

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
Board Meeting Transcripts
September 22, 2016

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Okay, at this point the Board Meeting of Port Authority of New York and New Jersey and its subsidiaries is called to order. Earlier today, the Committee on Operations and Capital Planning, Execution and Asset Management met in public session as you've just heard. The Committees on Security, Finance, the World Trade Center Redevelopment Subcommittee and the Nominating Committee met in executive session and their reports will be filed with the official minutes of today's meetings. The Commissioners also met in executive session this morning to discuss matters involving ongoing negotiations or reviews of contracts or proposals, or matters related to the purchase, sale, or lease of real property, where disclosure would affect the value thereof or the public interest. Matters involving public safety or law enforcement and matters in which the release of information could impair a right to receive funds from the United States or other grantor, and finally, to discuss and act upon matters related to proposed, pending, or current litigation or judicial or administrative proceedings. I would now call, as is our custom, for a moment of silence in remembrance of the 15th anniversary of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and those who lost their lives on that terrible day, which included 84 friends and colleagues from the Port Authority, as well as those who perished in the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center. Thank you. Our next order of business is the election of officers, in accordance with the By-Laws of the Port Authority, the Nominating Committee met in executive session prior to today's meeting in connection with the election of General Counsel. Commissioner Steiner as Chair of the Nominating Committee will now give his report.

[Comm. D. Steiner] Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, on behalf of the Nominating Committee of the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey... Excuse me. On behalf of the Nominating Committee of the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, I report that at its meeting held earlier today in accordance with the visions of Article VII of the By-Laws, the Committee by unanimous actions submits the nomination of Michael Farbiarz for election to the office of General Counsel of the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. Michael began his service on September 6, 2016.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Would you like a motion to make that formal?

[Comm. D. Steiner] Could I?

[Board Chair J. Degnan] It has to be somebody, neither Steve nor I. >> I move, Mr. Chairman. >> So moved. >> Second.

[Comm. D. Steiner] All those in favor. >> Aye. >> Aye.

[Comm. D. Steiner] Motion is carried.

[Comm. D. Steiner] That concludes my report.

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Do we need a roll call on that? No. Okay, good. Thank you, Dave.

[Comm. S. Rechler] Michael.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] I want to welcome Michael Farbiarz happily. And in a coincidence, Michael was well-known to me and to Steve Cohen. And we were delighted that he was willing to entertain the possibility coming to the Port Authority. We are indebted to Judge Holwell for his service as acting General Counsel for the last few months, couple of months longer than I promised him he would have to stay. And the Port Authority is in his debt. Michael welcome aboard. You've come to the agency at a critical time with a background both in law enforcement and otherwise that's superbly suited to the current needs of the Port Authority. We look forward to working with you. I'm now going to proceed to... Yes, Pat, as Executive Director to give his report.

[Exec. Dir. P. Foye] Thank you, Chairman. Members of the public, Commissioners, colleagues, I wanted to cover two items today. First, JetBlue and AirMall which I understand and know is of interest to many in the room, and second, a brief report on the act of shooters, plural, security scare at JFK in mid-August. With respect to JetBlue's recently announced selection of AirMall as its proposed concessions developer at terminal five at JFK, a number of members of the public, over the last several months including many members of UNITE HERE have spoken at our Board Meetings, expressing concerns about AirMall including with respect to its relationship with organized labor. I'd like to note a few things. First, under the Port Authority's lease with JetBlue, this proposed selection requires the consent of the Port Authority to the management agreement with AirMall. Second, we have not yet received a formal request for consent from JetBlue and will not make any decision until we have met again with JetBlue and with representatives of UNITE HERE and completed our review. Our existing policy outlines that agreements with concessionaires must include provisions for labor harmony. I'll note that's unlike other jurisdictions around the nation which do not require labor harmony provisions. I have spoken with the CEO of JetBlue and the aviation staff has had a number of conversations and meetings with staff at JetBlue all regarding the selection of AirMall. And our teams will be meeting in the coming weeks so that the Port Authority can understand the basis of the selection and the business plan, including plans with respect to labor. I do note that JetBlue has been an important tenant and partner of the Port Authority, having invested hundreds of millions of dollars, actually well over a billion, in our airports over the last several years. And we have always had an open and great dialogue with them on issues of importance to both of us. Lastly, our staff has also been in touch with UNITE HERE and UNITE HERE has sent us and members of the Board several letters outlining their concerns. So I just wanted to acknowledge prior to the public speaker program today that we've all received and read and listened to the concerns that you all have outlined in those letters. And I expect that we will begin meeting with the leadership of UNITE HERE in the near future. We have traded calls with the President of the Local this morning and a meeting is in the process of being scheduled. Second, I wanted to briefly say a few words on the act of shooters, plural, security scare at JFK in mid-August. As very recent events have reminded us, vigilance on a security issue continues to be of utmost importance. I want the public to know that I, the Chief Security Officer, the entire Board of Commissioners on the Security Committee led by Commissioner Schuber have been focused on reviewing the

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

incident and our response to it and lessons learned, including obviously, given the security-sensitive nature of this, much of this review has been conducted in confidential executive session. We are also continuing to work closely in cooperation with our law enforcement partners in the region, including New York State, the NYPD, which responded rapidly and at substantial numbers that night together with the PAPD that evening at JFK, and federal agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security in reviewing the incident and lessons learned. We're also in the process of engaging an outside consultant to assist in that review. We've been in communication with the leadership at LAX who experienced a similar incident just over a week later on sharing lessons learned. As I commented publicly shortly following the incident, I believe that the response with the PAPD, our security personnel, and mutual aid law enforcement was timely and tactically sound. I'll note that Tom Belfiore, the Chief Security Officer, John Bilich, the Deputy Chief Security Officer, and Ed Cetnar, Deputy Superintendent of the Port Authority Police along with leadership of the Port Authority police at all levels, including the JFK command, was on sight that evening. The Port Authority police demonstrated again that evening their professionalism and the benefits and the trainings and drills including active shooter full-scale exercises that are done regularly, including the drills that are done on a weekly basis at JFK to respond to active shooter scenarios like this. I also acknowledge that we have lessons to learn in terms of communication, especially with the traveling public in situations like this. As the incident at JFK and the similar scare at LAX in August days later have illustrated for us the power of social media in this day and age has made communication and accurate information flow in these situations more dynamic, fluid, and frankly more challenging. Nevertheless, as recent events have reminded us, I'd like to emphasize that the incident at JFK was ultimately and fortunately a false alarm with no shots fired and fortunately no one seriously injured. I do want to point out that the men and women of the PAPD and NYPD who ran down airport concourses that night with weapons drawn were doing so based on multiple reports from members of the public to the Port Authority police and to 911 that there were active shooters in two or three terminals at JFK, that's uncommon heroism. We have lessons to learn certainly and just wanted to note for the public that we're in the process of doing so and we'll be reporting back to the Security Committee, the Board, and the public. Thank you, Chairman.

[Comm. W.P. Schuber] On behalf of the Security Committee, I just wanted to thank and concur with Director Foye's report and with Tom Belfiore's report that was given particularly to myself after the incident as well as today's meeting. And to thank them publicly for keeping us posted directly on that night, which I think was a Sunday night, on a regular basis as to what was happening. I want to also echo the comments that Director Foye has made with regard to our staff and what they did that particular night and the fact that we are very proud of what they did. Thank God the incident was not a real incident at that time and there are some things that we are going to learn from that. And I think the importance of the collegial meetings are going to take place with LAX and JFK are going to be extremely important for us. But again, Pat, thank you very, very much. Tom, thank you very much and your team.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thank you, at this point in the meeting, we provide an opportunity for members of the public to comment on Port Authority matters. There are 21 scheduled speakers. We're gonna ask our speakers, and we'll give some leeway to public officials who were elected to represent more than one person to limit their remarks to three minutes. And we'll start with Senator Loretta Weinberg from New Jersey.

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

[Hon. L. Weinberg] Thank you and good afternoon, Commissioners. I was happy to see, if I made a point of personal privilege to see your senior staff who made reports today to see the diversity in your senior staff that I often comment is not quite represented here, so... Forgive me, I always have to make a little point about that. And also, my colleague from New York Senator arrived with his helmet, which I told him he did not need here. I have three subjects I'd like to cover with you, three very different subjects. And the first is I was glad to hear about the in-depth discussion about traffic around LaGuardia Airport. And the first issue I would like to bring up to you is about a town I represent Leonia, New Jersey, which is a town of approximately 9,000 residents with a 17-member police department contiguous to Fort Lee and contiguous to all those entrances and exits to and from the bridge. They have been experiencing tremendous traffic problems over the last few weeks, more so than usual. I know Commissioner Schuber is very familiar with the community and with the geography. We did have one meeting with senior staff of the Port Authority. And I would really like to put this on your agenda as some way to help this small town that's stuck in the middle of the big Overpeck Park and Fort Lee and the George Washington Bridge to get some relief or some little help from the Port Authority on the particularly bad days. So that's really the first subject. And the second, I know, by the red shirts in this room, has a large audience here, these hardworking men and women around the frontlines, they keep airplanes and airports clean and safe, they transport disabled passengers in wheel chairs, and they perform a variety of other jobs that help keep Newark Airport moving and thriving. And I was in and out of the airport very recently and I can attest to all of that personally. But they can't feed their families because they earn so little money. Because wages are low, turnover is high. A living wage will help airline contractors to keep and attract experienced airport workers. And certainly, that's what we all want collectively. A living wage will also help lift thousands of airport workers and their families out of poverty. And this is the time to right that wrong. I cannot understand how we can have a disparity between the New York Airport workers and the New Jersey Airport workers. You are a regional Board of Commissioners. I know some of you might have sympathy for the workers. But if you have sympathy for them, if you believe this in your heart, if you believe that it is moral, then please vote yes today to increase this into a living wage. My last issue also unrelated is about the bus terminal. First of all, I'd like to thank the Port Authority and senior staff who took the time to brief all of us on the results of the first design competition, I guess, it was called. And I suppose collectively many of us were kind of underwhelmed. But we also understand that senior staff will be looking at these in-depth and picking and choosing perhaps different elements from each of these. And we were also heartened, I know, with our New York partners to see that most of them did not require eminent domain in order to build what we know is a necessity. But the briefings also enabled us to again communicate with our New York counterparts. And I know that beside the state legislators who were here, the District Director for Congressman Jerry Nadler is also sitting here and we have already agreed that we will meet, we have a common interest along with all of you into providing the best transportation system for the people in the tri-state area here, and that's what we will do together. So thank you for enabling us to have the atmosphere to reach out to each other. We will do that and I think we will find we have more of a common interest than we do disparate interests. So you have my pledge on behalf of the elected official constituency that I represent along with Senator Tom Kean who is on the other side of the aisle that we will continue doing that. So thank you.

