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MR. SINCLAIR: The Congestion Buster Task Force was created pursuant to Section 13 of the New Jersey Public Laws of 2000, Chapter 73. Official notice of this public hearing was made by the Department of Transportation in the following manner: A general press release dated April the 8th 2002, legal notice was published on April the 17th, 2002 in the Newark Star Ledger the Atlantic City Press, the Times of Trenton and the Courier News. Informational postings on the Department's Internet web site and individual notice mailed to various elected public officials, municipal officials, county officials, transportation entities and other interested parties, and lots of notice went out from the different organizations represented on this committee's constituencies.

The proceedings of this public hearing are considered open public records and all the records pertaining to this hearing may be examined during normal business hours at the Department of Transportation headquarters by appointment. And I also should say that this particular task force has published all of its pertinent information on-line on the Department
of Transportation web site at Congestion Busters
and has been open to public comment through
e-mail process right from the beginning since
last July when we first did this.

It's my pleasure to introduce
Assemblymen DeCroce who created this, this is his
idea.

MR. DECROCE: Thank you, very much
Jim, I appreciate that. I appreciate the fact
that you are allowing me to come before your
group to talk a little bit about this issue.

The fact of the matter is that New
Jersey is a great place to live and people do
like to come into the State of New Jersey and
live here. They bring their corporations here.
The reasoning being we have great schools despite
the fact we are always criticized about our
schools, we have good highways, good mass
transportation programs. And frankly, most of
the major companies that you and I know or deal
with one way or another are probably
headquartered here in the State of New Jersey,
despite the fact that we are sometimes criticized
by the New York press and sometimes the
Philadelphia press, but at the same time those
same people want to live here in the State of New Jersey. There are those in the State of New Jersey that might criticize our insurance rates, but if you lived in New York or Philadelphia you would be happy to live in the State of New Jersey. So when I hear that stuff it kind of bothers me, but I also understand why it's being done. It always seems to me that a more efficient use of our highways particularly at peak hours would probably be good for everyone.

We created the Congestion Buster Task Force within the 1999 transportation fund renewal to bring transportation people and the private sector together. Apparently we are doing that today. The Task Force was empowered to develop and implement strategies to attract more commuters to mass transit and encourage use of car pools, telecommuting, to minimize peak hour congestions. In addition, the Congestion Buster Task Force provides a voice for business to assure that the strategies and incentives are business friendly.

We researched the use of technology and better planning to solve congestion problems as well. We know that traffic congestion is not
necessarily limited to New Jersey. The Texas Transportation Institute puts the cost of congestion in the nation at $78 billion, which is of value -- is the value of delay and excessive fuel consumption. In New Jersey alone a 2000 New Jersey Alliance For Action study reported the figure to be $5 billion in the state as the cost of lost time, fuel consumption and additional vehicle operating costs on an annual basis. This breaks down to an average annual cost of congestion at about $880 per licensed driver.

I want to take a moment to thank all the members of the Task Force for taking this year to help make New Jersey a better place to live and work. The Congestion Busters Task Force members are all volunteers. Special thanks to you Jim for chairing this committee. Jim is vice president, as you know, of NJ BIA and has no problem tackling jobs certainly with energy, curiosity and determination to make sure a good report is workable. Thank you.

MR. SINCLAIR: Thank you, very much.

Steve Carrellas, you've been here all day, why don't you come forward and testify.
MR. CARRELLAS: Steve Carrellas, the New Jersey chapter coordinator for the National Motorists Association. I've been doing this for almost 15 years, I've seen a lot in motorist issues and transportation and I'm a registered professional engineer, so it's like I kind of even the field.

I'd like to say our organization has helped bust congestion over time with our drive to set speed limits to more proper levels and to remove the HOV lanes that weren't quite doing what they were supposed to be doing on a couple of our New Jersey interstate highways. Smoothing the flow of traffic is always helpful in the battle against congestion.

I'd like to thank the Task Force for scheduling today's meeting and I guess I learned earlier it wasn't a coincidence. I was here this morning as part of the Regional Transportation Advisory Group working with NJTPA on the subject of congestion, looking at strategies from I guess the very process, methodological, data driven sort of need. So that work has been on my mind and I think I kind of put together some things that kind of meet the charter you have. That was
one of the things -- I think a lot of folks doing
the detail work were wondering, well, we know why
the Congestion Buster Task Force was created but
it's like how does it fit in with this other
methodological work being done by NJTPA. And
I'll talk more about that in a second.

First, nice job with the web site.
In terms of being -- I mean organization, being
able to find things, the amount of material
that's there. I want to be able keep an eye on
what's going on, so very well done.

MR. SINCLAIR: Thank you.

MR. CARRELLAS: Since these meetings
aren't geared for the public, allowing the use of
e-mail comments was an excellent idea. And I can
give you a few others in the remaining time that
you're soliciting them.

Can you imagine if you run some
radio ads with the traffic reports; so after they
read the traffic report and they hear about
congestion they say, And this traffic report was
brought to you by the Congestion Buster Task
Force, give your comments on what you don't like
by congestion by mailing -- nothing like a
captive audience. And then you can also have ads
or links on traffic web sites and an easy one,
even a more visible link on the DOT home page. I
mean certainly there's the link in the column for
finding Congestion Busters, but --

MR. SINCLAIR: You have to look.

MR. CARRELLAS: But a Comment Here
If You Don't Like Congestion or something like
that.

Back to the question of what the
Task Force is doing given the work by NJTPA. I
won't give you all the results of kind of my
thinking about it, but I tell you it was well
summed up by Jim in his open letter on seeking
new ideas to cut traffic congestion and I think
he really put things in perspective. I want to
highlight from it.

I think tieing together the
practical aspects for maybe identifying ten
workable projects that could relieve congestion
or help to do it and doing it within a year is
definitely contrasted with what NJTPA is doing.
I got more impressed toward the bottom, Using
governmental policies to shape human behavior,
however, does not always work in real life, and
referencing the ETR program. Develop doable
proposals, remembering that if the public doesn't want to take the bus to work, car pool or live in cities, those solutions aren't going to do anything. Reflecting the real world of business and employment; I know NJTPA is trying to do that on a longer-term scale. And innovative solutions that are fiscally sensible and politically doable; that's what I remind the NJTPA about too.

With that said, along the lines of fiscally sensible, to me that means ideally a solution that won't cost government much, if anything. And if we can accomplish multiple things with a particular solution, all the better. And you know, thinking about what you all can do, it might be a good idea to address things that are generally considered outside or on the edge of traditional transportation solutions; we have lots of people to do that and they tend to think that. And of course there's taking advantage, riding the wave of some current trends. So picking up on a few of the current Task Force recommendations and some of our own, here's NMA's recommendations.

