Meeting Minutes

Finance Stakeholders’ Advisory Working Group (SAWG) #6

December 2, 2009
Meeting Title: Finance Stakeholders’ Advisory Working Group (SAWG) #6

Meeting Purpose: Exchange of information

Location/Date: Multipurpose Room, Greenburgh Library
Elmsford, NY
6:00 P.M.

Attendees:

SAWG Members
Chris Crane              Office of Westchester County Legislator Tom Abinanti
Steven Kaplan
Thom Kleiner            Supervisor, Orangetown
Jack McLaughlin         East Irvington Civic Association
Mammen Samuel
Sy Schulman
Mary Jane Shimsky       Office of Assemblyman Richard Brodsky

Project Team Members
Michael Anderson        NYSDOT
Phil Ferguson           NYSDOT
Yvette Hinds            NYSDOT
Susan Kugler            NYSDOT
Brian Sterman           MTA MNR
Angel Medina            NYSTA
Paul Plotczyk           WSA
George Paschalidis      HSH
Paul Plotczyk, a facilitator with Work Systems Affiliates, welcomed the attendees.

Phil Ferguson (NYSDOT), Finance Study Project Manager, provided a brief overview of the previous meeting and presented the agenda: to update attendees on the status of the Finance Study.

Mr. Ferguson then gave the presentation (see attached).

Questions and comments included the following.

Q: Does your timeline indicate a finance plan for only the bridge and highway design portion, and not necessarily the transit?
A: We’re describing and looking into financing all aspects of the project. The team will naturally have more analysis about the bridge and highway first. The team is taking care to ensure that any decisions that are made with respect to the bridge and highway funding do not compromise funding for Bus Rapid Transit or Commuter Rail Transit.

Q: What is the timeframe estimated for completion of Step 2?
A: The team is estimating approximately two years.

Q: Can you provide us with an example of the creation of a new regional entity?
A: At the last meeting, we discussed the Bay Area Transit Authority (BATA). BATA was empowered to manage a program of projects and control toll rates on the various bridges to provide the necessary revenues.

Q: Are we going to see the Financial Study? Is there an executive summary or interim report?
A: The Preliminary Alternatives Review will be posted on our website by next Monday.

Q: Will Merrill Lynch be precluded from participating in the issuance of any bonds associated with the project?
A: Per contractual agreement, Merrill Lynch is precluded from participating in the solutions they recommend.

Q: What is the yearly annual revenue from the Tappan Zee Bridge itself and the Thruway as a whole?
A: The Tappan Zee Bridge alone provides approximately $130 million per year in revenues.

Q: I attended a meeting at the Rockland County Legislature, where a representative from the New York State Comptroller’s office spoke. Does the project team have a response to the message that issuing future debt will be a problem?
A: The message offered by the Comptroller’s office was ‘if you’re talking about issuing more debt, you need to generate more revenues. The representative also acknowledged the team’s efforts in trying to identify where additional revenues would come from. The project team recognized early on that
whatever solutions may be offered cannot take away from other existing financial needs identified by the NYSDOT, MTA and NYSTA. The team also recognized early in the project the need for specialized expertise in major project funding, which led to the selection of the team that is presently performing the finance study.

C: If you regionalize tolling, there will be additional wear and tear and increased maintenance costs to a new Tappan Zee Bridge (e.g., truck drivers currently use the Newburgh-Beacon Bridge because it is cheaper).

C: The methodology and metrics we use to try to predict savings as a result of private sector involvement—and whether there is going to be savings at all—are very important as we move forward.

A: Absolutely. The project team needs to thoroughly explore shifting risk to the private sector.

C: The Metropolitan Commuter Transportation Mobility Tax (MCTMT) should be recognized as a regional revenue source that currently exists and that could be augmented.

A: Agreed. This will be further discussed in the Preliminary Alternatives Review.

Q: Have you looked at financial models outside of the United States?

A: We haven’t taken an in-depth look at other countries yet, primarily because financing is very different outside of the United States. We have asked our consultants to provide us with examples of systematic tolling abroad.

The meeting ended at 7:40 p.m.