

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

:
RE: CONGESTION BUSTER TASK FORCE :
PUBLIC MEETING :
:

NJTPA Offices
One Newark Center, 17th Floor
Newark, New Jersey 07102
Tuesday, April 30, 2002
2:00 p.m.

GUY J. RENZI & ASSOCIATES
824 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08618
609-989-9199 or 800-368-7652 (TOLL FREE)
<http://www.renziassociates.com>

1 CONGESTION BUSTER TASK FORCE:

2 Jim Sinclair, Chair

3 Judith P. Schleicher

4 Gerald T. Keenan

5 J.P. Miele

6 Doty Drinkwater

7 James Redeker

8 Hamou Meghdir

9 Michael Egenton

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	I N D E X	
2	SPEAKER	PAGE
3	Assemblyman Alex DeCroce	5
4	Stephen G. Carrellas	8
5	Clifford Heath	36
6	Brian Intindola	49
7	Brian Fineman	54
8	Michael Brimmer	57
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

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

18 The proceedings of this public
19 hearing are considered open public records and
20 all the records pertaining to this hearing may be
21 examined during normal business hours at the
22 Department of Transportation headquarters by
23 appointment. And I also should say that this
24 particular task force has published all of its
25 pertinent information on-line on the Department

1 of Transportation web site at Congestion Busters
2 and has been open to public comment through
3 e-mail process right from the beginning since
4 last July when we first did this.

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

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

12 The fact of the matter is that New
13 Jersey is a great place to live and people do
14 like to come into the State of New Jersey and
15 live here. They bring their corporations here.
16 The reasoning being we have great schools despite
17 the fact we are always criticized about our
18 schools, we have good highways, good mass
19 transportation programs. And frankly, most of
20 the major companies that you and I know or deal
21 with one way or another are probably
22 headquartered here in the State of New Jersey,
23 despite the fact that we are sometimes criticized
24 by the New York press and sometimes the
25 Philadelphia press, but at the same time those

1 same people want to live here in the State of New
2 Jersey. There are those in the State of New
3 Jersey that might criticize our insurance rates,
4 but if you lived in New York or Philadelphia you
5 would be happy to live in the State of New
6 Jersey. So when I hear that stuff it kind of
7 bothers me, but I also understand why it's being
8 done. It always seems to me that a more
9 efficient use of our highways particularly at
10 peak hours would probably be good for everyone.

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

23 We researched the use of technology
24 and better planning to solve congestion problems
25 as well. We know that traffic congestion is not

1 necessarily limited to New Jersey. The Texas
2 Transportation Institute puts the cost of
3 congestion in the nation at \$78 billion, which is
4 of value -- is the value of delay and excessive
5 fuel consumption. In New Jersey alone a 2000 New
6 Jersey Alliance For Action study reported the
7 figure to be \$5 billion in the state as the cost
8 of lost time, fuel consumption and additional
9 vehicle operating costs on an annual basis. This
10 breaks down to an average annual cost of
11 congestion at about \$880 per licensed driver.

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

22 MR. SINCLAIR: Thank you, very
23 much.

24 Steve Carrellas, you've been here
25 all day, why don't you come forward and testify.

1 MR. CARRELLAS: Steve Carrellas, the
2 New Jersey chapter coordinator for the National
3 Motorists Association. I've been doing this for
4 almost 15 years, I've seen a lot in motorist
5 issues and transportation and I'm a registered
6 professional engineer, so it's like I kind of
7 even the field.

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

16 I'd like to thank the Task Force for
17 scheduling today's meeting and I guess I learned
18 earlier it wasn't a coincidence. I was here this
19 morning as part of the Regional Transportation
20 Advisory Group working with NJTPA on the subject
21 of congestion, looking at strategies from I guess
22 the very process, methodological, data driven
23 sort of need. So that work has been on my mind
24 and I think I kind of put together some things
25 that kind of meet the charter you have. That was

1 one of the things -- I think a lot of folks doing
2 the detail work were wondering, well, we know why
3 the Congestion Buster Task Force was created but
4 it's like how does it fit in with this other
5 methodological work being done by NJTPA. And
6 I'll talk more about that in a second.

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

12 MR. SINCLAIR: Thank you.

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

18 Can you imagine if you run some
19 radio ads with the traffic reports; so after they
20 read the traffic report and they hear about
21 congestion they say, And this traffic report was
22 brought to you by the Congestion Buster Task
23 Force, give your comments on what you don't like
24 by congestion by mailing -- nothing like a
25 captive audience. And then you can also have ads

1 or links on traffic web sites and an easy one,
2 even a more visible link on the DOT home page. I
3 mean certainly there's the link in the column for
4 finding Congestion Busters, but --

5 MR. SINCLAIR: You have to look.

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

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

17 I think tieing together the
18 practical aspects for maybe identifying ten
19 workable projects that could relieve congestion
20 or help to do it and doing it within a year is
21 definitely contrasted with what NJTPA is doing.
22 I got more impressed toward the bottom, Using
23 governmental policies to shape human behavior,
24 however, does not always work in real life, and
25 referencing the ETR program. Develop doable

1 proposals, remembering that if the public doesn't
2 want to take the bus to work, car pool or live in
3 cities, those solutions aren't going to do
4 anything. Reflecting the real world of business
5 and employment; I know NJTPA is trying to do that
6 on a longer-term scale. And innovative solutions
7 that are fiscally sensible and politically
8 doable; that's what I remind the NJTPA about too.