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thank you, Senator. Senator Hoylman. Senator Brad Hoylman.

[Hon. R. Gottfried] We decided to do it all together.

[Hon. B. Hoylman] Speed it up.

[Hon. R. Gottfried] Group effort.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] So, so, assemblyman or Senator, maybe you could introduce or would you like me to. This is...

[Hon. R. Gottfried] I can do that. I'm Assembly Member Richard Gottfried. With me is State Senator Brad Hoylman and Rob Gottheimer representing Congressman Nadler. We are speaking on behalf of the local elected officials whose districts include are about the Port Authority Bus Terminal, Congressman Nadler, Borough President Brewer, Senator Hoylman, New York Assembly Member Linda Rosenthal, and Council Member Johnson. We thank the Port Authority for listening to our concerns about the design competition which lack the transparency and public process that is a hallmark of our planning efforts in Manhattan. We appreciate restarting the process. Earlier this week, we joined Port Authority officials and our New Jersey colleagues, in publicly stating our common purpose and grounds for moving forward. We need a new West Side Bus Terminal and the planning for that new terminal will include a robust public process and analysis that considers rational planning principles, environmental impact, and transportation issues. The process will include federal, state, and environmental review and regulatory processes with extensive public and stakeholder input such as regular meetings with city and state officials and local partners, which the Port Authority expects to begin shortly, as well as public meetings in the future. Only after sensible public policy decisions are settled should there be a design chosen. This week's agreement helps pave the way. Those of us who represent Manhattan have never questioned the need for a new Port Authority Bus Terminal. The current one is in bad shape, does not meet current commuter volume, and will not be able to handle the anticipated future growth in volume, and it is a significant eyesore, nor have we questioned the utility of a replacement facility in Manhattan. However, we have not agreed that any future terminal in Manhattan should be the end of any discussion of alternatives nor did we agree that there is no need for any other facilities in coordination with the growth in rail or river capacity. What is true and what we all agree on is that in order to comply with federal regulations and a project of this scope and size will undoubtedly require federal funding, all alternatives or scenarios must be considered in way against each other in terms of environmental, social, economic, and neighborhood impacts. It is premature to say something is off the table when we don't have all the facts. We appreciate that the Port Authority will now study additional and temporary facilities in both states as recommended by the Trans-Hudson Commuter study released today, September 22, 2016. This makes common sense and planning sense. The study represents a solid baseline from which we can begin a new and set up a public process that is informed by the fact of commuters and residents' experiences with the current terminal and transit system. This process will be sensitive to neighborhood concerns while remaining focused on the need for a 21st century bus terminal that is well-designed, contextual with and respectful of its surroundings, incorporates advances in technology, is complementary to other forms of transit service, and ultimately improves access to the region's central business district. As

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

representatives of the community, it is particularly important to us to reiterate our strong opposition to any plan that requires the destruction of non-Port Authority residential, commercial, religious, historic, or non-profit buildings in the Hell's Kitchen neighborhood. Decades ago, the Port Authority took vast amounts of property in Hell's Kitchen. We are determined to protect our community from being further diminished. We believe that the Port Authority, while not pre-judging the outcome, hears and understands our concern. We look forward to working with the Port Authority, the two states, our city, and other local governments and elected officials and communities on both sides of the Hudson, as this important project goes forward. Thank you.

[Hon. B. Hoylman] Thank you, Mr. Chairman. State Senator Brad Hoylman. I join my colleague, and both from Congressman Nadler's office and of course my Assembly Member Dick Gottfried, to thank you, to thank you, Mr. Chair and Mr. Vice-Chair and your entire Board for restarting this process. It is so important that we hear from our local communities, it is so important that we consider the panoply of exciting transportation projects that are planned for the Westside, including the new Bus Terminal. And I think through a reset as you have indicated you'll do, we will engage in that process. I want to also note speaking of both sides of the river that it's important that we work together with our New Jersey colleagues, both in government and at the grass roots level. So I'm excited that the idea is that we'll have planning sessions involving local communities on both sides of the river, so any opportunity to spend more time with Senator Weinberg, I welcome, so...

[Hon. B. Hoylman] Yes. You're welcome to do that. Speaking of both sides of the river, the second point I wanted to bring up, which you did hear from Senator Weinberg is the \$15 wage for Newark Airport workers. I strongly believe and I know some of them like Rick Gottfried and Congressman Nadler agree that a standardized wage for all Port Authority workers is essential. The Newark Airport workers do the same job as their colleagues in New York. They do it at the same level of quality with the same level of expertise, and there is no reason why they should be treated as second class workers in the process. And I'll just add that we have seen through this discussion of the Port Authority Bus Terminal that in many respects, the river is an artificial dividing line, the cost of living on both sides of the Hudson are extraordinary. And what it takes to feed a family in New Jersey is equivalent to what it takes to feed a family in New York and the wage should be the same. So I hope you, Mr. Chairman, will be voting on that today. Thank you very much.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Robert Gottheimer is Chief of Staff for Congressman Nadler.

[Robert Gottheimer] Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. I'll be very brief because it has basically been said, but I wanted to thank the Port Authority, and thank Senator Weinberg and our colleagues in New Jersey. I think the agreement that we had last Friday, you know, I'm speaking on behalf of the Congressman, he is in Washington and he couldn't be here today, he would have otherwise. But it's a new beginning and the press likes to make that this is about New York versus New Jersey elected officials that sells papers. But the reality is we are both fighting for our constituency and we both have the same goals. We want a new bus terminal, our residents or our constituents deserve it on both sides. And by working together here and beginning this process again, we can redo the Bus Terminal and provide a much more

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

comfortable, not an eyesore for both our constituents, and at the same time, have a planning process that's respectful of federal law or state law, where we look at all alternatives and come with a plan that works for both sides of the river. So I thank you, I thank you for meeting with all of us and working together. And I know together that we can come with a plan that works for both states, not something that's gonna sell newspapers. Unfortunately, for the papers, I know papers aren't doing too well today, but it's good for us and the region. And I just want to reiterate what Senator Weinberg and Senator Hoylman said, the Congressmen very support a \$15 minimum wage. We've been very supportive at LaGuardia and at JFK prior to come into the meeting, I didn't know that was on the agenda. But it has been on record very much of supporting a living wage. There's no difference with somebody living in New Jersey and working in New Jersey as working in New York. This is the same metropolitan region with the same financial constraints all families have. They deserve to have a living wage, they can bring up their families here in a point of pride. And they do an important job of cleaning and protecting our airports. Newark is very similar to JFK and LaGuardia, so I urge you to support that. Thank you very much.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thank you.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Brad, is Councilman Johnson here or he is on...

[Brad Hoylman] No, he is not.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Okay, great. Thanks. Reverend Ronald Tuff.

[Reverend Ronald Tuff] Good afternoon. My name is Reverend Ronald Tuff and I am the pastor at First Bethel Baptist Church, located in Irvington, New Jersey. Most of you know my face by now because this is my third or fourth time testifying. But I have testified at previous meetings here and I have rallied and marched at meetings. And numerous times, because I'm a man of faith and I believe in the airport workers, and I believe in speaking against injustice, and when people who work hard for a living aren't able to make a living, that's injustice. It's an injustice that airlines are making record profits but airport workers are not. It's an injustice that airlines are making profits, and again I say, the airport workers are not. And they are making poverty wages, and I again say, poverty wages. And if you don't live up to your promise to raise wages for the Newark Airport workers, the injustice and hardships that poverty breeds will continue to hurt the workers and their families. Let me say that again, the injustice and the hardship that poverty breeds will continue to hurt the workers and their families. You know well that these airport workers are on the frontlines and they're often to first to respond to an emergency, the terror attack in Brussels where several airport workers were credited with helping to save lives. It is a reminder of the critical role that play in keeping airports and passengers safe. Tell me, would you want to put your life on the line for \$10.10 an hour? And since higher wages, reduced turnover at airports, wouldn't you want to do everything you can to help retain the most experienced and reliable workers? So here's your chance, raise the wages, again I say, raise the wages. Vote yes for priority, vote yes for \$15, vote yes for \$15. Vote yes for safer airports and a better life for airport workers. That concludes my report. Thank you.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Murray Bodin, Murray Bodin, Murray.