Starting from the Demand Management recommendations; teleworking. First, using the
word teleworking means that you're really with it, because that's kind of the new way of looking at it. This is probably the biggest bang for the buck and the most doable. I have a reference here; a George Mason University study found that for every one -- every one percent reduction -- every one percent of the regional work force teleworks, there is a three percent reduction of traffic congestion. Telework also benefits both employers and -- employees and employers. According to the International Telework Association & Council, telework results in increased productivity and worker retention. And AT&T is referenced, it has 25 percent of its work force on a regular basis, has found fewer people taking sick leave, better work retention, higher productivity and so on. And actually --

MR. SINCLAIR: Do you have that study or can you cite where we can get that study?

MR. CARRELLAS: George Washington (sic) University. Last year and I think -- probably 2001. I was following up on the Friday morning effect on what they were experiencing around the beltway. And Congressman
Frank Wolf of Virginia, a big proponent of telework, he is also working with the Software Productivity Consortium which is down in Virginia on real studies for bringing the technology to bear even more so than what we've got today to kind of make that work.

I referenced AT&T. There's actually published information they put out, what it meant for them. It reduced real estate costs, increased productivity; it accounts for all this stuff. They were estimating savings of about 150 million in 2000. And in terms of the environment, 2000 alone they say employees avoided commuting 110 million miles, translating that to a savings of 5.1 million gallons of gas, for a reduction of almost 50,000 tons of carbon dioxide from exhaust emissions.

MR. SINCLAIR: This is AT&T?

MR. CARRELLAS: AT&T talking about 2000.

MR. SINCLAIR: One of the things -- let me just interject here.

MR. CARRELLAS: Sure.

MR. SINCLAIR: We'll keep it free flowing.
We desperately want to support teleworking as a strategy, but I particularly and several other people on the committee are uncomfortable with doing that without having really good data to back it up. And as much as we love AT&T here in New Jersey, they are suspect because they're in the business. And what I'm looking for is longitudinal studies that can convince employers that by supporting teleworking, it is a good business thing to do. That in terms of productivity it -- there is a payoff for the employer. And that that payoff continues beyond the first -- the honeymoon period. And so, I'm looking for that.

And I say this in every forum, that I'm looking for the study that I can take back to the business community and say wow, this is good, and this shows the point. But we are like junkies here, we are desperate to support this because it makes so much sense to get people out of their cars; this is a real trip that you get out of the morning rush hour. But we don't want to do just lip service. We don't want to go to the legislature and say the Task Force loves teleworking, because unless we can convince my
boss that it's a good idea and I haven't yet, we're not getting anywhere.

MR. CARRELLAS: The good thing about it, this can be a very ride-the-wave sort of thing. People are doing it. They are seeing their own benefits. They get the double benefit of -- good for the employee as well -- is to be able to manage their hectic life by being able to be in the home environment. It's one of those -- what makes it real interesting is it's not a transportation solution. It certainly impacts demand, yet in most cases, because there are exceptions, everybody wins. And it's only going to get easier to do and more accessible as time goes on.

MR. SINCLAIR: Everybody wins if the employer, the person who is paying the paychecks, thinks they are going to win too. As an employee we all can see how it would be really nifty if I can stay home one day a week and do all the work that I can't get done in the office because it's not conducive to work.

MR. REDEKER: You mean the interruptions?

MR. SINCLAIR: Yes.
and again, it doesn't necessarily require legislation; maybe incentives to do it. It's more like what's in it for the --

MR. SINCLAIR: I think you're right. I think you hit on it. The beauty is it doesn't require legislation, what it requires is convincing. Not to belabor this, but I reach out to you and your association if you have definitive data out there to bring to us that we can use and cite. We will look at your study that you cited, the George Mason.

MR. CARRELLAS: I really tried to focus not how well it works in terms of productivity, but what it actually saves in terms of congestion. I think I also referenced the trade group, International Telework Association & Council. It's like -- there's another source of gathering information. It's kind of one of things lying around. It's really going to mushroom. Maybe it will solve the problem you are talking about in the right time frame.

MR. SINCLAIR: Tom, could you reach out to that organization and you know what it is you are looking for?
MR. THATCHER: Yes.

MR. SINCLAIR: Cause that's what we are supposed to do here, we are supposed to be looking at national things and drawing them in.

MR. CARRELLAS: I'll continue.

Let's see. Here is another one. Let's talk about auto insurance discounts. You're on the right track, but I think you need a better way to get a clear motorist benefit. Our organization had a recommendation since the early '90s, since we've been involved from the beginning of insurance reform, and it's called per mile pricing. It solves a bunch of problems. I won't get into all of them, it's out of scope with what we are doing here, but based on the premise that exposure is the greatest risk indicator and current exposure measures provide little difference.

For example, let's say everything being equal, two people, everything the same; one drives 15,000 miles a year, the other one 30,000 miles and the same insurance carrier, the difference in their bills for a year could be $50 despite even when they talk about different rate classes, less than three miles, you know. Think
about it too, if in the course of a year I pay
let's say a thousand dollars for one car and
someone else drives 30,000 miles; it takes the
first person when that person gets 30,000, they
paid $3,000 over two years. And as much as we
want to talk about a bunch of interesting things,
it's really exposure to being out there that's a
big indicator.

So what we've proposed to actually
implement that -- it's not something that's new
from an understanding point of view in the
insurance industry -- is as a starting point you
take the current components today, liability,
PIP, collision -- not comprehensive necessarily
cause that's not necessarily mileage and that
kind of exposure related -- and you just convert
them. You change what you are doing, instead of
a dollar per year that you see on your schedule,
but cents per mile and then what you actually pay
is based on how much driving you do in the scheme
of prepay up to that point -- there's different
ways you can do that.

The benefit side is you can really
understand what it's costing you in terms of
insurance as opposed to the discount you're
supposedly getting for doing this, that and the
other thing. So when you actually car pool,
share that with someone else, you can calculate
from the beginning I'm going to save this many
miles and I'm going to save this much money. It
turns out to be more money than your ever going
to realize in the kind of discounts we tend to
talk about.

And you know, even the person with
the train car, it can be expensive to have that
car to take to the train station under the
current system. But if I'm going to drive it 500
miles in a year, it's very inexpensive to have it
mainly for that purpose. And that can be a
motivation for a lot of them to get them to get
to transit -- because you need other cars for the
other purposes -- then you're really helping
someone make a decision. Again, this is not
necessarily costing the government money to do.

