
Committee Meeting

of

ASSEMBLY TRANSPORTATION, PUBLIC WORKS AND INDEPENDENT AUTHORITIES COMMITTEE

"The Commissioner of Transportation and other experts on transportation matters in the State of New Jersey will testify regarding the repair and rehabilitation of the Pulaski Skyway and other issues concerning the Department of Transportation"

ASSEMBLY BILL No. 3529

*"Designates Paterson Plank Road bridge in the Town of Secaucus as
"Joseph F. Tagliareni Jr. Memorial Bridge"*

LOCATION: Hudson County Community College
North Hudson Higher Education Center
Union City, New Jersey

DATE: February 28, 2013
9:30 a.m.

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Assemblyman John S. Wisniewski, Chair
Assemblywoman Linda Stender, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Upendra J. Chivukula
Assemblyman Thomas P. Giblin
Assemblyman Charles S. Mainor
Assemblyman Ruben J. Ramos Jr.
Assemblywoman Valerie Vainieri Huttle
Assemblywoman Nancy F. Munoz
Assemblyman Brian E. Rumpf



ALSO PRESENT:

Charles A. Buono Jr.
Patrick Brennan
*Office of Legislative Services
Committee Aides*

Aaron Binder
*Assembly Majority
Committee Aide*

Glen Beebe
*Assembly Republican
Committee Aide*

***Meeting Recorded and Transcribed by
The Office of Legislative Services, Public Information Office,
Hearing Unit, State House Annex, PO 068, Trenton, New Jersey***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Glen E. Gabert, Ph.D. President Hudson County Community College	2
Thomas A. DeGise County Executive Hudson County, and First Vice Chair Executive Committee North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority	6
Jerramiah T. Healy Mayor City of Jersey City	12
Steven Fulop Councilman Ward E City of Jersey City	20
Anthony J. Attanasio Assistant Commissioner Government and Community Relations New Jersey Department of Transportation	29
Richard T. Hammer Assistant Commissioner Capital Program Management New Jersey Department of Transportation	35
Anthony DeJohn New Jersey Area Manager Parsons Brinckerhoff	35
Ali Maher, Ph.D. Director Center for Advanced Infrastructure and Transportation, and Professor Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	87

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Kay LiCausi President, and Chief Executive Officer Hoboken Strategy Group, Inc.	90
Janna Chernetz, Esq. New Jersey Advocate Tri-State Transportation Campaign	93
Robert Luckritz, Esq. Director Government Relations Jersey City Medical Center LibertyHealth System	97
Maria L. Nieves President, and Chief Executive Officer Hudson County Chamber of Commerce	101
Brett Harwood Partner Harwood Properties and Square Parking	105
William F. Wissemann Senior Project Engineer Newport Associates Development Company	107
APPENDIX:	
Testimony, plus Attachments, plus Press release submitted by Anthony J. Attanasio	1x
PowerPoint presentations presented by New Jersey Department of Transportation	16x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Testimony submitted by Maria L. Nieves	76x
Testimony submitted by Brett Harwood	77x
Testimony submitted by William F. Wissemann	78x
pnf 1-116	

ASSEMBLYMAN JOHN S. WISNIEWSKI (Chair): Good morning.

I'd like to call this meeting of the Assembly Transportation Committee to order. We'll start with a roll call, please.

MR. BUONO (Committee Aide): Assemblyman Rumpf.

ASSEMBLYMAN RUMPF: Here.

MR. BUONO: Assemblywoman Munoz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: Here.

MR. BUONO: Assemblyman Ramos.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: Present.

MR. BUONO: Assemblyman Mainor. (no response)

Assemblyman Giblin. (no response)

Assemblywoman Vainieri Huttle.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN VAINIERI HUTTLE: Here.

MR. BUONO: Assemblyman Chivukula.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: Here.

MR. BUONO: Assemblywoman Caride. (no response)

Vice Chair Stender.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LINDA STENDER (Vice Chair):
Here.

MR. BUONO: Chairman Wisniewski.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Here.

We have a quorum.

Good morning, everyone. Thank you for being here this morning on this important public policy discussion on the Department of Transportation's plans to do renovations to the Pulaski Skyway. I want to

say, at the outset, as Chairman of the Committee -- and I think it's probably a sentiment shared by everybody on the Committee -- we all agree that the Pulaski Skyway is in dire need of work. And we're very happy that the work is about to begin.