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

[Murray Bodin] I'd like to speak at the end of the meeting.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Louis Heimlock... Heimbach. I apologize.

[Louis Heimbach] Good afternoon, Chairman Degnan and honorable members of the Commission. I am the Chairman of the Stewart Airport Commission. And I'm with Paul Quartararo who is the Vice-Chairman. I last addressed you in May of this year, talking about the advantages of Stewart Airport and I was prepared to make some more arguments about that. But I think the folks from LaGuardia made a much better argument for me than I could have made myself. One of the things I left out of that proposal to you was finding an alternative for several million people who use LaGuardia. And I suggest to you that Stewart Airport is that place to do that. We have far better physical facilities, no parking problems, no access problems, at the intersection of Interstate 84 and 87, 12,000-foot runway that you folks paid to have resurfaced a few years ago. And I think it would not only help the situation of LaGuardia but make it much more convenient for folks in the Hudson Valley to have air service and not endure the problems at LaGuardia, which probably will not be solved even after the construction is completed as I kind of summarize from the statements that were made. This is a long-term solution, no cost to you, because you already own the place, all the facilities are there, and I suggest to you that we would be happy to work with you to make that happen and have your senior staff talk about that and make those adjustments to alleviate some of the congestion. Thank you for listening to me.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thank you. Nancy Velazquez.

[Nancy Velazquez] Good afternoon, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. This is one company, right, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. We do the same work in all three airports, JFK, LaGuardia, and Newark Liberty International Airport. I am appalled by the Board's decision to postpone this vote for the last two years, to postpone the wage, the wage lift at Newark Liberty International Airport, JFK, and LaGuardia. We all do the same work, we all go work day in and day out and give our lives to this job. We make profitable, profitable means for you guys, we clean and give you a safe environment, we are the backbone in the economy of the airport, the engine that keeps the facility moving and driving. But it's clear that you guys don't hear because you postponed it for two years. This is modern day slavery for us. It's an injustice. And it's not fair and it needs to stop. And it needs to stop today. You can lift our lives out of poverty at Newark Liberty International Airport by voting yes for \$15 an hour for all three airports who do all the same work. I want to address Chairman Commissioner John Degnan, Commissioners, Laufenberg, Steiner, Schuber, and Pocino who's on vacation, one day hopefully you would understand that you're only as strong as your weakest link. And whatever hurts my brother hurts me, whatever helps my brother helps me. And what do you think postponing this or not voting yes would do to the state of New Jersey and our morals. There is not justice and there will be no peace if there's not a vote for yes for New Jersey. One union, one fight. Let's go, gentlemen. Thank you.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Sharlene Davis. Sharlene Davis. She's not here. Richard Hughes. She's here, I'm sorry. I apologize, Richard.

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

[Sharlene Davis] Good morning, everyone.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Good morning... Afternoon.

[Sharlene Davis] My name is Sharlene Davis and I work for HMSHost in JFK Terminal 5 at Starbucks. I worked in the airport for over three years. HMSHost is contracted by JetBlue that operates several stores in the terminal, including Starbucks. I value my job at JFK. It's a good union job that provides decent wages, benefits, and job security. It would be devastating for me and my family if I were to lose it. I'm concerned because JetBlue selected AirMall for the Terminal 5 concessions program. Excuse me. When companies change, workers are at risk of losing their jobs. AirMall has not committed to requiring its substance to keep our jobs at Terminal 5, if it's chosen. The Port Authority still has the power to reject JetBlue's selection. My coworkers and I have told you at the past six Board Meetings that AirMall is the wrong choice for JFK. Please listen to us and reject AirMall. That's all for today.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thank you. Richard Hughes.

[Richard Hughes] Good afternoon, Commissioners. I've been coming to these meetings for longer than I want to remember. And for at least two years, I've seen these good folks show up at these meetings and I don't know why they're still here because this should have been resolved two years ago. You know that most of the people in the area support what they want. We think it's only just and right. What I don't understand is why we're still waiting two years later for them to get the justice they deserve. It's a very simple thing that you have to do, very easy, it's almost one cent. You just have to say that all airport workers will be paid at least a living wage. That's all you have to do. That's all the Port Authority has to do is pay us a rate or a rule or a regulation or resolution or whatever you want to call it that all workers at Port Authority facilities will be paid at least a living wage, that's all. So why doesn't it happen? You're going to have to answer that at some point. And I think, I hope you'll come up with a right answer. That's my first point. My second point is on the Bus Terminal. As a former resident of Hell's Kitchen, I know if you're going to try to build a new bus terminal in the current location, you're going to be faced with very daunting challenges, not the least of which is congestion and pollution and expense. So I'm going to float a little idea which I'll hope you'll at least think about and that is that you build the terminal at the end of 42nd Street over the Hudson River or at the end of 34th Street over the Hudson River. There, you don't have any problem with congestion, you don't have any problems with pollution, and it's much less expensive. And you may be able to keep the Bus Terminal at 42nd Street and renovate it for less usage. And it will save a lot of money, you have the 7 train going in the Hudson yards, which would take care of 34 Street, you can run shuttle buses back and forth on 42nd Street between 8th and 9th and the river, and you'll have something that will, I think, solve your problems. The final thing I'd like to say is you still don't have a CEO. After all this time we keep hearing about it, you haven't picked anybody. I suspect it's because you can't find anybody or the people you want don't really want to accept the job. I think you ought to consider Pat Foye for the job. I don't know Pat personally, I've never spoken to him. I've had my differences with him but I've observed him over the years. I think he would be an excellent choice. You can't go without a captain of the ship. You're sailing without a captain. Let's get a captain and get going forward on these things. Thank you.

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

[Board Chair J. Degnan] David Gale, David Gale in the audience?

[David Gale] Yes sir.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Neile Weissman, you're next.

[David Gale] Good afternoon. My name is David Gale. I've been a security officer with Summit Security for 10 years, working at Terminal 5 JetBlue, JFK. I want to read you something from the Port Authority website in June of 2014. "The Port Authority is currently developing a plan for the development of enhanced wages and benefits, including health benefits for covered workers and will publicly release such a plan no later than September 2014." What happened? Nothing. How did you promise to give us both higher wages and benefits in 2014, and two years later, you present us with these two insufficient options. I am a New York Airport worker and even I know that option B is absolutely unacceptable. New Jersey workers are employed by the same contractors as we are. They do the same exact work that we do in New York. For them to be paid so much less makes no sense. Is New Jersey less valuable than New York? No. And New Jersey Airport workers are not second class citizens. Do you know what two years of poverty wages augment? Do you know what continuing this practice means to them? Actually, I know you know because you put out a report about it. But our lives are not words on a piece of paper. Our lives on both sides of the river are stronger and hard work, work we do for you. Do you know what two years of no benefits means? It means my coworkers and I have not received appropriate amount of training, emergency preparedness training is something I know you care about. When the shooting scare started at JFK Airport, security officers like me and other airport workers didn't have the training they needed to assist passengers. Some airport workers who were there during the shooting scare are here today and I would like to acknowledge them. This is clearly not enough we need higher wages that will make these jobs... Okay, time is up. Thank you.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Neile Weissman.

[Neile Weissman] Chairman Degnan, Director Foye, Commissioners, you have copies of extended remarks also online at CompleteGeorge.org Capacity and Demand. Earlier this year, you shared traffic counts for the George Washington Bridge with select groups who support your restoration plans. They reported 524 cyclists and 309 pedestrians cross the bridge each day in 2015, but that's a fraction of the 1,700 cyclists and 900 pedestrians that you reported in 2014. And at odds with hand counts I took this past summer of 5 to 600 uses per hour. On further examination, it appears you omitted west bound trips from your 2015 totals but included winter months when the paths were closed for extended periods. However, a series of bike counts with the GWB for 2014, 2015 was performed by New York City Department of Transportation and in a manner consistent with 30 years of reporting on its East River bridges, making comparisons possible. Some highlights, peak use on the East River bridges is weekdays, whereas peak on the GWB is weekends. But for the six-month survey, the GWB was the number three most biked bridge in New York on a daily basis, 3,700 trips per day, that's a head of the Queensboro and the Brooklyn. And then October 2014, the GWB was number one with 5,100 daily trips. Between 2010 and 2015, bike travel across the George grew faster than any East River bridge at 10.4% per year. If that growth sustains through 2024, the GWB will exceed 9,000 bike trips per day,

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

raising the George to number 2, ahead of the Williamsburg. And their proposed improvements to the Brooklyn reduce overflow onto the Manhattan, the George could slip into the number one spot. But at seven feet, it will by far have the narrowest path. The Port Authority asserts that it is meeting its responsibility to the region with its current plan but that's not supported by a plain reading of federal guidance or an authoritative outside assessment by New York City DOT showing bike travel across the bridge at seven times what you reported, or that a 130 organizations, businesses and communities now included Edgewater, Englewood Cliffs and Fort Lee are calling on you to widen the paths. The PA has stated that it's willing to consider widening them at some point but won't say when or under what circumstances. Meantime, the low cost opportunity afforded by the re-cabling is slipping away. Thank you.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thank you. Jocelyn Andrews

[Jocelyn Andrews] Hello, good afternoon. My name is Jocelyn Andrews and I work at Starbucks JFK Terminal 5. I work at Starbucks JFK Terminal 5. I've been working for JFK for one year and I'm a member of UNITE HERE Local 100, a union for food services. We saw and flighted catering workers at JFK, La Guardia, and Newark Airport. Over the past eight months, my coworkers and I have told Port Authority not to approve AirMall for Terminal 5 concession program. A few weeks ago, JetBlue selected AirMall for Terminal 5. AirMall hasn't committed to keeping the Terminal 5 workers. If they win, this business, our jobs could be at risk. This is a really important issue for us. We rely on our jobs at the airport to support ourselves and our families. The airport still holds the power... Sorry. The Port Authority still holds the power to reject selection. The Port should respect JFK workers and their jobs and reject AirMall for Terminal 5. Thank you.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Margaret Donovan. Margaret Donovan, are you here?