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

24 Starting from the Demand Management
25 recommendations; teleworking. First, using the

1 word teleworking means that you're really with
2 it, because that's kind of the new way of looking
3 at it. This is probably the biggest bang for the
4 buck and the most doable. I have a reference
5 here; a George Mason University study found that
6 for every one -- every one percent reduction --
7 every one percent of the regional work force
8 teleworks, there is a three percent reduction of
9 traffic congestion. Telework also benefits both
10 employers and -- employees and employers.
11 According to the International Telework
12 Association & Council, telework results in
13 increased productivity and worker retention. And
14 AT&T is referenced, it has 25 percent of its work
15 force on a regular basis, has found fewer people
16 taking sick leave, better work retention, higher
17 productivity and so on. And actually --

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

21 MR. CARRELLAS: George
22 Washington (sic) University. Last year and I
23 think -- probably 2001. I was following up on
24 the Friday morning effect on what they were
25 experiencing around the beltway. And Congressman

1 Frank Wolf of Virginia, a big proponent of
2 telework, he is also working with the Software
3 Productivity Consortium which is down in Virginia
4 on real studies for bringing the technology to
5 bear even more so than what we've got today to
6 kind of make that work.

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

18 MR. SINCLAIR: This is AT&T?

19 MR. CARRELLAS: AT&T talking about
20 2000.

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

23 MR. CARRELLAS: Sure.

24 MR. SINCLAIR: We'll keep it free
25 flowing.

1 We desperately want to support
2 teleworking as a strategy, but I particularly and
3 several other people on the committee are
4 uncomfortable with doing that without having
5 really good data to back it up. And as much as
6 we love AT&T here in New Jersey, they are suspect
7 because they're in the business. And what I'm
8 looking for is longitudinal studies that can
9 convince employers that by supporting
10 teleworking, it is a good business thing to do.
11 That in terms of productivity it -- there is a
12 payoff for the employer. And that that payoff
13 continues beyond the first -- the honeymoon
14 period. And so, I'm looking for that.

15 And I say this in every forum, that
16 I'm looking for the study that I can take back to
17 the business community and say wow, this is good,
18 and this shows the point. But we are like
19 junkies here, we are desperate to support this
20 because it makes so much sense to get people out
21 of their cars; this is a real trip that you get
22 out of the morning rush hour. But we don't want
23 to do just lip service. We don't want to go to
24 the legislature and say the Task Force loves
25 teleworking, because unless we can convince my

1 boss that it's a good idea and I haven't yet,
2 we're not getting anywhere.

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

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

23 MR. REDEKER: You mean the
24 interruptions?

25 MR. SINCLAIR: Yes.

1 MR. CARRELLAS: Looking at all --
2 and again, it doesn't necessarily require
3 legislation; maybe incentives to do it. It's
4 more like what's in it for the --

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

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

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

1 MR. THATCHER: Yes.

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

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

19 For example, let's say everything
20 being equal, two people, everything the same; one
21 drives 15,000 miles a year, the other one 30,000
22 miles and the same insurance carrier, the
23 difference in their bills for a year could be \$50
24 despite even when they talk about different rate
25 classes, less than three miles, you know. Think

1 about it too, if in the course of a year I pay
2 let's say a thousand dollars for one car and
3 someone else drives 30,000 miles; it takes the
4 first person when that person gets 30,000, they
5 paid \$3,000 over two years. And as much as we
6 want to talk about a bunch of interesting things,
7 it's really exposure to being out there that's a
8 big indicator.

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

23 The benefit side is you can really
24 understand what it's costing you in terms of
25 insurance as opposed to the discount you're

1 supposedly getting for doing this, that and the
2 other thing. So when you actually car pool,
3 share that with someone else, you can calculate
4 from the beginning I'm going to save this many
5 miles and I'm going to save this much money. It
6 turns out to be more money than your ever going
7 to realize in the kind of discounts we tend to
8 talk about.

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

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

25 MR. SINCLAIR: Do we say no free

1 parking?

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

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

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

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

23 MR. SINCLAIR: We did learn last
24 week, because we had a bicycle advocate come into
25 our last hearing, and told us that Portland,

1 Washington DC and someplace else, that had a --
2 anyhow Washington DC had a huge number of
3 commuter bicyclists which was a staggering number
4 of trips that was used by bicyclists that just
5 could not compute to me. It seemed very, very
6 large.