Members of this Committee have been approached by constituents from all areas of the state who are affected by this with concerns about the plans that we've read, on how the work will be done and the potential dislocation and inconvenience that it will cause folks in Hudson County and in Essex County and, quite frankly, throughout the northeast region of the state, as well as those people commuting in and out of New Jersey from New York City.

Our goal today is to get answers, to understand it better. My view of this Committee's role -- and any Assembly Committee -- is to ask questions and to get answers. We can then make informed judgments as to legislation that may be needed or policy changes that may be wise. But if we don't ask the questions and have the hearings then we're just operating in the dark.

We are, today, at the Hudson County Community College. This wonderful facility is serving as our host forum for this hearing of the Transportation Committee. We have with us this morning the President of Hudson County Community College. And I would like to welcome Dr. Glen Gabert to come and say a few words of welcome before the Committee.

G L E N E. G A B E R T, Ph.D.: (off mike) Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Please, if you would sit at the-- So it gets recorded for the record.

DR. GABERT: All right. But I need to be very careful about what I say. (laughter)

Well, we're delighted to welcome you to the Hudson County Community College. We have almost 10,000 students attending this college on two campuses. This is one of our beautiful campuses; the other one is in Journal Square.

This is really an interesting campus. It is, literally, on top of the light rail station and it's the busiest light rail station on the line. You don't even have to go outside -- you can go up to the third floor, across the bridge, down, and go down and take the subway. And this was a wonderful support-- This building is an example of what the Assembly and the Senate supports through its Chapter 12 program -- wonderful State support for this, and County support. We're proud of the building; we're really proud to have you here. And it's a great site for you to be having this hearing, since the Pulaski Skyway, about 90 percent of it, is in Hudson County. So welcome to the college, and we're sure this is going to be a great day for you. Thank you so much for coming.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Dr. Gabert, thank you very much. Thank you for the hospitality you have extended to us. It's, as I said, a wonderful facility and a great opportunity for legislators to see what our decision making in Trenton actually produces in the various counties around our state that help educate our children.

I'd like to note for the record that we have two substitutions. We have Assemblywoman Nancy Munoz joining us and substituting in for a member, as well as Assemblywoman Valerie Vainieri Huttel substituting in. Both of you, welcome, and thank you for participating.

Assemblyman Ruben Ramos is a member of the Committee and has long expressed interest in the Pulaski Skyway -- as long as I can remember. He and I serve in the Legislature together; this has been one of the issues of prime concern to him. And for a brief opening statement, I turn it over to Assemblyman Ramos.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: Thank you, Chairman. I really appreciate the opportunity here today.

And good morning and thank you all for attending.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Ruben, you don't have any amplification.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: This mike doesn't work?

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: That's only recording; you don't have any amplification, so just belt it out.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: I have to belt it out? (laughter)
Should I sing soprano or--?

Good morning, all, and thank you for attending this morning.

Before we hear testimony from the public, I want to take the opportunity to thank Chairman Wisniewski and the members of the Committee for holding this special hearing and for coming to Hudson County this morning. I'd like to thank Richard Hammer and Anthony Attanasio, New Jersey Department of Transportation, for joining us, as well as elected officials, and all local residents who are here to participate in this discussion about fixing the Pulaski Skyway.

And last, but certainly not least, I'd like to extend a special thank you to President Glen Gabert and Hudson County Community College for graciously allowing us to use their campus for this hearing.

Anyone who has driven the Pulaski Skyway during peak hours knows the heavy volume it bears. The communities of Hoboken and Jersey City endure bumper-to-bumper traffic before they even get on the highway. The Pulaski Skyway is an important artery for both commuters heading towards Manhattan and residents of what we call the *Gold Coast of New Jersey* traveling to other areas of our state as well.

So when the flow of traffic stops, we need to ensure that our local infrastructure is equipped to manage the heavy traffic that will be directed its way. In a sluggish economy we cannot afford to have an inefficient flow of traffic for those individuals traveling to and from work.

Only months ago, Hurricane Sandy demonstrated what a tremendous impact loss of transportation infrastructure can have on our communities and how heavy a burden it has on other modes of transportation infrastructure. Through this process I am sure we'll hear about some of these different difficulties our communities faced, and we must keep these considerations top of our mind.

