered by Representative Guerrero, Senator Maynard, Representative Scribner, Senator Boucher and Representative Sharkey.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment.

Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, Representative Guerrero, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. GUERRERA (29th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, this bill finally becomes -- I'm sorry -- this amendment becomes the bill in regards to our ports and our waterfronts. Far too long, we have -- we have ignored our ports in regards to the economic boom that could happen throughout the State of Connecticut.

This amendment, which becomes the bill, would create a new entity, the Connecticut Port Authority, in October of 2015, and will provide us time to

determine the appropriate structures of powers and functions that will make it successful.

The Connecticut Port Authority will be charged with coordinating our state's ports development, pursuing federal and state grants in regards to dredging and also infrastructure to our ports, and allow it to have cargo to move throughout our ports with greater ease.

Similar to the Connecticut Airport Authority, the new Port Authority will have a board of directors, made up of 15 members, a mix of legislation and gubernatorial appointees, as well as a treasurer.

The ultimate goal is to shift most of the maritime functions over to the new Port Authority and the DECD will help prepare for this transition, while developing a business operation plan for the new Port Authority.

And I move adoption, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

The question before the Chamber is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A".

Representative Scribner, you have the floor, sir.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Through you, a couple of questions to the

gdm/cah/cd/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

49
May 6, 2014

proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Please proceed.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, to the Chairman of the Transportation Committee.

The bill that's before us or the amendment that's before us, which becomes the bill, and passing now, is not going into effect until October of 2015.

Could the Chairman please explain to us why we're waiting until October of 2015?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Guerrero.

REP. GUERRERA (29th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, to our distinguished Ranking Member.

We are waiting until 2015, obviously, to help transition this period, so we can get all the -- our Is and Ts dotted, but we felt very strongly that now is the time to get the ball rolling, to implement this procedure.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Scribner.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you.

I also took note that part of the structure of the appointed board of directors does include the elected state treasurer, as well as the DEEP commissioner. Could you explain to us why they are included in the makeup of the board?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Guerra.

REP. GUERRERA (29th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, to the good Representative.

The treasurer traditionally is included on the boards when we have bonding authority. Again, DEEP is included also and because we will have significant involvement in regards to our waterfronts, and also, as we all know, including the dredging of our ports.

So, therefore, it was based upon -- with those two similarities that we would have both of them involved in this.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Scribner.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you to the Chairman.

I'm curious if there is a fiscal note for the amendment and what that figure might be.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Guerrero.

REP. GUERRERA (29th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, to our distinguished Ranking Member of the Transportation Committee.

There is a small fiscal note, which, you know, unfortunately, it ranges between 50 to \$125,000 because now most of these ships, as we know, are gassing up in other docks, such as in New York, and not in the State of Connecticut, where they would be tax exempt.

But on the other side of this, I just want everyone to realize that, when these ships do come in, we will get more -- hopefully more monies being spent throughout the commerce, or whatever it be, through -- through people leaving the dock, spending more monies, therefore I don't believe that this fiscal note is truly reliable when we say 50 to \$125,000.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Scribner.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And thank you to the Chairman.

I wanted to first thank Chairman Guerrera, as well as Chairman Maynard, who were the impetus behind this bill, and all of the members of the Transportation Committee. This is a concept that's been closely evaluated for several years. And it has been recognized that particularly our deep ports here in the State of Connecticut are a very valuable asset that have not reached their plateau, if you will, or their real benefit to the state as a new potential mechanism for various sources of revenue, and really an attraction for the industry to frequently utilize those ports here in the State of Connecticut.

It is also a collaboration, not only from the Transportation Committee, but we've had a lot with the Commerce Committee and its leaders, as well as various commissions, including DOT, DECD, and DEEP, and the Governor's administration.

We really believe that this is a step in a very positive direction. And I can tell you, from my experience being involved in the process, that it's been very thoroughly assessed. And one of the things I wanted to point out for the benefit of the membership is that, I think, very responsibly, there is an advisory board that will be appointed at the

onset to help establish the structural foundation for what will become the appointed board by October of 2015.

So this was not something that was done haphazardly in any stretch. It's been very thorough, very accurately evaluated by various entities, including members of Transportation and Commerce.

And I would strongly urge unanimous adoption of this measure, which I think will benefit the entire State of Connecticut.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Thank you, Representative.

Will you remark further on the bill -- excuse me, on the amendment before us?

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143rd):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Good afternoon, Representative.

REP. LAVIELLE (143rd):

I want to thank Representative Guerrero and Representative Scribner for everything they've done on this. The -- this is -- this is a good bill, I think. We have worked on something similar in the

Commerce Committee, because this is both an infrastructure development issue and an economic development issue.

And this bill articulates the confluence of those two concerns very, very well. I rise in very strong support of the bill, unqualified support of the bill. And I just have a couple of questions for clarification to the excellent Chair of the Transportation Committee.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Please proceed.

REP. LAVIELLE (143rd):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

One of the things that comes out of the bill and all the work that was done leading up to it is that we have three very important deep water ports in Connecticut, New London, New Haven and Bridgeport.

And the governance structure proposed in this bill is -- is meant to cover them and their needs and their issues.

Is there any possibility that some of the other ports, which are not deep water ports, might be covered under the authority of the Port Authority?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Guerrero.

gdm/cah/cd/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

55
May 6, 2014

REP. GUERRERA (29th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you to the good Representative.

Absolutely. Everyone can be brought to the table on this. We're not going to specifically just rule out any ports. All ports will be invited to help make their ports even better.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143rd):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

And as well, I know that throughout the amendment, we find different roles assigned to the DOT and the DECD, which I believe is very appropriate. But again, just for clarification, I wonder if the good Chair of Transportation could just explain that concisely so that -- so that it's clear for everyone.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Guerrero.

REP. GUERRERA (29th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, and to the good Representative.

Again, this will be through the DECD, working in regards with the Port Authority through the

gdm/cah/cd/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

56
May 6, 2014

membership in regards to eliminating the maritime coalition, in regards to making sure that we get all our ports up to par to the ability that they can get to the best, in regard to those deep ports or smaller ports, as you mentioned, and would be brought to the table any time that they would like.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143rd):

I thank the Representative for his answers.

And, finally, one -- one last question. The -- what is the plan for the way in which the Port Authority will go forward in terms of generating its own revenues and having -- having funds to work with?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Guerrera.

REP. GUERRERA (29th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, to the good Representative. And thank you for that question.

Again, this -- we hope to have this all running by -- by October of 2015. We know it's a transition period. Obviously, we'll start with the deep port of New London, and from there we hope to get other ports involved, and as I stated before, to get all

gdm/cah/cd/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

57
May 6, 2014

ports to the capability that they can be used to
their full capacity.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Lavielle:

REP. LAVIELLE (143rd):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Again, I thank the good Chair for his -- for
his answers.

And ladies and gentlemen, this is really a
very, very important bill for the State of
Connecticut. Connecticut's deep water ports may be
our most underused, significant economic asset.

A study was done by OPM and there was
participation from the DECD. And published in
2012 -- and you all know how we get these studies,
and they are hundreds and hundreds of pages and we
can't read them. And they're far too dense to be of
any good to anyone.

This was a short, concise, informative study.
And it laid out four business lines where
Connecticut could develop a niche. And it also laid
out four additional opportunities for new
ports-related business that it hasn't been engaged
in yet.

The imports in Connecticut, through its ports,
have declined by 80 percent since 2006. We have two

fine a siting for -- for our ports for something like that to happen. We are the only east coast state without a state-level governance structure for our ports.

It's high time we did something about this because we are in dire need of a real economic development strategy on all fronts. And having a port authority and some leadership and some central thought processes from people who know how to market an infrastructure asset as a fount of economic development has been lacking.

So I applaud the leadership of the Transportation Committee in this effort. I was very pleased to work through the Commerce Committee to help emphasize the importance of it. I strongly support the bill. I can't wait to see it move forward, and I'm sure it will be an asset to us all.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Wright of the 41st district, you have the floor.

REP. WRIGHT (41st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Just a few words of support for the amendment and the bill.

Connecticut's three major deep water ports are

an extraordinary and uniquely valuable asset, but currently, these assets are underutilized. And I have every confidence that this bill will help take advantage of and realize the economic and business opportunities that are there and -- and the potential for economic vitality that these deep-water ports in New London, Bridgeport and New Haven offer.

And in so doing, will assist in developing a broad spectrum of the state's and our region's economy, and I urge support.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Thank you, Representative.

Will you remark further on the amendment before us?

Representative Vicino.

Where is Vicino?

REP. VICINO (35th):

Thank you, Madam Chair.

This is a great opportunity for our state to develop our underused ports, being that we're one of the only states on our 18 Atlantic coasts, that are not using all of our opportunities to bring in more opportunities in cruise lines, tourism, petroleum products, freeing up our highways that are over congested, by using some of our ports to bring in a

lot of our steel, building supplies, salt, stone.

These are all things that have overburdened our highways. And this could also help us out and free everything up to bring more business into our state.

As everyone knows, our lower I-95 corridor is just so overburdened with trucks. This is a way to bring some of these large supplies, building supplies for our future infrastructure, expansions, and this all contributes to our economic development.

So I wish only the best for this project, and this is something that should have been done years ago so that we can keep up with the rest of our neighboring states that are absorbing all of our opportunities for our underused ports.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Perone of the 137th district.

REP. PERONE (137th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I just want to echo some of the similar comments that have been already stated. I think one of the biggest impediments to Connecticut's economic growth over the last 30 years has been the inefficient use of the resources that we have.

However, when you stop to consider what this

bill looks to do, which is essentially to manage and coordinate and better -- which will better enable us to utilize our port system in the State of Connecticut, I think it's going to go a long way towards helping our economic -- long-term economic growth.

Representative Lavielle mentioned the fact that our imports are down. However, our exports are up. But I can't help to think that they are being underutilized, or that capacity for exportation is being underutilized until we have a, you know, a fully-coordinated and operational port system that will make us competitive with surrounding states and -- and other nations.

So I applaud the Transportation Committee. And I also enjoyed working on this concept with my Ranking Member, Representative Lavielle. And I just -- just want to say good bill, ought to pass.

Thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further on the amendment before us?

Representative O'Dea, you have the floor, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125th):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

I stand in strong support of this bill. Just a

gdm/cah/cd/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

62
May 6, 2014

few questions to the proponent, if I may.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Please proceed.

REP. O'DEA (125th):

I see that the working group will be given monies through the Economic and Community Development Commission. I'm wondering, within available funds, I'm wondering what the anticipated costs of the working group would be, and if that amount of money is anticipated within the commission. -

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Guerrero.

REP. GUERRERA (29th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you to the good Representative.

DECD will, obviously -- will use it in regard -- they'll do it within appropriated funds. Let's put it that way.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125th):

Thank you. And I agree with all the prior speakers. This is -- this is something we should do. I'm just concerned that it has the -- Economic

Development has enough monies and what the anticipated costs would be. Are we talking about a few thousand dollars or are we talking about a few hundred thousand dollars to get things started?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Guerrero.