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

20 From the Traffic Management
21 recommendations, the idea of providing
22 alternative routing and use of technology; and I
23 will add to that in a broader discipline and we
24 talked about it in the NJTPA work of incident
25 management. We must do comprehensive incident

1 management. And be it the recommendations you
2 have about moving those cars off the road -- I've
3 been known to tell people, no, you don't have to
4 keep your car blocking traffic when you're in an
5 accident, move it over. And it's like a great
6 idea to make that obvious to people. This might
7 be a medium to long-term thing that, you know,
8 may be out of the scope at the --

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

11 MR. CARRELLAS: Yes.

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

16 MR. CARRELLAS: Which one?

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

20 MR. CARRELLAS: From my
21 understanding that one is an education issue. I
22 have even seen insurance publications talking
23 about doing that. And it's not clear, I don't
24 think it is, but I can't say with a hundred
25 percent certainty that there's a state law that

1 says you can't.

2 MR. SINCLAIR: It seems to me I
3 remember from driver's ed and from a book that
4 you don't move the car until the police come
5 and --

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

13 MR. CARRELLAS: Cause you could.

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

17 MR. CARRELLAS: My experience, one
18 experience was after someone running a stop sign
19 and hitting the back of the car; there was a
20 single major accident up the street and they
21 wanted me to move my car out of the way because
22 it was near the rescue squad and fire department.
23 So when it comes time to the hierarchy needs they
24 had no problem with it. It was a complicated
25 accident situation. But people they think that

1 way, they think about -- it's a big education
2 effort if indeed that's all there is.

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

12 MR. CARRELLAS: You segueway nicely
13 to my next thing. Kind of -- I tend to think
14 about the moving your car over, I'm thinking of
15 the more local streets where it's kind of you
16 have more ability to do it because you are not
17 dealing with a whole lot of traffic. But take
18 the situation of -- you know, one of the things
19 that maybe we can deal with and you hear talk
20 about it on the radio a bunch is the rubber
21 necking effect. And while it's bad enough that
22 there is disruption -- it's amazing. I don't
23 need to look not because what gore there might
24 be, but you can watch everybody looking and
25 slowing down.

1 And earlier this month at the World
2 Traffic Safety Symposium there was some
3 industrial design students had a project and they
4 actually -- it was something I thought of or have
5 seen before at one time -- put curtains up to
6 cover these accident scenes, you can't just see
7 it anymore. That may draw its own attention, but
8 certainly the details of what you see.

9 Let me make it more practical. You
10 know, we have enough staff trying to deal with
11 what's going on, but it's real important to keep
12 traffic moving. Take the idea of taking more
13 staff with bullhorns, and just getting people's
14 attention to keep people moving, Look forward to
15 where you're hearing the sound coming from and
16 keep on moving. Let them find another distraction
17 so you are not moving over there. Again, that is
18 just another operational kind of technique. I
19 mean, you can experiment the viability, the
20 safety, the ability, the effectiveness of it. If
21 you can just avoid all that stop and go and you
22 can save that five mile backup. Even if it's
23 just a half mile backup, it's more tolerable.
24 You take all the incident management in all these
25 spots that people go through and all of a sudden

1 their perception of congestion everywhere to the
2 current congestion isn't bad. But it's just
3 amazing what solving something like the rubber
4 necking problem could --

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

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

14 Single timing and synchronization
15 which was something in there, I support that.
16 Lots of benefit here. Implementation could range
17 from simple and quick to more complex and more
18 time. But we can do one thing, and my traffic
19 engineering says at least get the sensors to work
20 properly so the existing semi smart lights can
21 respond better to traffic. And even if it's not
22 the immediate congestion, just the person not
23 waiting at midnight to take a left turn or
24 something.

25 The subject is talked about in here

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

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

25 MR. SINCLAIR: What would be wrong

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

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

24 One of the suggestions I made to the
25 New Jersey Turnpike back at their latest toll

1 increase was hey, sell part of the road where
2 you've got the utilized lanes to a private
3 concern, let them charge tolls for offering
4 congestion relief for what would now be a free
5 road. So if you do it in the context of you got
6 the choice of what we are used to and something
7 else you can offer that's new, you are not going
8 to have people really complaining about it. It's
9 just trying to reclaim stuff that is currently
10 free and then doing it with a poor design, which
11 is part of our HOV problem, and it's not going to
12 work.