[Margaret Donovan] Yes.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Great.

[Margaret Donovan] Good afternoon, gentlemen. As you know this agency has one purpose above all others to act in the public's interest. And even though there are many signs that this is a new Port Authority, you can't pick and choose when you will behave like one. The current Bridgegate scandal is focusing attention on how the public interest was abused, but the traffic jam at Fort Lee pales in consequence to the original Bridgegate scandal that took place when you raised the tolls on August 5th, 2011. That was the day we filed the Freedom of Information request that was just decided in the public's favor on August 30th. We filed the original request because it was only right that before you asked everyone who crosses the Hudson to pay for the World Trade Center, the least you could do is give the public a full account of what Silverstein has put into it and what he has taken out of it. Why the mystery? Why did you fight so hard to block disclosure of that information? What business does this agency have to enter into agreements that the public may finance but not see? Judge Schecter's August 30th decision in our favor in New York Supreme Court found that, "Respondents failed to provide any rational basis for denying access of the records requested to Donovan. Thus, the determination must be deemed arbitrary and capricious." She also found that "The Port Authority's contention that disclosure of

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

the material requested could impair the competitive offers for leasing, etcetera, is speculative and unsupported by any evidentiary documentation." She pointed out that, "Respondents provided," underlined, "no evidence and made no showing to support the applicability of the cited exemption." Finally, she did not find respondents reliance on quoted confidentiality provisions availing. This decision referred to the agency pre-FOI, your code pre-FOI. Now that you're entering into more and more public-private partnerships, you should make sure that the public's partners know that you have very narrow authority under FOI to enter in confidentiality agreements. And you could be sure that this was just the first of our challenges to the ones that exist because if a New York Supreme Court Justice did not find your claims credible, why should anyone else? I resent the fact that I had to put so much time and effort, years of time and effort, into fighting for something that has been the public's business all along. Why would the new Port Authority fight so hard to block access to decisions made by the old Port Authority? I think if you continue to obstruct the release of documents that belong in the public domain, you will lose again and again and the public will win the respect it has always deserved. Thank you.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Emma Quail. Emma Quail.

[Emma Quail] Hi, Commissioners. My name is Emma Quail. As you know, I'm with the airport group from UNITE HERE. I'd like to firstly just thank Director Pat Foye for acknowledging the situation with AirMall and Jet Blue at JFK Terminal 5. We're glad that you received out letter demanding transparency in Port Authority contracting decisions. This issue remains urgent for JFK workers. As you know, a few weeks ago, JetBlue announced its selection of AirMall for the Terminal 5 concessions program. JetBlue made this decision despite the fact that, for over eight months, JFK concession workers including Terminal 5 workers have been raising concerns regarding AirMall both at the JetBlue headquarters and at six consecutive Port Authority Board Meetings. We have reminded the Port Authority and JetBlue numerous times that there are four other companies that bit on this concessions program, all leaders in the industry. It would be shameful of the Port Authority to approve the one and only company that workers have opposed for the past eight months. To ignore the voices of the people who will be directly impacted by this decision sends a clear message that private companies take precedence over workers' voices in the Port Authority's decision making process. JFK is a public airport, the Port Authority is a public agency. The Port Authority commits itself to the, "Highest standards of accountability and transparency." "One of the few ways that the Port Authority does that is through holding these public comment sessions at the Port Authority Board Meetings." To ignore what the public and what JFK airport workers say during these public sessions would be an offense to that commitment and a breach of public trust. We ask you to reject AirMall for this program. Thanks.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thank you. Michael Carey.

[chanting] >> Say no to AirMall! Say no to AirMall! Say no to AirMall! Say no to AirMall!

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Michael Carey. Mr. Carey, speak now or waive your turn. Consider it waived. Arthur Piccolo.

[Arthur Piccolo] Commissioners, since I last spoke here in your most recent meeting in July in favor of the Alexander Hamilton transit hub, there has been a significant development as you

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

know. The transit center is now fully operational and Westfield shopping mall opened late in August. What it has done is highlight the fact that the magnificent \$4 billion Santiago Calatrava designed structure is in need for a meaning and a purposeful image as more than a very expensive shopping mall, that this iconic building was not built just to satisfy the needs as a shopping arcade. The building clearly addresses that function but it is not enough. When you walk into the building, the only name you now see attached to it at each entrance and in big letters is Westfield. Logically, anyone coming there might well assume the name is Westfield Transit Center. That is not an appropriate way for this very expensive, impressive, and notable public building. It demands a name that reflects its higher purpose. I have made the case over and over again at the last five monthly Port Authority Meetings and I'm here to do so again. And I'm certainly not alone in expressing this view. The architectural critic of the New York Times David Dunlap said as much and put it very well in the Times on September 5th, 2016 in a story titled "A shopping mall at Ground Zero, uninformed by its sacred land." The structure is viewed as just a shopping mall by those who visit it. This rings hollow. It mocks the value of an iconic public building. Westfield did not build the new transit center. They paid the Port Authority a large fee for the right to place retail stores within. They did not purchase the name of the building. It should not and must not be known as the Westfield Mall, which logically brings me to the very successful businessman Ronald O. Perelman. You at the Port Authority, Port Authority Commissioners certainly have no objection to the fact that the new public performing arts center will be known as the Ronald O. Perelman Performing Arts Center. Mr. Perelman is a generous individual and his \$75 million donation will cover a fraction of the cost of the building and its operations. At the same time, the country and the economy in which Mr. Perelman has successfully prospered to become a billionaire many times over is built on the foundation created by Alexander Hamilton as the first Secretary of the Treasury working in New York and in New Jersey. This important moment offers us all a very rare opportunity to commemorate Alexander Hamilton, lately acknowledged as the second most important founding father after Washington, an architect of the tremendous financial success we have enjoyed as a nation. Ronald Perelman is contributing 75 million to the new arts center. The value of what Alexander Hamilton did for our nation and for New York and New Jersey can be measured in the trillions. It will just take a one sentence symbolic resolution in your part when you go into private session, the transit center at the World Trade Center will formally be known as the Alexander Hamilton Transit Hub. Thank you.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thank you. Saeed Bacchus. Mr. Bacchus. Not here. Alison Kreideweis. Is she here?

[Alison Kreideweis] Hello. My name is Alison Kreideweis. And I'm the co-founder and Head Coach of the Empire Tri Club, New York City's premier triathlon club and coaching organization. Additionally, I'm a member of the U.S. National Team for the sport of triathlon and I just returned from racing in the world championships last weekend. Empire Tri Club coaches approximately 1,000 endurance athletics each year. The GWB is one of the New York City's most frequented cycling routes for competitive and recreational athletes as well as for commuters. There are no recreational facilities in New York City that are not shared with pedestrians. The only way to get quality training in is to ride over the George Washington Bridge. The bridge is essential to my organization and the entire triathlon and cycling community. The sport of triathlon has seen exponential growth for the last 20 years. During that

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

time, USA Triathlon membership has quadrupled. In just the last seven years, the number of USAT sanctioned events has tripled. In 2000, triathlon was introduced as an Olympic sport. And just last month, the US took home the gold medal on the Olympics for the US, increasing its visibility to the public. Triathlon is no longer viewed as a fringe sport, it's a mainstream sport. Youth triathlons are on the rise and triathlons are now on the list as one of the top emerging NCAA sports at the collegiate level. As triathlon grows in popularity, the number of athletes who utilize the most frequented training ground in New York City will sky rocket. On weekends, 3,700 cyclists cross the bridge a day. It ranks third for heaviest pedestrian and bike traffic in New York City, and with the increase in bridge traffic, it will simply not be safe or even possible for a cyclist to ride across the bridge if improvements are not made. Many will be forced to walk. Have you ever tried walking a mile in cycling shoes? And I have brought mine with the cleats on the bottom to demonstrate and I'm happy to pass them around. A recent study by USA Triathlon shows that triathletes come from a high socioeconomic background, pay their taxes, and contribute to our economy. Many of the athletes I train are doctors, lawyers, work in finance, etcetera, the list goes on, they work hard, they play hard, they deserve a first class facility. It's a quality of life issue. The city wants to attract these people. Major cities around the country are promoting their cycling infrastructure to attract this demographic and if New York City does not do the same, we will lose them. Our infrastructure must be up to national standards to support the growth of the sport. Without places to train, people will look elsewhere to live. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak and taking the time to hear our concerns.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thank you. Alfonso Shlomo. Is that individual here? If not, Murray, you're last. Murray Bodin.