REP. GUERRERA (29th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And to the good Representative -- and I thank you for your question. Again, it is very minimum. It's talking about bringing individuals to the table to discuss the strategies in regards to how to bring those ports to the best of their ability. Again, it's minimum. I can't emphasize that enough. I don't ever, ever seen it going into figures of tens of thousands of dollars. It's very, very minimal.

Thank you.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125th):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

And thank you to the proponent.

With the understanding that it's going to be closer to a couple thousand dollars rather than a couple hundred thousand dollars, I am going to fully

support this -- this bill, and thank you very much
to the proponent.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Will you remark further on the amendment before
us? Will you remark further on the amendment before
us?

If not, let me try your minds.

All those in favor please signify by saying
aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Opposed, nay.

The ayes have it and the administer is adopted.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?
Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

If not, will staff and guests please come to
the Well of the House. Will members please take
their seats. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.
Members to the Chamber please. The House of
Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the
Chamber please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Have all the members voted? Have all the

members voted?

Will the members please check the board to determine if your vote has been properly cast.

If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the Clerk will take a tally.

The Clerk will please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Madam Speaker, House Bill 5289 as amended by House "A".

Total Number Voting	147
Necessary for Passage	74
Those Voting Yea	147
Those Voting Nay	0
Those Absent and Not Voting	4

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

The bill as amended passes.

Representative Ayala, for what purpose do you rise, ma'am?

Try again.

REP. AYALA (128th):

Good afternoon, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RITTER:

Good afternoon, Representative.

Please proceed.

REP. AYALA (128th):

Thank you. I rise for the purpose of an introduction.

**S - 679
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2014**

**VETO
SESSION**

**VOL. 57
PART 11
3246 – 3508**

pat/gbr
SENATE

277
May 7, 2014

580, House Bill 5310, move to place on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Second, Calendar 584, House Bill 5334, move to place on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

And Calendar 585, House Bill 5586 move to place on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

And the fourth item on Calendar Page 28, Calendar 583, House Bill 5289, move to place on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Moving to Calendar Page 29 where there are three items. The first, Calendar 589, House Bill 5550, move to place on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

pat/gbr
SENATE

291
May 7, 2014

On Page 27, Calendar 574, House Bill 5564.

House Bill 578, House Bill 5220.

On Page 28, Calendar 580, House Bill 5310.

Calendar 584, House Bill 5334.

Calendar 585, House Bill 5586.

Calendar 583, House Bill 5289.

On Page 29, Calendar 586, House Bill 5402.

Calendar 589, House Bill 5550.

Calendar 590, House Bill 5262.

Calendar 587, House Bill 5377.

On Page 30, Calendar 593, House Bill 5526.

Calendar 592, House Bill 5476.

On Page 33, Calendar 215, Senate Bill 243.

On Page 39, Calendar 387, Senate Bill 432.

On Page 40, Calendar 475, House Joint Resolution
Number 20.

Calendar 476, House Joint Resolution Number 26.

Calendar 532, House Joint Resolution Number 42.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, can you please check on Consent Calendar
House Bill 5593. I don't see if you called that, on
the top.

THE CLERK:

That's on the previously adopted Senate Agenda House
Bill 5593.

THE CHAIR:

pat/gbr
SENATE

295
May 7, 2014

SENATOR LOONEY:

If we might pause for just a moment to verify a couple of additional items.

Madam President, to verify an additional item, I believe it was placed on the Consent Calendar and Calendar Page 30, on Calendar Page 30, Calendar 592, Substitute for House Bill 5476.

THE CHAIR:

It is, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

It is on? Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. If the Clerk would now, finally, Agenda Number 4, Madam President, Agenda Number 4 one additional item ask for suspension to place up on Agenda Number 4 and that is, ask for suspension to place on the Consent Calendar an item from Agenda Number 4.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President, and that item is Substitute House Bill Number 5566 from Senate Agenda Number 4.

Thank you, Madam President. If the Clerk would now, if we might call for a vote on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. Will you please call for a Roll Call Vote on the Consent Calendar. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

An immediate Roll Call has been ordered in the Senate.

pat/gbr
SENATE

296
May 7, 2014

An immediate Roll Call on Consent Calendar Number 2 has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

If all members have voted, all members have voted, the machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk will you please call the tally.

THE CLERK:

Consent Calendar Number 2.

Total number voting	36
Necessary for adoption	19
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar passes. Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Two additional items to take up before the, our final vote on the implementer. If we might stand for just, for just a moment.

The first item to mark Go is, Calendar, to remove from the Consent Calendar, Calendar Page 22, Calendar 536, House Bill 5546. If that item might be marked Go.

And one additional item, Madam President, and that was from Calendar, or rather from Agenda Number 4, ask for suspension to take it up for purposes of marking it Go, that is House Bill, Substitute for House Bill 5417. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**TRANSPORTATION
1 – 499**

**2014
INDEX**

have a feeling that Mike Lowdy was behind that, Commissioner, but, you know what I mean, but --

SB34
SB235
HB5289
(SB237) (HB5308)
(HB5409)

COMMISSIONER JAMES REDEKER: Good morning, Representative Guerrero and members of the Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to be here to give you a brief presentation on our snow and ice program, as well as to just give a few comments on the bills before you from a transportation perspective today.

HB5288

I want to start the presentation on our snow and ice program by saying it's all about one thing and one thing only, and that is safety. Safety of our roads, safety of our drivers and second to safety is to keep roads open for business, open for mobility, and those two things guide our program and our deliberations about the work that we do and how we deploy our resources.

We're responsible for 5,700 two-lane miles of roads, or 10,400, you know, miles of roads with 1,400 employees to take care of those, 632 plow trucks, hoping to keep those going every day. It's an old fleet, but we try to keep those moving, a hundred and two loaders. We purchased this year snow blowers after last year's major storm. They've been very effective in clearing some of our bridges, and 205 contractors that we use to augment and supplement our forces during a snowstorm.

Typically, we've got 12 storms with a 20-hour duration and 10 activities with smaller durations, smaller storms, different things that we deal with. That has not at all been the case this year. That average storm of 20 hours has been exceeded in almost every one of the storms. We're up to 15, probably 16 storms coming. Each one has been an extraordinary duration, and this year in particular, extraordinary temperature swings, with

but not the competitive sort of issues that have been part of our evaluation.

That proposal will streamline the application process for household goods carrier applicants and create efficiencies in my department, which I favor.

Senate Bill 235, some revisions to the transportation statutes. The most important ones are revision 2, Sections one to four that deal with the definition of a fare inspector.

As we open Connecticut Fast Track next year, that system will be using a fare collection technology called proof of payment. It will require fare inspectors to be part of the program on checking on fares and authorizing a fare inspector to issue citations and infractions and reclassifying failure to pay a transit fare from a misdemeanor to an infraction are the key elements of this proposal.

So instituting a fare collections system, defining a fare inspector, and redefining fare, failure to pay a fare, as an infraction are the key parts of that.

Section 5 of the bill would exempt salt sheds, parking garages and maintenance facilities from the requirements of high performance building construction standards for state facilities. We are committed to lead standards. We do that around our system but salt sheds and some of these other facilities just don't lend themselves to that. They can't meet the standards. This would grant that exemption so we don't have to go through that each and every time.

And then finally, just a quick comment on House Bill 5289 which is a port authority bill. The

department does support the concept of a port authority. As we think about that, there are several issues that continue to need some clarification from our perspective. That's the structure of it, the leadership of it, funding of it, and a classification of functions that would remain with DOT or get transferred to a port authority and ultimately a transition plan to a port authority.

Speaking from experience with the airport authority, we're 20 months into the airport authority and we're still doing transition work and working toward a final sort of definition of roles and responsibilities for the authority and for the DOT, so a transition plan would be important.

With that, I'll conclude my remarks and thank you for the opportunity.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, Commissioner for your presentation and thank you for your remarks.

HB 5288

Commissioner, first of all, let me just say that on behalf of myself, and I think I speak for the entire Committee here, I think that your staff has done a terrific job this year in regard to snow removal and snow plowing.

Obviously, with the amount of storms that we've seen this winter and another one approaching us, I think Monday, you've done a superb job in opening up our highways and making them as safe as possible for the residents of the State of Connecticut.

So I want to make sure you relay that to all your employees, the ones that are on the line there and do it every day and just, it's hard work. It's hard work behind those trucks and we appreciate everything that they do.

needs to get addressed, so we'd like to leave it just the same.

We can fax it. We can e-mail it to them at a different time. When the small businesses sometimes we represent our guys are out on the road clearing the highways, so they're not necessarily there. They're talking with maybe a person that's answering the phone when DMV comes in. It presents a little bit of a hardship sometimes, so if we can just simply leave it at the three days, and we can fax it over. It's not a grave consequence they have that information that day.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, Tim. And obviously, I give you my assurance that this Committee will look at this very seriously, so, I take your comments into consideration here, both of you.

TIM VIBERT: Thank you.

LEE TELKE: Thank you.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you.

SENATOR MAYNARD: Thank you very much. Next is, I see the lovely Representative Lavielle. Take this opportunity between Committee meetings?

REP. LAVIELLE: Thank you for that introduction, Mr. Chairman. Good morning. We have seen each other on this matter before. I am here to testify in strong support of House Bill 5289, which is AN ACT CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY.

I will not read my testimony to you. You have it and some of it is substantially similar to what I delivered last year.

I support the bill both for economic development and for transportation reasons. We had a study last year, actually the year before

that was the Connecticut Deep Water Port Strategy Study, which was commissioned by OPM and it gave us pretty substantial evidence that there was a lot in the development of our ports for us in an economic development context.

Also, there is a lot that, considering the poor state of our freight rail at this point in the state, developing our port activity could even do a lot to improve the state of our highways where a lot of our freight is carried.

So I will leave all of that economic rationale, which is in my testimony. I think we've all covered it before.

Let me just say a couple of things. Last year we had a bill in the Commerce Committee that I had introduced and you had one in here. We joined them together. Senator Maynard then made some further adjustments to it and we had a bill that I believe most of us could live with. For various reasons it just didn't make it on the last day.

I would very much like to see this go through. Senator Maynard and I have had some discussions about it and in the Commerce Committee, we're looking at the possibility of pieces, complimentary legislation that would support the economic development of our ports, not just the infrastructure side, and we, what I'd like to ask you, very respectfully, is that you consider the question of sharing the cognizance of the port authority between the Transportation and Commerce Committees because of the importance of the economic development aspect of this.

And so I think if we, as we work this together, I hope that we will be able to come to a final piece of legislation that we can get through at the end of the Session and make sure that we

can move ahead with developing this probably Connecticut's most under-utilized asset. Thank you very much.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, Representative Lavielle. I couldn't agree with you more. Obviously, as we know, my Co-Chair here, Senator Maynard, worked extremely hard on that port bill and had a lot of input and the bill was ready to go in the House but unfortunately ran out of time.