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

15 MR. CARRELLAS: Well, broadly --

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

22 MR. CARRELLAS: The thing is -- I
23 had this discussion this morning. Depending on
24 what these other alternatives are, like telework
25 that aren't necessarily under transportation

1 alternatives, non-transportation alternatives,
2 what it is going to mean when they have these
3 million people. Does it mean we are going to
4 have the same situation we have today? Are you
5 going to believe the models? Yeah, maybe we are
6 going have the total number of people but what's
7 the travelling situation and the commute going to
8 look like? Just like we've seen a transformation
9 in a lot of different areas in a short time, like
10 things we can't even imagine in the study time
11 frame of 25 years, I just don't believe we are
12 going to have that problem if we act smart now.

13 On the subject I want to give you
14 for some of the discussion -- you know, I said
15 earlier we are not supportive of HOV lanes. By
16 the way we don't support tolls, but if you
17 propose a hot lane with a legal 80 mile an hour
18 speed limit, you might get my attention; talk
19 about value, and it's not unprecedented. Last
20 July Virginia raised its speed limit to 65 in the
21 barrier separated HOV-3 lanes in the I-95
22 corridor, and that was between Dumfries and the
23 Beltway and on I-395 between Beltway and the
24 Pentagon. And the Governor said quotes as
25 saying, Higher speed limits help keep traffic

1 moving more efficiently and should encourage even
2 more people to move to HOV lanes to help reduce
3 congestion. Some of our really nice real access
4 roads, they are around 75 miles an hour -- and
5 I'll talk about that in a moment in a broader
6 scale, the speed limit component. But if you're
7 looking for people who want to adopt certain
8 things, we really have to give them what they
9 want and that's why I threw that over in the
10 context, that's a value to people. They may even
11 car pool to be able to travel 80 miles an hour.
12 You've got to think of what -- if you don't like
13 that, think about what really would incent (sic)
14 people without having to throw money out. If you
15 don't want to take the specifics, take the
16 general case.

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

1 coming out talking about how the toll barriers
2 contribute to pollution.

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

15 We have been promoting this and I
16 will recommend it to you folks to remove EZ-Pass
17 and tolls from the Garden State Parkway and this
18 too is riding a wave of popularity. In the
19 latest scientific member poll the Triple A finds
20 69 percent of its members favor the removal of
21 Parkway tolls. And from the first time they
22 asked, its an increased number. It looks like
23 potential for opinion behind that from a lot of
24 people and of course the governor now has a
25 consolidation study and with some of his current

1 actions, Parkway funding by the Turnpike, this
2 kind of recommendation is getting closer to
3 reality and is a bright spot on the radar screen.
4 So I just give you a context for it to put it
5 there with everything else.

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

19 For example, one of my favorite
20 topics, speed limits; setting speed limits as
21 recommended in the MUTCD would raise many speed
22 limits in New Jersey. While that won't change
23 the general behavior since most motorists are
24 already going above artificially low speed
25 limits, it will smooth out the traffic flow and

1 allow all traffic to move incrementally faster
2 and safer and that translates directly to
3 incrementally increased capacity. I'm not
4 talking about great changes either of speed
5 limits or capacity, but again when I started to
6 talk, the smoothness factor really helps.

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

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

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

25 MR. CARRELLAS: That's just on the

1 upgrade.

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

12 Those are the recommendations I
13 wanted to bring to the Task Force's attention
14 today. I want to leave you with some final
15 thoughts on congestion; that seems to be the name
16 of our game here. We all don't like it and when
17 it happens we gripe about it, but congestion
18 doesn't exist every where all the time. That's
19 one reason why one size fits all solutions don't
20 work. We motorists, we also adapt. And
21 congestion may not be a bad thing given the
22 alternatives some would like to give us. Perhaps
23 some level of congestion is just another cost of
24 the use of our automobiles and the overall
25 freedom that it really gives us; there is a

1 context here. And that's why I almost always
2 offer this challenge and I remember doing it
3 talking to NJTPA back in 1995; if you can provide
4 transportation alternatives that are more
5 comfortable, safer, more convenient and faster
6 than the personal automobile, then you will win
7 the war. Just figure that out -- but remember,
8 and Jim you put it in the open letter, solutions
9 that counter this need will fail and it can get
10 to the point of not being tolerated. Good
11 example is getting rid of the HOV lanes, it
12 catches up to you. That's what I wanted to bring
13 to you today.

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

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

23 MR. HEATH: I'm Clifford Heath,
24 Vice President of the New Jersey Alliance For
25 Action.

1 Just a preamble to what I'm going to
2 say, we do support the work of this Task Force
3 and have -- and happy to have a member of the
4 Alliance, our executive vice president, be an
5 active participant on this Task Force. So we are
6 aware of your deliberations and we are happy that
7 you took the time and I will mention some of that
8 in some of this testimony.