[Murray Bodin] My name is Murray Bodin. My presentation today will be in the form of report on traffic conditions at LaGuardia Airport. I've been involved with traffic engineering for the last 20 years. If you Google me, you'll find everything I have done. I'm one of three people who designed the dotted line segment that separates the left turn lane and the right turn lane. After the fiasco at LaGuardia, I went out and I looked at it. I spent an hour there. And I will tell you some of the things that should have been done and haven't been done. Where in front of the Delta Terminal, traffic was moved across a neutral area, the lines for the neutral area were never obliterated. There was never repaving to make it smooth, an example of traffic control at the Tappan Zee, when they took the toll booths out, they paved it and put correct lines in so the traffic could move smoothly. This was not done at LaGuardia. The sign going out for four lanes points the arrows down. They moved the lanes, they don't match up. Tuesday, I was in Binghamton to have lunch with my grandson, just started there, the signs on the highway are pointed up, tell you which lanes to be in. There is a sign there that says, "Road Closed," behind the barricade. Why is it there? Because nobody ever removed it. The people working there are active. They want to do a good job. The lines that your traffic engineers. Oh, we've got these traffic engineers that they've given us the..." They're completely wrong. The line on the left should be yellow. The line on the right should be white. Many years ago, I went out to JFK and I pointed out, Luke's here, he's going to do a little presentation a little later, has my pictures on his computers from 10 years ago, the lines are still wrong. The people that you've hired for traffic engineers are incompetent. They are causing you a fortune in bad publicity and bad traffic. It's your responsibility. When I was going up to Binghamton, I listened to John Stumpf, the chairman of Wells Fargo saying, "Well, I didn't know, I didn't know, I didn't know." If he didn't

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

know for five years that they were creating two million fake accounts, well, this Board now knows that the traffic engineering that you've presented today, that are doing your airports, needs to be replaced. And if you don't, I understand what I'm doing, I follow your rules. Your rules said, we request.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] No, we require...

[Murray Bodin] I'm not finished.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Murray, we require three minutes three minutes. You can go ahead and wrap up.

[Murray Bodin] I'm not required, I'm requested. I follow the rules correctly.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] The rules are three minutes. Everybody else complied. Please wind up.

[Murray Bodin] And that's one of the problems going on. Is it important to change...

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Could you tell us that in 10 seconds because otherwise you're out of here?

[Murray Bodin] Something that's been wrong for years or not. These people have been saying you're not paying attention. The publicity, what's going on in the country today, you're not paying attention. These people want you to pay attention. I want you to pay attention. There have been mistakes made and it's time to change them now.

[Murray Bodin] Thank you. Thank you.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Okay, thank you. As most of the people in the audience know, Commissioner Pocino has acted as chair of the Board Working Group on a Minimum Wage Policy. He is not on vacation. He is working but away from the state today. In his absence, he has asked Vice-Chairman Cohen who is in that working group to deliver the recommendation of the group. And I'm going to turn it over to him at this point, Steve.

[Board V. Chair S. Cohen] Thank you. Thank you, Chairman Degnan, for the opportunity to update the Board and the public on this particular matter. As you may recall, pursuant to the Board Working Group's recommendation, InterVISTAS Consulting was retained to assist in determining the impact of potential wage increases at the Port Authority's airports. And a draft of their report was released publicly following the Port Authority's July Board Meeting. I believe that report made available on the website and that it has now been out for almost two months. At that time, a commitment was made to return, to the Board in September with a recommendation. On behalf of Commissioner Pocino and myself, I am recommending a revision that the Working Group is recommending a revision to the Port Authority's minimum wage policy. The proposed revision would provide for non-trade labor service contract workers of entities doing business at the Port Authority facilities to receive the applicable minimum wage required by the law of the state of New York or New Jersey, provided that where there is a conflict between the laws of the

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

states and/or municipality, the higher of the minimum wage will be adopted by the Port Authority but in no event may the pay be at the rate of less than \$10.10 per hour, the rate pursuant to the policy adopted by the Board in April 2014. To make that a little more understandable, the concept is that the Board is being asked to adopt a policy that would set the minimum wage in all Port facilities, which means regardless of what state they are in at the highest minimum wage level of where any Port facility is. Right now, as I understand it, that means that if this recommendation were adopted, the current minimum wage in New York City would be the minimum wage that would apply to all Port facilities. In the event that the minimum wage were to become higher, for example, in New Jersey, it is that minimum wage that would then be applied. In other words, the objective of this proposal would be to create parity in the wages paid at the facilities. So there would then be for, positions that are under this proposal, the same pay across the board. This is what I am happy to put forth, the proposal is a little more complicated. But in essence, that's what it does. I do note, as others have, that unfortunately Commissioner Pocino is not able to join us. I would note that I don't know how the vote will come out. But in the event that this is voted down, I would note that Commissioner Pocino, if his vote would have mattered can always reintroduce this at a subsequent Board Meeting. That's it.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thanks, Steve. Karen, can you confirm that there are no recusals on this matter?

[K. Eastman] There are no recusals.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Okay, and at this point, I would ask the Commissioners for any comments but I'm gonna take the liberty of making one myself. The resolution that Vice-Chairman Cohen has offered is a fundamental issue for the Port Authority and for me. He is in the Port Authority enabling legislation, no explicit statutory authority for us to implement a minimum wage. There is no statutory guideline. There is no regulation that's been passed that sets standards by which we should decide what is a living wage, how much should it be. I wasn't elected as Chairman of the Port Authority or as a member of this Board to implement social policies that I may believe in or care about. That's the job of the legislature and the governor of the two states. The workers who have testified so convincingly and sincerely and who engender a lot of empathy from me and most of the Board over the last two years are well represented by a very aggressive union. They should be bargaining collectively with their employer, not using politics to secure a mandated imposition by this Board without statutory authorization as non-elected, non-partisan Commissioners. Minimum wages in my mind are an issue to be decided by the elected representatives of the public in the respective states, New Jersey and New York. New York has a law which the Port Authority is obliged to follow in the state of New York. New Jersey has a law which the Port Authority is obliged to follow in the state of New Jersey. I will vote no on this resolution, which would have...

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Which would have the effect of mandating New York's law on workers in the State of New Jersey. And no intimidation factors by a union will convince me to change my vote, notwithstanding their having happened.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Are there any other Commissioners who would like be heard? Okay,

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

Karen, at this point, I'm going to ask you take a roll call of vote. I want it clear to the audience that under the By-Laws of the Port Authority, three affirmative votes from each state are required for a resolution to pass.

[K. Eastman] Yes, in the case today, since there are six New York Commissioners, four votes would be required.

[K. Eastman] Because they have...

[Board Chair J. Degnan] I'm sorry, say that again.

[K. Eastman] Because New York has six Commissioners present, a majority needs to vote affirmatively, which we'll be four votes for New York.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Okay, so we would need four affirmative votes from the state of New York, we would need three affirmative votes from the state of New Jersey?

[K. Eastman] Correct.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thank you. You want to take the roll?

[K. Eastman] Yes. Chairman Degnan? >> No. Vice-Chairman Cohen? >> Yes. Commissioner Bagger? >> No. Commissioner Fascitelli? >> That was a yes. Oh, I didn't hear, sorry. Commissioner James? >> Yes. Commissioner Laufenberg? >> Yes. Commissioner Lipper? >> Yes. Commissioner Lynford? >> Yes. Commissioner Rechler? >> Yes. Commissioner Schuber? >> No. Commissioner Steiner? >> No.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Would you give us the count for the respective states?

[K. Eastman] There are six affirmatives for New York and two affirmatives for New Jersey.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] The motion having failed to secure the require votes from the State of New Jersey, it fails.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Clarify that.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Actually, Karen, let the record reflect, there was one vote for New Jersey, not two.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thank you. Same result.

[K. Eastman] Thank you. At this point, I want to offer option B as a resolution of the Board. This would require that the Port Authority follow as a matter of policy, the minimum wage law, where the facility located in a state of that particular state. So for Newark, it would be it would be New Jersey minimum wage law, and for New York facilities, it would be the New York minimum wage law as it applies. That motion has been posted with the agenda and has been shared with

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

the members of the Committee. Is there motion to move it so we can consider it?

[Comm. D. Steiner] So moved.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Is there a second? It's been moved and seconded. So are there any comments on this alternative resolution that Commissioners would like to make?

[Comm. S. Rechler] I'm going to vote against this motion because I think that the states laws are the state laws, so it's a little bit ice in the winter time and I'd rather reconvene and deal with the larger issue of trying to get living fair wages for all of the Port Authority facilities.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thank you, Scott. Anybody else? Karen, would you take a roll?

[K. Eastman] Chairman Degnan? >> Yes. Vice-Chairman Cohen? >> No. Commissioner Bagger? >> Yes. Commissioner Fascitelli? >> No. Commissioner James? >> No. Commissioner Laufenberg? >> No. Commissioner Lipper? >> No. Commissioner Lynford? >> No. Commissioner Rechler? >> No. Commissioner Schuber? >> Yes. Commissioner Steiner? >> Yes.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Would you read the votes please?

[K. Eastman] We have four affirmatives for New Jersey and the remaining are no.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] There being only vote in New Jersey, I'm not sure how this can be reconvened. But the decision is made on both resolutions. So let's move on. The Executive Director is now going to review you a proposal for the Port Authority to participate in the redevelopment of the James A. Farley Building at the Moynihan Station Transportation and Commerce Center that would include a commitment of up to a \$150 million dollars by the Port Authority to the Moynihan project.

[Exec. Dir. P. Foye] Thank you, Chairman. Members of the public, Commissioner and colleagues, I would like to present for the Board's consideration, a resolution for a new program authorization for a \$150 million capital contribution by the Port Authority to the Moynihan Station Redevelopment Project at Penn Station. This funding would be subject to three conditions, A, consideration by the Board and Board approval today.

