

R152  
1985a

**PUBLIC HEARING**

before

**SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE  
ON PATH SAFETY AND FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS**

on

**WALDO YARD MAINTENANCE FACILITY**

October 17, 1985  
Room 348  
State House Annex  
Trenton, New Jersey

**MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEE PRESENT:**

Senator Thomas F. Cowan, Chairman  
Senator Walter Rand  
Senator S. Thomas Gagliano

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Nicholas LaRocca  
Assemblyman Paul Cuprowski  
Laurence A. Gurman,  
Office of Legislative Services,  
Aide, Senate Transportation and  
Communications Committee

**New Jersey State Library**

\*\*\*\*\*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Honorable Anthony Cucci Mayor, Jersey City	3
Paul Costello Representing Congressman Frank Guarini	5
Morton Farrah Assistant Executive Director, Jersey City Economic Development Corporation	7
Joseph L. Vanacore Executive Officer, Capital Programs, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey	10
Richard R. Kelly Deputy Director of Rail Transportation, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey	12
Francis A. Gorman Vice President of PATH, and Director of Rail Transportation, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey	15
John Rahenkamp President, John Rahenkamp and Associates	19
Frederick R. Hayes Cooperating Consultant to Mr. Rahenkamp	24
Henry L. Stuart Cooperating Transportation Consultant to Mr. Rahenkamp	27
Father James Pagnotta Saint Joseph's Church, Jersey City	39
Ted Anderson Anderson Lumber Company	42
Jerry Brancato Hilltop Neighborhood Association	45

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Mary McDonald Hilltop Neighborhood Association	48
Jonathan Peters Vice President Block Drug Company	50
Joseph Filc Hudson County Chamber of Commerce	53
William Scholl First Jersey National Bank	54
Antonio Pagkalinwan Student, St. Joseph's School	55
Robert Feldman General Manager, McMillan Blodell Container Company	56
Morris Longo Hudson County Register	60

\* \* \* \* \*

**SENATOR THOMAS F. COWAN** (Chairman): Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I want to welcome you to this public hearing, which is being conducted by the Senate Transportation and Communications Subcommittee on PATH [Port Authority Trans-Hudson Corporation] safety and facilities improvements. I am Senator Thomas Cowan, and I have been appointed by the President of the Senate to serve as Chairman of this Subcommittee. Serving with me on this Subcommittee is Senator Tom Gagliano from Monmouth County on my right, Senator Walter Rand from Camden County who will be here shortly, and sitting in this morning are Assemblyman LaRocca from Union City, and my companion from the Thirty Second Legislative District, Assemblyman Paul Cuprowski. On my left from the Office of Legislative Services is Larry Gurman, serving as an aide to this Committee.

There is a general recognition today that PATH is obliged to provide additional facilities and equipment for the maintenance and repair of PATH's fleet of rapid transit cars. The Henderson Facility is already operating at or near its maximum capacity at a time when there is an increasing inability to meet PATH's needs within the current system. In addition, as we know, the planned replacement of the K-cars and expansion of the fleet, which involves the addition of another series of vehicles requiring different technology and maintenance procedures, will require the establishment of increased maintenance facilities.

Recognizing this need for increased maintenance of PATH cars, the fundamental question that seemed to confront us was whether or not it was advisable to locate a new repair facility at the proposed Waldo Yard site. As you may all know, late yesterday afternoon the Governor announced he will direct the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey to abandon plans for construction of a major facility at Waldo Yards and instead seek another site for the project.

One of this Subcommittee's primary goals is to assure that any major project built by the Port Authority in the future meets the specifications and interests of affected local governments and the people living within any affected community. The public information that is now available clearly indicates that there is a serious issue

with regard to how bi-state agencies operate in this State, and whether they should be required by law to operate in a manner which is consistent, not merely with their own operational interests, but rather with the best interests of the citizens of this State.

Over recent years, public agencies in New Jersey at all levels of Government have been subject to increasing scrutiny, by way of mandated public hearings and legally required impact statements as to environmental, economic, and social implications, with regard to significant public projects. Until now, such public overview has not been specifically required for bi-state agencies such as PATH, but the subject matter of this hearing compels us to consider a more rigorous evaluation process for future projects, and it may very well be the time to bring such agencies under the umbrella of such legislation; legislation that in most situations has been enacted after they were established.

It is the hope of this Subcommittee that this hearing will begin to assemble the information and material that will enable this Subcommittee and the State Legislature to consider appropriate legislation that will prevent such events from reoccurring in the future and thus avoid unnecessary disruption, anxiety, and delay in the orderly and intelligent development of better services for all our citizens while at the same time not sacrificing people's homes, neighborhoods, and jobs.

For the purpose of this public hearing, this Subcommittee is also interested in the consideration of alternate sites to Waldo Yards, a determination of the major factors that should be taken into account in selecting the location for a maintenance facility, and the information as to when we can expect a new facility to be in operation.

We hope that the proceedings of this public hearing will suffice in providing this Subcommittee with enough information to make some recommendations for alternate sites. However, if we find that further information is required, our intent is to hold further public hearings.

As Chairman of this Subcommittee, I invite any interested person to assist in providing information that may be useful to this

Subcommittee. Your involvement and participation is most important and fully appreciated.

We do have a speakers list of people who have indicated that they would like to testify this morning. When we finish with the list of names, anyone else who wishes to testify will be most welcome. Our first person this morning is the Mayor of Jersey City, the Honorable Anthony Cucci.

**MAYOR ANTHONY CUCCI:** Thank you very much, Senator Cowan.

Senators, Assemblymen, elected officials, and State representatives, thank you for this opportunity. I promise to be very brief and not intrude or circumvent anyone else. Of course this is not the first time Senator Cowan and others here have spoken out on this, but it seems to have taken a new and needed direction which I very much commend. This proposed legislation and any other legislation that could serve the public is needed. It may not be legislation that punishes anyone, such as the Port Authority or any other agency, but may be a necessary legislative way of saying no one is above the public. I think that is what you are trying to say. I would not think or dream of an administration that did not conform to every aspect of the public's right to know, and other public input on resolutions, ordinances, and such. Neither does any other township work that way.

Once again, it is not as a form of punishment, but as a necessity, to ensure that no one rises above the genuine welfare of the public. What I also see here -- and I will support any legislation to this effect and give whatever representation and valid enforcement needed -- is a recognition that, regardless of the agency, no one should break the spirit of the law. I am talking about the Port Authority not being open and public about it -- I had to learn about it from the Block Drug Company -- and I immediately realized my obligation to the public. What we need now, is for all agencies to share information with the public whenever it is in the best interest of the city, county, State, or country.

I am elated on one hand that Governor Kean has implied -- I am using the word "implied" with reservations -- but stopped short of saying he will veto this project if they proceed. I think if he does

say he will veto it, it will have much more meaning, and yet I am not trying to take away from the brave governmental step that Governor Kean took. On the other hand, I don't see the Port Authority in any way saying they are going to surrender this area or this site. So, I think that although we have made great strides, we haven't crossed the finish line. I am hoping the Governor will make it final and say he intends to veto any site in the Waldo Avenue area or anything in proximity to it such as Montgomery West. I have the full support of our legislative delegation, and I am certain government on the State and county level will join me and indicate they do not want any part of the Port Authority's proposed site at Waldo, West Montgomery, East Montgomery, or anywhere else. We hope this will be recognized and taken into consideration.

Now, that doesn't mean there are no alternate sites that can be studied. There certainly are. The study by the Port Authority was made strictly on a technological and scientific level, and it certainly left out the ramifications on the social and economic level which were far reaching for the public sector.

So, Senator Cowan, I offer you full support for any legislation that I think is proper, and has integrity, that makes agencies accountable to the public, and makes them conform to the principles of government and communication with the public. So if you can direct me, I will direct the council and the entire administration, and we will be in full support.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you very much.

MAYOR CUCCI: Thank you very much for your time, and I hope I haven't imposed on anyone. If there are any questions--

SENATOR COWAN: Are there any questions of the Mayor?  
Senator?

SENATOR GAGLIANO: I have no questions. Mayor, nice to meet you.

SENATOR COWAN: Assemblyman?

ASSEMBLYMAN CUPROWSKI: I have no questions. I give you credit, Mr. Mayor, for taking time to come down here and for supporting your constituents.

MAYOR CUCCI: Thank you Assemblyman. It is the least I can do, because I know you feel as I do. We don't intend to lose one square inch of space, nor one job. I don't intend to lose one job, not one. Thank you very much.

SENATOR COWAN: We are going to create them, Mayor.

MAYOR CUCCI: Yes. The trick is to keep what you have right now and create more. We don't need a revolving door.

SENATOR COWAN: For your information, Mayor, I will provide you with copies of the two drafts of legislation I have. I'm sure Larry will give you copies before you leave today, so you can review them. The bills deal specifically with Executive Order 53, where certain buildings over \$5 million -- actually the figure was set at \$1.5 million when the legislation was first enacted -- would require certain permits from the DEP, and the other would deal specifically with the local zoning laws, which I think is very important.

MAYOR CUCCI: Fine, Senator. If I may just repeat something I said before in Jersey City, I don't think eminent domain, or any law with the spirit to trespass with total disregard for the welfare of any community-- I don't think lawmakers make laws with that intent. So, the spirit of the law is being broken, not only by not making their plans public, but by threatening the use of eminent domain. I am certain the fathers of eminent domain never intended it to be abused or an invasion of one's welfare. Thank you very much.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you very much, Mayor. Our next witness is representing Congressman Guarini. Paul Costello.

**PAUL COSTELLO:** Senator Cowan, fellow legislators, I am here representing Congressman Frank Guarini from the 14th Congressional District. I am here to read his statement into the record.

Congressman Frank J. Guarini, in Washington, D.C. is today attending to his legislative duties and cannot be with you. However, he is aware of the circumstances surrounding the Port Authority's proposed rail maintenance facility at the Waldo Yards in Jersey City, New Jersey, and of the concerns being addressed by this Subcommittee of the Senate of the New Jersey Legislature, and has asked the following remarks be read into the record at these proceedings:

"At the request of my constituents, I have followed closely the recent developments regarding the Port Authority's proposed siting of a rail maintenance facility at the Waldo Yards in Jersey City. Upon due consideration, I feel strongly that this proposal is manifestly inappropriate, and I fully support the stance of the Administration of the city of Jersey City, and Mayor Cucci in particular, in resisting this plan. It is readily apparent that the placement of such a facility at Waldo would cause serious injury to the many nearby residents, would jeopardize the investment of businesses and residents alike, and would be contrary to the redevelopment efforts of the city. It is a bad project in the wrong place.

"The furor generated by this proposal, though, raises a more fundamental issue; the absence of true oversight of the actions of the Port Authority. It has been over a half a century since the basic bi-state compact creating the Port Authority as an autonomous agency was approved by Congress. In the ensuing decades, governmental agencies, Federal, State, and local, have come under the spotlight of public inquiry with the citizenry demanding more openness in government, and a greater assurance of public participation. This trend has led to the increasing series of statutory requirements at both the State and Federal level, aimed both at mandating public disclosures and involvement and of promoting objective considerations by governmental officials of all relevant factors. This has been most paramount in the environmental field, where considerations of public health and safety has commanded the documenting of the fullest implications of public works projects. Bi-state agencies, however, being peculiar governmental creations, have only limited obligations of this kind, and generally only when public moneys are involved. It is time to reconsider this issue as to whether or not such bi-state agencies should be subject to the same manner and decree of public scrutiny and review that virtually all other levels of governmental operation are presently subject.

"It is my belief that agencies such as the Port Authority should be no less responsible to the public than other governmental agencies. It is certainly appropriate to begin this at the State

level, where the compacts originated, and I commend you for undertaking this important investigation.

"Furthermore, I wish to assure you that I stand ready to assist you at the Federal level to press for such legislative action in Washington as may further be required to bring these agencies into the twentieth century of government accountability. Thank you."

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you very much for that. Our next witness is Morton Farrah. Morton is the Assistant Executive Director of the Jersey City Economic Development Corporation.

MORTON FARRAH: Gentlemen, thank you for the opportunity to be here. I am here representing the City's Department of Housing and Economic Development. My comments are prepared comments, and they were written prior to the Governor's announcement yesterday, and prior to my having a chance to study some of the proposed legislation available to us. However, these comments are still quite appropriate and quite in line with what is being proposed, and I would like to read them. I think you will see, since they do address the zoning and environmental issues, they are appropriate.