Let's see, some other things. No
free parking. We can support things like Parking
Cash Out and Transit Check, we won't support free
parking. Talking about bicycle mode, just a word
of warning --

MR. SINCLAIR: Do we say no free
parking?

MR. CARRELLAS: Well, it depends what version. It's all mentioned in the form.

MR. SINCLAIR: Actually we do, we say that is one of the Big Brother kind of things, the tools that we have, including limiting your right to drive four days a week.

MR. CARRELLAS: I'm just telling you what we think.

Bicycle mode of transportation. Just a word of warning when considering alternatives that help bicyclists. I gave it some thought and I want to -- are solutions in that area being driven by the advocates or by the data? Outside of those who bike now, who else is going to adopt that mode of transportation if we actually make those kinds of improvements. You know, I'm not saying I have the answer to that but that's a question to pose. Certainly I probably would focus on pedestrians and access for the disabled first, because I have experience with both.

MR. SINCLAIR: We did learn last week, because we had a bicycle advocate come into our last hearing, and told us that Portland,
Washington DC and someplace else, that had a --
anyhow Washington DC had a huge number of
commuter bicyclists which was a staggering number
of trips that was used by bicyclists that just
could not compute to me. It seemed very, very
large.

MR. CARRELLAS: And the thing is
it's kind of base to base, that's one thing. If
you're going to do something you're going to
attract more to that mode. Who isn't bicycling
already is going to start? And who is doing
recreational cycling is going to do it in their
business suit or those kinds of things? It's
real easy to say yeah that'll be nice, we know
it's good for your exercise, no air pollution so
on and so forth but is it really going to have an
adoption rate in the state? I don't know the
answer to the question but those are the kinds of
things to think about.

From the Traffic Management
recommendations, the idea of providing
alternative routing and use of technology; and I
will add to that in a broader discipline and we
talked about it in the NJTPA work of incident
management. We must do comprehensive incident
management. And be it the recommendations you
have about moving those cars off the road -- I've
been known to tell people, no, you don't have to
keep your car blocking traffic when you're in an
accident, move it over. And it's like a great
idea to make that obvious to people. This might
be a medium to long-term thing that, you know,
may be out of the scope at the --

MR. EGENTON: Can I ask a question
related to that?

MR. CARRELLAS: Yes.

MR. EGENTON: How doable is that
from our level when we are looking at what's
doable right away? Is that something that is
going to require talking to --

MR. CARRELLAS: Which one?

MR. EGENTON: There's a fender
bender, nobody is hurt in it and moving it on the
side of the road.

MR. CARRELLAS: From my
understanding that one is an education issue. I
have even seen insurance publications talking
about doing that. And it's not clear, I don't
think it is, but I can't say with a hundred
percent certainty that there's a state law that
MR. SINCLAIR: It seems to me I remember from driver's ed and from a book that you don't move the car until the police come and --

MR. KEENAN: When I was in my misguided high school days, I was in a car accident and didn't know the rule. And no one was hurt, but the car was demolished and I moved it off to the side of the road and the woman also did. The first thing they said to me was why did you move the car?

MR. CARRELLAS: Cause you could.

MR. KEENAN: But it doesn't help them out, they are trying to figure out what happened.

MR. CARRELLAS: My experience, one experience was after someone running a stop sign and hitting the back of the car; there was a single major accident up the street and they wanted me to move my car out of the way because it was near the rescue squad and fire department. So when it comes time to the hierarchy needs they had no problem with it. It was a complicated accident situation. But people they think that
way, they think about -- it's a big education
effort if indeed that's all there is.

MR. SINCLAIR: Michael at lunch time
brought up a corollary to this. It's not only
the cars moving over but it's how the emergency
responders, how they conduct themselves in doing
the investigation. Now clearly safety is a
primary consideration, but also there probably
should be uniform procedures and standards for
moving traffic through and a hierarchy of how
they do it.

MR. CARRELLAS: You segueway nicely
to my next thing. Kind of -- I tend to think
about the moving your car over, I'm thinking of
the more local streets where it's kind of you
have more ability to do it because you are not
dealing with a whole lot of traffic. But take
the situation of -- you know, one of the things
that maybe we can deal with and you hear talk
about it on the radio a bunch is the rubber
necking effect. And while it's bad enough that
there is disruption -- it's amazing. I don't
need to look not because what gore there might
be, but you can watch everybody looking and
slowing down.
And earlier this month at the World Traffic Safety Symposium there was some industrial design students had a project and they actually -- it was something I thought of or have seen before at one time -- put curtains up to cover these accident scenes, you can't just see it anymore. That may draw its own attention, but certainly the details of what you see.

Let me make it more practical. You know, we have enough staff trying to deal with what's going on, but it's real important to keep traffic moving. Take the idea of taking more staff with bullhorns, and just getting people's attention to keep people moving. Look forward to where you're hearing the sound coming from and keep on moving. Let them find another distraction so you are not moving over there. Again, that is just another operational kind of technique. I mean, you can experiment the viability, the safety, the ability, the effectiveness of it. If you can just avoid all that stop and go and you can save that five mile backup. Even if it's just a half mile backup, it's more tolerable.

You take all the incident management in all these spots that people go through and all of a sudden
their perception of congestion everywhere to the
current congestion isn't bad. But it's just
amazing what solving something like the rubber
necking problem could --

MR. SINCLAIR: The number we are
using is 25 percent of the congestion is due to
incidents.

MR. CARRELLAS: And of course
there's, you know, moving it over and all the
other stuff that is traditional that you know
about. But, you know -- so speeding all that up,
so that's why I kind of focus on what can you do
quickly.

Single timing and synchronization

which was something in there, I support that.

Lots of benefit here. Implementation could range
from simple and quick to more complex and more
time. But we can do one thing, and my traffic
engineering says at least get the sensors to work
properly so the existing semi smart lights can
respond better to traffic. And even if it's not
the immediate congestion, just the person not
waiting at midnight to take a left turn or
something.

The subject is talked about in here
congestion/variable pricing. We don't support
it, neither do my colleagues at Triple A. While
we don't support this in general, one of the
problems with attempts at it in this region is
that it isn't really value pricing. That's kind
of the names that are used in here, but value
pricing implies you get something for putting up
more money.

The example I like to use is the
SR-91 in California. Private enterprise built a
toll road in the median area of an existing
freeway. Tolls get charged based on the amount
of congestion in the free lanes of the freeway.
You have a choice, you can stay in that level of
congestion or pay a toll based on how much faster
you can go because of the amount of traffic. Now
at least, that -- I mean, we kind of support that
because it's a private interest involved. But
that is providing value. You have a choice and
you're paying something to get something. If you
don't agree with that value you don't have to
pay. That's why I call it congestion/variable,
I'll never call it value pricing because it
ain't.