The commuters in our area have already endured so much during these past few months and deserve any reasonable accommodations that make travel a little easier. The Pulaski Skyway is one of the few routes that connect areas south and west of us to Manhattan, yet public safety is even more critical. And there is no dispute how imperative it is that we replace the Skyway's decks. After spending \$90 million over the past seven years for short-term repairs just to keep the Skyway functioning, we owe it to the commuters to properly repair it to last for decades to come.

There has been extensive research done on the Skyway and the impact closing it would have on traffic patterns, as well as the ability to fix

it properly and permanently. The decision to close each side of the Skyway for 24 months at a time was not reached quickly or lightly; but there is no substitution for an ample public comment period to hear the commuters who know this area best. The close of the Pulaski Skyway's northbound lanes is only 11 months away, and I hope you will give the weight and substance of today's testimony your full and earnest consideration. That is why I was so vocal in my request for an additional hearing, and I thank you again, Chairman, and members of the Committee for having this hearing today and for coming to Hudson County. So I'm looking forward to a healthy dialogue as we go forward today.

Thank you very much, Chairman.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you, Assemblyman Ramos. Thank you for those comments. And I think they adequately frame our discussion this morning.

We have representatives -- elected officials from Hudson County here. And our County leader -- I'd like to call first our County Executive, Executive Tom DeGise.

T H O M A S A. D e G I S E: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it and welcome you, one more time, to Hudson County.

I know Dr. Gabert mentioned to you that this beautiful college of ours, which we just opened up last year, is built over the air space in Hudson-Bergen Light Rail. So I just want to remind you that we're not really finished with this yet. If you talk to our good friends at Bergen County they'll tell you, "When does the Bergen part of Hudson-Bergen Light Rail continue?" So we have one more western terminus on Tonnelles Avenue in North Bergen. We are looking forward-- I know times are tough

and everything, but somewhere down the line, I think we ought to be talking about moving it into Bergen County and out towards the Meadowlands and Xanadu and Giants Stadium and MetLife -- or whatever they call it -- in the future. But that's a story for another day.

With the Pulaski Skyway-- A quick little story: Besides being the County Executive, I'm the Vice Chair of the NJTPA -- the North Jersey Transportation Planning Association (*sic*). I'm also the Chairperson of the Project Prioritization Committee. We found out in a rather unfortunate way about the plan -- by being invited to go to a press conference with DOT where the plans, in their completion, were announced. And my first reaction to that was, "This isn't good, because you're going to need input, not only from the professionals on the NJTPA, but also from the local elected officials and community people," which we really didn't get.

After talking to Commissioner Simpson about that, and with some of the staff there, we were apologized to in many ways. And then the project was explained to us. And I have to say that while I didn't like the delivery of how we were informed as to what the plan would be for DOT, as a Jersey City resident, as a Hudson County resident, as a member of the TPA, I think this is the best way for us to go there. And very simply put from my point of view -- and I know that you'll hear arguments today of the money that it will save -- which is approaching \$300 million -- it would be cheaper to do it this way than any other type of direction for that. It would also add years to the project not to do it that way. But for me, again, a Jersey City guy and a Hudson County guy, the biggest thing I think is just a commonsense approach to it for the people I represent as an elected official.

People use the Pulaski Skyway to come in to Hudson County, to come in to Jersey City -- either to stay there or on their way to work in Manhattan. So Jersey City people use it to get out of Jersey City. If we're heading out towards Newark Airport, or people working or recreating themselves there, they get on it. That direction will always be open for the Jersey City people. The people who will be having problems are people coming in from Union County and different areas coming in to our area. When we're coming back into Jersey City, after Newark Avenue, we won't be travelling on rush hour.

Now this doesn't-- So I'm in favor of the plan as it's proposed by New Jersey Transit (*sic*). That said, I do realize that the traffic coming in -- and I believe it's 65,000 cars, 37-some thousand each way each day during the rush hour -- are going to cause problems, in particular in Jersey City; and, to a lesser extent, in Hoboken and to Kearny, where the span also goes over and has an entrance and an exit there also. And some of the mitigating plans that have been presented to us from the Commissioner and his staff, quite frankly, will not work there. Truck Route 1 and 9 -- which, in local parlance is 440 and Communipaw Avenue there -- is above capacity right now. And to add thousands of cars to that will only make an impossible situation more impossible -- if there is such a word as more impossible, or phrase such as that. It just isn't going to work there.

I view traffic somewhat like water that's on the loose with a broken pipe. It's going to go everywhere. And you're not exactly sure where it's going to go. And our fear will be for the local streets to be flooded by people who are trying to figure out a taxi cab route to get from wherever they are over to the Holland Tunnel, or to Jersey City, or

Hoboken waterfront to get to work or something like that. And we don't need that.