It is the position of the City's Department of Housing and Economic Development that the PATH proposal to acquire the necessary lands to build a major passenger train repair facility is not in conformance with the city's officially adopted zoning ordinance. The area in question is zoned I-3 Industrial Park, a district that encourages modern industrial development in a park-like setting. It is not meant to be the city's heavy industry zone.

Under permitted uses, the I-3 zone does allow terminal facilities for rail, but there is a great difference between terminal facilities and repair facilities. The city's I-2 zone controls are quite similar in many respects to the I-3 zone, but it is our contention that despite these similarities, the I-2 zone is much closer to the definition of heavy industry.

In the zoning ordinance, two key differences in zone controls are evident. The I-2 zone has a permitted floor area ratio of 2.5, while I-3 only allows a 1.5 floor area ratio. In addition, in I-2, on site service and maintenance operations for equipment and operations

conducted on site is permitted as an accessory use, something not allowed in the I-3 zone. I make this comparison only to emphasize that the proposed repair facility is more appropriate to an I-2 area, not the I-3 area proposed by the Port Authority.

There is also a question of building coverage. The proposed facility includes extensive rail yards to be used not only for moving trains in and out of the proposed repair building, but also for train storage during off-peak hours. The nature of trains, with their impressive dimensions, gives them the same visual value as a series of rather large structures, and it is speculated if the proposed building coverage is added to the proposed storage area the 45% building coverage limit in an I-3 zone will be surpassed.

There is another aspect of this proposal that needs mentioning here, and regards the adjacent Montgomery Gateway residential area. This area was once declared a blighted area, cleared, and redeveloped for residential land use. The resource utilized to accomplish this was the Federal Urban Renewal Program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD]. In the 1970s, when this project was executed, HUD initiated an environmental review process which mandated that whenever residential land use was proposed in an urban renewal project, proof had to be offered that adjacent land uses would pose no noise, light, or other environmental hazard. Naturally, HUD approved the residential re-use, since no hazards were evident, and we now have an attractive and successful residential area. But, what if the proposed Waldo Yards facility had been built first? Would HUD have approved the residential area land use? In prior positions, both as a consultant and as planning director for the City of Trenton, I had numerous occasions to address similar issues with HUD, and from these experiences I can assure you that HUD would never have allowed Federal dollars to go into a residential re-use project with such a repair facility nearby.

I mention this because, in a sense, nothing has changed. What would have been unthinkable a decade ago should be unthinkable now. HUD would have viewed the residential areas as being in jeopardy by offering a reduced quality of life and that would still be the case. I thank you.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you very much, Morton. Senator, do you have any questions for Morton?

SENATOR GAGLIANO: Yes. Mr. Farrah, in your opinion as part of the Jersey City Economic Development Corporation, are there other sites that would be as suitable or more suitable for the proposed Yard facilities? I think even based on what Senator Cowan said in his opening statement there is a recognition of a need, and I know the Port Authority is doing a lot to improve PATH, which is absolutely necessary, and I just wonder if-- We don't want to start World War III either, we would like to see a facility, if not in Jersey City, some place which could service the cars and trains.

MR. FARRAH: My office and I have not directly analyzed the ability of other alternate sites to satisfy the Port Authority needs. However, I notice on the agenda of speakers there are other consultants that have gone into this quite thoroughly, and I think they would be in a much better position to answer that question. They have the technical background.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: Okay, because you had mentioned the I-2 zone would be more suited, and I didn't know whether there was someplace in the I-2 zone that would be--

MR. FARRAH: There were some alternates in Jersey City I believe they will discuss that are in--

SENATOR COWAN: They do have a particular number of sites they had proposed in the first study. We would like to welcome at this time Senator Walter Rand from Camden County who serves as my Chairman in the Transportation and Communications Committee in the Senate. Do you have any statement, Walter?

SENATOR RAND: No.

SENATOR COWAN: Paul, do you have any questions of Mr. Farrah? (negative response) Thank you very much, Morton. Next we will have three individuals who wish to present themselves all at once. They are, Joseph Vanacore, the Executive Officer for Capital Programs, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey; Frank Gorman, Director of Rail Transportation, Port Authority; and Richard Kelly, the Deputy Director of Rail Transportation, Port Authority. Welcome gentlemen, and good morning.

**JOSEPH L. VANACORE:** Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee, and the public, my name is Joseph L. Vanacore, Executive Officer for Capital Programs for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. On behalf of the Port Authority Trans-Hudson Corporation, a Port Authority subsidiary, I wish to express our appreciation for this opportunity to present remarks on a key element of the Capital Improvement Program for the PATH rail system. Also here today are Frank Gorman, Vice President and General Manager of PATH and Director of our Rail Transportation Department, and on my left is Richard R. Kelly, Deputy Director of the Rail Transportation Department.

Governor Kean yesterday issued a statement requesting the Port Authority abandon plans for construction of a major train maintenance and repair facility at Waldo Yard in Jersey City, and instead seek another site. As a result of earlier discussions between Governor Kean and Port Authority Chairman Philip Kaltenbacher, our Executive Director Stephen Berger had directed me to take charge of a complete reevaluation of all alternative locations for the PATH facility, including sites suggested by the Jersey City community. Following the Governor's statement of yesterday, we have removed Waldo Yards as one of the alternative sites for the major maintenance facility.

I am now responsible for developing a recommended site for this vitally needed major repair facility. As part of this study, we will review engineering and operational criteria, and environmental and community impact. In this study, I plan to make use of all the applicable studies previously produced. I have also retained the services of SSTV/Seelye, Stevenson Value and Knecht to assist me in this effort.

I would like to take this opportunity to reemphasize the critical need for a major new train repair and maintenance facility, a need that no one has questioned. PATH currently serves 200,000 riders daily and anticipates an increase to 230,000 by 1990. The purchase of new cars and rehabilitation of older cars is necessary in order to continue to serve the travel and economic growth of the region and the cities along the rail line. These new and rehabilitated cars cannot be

adequately maintained at PATH's existing Henderson Street facility in Jersey City, which opened its doors in 1910.

The Capital Improvement Program also includes safety improvements, an electrical power program, station improvements, and the car program.

I would like to thank the Subcommittee for continued interest and support for the PATH Capital Program. We will continue to keep you and local officials and citizens informed. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you very much. I would, of course, like to thank you for your fine presentation this morning. I am sure it is most appealing to many people here. I was just wondering, in your presentation have you given thought now to the fact of expanding? Are you going to expand your site search to other than the alternate sites that have been suggested up to this time?

MR. VANACORE: In my opinion, we are at ground zero. We have retained a consultant to assist us, and we are going to quickly review everything we know about all the sites that have been considered to date. In my opinion, it doesn't rule out looking at any other site that either our consultant, our staff, or any people here today might recommend to us. I welcome those comments.

SENATOR COWAN: What would be the time frame now and what are you looking for as far as your study-- When would you look for a completion date of this facility you need?

MR. VANACORE: We -- my boss, Stephen Berger, and our board -- are very concerned about meeting the need for this maintenance facility in the shortest possible time. However, it is a major facility and is not like a normal automobile maintenance facility that if you can't build here you can build somewhere else quickly. My guess, and my target, is to have something to recommend to Mr. Berger, who assigned me this responsibility, by the end of the year. That is a very tight timetable, because we are really almost starting from scratch. But we are going to use all of our resources to move that as quickly as we can.

SENATOR COWAN: Senator?

SENATOR GAGLIANO: Mr. Vanacore, I'm not that familiar with the existing Waldo Yards. How many acres are you using at this point?

MR. VANACORE: I would guess -- that is why I brought along these two, they are the experts -- it is about two acres.

RICHARD R. KELLY: No, it is slightly over three acres we are currently involved with.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: You were going to expand it to be how many acres?

MR. KELLY: Twenty-nine.

MR. VANACORE: Twenty-nine.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: And, if you go someplace else in the Hudson County area you anticipate that is the kind of acreage you will need? In other words, this is quite a large facility. Can you do it with less, or do you think it is going to be about 29 acres?

MR. KELLY: It will be a minimum of 29, and could conceivably be more.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: And the sites you have discussed or you will consider-- Do you consider what the zoning is at those individual sites when you go in there?

MR. VANACORE: It is a factor we would consider. As we move a project forward there are a series of factors that have to be addressed.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: You are not technically bound by the local zoning ordinance, is that correct?

MR. VANACORE: I believe we are not.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: So, you would go there and-- Would you anticipate going before, for example, the local Jersey City Planning Board at least on a recommending type situation as opposed to an approval? I think that is what the people are concerned about and I guess I've got too much experience in zoning. I can understand the people's concerns that someone is going to move a huge facility into their neighborhood and they are powerless to do anything about it. I think that is why we are here.

MR. VANACORE: Senator, I have been involved with the Port Authority for over 26 years, most of the time involved in project

management, and I don't recall any time we moved forward with a major or minor project without, as a minimum, reviewing it with the local officials in the city or jurisdiction in which the facility was planned. Many times, concurrently, we would talk to the local planners and the economic development people. Also, I think you should appreciate that before we can actually build anything we have to bring an item to our Board of Commissioners at an open public meeting to get approval. We cannot, sitting here, build anything at Waldo or anyplace else with that kind of process.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: I understand that, but once the Board makes its determination, you can go forward even though people in the municipality, including even the Mayor, would not be so happy with it. From a legal standpoint, you could, technically, go forward with the project.

MR. VANACORE: Legally, I guess we could. But, also, the officials have a right to contact the Governor. It is not unusual for officials to contact members of our Board before they take action, or to meet with them to discuss a particular action.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: Mr. Chairman, I think that is one of the issues we are going to have to think about addressing. I don't know the jurisdiction of our Legislature on whether or not we can oblige a bi-state agency to take certain definitive actions before the local planning board or the local mayor and council, whoever it might be. That may even be reserved for the Federal government; I am not sure. I would like the staff to research that issue because as part of anything that might come of this, we would want to know what our jurisdiction is, which in turn we then can give to the local municipalities under the Constitution of New Jersey.

And, I am not sure we can, I'm just saying it's something we should know whether or not we can. I mean, this type of thing happens all the time with the State or county coming into an area-- For example, there are some areas where people don't really want a park, yet the county park system says they are going to put a park there. They are not necessarily obliged to go through the same procedures an individual would have to go through. So I just want to point that out,

and I think we should know exactly what our jurisdiction would be as a Legislature, and whether or not we can legally require the Port Authority or any other bi-state agency to follow certain procedures that-- For example, if the Block Drug Company wanted to expand, they would have to go to the local boards for approval. The Port Authority doesn't have to at this point. I certainly understand the need and am on your side in that regard. I have thousands of people that I represent in the Legislature who commute and use PATH. So, I understand the need. And we have been to other hearings that Senator Cowan has Chaired, so we know that you are getting in the new equipment and you certainly have outdated repair facilities. We know that, and we want to help any way we can.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you Senator. Senator Rand, nothing? Assemblyman Cuprowski?

ASSEMBLYMAN CUPROWSKI: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to ask a question. Mr. Vanacore, your statement made reference to the Governor's statement where he requested the Port Authority abandon the plans for the construction. I was just wondering, for a point of clarification, did the Governor indicate that he was willing to veto the minutes of the Port Authority if that request was not met?

SENATOR GAGLIANO: If you know the answer.

MR. VANACORE: I don't know the answer to that at all. But, we have abandoned plans to build at Waldo Yard.

ASSEMBLYMAN CUPROWSKI: Suppose there is no other suitable site, what then?

MR. VANACORE: Well, it is premature to say now. We have to quickly look for an alternate site. I don't know what would happen if we reached the end of that study and found there was no alternate site. I would doubt it.

ASSEMBLYMAN CUPROWSKI: The last question I have is you made a reference that you are now requiring some consultants do a community impact statement, if I recall?

MR. VANACORE: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN CUPROWSKI: Why wasn't that done on this particular project?

MR. VANACORE: Well, the stages they went through in the sequence that led to the point where we are today, basically was based on our own staff -- that is our Rail Department and Engineering -- doing a lot of work in-house. They had retained a consultant, Kaiser, but with a fairly narrow charge, to look at operational, engineering, and land use criteria. They were in the process-- And, by the way, I should say they had discussed this plan with former officials of the city of Jersey City, and former members of the economic development arm of the city, so this was not done in secret.

The next step in the process would have been to start analyzing the environmental impact items, such as noise, lighting, and community impact. Before we had a chance to get to that other things happened.

ASSEMBLYMAN CUPROWSKI: Okay. Thank you and thank you Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR COWAN: Senator Rand?

SENATOR RAND: Thank you very much, Senator Cowan. Mr. Vanacore, first of all let me applaud you for removing the Waldo Yard as one of the alternative sites. I know Senator Cowan has been concerned about this for quite a few months, and that is why this Subcommittee was formed.