But I feel confident that this year that we'll be the ones to bring it out first and get it up to Senator Maynard so he can do his due diligence and to see all the hard work that he put into it last year to make sure it gets to all the proper channels for the signature of the Governor.

So, any comments on this? Senator Maynard.

SENATOR MAYNARD: Thank you for those kind remarks, Mr. Chair. Also, Representative Lavielle, thank you very much for being here in support of the bill. I know you've been a strong supporter from the beginning and we thank you for the contributions that you made at the Commerce Committee.

I know we're going to probably still have a few little tweaks to make before this final bill is voted on on the Floor, but I very much appreciate your coming here today and also your continued support for it. We obviously all share an interest in Connecticut's historic and important three deep water ports.

I happen to have the only one nearby that has actual state-owned property in New London. It's on the border of my district, but each of them contributes mightily and could do so much more in terms of commerce and job creation, so

I thank you very, very much for helping with that effort.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, Senator Maynard. Any other comments? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony.

REP. LAVIELLE: Thank you. Thank you to all the members of the Committee.

REP. GUERRERA: Next we have Marty Mador. Is Marty here? Seeing none. All right. Then we're going to First Selectman Robert Morra. Is he here? You know, would ask the next one I have on the list is Ken Crowley and I was wondering if, I see quite a few guys out there. If you guys, would you mind all getting together to come up and just say a few words and all that to try to get things moving here. Would that be okay? Good. After you, sir. Just push the button.

ROBERT MORRA: Thank you. Thank you very much for this opportunity. I will be brief. I know there's many people here who also want to speak on the hot salt issue.

HB 5288

And I just want to present to you today my experience in a small town of three aspects. One as my hat as first selectman and two, as a 50-year firefighter. I would just like to support Tony's testimony and back him up 100 percent.

We are experiencing the exact same issues. We're a small town and for us to replace a \$500,000, \$600,000 piece of apparatus in less than 20 years is fiscally prohibitive and that's our life cycle on our vehicles, 20 years and we refurbish, and we do have a \$750,000 ladder truck, just like they do and we only have 5,000 people to pay for it. That's the difference.

and we also have to be concerned about what seeps into groundwater as well.

MARK CARLINO: I think that the point that the earlier speaker made is that Connecticut is not the only place within the United States that's using these processes to manage winter, and I think there's a wealth of information out there that I think we should try to tap into from some of the Midwest states that have been doing this for a long time.

The other comment I just want to make is that when we were using sand, that created quite a bit of damage to our streams and our waterways. I know if you speak with officials from fisheries at DEEP, they will talk about the impact that the road sand and the runoff had in our tributaries, and I know from firsthand experience in Manchester we experienced the same kind of problems.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, Senator Boucher. And she may want to make you the First Selectman of Manchester there, Mark, so, thank you for your comments. They're well taken, and thank you for the job that you do for the Town of Manchester.

MARK CARLINO: Thank you very much.

REP. GUERRERA: Tom McCarthy.

TOM MCCARTHY: Good afternoon. Just to help you guys move this along, would you mind if the Executive of the Port Authority just testifies with me just so we can both, one testimony?

REP. GUERRERA: Yep. Yep.

TOM MCCARTHY: My name is Tom McCarthy. I'm the City Council President in Bridgeport and I'm here today to speak in favor of House Bill

5289, which is AN ACT ESTABLISHING A
CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY.

I want to say thank you to the Committee for taking this up and also thank you for focusing on the deep water ports in Connecticut. Bridgeport is one of three deep water ports in Connecticut, as you know. We have New London and we have New Haven and Bridgeport and it is our firm belief in the City that focusing on the deep water ports is something that would be a great boon to both the, not only the cities that the ports are located in, but the State of Connecticut in terms of economic development.

We fully support the bill. We have a few reservations that we just wanted to highlight about the bill. Number one is about property. We have a concern in the City of Bridgeport that we have our own port authority in the City. We want to make sure, number one, that we don't lose any more land that's taxable to the state to make it non-taxable land.

We are a very small community, Bridgeport, 16 square miles and the more we can do to sustain the property that we can tax, the better it is for the City of Bridgeport. So we would like to, you know, just caution about the idea that any land would be taken by the state port authority from the City of Bridgeport and it will take away our ability to tax that.

We also would like to maintain local control of the land surrounding the ports for development purposes. As you are all I'm sure aware, the state has been very helpful in supporting the City of Bridgeport in the Steelpointe development program and it is really the, it is the number one changing idea in the City of Bridgeport. It's very important. It is progressing greatly and it is for the first

time after 20 plus years we can see it's going to happen and we're very excited about that.

Our concern is step two, which is the land surrounding Steelpointe on the water. We don't want to lose the ability on a local level to continue to develop that land and build off of the success that Steelpointe would be. So we are asking for that kind of consideration.

We also would like, and I think New Haven and New London, would probably say the same thing is that we want to make sure that the three deep water ports are number one, represented on the port authority, the state port authority, if that would mean just a suggestion of maybe a rotating membership on the board between the three deep water ports, something to that effect. We would greatly appreciate that so that at least one of us is always at the table to get the local concern.

And that the funding in the prioritization for the deep water ports is equalized throughout the three deep water ports. We would appreciate that.

Lastly, in terms of, and this is just in a personal vein, but we appreciate the highlighting of the deep water ports because the City of Bridgeport has been waiting since, has been trying since 1964, which is our last time that our deep water port was dredged, is in desperate need of dredging and it is the dredging by itself is a humungous obstacle to further development of our deep water port.

And a lot of things can happen in the City if the dredging goes forward, so we appreciate the focus that the state is taking on by forming a port authority on the deep water ports but in particular, we wanted to highlight that we hope that focus would spill over into helping us

push the federal government to help us with the dredging.

So I'd like to say thank you to everyone for listening, and particularly to Representative Santiago, the great Representative from Bridgeport for being here and we fully support the bill with those reservations.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, and just, would you like to say a few words if you like?

ANDREW NUNN: Sure, thank you. I'm Andrew Nunn. I'm the CAO for the City and the Acting Executive Director of the Port Authority and Tom shared the sentiments that we have.

Our concern really is just the, from our standpoint, we do want a seat at the table when you do enact this legislation. We think it is great legislation and emphasize the ability to help us with the federal government with getting the dredging is crucial.

Our port is in kind of a death spiral when we talk to Army Corp of Engineers about funding for dredging. They say well, you don't have activity there. Well, we don't have activity there because the port hasn't been dredged since 1964, so you know, it's the chicken or the egg problem but we do need to do that and we do have plans to develop along our port, besides just the Steelpointe that would greatly, that would be greatly enhanced by that.

So I thank you for your work and for your time.

REP. GUERRERA: Well, thank you. Thank you both for waiting and I would just ask that, Tom, make sure that, you know, your testimony is with us today, copies of it and I want to make sure that, especially to the point that you know, it is a very good idea in regard to having a seat

on that to give some information. I think that would be very beneficial to the Port Authority when this all should come to fruition here, which I do believe it will happen this year.

As you know, last year it didn't make it in the Senate but we didn't have enough time in the House to really push it along but I think this year you'll see it get passed fairly early.

TOM MCCARTHY: We appreciate that and I'll make sure that my testimony is submitted and also Mayor Finch has submitted testimony.

REP. GUERRERA: Okay. And I want to just, let me, I know Representative Santiago who represents the Town of Bridgeport and does a very good job I know would like to say a few words.

REP. SANTIAGO: Thank you, guys. Just a question, because I know you were here in the past regarding this type of legislation and you were, had a view on a different side, you weren't supportive, and I know it's because many of the concerns that you just addressed.

I was just wondering, what has changed in this legislation from the previous one that now you are more supportive, or not much, but you just want to, you know, be supportive of the process and be assured that your concerns are addressed along the way?

ANDREW NUNN: Thank you, Representative Santiago. We were in support of it last year as well. We just had some reservations and these are the reservations we sort of explained --

REP. SANTIAGO: Okay.

ANDREW NUNN: -- more or less having a seat at the table and understanding that we still want to maintain the local control over our port

123
pat/gbr TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

February 28, 2014
10:00 A.M.

projects and the local projects within the city.

REP. SANTIAGO: Okay. All right. Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, Representative. Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman and welcome. Having been very supportive of your project there and visiting there a number of times from the Finance Committee wearing the other hat on some of these projects.

You make very valid points. There's got to be a way that we can work together to accomplish the goal throughout Connecticut and have that kind of seamless relationship so that one isn't off on their own completely, but taking into consider the point that you made very, very well with regard to the land development around it. There are opportunities there.

But it also would help you all as well to have a state port authority that could actually augment what you do, given a little bit more voice and certainly maybe access to federal and state funds for projects as well.

But you know, question, I think some of our current port authorities should have representation as we move forward on this and stay closely aligned with the chairs who I know are open to receiving feedback from you and our best wishes to your Mayor Finch who I know has been working very hard on this as well. Thank you very much.

TOM MCCARTHY: Thank you very much.

REP. GUERRERA: Senator, you're done. There you go. Thank you both for waiting and I'm sorry,

Representative Scribner would like to say a few words.

REP. SCRIBNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, gentlemen and thank you both for being patient and sticking it out with us through this morning.

I think there's a strong sentiment, not only within the Transportation Committee, but throughout the Legislature to address perhaps a very missed golden opportunity for the state to really take notice and pay attention and invest in the value and quality of the ports that we have and that certainly includes Bridgeport.

Like Senator Boucher, I also serve on Finance, Revenue and Bonding where we as you know, addressed that financially and I believe it's a very significant long-term investment on behalf of the state that will have all kinds of benefits, not only to the City of Bridgeport and its surrounding communities, but the entire state.

The only way that we're going to get there is to focus on it as a statewide issue and make sure that every port that is in existence is focused upon, and I also am well aware of the long overdue need for the dredging to go on, which I strongly support as well.

So thank you for coming here as strong advocates bringing your knowledge and experience to us for our further consideration and support. Thank you.

TOM MCCARTHY: Thank you.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, Representative Scribner. Any other comments? Thank you both for waiting.

TOM MCCARTHY: Thank you very much. We appreciate all your effort.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you. Is Bob Hamilton here? Bob, you're up. Did you want Mike Riley to be up with you also? I would say no, would say no if I were you, but again --

BOB HAMILTON: I travel with him, so I'm going to agree with him being alongside me here.

REP. GUERRERA: Go ahead, Bob. Thanks for waiting.

BOB HAMILTON: Thank you.

REP. GUERRERA: Why don't you let Bob start, Mike? Why are you, you know?

MICHAEL RILEY: Well, we're trying to build the drama here. I'm Mike Riley, Motor Transport Association of Connecticut. We are here to testify in support of 5288. We've submitted testimony, which includes a letter which we've sent to Governor Malloy in November and a response from Commissioner Redeker on our suggestions about what to do about the damage done by road chemicals in Connecticut.

Unfortunately, we come to you with a problem, but we don't come to you with a solution. The product apparently works very well, and I have to say that DOT does a great job in this state of making sure that our highways are open and passable, and we appreciate everything that they do. They work closely with us during summer storms and we have a very good relationship with DOT. We don't think that they're a bogey man in this whole thing.