So while I am in favor of the plan as it has been stated by the Commissioner, I think that this would be predicated and this would be dependent upon the local authorities having a role in dealing with the mitigating factors: opening up a third lane of the Turnpike Extension as it goes through Bayonne -- that will help quite a bit. Route 7 coming in from Kearny -- a good thunderstorm puts that underwater immediately. If you are really looking to mitigate, then help us out with this \$1 billion project. Either raise a new roadway or improve some of the floodgates that are already in place there so that road doesn't. Guiding the maritime traffic on the Wittpenn Bridge -- which opens up at the most inconvenient of times -- would be disastrous when you're putting all of these things in its way. Park-and-rides in Harrison near the PATH station, park-and-rides by Giants Stadium, and any other place there would be helpful. Single-occupancy cars should not be allowed into the tunnel traffic at that point.

Will this solve everything? And there are many other ideas, you know. The guys from Jersey City -- and I know Mayor Healy is behind me to speak also -- but there, you know, we play a critical part in Hudson County in the evacuations and catastrophic situations from Manhattan. We need to make sure that roads, in order to evacuate in times of distress, are available to us.

So what I'm saying is that I can give my support to the project that's here, because I like the fact it will be finished in two years rather than five years. Any time you go through home renovations, you just kind of put

up with things for a little while as best you can do. And then it's done and you have a new bridge.

Last year I took a tour with the Riverkeeper -- the Hackensack Riverkeeper -- by boat up the Hackensack River. And not only the Pulaski Skyway -- but more of the Pulaski Skyway than any of the other bridges -- it's a little bit frightening to ride under bridges that you're on all the time and see the concrete actually falling off the steel as you're driving under that. The Skyway needs this improvement. We need to have Jersey City, Hudson County, the town of Kearny, and any of the other elected officials dealing with the mitigating factors -- with that traffic that is going to flow into streets. We need to have policing to make sure it keeps the traffic out of places that it shouldn't be. We need to be working with Transit and with you guys also to make sure that all of the alternatives and anything that could ease the congestion as it comes into Hudson County can be dealt with in the best possible way. It's going to be a problem. It's going to be a pain in the butt for two years. We understand that.

We want a place at the table. We want to be able to sit at that table and deal with all of the problems as they go. Some of them can be anticipated right now by looking at the traffic flows and where it naturally -- where people will be directed; and I know that surveys are being done. But not all of them are going to be able to be seen right away. Until it actually happens, until people are sitting in that traffic, until people are trying to figure out a different way or a different time -- possibly staggering times for workplaces. Judge Peter Bariso, who is the Chief Assignment Judge here in Hudson, spoke to me yesterday as we were on a lunch line on Newark Avenue. And he said, "You know what would help us a lot with the lawyers

and some of the judges coming in? Make the courts start at 10 o'clock rather than 9 o'clock until we could be behind that." This is the kind of out-of-the-box thinking I think all of us need to do.

That said, the Pulaski Skyway is one of the most vital pieces of infrastructure in Hudson County -- in the entire region. It needs to be fixed. It should not be patchwork. It lasted, right now, for 80 years. It should be put into a state of repair that will keep it going for another 80 years. We should do it as quickly and as cheaply as we possibly can and all of the local officials should be brought to the table to make sure that our input is there. It wasn't done the first time around. But we've been assured-- And I've been holding meetings in the county, the TPA has been holding meetings. We've had a very honest discussion and dialogue about some of the things that I'm talking about. And I'm confident that if they allow us -- and us being Hudson County and Jersey City and Kearny and Hoboken -- if they allow us at the table, we know our areas; we know what would be the best solutions for some of the problems; we know what some of the other projects that are going -- sometimes there is too much going on here in Hudson County all at once. We want this project, we want it to start right after the Super Bowl. We want it to last for 80 years. And we want to be part of the solution in dealing with the inevitable problems that it's going to cause.

So I appreciate you coming up here today to speak in Hudson County. If anybody has any questions for me, I'll hang around a little bit. If not, welcome and good luck trying to get out of Hudson County to get home. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Mr. Executive, thank you for your testimony and your hospitality this morning. And if you don't mind sticking around, there may be some questions that come up later.

MR. DeGISE: I'll be here.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you.