Let me go on a little bit. Evidently, there are some 75 million riders a year, if my figures are right based on the 200,000, is that correct?

FRANCIS A. GORMAN: It is closer to 55 million right now.

SENATOR RAND: It is closer to 55 million. The bottom line is you are going to have to have the site or you are not going to be able to give the service as anticipated with the new trains. Am I correct on that?

MR. VANACORE: Yes, sir.

SENATOR RAND: So, I don't think we now are in a position to say that a new site can't be found. I would have to say that if you are going to give the service to those 55 million riders per year, some site is going to have to be found.

MR. VANACORE: I agree.

SENATOR RAND: Okay. So, Senator Cowan, if I understand it, the bottom line is that we are going to have to find the site somewhere. Now, I don't know where that site is geographically, but I want to establish at least in my own mind that if the alternative site is dropped -- and I have no problem with that -- then in order to keep or upgrade that service we are going to have to find a yard. Is that correct, sir?

MR. VANACORE: That is correct.

SENATOR RAND: Thank you very much. Thank you Senator.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you. Assemblyman LaRocca?

ASSEMBLYMAN LaROCCA: I just have one question. In your opinion, has PATH ruled out the expansion of the present three acre facility at the Waldo Yard?

MR. VANACORE: We currently have three acres. I thought it was a little over two, but it is three. We also are in the process of concluding an arrangement with Conrail to take over a number of their properties, which includes a piece of about 16 acres at the Waldo site. That is part of a more elaborate arrangement we have made with Conrail.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: I guess the question is, what would you do with the extra 12 or 13 acres?

MR. VANACORE: Senator, our charge right now is to find a site for the major maintenance facility, the one that is vitally needed. Exactly what will we do with the remaining property? We will certainly want to put it to some use. I don't know at this point if it will be developed as part of our overall study. I can state here today that whatever plans we have for the balance of that site, I, together with Frank and Dick, will review it with the Mayor, his staff, and the citizens in the local community. I pledge that.

SENATOR COWAN: I would hope you would indicate that the Subcommittee would also be afforded the opportunity of having the information.

MR. VANACORE: I'm sorry. That was a given, Senator. I am sorry, I didn't mean to overlook you.

SENATOR COWAN: We started with you and we were sort of left back at the station for a couple of months, but we're back together. What would be some of the prime criteria for selection of this site?

MR. VANACORE: A new site?

SENATOR COWAN: Yes.

MR. VANACORE: One of them -- we call it engineering criteria -- is we would normally go in and take borings to determine the difficulty of building what we plan to build. We investigate the availability of utility service to the site. From an operational standpoint, Frank, Dick, and their staff would lay out what kind of criteria were necessary and how easily they could get downed trains off the revenue track to a particular maintenance facility -- how easily they could get them to and from. They would then also provide the criteria for the size of the facility. We are going to spend over \$100 million for this facility and it is vitally needed today. Since it is going to take us years before we have it operational, we want to assure ourselves and the traveling public that we will have a facility which costs that much and is going to serve us for many years to come.

SENATOR COWAN: There was some discussion when we had our meeting in Jersey City a month ago that was in the matter of sites in the West Hudson area. Now my understanding is you have taken -- PATH or the Port Authority -- the operational control of several of the bridges going out into the--

MR. GORMAN: We will be very shortly as part of the agreement with Conrail under which we get additional land at Waldo.

SENATOR COWAN: Because, it appeared that one of the stumbling blocks to some of the sites in that area was the fact that the bridges, perhaps, being inoperable at some given time, and--

MR. GORMAN: The condition of the bridges is one of the major drawbacks.

SENATOR COWAN: Of course, there have been some major repairs done on some of these bridges now, so would you still consider that as part of your pre-criteria for actual site development?

MR. VANACORE: In my opinion, having responsibility to develop a site location, I wouldn't rule out any site. The only site that is ruled out is Waldo Yard.

SENATOR COWAN: Anything further?

ASSEMBLYMAN LaROCCA: In this contemplated expansion of this 16 acres with the Conrail tract within the Waldo area, are there any uses that you have in mind for that area that you are contemplating or thinking about?

MR. VANACORE: Today, no. We had a master plan to do a lot of things at Waldo that got scrubbed, so we are starting all over. Our first priority is to find a site for the major maintenance base. There are other pieces of the program that we need. Sitting here today, I don't know exactly what we might propose at Waldo.

Let me state something that may not be obvious. Once you move out the major maintenance base, it eliminates the need for any taking of private property, it does away with the issue of dislocation or relocation of jobs, it gives us a narrower site with more distance to the community, and affords us the opportunity to create a buffer zone of some kind so we can make the site, whatever it is, more compatible with the neighborhood. I am talking about such things as landscaping and sound barriers and other things you can do to make these required facilities compatible with the surrounding community. So, there are several advantages to us we can now take a look at. But, my first priority is to get a site for our major base.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you very much, Frank, Joe, and Richard, we certainly appreciate your presentation.

MR. GORMAN: Thank you.

SENATOR COWAN: Mr. Vanacore, if you said it once, you have said it four times; you have abandoned that site, and we appreciate that.

MR. VANACORE: I felt that was one message I should leave here today.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you. (To audience) Can we have your attention, please, so that we can hear the witnesses as they do come up here? Thank you.

MR. GURMAN: Mr. Rahenkamp, Mr. Hayes, and Mr. Stuart.

SENATOR COWAN: They are cooperating consultants from Rahenkamp and Associates. Gentlemen, would you please individually state your name and company affiliation?

**JOHN RAHINKAMP:** I am John Rahenkamp. I am a planner and President of John Rahenkamp and Associates in Philadelphia. With me is Fred Hayes, an economist from Boston, and Hank Stuart, a transit engineer.

**SENATOR COWAN:** Thank you, John.

**MR. RAHINKAMP:** If you will, I will present some of the facts we have gone through over the last several months in an attempt to be helpful to you to--

**SENATOR COWAN:** Excuse me just a moment-- It has been suggested by some of the Committee members who are not familiar with the background information that it would be helpful if you would identify the sites that were first selected. I think that would give the Committee some basic--

**MR. RAHINKAMP:** We were retained by Block Drug.

**SENATOR COWAN:** Block Drug.

**MR. RAHINKAMP:** We have worked on the planning analysis for several months. In that process we have been able to assess not only the Waldo site, but several of the other alternative sites as well, which we will address. There is no question about the fact the PATH facility is necessary, and that the Henderson Yard presently is extraordinarily too small. Therefore, there is a need for a new facility.

The question at hand is not so much the need, but the method by which a location is selected. The distinct disadvantage in that which we evaluated over the last several months was that there was rather little of the planning criteria involved in the process, which is essential in reassessing alternative sites in the future. At least three planning criteria have to be assessed in fact assessment.

The first would be consistency with local policies. Obviously, the site is zoned for light industrial, and the 22 acres being discussed for Waldo are inconsistent with all public policy for the last 30 years. Over \$200 million has been invested in the area. A euphemism planners use is public/private partnership. This, in fact, is the example of public/private partnership. Most particularly, significant public/private investment in this specific neighborhood.

Secondly, it is essential that there be less impact on the neighborhood and the surrounding areas. This is one of the more sensitive sites of all of the 17 evaluated by PATH. It is the one of those closest to residences, and it is extraordinary that the yard was proposed for this particular area. The impact on the neighborhood has to be evaluated. The impact on the surrounding environment has to be evaluated and that has to be an essential ingredient in the technique.

Thirdly, it has to be cost-effective, not only from an engineering point of view, but also in terms of the total cost. How many jobs are lost or gained? What are the tax implications since PATH is not taxed? And, it has to be looked at in the total context of the whole operation. What will it do to the neighborhood, the city, and the total region?

Let me demonstrate using some maps, and bracket it in terms of the neighborhood. I understand I should take this with me. (referring to microphone) We have several aerial photographs which demonstrate what has happened in the neighborhood. (speaker begins to refer to maps and photographs) These are the employers in the area. This is Muehler, this is McMillan Blodell in the middle of the red area, which is about a 22 to 29 — plus or minus — acre area. This is, essentially, the area of the Waldo Yard. There is an existing Conrail line that runs on the outer edge of it. Block Drug is "C" on this side of it, and it shows significant residential development as well. This is the Montgomery Gateway neighborhood which has been discussed. It was a HUD financed neighborhood that directly abuts the proposed line of this side, and the Hilltop neighborhood, or the Island, up in this corner of the site as well.

Essentially, it is surrounded by residential users. Their jobs are in the same location as well as a school located on the farther corner. All of this would be impacted by a yard going into this neighborhood.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: Mr. Rahenkamp, that large factory building in the middle--

MR. RAHENKAMP: That is an existing employer.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: How many people work there?

MR. RAHENKAMP: There are about 70— No, I'm sorry, 86 there.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: And that was to be acquired by the Port Authority as per negotiation and condemnation, I presume.

MR. RAHENKAMP: Yes. In addition, there is an employer, who is called Anderson Lumber in "D" here. That is on a lease with Conrail, and that is in the area that had been negotiated, evidently, with Conrail. The proposed rail facility is shown in this map. The "E" area, shown here, (points to spot on map) is the existing McMillan Blodell, the "F" building is the proposed car facility for PATH, and the rail lines are shown. Notable are very tight radiuses which generate squeal from wheels going around tight radius areas. One of the problems acknowledged even by some of the PATH engineers was that this was, essentially, a shoehorn fit. It is a very tight site. The Kaiser Report and the engineers have acknowledged they need approximately 40 acres. This site is on the order of 22 to 25 acres. So, it is a very tight fit.

In addition, there is extraordinary topographic change from the Island neighborhood and a palisades on the bottom of it, with relatively little room to move in the residential area on the bottom side, so there is little flexibility for future adjustments if the ridership continues to increase. It is a very tight fit.

Of further significance, in terms of public policies, what has happened is in the late 40s — at the end of the war — this was an acknowledged rail yard, and we have a series of aerials illustrating that. However, subsequently over the last 30 years, the rail yard has continued to diminish in use, the rail lines have continued to be substantially reduced, and the residential areas have moved into the area. In addition, Block Drug and other industries have come into the area, stayed in the area and with the city, and brought back the neighborhood. In addition, the public policies reinforce that, to the point that this then — this is the Waldo site (referring to area on map) — was rezoned, or down-zoned, to light rather than heavy industrial.

So, over the last 30 years, the public policies have consistently reinforced the fact that this is not to be heavy industrial or high intensity use.

There are also significant and notable impacts on the neighborhoods which I would suggest should have been anticipated much earlier in the process. The difficulty we have in this case is that very late in the process we began to mitigate the impacts when they should have been anticipated much earlier in the process and, in fact, none of us should ever have had to be here. The points are, a facility like this which should at least be characterized as heavy industrial, would undermine property values. With \$200 million of investment -- both public and private -- it is unusual to bring this kind of facility against that kind of investment and public policy.

Secondly, the site is too tight, so over time you can't mitigate problems. It would be very difficult because the site is so tight that to mitigate lighting, noise, and pollution problems would be very expensive. We did a lighting diagram-- Now, we would acknowledge that PATH has not gone into technical detail, so we have had to use some judgment in the size of the lights required. Based on what transit engineers have told us, the yellow areas indicate the broadcasting of light over the neighborhood. It has a significant impact and should have been anticipated. Yes, you can mitigate some of it; and yes, you can go with lower standards; but, why even bring the facility there if these things have to be mitigated down the road? It simply doesn't make sense.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: Okay, you show these circles of light-- Are you saying that a facility like that will cause it to appear near daylight or dusk all the time, regardless of whether it was night or day?

MR. RAHINKAMP: Yes, that is accurate. It would be like living alongside a ballfield that is lit up, and it would broadcast the same level of light. The three rings, essentially, are the diminution in value as you go further away, but it obviously does spill out into each of the abutting residential areas, but it would affect their property values and the very livability of those neighborhoods.

Also, it would significantly impact the neighborhood with noise. Any rail facility, most particularly one that is very tight, would generate some noise because a very tight radius will generate wheel squeal. With that, if you don't mind, we will run a noise study that engineers from Boston have generated, which will speak for itself. (At this point, Mr. Rahenkamp plays a tape of the ambient noise generated from the rail site at Waldo, with the superimposed noise of train movement from a rail yard of the SEPTA system in Philadelphia, which is a similar yard to the Waldo site.)