But, the fact of the matter is, this substance does create real damage on the part of every vehicle that travels over it, including the highways and bridges upon which it is distributed, and you can look at Bob Rossi's

REP. GUERRERA: There you go. You could take Mr. Riley with you, too.

BOB HAMILTON: We do work with other associations, so we are sharing that information.

REP. GUERRERA: No problem. You don't have to bring him back. You can just leave him over there, too.

MICHAEL RILEY: You've told me where to go before, Mr. Chair.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, Mike. Seriously, good job in bringing this to our attention. I appreciate it.

MICHAEL RILEY: Thank you.

REP. GUERRERA: Is Representative Case here? He's not. Okay. So that leaves Eric Gjede. Is Eric here from CBIA? Followed by Grant Westerson. I see Grant's here, yep.

ERIC GJEDE: Good afternoon. My name is Eric Gjede and I represent the Connecticut Business and Industry Association. And as many of you may know, a number of surveys came out this past summer that showed that Connecticut was not considered one of the better states to do business, and one of the factors included in a lot of those surveys was our transportation system.

So we really applaud this Committee because we think there are a number of bills, both on this public hearing agenda and in the future public hearing agendas that attempt to address all portions of our transportation system and you know, prevent the fact that our transportation should be a barrier to the flow of commerce. We'd like to stop that.

HB 5289
HB 5288

So I'm here today to support Bill 5289 AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY. This bill would coordinate and expand the capabilities of our ports and these resources are critical to the movement of products, particularly fuel and energy products in the state, and it also could help to reduce the number of vehicles on our highways, which is one of the primary concerns of Connecticut businesses.

The second bill I'd like to support is Bill 5288 AN ACT CONCERNING CHEMICAL ROAD TREATMENTS. Now I don't have anywhere near the expertise as a lot of the folks you've already heard from today, but I do know that our state and federal transportation dollars are in short supply now and don't even come close to addressing the needs we have.

So we should be definitely looking, when we have the opportunities to do anything we can to protect the infrastructure that we currently have and if the chemicals we are using now are causing corrosion, which I think has been the consensus I've heard so far, then we should be definitely studying any way we can to stop that.

So I'm happy to take any questions, but again, I'm here just on a general business perspective, so.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, Eric, and I appreciate that, you know, obviously the input from the CBIA, especially when it comes to the port authority, that means a great deal to us.

And knowing that you are fully behind us and the membership is, you know, understanding that this could be a huge economic boost for the State of Connecticut by getting our ports in order here.

ERIC GJEDE: Absolutely. We completely agree with that.

REP. GUERRERA: Any other comments? Seeing none, thank you.

ERIC GJEDE: All right, thank you.

REP. GUERRERA: Before Grant, I apologize, I did skip over, is Michaela here? Michaela Cisowski.

MICHAELA CISOWSKI: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. My name is Michaela Cisowski. I am 16 and am currently a sophomore at Northwestern Regional 7 in Winsted, Connecticut. I'm in an FFA Chapter. For my annual agri-science project I have constructed a study pertaining to Bill Number 5288 and I support this bill.

Throughout the winter season I have heard several conversations about how people believe the road treatments are corroding car parts, specifically brake lines and brake rotors. This then got me thinking.

For my project I testified the effects of three different road treatments, specifically, clear lane magnesium, chloride brine and sodium chloride on brake lines and brake rotors. I have been working on my project since August and plan to continue through March.

After six months of spraying parts multiple times a month, I see substantial damage. The damage is escalating, including multi-colored rusting, metallic spotting, bulging and flaking.

For those of you who would like to see the results of my experiment, including pictures, please provide me with your e-mail and I will be happy to send them to you. Thank you for this opportunity.

143
pat/gbr TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

February 28, 2014
10:00 A.M.

MICHAELA CISOWSKI: Okay. I have pictures here. I also have my log book with detailed observations.

REP. GUERRERA: Mike, she's making you look bad, Mike. Wow. A log book, too. You just became the new lobbyist.

Well, thank you, seriously, and I give you a lot of credit because seriously you did a tremendous amount of work and seriously I think that's something that we could use. And also, I wish the Department of Transportation was here. I will put you in contact with them. I would like you to meet with them in regard to what your study has found and it may go a long way.

Any comments for Michaela? I've never seen Mike Riley so speechless in my life. Any comments? Thank you very much.

MICHAELA CISOWSKI: Thank you.

REP. GUERRERA: Great job. Grant Westerson.

GRANT WESTERSON: Thank you for allowing me to follow that. Good afternoon. I'm Grant Westerson. I'm President of the Connecticut Marine Trades Association and I'd like to speak to you about 5289 the port authority bill.

Our association supports it. While we're not dependent upon the three deep water ports that's certainly an important part of our waterfront in Connecticut, and it needs to get a little bit better care.

I've given you some written testimony, one page, but I'd like to just make a couple of additional points if you have a couple of seconds.

I think it's a great bill. We are very serious about our three ports and our association strongly does support this initiative.

Our feeling is that the port authority should be a marketing arm for the state and probably while it's not specified in the bill, it should fall under something like perhaps DECD, but it needs to be a marketing arm. It needs to be able, the people that are involved in the port authority need to be able to get out and sell the state and sell the assets of the state and sell the waterfront of the state because that's where business comes from.

It's important that we have the appropriate personnel, people that have a marketing background, marketing capability and skills and if they don't perform, then they need to be replaced, but it's going to be critical to the success of a port authority, that they be able to sell themselves.

One of the previous people up here mentioned that without dredging you can't sell it and without selling it, you can't afford to dredge it. Very true. But marketing has to start some place.

I hope the bill gets fully funded. If this is going to be a marketing arm, these people need to have some sort of an expense account so that they can go out and sell. If travel expenses are necessary, they should be available.

Also in the bill, little reference was made to the Connecticut Maritime Commission and the existing waterfront representation. I think perhaps it is mentioned in there as a study, but in my mind there's an awful lot of waterfront in the state that does not fall under a port authority's purview, and the Maritime Commission has done a fairly credible

job of keeping track of that, advocating for dredging in different areas and watching the other waterfront interests of the state and it probably should remain and be able to take some of the burden off the port authority so they can concentrate on their main job of selling the three ports.

And then just as a last comment, keep the bill simple. It's one of those bills that everybody liked for the most part, liked and fell through the cracks for the last couple of years. Let's keep it simple, keep it without encumbrances and try to get it from house to house a little quicker this year so it can actually start making some money for the State of Connecticut and for the businesses that are surrounding the port.

Other than that, it's a great opportunity, I think for the state to move ahead.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, Grant, and thank you for all your help in the past in regards. I know you came in front of us many a times and talked about this and finally we're going to see the light of day on this.

Keeping it simple. When you talk about that, I mean, you've seen the bill, what you saw last year, were you happy with that, the language that was there?

GRANT WESTERSON: We were. We were. It just but for whatever reason, it just didn't have any traction. This year I think it apparently has a lot more traction --

REP. GUERRERA: Yes.

GRANT WESTERSON: -- and I just hope it doesn't get encumbered so that it gets bogged down in the process.

REP. GUERRERA: Again, Grant, I couldn't agree with you more in regards that we need to make sure that we use this to our ability and start making Connecticut a better place and to get more businesses to use the ports as you stated, and I do think it will travel throughout both chambers rather quickly. I think we got the support from leadership on this, too, now.

GRANT WESTERSON: Thank you.

REP. GUERRERA: Any questions for Grant? Thanks for waiting.

GRANT WESTERSON: Thank you.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you for all your help with this.

GRANT WESTERSON: We'll go back to the salt water.

REP. GUERRERA: After all this snow, right, Grant? Is Judi here from Connecticut Maritime Association, followed by Representative Case.

JUDI SCHEIFFELE: Representative Guerrero, members of the Transportation Committee, my name is Judi Scheiffele and I'm the Executive Director of the New Haven Port Authority and I'm here to speak in support of Raised Bill Number 5289.

The Port Authority in New Haven is a quasi-governmental agency that was created in 2003 by a local ordinance under 7-329 of Connecticut State Statutes for the, really for the primary purpose of promoting water borne freight to the port of New Haven, but as things would happen a whole variety of issues come up in trying to accomplish that.

The port of New Haven consists of a cluster of privately-owned facilities that handle a variety of products, including petroleum products, general bulk cargo, including scrap

metals, cement, sandstone and the much-talked about salt. In addition, we do handle some break bulk cargo but that has severely diminished, I'd say, probably since 2008 when the construction industry saw a downturn, so we handle far less in the way of lumber and steel than we did prior to that, and we're hoping that that will come back.

And we also handle some project cargo. This would be like the parts to turbines and anything that actually has been preassembled but is too heavy to travel over road.

The terminals in New Haven control all of the waterside property and the Port Authority actually only has 14 acres of land that we make available through lease to the dry cargo operators. It's actually used as lay down area and that represents the only revenue source that the Port Authority has.

As prescribed in State Statutes, the Port Authority did actually create a comprehensive plan back in 2007. We adopted our strategic land use plan from that and that actually continues to guide our work, primarily to try to expand the maritime uses within the port district.

And to achieve some of the objectives defined in that plan, we have been able to collaborate with other local, regional and federal partners to secure funding for port security grants, dredging, and also to effect some positive port legislation.

One of the major issues that continues to face us is with regard to land use regulations. It is of critical importance, not just for the port of New Haven, but to ports throughout the country. Water-sided land side property that support maritime activities are often viewed as

prime areas for gentrification and the tank farms, stockpiling of bulk cargo and the trucks that service those areas are often not considered desirable by municipalities, especially municipalities that are struggling for increased tax benefits and can see those properties being utilized for something other than maritime use.

Unfortunately, once you take them out of that maritime realm, as actually I think we can see what's happened in Bridgeport. You can't get your channels dredged because the Army Corp of Engineers looks at what is the economic impact of dredging these harbors? Who needs to get in here, you know? So we don't want to see that. We want to see our three ports thrive.

And among the recommendations of the 2012 study of Connecticut's deep water ports that was prepared by Moffat & Nichol, they did actually call for the creation of a statewide port authority that could develop consistent, long-term strategy for the state that would provide a stable investment and regulatory environment, which is really critical for these private businesses to continue to invest in the infrastructure at our ports.

We at New Haven, at the New Haven Port Authority rather, we actually truly believe that a statewide port authority would definitely, positively impact upon our growth and our ability to attract new customers.

I am only one part-time person that's the only employee of the Port Authority. We try to do as much as we can, but we really need a greater voice that we believe this statewide organization would represent. Thank you.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, Judi, for your testimony. Any comments? Representative Mikutel.

REP. MIKUTEL: Quickly. So am I correct in assuming that when you say the need for this statewide authority, port authority would like be a, be the marketing arm that would benefit all the people at water ports in Connecticut that it would be, as you said, create that positive impact that these individual port authorities can't do now?