MR. DeGISE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Take care, guys.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Next, I'd like to call the Mayor of Jersey City, Mayor Healy.

MAYOR JERRAMIAH T. HEALY: Good morning, everyone.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Good morning, Mayor.

MAYOR HEALY: Thanks for coming up here.

I guess Tom has said everything that I was going to say. But I want to highlight a couple of things.

Tom mentioned single-occupancy vehicles. They have to be banned while this is going on. We, in Jersey City, have Jersey Avenue. If you know about Jersey Avenue and downtown Jersey City, it's only about 120 meters that needs to be built out and that will be another access and egress point to the New Jersey Turnpike. So we're asking the State -- we've been advocating for this for a long time -- we're asking the State to take a look at that -- DOT -- get us some funding so we can extend it. That will be some mediation.

I think the Turnpike Extension -- the Northeast Extension -- could probably be expanded to four lanes in the mornings, not three. But we're still going to run into that problem that, when you get to Bayonne

and Jersey City, you're going to be down to two lanes anyway. But let's expand some of those lanes. That's going to be a help.

In addition, this is an opportunity, maybe, which will force everybody in the transportation industry and everybody involved in government to do something that I've been advocating for a long time. We have the Lautenberg Station -- it's a big, beautiful railroad terminal out in Secaucus. It's totally underemployed. Nobody goes there, nobody uses it. We should put 5,000 to 10,000 parking spots out there. People could leave their cars outside of Jersey City, outside of Hudson County, and run some kind of a light rail or a bus rapid transit system over to the Meadowlands. By the way, these are all railroad right-of-ways; we don't have to spend a lot of money to acquire them. And you run it in by the Charlotte Circle where it commences at the Bergen Arches. They're already up and built -- where trains used to go through. Run that light rail or that rapid transit bus through there and it comes out the other side -- the eastern end -- under Dickinson High School; it's very close to the Sixth Street Embankment. You can then run that rapid transit -- whatever it is, light rail or bus -- up the Sixth Street Embankment right down to Pavonia Avenue which is, of course, where all of our jobs are. We have about 24,000 private sector jobs in our Jersey City financial district. And anybody who wants to go to New York City can get on the PATH train right there. So this is an opportunity for us to look at those things and work on them. They have to be done anyway, in the long term. Now it's an opportunity for us to look at that and get some progress made on all of those things.

But at any rate-- Oh, what Tom was mentioning. The Pulaski Skyway is 80, 81 years old right now. There is no doubt it must be

repaired, it must be fixed. And as he said, you go under those bridges -- in particular, the Skyway -- with the Riverkeeper and you'll see the tremendous deterioration there. So we agree with the State -- it must be fixed and it must be fixed now. And we can't say, "Well, we'll just close one lane, and it's going to take us five or six years." We have to swallow the bitter pill and get it done in two years because it's very important to us -- all of us.

But here in Jersey City we're going to need extra police for trafficking purposes so we're going to need some assistance from the State.

Other than that, it's something that has to be accomplished, it has to be done now, and it has to be done by closing the two lanes. But we should look at all of these other options that are out there to encourage -- by the Skyway and also by the Northeast Extension of the Turnpike. There's a lot of open space there: parking, ferry -- people park the vans, the buses, the vehicles and then get the ferry across the Hackensack River and move us into the Jersey City area -- Hudson County area -- and have other vans there to get people to where they have to go: downtown Jersey City, Bayonne, or New York City. This might be an opportunity for us to fast-forward on those plans.

So thanks for being here and listening to our concerns. And we hope that, together, we can all fix the Skyway without causing havoc in Jersey City and the rest of Hudson County.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Mr. Mayor, thank you for your testimony.

Members of the Committee, any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: I just want to make a statement, if I may.

It's true what you're saying, Mayor, and I want my colleagues to understand that if you honestly look at it, coming into New Jersey, there are three veins that come into New Jersey when they come over Communipaw: that's 1 and 9, 15E, and also from Newark. And I'm looking and I'm wondering: That is going to be a major problem. Because they are all going to end up right there on Communipaw and 440. Where do they go from there? That's a problem.

Also, if you look at the people who are coming on at Exit 14 -- that Bayonne Extension -- every morning right now the traffic is backed up to the tolls. I believe a better plan has to be put in place because, like you said, the Skyway has to be fixed, and I agree. We really have to do this. But the inconvenience for my constituents in Jersey City is going to be a major problem because right now it could take you a half an hour to leave from Greenville Avenue to get down to downtown Jersey City -- yet alone another half an hour to get to Hoboken.