If you like I will show you where Trenton Street is, and then address the 16 acre issue. (shows point on map) The Trenton area is up on the top side in the Island neighborhood, and would be impacted by the noise. We have tried to indicate as accurately as possible where the noise impacts would be the most. The Conrail line, essentially, goes on this side of the site, and is basically up against the Montgomery Gateway neighborhood. We are concerned that even if McMillan Blodell were to stay, the residual 16 acre area here which presently houses the Anderson Lumber site would still be accessible to intensive use. The noise, the lighting problems, and some of the other problems would not be changed by the release of only a portion of the lands.

Let me go back to the total impacts of the 22 acres and the proposed yard. We projected the impacts on the city would be on the following order: Firstly, the city would directly lose about 713 jobs, about 50% of whom are filled Jersey City residents, which based on the statistics we have seen would not be replaced by PATH. Essentially, these are workers at Anderson who would be moved over, so it would have no advantage to the city.

Secondly, there would be another indirect loss of about another 300 jobs, because some of these industrial operations would move out of town.

Finally, there is no expansion available. Muehler was expanding, Block was expanding, and those jobs would be lost. We would anticipate about 1500 jobs would be lost by this going forward.

This is critical because Jersey City, in 1960, had about 30,000 jobs. In 1982 it was down to about 15,000. So the job flight is extraordinary, and it is important to keep these kinds of facilities in these older, urban areas. Also, there is an extraordinary amount of lost trade by those employees who are no longer employed, by the loss of the housing demand, et cetera, and approximately \$11 million a year lost in ancillary things from the loss of these jobs.

In payroll, there would be on the order of \$22 million lost. In new construction, there would be about \$2 million -- Block Drug has a UDAG Grant for about \$3 million, which they would not go forward with. In real estate taxes, we would lose on the order of a half a million dollars in real estate taxes by the land becoming part of PATH. So the impact is quite extraordinary. None of these impacts were assessed in any of the information we say from PATH. All of that has to be done as part of the evaluation of any alternative sites.

With that I would like to introduce Fred Hayes to talk about the economic issues.

**FREDERICK R. HAYES:** John has already summarized some of the most important economic issues. I think it is worthwhile putting some emphasis upon the loss of jobs. The 30,000 jobs are manufacturing jobs that Jersey City had in 1970. They had something less than 15,000-- The data for cities is a little slow in coming, that is actually 1982 data that showed there were between 14,000 and 15,000. The county data show a drop in the general vicinity of 50% over that same period -- from 1970 to 1982. This is serious, and what it says, I think, is that it places a higher value on the remaining jobs, particularly in industry, than would exist if you were confident they would be replaced. They also are serving a part of Jersey City's population that is going to find limited job opportunities in the renaissance areas of Jersey City's economy, such as the waterfront development and so on. So, the jobs are important, and the general economic effects are important.

I reviewed the Kaiser Report. As Mr. Vanacore said, the Kaiser engineers who did the analysis of sites for PATH had a narrow charge, which I think is part of the problem. It was a charge that

really dealt, essentially, with the initial analysis of site opportunities and feasibility, and basic costs and benefits primarily to PATH operations, but it did not deal with the broad issue of overall cost and benefit. Of course, it did not address the impact upon the community. These are what economists call "externalities." They are the cost that anyone imposes upon someone else, that is, that occur outside his system. Whether it happens to be the classic case of the smoke-belching factory which increased cleaning bills and reduced the quality of life in its neighborhood, but involved no cost to the person or company who owned the factory, these externalities are clearly very important. That is really what we have been discussing in terms of community impact, loss of jobs, loss of quality of life, or prospective impact of noise, light, and so on.

I think that we have gone through a change in public climate over the last 15, 20, or 25 years that all of us are familiar with. What it really says is that sequence is such that you really have to start by including at least a preliminary assessment of those issues: the community impacts, the costs that are imposed upon other people, and the objections that are going to be raised. At the same time, you must look at the technical issues. At one time it was perfectly possible to take that sequence and say, "Do the technical engineering analysis, and then try it out on the community." In fact, whether we like it or not, as a practical matter, that has become harder. I think the community issues really have to be looked at first, because they are very substantial here. Some of them, like the impact upon the investment that has already occurred in the area we can't measure. I think that John Rahenkamp's team has identified, in terms of current outlay, something in excess of \$150 million being invested in housing, by Block Drug, in improvements by McMillan, and so on in this general area. It also includes two new schools over that period. These are all moneys that went into that area -- or nearly all of it -- on the assumption that the character of the area changed. It is a big investment. It is a big sunk cost, and it includes State money in the form of guarantee of industrial development bonds, Federal money like UDAG, and it has involved the city of Jersey City in the

relocating of streets on the block guard improvement. It is a very substantial process, backed by a lot of money. That is very important.

I think the second point of some concern on Kaiser, is that in their own criteria, at least in the discussion of this report, they did not really apply those criteria or define them rigorously and consistently. I think the only point where that is relevant here is on the Waldo site, and the Waldo site of about 25 acres would have been ruled out by strict application of Kaiser's own criterion of a minimum size of 40 acres. It is too small, and it seems to me that the tightness of that site has been demonstrated by the engineering analysis that has been done this group of consultants.

Secondly, I think they used a requirement that the site had to be compatible with existing and planned land uses in the area. They knocked out four possible sites on this ground. But, the Kaiser group did not even discuss the land use compatibility issue with respect to the Waldo site. I think there is a good deal of work in there that is very good, but the application of that criterion was just rather casual and sloppy.

Let me say a few other important and correct things about the Kaiser Report. One is they found in examining a series of different sites that there were differences in the estimated cost of acquiring the site and of developing the facility on that site. They concluded on the basis of their analysis that the capital cost -- these costs of acquisition and development -- should not be a factor in site selection. In other words, the difference turned out to be plus or minus 10% around the mean on discounted costs on all the sites they had considered, and they said, explicitly, given the long life of facilities of this kind -- and remember that Henderson has been in use for something like 75 years -- that the effective difference in cost among the different sites was negligible, so you could ignore that.

The second thing is, unless the facility was split between two sites, normal operating and maintenance costs would be the same on any one of the four, five, or six sites that seemed to be in consideration.

The last thing is the locational advantage that a site might have, which essentially is the reduction in what you might call the system inefficiencies -- that is that you have to ferry more trains on a dead-head basis. They list the cost for dead-head mileage in the report for a half dozen sites. The differences among the sites in those costs are really quite negligible.

What do all these things add up to? I think they add up to several things that are worth saying. One of them is there are alternatives that appear to be feasible on the basis of the analysis done by the Kaiser Engineering Group, and what Kaiser said is essentially feasible or viable.

The second thing is it is not really a cost factor, neither in terms of what you might call location attributable costs, nor in terms of acquisition and site development costs, nor in terms of normal operating and maintenance cost of the facility. These are not a factor. I think what this emphasizes is there are other sites and, as a matter of fact, other sites that at least do not have the size disadvantage of the Waldo site, and sites that do not appear to have the same kind of community impacts.

I think the point I would return to is the one I made in the beginning, and that is in the economic analysis of alternatives the community impact is important enough to go in the beginning. That is, even on the most preliminary basis they should be looked at at the same time the basic technical and feasibility issues are being examined.

MR. RAHENKAMP: If you like, Hank Stuart, our transit engineer can talk to the alternative sites most particularly.

HENRY L. STUART: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, my name is Henry L. Stuart, and I have been an independent transportation consultant for the past 13 years, specializing in railway and transit matters. Prior to joining the consulting trade, I was the first employee and general manager of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority, where I assembled the group and led them through the planning studies which led to Atlanta's comprehensive transportation system which was put into place in a successful funding election in 1971. Prior to that time, I had 19 years with Southern Railway System, in such jobs as

Vice President and General Manager of subsidiaries, Assistant General Manager of Eastern Lines, and Division Superintendent. Most of my work on Southern dealt with terminal and yard operations.

The Waldo site was a Pennsylvania Railroad freight operation 30 or 40 years ago. As John Rahenkamp has mentioned, all that is left now is a Conrail switch engine that comes by as needed to serve a few customers. There have been no yard or railway operations of any consequence at Waldo in decades. For your benefit, I would like to address the characteristics of the plant PATH would require in this shop. I will give you some idea of what is really involved in a thing like this.

Car repairs begin with cleaning. There are two steps in cleaning: One is washing trains for cosmetic purposes and to remove pollutants that might damage exposed metal or paint. The other cleaning process is often referred to as "blowdown," which helps to clean the grime off the underneath parts of the train so inspections and maintenance can be conducted in a clean environment. It is much more effective if the equipment is clean. After the trains have been cleaned, they undergo a periodic inspection looking for incipient failures, for safety purposes, and mechanical and electrical components, which are then repaired. This item is referred to as running repairs, which is what a couple of mechanics can do in eight hours or less. Trains that require more serious attention require what are referred to as heavy repairs which are also done in a car shop.

Every car repair shop requires a support yard. There have to be tracks to receive trains while they await their turn in the shop and of course, there have to be tracks to hold trains that have been released from the shop and must wait until they are needed in revenue service.

Frequently, a shop is accompanied by facilities for storing trains during off-peak hours. When train service is reduced after peak hours, there is a need to park these trains somewhere, and it is convenient to have them near the mechanical department operations.

Kaiser Engineering was retained to develop PATH's needs for a car repair shop and a support yard. In fulfilling this assignment,

they have come up with a shop building of about 200,000 square feet, or four and a half acres, under one roof. Wherever it is built, it is going to be of that nature and size. Spots were provided in the shop for repairing 82 cars simultaneously. It is unlikely the shop would ever be that full of cars, but that is the allowance you have to make to be sure there is space enough to get cars in, repair them promptly, and get them out. Provisions were made in the Kaiser shop for blowdowns, periodic inspections, running repairs, body work, truck repairs, and wheel troweling. Spaces were also identified for maintenance of components, such as air brakes, air conditioning, machine and welding shops, traction motor shops, battery maintenance, and other mechanical and electrical repairs. Of course, space was set aside for supplies and stores, and for ancillary functions such as supervisors' offices, locker rooms, washrooms, lavatories, and lunchrooms. It has to be a big place. This is not something you can go by and not see. Curiously, in the Kaiser shop, there was no place set aside for upholstery and seat work. I haven't pursued why it wasn't there, but this is special work and they are high maintenance items. There would have to be a place for that to be taken care of.

The yard recommended in the summary of the Kaiser Report to go with the shop to support its operations had over 14,000 feet of track in the clear. That is to say, we are not counting the switches and the leads to the yard. That is about 2.7 miles of track in the yard used to store trains. The longer tracks provided space for about 22 eight car trains, and the shorter tracks provided storage space for about 16 cars to be used as spares. However, table eight in the Kaiser Report's main body defined a need for 28 tracks for eight car trains, but the shop drawn in the sketch showed only 22 car trains. I have not gotten to the bottom of where the extra six trains were supposed to go. The plan presented by Kaiser did not measure up to the criteria they established in the body of the report.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: Why would you suspect that? Would you suspect they just ran out of room, or did Kaiser forget it?

MR. STUART: I suspect they ran out of room, because the engineering criteria originally designed to the shop, for example,

required curves whose radius was no less than 140 feet, and a turnout described in the jargon of the trade as a "number six." This is comparable. They ended up with curve radiuses as short as 100 feet, and turnouts known as "number fours," which is a very very tight operation.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: Would you please address for the Subcommittee how the trains would get there? We are talking about anywhere from 22 to 28 trains that would lay over there, not counting those that are going in for repairs. How would they get there? I am looking at the area enclosed by red (referring to chart), and I don't really see a decent railroad line into that area which doesn't go through neighborhoods.

MR. STUART: The perspective of this photograph is a little difficult— The PATH line runs here (referring to photograph). The tunnel portal that puts PATH underground for the rest of its route is here. The PATH line runs in this direction. Trains could come into the proposed facility here, and they could come in on a loop here, over the top of the portal. There are two ways to get in. Does that answer your question, sir?

SENATOR GAGLIANO: Is most of that track now in existence, or would they have to add track to do that?

MR. STUART: All this track would have to be added. The only track there now is the Conrail line, which is on the extreme south of the property. Conrail comes in this way, and then works toward Block and Muehler.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: In terms of lineal feed miles, how much track would have to be constructed externally to the Waldo facility itself -- I realize we are not going to have one -- in order to serve the facility?

MR. STUART: I estimate that there is 2.7 miles of track in the clear, plus the leads to it.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: I meant the leads to it which are outside the area.

MR. STUART: The leads are going to be at least a mile and a half more. That includes track here, and this track.

SENATOR RAND: Mr. Chairman?

SENATOR COWAN: Yes, Senator?

SENATOR RAND: May I ask a question? Do I take it from your testimony that the four and a half acres would not be enough to service that facility?