MR. SINCLAIR: What would be wrong
from your standpoint, if we -- let's invent a system here, because I've been talking about this. What if we all had EZ-Pass systems and what if we took those major toll roads or the major roads that are suffering from morning crush, and threw up -- and just charged people for using them at some value, some meaningful value that might deflect -- make people think twice about taking that road to defer people from what they have to pay, and that relieves congestion on that road and plus the people that were using it would pay -- would be paying a premium to provide some alternative, whether it was bus rapid transit or some mass transit alternative. And that's -- you rejected that.

MR. CARRELLAS: Fortunately, all the things I have done -- like poorly implemented HOVs in the past, I don't have to be the only voice in the wind saying good luck. But the example I just gave involves new construction, a private interest and they are betting their money that people will pay to avoid their free choice to be in congestion on a free road.

One of the suggestions I made to the New Jersey Turnpike back at their latest toll
increase was hey, sell part of the road where
you've got the utilized lanes to a private
concern, let them charge tolls for offering
congestion relief for what would now be a free
road. So if you do it in the context of you got
the choice of what we are used to and something
else you can offer that's new, you are not going
to have people really complaining about it. It's
just trying to reclaim stuff that is currently
free and then doing it with a poor design, which
is part of our HOV problem, and it's not going to
work.

MR. SINCLAIR: Do you think there
should be an unlimited access to the road?

MR. CARRELLAS: Well, broadly --

MR. SINCLAIR: We are going to have
a million more people here that are going to be
driving around in their cars going to their jobs,
and that's going to be a million more people that
are going to be competing with you and I and
Dotty.

MR. CARRELLAS: The thing is -- I
had this discussion this morning. Depending on
what these other alternatives are, like telework
that aren't necessarily under transportation
alternatives, non-transportation alternatives, what it is going to mean when they have these million people. Does it mean we are going to have the same situation we have today? Are you going to believe the models? Yeah, maybe we are going have the total number of people but what's the travelling situation and the commute going to look like? Just like we've seen a transformation in a lot of different areas in a short time, like things we can't even imagine in the study time frame of 25 years, I just don't believe we are going to have that problem if we act smart now.

On the subject I want to give you for some of the discussion -- you know, I said earlier we are not supportive of HOV lanes. By the way we don't support tolls, but if you propose a hot lane with a legal 80 mile an hour speed limit, you might get my attention; talk about value, and it's not unprecedented. Last July Virginia raised its speed limit to 65 in the barrier separated HOV-3 lanes in the I-95 corridor, and that was between Dumfries and the Beltway and on I-395 between Beltway and the Pentagon. And the Governor said quotes as saying, Higher speed limits help keep traffic
moving more efficiently and should encourage even
more people to move to HOV lanes to help reduce
congestion. Some of our really nice real access
roads, they are around 75 miles an hour -- and
I'll talk about that in a moment in a broader
scale, the speed limit component. But if you're
looking for people who want to adopt certain
things, we really have to give them what they
want and that's why I threw that over in the
context, that's a value to people. They may even
car pool to be able to travel 80 miles an hour.
You've got to think of what -- if you don't like
that, think about what really would incent (sic)
people without having to throw money out. If you
don't want to take the specifics, take the
general case.

Tolls. Okay, our former acting
governor who helped create this task force, also
had the DOT look at the Garden State Parkway.
And one outcome of it was it really recognized it
as a congestion issue and it has a specific plan
which becomes more and more detailed as to what
to do about it, over the ten years and possibly
at the end of 18 years getting rid of the tolls.
Also a new pollution study that's going to be
coming out talking about how the toll barriers contribute to pollution.

We know about EZ-Pass problems in general. One of the big messes going to happen in the Parkway -- I guess the Turnpike won't experience this -- because it's still using coins and they want to have the enforcement system with the coin lanes being mix use; it's going to be difficult if you use coins to prove that if you get a violation notice, to prove you weren't in violation. It's easy when you have an EZ-Pass, you send back the form and give your account number. It's going to be a nightmare if they implement that and I wonder if they'll ever.

We have been promoting this and I will recommend it to you folks to remove EZ-Pass and tolls from the Garden State Parkway and this too is riding a wave of popularity. In the latest scientific member poll the Triple A finds 69 percent of its members favor the removal of Parkway tolls. And from the first time they asked, its an increased number. It looks like potential for opinion behind that from a lot of people and of course the governor now has a consolidation study and with some of his current
actions, Parkway funding by the Turnpike, this kind of recommendation is getting closer to reality and is a bright spot on the radar screen. So I just give you a context for it to put it there with everything else.

A few more recommendations and I'll wrap up. This is real important to our organization, knowing the underlying things could help a lot of things. We recommend the proper engineering application of the traffic control devices as specified in the manual in the federal Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, MUTCD; be it signals, signal timing, use of stop signs, yield signs, speed limits, passing zones, etcetera. If we don't follow the MUTCD, we don't stand a chance of properly moving traffic. Political decisions override proper engineering much too often.

For example, one of my favorite topics, speed limits; setting speed limits as recommended in the MUTCD would raise many speed limits in New Jersey. While that won't change the general behavior since most motorists are already going above artificially low speed limits, it will smooth out the traffic flow and
allow all traffic to move incrementally faster
and safer and that translates directly to
incrementally increased capacity. I'm not
talking about great changes either of speed
limits or capacity, but again when I started to
talk, the smoothness factor really helps.

Another one, aggressive construction
or maintenance zone management. Have the most
disruptive work done at times when there will be
the least conflict. And remove all construction
related obstacles or obstructions and regulations
when work is not actually in progress. Again
construction zone speed limits.

Finally, a broader and more long
term recommendation related to New Jersey's
roadway network. Enhance New Jersey's principal
arterial network by eliminating traffic signals
on several key corridors along with widening and
access control. Select new freeways should also
be considered. I think I saw a list in here and
I have a list of 30 segments I will be happy to
e-mail you.

MR. SINCLAIR: Would you? I'd
appreciate that.

MR. CARRELLAS: That's just on the
upgrade.

Let's see. Basically, the conclusion is by improving the system, the hierarchy of roadway classification would be strengthened and lesser roads would be relieved of through traffic that doesn't belong on them to begin with. So there is kind of a -- if you fix the ones that are made for getting people around and connected, and you solve the problem that we are starting to see a lot of the additional congestion.