9 I will repeat my name again, it's
10 Clifford J. Heath, Vice President of the New
11 Jersey Alliance For Action, a statewide nonprofit
12 non-partisan coalition of over 600 businesses,
13 labor, professional, academic and governmental
14 organizations. The Alliance, since its inception
15 27 years ago, had been viewing the growing
16 problem of congestion on New Jersey's highway
17 network, and thus in the year 2000 with the
18 intensity of the problem, a major concern
19 affecting the quality of life for daily commuters
20 as well as for the hundreds of commercial
21 establishments that depend on the smooth flow of
22 goods, the foundation of the Alliance For Action
23 commissioned the New Jersey Institute of
24 Technology's National Center for Transportation
25 and Industrial Productivity to undertake a

1 comprehensive study of congestion. The final
2 report, Mobility and The Costs of Congestion in
3 New Jersey was completed in February 2000. The
4 report was updated in August 2001 and it
5 indicated the cost of congestion had continued to
6 increase substantially during the intervening
7 year and-a-half. We have a copy of that report
8 if you want that for the record and also the
9 updated report in August of 2001.

10 When the formation of the Congestion
11 Buster Task Force was announced, the Alliance For
12 Action enthusiastically endorsed its goal, I
13 quote now, To study traffic congestion, to
14 develop a commuter options plan that would result
15 in capping peak hour vehicle trips at 1999
16 levels. I must say we had a little skepticism
17 whether we could achieve the 1999 level with all
18 the additional traffic that's been on the road in
19 this intervening three-year period. However,
20 from our perspective we thought that the
21 identification of the projects, and I continue to
22 quote, Which can be quickly implemented to
23 relieve congestion or as I call them hot spots,
24 or improve safety on our roads was all very
25 noble.

1 With the appointment of James
2 Sinclair, Vice President of the New Jersey
3 Business and Industry Association, as the
4 chairman of the Task Force we recognized someone
5 who has for many years been reconciling the
6 divergent views of business on one side and the
7 regulatory agencies on the other. The finished
8 product, to the extent that we are totally
9 familiar with it, would indicate that he has done
10 a creditable job of using the talents of the Task
11 Force members while remaining ever mindful of the
12 legislative charge of submitting a final report
13 by June 2002. And that -- for that we do commend
14 him and the members of the Task Force. It surely
15 had to be a labor of love requiring the devotion
16 of countless hours pouring over the language,
17 phraseology and statistics incorporated in the
18 Task Force recommendations.

19 Thus we hesitate to enter into the
20 record -- I use the word discordant, but that's
21 not quite what it is -- exception to the
22 otherwise admirable work of the Task Force. But
23 did not the legislature expect the identification
24 of projects which can be quickly implemented to
25 relieve congestion -- I think we have heard

1 previous testimony and it has been recognized
2 that that's what they were looking for -- or is
3 the phrase subject to other interpretations,
4 meaning selective widening, intersection
5 improvements, sequential signaling, grade
6 separated crossings, etcetera, on the state and
7 interstate highway network. I know you have had
8 some of that incorporated in your reports.

9 I'm going to take your favorite
10 highway as an example, Route I-287 which I
11 believe was the subject of the most frequent
12 complaints and the most hits on your web site.
13 Nothing was offered to give comfort to those
14 drivers who surrender a half hour every morning
15 going north and another half hour every evening
16 going south through Middlesex County. While the
17 Alliance For Action has always supported mass
18 transit options and light rail systems where
19 feasible, we see no alternatives to Route I-287
20 other than widening as was done in the Morris
21 County section a few years ago, and I know that
22 was a very contentious widening. I attended the
23 hearings in this room when they were
24 deliberating -- the North Jersey Transportation
25 Planning Authority was deliberating whether to

1 put a stamp of approval on that widening program
2 through Morris County. Anyone riding that road
3 since that widening can see every day the
4 difference it has made. There was literally no
5 option but to allow more space for the
6 automobiles literally that are -- they are
7 already there. I don't think it necessarily
8 encouraged more cars as we sometimes think that
9 more lane miles encourage more cars; lane miles
10 are sometimes for those people who already have
11 no alternative.

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

23 May I also say, and this is a
24 personal observation, when we talk about trying
25 to go to telecommunication -- I would like to

1 stay at home too, Jim. I think that is a great
2 idea at least once a week, two days, as many days
3 that are available, but a lot of our businesses
4 are small businesses in this state and they have
5 no -- they literally don't know much about
6 telecommunications. That's a big corporate kind
7 of thing in many circles. And all these small
8 businesses that have their employees on the road
9 driving to work are probably going to be always
10 in that condition. So whether we accomplish
11 reducing a lot of traffic by telecommunication,
12 that's something you ask for the study and it
13 would be interesting just to see definitively how
14 much could be reduced. If we can reduce and get
15 25 percent of vehicles off the road then we don't
16 really have to consider widening or anything
17 else, the problem is solved.

18 MR. SINCLAIR: We don't have to get
19 25 percent. As Steve told us, if you take one --
20 if you take one percent out, you get three
21 percent reduction in congestion. I don't know if
22 he made that number up but it's a great number
23 and I'm going to keep using it.