[Moynihan Station: Program Authorization for Funding] B, the closing of the Port Authority's next bond financing expected in October. And C, consideration and Board approval of a possible certification resolution by the Board later this year, expected to occur at the November 17th full Board Meeting. Earlier this year... Thank you.

[Proposed Program Authorization for Funding] Earlier this year at the March Board Meeting,

[Proposed Program Authorization for Funding] we reviewed, the Board reviewed and discussed the history of prior Board authorizations, dating back to the year 2000, which authorized Port Authority contributions to the Moynihan Project. Those year 2000 authorizations were for the

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

Port Authority to enter into a 35-year lease for space at the new Moynihan Station Train Hall for approximately \$10.5 million per year. That lease was never entered into by the Port Authority with Empire State Development Corporation or its subsidiary Moynihan Station Development Corporation. This past March, the Board rescinded the prior year 2000 Board actions, authorizing the Port Authority to lease space at Moynihan and direct its staff to develop proposals for the Port Authority to participate further in the project, which could include a commitment of up to a \$150 million to the project. Under today's proposed Board resolution, the Port Authority would authorize the Moynihan Station Transportation Program in an amount not to exceed a \$150 million. Instead of the lease envisioned in the year 2000, this contribution would be in the form of a capital contribution. The \$150 million would come from amounts in an aggregate of \$250 million already budgeted in the Port Authority's existing 10-year capital plan adopted in early 2014 for New York regional transportation projects. I note that Moynihan Station will provide significant transportation benefits to the entire region. Penn Station today is a dismal home to Amtrak, New Jersey Transit and the Long Island Railroad as well as subway riders. Creating a new train hall at Moynihan will benefit not just Amtrak but New Jersey Transit and Long Island Railroad, which are the largest users by passenger volume in the existing Penn Station. And while Moynihan is not directly part of the Gateway Program that we continue to work on with USDOT, Amtrak, New Jersey Transit and other stakeholders, expanded capacity at Penn Station will compliment and clearly be a direct benefit to the larger Gateway Program and Trans Hudson commuters. I'd also like to note that a legal opinion has been delivered from an outside council as to the Port Authority's statutory authorization to make this capital contribution to the Board program. Lastly, the resolution before the Board today is the authorization of a one-time contribution, capital contribution of a \$150 million to the state of New York and its subsidiary Moynihan Station Development Corporation for the Moynihan Station program, subject to consideration by the Board of a possible certification resolution later this year. Additionally, this resolution does not include any operating support from the Port Authority for this facility. Commissioners, with that I ask that you move forward with this important regional project. Thank you, Chairman.

[K. Eastman] Yes, Commissioner Fascitelli and Commissioner Steiner are recused.

[Comm. D. Steiner] Excuse me. I believe that's in error. I am not recused from this. I did not recuse myself. There is no reason to.

[K. Eastman] You've received a letter on this from General Counsel.

[Comm. D. Steiner] And I think that might be because I own a couple of shares of stock in a railroad.

[K. Eastman] No, this is Moynihan Station.

[Comm. D. Steiner] I didn't receive any letter but I don't think I'm recused. But if it's going to complicate things, I'll abstain.

[K. Eastman] Okay, General Counsel advises that abstaining is appropriate or can be done.

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

[Board Chair J. Degnan] So Commissioner Steiner agrees he should be characterized as recusing himself to this point.

[K. Eastman] Okay.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] So subject to those recusals, do you want to take a roll call of vote? Is there a motion first of all? >> So moved. >> Second. >> Second.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Okay. Any comments? Now we'll take the vote.

[K. Eastman] Chairman Degnan? >> Yes. Vice-Chairman Cohen? >> Yes. Commissioner Bagger? >> Yes. Commissioner Fascitelli? >> Recused. Commissioner James? >> Yes. Commissioner Laufenberg? >> Yes. Commissioner Lipper? >> Yes. Commissioner Lynford? >> Yes. Commissioner Rechler? >> Yes. Commissioner Schuber? >> Yes. Commissioner Steiner? >> Recused.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] As the votes are in order, the motion is passed. At this point, Louis Venech who is our Manager of Regional Transportation Policy is going to update the Board on the results of the study conducted regarding commuter capacity on the Trans-Hudson transportation network. Louis.

[L. Venech] Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Executive Director, Commissioners. This afternoon, I will share the results of Trans-Hudson Commuting Capacity Study you authorized last fall. In the interest of time, I'll trim my comments this afternoon. You authorized this study the same day you called for the Bus Terminal design and deliverability competition. You asked that we assess available strategy

[Board Resolution - Oct. 22, 2015] is to address long-term Trans Hudson demand,

[Board Resolution - Oct. 22, 2015] including the effect of improving other transit services and existing infrastructure, the impact of new technologies on bus operations and commuter choices, and other factors I'll discuss in few minutes. The study focused on the entire west of Hudson transit network rather than the terminal itself, which has been the subject of the other planning work you've heard about in the last year. We retained Parsons Brinckerhoff to support this effort and sought independent input by convening a panel of experts at an early workshop to inform the study. We've shared interim findings on bus operations and related technologies with the D & D panel and the finalist teams for the competition. Taking the 2040 Bus Terminal forecast from the bus master plan effort as a benchmark, we assessed constraints on getting more buses through the Lincoln Tunnel corridor, the potential for diversion... Move one slide behind.

[Study Approach] The potential for diversion of some bus terminal passengers to other Trans Hudson options and trends in commuter behavior that might affect demand in the long-term. Let's start with the system that carries buses to the Lincoln Tunnel and the Bus Terminal. It's critical to recognize that the terminal is not a standalone facility but one element of an integrated Trans Hudson bus system, connected through the tunnel in the 495 corridor shown in this diagram.

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

[Rte. 495-Lincoln Tunnel-PABT System] Every weekday, most buses from the sprawling west of Hudson region come together through a series of merges in the “teardrop” on the left-hand side of this graphic. There, they enter the contra- flow Exclusive Bus Lane, Or XBL for a straight run along 495 separated from other traffic around the curving helix to the toll plaza in the tunnel. Other buses approach the toll plaza in the regular eastbound 495 lanes in mixed traffic. Still others, enter the toll plaza via local streets. They all cross through the tunnel to New York, although not all go to the bus terminal.

[The XBL Today] The XBL is a vital link in the regional transit network. The corridor and tunnel serve more commuters than either, more Trans Hudson commuters, than either PATH or New Jersey Transit Rail Service to Penn Station. As currently operated, the XBL is nearing its peak hour capacity. One concern you have expressed is whether the corridor could process the growth in peak hour bus volumes that are forecast in the Bus Terminal master plan. The study team and PA staff addressed this issue with input from New Jersey Transit. We took a fresh look at each part of the corridor with a special focus on the role of emerging technologies that can safely support more intensive bus operations.

[Upgrading Corridor Operations] We identified strategies that would upgrade the corridor operations in the near and mid-term with benefits well before completion of a new terminal. These include improving merges at the teardrop, applying technologies for more precise dispatching of buses through the tunnel to the right gate at the terminal, using driver assist technologies like lane keeping to safely increase throughput on the XBL and the helix. Looking further ahead, technology experts involved in this study and bus operators foresee significant gains in throughput by phasing in more advanced automated vehicle technologies, eventually using automated features to control spacing and breaking for safety, platooning buses closer together for more capacity in peak periods. This is a promising opportunity, but it's complex. It would take years to implement fully. But the team points out that the corridor is uniquely suited to apply these new technologies through partnerships with operators and other agencies and to attract industry and federal support going forward.

[Potential for Expanded Bus Priority on 495] The team concluded that these strategies alone at the teardrop and on the XBL could provide enough additional throughput at the teardrop and the exclusive bus lane to match the long-term peak hour forecast for the new terminal. However, if technology falls short or other conditions change, another option previously studied would assign one inbound 495 lane for bus priority operation in peak hours to augment the exclusive bus lane operation. Fine tuning traffic flow would be critical to maintain the flow of other traffic for local access and other New York -bound trips. So the team... Next slide.

[Lincoln Tunnel/Toll Plaza Operations] So the team sees solutions for the constraints on the corridor

[Lincoln Tunnel/Toll Plaza Operations] and that brings us to the toll plaza and the tunnel itself. Our facility management and traffic engineers agree that the emerging bus technologies and lane management opportunities can process more buses beyond current volumes. Staff expects to conduct additional analysis next year to dig deeper into that. On the New York side, the existing

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

bus terminal facility limits tunnel throughput. A new facility would relieve that constraint substantially, coupled with attention to local traffic conflicts in the vicinity of the tunnel and the terminal. Similarly, in the evening, a more efficient bus terminal complex would allow a smoother flow out of the tunnel to New Jersey where buses disperse to local streets and along route 495 to several highway segments. And finally, it's essential in considering long-term management of this facility to continue the agency's policy of many years to prioritize bus access to the tunnel during peak commuting hours.

[Transit Options Shape Commuter Choices] The second major focus for this study was to assess options

[Transit Options Shape Commuter Choices] that could reduce long-term demand for bus service to the terminal. That effort starts with understanding what transit options actually are available in different areas of New Jersey, as well as Rockland and Orange Counties. New Jersey Transit Rail, commuter bus, and PATH are the main stays of Trans-Hudson transit. This map shows the concentration of all Trans-Hudson commuters west of the Hudson. And the colors show which modes they use, with rail users in blue, the colors tell the story. Rail service is heavily used where available on West-of-Hudson corridors. Rail and bus systems serve somewhat separate markets. Orange reveals the markets that are mainly dependent on bus service and more than 40% of the commuter bus market to the terminal originates in the residence of Bergen and Hudson counties. And that makes them an important focus for testing alternative services and modes. PATH carries customers who are transferring from trains at Newark and Hoboken or from other modes as well as local residents in Newark and Hudson County, who board the system for a direct trip to Manhattan.