Those are the recommendations I wanted to bring to the Task Force's attention today. I want to leave you with some final thoughts on congestion; that seems to be the name of our game here. We all don't like it and when it happens we gripe about it, but congestion doesn't exist everywhere all the time. That's one reason why one size fits all solutions don't work. We motorists, we also adapt. And congestion may not be a bad thing given the alternatives some would like to give us. Perhaps some level of congestion is just another cost of the use of our automobiles and the overall freedom that it really gives us; there is a
context here. And that's why I almost always offer this challenge and I remember doing it talking to NJTPA back in 1995; if you can provide transportation alternatives that are more comfortable, safer, more convenient and faster than the personal automobile, then you will win the war. Just figure that out -- but remember, and Jim you put it in the open letter, solutions that counter this need will fail and it can get to the point of not being tolerated. Good example is getting rid of the HOV lanes, it catches up to you. That's what I wanted to bring to you today.

MR. SINCLAIR: Thank you very much, Steve, for coming here and giving testimony. You gave us lots of good valuable input into the process. You reaffirm some of the things that we thought we knew and challenged us on some of the other things what we thought we knew, so that's good. Thank you very much.

Would you identify yourself and who you represent for the record?

MR. HEATH: I'm Clifford Heath, Vice President of the New Jersey Alliance For Action.
Just a preamble to what I'm going to say, we do support the work of this Task Force and have -- and happy to have a member of the Alliance, our executive vice president, be an active participant on this Task Force. So we are aware of your deliberations and we are happy that you took the time and I will mention some of that in some of this testimony.

I will repeat my name again, it's Clifford J. Heath, Vice President of the New Jersey Alliance For Action, a statewide nonprofit non-partisan coalition of over 600 businesses, labor, professional, academic and governmental organizations. The Alliance, since its inception 27 years ago, had been viewing the growing problem of congestion on New Jersey's highway network, and thus in the year 2000 with the intensity of the problem, a major concern affecting the quality of life for daily commuters as well as for the hundreds of commercial establishments that depend on the smooth flow of goods, the foundation of the Alliance For Action commissioned the New Jersey Institute of Technology's National Center for Transportation and Industrial Productivity to undertake a
comprehensive study of congestion. The final report, Mobility and The Costs of Congestion in New Jersey was completed in February 2000. The report was updated in August 2001 and it indicated the cost of congestion had continued to increase substantially during the intervening year and-a-half. We have a copy of that report if you want that for the record and also the updated report in August of 2001.

When the formation of the Congestion Buster Task Force was announced, the Alliance For Action enthusiastically endorsed its goal, I quote now, To study traffic congestion, to develop a commuter options plan that would result in capping peak hour vehicle trips at 1999 levels. I must say we had a little skepticism whether we could achieve the 1999 level with all the additional traffic that's been on the road in this intervening three-year period. However, from our perspective we thought that the identification of the projects, and I continue to quote, Which can be quickly implemented to relieve congestion or as I call them hot spots, or improve safety on our roads was all very noble.
With the appointment of James Sinclair, Vice President of the New Jersey Business and Industry Association, as the chairman of the Task Force we recognized someone who has for many years been reconciling the divergent views of business on one side and the regulatory agencies on the other. The finished product, to the extent that we are totally familiar with it, would indicate that he has done a creditable job of using the talents of the Task Force members while remaining ever mindful of the legislative charge of submitting a final report by June 2002. And that -- for that we do commend him and the members of the Task Force. It surely had to be a labor of love requiring the devotion of countless hours pouring over the language, phraseology and statistics incorporated in the Task Force recommendations.

Thus we hesitate to enter into the record -- I use the word discordant, but that's not quite what it is -- exception to the otherwise admirable work of the Task Force. But did not the legislature expect the identification of projects which can be quickly implemented to relieve congestion -- I think we have heard
previous testimony and it has been recognized
that that's what they were looking for -- or is
the phrase subject to other interpretations,
meaning selective widening, intersection
improvements, sequential signaling, grade
separated crossings, etcetera, on the state and
interstate highway network. I know you have had
some of that incorporated in your reports.

    I'm going to take your favorite
highway as an example, Route I-287 which I
believe was the subject of the most frequent
complaints and the most hits on your web site.
Nothing was offered to give comfort to those
drivers who surrender a half hour every morning
going north and another half hour every evening
going south through Middlesex County. While the
Alliance For Action has always supported mass
transit options and light rail systems where
feasible, we see no alternatives to Route I-287
other than widening as was done in the Morris
County section a few years ago, and I know that
was a very contentious widening. I attended the
hearings in this room when they were
deliberating -- the North Jersey Transportation
Planning Authority was deliberating whether to
put a stamp of approval on that widening program through Morris County. Anyone riding that road since that widening can see every day the difference it has made. There was literally no option but to allow more space for the automobiles literally that are -- they are already there. I don't think it necessarily encouraged more cars as we sometimes thinks that more lane miles encourage more cars; lane miles are sometimes for those people who already have no alternative.

In conclusion, congestion and the bottlenecks that are causing it is the relieving that we frankly had envisioned would be an important part of the Task Force deliberations. And while commending the great work that you've done, the Alliance For Action does suggest consideration should be given to identifying the many traffic bottlenecks that delay, interminably so at times, delays the flow of goods and people who have one and only one option, a motor vehicle.

May I also say, and this is a personal observation, when we talk about trying to go to telecommunication -- I would like to
stay at home too, Jim. I think that is a great idea at least once a week, two days, as many days that are available, but a lot of our businesses are small businesses in this state and they have no -- they literally don't know much about telecommunications. That's a big corporate kind of thing in many circles. And all these small businesses that have their employees on the road driving to work are probably going to be always in that condition. So whether we accomplish reducing a lot of traffic by telecommunication, that's something you ask for the study and it would be interesting just to see definitively how much could be reduced. If we can reduce and get 25 percent of vehicles off the road then we don't really have to consider widening or anything else, the problem is solved.

MR. SINCLAIR: We don't have to get 25 percent. As Steve told us, if you take one -- if you take one percent out, you get three percent reduction in congestion. I don't know if he made that number up but it's a great number and I'm going to keep using it.

MR. HEATH: And the mass transit option, which would be great also, almost anyone
could get on the train -- I would like to work on Wall Street like my children are, and it would be lovely to get on the train in the morning and read your paper and ride to work. But many of us in the state, most of the people, 95 percent of the workers in New Jersey have no other option, cars are how to get to work. There is no transit of any sort available to them, unless they go in some kind of convoluted direction to go to work. That's all I have, thank you very much.