JUDI SCHEIFFELE: I think the port authorities in Connecticut presently have limited resources and capacities to do what's needed, to actually bring the ports into their full potential.

REP. MIKUTEL: And that's been the experience of the other east coast states that have statewide port authorities?

JUDI SCHEIFFELE: Actually, they just lend a stronger voice, especially when you have it at a state level. I mean, I can just tell you that in 2009 when the port authority had made application to the federal government for a TIGER grant, and when I went down to actually do the post mortem with the staff and USDOT, they basically told me that one of the main reasons we were not successful in securing the money was because there was nothing to indicate that it was a priority of the state. So, I mean, it's extremely important.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, Representative Mikutel. Senator Boucher for a quick comment.

SENATOR BOUCHER: Yes, thank you. For a quick comment. Thank you for that last statement. That was my thought as well. I think that here we are, a very small state, but yet look at how much of it is on the coastline --

JUDI SCHEIFFELE: Uh-huh.

SENATOR BOUCHER: -- and what potential it really does have, and that we should have a stronger

voice on a federal level and this certainly would probably be able to do that and I'm really grateful for your testimony here today. Thank you.

JUDI SCHEIFFELE: Thank you.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you. Any other comments? Thank you, Judi.

JUDI SCHEIFFELE: You're welcome.

REP. GUERRERA: Representative Case.

REP. CASE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to congratulate Michaela for a great job. She comes from a school that I represent and Representative Simanski represents, so it was a great job and we're doing good things in the northwest corner.

(HB 5288)

So, I'm here today to sort of, I have my testimony in support of Bill 5228, the act concerning the chemical road treatments.

Senator Maynard, Representative Guerrero, Senator Boucher, Representative Scribner and other members, I won't read my testimony. I'm just going to set it aside for now. I come sort of on a personal reason, but also on a concern.

About three weeks ago, you know, I did lose the brakes on my truck as I was coming down a hill right here, and luckily I had a nine foot blade on the front of it, so I was able to drop the blade and go off into a snow bank and stop myself.

When I brought it to the garage what concerned me was the garage was kind of unhappy, but they were excited because they get about two or three vehicles in a week to replace brakes.

long time, longer than that. It's not the brake pad itself, it's the corrosion, everything that just rusted away and rotted away on us.

REP. GUERRERA: Well thank you very much. Appreciate your taking the time to be here with us. As you know, we're hearing much the same from folks both professional and non-professional alike, but thank you very, very much for taking the time out. Any questions or comments for Mr. Zaine? Thank you very much, sir.

JOHN ZAINE: Thank you.

SENATOR MAYNARD: Next is Bill Gash. Good afternoon.

SENATOR MAYNARD: Good afternoon, Mr. Gash. Thank you for your patience. I apologize that it took this long.

BILL GASH: No problem. Mr. Chairman it seems like a blink of an eye and we were here last year. A slightly different bill number, but pretty much the same bill.

SENATOR MAYNARD: Indeed.

BILL GASH: So I appreciate --

SENATOR MAYNARD: Thank you.

BILL GASH: -- all the hard work that you, Mr. Chairman and the Committee have put forward to drive the port authority bill hopefully into existence this year.

I am the Executive Director of the Connecticut Maritime Coalition and I'm here to represent the membership today in support of Raised Bill 5289 AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY.

The CMC is a 501C-6 nonprofit trade organization. We've represented the Connecticut deep water port industry since 1999. Our membership, Briarpatch Enterprises, Blakeslee Arpaia Chapman, Cross Sound Ferry Services, the Connecticut Maritime Association, Connecticut State Pilots, Empire Fisheries, Gateway Terminal, Gwenmor Marina & Marina Contracting, GZA Geoenvironmental, Interport Pilot Agency, Moran Towing Corporation, New England Shipping Company, New Haven Port Authority, New Haven Terminal, Port Security Services, Santa Energy Corporation, Sea Support, Thames Towboat, Thames Shipyard and Repair Company and Underwater Construction Corporation, thanks Senator Maynard, Representative Guerrero and all of the Committee members for your hard work in 2013 that resulted in unanimously passing Senate Bill 1043, now reflected in Raised Bill Number 5289.

As you can imagine, we've had a lot of discussion around the port authority bill over the last couple of years and all these companies have come to the forefront and are supporting this bill.

We supported Senate Bill 1043 and now fully support Raised Bill 5289 because for the first time in ~~Connecticut's~~ history a port authority will be put in place that mirrors successful port authorities across the United States and contains the following attributes.

A lean seven-member board with experience and expertise in international trade, marine transportation, finance and economic development.

An executive director with a strong background in the commercial maritime industry and

extensive experience in the development and management of multi-use port operations, one that pursues federal funds for dredging and other infrastructure improvements to increase cargo movement through the ports, that markets the advantages of the ports to the domestic international shipping industry, that plans and funds capital projects promoting the development of the ports, and develops strategic entrepreneurial initiatives in the ports.

Our three deep water ports, New London, New Haven and Bridgeport, some you have heard from this morning, are great assets to the state and for too long have been in decline and at a competitive disadvantage with our neighboring states.

For instance, in 2008 we had a through put of shipping into our ports of about 300 ships, large commercial ships. In 2013 we had 143 ships, so we've declined almost 50 percent over the last 5 years.

Given the close proximity to the shipping lanes, and with careful planning and marketing by the port authority described in Raised Bill 5289, our ports will again attract commercial shipping lines enthusiastic to do business in Connecticut.

For all these reasons, the Connecticut Maritime Coalition supports Raised Bill Number 5289, LCO Number 1106 in its entirety and effective from passage.

Thank you for your consideration and especially for Senator Maynard of his leadership, wisdom and foresight in the creation of the Connecticut Port Authority. And that's my testimony. Thank you very much.

SENATOR MAYNARD: Thank you, Bill. Very much appreciate your kind remarks there. Obviously, your colleagues and your members have been very much a part of the whole shaping of this. We very much appreciate the support and the effort that's being made to help people understand it.

The bill's got a fairly simple purpose. We're here to promote and market our three deep water ports and to do that which we can to see that they're in the kind of condition to receive ships and add jobs and utilize Connecticut's waterways up to their full potential, so we very much appreciate that.

Any questions or comments from members of the Committee? As I think you know, Bill, last year I think we got this out of the Committee unanimously and it passed the Senate unanimously, so we're going to send it right down to the House in --

BILL GASH: And was on the Consent Calendar.

SENATOR MAYNARD: Oh, I know, and it was on the Consent Calendar in the House. We just had a snafu at the end of the day. So my good friend, Representative Scribner is here to make it sure we get it right through the House. Thanks again.

BILL GASH: Senator, thank you.

SENATOR MAYNARD: Thanks for your patience, too. We're almost to the conclusion, my friends. We have three more names on the list. Gordon Gibson. Is Gordon here? Mr. Gibson as well, thank you for your patience and endurance today.

HB 5288

GORDON GIBSON: Senator Maynard, members of the Committee, I'm Gordon Gibson from Vernon. I'm

171
pat/gbr TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

February 28, 2014
10:00 A.M.

sharing their experience because obviously for them, they have a much, pretty tough road to hoe --

HENRY TALMAGE: Right.

REP. SAWYER: -- to make ends meet. Thank you.

HENRY TALMAGE: Well, I would also, the forestry industry as well, which is in play here, too. A lot of those trucks that are on the road, they come, certainly come into play in this, too, so I want to make sure we make that point, too, but thank you.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, Representative Sawyer. Any other comments? Thank you, sir, for waiting here. Thank you for your testimony.

HENRY TALMAGE: Good.

REP. GUERRERA: Jeff Bishop. Good afternoon, Jeff.

JEFF BISHOP: Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to be here today. I'm here to talk in regard to Bill 5289. My name is Jeff Bishop and I am with the Center for Sustainable Business Growth in the City of Bridgeport. I'm also here on behalf of Mr. Paul Timpanelli, who is President and CEO of the Bridgeport Regional Business Council.

I have been involved with business retention and business recruitment in the City of Bridgeport for the past 15 years. Before that, I have had over 20 years experience in international business and trade and yes, I am that old. Thanks for asking.

Over the years, we have worked with many, many organizations that have considered expanding or

moving their businesses into the great City of Bridgeport.

Recently there have been several foreign missions as well as companies that have expressed interest in the Bridgeport area. Whenever we entertain these companies and guests from overseas, they are always impressed with Bridgeport's impressive industrial past, but more importantly our deep water port.

The fact that Bridgeport has a deep water port always conjures up fantastic images of opportunity and economic activity. The hope and dream of having a vibrant, bustling port always seems to be within reach.

We applaud the state's efforts to establish a State of Connecticut Port Authority. We believe as does the state, that Connecticut's three ports represent an immeasurable economic benefit for the state.

We believe that a State of Connecticut Port Authority can bring tremendous resources and leverage foreign, state and local assets to the local economies when working in concert with the local port authorities. We recognize the value that a statewide port authority can provide as it relates to marketing, economic growth, increased trade, job creation, but more importantly, dredging issues and port maintenance.

These critical functions can go a long way in helping the local port authorities flourish and focus on the task of expanding economic activity.

We acknowledge the importance of this legislation and what it means to the local port authorities and the state's overall economic

health. We want to support this legislation and make sure that it's intelligent and is designed to work in partnership with the local entities that encourage and foster prosperity, and does not wrest control from the local community.

We look forward to this important legislation and look forward to working in partnership on the implementation of this much needed economic development. Thank you very much for the opportunity.

REP. GUERRERA: Thank you, Jeff. Yeah, we've had some very good testimony with regard to House Bill 5289, so I think that we will see this move through the Committee without any obstacles. I believe it's something we've been working on obviously over the last couple of years and I think, as I stated before, we're hoping to see it get through both Chambers, so. Any comments? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony. Thank you for waiting.

JEFF BISHOP: You bet.

REP. GUERRERA: Rafie. Is there any other individual who would like to speak that did not sign up on the sign up sheet? Okay, you're our last speaker, then Rafie. Last but not least.

RAPHAEL PODOLSKY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. My name is Raphael Podolsky. I'm with the Legal Assistance Research Center in Hartford.

I'm here really for just a very, very brief comment on Section 19 of House Bill 5290. That's the Commissioner of Motor Vehicle's bill. There is a change that's made in Lines 383 to 385 that are ambiguous in a way that presents a problem from the point of view of the owner of the vehicle.

Room 3300
Legislative Office Building
Hartford, Connecticut 06106-1591



860-240-8600
1-800-842-1420
www.SenatorWilliams.cga.ct.gov

State of Connecticut
SENATOR DONALD E. WILLIAMS, JR.
Twenty-ninth District
President Pro Tempore

**Testimony before the Transportation Committee
Senator Donald E. Williams, Jr.**

February 28, 2014

In Support of Senate Bill 236 *AAC Transparency In Motor Vehicle Dealer Fees*
In Support of House Bill 5289 *AA Establishing The Connecticut Port Authority*

Senator Maynard, Representative Guerrero, distinguished members of the Transportation Committee; I am submitting this testimony to you in support of SB 236 and HB 5289.