MR. STUART: I think four and a half acres under roof in the shop is quite adequate.

SENATOR RAND: Even with the amount of cars left out?

MR. STUART: What is inadequate is the yard on the outside. One of the alternatives that was proposed in the Kaiser Report has to do with dividing the shop between functions. Heavy repair operations and running repair operations are related, but the time required is the distinction. It is not uncommon to find that cleaning and running repairs can be kept together and done in one place and heavy repairs can be done somewhere else. There is a penalty for that; the divided shop tends to dilute supervision, it complicates the material and stores problem, and the divided thing is a little more difficult to manage. Of course, each element of a divided shop would have to have its own support yard, and certain inefficiencies creep in at that level.

Not fully addressed in the report, so far, is the need for additional line storage. It has nothing to do with maintenance, but PATH is going to receive more cars than they now have. They will have a larger fleet, and they are very close to using up their capacity for line storage -- this is the peak-hour trains that must come out of service when commuter hours are over, along with the need to get trains out of service on weekends and holidays -- and they have to put them somewhere. PATH's capacity for this line storage is very limited. More is going to have to be provided. This was not directly addressed in the report, but it is something that we should keep in mind is going to have to happen.

One of the things about line storage we have heard a lot about, and has been mentioned here this morning, is the bridge over the Hackensack River. There is some concern on the part of PATH people that this bridge presents a problem, and they do not like the idea of having their equipment west of the bridge. We think this is overstated

because the difficulties with the bridge are those of the bridge. It is operating without reliability, and moving the shop from one side to the other doesn't fix the bridge. The bridge is going to be fixed, and in fact, Mr. Frick of PATH went ahead and testified before the Freeholders in Hudson County earlier this year with the rehabilitation project which will make the problems of the bridge more or less nonexistent. He said almost nonexistent. There is no reason for a lift bridge to be mechanically or electrically unreliable. The problem with this bridge is that Conrail owned it, didn't use it, and Conrail's money and efforts go to its own problems first. That is perfectly reasonable. They weren't receiving any compensation from that bridge that I know of.

The line storage problem and the bridge can be looked at if you look at PATH's service levels now, and for the longer-term future. There is almost enough line storage east of the bridge to provide equipment for service that originates east of the bridge -- that is to say, Hoboken, World Trade Center, Journal Square, and places like that. Over the longer-term we estimate there will be a deficit of storage space west of the river to the extent of some seven or eight trains that will have to be moved -- not under the present circumstances -- from east of the river to west of the river to start their service. It is our opinion that a storage yard west of the river is not only reasonable, it is necessary.

This leads us to some of our conclusions as to alternative sites. Getting into the bridge a little deeper, there were about three lifts per week, based on the bridge captain's log we examined. There were 165 lifts in 1984. Under present conditions, seven percent of these lifts fail -- that is to say they are not done smoothly and correctly -- because of the condition of the bridge. Under proper maintenance that should be reduced practically to zero. The bridge is old, has been there a long time, and has been neglected. Money will fix it. And under PATH's ownership, operation, and maintenance, I would fully expect the situation to get much better. It is possible, and looking at the bridge captain's log it is found that the operation of the bridge does miss PATH's commuter hours. They are able to

control that, although it can open, of course, at other times. One interesting thing about the bridge is marine traffic that has to clear the bridge comes into the river -- the larger ships -- only at high tide, and of course we are not the masters of that. So the real problem of the bridge is its unreliability, not its location. We think the yard should be located where the yard is needed, and the bridge should be fixed. This is the course that has now been announced.

In the Kaiser Report, there were two separate types of alternatives that were discussed, and I would like to address them both in spite of the fact that the statement has been made here this morning that the Governor has been quoted and Mr. Vanacore's response was that a major facility is not to go in at Waldo. I think that is good news, but I am also concerned that the difference between major and something else is in the eye of the beholder, and we need to examine some of these alternatives because they were proposed in such a way that they tend to reduce the scale of PATH's proposal at Waldo. To the extent that some people may see them as less than major, they remain germane.

These alternatives at Waldo were based on the concept of a divided shop that I mentioned a moment ago. One concept presented Waldo as a place for running repairs with a support and storage yard, and placed heavy repairs at Harrison, New Jersey, or left them at Henderson Street. So, there were two separate facilities. That concept put cleaning at Journal Square where the present Journal running repair shop is, and the running repairs there, as well. The curious thing is in the sketches in the body of the Kaiser Report, they showed three tracks for periodic inspection and running repairs. In the master plan shown in the executive summary of the Kaiser Report, they showed five tracks for this. Nowhere in the report is that increase in capacity discussed or explained. I think that is most unusual. That is a large increase. When it would only be a running repair shop, the storage yard at Waldo shows space for about 180 cars lined between McMillan Blodell and Academy Street. The diagram was not scaled, but a reasonable estimate would show about 16 eight car trains in storage. The number of cars isn't really very relevant because PATH, like rapid transit and railroad passenger trains everywhere,

don't store cars, they store trains. You don't break up the trains into cars anymore than you absolutely have to.

Under the plan that would put a running repair shop and a storage yard at Waldo -- the running repairs being up in the present Journal Square running repair shop that is now being constructed -- McMillan Blodell would remain in operation, but Anderson Lumber Company would be wiped out, and Conrail's industrial switching would be unaffected.

The other concept placed all the mechanical department operations at Waldo, but put them in different places on the site. In one plan that was called Waldo Waldo, which is figure 19 in the Kaiser Report, the shop occupied the site of the McMillan Blodell Company, as you see on the chart I pointed to earlier. The Journal Square running repair shop, which is "C" on that chart if you can spot it to the top, became a running repair shop with three tracks for periodic inspection and running repairs. Such an arrangement put the heavy repairs down where the big shop is, and the running repairs up where the present running repair shop is located. Under that arrangement, McMillan Blodell and Anderson are wiped out, but Conrail's industrial switching remains the same. Another one they presented was called Waldo Alternate Number One.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: But, excuse me, sir, I would appreciate it if we can get into major alternative sites, because I think the people here today -- most of them from that area -- are very interested in where this may go, and I realize we are concerned about what may happen to Waldo, but at this point, we have the Port Authority's statement that it will not be a major facility. They are still going to acquire it. Personally, I am more concerned about the alternative sites, and what might be going on those. We have a limited amount of time.

MR. STUART: Mr. Chairman, shall I go on?

SENATOR COWAN: Yes, see if you can summarize it.

MR. STUART: In summary, these several different applications at Waldo only move the functions around. Moving them around does not change the impact on the neighborhood communities, it just happens in a slightly different place. The other sites in which you are interested

are the real alternatives to Waldo. I consider juggling the functions at Waldo a rather specious approach to the problem. It made it look different, but it wasn't any different. Harrison, New Jersey is 3.1 miles from Journal Square.

SENATOR COWAN: Is that Harrison Yard also known as the Harrison Transfer?

MR. STUART: It used to be called Manhattan Transfer many many years ago -- almost before my time.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: They didn't write a song about that, did they? (laughter)

SENATOR COWAN: What was the fare at that time?

MR. HAYES: A nickel, I think.

MR. STUART: It is three miles from Journal Square, west of the Hackensack River. The access to Harrison from PATH is a little complicated by the fact that the PATH main lines split, and one goes north of the Harrison site, while the other is south of the Harrison site, however, to the east they are together and by means of crossovers and a lead access to either track on the east would be available, and they have access to one track west from Newark. It can be reached without--

SENATOR COWAN: Where is Newark on the chart?

MR. STUART: Point to Newark. (speaking to aide who is indicating points on charts and photographs) Penn Station, just across the river. There it is.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: And how big is Harrison?

MR. STUART: Harrison has 20.5 acres of unoccupied land at this time. There are 30.8 acres now occupied by a truck terminal. Truck terminals are not expensive construction, they are mobile, they can be moved, and they are not big employers. We would suggest this truck terminal could be made available.

MR. RAHENKAMP: There is no residential in the area.

MR. STUART: There is no residential, all the neighbors are other railroads or heavy industry. We think a site-- We estimate 51.3 acres at Harrison, which shows great promise of being enough to fill PATH's needs.

SENATOR COWAN: We are still talking about the same site-- Does New Jersey Transit or Conrail have some facility there now, or--

MR. STUART: New Jersey Transit. Ray, (speaking to aide at charts) you can point to the New Jersey Transit force in there in the barred part. We are assuming New Jersey Transit will stay there.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: Their acreage is not counted in your calculations?

MR. STUART: We are not counting it. We are counting the part that is covered solidly and the truck terminal. And we think that isn't quite adequate. A different site we are interested in seeing PATH pursue which was looked at briefly in the Kaiser Report is at Crockston Yard. It is in Secaucus and was the focus of the Erie Lackawanna Railroad's freight operations. Of the two orange blobs we have shown to the lower right, the one to the lower right is called the loop area, and we have suggested this site should be examined. There are no tracks in there at this time, access is back to PATH on a right-of-way that presently exists, the--

SENATOR GAGLIANO: The size?

MR. STUART: --size is about 70 acres. There is a great amount of room in there. Some concern exists because Conrail owns this land, and we don't know if it can be made available. That can only be found out by negotiating with Conrail. We can't run from it just because Conrail might have some plan for it.

SENATOR COWAN: Is it presently being used by Conrail?

MR. STUART: It is not being used by anything at this time. Conrail may have some expansion plans, which would have to be investigated.

MR. RAHENKAMP: And no residential in that area either.

MR. STUART: The orange blob to the upper left (continuing to refer to charts) is a place known to railroad people as CP Bergen, or Bergen Junction. This is also vacant land and can be reached over the same right-of-way as Crockston. It is just a little farther out. Public Service Electric and Gas owns part of that; they had plans for it, but then electric requirements have fallen to some degree and that site should be investigated.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: It is larger than the other one.

MR. STUART: It is even larger, but it is a little farther out. Distance does cost money. You have to stay close to your operation.

A thing we think is interesting has happened. Marion, the PJP Landfill as it is known -- the one that is burning -- was originally considered by Kaiser to be one of the preferred sites, but it lost out in the final analysis to Waldo. During the course of our studies we have learned that, as reported in the Jersey Journal on August 31, a fire extinguishing specialist type firm had been successful in extinguishing some of the fire at the PJP site. Well, if real progress can be made on putting out that fire, then the Marion site that was highly thought of in the Kaiser Report should come back up for further consideration. As long as it is on fire it is hard to take it seriously. But, if they can really get at this and put it out, it should be considered.

SENATOR COWAN: Perhaps you are not aware -- but I am sure many of the residents of Jersey City are -- that according to this morning's papers, the fires have been put out. Of course, there is always the possibility of them reigniting on the ground, but the contractor who has been awarded the contract is expected to start the work for actual excavation of the ground within the next two weeks.

MR. STUART: This is--

SENATOR GAGLIANO: Isn't that several -- I won't say hundred feet deep -- but isn't it very deep, and wouldn't that be a very difficult site to prepare for a railroad yard?

MR. STUART: I think you are correct, sir. The thing about it is--

SENATOR GAGLIANO: The compaction would take years.

MR. STUART: This material would have to be cleaned out. It has to be recognized as a fire hazard, and you certainly couldn't put anything on top.

SENATOR GAGLIANO: I agree. Then you are putting material back in--

MR. STUART: But we are mindful of the terms of the compact with the Port Authority to assist in improving the port district.

Perhaps if Marion were taken back under active consideration it would be an impetus to proceed--

SENATOR GAGLIANO: How big is it?

MR. STUART: The Marion site is -- I am not sure I have that in here -- but it is huge. One further option--

ASSEMBLYMAN CUPROWSKI: Excuse me?

MR. STUART: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN CUPROWSKI: Just one point. I believe the study that was made on that, and I think there was a comment on the Marion site -- the PJP site -- that land would only be able to be used for passive activities, and really not be any beneficial use thereafter. At least that is my understanding of the report.

MR. STUART: My understanding of the Marion site also included property across Duncan Street toward Route 1, but I am not a soils man and I really can't tell you what the future of that dump is; I don't think anybody can. But if the fires are out, at least it has some promise.

ASSEMBLYMAN CUPROWSKI: But, obviously, you are talking about a residential area, and you might be creating another Waldo community wise.

MR. STUART: I don't know about residential areas around that site. Terminals are in there, and a cemetery is on the other side of the highway--

ASSEMBLYMAN CUPROWSKI: I assure you there are a lot of residential problems, yes.

MR. STUART: Are there people that live--

SENATOR COWAN: There are a number down there in the Marion Gardens in particular, which is just across the highway.

MR. STUART: Which might create a problem?