Mr. Sinclair: Anybody have some questions for Cliff on his comments?

Send in those projects to us. One of the things that we -- initially when we did the hot spots, and although there was grumbling on the Task Force that we did that, the hot spot thing was good because it focused -- because what I've learned is congestion is personal, it's personal, it's temporal, it's in a time, it's in a place and it's how it affects you personally and people did send in those ideas of where there was congestion, that it impacted them personally. And we gave that to the Department of Transportation, they looked at that list and it pretty much -- it pretty much looked like what
they knew; that the Department could look at the
complaint and see on their 25 year plan which
thing they were going to deal with. But I would
encourage you to send that to us and put that
into the record of the Task Force.

MR. HEATH: I would also like to
tell you that we realize that no one is in
competition with the mass transit. And I think
we should all look at this as we go forward as to
being a cooperative endeavor between those who
represent the drivers of automobiles and those
who represent mass transit. We are not at a war
with each other and I don't think we should be.
I think we need mass transit in this state
desperately, no question about it. And we also
view that we probably need more lane capacity
desperately also. So maybe with that as a model,
we can get some of the competition put to rest,
which makes me uncomfortable.

MS. SCHLEICHER: I would like to
make a comment. The charge of this committee is
to add more capacity by managing the demand. You
know, it's the other side, it's the softer side
but the harder side, the harder thing to do. We
don't, you know, disagree with you. I think the
focus was trying to make these behavioral, if you will, kinds of changes that we're talking about, which are the most difficult kinds of changes to make. It's almost easier to build that road, which DOT will tell you no. But when you look at what goes into incenting and giving people a reason to change, it's probably one of the most difficult things to do. But in a state that's as land poor as we are, rich in everything else, we really need to find a way to make -- to improve capacity by managing the demand at a time when we know it's the easier time to do that and it's probably the worse time, which is the people going and coming from work.

I was going to ask Steve Carrellas by the way -- because I don't think anybody has a problem with telecommuting, telework. That, by the way, is one of the more difficult things to get incorporated within even large corporations because again it changes the way or the perception of the way work is being done or isn't being done. So, you know, change is hard for all of us, and that's what we're about is trying to change things. And I appreciate your remarks and I look forward to working with you.
MR. KEENAN: I think what the key is and it kind of echoes what Judy was saying, the key is you can't do one or the other. You can't pave the entire state and you can't think you're going to get everyone on to a train or a bus or car pooling, telecommuting. It's all of that. Steve was talking about the synchronization of lights. We think you need expanded capacity, you also need to get the MOM (ph) going, to get additional light rails wherever possible, it's really -- telecommuting. It's really -- you are right Judy, it's a shift of beliefs, the way of lives -- the way of life here in New Jersey. It can't just be one or the other, and that's the hard part, getting every one to kind of change their ideas about what's the right thing. It's not all getting on a train or bus or getting in the car and making bigger roads; it's got to be that, it's got to be removing traffic lights where possible, synchronization of lights when possible, getting people -- building new rail lines when possible, increasing and promoting the use of additional bus lines when possible. It's really got to be a well rounded attack, so to speak.
MR. SINCLAIR: One of the things --

two things -- two of biggest things that I've
learned in this process. One that this is a
system, it's a complete transportation system
that has the individual as the primary consumer
of that system and that consumer makes choices.
And they are very intelligent consumers, they
make the choice that's best for them. And
confronted, as Steve said, with an attractive
alternative to the automobile -- it has to be
very attractive -- they will venture out that
way. That's what we need to look at as a system.
And I think that I see all of these actors
competing one with each other for limited
resources, limited public resources, and that
takes me as the citizen who doesn't have, you
know, I haven't picked up teams here -- I can't
understand clearly and simply the equivalencies
of projects and dollars.

And I think that's what we need, we
need to be able to take and compare a tax
incentive for somebody to do something to get out
of the flow versus widening a lane versus adding
another tunnel to New York or taking the tolls
off the Turnpike. We do these projects, we go
after federal funding as if it was some gift, you know, that we are not really paying for here in the process. And we have this -- and we're very proud of ourselves if we can do that. And sometimes we capture money because it's there to capture instead of capturing something that's the greater priority or the greater, you know -- our ability to prioritize transportation dollars is not inherent to me as a citizen. Maybe it is, maybe people understand the calculus of doing this. But it isn't -- having done this for nine months now, it isn't apparent to me how we just -- we just do things because that's what we do.

MR. KEENAN: That's the way it's always been done.

MR. SINCLAIR: That's the way it's been done. There is no easy answer to this and I don't know if there is, but it is something that I intend to say in a public forum.

Is there somebody else who is going to testify?

MR. MEGHDIR: Hamou Meghdir, NJTPA. One of our staff members, Brian Fineman, who is heading up the group that's updating the CMS, the
congestion management system program that's mandated by TEA-21 wanted to say a few words. It happens that what this group has done dovetails very well with the update of the CMS. And he just wanted to give the planning perspective, he'll will take four, five minutes to, you know, just tell you how important it is as mandate, and what we have been doing about it recently. It's important because anything that's going to be funded in federal dollars that has something to do with congestion is going to have to be part of the CMS process. So what I have been doing is once we've had those early recommendations, I've been feeding these recommendations to our group here who has been giving them to the consultant to do the evaluation, they will be tested and included in the CMS. If I may get him --

MR. SINCLAIR: We'll just hold the record open and bring him in.

MR. INTINDOLA: My name is Brian Intindola and I'm associated with Pennoni Associates Incorporated in the Clifton office here in New Jersey. I pretty much spent my entire career as a traffic engineer working on projects as small as gas stations and as large as
putting a new bridge in Mercer County, so I've seen all sides of the coin.

What strikes me as -- where the creativity in transportation solutions is coming from in New Jersey, as I work on the consultant side, is that the counties have really stepped up and have gotten creative in terms of addressing traffic and congestion issues. Somerset County is doing great work, Union County is doing great work; and it seems to be some counties are doing great jobs and some counties don't have the expertise to do what the other counties are doing. It would be helpful, I think, to help the other counties if there is some sort of way of sharing that expertise, that the Congestion Buster Task Force can somehow have summit meetings with county expertise or whatever they would have, share experiences of what works and what doesn't work. The difficulty right now is that the counties' creative solutions have to go to the federal highway administrative approval process, and in some instances they balk at what is seen as more creative solutions than what they are used to. Just providing new lane miles and that adds a whole other layer of review and time
where you can get the project out to bid.