SB 236 AAC Transparency In Motor Vehicle Dealer Fees:

Thank you for raising this concept. This bill is part of a larger focus on consumer issues that Senate Democrats have put forward for consideration this session. This bill is intended to give consumers shopping for cars (both new and used) full knowledge of the price from which they are negotiating up front. Specifically, the bill is intended to address a situation that many of us have experienced – you've concluded negotiations with the car dealer, settled on a price that you can afford, only to learn when presented with the invoice that the price you negotiated isn't really the price because the dealer has tacked on additional charges and fees, sometimes totaling several hundred dollars, that you were unaware of, for services that you never asked for. The bill attempts to protect consumers from these unfair and deceptive practices in the following ways:

- Existing law prohibits any dealer prep fee that is not requested. The proposal makes clear that any such request must be made prior to the preparation of the invoice.
- Regarding conveyance/processing fees: Existing law requires either (1) that the dealer provide a written statement explaining the fees or (2) that DMV determine a type of sign that the dealer must display in the area where negotiations take place. This proposal will mandate that both requirements are met
- Regarding the advertising of prices for cars: Existing law says that advertisements for new cars must include in the price federal tax, cost of delivery, dealer prep fees and any other charges, except that local tax, registration fees, or dealer conveyance/processing fees are excluded from the advertised price. This proposal (1) applies this advertising restriction to used cars as well and (2) makes a violation an unfair trade practice.

HB 5289 AA Establishing The Connecticut Port Authority

I am pleased to see that the Transportation Committee is again taking up the issue of deep water ports and the creation of a statewide port authority. In 2011, the General Assembly recognized the importance of Bradley International Airport and our five general aviation airports as economic development engines for Connecticut, and created the Connecticut Airport Authority. Similarly, Senate Democrats have long held that our three deep water ports are untapped and underutilized economic development engines, and in fact, this committee raised and the Senate passed a bill creating a statewide port authority last session (SB 1043, An Act Establishing the Connecticut State-Wide Port Authority). A Port Authority would be responsible for developing and promoting these underutilized assets in a coordinated and cohesive manner. With coordinated leadership, Connecticut will be poised to play a prominent role in the short sea shipping industry, with the benefits of job creation and growth in local economies. I am confident that this committee will move this issue forward, and I look forward to supporting its passage in the Senate.



TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

February 28, 2014

The Connecticut Conference of Municipalities (CCM) is Connecticut's statewide association of towns and cities and the voice of local government - your partners in governing Connecticut. Our members represent over 92% of Connecticut's population. We appreciate the opportunity to testify on bills of interest to towns and cities.

HB 5289, "An Act Establishing the Connecticut Port Authority"

CCM asks the Committee to amend HB 5289.

CCM supports HB 5289 which would create a state wide quasi-public port authority that would have the ability to develop, expand infrastructure in and around the ports and the power to acquire, lease, hold and dispose of real and personal property.

CCM would ask the Committee to amend Section 1 of HB 5289 to designate that one member of the Board of Directors of the proposed Port Authority be a representative of one of the state's cities that contain a deep water port. This designated municipal seat could rotate among the three cities and additionally that a representative of the other cities be allowed to serve as a nonvoting, ex-officio member.

CCM asks the committee to amend HB 5289, ensuring that cities that are home to these deep water ports have adequate and continuous representation on the board of the proposed Port Authority.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

If you have any questions, please contact Randy Collins, Senior Legislative Associate for CCM, at rcollins@ccm-ct.org or (860) 707-6446.

183

CONNECTICUT MARITIME COALITION



February 25, 2014

Transportation Committee
Room 2300
Legislative Office Building
Hartford, CT 06106

Dear Senator Maynard, Representative Guerrero, and members of the Transportation Committee,

This testimony is submitted by the Connecticut Maritime Coalition, Inc. in support of Raised Bill No 5289, LCO No. 1106, AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY.

The Connecticut Maritime Coalition, Inc (CMC) is a 501-c-6 non-profit trade organization representing the Connecticut's deep-water port industry since 1999. Our membership; Briarpatch Enterprises, Blakeslee Arpaia Chapman, Cross Sound Ferry Services, Connecticut Maritime Association, Connecticut State Pilots, Empire Fisheries, Gateway Terminal, Gwenmor Marina & Marine Contracting, GZA GeoEnvironmental, Interport Pilots Agency, Moran Towing Corporation, New England Shipping Company, New Haven Port Authority, New Haven Terminal, Port Security Services, Santa Energy Corporation, Sea Support, Thames Towboat, Thames Shipyard & Repair Company, and Underwater Construction Corporation, thanks Senator Maynard, Representative Guerrero and all of the Committee Members for your hard work in 2013 that resulted in unanimously passing Senate Bill 1043, now reflected in Raised Bill No. 5289.

We supported Senate Bill 1043 and now fully support Raised Bill No. 5289 because for the first time in Connecticut's history, a Port Authority will be put in place that mirrors successful Port Authority's across the United States and contains the following attributes:

1. A lean 7 member board with experience and expertise in International Trade, Marine Transportation, Finance, and Economic Development.
2. An Executive Director with a strong background in the commercial maritime industry and extensive experience in the development and management of multi-use port operations.
3. Pursues federal funds for dredging and other infrastructure improvements to increase cargo movement through the Ports
4. Markets the advantages of the Ports to the domestic and international shipping industry
5. Plans and funds capitol projects promoting the development of the Ports
6. Develops strategic entrepreneurial initiatives in the Ports

Our three deep water ports, New London; New Haven; and Bridgeport are great assets to the State, and for to long have been in decline and at a competitive disadvantage with our neighboring states. Given the close proximity to the shipping lanes, and with careful planning and marketing by the Port Authority described in Raised Bill No. 5289, our Ports will again attract commercial shipping lines enthusiastic to do business in Connecticut.

For all these reasons, the Connecticut Maritime Coalition, Inc. supports Raised Bill No. 5289, LCO No. 1106 in its entirety and effective from passage.

Thank you for your consideration and especially for Senator Maynard's leadership, wisdom and foresight in the creation of the Connecticut Port Authority.



David E. Pohorylo
Chairman

⑤



BILL FINCH
Mayor

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
CITY OF BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT
MARGARET E. MORTON GOVERNMENT CENTER
999 BROAD STREET
BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT 06604
TELEPHONE (203) 576-7201
FAX (203) 576-3913

HB 5289

TESTIMONY OF THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT
TO THE
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Friday, February 28, 2014

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to testify regarding the proposed establishment of a State Port Authority.

As Mayor of the state's largest city and the president of the board of the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities, this issue is of great concern in my city and fellow deepwater port cities such as New Haven and New London.

Bridgeport knows firsthand the importance of the ports and how critical they are to the future of our state's economic growth. I believe that we must take action; to support our deepwater ports and I applaud this committee for making them a priority. However, I do have several concerns regarding the proposed legislation.

Allowing a State Port Authority to move forward and control City-owned property for state purposes could result in a loss of tax revenue. Bridgeport is only 16 square miles in Bridgeport, and much of that land is not on the tax rolls, which places a great deal of the tax burden on residents of our City. Forfeiting of valuable property to the State, as the result of a newly established statewide port authority could further impact our city's taxpayers.

I am also concerned that the establishment of a statewide port authority could limit the City's ability to utilize the port for future development. In Bridgeport, infrastructure work is currently underway on the peninsula at Steel Point, home to a transformative economic development project on the harbor. This development will result in hundreds of new jobs for Bridgeport and will attract millions of visitors to our city. I am concerned that the establishment of a statewide port authority will have a negative impact on the future of this project and any other potential development adjacent to our port.

All three deepwater ports must be equally funded and equally prioritized by a statewide port authority, if this legislation moves forward and this quasi-public agency is established. I am sure that New London and New Haven share this concern, as well.

Bridgeport Harbor has not been dredged since 1964. This lack of action from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has affected the City's ability to effectively market the harbor's economic opportunities. We are long overdue for a dredging of the harbor. If we want to make the ports a priority for the future of the State's growth, a critical step forward would be to support the dredging of Bridgeport Harbor.

In addition to the dredging of the harbor, the relocation of the Bridgeport/Port Jefferson ferry also will have a positive effect on the future of our port, and also will further reduce congestion on I-95. I ask that the State continue to support this relocation project.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak about Bridgeport's port and for making the state's ports a priority.

Sincerely,

Bill Finch
Mayor

*Jeff Bishop***Statewide Port Authority Legislation Testimony**HB 5289

Hello my name is Jeff Bishop, I am with the Center For Sustainable Business Growth. I am here on behalf of Mr. Paul Timpanelli President & CEO of the Bridgeport Regional Business Council. I have been involved with business retention and business recruitment in the City of Bridgeport for the past 15 years. Over the years we have worked with many, many organizations that have considered expanding or moving their business into the great City of Bridgeport.

Recently there have been several foreign missions as well as companies that have expressed interest in the Bridgeport area. Whenever, we entertain companies and guests from overseas they are always impressed with Bridgeport's impressive industrial past but more importantly our deepwater port. The fact that Bridgeport has a deep port always conjures up fantastic images of opportunity and economic activity. The hope and dream of having a vibrant, bustling port always seems to be within reach.

We applaud the State's efforts to establish a State of Connecticut Port Authority. We believe, as does the state, that Connecticut's three ports

represent an immeasurable economic benefit for the State. We believe that a Connecticut Port Authority can bring tremendous resources and leverage Federal, State and local assets to the local economies when working in concert with the local port authorities. We recognize the value that a statewide port authority can provide as it relates to marketing, economic growth, increased trade, job creation, but more importantly dredging issues and port maintenance. These critical functions can go a long way in helping the local port authorities flourish and focus on the task of expanding economic activity.

We acknowledge the importance of this legislation and what it means to the local port authorities and the State's overall economic health. We want to support this legislation and make sure it is intelligent and designed to work in partnership with the local entities that encourages and fosters prosperity and does not wrest control from the local community. We look forward to this important legislation and look forward to working in partnership on the implementation of this much needed economic development.

Thank you

98 CONNECTICUT MARINE TRADES ASSOCIATION

20 Plains Road
Essex, CT 06475-1501

(860) 767-2645 • Fax (860) 767-3559 • e-mail cmta@snet.net

Transportation Committee
Legislative Office Building
Hartford, CT 06106

Re: **R.B. No. 5289, AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY**

Chairmen Maynard and Guerrera, Senator Boucher, Representative Scribner and Distinguished Members

The Connecticut Marine Trades Association (CMTA) and our 340 member businesses urge you to support **R.B. No. 5289, AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY**. Connecticut's three deep-water ports, New London, New Haven and Bridgeport are one of Connecticut's most valued maritime assets. Currently underused, needing dredging, expanded berthing facilities, and the installation of cranes and infrastructure, they have the potential of competing for business that presently goes to our neighbors here in New England and further south. Major highway, ferry service, and rail service located in the cities of New Haven, New London and Bridgeport make the potential of our ports even greater! Expanded Connecticut ports will take trucks off I-95, grow Connecticut jobs, and bring more goods into our region to benefit all our citizens.