SENATOR COWAN: I think let's first get out all PJP and let's get the fires out, and we'll go from there.

MR. STUART: All right. I have one other option to present that the Port Authority might consider. If they are able to make the case, or if they insist on the need for more line storage east of the Hackensack River irrespective of the bridge problem, there is a place

to the northeast of Waldo that in railroad parlance is known as CP Knave. It can be reached from the PATH tracks; it is adjacent to the turnpike; it is presently occupied by the Jewel Electric Supply Company; it has the turnpike on one side and the Conrail Docks secondary track on the other; and the area is committed to heavy industry. There are some railroad bridges and the turnpike through there, but we have done enough engineering work to know that a storage yard could be laid out there that would take, perhaps, as many as 15 eight car trains, and line storage could be achieved at Marion. The site is well buffered from its neighborhood from the industrial stuff that is around it. Thank you.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you. Any questions? (negative responses) A very fine presentation, and if there are no questions we would appreciate you continuing to be in touch with the Committee on anything you do, because hearing from you has been very beneficial and, you certainly put a fine report together.

MR. RAHENKAMP: Thank you. We would be pleased to be available.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you. We will have one more witness before we recess for lunch, and when we do recess, we will announce the time when we will be back, and we will be back promptly at that time. Our next witness is a young priest from Jersey City, Father James Pagnotta, St. Joseph's Church.

**FATHER JAMES PAGNOTTA:** Thank you Senator Cowan, ladies and gentlemen, and members of the Legislature. I did have a prepared statement to make, but in light of the PATH announcement today I think that most of what I would say would be superfluous.

I am greatly concerned, though, about the Governor's statement yesterday and what is even stated here again today, that there would be no major construction at the Waldo site. What that comes to mean is something I think we have to be concerned about. I think a value in this hearing today, if I understand the purpose of it correctly, is to get testimony and to look into possible legislation you could offer. I think we do need some legislation when it comes to such things as bi-state agencies which seem to have a great deal of

power and really aren't answerable to a lot of people. It has taken us a great deal of time and money to get to where we are today and to get the announcement today that the Waldo site would not be used for its announced purpose. I think it is a shame we had to spend public money. I think PATH spent a lot of money developing their report, and I know on our side, the Jersey City Citizens against Waldo have spent a great deal of money to get to where we are today and to perhaps force the abandonment of this site for major construction.

I think if we operated in a different avenue, perhaps these things would not happen. Maybe it is going to have to come about by legislation you could introduce to see that agencies like the Port Authority are accountable to some people and subject to some of the local zoning laws and the like, so that we wouldn't have to be constantly under this stress.

I know this is the second time the people I represent in St. Joseph's Parish in Jersey City and the Hilltop area had to go to bat and fight to prevent someone encroaching on our well-being. We had to do it on the local issue of a jail in Hudson County -- and we won that fight -- and we have spent a great deal of time and effort to try to bring about this change today. I know if it was not for the cooperation of the business and commercial community, and for some funds coming forth from them, that perhaps we would not have been as successful as we appear to be today.

I think it is unfortunate in this day and age in which we live that we should always have to go to bat and be fighting against each other. Different means of coming up with plans and making proposals for improvements are certainly needed. I am a lifelong resident of Hudson County; I grew up in Hoboken, and for many years I rode the Hudson Manhattan tubes to New York. I appreciate what PATH has done in the improvement of the PATH system from the days of the old Hudson Manhattan trains when you sat in the tunnel for long hours not knowing when you would get out. So, I do think PATH provides a viable transportation service. We at St. Joseph's are only about three minutes away from the Journal Square Station, so we greatly benefit from PATH. But at the same time, our mental, psychological, social,

and economic environment does not have to be impacted upon by such construction as was proposed here. At the same time, I don't think we should have to enter into such a battle as we have entered into culminating here today to bring about change.

So, if the purpose of this hearing is to affect legislation, then I would encourage you to propose legislation that would be approved not only here in New Jersey, but I guess in New York also, that would make this agency and others like it accountable to the public and to the well-being of people. I think that is very important.

The other thing I am greatly concerned about today is what is meant by major construction. While they are saying they are abandoning the original proposal, what is going to be substituted on those remaining acres? What will happen there will greatly impact on our people in much the same way. If a 25 acre facility is not developed and a 16 acre facility is, some of the very things we are concerned about will probably still be present. The noise, the light, and all the other problems we were arguing about originally will not be diminished because we are going from a 25 acre to a 16 acre site. I think this is something that we have to be on guard for and watch for.

As I said, what I originally intended to speak about I withdraw. I appreciate the opportunity to come here today, and I urge you to come up with whatever legislation is necessary to ensure that the public does not always have to be fighting for their rights and their right to be heard. I thank you for this opportunity.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you very much, Father. I think at this point in time it would be a good time to recess. Most of the lunch crowd should be out of the cafeteria if you are going to the cafeteria. So we will recess. It is a few minutes after one now, and we will start promptly at two o' clock.

(RECESS FOR LUNCH)

AFTER RECESS:

SENATOR COWAN: Ladies and gentlemen, if we can have your attention, we will reconvene the hearing of the Subcommittee. Our first witness will be Mr. Ted Anderson from Anderson Lumber Company. Is Ted here?

TED ANDERSON: Good afternoon.

SENATOR COWAN: Good afternoon.

MR. ANDERSON: I appreciate very much the opportunity to come down here to Trenton to speak. I represent our small lumberyard, Anderson Lumber, which is located at ground zero of this project of the Port Authority. Honestly, what I am going to talk about will be no more or less than an emotional plea for our predicament. I mention this because we are a small business who has been located in Jersey City on Conrail property for 35 years. Most importantly, I come here to represent my father, Charles Anderson, who will be 81 next month, and is our very active president, and who is honestly very concerned about us entering our 60th year as a business and wholesale lumber supplier in the Port of New York.

We have watched the progress of this project, which from our point of view it is a regression, because we feel we know sooner than anybody else in this room the ultimate outcome of our business. Being a small business we have the flexibility of servicing the local residents. We are very active right now in supplying the contractors involved in the renaissance of Jersey City. More importantly, we have serviced the maritime facilities for the past 60 years.

Seven, eight, nine months ago, we were contacted by Port Authority requesting a right of entry. This was the first indication to us that possibly there was something afoot. My father, being a businessman but the gentleman he is, agreed to this right of entry, being assured we would be kept notified as to what was happening. During this time there was bore testing done by Port Authority which was an inconvenience to us, but again, we had the assurance we would be kept advised of what was going on. After six months of testing, the right of entry application expired, and the Port Authority requested more testing. At this point, we felt we deserved some kind of indication as to what was going to happen to us; what was going on

here. We are a business, and after so many years on Conrail property we need to know what this project involves. I believe when we denied entry at this point, within about five to six weeks this particular project became more publicly known.

After that, Port Authority would call us once a week to ask us if we had found a new location and if we were looking. From one point of view this may look like harassment, but it is difficult to operate a small business like ours where the decisions are many and need to be made every minute. We acknowledged we would look for property, but this was perpetual, and again we asked if there was any help for us since we needed help. We have had a small business on this property for so many years. We have heard absolutely nothing from the Port Authority. Yesterday, Conrail confirmed that the property has been turned over to the Port Authority, so once again we await the outcome.

As I say, this is an emotional plea. We are a business that has been in operation for 60 years, and we are sorely needed in the area. We are a trauma center for emergencies. I await some indication of the future of this project. It is nice news to know that it has been abandoned, but I don't think this makes any difference for us. We, in all probability, will be asked to relocate. But, we are looking for help and we have asked Port Authority for help, if there is any to be found.

Again, I think we are a viable part of the community, we are very necessary. My father, in his gentlemanly way, awaits some kind of indication of what we are supposed to do. What happens next? We respond very rapidly when there is cause for help. Last night, we serviced the rapid deployment force at the military bases. When they call, we must respond. If we are relocated beyond a certain area, it will make it difficult to respond. So, all I am saying is we have been in the center of this project from the beginning, with no indication as to what is going on. We have been left in the dark, and possibly we were meant to be left in the dark as long as possible. We still look for an answer as to what will be our outcome, where we are going, and

will there be any help to come forth? At the last meeting I was quite emotional and outspoken, because I am concerned, obviously, for our firm; for something my father has maintained for 60 years. I actually drew the analogy that I felt we were just a cigarette butt that would be stomped on by Port Authority.

I would at least ask Port Authority when they get further into their reduced project to consider that we respond to emergencies. We are there to help all concerned. Two years ago, we had a call suddenly at night, an emergency— A ceiling had collapsed in Journal Square. We worked around the clock, 76 hours, loading Port Authority's cars so they could go onto the terminal to make as rapid a repair as possible to their facilities. I think we are needed. I do not wish to relocate, but at least I deserve the chance to know what is going on. I thank you for this chance to speak.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you. How many people do you employ there?

MR. ANDERSON: We employ ten.

SENATOR COWAN: Ten?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

SENATOR COWAN: And, you are basically a lumber supplier?

MR. ANDERSON: We are lumber supply, but in our particular industry what that means is not what you carry, but how fast can you get it there.

SENATOR COWAN: And you have been located at that site for 60 years?

MR. ANDERSON: We were initially at the Muehler's Noodles. There is an area they took over, but we have been on that Conrail property 35 years.

SENATOR COWAN: In that area now that the Port Authority owns you have been for 35 years?

MR. ANDERSON: That particular spot, only seven to eight years.

SENATOR COWAN: Seven to eight years.

MR. ANDERSON: This, again, is what makes it detrimental. To be forced to move within such a short time span is going to be cataclysmic for us.

SENATOR COWAN: From what you stated, the Port Authority now has the rights to that property? Has it been turned over?

MR. ANDERSON: We have been advised of that by Conrail.

SENATOR COWAN: There has been no communication from the Port Authority in regard to your relocation as to a determination of when you would have to leave, if you do have to leave?

MR. ANDERSON: No indication at all.

SENATOR COWAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

SENATOR COWAN: Next we have the President, I believe, of the Hilltop Neighborhood Association, Jerry Brancato, and Mary McDonald. Do you intend to testify together? Is Mary here also? Would you prefer to testify one at a time? Whichever way you prefer. Okay, Jerry?

**JERRY BRANCATO:** Thank you gentlemen for giving the community an opportunity to speak before you. I am Jerry Brancato, however, I am not the President of the Hilltop Neighborhood Association, I am the founder of the Hilltop Neighborhood Association, and the ex-President. I am also the Chairperson of the committee that met in the Jersey City Hall with our elected officials, Mayor Cucci, many of the council people, Port Authority representatives, the community representatives, and, of course, the corporate representatives from the industries that are being affected by this. I would like to share with you some of the things that happened at our meeting and make a plea for the community. We have met several times with this Committee.

---We told Port Authority they are intimidating the community with their preliminary approval for the construction of a \$100 million around-the-clock railroad maintenance repair and storage facility at the Waldo Yard site, in the heart of Jersey City.

---We told Port Authority that our elected State, county, and city officials, as well as our business and residential community are opposed to this construction.

---We told Port Authority their research, namely the Kaiser Report, was narrow, selfish, and advantageous only for Port Authority, with no regard at all for the community.

---We told Port Authority their proposed facility would result in displacement of numerous companies and the estimated loss of nearly 1100 jobs.

---We told Port Authority our families would be subjected to additional environmental degradation, including noise, light, and odor pollution.

---We told Port Authority that Jersey City would lose tens of thousands of dollars in tax revenue because Port Authority could be exempt from taxes.

---We told Port Authority their Waldo site may not be large enough to accommodate their future expansion needs, thus again they may try to implement their omnipotent power of eminent domain to acquire additional surrounding properties.

---We told Port Authority of our safety concerns for our children playing near this dangerous railroad site.

---We told Port Authority that vandalism and crime may be attracted to such a railyard.

---We told Port Authority this site would be in violation of local zoning ordinances because it is located in a light industrial and residential area.

---We told Port Authority that Jersey City already has the insurmountable problems associated with the Holland Tunnel and Journal Square complexes.

---We told Port Authority that Jersey City has already accommodated three of their major facilities within about one mile a one mile radius of the Hilltop area.

---We told Port Authority that seven schools surround this proposed railroad yard site and their yard may cause a distraction to learning for our children.

---We told Port Authority they can't have their railroad yard in our back yard. They have been evasive and they are stalling for time.