24 MR. HEATH: And the mass transit
25 option, which would be great also, almost anyone

1 could get on the train -- I would like to work on
2 Wall Street like my children are, and it would be
3 lovely to get on the train in the morning and
4 read your paper and ride to work. But many of us
5 in the state, most of the people, 95 percent of
6 the workers in New Jersey have no other option,
7 cars are how to get to work. There is no transit
8 of any sort available to them, unless they go in
9 some kind of convoluted direction to go to work.
10 That's all I have, thank you very much.

11 MR. SINCLAIR: Anybody have some
12 questions for Cliff on his comments?

13 Send in those projects to us. One
14 of the things that we -- initially when we did
15 the hot spots, and although there was grumbling
16 on the Task Force that we did that, the hot spot
17 thing was good because it focused -- because what
18 I've learned is congestion is personal, it's
19 personal, it's temporal, it's in a time, it's in
20 a place and it's how it affects you personally
21 and people did send in those ideas of where there
22 was congestion, that it impacted them personally.
23 And we gave that to the Department of
24 Transportation, they looked at that list and it
25 pretty much -- it pretty much looked like what

1 they knew; that the Department could look at the
2 complaint and see on their 25 year plan which
3 thing they were going to deal with. But I would
4 encourage you to send that to us and put that
5 into the record of the Task Force.

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

20 MS. SCHLEICHER: I would like to
21 make a comment. The charge of this committee is
22 to add more capacity by managing the demand. You
23 know, it's the other side, it's the softer side
24 but the harder side, the harder thing to do. We
25 don't, you know, disagree with you. I think the

1 focus was trying to make these behavioral, if you
2 will, kinds of changes that we're talking about,
3 which are the most difficult kinds of changes to
4 make. It's almost easier to build that road,
5 which DOT will tell you no. But when you look at
6 what goes into incenting and giving people a
7 reason to change, it's probably one of the most
8 difficult things to do. But in a state that's as
9 land poor as we are, rich in everything else, we
10 really need to find a way to make -- to improve
11 capacity by managing the demand at a time when we
12 know it's the easier time to do that and it's
13 probably the worse time, which is the people
14 going and coming from work.

15 I was going to ask Steve Carrellas
16 by the way -- because I don't think anybody has a
17 problem with telecommuting, telework. That, by
18 the way, is one of the more difficult things to
19 get incorporated within even large corporations
20 because again it changes the way or the
21 perception of the way work is being done or isn't
22 being done. So, you know, change is hard for all
23 of us, and that's what we're about is trying to
24 change things. And I appreciate your remarks and
25 I look forward to working with you.

1 MR. KEENAN: I think what the key is
2 and it kind of echos what Judy was saying, the
3 key is you can't do one or the other. You can't
4 pave the entire state and you can't think you're
5 going to get everyone on to a train or a bus or
6 car pooling, telecommuting. It's all of that.
7 Steve was talking about the synchronization of
8 lights. We think you need expanded capacity, you
9 also need to get the MOM (ph) going, to get
10 additional light rails wherever possible, it's
11 really -- telecommuting. It's really -- you are
12 right Judy, it's a shift of beliefs, the way of
13 lives -- the way of life here in New Jersey. It
14 can't just be one or the other, and that's the
15 hard part, getting every one to kind of change
16 their ideas about what's the right thing. It's
17 not all getting on a train or bus or getting in
18 the car and making bigger roads; it's got to be
19 that, it's got to be removing traffic lights
20 where possible, synchronization of lights when
21 possible, getting people -- building new rail
22 lines when possible, increasing and promoting the
23 use of additional bus lines when possible. It's
24 really got to be a well rounded attack, so to
25 speak.

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

20 And I think that's what we need, we
21 need to be able to take and compare a tax
22 incentive for somebody to do something to get out
23 of the flow versus widening a lane versus adding
24 another tunnel to New York or taking the tolls
25 off the Turnpike. We do these projects, we go

1 after federal funding as if it was some gift, you
2 know, that we are not really paying for here in
3 the process. And we have this -- and we're very
4 proud of ourselves if we can do that. And
5 sometimes we capture money because it's there to
6 capture instead of capturing something that's the
7 greater priority or the greater, you know -- our
8 ability to prioritize transportation dollars is
9 not inherent to me as a citizen. Maybe it is,
10 maybe people understand the calculus of doing
11 this. But it isn't -- having done this for nine
12 months now, it isn't apparent to me how we
13 just -- we just do things because that's what we
14 do.