Control of the state's commercial waterfront is with Connecticut's Department of Transportation, Bureau of Aviation and Ports. The Connecticut Maritime Commission currently is the primary body within the State to develop and recommend maritime policy to the Governor and the General Assembly. It is responsible for developing and updating a long-term strategic plan for all ports and waterways in the State of Connecticut with a focus on the aforementioned three deep-water ports. While a Maritime Commission deals with strategy and policy, hands-on management of the ports should fall under a new Port Authority as it does in many other Northeast states.

This initiative would have the Department of Transportation develop a Connecticut Port Authority with assistance from the Department of Economic and Community Development and other interested stakeholders. The primary job of a Port Authority is to not only manage the ports but to market them and generate the business that will utilize each port to its best capability. It is a critical issue that the personnel serving on this newly formed CPA be the right ones and that there be great due diligence in the selection process. They must be marketing oriented and motivated to use their marketing skills to advance the interests of each port. Also too, is the importance of prompt & significant initial funding that would ensure that the authority gets off to an aggressive start. And this commitment by the State has to be enduring and outside the political arena.

We urge you again to support **R.B. No. 5289, AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY**. Proper personnel and prompt funding and a focus on marketing and success will grow the three Connecticut ports. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

John S. Johnson
Vice Chairman- Legislative Affairs

Grant W. Westerson
President

Linda A. Kowalski
The Kowalski Group

109

February 28, 2014
Transportation Committee Hearing

Raised Bill No. 5289, LCO No. 1106: An Act Establishing the Connecticut Port Authority

My name is Judi Sheffele, I am the Executive Director of the New Haven Port Authority and I am here to speak in support of Raised Bill No. 5289. The New Haven Port Authority is a quasi-governmental organization established in 2003 by local Ordinance, under Section 7-329 of the Connecticut General Statutes for the purpose of promoting waterborne freight at the port of New Haven. The port of New Haven consists of a cluster of privately-owned facilities that handle petroleum products, general bulk cargo including scrap metal, cement, sand, stone and salt; break bulk including steel and coils and project cargo. The terminals control all waterside property within the port district and the Port Authority owns approximately fourteen acres of land within the district that is leased to dry cargo operators for lay down area.

As prescribed by State Statute, the Authority did prepare a comprehensive plan and in 2007 adopted a Strategic Land Use Plan which continues to guide its work plan. To achieve some the objectives defined in that plan, the Authority has collaborated with local, regional and national partners to effect port-friendly legislation and to secure funding for port security projects, and most recently the dredging of its federal channel.

Land use regulations are of critical importance to ports around the county; waterside and landside property that support maritime activities are often viewed as areas prime for gentrification. Tank farms, trucks and large stockpiles of bulk cargo are often considered undesirable for many struggling municipalities that can envision uses that will produce greater tax revenue while ignoring the asset our ports represent. There is a limited amount of land available for growth within our port district and consequently terminals have had to secure land for cargo storage outside the district. This presents a potential land use conflict but could also present an opportunity for properties located along the Interstates and rail corridors that could support port activities.

Among the recommendations in the 2012 study of Connecticut's three deep water ports, prepared by Moffat & Nichol, is the creation of a statewide port authority that could "...develop a consistent, long term strategy for the State, providing a stable investment and regulatory climate for the private sector ..." The development of a state-wide port authority with a strategic plan that identifies the strengths of each of the ports could also serve to eliminate competition between ports for limited state and federal resources not to mention cargos.

We believe the port of New Haven would benefit from having a state-wide port authority serving as the over-arching entity to undertake the planning and marketing needed to increase the movement of freight through Connecticut's deep water ports.

**STATEMENT OF ADAM WRONOWSKI
VICE-PRESIDENT
THAMES SHIPYARD & REPAIR CO., INC.
IN SUPPORT OF R.B. NO. 5289**

Sen. Maynard, Rep. Guerrero, ranking members and members of the Transportation Committee. My name is Adam Wronowski and I am Vice President of Thames Shipyard & Repair Company headquartered in New London, and I am submitting this testimony in support of Raised Bill No. 5289 AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY.

Thames Shipyard is a third generation family business started by my grandfather, John H. Wronowski in 1967. Our "North Yard" site located at the foot of Farnsworth Street dates back to the early 1900's as a commercial ship repair facility on New London's waterfront. Thames Shipyard is the largest commercial vessel repair facility in Connecticut and one of the largest in the Northeast. The importance of Thames Shipyard's impact as a vital regional facility located in Connecticut cannot be stressed enough as other shipyards in neighboring states have gone out of business over the past 10-15 years.

Thames Shipyard services vessels in many of the major ferry systems in the Northeast including the Wood's Hole, Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket Steamship Authority, Cross Sound Ferry, Block Island Express, Fishers Island Ferry, Bridgeport-Port Jefferson Ferry, and the Lewes, Delaware - Cape May, New Jersey Ferry. The shipyard also services the commercial tugboats in the region, vessels for the Army Corps of Engineers, commercial barges, commercial fishing vessels, and vessels for the Naval Submarine Base in Groton and Electric Boat Shipyard. The shipyard currently has over 90 employees and according to Connecticut's Deep Water Port Strategy Study is the largest non-cargo employer among the three deep water ports. We have seen growth in both our business and number of employees in the past five years. We are optimistic about the future of Thames Shipyard as the premier commercial ship repair facility in the Northeast.

The shipyard's main activities take place on two large floating drydocks which are used to haul vessels out of the water in order to perform repairs and maintenance on them. We recently completed a project to expand our Number 2 drydock and dredge around our facility in order to

service larger and deeper draft vessels. This work was largely funded through federal and State grants. Because of these capital improvements, Thames Shipyard secured a seven year, \$7 million contract to service and maintain the New York City Fire Department's fleet of fireboats. In fact, many of Thames Shipyard's customers are out-of-state interests. In other words, we are bringing in revenue from other states and using it to create and support Connecticut jobs.

We feel that the formation of the Connecticut Port Authority should protect and enhance commercial shipyard activities and ship repair services as recommended in the 2012 Connecticut's Deep Water Port Strategy Study. We also support the recommendations in the Study to "review the combined effects of the multiple local, regional, state, and federal requirements on this industry and streamline the regulatory processes for ship repair and shipbuilding." We feel a Connecticut Port Authority made up of entrepreneurial thinkers can play the role of advocate when dealing with local, State and federal agencies when dealing on regulatory issues and protect the industry in this State and the people whose livelihoods depend on employment in this business.

A Connecticut Port Authority can also be instrumental in identifying and helping to secure federal funding opportunities for commercial shipyards. Federal funding for shipyards is extremely competitive with hundreds of yards applying for a limited amount of funding each year. Funding is used for capital projects and large equipment purchases such as cranes and power washers used to clean vessel hulls.

With a clearly defined mission and properly assembled, the creation of a Connecticut Port Authority has the chance to greatly improve the maritime climate in the State, especially if members of the maritime industry are included in the Authority. A Connecticut Port Authority should be an advocate for commercial shipyards and the entire maritime community. A Port Authority must not create another layer of bureaucracy and regulations, which will do nothing more than stifle an industry that has the potential to become a significant economic generator for the State of Connecticut.

TESTIMONY PRESENTED TO THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE*February 28, 2014**Tim Sullivan, Director of Waterfront, Brownfield and Transit-Oriented
Development*

Department of Economic and Community Development

House Bill No. 5289

AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY

Good morning Senator Maynard, Representative Guerrero, Senator Boucher, Representative Scribner, and the members of the Transportation Committee. My name is Tim Sullivan, and I recently joined the Department of Economic and Community Development as the State Director of Waterfront, Brownfield and Transit-Oriented Development. Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on behalf of DECD Commissioner Catherine Smith regarding a coordinated approach to our ports as an economic driver in the Connecticut and HB 5289, AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY.

Connecticut's deepwater ports – located in Bridgeport, New Haven and New London – as well as smaller ports and harbors along the Long Island Sound coast, represent an important economic development asset for the state. Prior to the onset of the Great Recession, Connecticut's maritime industry contributed more than \$5 billion to the state's economy and employed more than 30,000 people, according to a study published in 2010 by the Connecticut Maritime Coalition. In 2007, according to the same study, average wages in the maritime industry were 15 percent higher than the state average.

But while our ports are an important component of the Connecticut economy, in recent years they have faced significant challenges. Import volumes at the three deepwater ports have fallen by more than 80% since 2006, to less than 2 million tons annually; export volumes have risen modestly in recent years but still are less than 1 million tons annually. By comparison, 5.5 billion tons of cargo is moved through the Port of New York and New Jersey annually.

The most significant factors contributing to these challenging conditions are driven by trends in the global economy. Containerization continues to drive more and more cargo volumes to the country's largest ports, including New York/New Jersey, Los Angeles, Long Beach, Houston and Norfolk. Most of the vessels calling on these ports are simply too large to call on Connecticut's ports, and these ports have invested significant resources in infrastructure such as multi-modal connections and warehousing facilities that can accommodate large cargo volumes.

The ongoing widening of the Panama Canal will only further exacerbate these challenges, enabling even larger vessels to bring cargo to the United States from Asia and other foreign markets.

But the Malloy Administration refuses to believe that the decline of Connecticut's ports is inevitable or irreversible, which is why we believe a comprehensive statewide strategy for our ports is necessary. We believe that a coordinated approach to developing our ports would better position Connecticut's maritime industry to expand export and import opportunities and, as a result, create new good-paying industrial jobs.

~~A stronger, growing maritime industry will also pay dividends beyond jobs and economic~~ development, as well. Every ton of cargo that arrives by water is a ton of cargo that isn't arriving on I-95, 84 or 91, which would not only reduce congestion, but also emissions. A study commissioned by the Connecticut Maritime Coalition estimated that 80,000 truck trips per year on I-95 could be eliminated if cargo was transported from hub ports through Connecticut's ports.

In 2012, the State commissioned the Connecticut Deep Water Port Strategy Study, which identified eight potential strategies for increasing volumes and activity at our ports, including expansion of scrap metal and wood pellet exports and fresh food imports, expansion of commercial fishing and shellfish operations, support for continued ferry service, and expansion of ship repair capabilities. The study also analyzed two potential new governance approaches: that the state consider either a market-based approach to developing its maritime infrastructure or the creation of a statewide Port Authority to rationalize and prioritize investments in Connecticut's deepwater ports, such as dredging, and to create a consolidated marketing and development strategy for the ports.

Unlike nearly every other state on the Eastern seaboard, Connecticut does not speak with one single, consistent voice when interacting with a host of important public sector partners – particularly federal agencies like the Army Corps of Engineers, the Coast Guard, the Maritime Administration, the EPA, and the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, among others, regarding its port development. Just as importantly, the State's ports are not marketed consistently to current and potential private sector partners.