The primary feelings we want to relate to you as our legislators is our fear, anxiety, and the stress we are experiencing because of this proposed site. The Governor announced yesterday that he will, and I quote, "Direct the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey to abandon plans for construction of the major facility at the

Waldo Yards and instead seek another site for this project." "Major facility" is the term that scares us. This is the terminology that will continue to enhance our feeling of fear. Does a major facility mean it is okay to establish a lesser facility? We know Port Authority has already begun their construction at this site, if you didn't know that. We know Port Authority has plans to acquire the land which Anderson Lumber and McMillan Blodell Containers currently reside on. We fear they have every intention of building or expanding this facility, however large or small that expansion or building. We fear that even if you, distinguished and powerful legislators, encourage our Governor to veto this site, the possibility still exists that in the future Port Authority will again try to expand this site. We fear Port Authority will eventually force their plans upon us, the innocent citizens, because they project to us an aura of omnipotence.

We heard just a short while ago that Port Authority expects to abandon major construction at this site. We fear this is only an immediate response to our opposition, and it is an appeasement to the community, the legislators, and the Governor.

The Hilltop area has already more than our fair share of Port Authority with the Holland Tunnel complex, and the Journal Square problems, and I need not tell you of the problems related to the Holland Tunnel and Journal Square. They are insurmountable with the traffic and the pollution. We submitted a proposal in years past to Port Authority urging them to consider putting the toll booths on alternate sides of each State, so that Jersey City doesn't have to incur the problems of traffic and pollution. It hasn't happened. We suggested to Port Authority years ago that they try to deal with the pollution problems and traffic problems at Port Authority and have some kind of responsibility regarding those pollution problems. We even suggested the planting of trees and other vegetation that may oxidize the air. Instead we got flags along the Holland Tunnel.

We need to be assured Port Authority will not now or ever expand this Waldo site. In representing the community, let me make this perfectly clear: We don't want new construction or expansion of this yard! It is obvious Port Authority doesn't care about the

residents and citizens in this area. We hope you legislators and the Governor do care about us, because that is what we are talking about — citizens, children, and families. Stop the yard in its current tracks. Let's end it now! Thank you for your time.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you. Senator Rand?

SENATOR RAND: No questions.

SENATOR COWAN: I think, Jerry, if you were here earlier this morning you heard that we do have some proposed legislation that has been drafted for me which we will be introducing. Of course, we will be looking for a formal opinion from our legal services in our Office of Legislative Services in order to ascertain whether, in their opinion, this can be done on the State level without going into a bi-state legislation. But, either way, we will pursue the two points we have mentioned in the proposed legislation. Okay?

MR. BRANCATO: Thank you.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you very much. Also from the Hilltop Neighborhood Association, we next have Mrs. Mary McDonald. Mary, good afternoon.

**MARY McDONALD:** Good afternoon. My name is Mary McDonald. I am from the Hilltop Neighborhood Association. For those of you who don't know where it is, it is in the Journal Square area. It is a great honor for me to be able to speak to you, the members of the New Jersey Senate. I know these speeches can be very boring, since some of you don't know the area we are talking about, but I would like you to please listen to me.

As you know, we are here today in the hope you can help us in our time of need. I have attended numerous meetings concerning the Waldo Avenue railroad yards. I have patiently listened to PATH personnel, Block Drug, and the Hilltop Neighborhood Association. I have even read the Kaiser Report. This is the Kaiser Report.(displaying size of report) It took me hours, but I read it so I would be prepared for you today. For those of you who don't know what the Kaiser Report is, let me explain. PATH hired Kaiser Engineering Corporation to do a feasibility study for a new and modern railroad yard. The Kaiser Report originally selected 17 sites. Of

these 17 sites, five were ultimately selected. They were Henderson Street, Waldo Avenue, Marion, Coppers, and Harrison Yard.

I would just like to digress for a minute to read the description of one of these sites from the Kaiser Report. Concerning the Marion site, Kaiser said the majority of this site is owned by the Holy Name Cemetery but is zoned for industry. There are no recorded burials on that site. I will get back to that in just a minute, but keep that in mind. And that is a quote.

It is interesting to me that the Kaiser Report even mentioned people, although they might have been dead, since nowhere else in the report did they mention live people. Nowhere in the report did they mention the impact this would have on the residents of the neighborhood. Shame on you Kaiser. How insensitive you are not to even think of the people who live in this area. The only site that affects, and I quote, "live people," is the Waldo site. Isn't it interesting that that is the site PATH chose? Somebody made a mistake. To the PATH people here today, if you paid Kaiser for that report, you overpaid them, because they didn't do a complete study. You got jipped, PATH.

Back in September at the first public meeting concerning the Waldo Avenue yards held in the basement of St. Joseph's Church, I asked Mr. Kelly, the representative from PATH, if he would buy property on Trenton Street. For those of you who don't know, Trenton St. is situated on the Island, for those of you who don't know, the Island is a body of land surrounded by railroads. I also ask you members of the New Jersey Senate, would you now buy a house there, knowing full well the lights would be on all night? It would be like living next to Shea Stadium. Knowing full well that the screeching of train wheels starting and stopping, the blasts of steam cleaning the cars would be going on 24 hours a day, is this the way you would like to live? My own view is you wouldn't even think about buying there. But the people there are stuck. They don't have the money to relocate like some of you and I do. Their property values would go down. There are just so many reasons why PATH should not locate there.

I implore you to ask the Governor to do something about this soon, which I know he has done. One last word to PATH. If you did your homework correctly, none of us would be here today. Thank you.

**SENATOR COWAN:** Thank you very much. Do the Committee members have any questions? (negative responses) Thank you very much, Mary. Next we have Mr. Jonathan Peters, a Vice President of Block Drug Company. Good afternoon, Mr. Peters.

**JONATHAN PETERS:** Senator, good afternoon. Gentlemen, we thank you very much for calling this meeting together and for listening to our stories.

Block Drug Company has been a resident of Jersey City for almost 50 years and has been in its present facility for approximately 35 years. Block Drug Company is a world-wide developer and manufacturer of pharmaceuticals, denture care products, and consumer products. The name of the company may not be familiar to you, but I am sure some of our products are. We are the makers of Polident, Dentu-creme, Poly-grip, Sensodine, Pykopay tooth brushes, Nytol sleep aid tablets, Romolar cough medicine, 2000 Flushes toilet bowl cleaner, and X-14 mildew stain remover. Our sales approximate \$250 million.

While companies were in the process of bailing out of Jersey City, Block Drug Company stayed. Not only did Block Drug Company stay, it made a major commitment to the city. Over the past eight years, Block has incurred capital expenditures at that facility of approximately \$11 million. Jersey City is the world-wide headquarters of Block Drug Company. We are an international manufacturer, and the only international manufacturer whose headquarters are in Jersey City. Our facility houses a multiple discipline operation: manufacturing, warehousing, executive offices, research and development laboratories.

Prior to the commitment I referred to moments ago, the area surrounding Block Drug had deteriorated badly. There were burned out warehouses, vacant property, and burned out railroad trestles. Block, in cooperation with the city of Jersey City, was able to secure the vacation of several through streets, and at its own expense was able to relocate a road around the facility, thus providing its employees with a secure and suitable working environment. We have over

600 employees at our facility in Jersey City, over half of those employees live in Hudson County, and over 200 live in Jersey City. Approximately 100 of those employees live within walking distance of our facility. Not only do we have the interests of the company at heart, we also have the interests of the employees. We wanted to provide a safe and secure working environment. We acquired property that surrounded our facility, established perimeter fencing and 24 hour guard service, and thus were able to attract employees to our operation. Prior to that, we were experiencing automobile thefts at an average of seven to ten per year. Cars belonging to Block Drug employees were vandalized weekly. Since we have undertaken the rejuvenation and rehabilitation of that area, car thefts are zero and vandalism is virtually nonexistent. The people feel safe and secure.

As I mentioned, a number of our employees are involved in research and development, and marketing. In that facility, of which there are 600 employees, Block provides an annual payroll of over \$19.5 million. Our company's total employment is 2600. We have two plants in New Jersey, one in Piscataway, and another in South Brunswick. Our operation is strongly staffed by the R & D, advertising, and marketing people I mentioned. In R & D we have over 20 people with Ph.D.'s, and 16 with M.S. degrees. That is more than a medium sized university. In our marketing department over 65% of our employees have M.B.A. degrees. We compete with the major companies in the world, such as Johnson and Johnson, Warner Lambert, Squibb, and other similar sized operations located in what we describe as campus-like settings. In order for us to compete with people of that magnitude and in those areas of responsibility we need to have an attractive working environment. To have a facility that is down by the rail yards across from the railroad tracks is not conducive to attracting the kind of people we believe are necessary to make us competitive.

We have indicated not only to the city, but to the Port Authority and the press, that if this facility went ahead we would leave our operations in Jersey City. We would move all 600 and some odd employees from that operation. We are equally concerned by the announcement that was made by the Governor to direct them to abandon

this site. It is obvious from the statements here this morning that the reduction of the scope of the size of the project, and the change in the magnitude of the project is not sufficient as far as Block Drug is concerned. Any diminution in those operations which are currently proposed for that site in the use of the 16 acres presents the same problems to us that I mentioned before. We do not believe we can tolerate that situation, not only as a company, but also for our employees who live within blocks of this area.

We have worked together with the residents, the Hilltop Association, the Montgomery Gateway area, et cetera, and we applaud the Committee's launching of these two pieces of legislation directed at the overall problem at hand which is the Port Authority's ability to circumvent the environmental laws of this State, and the zoning ordinances of the city in which they plan to put their facility.

We thank you very much for the time you have offered us to present our views. Thank you again.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Peters. Do you have a question, Assemblyman Cuprowski?

ASSEMBLYMAN CUPROWSKI: Yes. Mr. Peters, I can speak firsthand of Block Drug's history in Jersey City, because in 1979 I was City Council President and had the privilege of voting for those expansion plans by the vacation of streets to eliminate the traffic problems, and for the creation of jobs and retention of jobs. As a matter of fact, today's Mayor Cucci was on the City Council with me at that time, and I am proud to say we both voted for that expansion then. So, I can speak firsthand of your efforts and your capital investment in Jersey City, and I appreciate it.

MR. PETERS: Thank you. One other comment I would like to make in conjunction with that is the company has made a commitment to Jersey City, and as a result of that commitment as is expressed in the Urban Development Action Grant and the EDA financing the company has recently secured which amounts to \$3.3 million, the company has put those funds in escrow pending the satisfactory resolution of these problems. If they are not satisfactory, we resolve the funds will be returned, and unfortunately the city will lose its grant. I wanted the Committee to be aware of those actions.

SENATOR COWAN: Okay. Assemblyman LaRocca, do you have any questions of Mr. Peters? (negative response) All right, thank you very much--

SENATOR RAND: Senator Cowan?

SENATOR COWAN: Yes, Senator?

SENATOR RAND: Senator Cowan, I just wanted to tell you that even if I don't agree with Mr. Peters, and I do agree him, I would have to agree with him because his family comes from my area. (laughter)

MR. PETERS: I was born and reared in Camden County, and I appreciate that.

SENATOR RAND: So, I would have to support him.

SENATOR COWAN: We have had a lot of good people who realized how important Jersey City was to them when they migrated there, including one who only recently left as the Executive Director of our Redevelopment Agency a few years ago, by the name of Tom Kelly, who went into private industry to our unfortunate loss. Hopefully, we have another just as good to replace him. I can also attest to a great extent to Block Drug being a native of the area, and my legislative office is down on Montgomery Street and I travel up that way almost every evening and come through that shortcut. With your vacating of the streets you have made it very easy for me to come up Academy Street. The only thing I miss coming down to Trenton here, passing Johnson and Johnson, is they have geese. (laughter) But your plant is beautiful.

MR. PETERS: Thank you, Senator Cowan.

SENATOR COWAN: Our next witness will be Joseph Filc, from the Hudson County Chamber of Commerce. Is Joseph still here? Very good. Good afternoon, Joseph.

JOSEPH FILC: Good afternoon. I would like to thank you for letting me speak. The Hudson County Chamber of Commerce is pleased to hear today's decision by the Port Authority to look for alternate sites for repair facilities, excluding Waldo Yards.

The enlargement of the PATH facility would cause undue hardship to the surrounding community by way of increased noise and light pollution. Also, businesses such as Block Drug, Anderson Lumber,

and Scott Printing would be severely affected, and have spelled out the negative impact this proposal would have on their operations and future. As an example, Block Drug has detailed the hardship that would result from the projects implementation. Block Drug has been a consistent and significant element in the business community of Jersey City. Over the years, the company has employed many Hudson County residents, and deleterious implications for one of our major employers due to the Port Authority's action cannot be condoned.