So there's a problem, and I agree with a lot of the suggestions you made. And I also want to agree that we really have to bring our local elected officials to the table. Because who knows our town better than us and the things that we have to deal with? There's hiring more cops. And we need to make sure the traffic flows, and we have to open up another lane, and so on and so forth -- we need to do that. But that extension is going to be a major problem -- 14A, B, and C are going to be a major problem, I believe, if we don't act on it fast.

MAYOR HEALY: Absolutely. And you know, no matter how-- If we find another lane or another two lanes on the Turnpike Northeast Extension, you're still going to get to that end where it's down to -- you know, three to four lanes are going to go down to two lanes when you hit Jersey City and Bayonne.

One source of relief would be the extension of Jersey Avenue so that you could jump off the Turnpike, get into downtown Jersey City in the mornings; and in the afternoons, get out of Jersey City and get right on the Turnpike there.

But, really, this is going to be about banning single-occupancy vehicles and expanding our horizons and our views regarding the public and mass transportation.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: Thank you, Mayor.

MAYOR HEALY: Thank you, Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Another question?

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: Yes.

Mayor Healy, good to see you in your neck of the woods.

MAYOR HEALY: Good to see you, Upendra.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: I know you were talking about creating new public transportation opportunities, like creating ferries. They are going to take a lot of time and cost a lot of money. Why not make use of the existing infrastructure for public transportation -- maybe stop the traffic near Newark, and then you have the PATH; making use of the PATH train. Have you considered options like that? Because creating new things last minute, at the 11th hour, you're not going to be able to do all these things because they cost money, approvals -- all that stuff. So

existing infrastructure -- how we can better use it in terms of trying to -- for the 11-month period.

MAYOR HEALY: Well, Assemblyman, the PATH train is very much employed right now. In fact, we don't have enough PATH cars -- and you know that, Ruben -- in Hoboken and in Jersey City. It's already exploding, okay? So I don't think we can put any -- get any more use out of them. And I think this is an opportunity. Because of this crisis, we can think outside the box, as our County Executive said, and use what is already there. The Bergen Arches are already there. The right-of-way across from Lautenberg Station to the Charlotte Circle where the Bergen Arches commence -- that's already there. The Sixth Street Embankment is already there. Let's take advantage of what exists. Of course it's going to cost money, but it's not going to cost as much money as, for instance, land acquisition costs all across the Meadowlands. There are railroad right-of-ways that are in existence and we have to use this crisis as an opportunity to think outside the box.

In the mornings, coming into Jersey City and, of course, to the Holland Tunnel, and getting over to New York City, it's a crisis every morning coming in. And it's a crisis every afternoon or evening getting out. So we have opportunities; I think they should be -- not explored, I think we should act upon them.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you.

Mayor, I just have one question. You've been using the phrase that I'm sure has a lot of relevance to those representatives and residents of the Hudson County area: the *Bergen Arches*.

MAYOR HEALY: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I'm assured it's not like a competitor to the Golden Arches. (laughter) Could you just explain what the Bergen Arches are?

MAYOR HEALY: Yes. You know what it is, and I know the guys from Hudson County know what it is. But this is a pre-existing rail line -- there are several rail lines -- and it runs under the Palisades. It starts at about the Charlotte Circle. It's already up there; it exists, and it comes out--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: Where is the Charlotte Circle? Can you tell us where the Charlotte Circle is?

MAYOR HEALY: Oh, okay. I thought everyone knew where the Charlotte Circle was. (laughter) That's the place where you can't get through -- ever. (laughter) And they've made it worse in the last couple of years.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Mayor, I'd just like to interject that there are a lot of places in New Jersey that you just can't get through. (laughter)

MAYOR HEALY: Well, we're densely populated, and everybody has a car.

The Charlotte Circle is around 1 and 9, and you know Route 139 that takes you into the Holland Tunnel? It's the western end of that.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: It's in Jersey City?

MAYOR HEALY: It's in Jersey City, correct.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: Okay, thank you.

MAYOR HEALY: And these--

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: It's where 440, 1 and 9 -- going to the Holland Tunnel -- all meet.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: I'm sure I've been there -- stuck there, yes.

MAYOR HEALY: I'm sure you've been stuck there. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: We all have.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: I just didn't know it had a name.