Establishing an entity that will manage our ports collectively will require significant additional planning, analysis and consultation with key stakeholders. There are a number of factors that must be considered in creating any new quasi-public entity. It is important that we consider the lessons we have learned through the creation of past authorities, including the Connecticut Airport Authority. My colleagues at the Office of Policy and Management have submitted testimony on some of those administrative hurdles and I encourage you to consult with their testimony for more information

While many of the key details of a ports entity could be finalized during that planning process, we believe that several items must be clarified in legislation establishing a ports entity, including:

- **Specification of the entity's jurisdiction:** The Administration believes that at least all three deepwater ports (Bridgeport, New Haven and New London) should be included if an entity is created; including other smaller ports and harbors would allow for further enhancements in policy coordination and strategic planning
- **Status of the State Pier in New London:** The Administration believes that the State Pier is a critical public asset; discussions must be held as to the future of the state-owned facilities in New London
- **Start-Up Funding:** Any transition to a quasi-public entity will require modest levels of funding to support the hiring of an Executive Director as well as administrative and planning expenses.

In conclusion, the Administration believes that proper planning and analysis is required in order to work toward the establishment of an entity to manage Connecticut's ports; such a decision would be an historic step in the revitalization and strengthening of the State's ports and maritime economy. We look forward to working with the Assembly to move this important initiative forward.

94

CT20x17

BUILDING A BRIGHTER ECONOMIC
FUTURE FOR EVERYONE

#MoveCTUp

Testimony of Eric W. Gjede
Assistant Counsel, CBIA
Before the Transportation Committee
Hartford, CT
February 28, 2014

Testifying in support of HB 5289 AA Establishing the Connecticut Port Authority

Good morning Senator Maynard, Representative Guerrero, and members of the Transportation Committee. My name is Eric Gjede and I am assistant counsel at the Connecticut Business and Industry Association (CBIA), which represents more than 10,000 large and small companies throughout the state of Connecticut.

HB 5289 is good for Connecticut.

Currently, our state's transportation system often acts as a barrier to the flow of commerce. Businesses cite congestion on our state's highways as the number one culprit preventing the free flow of people and products. While expanding our highways is critical to the future of Connecticut, we must also continue to look for other means of addressing congestion. The coordination and development of our ports is a good step towards addressing the state's transportation and economic development needs.

The ports in this state are one of the primary entry points for fuel and energy products. A port authority that can help coordinate and expand the capability of storing and moving these products will help to reduce their high cost to consumers. Additionally, if our ports could handle the movement of more goods produced in the state, we can reduce the number of vehicles on our roads and bridges.

We encourage the committee to support HB 5289.

**STATEMENT OF STANLEY MICKUS
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
CROSS SOUND FERRY SERVICES, INC.
IN SUPPORT OF R.B. NO. 5289**

Sen. Maynard, Rep. Guerrero, ranking members and members of the Transportation Committee. My name is Stan Mickus and I am the Director of Public Affairs for Cross Sound Ferry Services and I am submitting this testimony in support of Raised Bill No. 5289 AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY.

Cross Sound Ferry is one of the largest vehicle and passenger ferry systems in the U.S. In 2013, we transported just over 1.1 million passengers and over 430,000 vehicles including commercial trucks and tractor trailers between New London and Orient Point, Long Island. We operate year-round service with as many as 58 arrivals and departures daily. We also operate seasonal high-speed passenger only ferry service to Block Island from New London. In 2013, this service carried over 100,000 passengers between these two points. We operate a fleet of nine vessels, seven vehicle and passenger ferries and two high-speed passenger-only vessels. We employ over 300 people during our peak operating season and over 225 year round. Our ferry terminal in downtown New London is the largest component of the City's multi-modal transportation center accounting for approximately 75% of all passengers coming through the transportation center which also includes rail, bus and taxi services and a 1000 car parking garage across the street not directly connected to the transportation modes.

In 2013, we experienced a modest increase in ridership in both services but both are still well below levels experienced prior to the recession. Both services are operating with excess capacity.

One of the recommendations coming out of the State's Deep Water Port Strategy Study is to "Protect and Enhance Connecticut's Private Ferry Services." The study identified that the U.S. EPA estimates greenhouse gas benefits of approximately 4-6 cents for every mile of reduced passenger vehicle travel. This figure does not take into account the congestion

benefits of taking cars and trucks off of I-95. The Connecticut DOT Policy and Planning Department calculated that based on present use data, use of Cross Sound Ferry's New London – Orient Point service to get to a central location on Long Island saves approximately 58,929,327 vehicle miles traveled annually. This accounts for more than \$3.5 million annually in greenhouse gas benefits.

As the traffic burden on I-95, 395 & 91 grows, travelers should be encouraged to utilize alternative modes of transportation such as ferries. The creation of a Connecticut Port Authority assembled properly with representation from the industry promoting maritime interests should have as its mission to promote interstate ferry travel as a cost-effective and environmentally-friendly alternative to the roadways for both passenger vehicles and heavy commercial trucks. The State has begun the process by installing some temporary signage on the approaches to the Gold Star Bridge on I-95 and a stand-alone sign on I-395 alerting travelers of the "L.I. Ferry." We appreciate this recognition and understand more permanent signage will be placed along both Interstates this spring alerting travelers of the "alternate route" by ferry. Thank you. Appropriate interstate signage for ferries as alternate routes is a must along with having the ferry routes posted on state maps, websites and mobile applications as a way to promote awareness of ferry travel.

As a carrier of large commercial vehicles, heavy trucks including tractor-trailers, we support the Port Study's recommendation that "Cross Sound Ferry could contribute to moving freight between New England and Long Island, taking trucks off of I-95. An incentive program recognizing the public benefits of doing so may be appropriate." With our vessels running at just over 50% capacity on a year-round basis and having the ability to add trips, expand schedules short term and procure new vessels long term, Cross Sound Ferry is capable of meeting the demand for increased commercial truck traffic. To that end we are having discussions with carriers about what sort of incentives might work in their logistics models

A Connecticut Port Authority with a clear mission of promoting and supporting ferry transportation should be an advocate for the maritime industry to bolster Connecticut's economy.



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

TESTIMONY PRESENTED TO THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
February 28, 2014

Office of Policy and Management

Testimony Regarding House Bill No. 5289
An Act Establishing the Connecticut Port Authority

Senator Maynard, Representative Guerrero, and members of the Transportation Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on HB 5289, An Act Establishing the Connecticut Port Authority.

OPM recognizes that Connecticut's deepwater ports – located in Bridgeport, New Haven and New London – as well as smaller ports and harbors along the Long Island Sound coast, represent an important economic development asset for the state. For this reason, OPM, in consultation with other state agencies, selected Moffat & Nichol in 2011 to do a complete and comprehensive strategy study of the state's three deep water ports, including a focused effort at growing maritime industry jobs. This comprehensive study was completed in 2012, suggesting several ways that Connecticut could revise how it oversees those ports.

This bill contains many positive proposals regarding the development and is a good place to begin our discussion of a governance structure for our state's ports. However, there are also certain unresolved issues, questions and concerns that we must raise. A significant concern for OPM is the way in which the bill would deal with labor and employment. It is unclear which divisions or state employees would be transferred to a new Port Authority, so it is difficult to assess what the impact will be. For instance, it is not clear whether transferred employees will have the right to stay at their current agency, or whether employees agreeing to the transfer will continue to remain members of the state bargaining units. The legislation would give significant authority over employment to the Executive Director of the Port Authority. However the employees would have collective bargaining rights which are not addressed in this legislation. The legislation also does not address the significant merit system issues as these employees are presently classified under the statutes. Given recent experiences with the creation of quasi-public authorities, we believe these issues need to be resolved before legislation is passed.

In addition to the labor and employment issues, we are concerned about the lack of clarity on funding for a Port Authority. With no indication as to what properties will come under its purview, there is no clear funding stream for a Port Authority

Connecticut's ports hold significant economic development potential for our state. We recognize the importance of this issue and the potential for economic development at our ports. While we cannot support the bill at this time, we are supportive of efforts to continue the discussion with the goal of working towards reaching a consensus on the best way forward.

For more information, please contact Garrett Eucalitto at 860-524-7363 or garrett.eucalitto@ct.gov

(4)



State of Connecticut

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STATE CAPITOL**

REPRESENTATIVE GAIL LAVIELLE
ONE HUNDRED FORTY-THIRD ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING, ROOM 4200
300 CAPITOL AVENUE
HARTFORD, CT 06106-1591

CAPITOL (860) 240-8700
TOLL FREE (800) 842-1423
Gail.Lavielle@housegop.ct.gov

HB 5289: An Act Concerning the Establishment of the Connecticut Port Authority

RANKING MEMBER
COMMERCE COMMITTEE

MEMBER
APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE
EDUCATION COMMITTEE
HIGHER EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT
ADVANCEMENT COMMITTEE

Testimony

Transportation Committee

February 28, 2014

Good morning, Chairmen Maynard and Guerrero, Ranking Members Boucher and Scribner, and former fellow members of the Transportation Committee. Thank you for this opportunity to testify in favor of HB 5289.

I support this bill for both economic development and transportation reasons. I believe that developing the state's ports will stimulate business, improve the movement of freight, and reduce highway traffic congestion.

While Connecticut's deep water ports (Bridgeport, New Haven, and New London) represent significant economic assets, the state has not optimized their potential. This has been made very clear by Connecticut's Deep Water Port Strategy Study, which was commissioned by OPM and published in 2012. We also heard corroborating testimony during the 2013 session in an informational hearing organized by this Committee and Commissioner Redeker. Both the study and the presentations at the informational hearing highlighted the ports' economic potential and the importance of coordination, oversight, and marketing, as well as an investment plan.

Connecticut has a long and rich maritime tradition, but its deep water ports are not thriving. According to the 2012 study, imports have declined by 80% since 2006. While it is generally acknowledged that Connecticut's ports cannot compete with the region's larger ports, the study makes compelling arguments for their economic potential by identifying four opportunities for expansion of their existing activities, as well as four additional opportunities for new business. It makes specific recommendations for investments that would improve the ports' capacity and operations, and suggests revising their governance structure. One possible alternative it mentions is the creation of a port authority

Connecticut is the only East Coast state without a state-level governance structure for its deep water ports. I believe that only such an umbrella structure can look beyond the needs of each individual port to develop a plan that will address capital investment, regulatory, marketing, and transportation infrastructure issues.

Ports cannot function in isolation. To attract and retain business and related revenues, they must be an integral part of local, regional, and global economies, and within an effective local transportation system. They also must operate as dynamic businesses themselves, rather than as static geographic destinations.

This is why leadership of the Commerce Committee is working on raising a bill that will support the economic development of our ports. It is also why several of us believe that it would be constructive to share with the Commerce Committee cognizance of this particular aspect of the port authority's activities, and I would ask respectfully that you consider this.

Last year, I introduced a similar bill which was passed by the Commerce Committee and strongly supported the proposal that subsequently emerged from your membership. I hope that we will be successful this year in passing legislation, and that we can help Connecticut move forward in optimizing these economic assets. I look forward to working with you.