With the potential expansion of PATH facilities there would be current, and more importantly, future tax loss incurred by the city. This would be due to any exemptions from real estate taxes that would be granted the Port Authority. This exemption would prevail regardless of whether the in lieu of payment would be made since, historically, they have been static in nature. The Chamber urges the Transportation Subcommittee review alternate areas to locate a repair facility in order to mitigate the severity of the proposal on Jersey City, and the businesses affected. As always, the Chamber offers its assistance in realizing this goal. Thank you.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you very much.

MR. FILC: Thank you.

SENATOR COWAN: Next we have a young man, Mr. William Scholl, from First Jersey National. Bill?

**WILLIAM SCHOLL:** Senator Cowan, members of the Subcommittee, my name is William Scholl, and I represent First Jersey National Bank and Chief Executive Officer, Thomas J. Stanton, Jr. with this brief statement:

First Jersey National Bank has strongly opposed the Port Authority's incursion into the Waldo Yards. We certainly applaud the action taken today in the abandonment of that plan because we felt there seemed to be a striking contradiction to the positive trend and the economic development of Jersey City as it has grown and will continue to grow in the future. It also would seem to be in direct opposition to the concept that the Port Authority should be a welcome and a strengthening influence in the general overall welfare of those communities which it serves. First Jersey National Bank has seen nothing redeeming about the Port Authority's desire to expand their

Waldo Yards operations, and strongly encourages their reevaluation of all alternate sites for an appropriate location for this vital service. Thank you.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you very much, Bill. Next we have another young man, a student spokesman, Antonio Pagkalinwan. Is that correct, Antonio? Will you come up? Would you please state your name, Antonio?

ANTONIO PAGKALINWAN: My name is Antonio Pagkalinwan. I am a student in the eighth grade of St. Joseph's School, and I am part of St. Joseph's Parish. That is where Waldo is. You answered some of my questions already.

SENATOR COWAN: Did you have some questions you were going to ask, or do you think most of them have been answered? Is there any brief statement you would like to read, Tony?

MR. PAGKALINWAN: Yes, I will just read my composition.

SENATOR COWAN: Very good.

MR. PAGKALINWAN: The PATH problem, presumably, is a greater problem to Jersey City than most know. I am sure it has some advantages but I think it can't make up for the loss it brings. For example, the yard is supposedly going to take up the companies that lie at the bottom of Trenton Street. These companies, like Block Drug and Muehler's provide plenty of jobs for the Jersey City residents. Think of the people who have to support families. Also, property values are in risk of declining. The city recently has been enjoying a period of rebuilding and renovating, which has brought the Jersey City property value up considerably. If the yard is built, the surrounding area value will decline. All the noise and the bad surrounding will really impose on anyone who is looking to buy a house in the area, so the demand is going to drop and the homeowners are going to be forced to lower their price.

This is not fair. Look at the people who stayed here when all the rest of the people left. They are the people who had faith and pride in Jersey City. This city's standard has grown so much that people are proud to live in the city. To build the yard is an injustice. All of the Island residents worked hard to make it what it

is now. If you ever decide to visit the area it is obviously one of the nicest places to live in Jersey City. Not only did they work hard to make it what it is, but most of their fathers did also, and their fathers before them. Some people are being forced to move out of their homes; homes that have been part of their lives since they were born. It is just not fair. It is not fair to take people's homes, pride, standards, and memories and put them in jeopardy just so the Port Authority can build their yard. It is not fair.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you very much Antonio. Do you have any questions for Tony?

ASSEMBLYMAN CUPROWSKI: No questions, but I am sure you had a very educational experience here today, and I give your school and especially you credit for being here. Good job.

MR. PAGKALINWAN: Thank you.

SENATOR COWAN: Do you have some other representation with you from the school today, Antonio?

MR. PAGKALINWAN: I think so.

SENATOR COWAN: Would you ask them to please stand. We have some students here from St. Joseph's School. (students stand to applause from audience) I am sure those students and most of you residents will be much happier as soon as that Chestnut Street bridge is finished over there, too. It is a long time coming, but it is coming. (laughter)

Our next witness will be Robert Feldman, from McMillan Blodell Containers. Bob? Good afternoon, Robert.

**ROBERT FELDMAN:** Good afternoon, Senator and gentlemen. My name is Robert Feldman, and I represent the McMillan Blodell Container Company in Jersey City as General Manager. We have been manufacturing corrugated cartons at this facility for 25 years. McMillan Blodell represents 90 jobs. Sixty percent of our employees are residents of Jersey City, with an average of 14 years longevity.

I have heard everyone's stories, and they have covered every aspect. I believe our story is very much akin to that of Anderson Lumber. We are part of a giant international corporation, but we are

very provincial in our attitude about working, living, and providing jobs in Jersey City. We cannot relocate this facility in the metropolitan area without suffering enormous economic loss; a reinvestment of the magnitude necessary to move the plant is totally unfeasible. The equipment we have is not readily moved. We would suffer an interruption of service which would not allow us to remain in business. Ours is a service business with a usual three to five day working time for delivering custom-made corrugated cartons to the industrial trade in New York City.

If we were to close, Jersey City, its merchants, the city tax revenues, our employees, and everything would be lost. They cannot readily secure similar employment at the wages we pay within this area. Many of them do not have saleable skills other than related to our industry. Our industry is not a growth industry. Something everyone in this room knows is the industrialization of the Northeast is diminishing. Our company operates throughout the country, and there are far stronger, more viable economic opportunities. To reinvest in this area with the kind of money necessary would be economic suicide. McMillan Blodell will not make that investment. They cannot; the stockholders will not allow it. We are a public corporation.

As a result of PATH's position and the ominous threat our employees recognized, we had a contract negotiation that expired October 1. We incurred an eight day strike at a great loss to the employees and an enormous dollar loss to McMillan Blodell and the customers we serve throughout this area. They were left without supplies. We have a very difficult and emotional condition in the plant facility itself because people are very much concerned about their future. I tell you unequivocally that it makes it so difficult to operate that if the situation is not resolved and we cannot alleviate this, the Company's position is one that we would have to eliminate any thoughts of investing more money, updating the plant and its future in Jersey City.

We produce the paper we consume in a mill in Alabama that is solely owned and represents an investment of \$500 million. The reason we exist is not so much from the profits we can make in the box

operation, or the fact that we do support a paper mill. Ours is a most competitive industry. If we were to close that mill we would suffer great loss of jobs in a ripple effect. My belief is if we were forced out, the Company would take that money and reinvest it nearer the economic industrial growth areas that we all know. That does not include metropolitan New York. Ours is only an industrial operation. Jersey City does not have enough of that. We have seen too many companies leave. We support Block Drugs position, Anderson Lumber, the Hilltop Association, and, indeed, it would be the end of our facility after 25 years. Thank you.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you, Bob. You say you employ 80 people?

MR. FELDMAN: Ninety people.

SENATOR COWAN: Ninety people. And 60% of those are Jersey City residents?

MR. FELDMAN: Yes.

SENATOR COWAN: Who owns the property on which your facility is located?

MR. FELDMAN: McMillan Blodell owns the property, which is eight acres.

SENATOR COWAN: Owns the property. And you say you had a strike there?

MR. FELDMAN: Yes, it was an eight day strike.

SENATOR COWAN: Is that completed now, and everything is back so that you have a--

MR. FELDMAN: It has been settled somewhat unsatisfactorily. We had no position to give the people, and we could not allay their fears of what tomorrow brings. I understand it and we appreciate it, but we can't commit economic suicide either by granting them things that are not to be had. We do have to compete in this area. The tax burden in Jersey City, a limited facility there, and the whole cloud we live under at this time does not make it conducive for further investment. I might acquaint you with a fact that we are a Canadian owned company, and have been since 1970, and decisions are made some 3000 miles away. It is only our performance and productivity that

keeps them at bay. It is very difficult to communicate anything other than shareholder concern for profitability. But they do have a wonderful and very well-known track record in Canadian Forest Parks Industry about concern for people, and that prevails here. Our job is to keep McMillan in Jersey City, and with your help, we hope to do so.

SENATOR COWAN: And I assume everything is back to order now, and people are back to work?

MR. FELDMAN: They are back to work, and--

SENATOR COWAN: The plant is functioning and productivity is up where it should be and you hope--

MR. FELDMAN: No, I am afraid we have a-- Everyone is licking their wounds, both management and labor. Hopefully, we will get back on course.

SENATOR COWAN: Well, I am sure that--

MR. FELDMAN: This will go a long way towards it, but the apprehension remains in the question, "What about the remaining acreage?" I might acquaint you that we have eight acres, Anderson has two. I believe there are 28 acres in the package and they have 16. So, basically McMillan is the linchpin to this thing.

SENATOR COWAN: Have there been any communications-- I mean, Mr. Anderson has stated that communications are nill, if anything at all, from the Port Authority.

MR. FELDMAN: At this time, we are in a very quiescent period. Prior to this, the relations were far from good. In fact they were quite antagonistic, and we refused any further discussion with the Port Authority.

SENATOR COWAN: Well, as a resident of Jersey City I, and I am sure the Committee itself, would certainly like to see you stay in Jersey City.

MR. FELDMAN: We look forward to it; it is getting to be a habit.

SENATOR COWAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Feldman.

MR. FELDMAN: Thank you.

SENATOR COWAN: That is the last of our listed speakers or witnesses. Are there any further witnesses out in the public who wish to testify? I see our County Register here, Mr. Morris Longo.

**MORRIS LONGO:** Thank you very much, Senator and Assemblymen. I am a supporter of this group, and really did not come to speak today. We spoke before, I spoke at their big meeting at Jersey City, but I didn't want one thing to go without being on record, and that is that many people came here today who traveled from Jersey City on a bus. They are here today, many people looking and practically begging to keep their jobs. Those people are here. They are using the process to get things before you, and I want to thank you very much for holding this hearing. It really inspired us, the neighbors of Waldo, and the Block Association of Hilltop. And just think what you had here today. I will make it very short. You had the parish priest, the pastor of the church. You had people that own homes, rent payers, workers, and you even had some people that came from another country that became citizens of the United States and bought property in that area and are happy to be here as Americans and happy to be here as citizens of Jersey City. But I don't want the people here today to go home without knowing what they did, what they have accomplished. They went through the process; they put democracy in action; they got thousands of petitions signed, and have sent them the Governor of the State of New Jersey; and they have called for this hearing. They have had rallies and done everything possible, and they represent thousands and thousand of people. I want to say this before the Committee and to these people, continue to be sure your voice is going to be heard. It is heard now. You elected officials, I know what it is to sit there. I know that you care about these people, and they have trust in you. And you have to convince every Assemblyman in the entire State of New Jersey and every Senator that the big cities need help. We have struggled long enough. We have worked hard, and we have made a city out of Jersey City. Don't take away our homes. Support us, and we'll continue to support people who help us. Thank you and God bless you all, and thanks to the people back there.

**SENATOR COWAN:** Are there any questions? (negative response)  
All right, thank you very much, Morris.

**MR. LONGO:** Thank you very much, Senator.

SENATOR COWAN: Thanks for coming down. Are there any other citizens among the audience that wish to testify? If not, is there any statement that any of the members of the Committee would like to give?

ASSEMBLYMAN CUPROWSKI: Mr. Chairman? I would certainly be remiss if I didn't commend the Chairman of this Committee, Senator Cowan, for his conduct of this hearing. I think it was very professionally done, I give him credit for that, and I certainly thank him for the courtesies extended to the members of the Assembly, including Assemblyman LaRocca and myself for our participation on a Subcommittee of the Senate Transportation Committee. Thank you very much, Senator.

SENATOR COWAN: Thank you very much. I want to thank you all for coming down, and I want to thank the members of the Subcommittee, who are certainly as dedicated in their positions as they have been, but more importantly for being here today to hear what was said about this situation. This way, it will not be just one, two, or three voices from Hudson that will be speaking, but I am sure we have the support and the well intentioned examination and analysis of all that has been presented here today by the full Subcommittee. We will be reporting back on that, and if any further hearings are required, we will hold them. In the meantime, I would suggest to all parties involved if there is anything you feel from this point on-- When I say from this point on, we have been involved with the PATH facility hearings since I have been in the Assembly, and immediately after coming over from the Assembly this Subcommittee was established. So, it has been in existence; it wasn't just something put into practice for this presentation here today. The young gentleman sitting on my left and your right is Larry Gurman who has been with the Committee as my aide since the Assembly, and at this point in time, is probably one of the most knowledgeable persons in the State as to the PATH functionings and operations. But, this is an ongoing Subcommittee, and I would just like to remind you of that, and we would feel, in a sense, left out or -- to use the phraseology -- left at the station, if we were not kept informed by all parties involved. Thank you very much.

(HEARING CONCLUDED)