And also what I know of my daily
experience as a traffic engineer is that we have
these models, these transportation models that
are run by NJTPA and DBRPC and South Jersey MPO.
Our problem is that they are not that accessible
to the people that really need to use them, which
is the county transportation planner. And to me
it's not -- it's just not accessible, and it's at
times we have -- consultants have to pay to use
these models that are already done. I don't know
if these models are in a public domain or who
owns the models, but if they were more readily
accessible I think that would help to make better
planning decisions on the transportation planning
side.

And those models too, they are
somewhat lacking in the mass transit choices in
the models. It looks like a separate module if
you will in the model, and some are -- they
aren't as good as they could be because most of
the emphasis has been on vehicles. Most models
prefer to deal with highway modeling because
transit modeling is a different approach
altogether. So the strength is there for highway
model but not for the transit model. And if this is something that the Congestion Buster Task Force could do --

MR. SINCLAIR: Can I ask you something about the capacity or capability of county transportation engineers to use the models, is that -- is it a tool that any transportation engineer would use?

MR. INTINDOLA: Not typically. Like what would be like a nice situation to have is if a county transportation has a what if scenario, he can e-mail someone and get a relevant response as to what the affect would be in a relatively short time frame when they are in the planning or in the conceptual frame work. That would help a lot.

MR. SINCLAIR: This is the sharing of the technology and the tools within the region especially at the county level and that sort of fits in -- that augments our recommendation on land use planning where we say the county should be more involved in major decision making on transit corridors and things like that on projects. Okay.

MR. INTINDOLA: Ultimately ideally
you can go to a New Jersey wide web site where
the model resides and put your info in right
there. But right now because the model is
fragmented along MPOs, it's difficult to do that.
Although you need to only work in your area, but
there's difficulty doing -- to get New Jersey
wide solutions because of the way it's set up
right now.

And just -- it just seems to be a
generational turnaround time to get some projects
built, it's amazing to me. Route 21 to go to 46
was laid out when I was born in 1962 and they are
just finishing that up. That always amazes me
how long these things drag on.

So anyway that being said, I just
hope this helps, if you strengthen the county
expertise may help get the individual
intersections improved on that much sooner; have
the synchronization done that much sooner because
their what if scenarios can be addressed by using
the models that already exist, making them more
accessible.

MR. SINCLAIR: Thank you, that's a
good suggestion. I'm sure there must be some
reason why they won't do that, but it's a good
suggestion.

MR. SINCLAIR: Brian?

MR. FINEMAN: I understand it would be helpful to discuss our congestion management system work a little bit. I did participate at least in one meeting with the Task Force a couple months back and we are certainly looking to closely coordinate. Happily, I think, we are working along complimentary paths to address congestion, mobility issues around our region and the state obviously.

The NJTPA as a metropolitan planning organization is required to implement a system for managing congestion as part of our planning process, and no surprise there are lots of parallels in terms of what we are looking to do. Right now we are undertaking a large scale analysis which we're calling our North Jersey Strategy Evaluation, which is intended to update our congestion management system and help us update our regional transportation plan.

And as part of that effort we are identifying performance measures, ways of measuring congestion and again things that the Task Force is working on as well, and ways of
identifying strategies dealing with accessibility, to enhance accessibility mobility and manage congestion around the region. We are trying to look to coordinate as much as possible. The reports back from the Task Force are going to our consultant that's developing some of our technical work. And we do have give and take and we're happy to have some interfacing more directly with you guys.

MR. SINCLAIR: I'd like ask to Deb to get a copy of the draft CMS strategies outline and there's also another -- there are two other reports that you gave this morning that are really very good. And I'll just interrupt you by saying that what I looked at, felt that their strategies looked a lot like our strategies. It's good. You are doing evaluations on those strategies, you're taking it one step further.

MR. FINEMAN: And we have a slightly different audience, obviously. And we are intending to repeat this year after year as we update our regional transportation plan. We're looking at specific strategies along all those categories to hand off to the variety of implementing agencies around our region.
MR. SINCLAIR: Some of your strategies -- and the reason I'm happy you are here testifying is some of your strategies are going to require legislative or regulatory action. And some of your strategies, in fact, are going to be our strategies that we are going to recommend as things that can be done right away. You know, things that we can do to help deal with the congestion. Sort of our ten projects -- our ten projects are not necessarily going to move us back to 1999 levels, but our ten projects are going to be wonderful ten projects that are going to have a meaningful impact on congestion around the state. And we would like to work with you in thinking through this as we move forward and coupling with your work.

MR. FINEMAN: Excellent.

MR. EGENTON: Brian, what is your time line? When do you anticipate finishing up as part of the meeting this morning?

MR. FINEMAN: The primary progress of our analysis right now, there will be two more milestones that we're looking for in the beginning of the summer, July 11, we are looking for our board to recognize the full analysis
essentially, although not make final decisions
about what gets incorporated into our regional
plan and what gets incorporated into what we
might hand off to implementing agencies. Those
two -- the real specifics happen by September of
this year. So that's the overall time frame, but
we will have our report by July.

MR. SINCLAIR: Anything else?

MR. FINEMAN: Any questions,

anything else?

MR. SINCLAIR: No. I'm glad you
came by. Actually I'm glad I came to your
meeting this morning, that's very helpful.

Yes, sir.

MR. BRIMMER: If I can beg the
committee's indulgence. My name is Mike Brimmer,
I'm the Vice President of State Relations for CSX
Transportation, one of the railroads that serves
New Jersey. I'd like to commend this committee
for the breath of the work that you have
undertaken and Demand Management recommendations
that I've just had a chance to look through. I
think you have really touched on a number of very
important short-term non-capital solutions which
are very helpful towards the process.
I think clearly the work NJTPA on congestion management, the focus on reducing vehicle miles traveled, the recognition that initially that single occupancy vehicles for passengers, the role transit would play as well as the important recommendations made by your Goods Movement subcommittee with respect to trucks are all appropriate and balanced. I'm here obviously to reflect the point of view of one other small -- relatively small component of this, and that's rail freight.

And I would suggest to you that rail freight is not only good for the rail freight industry, it also has a contribution to make with respect to two other important aspects that you're dealing with. One is the ability to contribute to the reduction and congestion through addition of transit projects and the second is the ability to accommodate the projected growth and demand primarily as a result of the expansion of the port.

If the Port Authority's plans move forward as they are currently projected to, they are going to double the number of containers that off-load at the marine terminals in this area.
And doubling the number of containers means doubling the amount of trucks that are going to move. Of the containers that land here, about 80 percent are going to be distributed in this metropolitan area by truck. 20 percent of them are destined for Chicago and the mid-west and they don't have to move by truck, they can move by rail if that's possible.

