

CONFIDENTIAL
LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2014

Bill Number: H.872 Name of Bill: An act relating to the State's Transportation Program and miscellaneous changes to the State's transportation laws

Agency/ Dept: F and M Author of Bill Review: Jason Aronowitz

Date of Bill Review: 4/30/2014 Status of Bill: (check one):

☐ Upon Introduction ☐ As passed by 1st body ☒ As passed by both bodies

Recommended Position:

☒ Support ☐ Oppose ☐ Remain Neutral ☐ Support with modifications identified in #8 below

Analysis of Bill

1. Summary of bill and issue it addresses. *Describe what the bill is intended to accomplish and why.*

See AOT bill review for section-by section analysis. The bill includes changes requested by the Administration to accommodate the increase in the Transportation Fund (TF) and the decrease in the Transportation Infrastructure Bond (TIB) Fund due to changes from the July consensus forecast to the January consensus forecast.

2. Is there a need for this bill? *Please explain why or why not.*

3. What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?

This bill makes effective use of available funds to support the Governor's recommended transportation program. For FY 2015, no new bonding was needed to fully utilize AOT's capacity for infrastructure improvements.

Some good news in Sec. 9: This new competitive grant rail project for continuous welded rail from Leicester to New Haven is the last continuously welded section needed to reach Burlington. Remaining work to achieve the Burlington goal is 13 gated crossings, three station platforms and one new siding.

4. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for other departments in state government, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?

5. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others, and what is likely to be their perspective on it? *(for example, public, municipalities, organizations, business, regulated entities, etc)*

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to laura.gray@state.vt.us and jessica.mishaan@state.vt.us

In general, this is not a controversial bill. The House version included \$84,089 directed from the TF increase to a specific bike-ped project, the Cross Vermont Trail Bridge project (Montpelier – Berlin STP CVRT(2)). There was a Floor Amendment on the Senate debate (sponsored by Sens. Pollina, Cummings and Doyle), which generated considerable debate – lots of support for bike-ped projects, and a defense by the Sen. Transportation Committee (Sens. Mazza, Kitchel and Westman, in particular) for the Senate version. The defense centered around supporting AOT’s process for prioritization, and the inequity of enabling a particular project to “jump the line” through political efforts at the last minute. There was a motion for a roll call, which was withdrawn at the end of the debate. The motion was defeated, overwhelmingly, by voice vote. We appreciate Sens. Mazza, Kitchel and Westman’s effort to enforce the integrity of the AOT project prioritization process.

6. Other Stakeholders:

6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why?

6.2 Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why?

7. Rationale for recommendation: *Justify recommendation stated above.*

This bill substantially follows Administration recommendations.

8. Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill: *Not meant to rewrite bill, but rather, an opportunity to identify simple modifications that would change recommended position.*

Secretary/Commissioner has reviewed this document: _____ **Date:** _____