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

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

21 Is there somebody else who is going
22 to testify?

23 MR. MEGHDIR: Hamou Meghdir, NJTPA.
24 One of our staff members, Brian Fineman, who is
25 heading up the group that's updating the CMS, the

1 congestion management system program that's
2 mandated by TEA-21 wanted to say a few words. It
3 happens that what this group has done dovetails
4 very well with the update of the CMS. And he
5 just wanted to give the planning perspective,
6 he'll will take four, five minutes to, you know,
7 just tell you how important it is as mandate, and
8 what we have been doing about it recently. It's
9 important because anything that's going to be
10 funded in federal dollars that has something to
11 do with congestion is going to have to be part of
12 the CMS process. So what I have been doing is
13 once we've had those early recommendations, I've
14 been feeding these recommendations to our group
15 here who has been giving them to the consultant
16 to do the evaluation, they will be tested and
17 included in the CMS. If I may get him --

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

20 MR. INTINDOLA: My name is Brian
21 Intindola and I'm associated with Pennoni
22 Associates Incorporated in the Clifton office
23 here in New Jersey. I pretty much spent my
24 entire career as a traffic engineer working on
25 projects as small as gas stations and as large as

1 putting a new bridge in Mercer County, so I've
2 seen all sides of the coin.

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

1 where you can get the project out to bid.

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

17 And those models too, they are
18 somewhat lacking in the mass transit choices in
19 the models. It looks like a separate module if
20 you will in the model, and some are -- they
21 aren't as good as they could be because most of
22 the emphasis has been on vehicles. Most models
23 prefer to deal with highway modeling because
24 transit modeling is a different approach
25 altogether. So the strength is there for highway

1 model but not for the transit model. And if this
2 is something that the Congestion Buster Task
3 Force could do --

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

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

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

25 MR. INTINDOLA: Ultimately ideally

1 you can go to a New Jersey wide web site where
2 the model resides and put your info in right
3 there. But right now because the model is
4 fragmented along MPOs, it's difficult to do that.
5 Although you need to only work in your area, but
6 there's difficulty doing -- to get New Jersey
7 wide solutions because of the way it's set up
8 right now.

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

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

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

1 suggestion.

2 MR. SINCLAIR: Brian?

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

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

22 And as part of that effort we are
23 identifying performance measures, ways of
24 measuring congestion and again things that the
25 Task Force is working on as well, and ways of

1 identifying strategies dealing with
2 accessibility, to enhance accessibility mobility
3 and manage congestion around the region. We are
4 trying to look to coordinate as much as possible.
5 The reports back from the Task Force are going to
6 our consultant that's developing some of our
7 technical work. And we do have give and take and
8 we're happy to have some interfacing more
9 directly with you guys.

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

19 MR. FINEMAN: And we have a slightly
20 different audience, obviously. And we are
21 intending to repeat this year after year as we
22 update our regional transportation plan. We're
23 looking at specific strategies along all those
24 categories to hand off to the variety of
25 implementing agencies around our region.

1 MR. SINCLAIR: Some of your
2 strategies -- and the reason I'm happy you are
3 here testifying is some of your strategies are
4 going to require legislative or regulatory
5 action. And some of your strategies, in fact,
6 are going to be our strategies that we are going
7 to recommend as things that can be done right
8 away. You know, things that we can do to help
9 deal with the congestion. Sort of our ten
10 projects -- our ten projects are not necessarily
11 going to move us back to 1999 levels, but our ten
12 projects are going to be wonderful ten projects
13 that are going to have a meaningful impact on
14 congestion around the state. And we would like
15 to work with you in thinking through this as we
16 move forward and coupling with your work.

17 MR. FINEMAN: Excellent.

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

21 MR. FINEMAN: The primary progress
22 of our analysis right now, there will be two more
23 milestones that we're looking for in the
24 beginning of the summer, July 11, we are looking
25 for our board to recognize the full analysis

1 essentially, although not make final decisions
2 about what gets incorporated into our regional
3 plan and what gets incorporated into what we
4 might hand off to implementing agencies. Those
5 two -- the real specifics happen by September of
6 this year. So that's the overall time frame, but
7 we will have our report by July.

8 MR. SINCLAIR: Anything else?

9 MR. FINEMAN: Any questions,
10 anything else?

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

14 Yes, sir.

15 MR. BRIMMER: If I can beg the
16 committee's indulgence. My name is Mike Brimmer,
17 I'm the Vice President of State Relations for CSX
18 Transportation, one of the railroads that serves
19 New Jersey. I'd like to commend this committee
20 for the breath of the work that you have
21 undertaken and Demand Management recommendations
22 that I've just had a chance to look through. I
23 think you have really touched on a number of very
24 important short-term non-capital solutions which
25 are very helpful towards the process.

1 I think clearly the work NJTPA on
2 congestion management, the focus on reducing
3 vehicle miles traveled, the recognition that
4 initially that single occupancy vehicles for
5 passengers, the role transit would play as well
6 as the important recommendations made by your
7 Goods Movement subcommittee with respect to
8 trucks are all appropriate and balanced. I'm
9 here obviously to reflect the point of view of
10 one other small -- relatively small component of
11 this, and that's rail freight.