[Bus Service Via Alternative Crossings] With that backdrop, we examined alternative services that might draw off some of the forecast PABT demand, looking closely at current bus commuting patterns. We work with a benchmark number of 860 peak hour buses needed to serve that 2040 forecast in the bus terminal planning to date. We starting with bus services that might use other crossings, including more service to the renovated George Washington Bridge Bus Station through the Holland Tunnel, and perhaps a new far west side loop that would use both tunnels to serve increasing development in that part of Manhattan. If all were successful, the team estimated they might take 40 to 60 buses off the 2040 peak hour forecast, ready use of double-decker and articulated buses also can yield modest reductions in the total number of buses to be processed in the peak hour. But they are not suitable for all routes and most require extra space at terminal gates.

[Diversion to Alternative Transit Modes] The team looked closely at other modes and transit transfer points in New Jersey listed here. Gateway in the 7 Line Extension I'll address in a moment. As for the others, they have important network benefits but limited potential to reduce PABT demand based on what is known now. And there's more details on that in our report. As a group, these improvements either have growth pressures to meet in their own core markets or do not offer advantages that would be likely to draw off many bus terminal commuters.

[Gateway: Expanded NJT Rail Service] As you know, the Gateway Program is a major regional initiative with many components, and it's at an early planning stage. If Gateway allows New

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

Jersey Transit to double peak hour trains Penn Station, as was assumed for the ARC project, it could divert as many as 50 to 60 buses from the PABT demand projected for 2040. Why not more? The bus routes and rail lines do serve somewhat distinct geographic markets, growth in the existing rail markets is expected to absorb most of the additional capacity and the rail network including in Rockland and Orange Counties has corridor and station constraints that limit how much service can be added.

[No. 7 Line to Secaucus w/ Bus Transfer] Then we come to the 7 Line, the one major Trans-Hudson investment that recent analyses suggest could significantly reduce long-term bus terminal demand would be to extend the number 7 subway line to Secaucus Junction to meet a major new bus transfer facility. A recent study paid for by the city administration in 2011 concluded that it could divert more than 20% of long-term demand at the bus terminal. We did not perform new ridership modeling for our commuting capacity study, but the Port Authority and New Jersey Transit both had input into the prior assessment. This concept would redirect many commuter buses to a new bus terminal at Secaucus but connecting them, connecting riders with a rapid transit link that it would have cross-town stops across 42nd Street as well as links to north-south subways and the new station at Hudson Yards. That said, this would be another multi-billion dollar project and it would not obviate the need for a new midtown bus terminal. Also, this concept is not on the MTA's long-term planning agenda.

[Commuting Capacity Study Findings] So the team's major findings. The study affirms regional forecasts that all see strong growth in overall Trans-Hudson commuting demand to 2040 though noting some uncertainties. Taken together, if the other strategies considered in the study were advanced successfully, the team estimated a potential 10% to 20% diversion in the long-term forecast for bus terminal demand. That assumes doubling New Jersey Transit peak hour trains as part of Gateway. It does not include the diversions attributable to an extension of the number 7 line as that's not currently being advanced in the region. However, the team and the expert panel also concluded that there were cross-cutting factors that would tend to sustain demand and erode those diversions from other strategies over time. They include delays in bringing some of the other options into service or their failure to attract commuters who would prefer to come to the bus terminal and use those services. Also, latent demand, the sense that there is unmet demand in the system now and that if the services were improved, then there are additional users who would want use the system and take advantage of improvements in service, and we also see the trend to use new technologies that empower commuters to make connections to transit especially in the suburbs and to have real-time transit choices. So these are things that are being thought that may increase demand beyond what are the official forecasts, looking long-term. And finally, historically, we know that the bus system has proven to have broader reach and flexibility in responding to changes in the market, new development, growth in jobs and so forth. It's a relatively affordable way for the region to add service where there is a need for additional capacity. So the recommendations. The key recommendations from the study team were, first, to recognize that the bus terminal is part of an integrated system. The report recommends that the Port Authority and partners work to improve the performance of the Lincoln Tunnel corridor to meet growing demand in the years immediately ahead and to make the changes that would be needed to support an increased capacity of bus operations in a new terminal. The team also recommended developing more bus staging and storage capacity as a near-term strategy and concluded that with the use of bus dispatching technologies, it would be possible to site some of

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

that capacity in New Jersey. So there would be some staging and storage in both states. Second, that the agency should seek concepts for a new bus terminal that could be built out to serve the 2040 forecast if the need at that level developed and that this should be a goal in the formal planning process that lies ahead for the Bus Terminal project. And third, the team recommends pursuing demand management strategies that were identified in the study. So next steps, we're reviewing these findings with partner agencies

[Next Steps] and stakeholders in both states. We need to reach out to bus operators in the city of New York to identify initial pilot trials of those alternative bus routes. We're watching progress on related transit initiatives. We should develop a strategy that report recommends with our partners to start exploring those bus technology opportunities that will take time to develop, and test, and implement. And finally, to reach out to others to discuss next steps in promoting the concept of flexible work schedules, one of the things mentioned in the Board resolution, we did some initial research and surveying that suggests that there is some real potential there over time to get a wider adoption of that and help flatten the peak of the peak which would be helpful to the MTA's system as well. So this has been an effort, a strong consultant team effort, great support from many people and the Port Authority staff in different departments. And we appreciate the opportunity and the insightful request by the Board to start digging into these issues, which is more beginning than an end in addressing some of these concepts and possibilities. Thank you.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thanks, Louis, for an excellent presentation, I apologize for having... I had to walk out on part of it to make a personal call, but I very much appreciate the work you and your staff have done on this. This is not an uncomplicated set of alternatives to evaluate. It will significantly contribute to the discussion that we'll be having over the next several months with local community groups and the jury, evaluating the design concepts and the local political officials, and commuters, and neighborhood residents. So it's an important contribution to the ongoing discussion of the bus terminal and how, where, and at what size it should be located. I've one question to ask. And if you answered this, simply tell me that, and I just want to be sure the point isn't lost and that I'm correct in assuming it. While some of the alternative Trans-Hudson modalities that you looked at, for example, the extension of the 7 Line, which when I last checked, had no political support in the city or the state of New York, certainly no financial funding. But if those were accomplished and they theoretically had a beneficial impact on commuter use of buses into Manhattan, I believe the report speculated that that might be offset by increased demand of commuters coming into the city with this enhanced capability to cross the Hudson. So it's not a necessary conclusion that improving other Trans-Hudson crossings would significantly diminished utilization of the bus terminal. Is that fair to say? Correct me if I have misstated it.

[L. Venech] No it speaks to the latent demand issue, which we see in New Jersey Transit would and private carriers would add more service to the bus terminal now if they were the capacity, New Jersey Transit would add train service to Penn Station. So the projections are based on the baseline of use now. So we already know that there's some unmet demand, if you will. But all of the Trans-Hudson options are in this together. PATH is under capacity pressure, the rail system certainly, as well as the bus network. So the concept of trying to develop a range of strategies that are nimble, that can speak to people in different markets, that give people more choice, that

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

anticipates what's happening with new technologies that empower commuters. We need more eggs in basket, we need to consider a lot of different options, and of course, there are a lot of uncertainties, funding and approvals and so on and so forth. And you can't make people do what they don't want to do. So trying to develop strategies that give people affordable and effective options for their commute is the name of the game and the better the menu we can lay out there with our partners, the more effective we're likely to be in all of these, in all of the components of what we and our partners do.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Okay, well, thank you. Rich?

[Comm. R. Bagger] I just want to echo, Chairman, what you are saying. This is really impressive work. And it is, you know, great to see the Port Authority's leadership in planning for Trans-Hudson commutation and thinking about this holistically in terms of the new bus terminal design, the optimization of the tunnels and the bus throughput on the tunnels that, the work that is being done on the Gateway Tunnel Project here, the capital programs we have for PATH and how that will help increase capacity and optimize PATH, thinking about the connectivity of the ferry network to all of this. This is, you know, the role that this agency should be playing and it is, at the end of the very long meeting, and it's great to see this work being discussed here today.

[L. Venech] If I may, it's a fulfillment of your role that you ask for it in conjunction with the bus terminal planning. And I think we like to think it's in our DNA to look at these issue this way.

[Comm. S. Rechler] Good job. There's a couple of... Just, you know, as you go forward, I encourage you to stay very focused and up to date on new technologies and what are the models are happening around the world. I mean, this is a very dynamic area right now, whether it's self-driving vehicles and how that impacts, or platooning of busses into almost train-like settings. And so this is gonna be dynamic and fluid, and so a lot of the work that you've done may have been applicable a year ago, two years ago, may not be applicable two to five years from now. And I think just trying to stay abreast of all that and try to forecast the impacts of that is gonna be very important. Particularly, with the amount of infrastructure that's gonna be needed and coordination with the other agencies to be able to able to handle increased capacity demands on the tunnel and getting to the tunnel.

[L. Venech] A key point and I just underscore that the team stressed and PA folks agree, these things won't happen by themselves, implementing this new technology is gonna take time. Procurement, intuitional technological coordination issues, time and money, and the team recommended that that effort start now as we have been discussing internally, so.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thanks.