One of those ships, mega ships unloading 6,000 containers in a 24 hour period is the equivalent of 20 miles of trucks bumper to bumper going down your roads, one ship. One train averaging 100 railcars, each railcar carrying the equivalent of roughly three trucks, and so that's three trucks coming in and three trucks going out in a round trip will be equivalent of six truckloads. If we do a little bit of math, one train takes 600 trucks off the local roads. And if that train runs five days a week, 50 weeks a year, that's 150,000 long distance trucks that are not on your local highways; one train.

I would suggest that is an important ingredient and there aren't too many additional kinds of improvements that can take the
equivalent of 150,000 trucks off your local
records with one shot. The advantage of using
the existing rail freight infrastructure system
is its already an existing right of way. It
does not require additional land acquisition; it
does not require additional displacement. It's
privately owned and to a large extent privately
invested.

However the freight railroads in
this area are facing two challenges. One, the
proposal to introduce more transit systems and
there are a half dozen very worthwhile proposals
on the table. All of those proposals assume the
use of that private freight right of way. And in
addition, the doubling of the port, which most
people recognize and regard as a good thing, also
proposes to double the amount of goods moving by
train in and out of this area. For us to
accommodate that we need more capacity on the
rail freight system. We are prepared to invest
our funds to build more freight capacity for our
freight customers. But we don't think we should
be asked to give up our scarce capacity or spend
our funds on new capacity for public transit nor,
frankly, to build support for a public agency
such as the Port Authority.

So what we would like to propose is a public private partnership, a sharing of the investment involved. So that by building more capacity -- and by building more capacity I mean putting back a second track where there is only one. Today most of the tracks through the area it's one track because Conrail, when it was created out of bankruptcies of six railroads, ripped it up in order to reduce the maintenance cost. So today one train coming from Chicago to New York down through Teaneck, for example, has to pull over and wait while the train goes north out of the port on the way to Chicago. And when that train sits and waits, it blocks crossings, causes train idling, promotes congestion and a lot of quality of life enhancements that we do not see.

MR. SINCLAIR: What you are saying is you need additional trackage or additional lines?

MR. BRIMMER: We need two tracks where there is one. We need upgraded signals, the technology and ITS everyone talks about. We need greater vertical clearances so we can carry
piggyback trains, one on top of the other, doubling the productivity of the train. And there are several places where there are tunnels. We need crossovers so a train can operate on either track and we need some grade separations.

MR. SINCLAIR: What about water crossings, is there adequate capacity to go across the river?

MR. BRIMMER: We are not talking at this point about servicing New York.

MR. SINCLAIR: Not that river, but --

MR. BRIMMER: In most of the cases we have two tracks to cross the Newark bay, for example.

But those kinds of things that we just mentioned, we have identified a list of projects in conjunction with New Jersey DOT and the Port Authority, which -- I'll give you the big number, it is capital, it's $300 million over 10 years, 30 million a year. If that's shared public and private, say 50/50, it's 15 million public 15 million private. If the 15 million public is half New Jersey and half Port Authority, that's seven and-a-half million
dollars a year out of a $2 billion transportation
budget in the state, it doesn't seem to be too
excessive to us.

   And for that amount of money, seven
and-a-half million a year by four parties, you
double the rail freight capacity in this region
and you enable us to then accommodate the half
dozen transit proposals and you enable us to
accommodate a doubling of growth at the port, as
well as permitting us to take those 150,000
trucks per train off your local roads, transport
them more safely, much more environmentally
benignly and with less wear and tear.

   Again let's not deceive ourselves or
anyone else, we are not talking about reducing
the absolute number of trucks from what it is
today, we are talking about reducing the rate of
growth that will otherwise be there in the
future. So I just offer that as --

MR. SINCLAIR: Thank you for putting
that on the record.

MR. MIELE: I fully endorse his
concept of a public-private partnership. I'm
involved in the largest in the world right now in
the Secaucus Interchange and Railway Junction.
And I think it behooves this commission to get a report on its long-term solutions from someone like our former Congressman Bob Roe regarding where we are on Secaucus Interchange, because as a result of it when it's completed -- the idea started in 1978. It's now at the major point of building the railroad station and junction being built, you will be able to have interstate and intrastate transportation throughout the whole State of New Jersey and it's a major long-term solution. But the reason I commend the gentleman is that that is a partnership between New Jersey Transit and Turnpike Authority, the state and private industry. It's a public-private partnership which can get a result, albeit taking a long period of time, but a major transportation hub for the world. So before we submit our report, if you want I will try to get you some information on it directly from Congressman Roe.

MR. SINCLAIR: Thank you very much.

MS. SCHLEICHER: I want some clarification because you brought up the problems of conflict between the freight and the passenger, and we all know what's gone on with passenger boom. So the seven and-a-half million,
I like the way you got that down to seven and-a-half million dollars a year. I heard a big number up there. But for that money, would that relieve this conflict or that just takes care of your problem?

MR. BRIMMER: That enables us to consider making a portion of our right of way available to New Jersey Transit. If we don't have the capacity to take care of our own needs and the port needs, then we don't have any reason to give it away to a transit agency. So without our getting additional freight capacity, we're just not in the position to sell it for transit.

MS. SCHLEICHER: I just wanted to clarify.

MR. SINCLAIR: The whole thing being a system, all working together.

MS. SCHLEICHER: You heard the what's-in-it-for-me question.

MR. SINCLAIR: We are all working here --

MR. BRIMMER: There is one other thing I do want to mention, because it doesn't come up and I think it's important. If you're going to put a passenger train on a freight line
right of way next to each other, we've seen in to
our sorrow in the last week what can happen in
terms of accidents. And one of the things that
we are also going to require is that there be
some liability insurance for the additional risk
that we're going to bear, because if God forbid
there is a wreck involving a passenger train and
on a freight line, they are not going to sue the
State or New Jersey Transit for more than a
certain amount of money, they are capped; they
are going to sue the freight railway. In our
case -- let's assume it was our fault, our
engineer fell asleep and drove his train into a
passenger train. The point is if the passenger
train hadn't been on the right of way there
wouldn't have been an accident and we wouldn't be
liable. So we are going to face an increased
risk of new passenger service next to freight
that we don't think our shareholders should bear
that risk and we'd ask the state to purchase
liability insurance or give us the same cap that
the state has.

MR. SINCLAIR: Thank you.

Is there anybody else that wants to
testify? Is there anything?
Is there anything else the board wants to say?

Why don't we recess the hearing.

(Hearing concluded at 3:32 p.m.)
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