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

22 If the Port Authority's plans move
23 forward as they are currently projected to, they
24 are going to double the number of containers that
25 off-load at the marine terminals in this area.

1 And doubling the number of containers means
2 doubling the amount of trucks that are going to
3 move. Of the containers that land here, about 80
4 percent are going to be distributed in this
5 metropolitan area by truck. 20 percent of them
6 are destined for Chicago and the mid-west and
7 they don't have to move by truck, they can move
8 by rail if that's possible.

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

23 I would suggest that is an important
24 ingredient and there aren't too many additional
25 kinds of improvements that can take the

1 equivalent of 150,000 trucks off your local
2 records with one shot. The advantage of using
3 the existing rail freight infrastructure system
4 is it's already an existing right of way. It
5 does not require additional land acquisition; it
6 does not require additional displacement. It's
7 privately owned and to a large extent privately
8 invested.

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

1 such as the Port Authority.

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

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

22 MR. BRIMMER: We need two tracks
23 where there is one. We need upgraded signals,
24 the technology and ITS everyone talks about. We
25 need greater vertical clearances so we can carry

1 piggyback trains, one on top of the other,
2 doubling the productivity of the train. And
3 there are several places where there are tunnels.
4 We need crossovers so a train can operate on
5 either track and we need some grade separations.

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

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

11 MR. SINCLAIR: Not that river,
12 but --

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

16 But those kinds of things that we
17 just mentioned, we have identified a list of
18 projects in conjunction with New Jersey DOT and
19 the Port Authority, which -- I'll give you the
20 big number, it is capital, it's \$300 million over
21 10 years, 30 million a year. If that's shared
22 public and private, say 50/50, it's 15 million
23 public 15 million private. If the 15 million
24 public is half New Jersey and half Port
25 Authority, that's seven and-a-half million

1 dollars a year out of a \$2 billion transportation
2 budget in the state, it doesn't seem to be too
3 excessive to us.

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

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

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

22 MR. MIELE: I fully endorse his
23 concept of a public-private partnership. I'm
24 involved in the largest in the world right now in
25 the Secaucus Interchange and Railway Junction.

1 And I think it behooves this commission to get a
2 report on its long-term solutions from someone
3 like our former Congressman Bob Roe regarding
4 where we are on Secaucus Interchange, because as
5 a result of it when it's completed -- the idea
6 started in 1978. It's now at the major point of
7 building the railroad station and junction being
8 built, you will be able to have interstate and
9 intrastate transportation throughout the whole
10 State of New Jersey and it's a major long-term
11 solution. But the reason I commend the gentleman
12 is that that is a partnership between New Jersey
13 Transit and Turnpike Authority, the state and
14 private industry. It's a public-private
15 partnership which can get a result, albeit taking
16 a long period of time, but a major transportation
17 hub for the world. So before we submit our
18 report, if you want I will try to get you some
19 information on it directly from Congressman Roe.

20 MR. SINCLAIR: Thank you very much.

21 MS. SCHLEICHER: I want some
22 clarification because you brought up the problems
23 of conflict between the freight and the
24 passenger, and we all know what's gone on with
25 passenger boom. So the seven and-a-half million,

1 I like the way you got that down to seven
2 and-a-half million dollars a year. I heard a big
3 number up there. But for that money, would that
4 relieve this conflict or that just takes care of
5 your problem?

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

14 MS. SCHLEICHER: I just wanted to
15 clarify.

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

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

20 MR. SINCLAIR: We are all working
21 here --

22 MR. BRIMMER: There is one other
23 thing I do want to mention, because it doesn't
24 come up and I think it's important. If you're
25 going to put a passenger train on a freight line

1 right of way next to each other, we've seen in to
2 our sorrow in the last week what can happen in
3 terms of accidents. And one of the things that
4 we are also going to require is that there be
5 some liability insurance for the additional risk
6 that we're going to bear, because if God forbid
7 there is a wreck involving a passenger train and
8 on a freight line, they are not going to sue the
9 State or New Jersey Transit for more than a
10 certain amount of money, they are capped; they
11 are going to sue the freight railway. In our
12 case -- let's assume it was our fault, our
13 engineer fell asleep and drove his train into a
14 passenger train. The point is if the passenger
15 train hadn't been on the right of way there
16 wouldn't have been an accident and we wouldn't be
17 liable. So we are going to face an increased
18 risk of new passenger service next to freight
19 that we don't think our shareholders should bear
20 that risk and we'd ask the state to purchase
21 liability insurance or give us the same cap that
22 the state has.

23 MR. SINCLAIR: Thank you.

24 Is there anybody else that wants to
25 testify? Is there anything?

1 Is there anything else the board
2 wants to say?

3 Why don't we recess the hearing.

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

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, AMARILIS VEGA, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, do hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of my original stenographic notes taken at the time and place hereinbefore set forth.

AMARILIS VEGA, CSR

Dated: MAY 17, 2002.