[Comm. S. Rechler] There's one more point. Just, I think, one other point, when you're out there looking at technologies, it maybe, you may come across things that actually would enhance the experience in your current bus terminal while we're going to this process because you already have, you know, in our last program, we find ways to enhance it. And to the extent that you're out there and you see things that help logistics with buses or other information items, you know, that can be implemented in the interim, and it's a great way to test it and a great way to enhance

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

the experience of the customers too. So I urge you to consider that as well.

[L. Venech] Thank you. It's another point that stressed in the report.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thanks, Lou. Any other questions?

[L. Venech] Thank you.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Okay, appreciate it. I'm gonna reverse the order here a little a bit because I'm beginning to worry about losing Commissioners who would necessary for a vote. So I'm gonna defer this SPIO report until the last item on the agenda and then you will realize you're standing between Commissioners leaving. And while I hate to give short trip to such an important thing, we'll do our best and condense it. So let's move on to the item that was discussed in Committee earlier today authorizing a lease with East Coast Warehouse and Distribution Corp for the building in the Port Authority Marine Terminal for an aggregate rental \$29.5 million. Any recusals? Any comments or questions? Is there a motion to approve that? >> So moved. >> Second. Any opposition? That's passed. Additional item that requires a vote is an agreement with Conrail under which the Port Authority would maintain Port Authority owned real assets at Port Newark and the Elizabeth Port Authority Marine Terminal in accordance with the Federal Railroad Administration's requirements for a 40-year term. Karen, are there any recusals?

[K. Eastman] Sorry. No, no recusals.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Any comments or question? Is there motion? >> So moved.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Second? >> Second.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Any opposition? Do we need... We don't need roll call votes on these, do we?

[K. Eastman] We generally do, but...

[Board Chair J. Degnan] All right. Well, let's do it then.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] On both those resolutions, let's do a roll call of vote. The latest too.

[K. Eastman] Okay, Chairman Degnan? >> Yes. >> Vice-Chairman Cohen? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Bagger? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Fascitelli? >>Yes. >> Commissioner James? >>Yeah. >> Commissioner Laufenberg? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Lipper? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Rechler? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Schuber? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Steiner? >> Yes.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thank you. The votes are in order for both.

[K. Eastman] Yes, and we had one item at the very beginning that we passed over.

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Both resolutions are passed? Okay, on behalf of the Committee on Operations, I'll now submit an item that authorizes agreements with PSE&G to construct, operate, maintain, and repair a new high-voltage underground electric power transmission cable station at Port Newark. Any recusals?

[K. Eastman] No.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Any questions or comments? Is there motion? >> So moved. >> Second.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Roll call of vote.

[K. Eastman] Chairman Degnan? >> Yes. >> Vice-Chairman Cohen? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Bagger? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Fascitelli? >> Yes. >> Commissioner James? >> Yeah. >> Commissioner Laufenberg? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Lipper? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Rechler? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Schuber? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Steiner? >> Yes.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Rich, you were scheduled to give a report of the Finance Committee as the last item on the agenda. Do you want to do that now?

[Comm. R. Bagger] Yeah, sure. Are you ready for that?

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Yeah.

[Comm. R. Bagger] As the Chair of the Finance Committee, I wish to propose for consideration a resolution authorizing the purchase of liability insurance coverage for all facilities of the Port Authority and its component units. This is a vote of the Finance Committee only the Board has delegated the authority to the Committee for this. So I'd ask if there are any recusals on the Committee.

[K. Eastman] There are no recusals on the Committee.

[Comm. R. Bagger] Can I have a motion from the member of the Committee? >> So moved. >> Second. It's been moved and seconded.

[Comm. R. Bagger] Any discussion?

[Board Chair J. Degnan] If not, Committee only vote?

[K. Eastman] Yes.

[Comm. R. Bagger] So if not, can we have a roll call of the Committee?

[K. Eastman] Commissioner Bagger? >> Yes. >> Commissioner James? >> Yeah. >> Commissioner Lipper? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Schuber? >> Yes.

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

[Comm. R. Bagger] That item is approved.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Scott, do you have an item?

[Comm. S. Rechler] I have actually four items.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Four.

[Comm. S. Rechler] Sorry about that.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] That's all right.

[Comm. S. Rechler] The first item authorizes \$7 million in planning for the replacement of fire alarms systems at Port Authority maintained buildings at the JFK International Airport. Before asking for a motion, is there any recusals, Karen?

[K. Eastman] No recusals on the fire alarm.

[Comm. S. Rechler] All right, do any Commissioners have any questions or can I have a motion?
>> So moved. >> Second.

[Comm. S. Rechler] Can we do roll call vote please.

[K. Eastman] Chairman Degnan? >> Yes. >> Vice-Chairman Cohen? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Bagger? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Fascitelli? >> Yes. >> Commissioner James? >> Yeah. >> Commissioner Laufenberg? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Lipper? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Rechler? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Schuber? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Steiner? >> Yes.

[Comm. S. Rechler] Okay, we have the votes and the item is passed. The next item authorizes a \$9.1 million project to replace and elevate a pump house substation and associated electrical work in order to enhance storm resilience at LaGuardia Airport. Any recusals that we need to have, Karen?

[K. Eastman] No recusals on the substation. >> So moved.

[Comm. S. Rechler] Okay, no questions. We have a moved.

[Comm. S. Rechler] Can I have a second? >> Second.

[Comm. S. Rechler] Okay, can we have a roll call vote?

[K. Eastman] Chairman Degnan? >> Yes. >> Vice-Chairman Cohen? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Bagger? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Fascitelli? >> Yes. >> Commissioner James? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Laufenberg? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Lipper? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Rechler? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Schuber? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Steiner? >> Yes.

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

[Comm. S. Rechler] Okay, the votes in order. The item is approved. The next item which also was discussed in Committee earlier today authorizes a \$400 million project to replace infrastructure in the PATH rail system tunnels between the Exchange Place Station and the World Trade Center Station in order to address the latent damage resulting from Hurricane Sandy. Any recusals related this matter?

[K. Eastman] No recusals.

[Comm. S. Rechler] Okay. Any comments or motion? >> So moved. >> Second, okay. Can we have a roll call of vote, Karen?

[K. Eastman] Chairman Degnan? >> Yes. >> Vice-Chairman Cohen? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Bagger? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Fascitelli? >> Yes. >> Commissioner James? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Laufenberg? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Lipper? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Rechler? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Schuber? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Steiner? >> Yes.

[Comm. S. Rechler] Okay, we have the votes in order. The motion passes. And my last item is to authorize a \$32.7 million project, to strengthen approximately nine acres of open area including associate subsurface work at the Howland Hook Marine Terminal which is severely damaged as a result of Hurricane Sandy. Any recusals on this matter, Karen?

[K. Eastman] No.

[Comm. S. Rechler] Okay, any comments or questions or have a motion? >> So moved.

[Comm. S. Rechler] Second.

[K. Eastman] Chairman Degnan? >> Yes. >> Vice-Chairman Cohen? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Bagger? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Fascitelli? >> Yes. >> Commissioner James? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Laufenberg? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Lipper? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Rechler? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Schuber? >> Yes.

[K. Eastman] Commissioner Steiner?

[Comm. D. Steiner] No.

[Comm. S. Rechler] Okay, the motions are in order. And with that no from Commissioner Steiner, a bold no. So it has passed. The item is passed.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] You handed me something, which I don't know what it is.

[K. Eastman] That was one of the items in your package that we need to vote on.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] This is one of the items on which we need to roll call vote?

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

[K. Eastman] Yes.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] And the item is the World Trade... What Committee does it come on?

[K. Eastman] That would be Operations.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Under the Operations Committee?

[K. Eastman] Yes.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] All right, we need a motion and a vote on the World Trade Center and other major capital projects. Well, I don't have anything for this.

[K. Eastman] No. It's the 80 Pine Street. Yeah.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] We're gonna suspend this until next meeting.

[Comm. D. Steiner] Oh, it's a lease... It's a lease for the facility.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Thank you, Dave. I appreciate that.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] The next item authorizes... I apologize for this by taking things out of order, I apparently confused... This is a sub-lease with Transatlantic Reinsurance Company at 80 Pine Street for one floor of office space that we would take to accommodate our World Trade Center construction and major capital projects staffed at an approximate five-year term at a total aggregate rental about \$8.2 million. Are there any recusals?

[K. Eastman] No.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Is there a motion on this? >> Yes. >> Second.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] Moved and seconded. Would you take the roll call vote?

[K. Eastman] Chairman Degnan? >> Yes. >> Vice-Chairman Cohen? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Bagger? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Fascitelli? >> Yes. >> Commissioner James? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Laufenberg? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Lipper? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Rechler? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Schuber? >> Yes. >> Commissioner Steiner? >> Yes.

[Board Chair J. Degnan] I take this next step with considerable regret but a lot of gratitude. We have scheduled today a Special Panel Implementation Office report which was going to summarize some incredibly hard and capable work done by literally dozens if not hundreds of Port Authority staff to consider implementation of the various recommendations of the Special Panel Report that Scott and I worked on in December 2014. It's not the first meeting I've put this off at, but I'm reading the body language of my fellow Commissioners and I think they're exhausted. I know I am. It deserves our respect, time, and attention. And Nicole Crifo headed up that office has volunteered to put it off until probably the October Meeting. So thank you,

(Board Meeting 9/22/16)

Nicole, for that. And for those of you who were here to make that presentation today, I apologize, but you're probably better off. Are there any other matters we need to discuss today? With that, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you.