MAYOR HEALY: But these things are already there; let's use them. They used them in the past and as we left the railroads -- less trains, more cars -- I don't think it's been necessarily productive for us. We should look at those things that we used years ago and bring them back into use and we may help ourselves -- not only out of this crisis, with the Pulaski Skyway -- but we'll help ourselves out of that whole mess in the morning coming in, and in the afternoons going out.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN VAINIERI HUTTLE: Chairman?

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes, Assemblywoman.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN VAINIERI HUTTLE: Mayor, good morning.

MAYOR HEALY: Good morning.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN VAINIERI HUTTLE: You raised a point about the Lautenberg Rail Station.

MAYOR HEALY: Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN VAINIERI HUTTLE: Why is that underutilized? Is it because it doesn't go anywhere, or we don't have trains coming in? What is the reason? What are we doing with that?

MAYOR HEALY: There is no parking there, okay? And, you know, when you get to the Lautenberg Station, you have to find somebody to pick you up. That's a great amenity, but you have to put parking there to encourage people to, "Leave your cars outside of Hudson County. If you come in from the south, the north or the west" -- where most people are coming from, to Jersey City, or to get to New York City in the mornings -- "leave your car there." And let's get some kind of mass transit -- whether it be light rail or rapid bus transit -- from the Lautenberg, across the Meadowlands, through the Bergen Arches, Sixth Street Embankment -- bang -- you're downtown Jersey City; or, if you want to go to New York, get on the PATH train at Pavonia Avenue.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you.

Mayor, thank you very much.

MAYOR HEALY: Thank you, Assemblyman. Thanks, everybody.

ALL: Thank you, Mayor.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Next I'd like to call Councilman Steve Fulop, Jersey City.

Good morning, Councilman.

C O U N C I L M A N S T E V E N F U L O P: Thank you, Chairman; and thank you, Committee, for having this.

I'm sure you all got the 1,500 e-mails from Jersey City residents requesting this -- and that was in 24 hours. I think that speaks volumes to the sentiment in Jersey City about how this kind of came to be. And I think the Jersey City residents feel that-- I think the elected officials there feel, for the most part, that we, in a lot of ways, represent an economic

engine for the State of New Jersey. And this came to us via a cover story in the *Jersey Journal* as kind of a done situation. And I think, for the most part, it is taken for granted what the impact will have on our commercial waterfront, on emergency management. And where I think myself and some of the -- the Mayor and the County Executive -- might slightly disagree on this, is that, as the plan is today, it's difficult for me or someone on the City Council to say that we're supportive of a two-year plan knowing that it could have huge impacts on our business community and our waterfront.

I think there are solutions that are worthwhile to explore that the Mayor and the County Executive both recommended, and we won't belabor those points. But I think that any sort of plan needs to work together with those solutions, and we can't just have push back saying, "Well, we're already in the 11th hour, and those cost money." Because I think that the long-term impact on Jersey City, from a financial standpoint, could be much more severe.

And thank you for having this meeting.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you, Councilman.

Questions?

Assemblyman Giblin.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: Councilman, do you have anything specific that you would like to see incorporated in this plan?

COUNCILMAN FULOP: I think the mass transportation opportunities; I think that 15X is an option; I think the Charlotte Circle, as mentioned, was an option; I think that, from my standpoint, personally, I would prefer not to see an absolute closure in both directions. I would

prefer to see access and, maybe, the renovation take slightly longer -- but in the case that it would still be able to facilitate traffic going through the Skyway, as opposed to coming through Jersey City residential communities.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: Well, are you aware that if you did what you're proposing -- about the time element -- would it mean two years versus three years or four years?

COUNCILMAN FULOP: Yes. And I think that the time trade-off is worthwhile *a)* for emergency access reasons and *b)* I think the financial impact that the plan, over two years, could have to our waterfront could be much more severe.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: And what about the cost factor with that -- extending the timeframe?

COUNCILMAN FULOP: And I think that the cost to the financial waterfront, our business community, and our commercial development, as I said, could be much more substantive than what the cost would be to extend it one year and still have access via the Skyway. I think anybody who reached out to you acknowledges -- as the Mayor and the County Executive and most of the elected officials in Jersey City would say -- that we recognize that the Pulaski Skyway is in need of repair. And I think there's a difference on absolute close down versus single-lane duration on timeframe, and what the potential impact is going to have on the residential communities.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: Okay, thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: I have one question.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Assemblyman Mainor.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: We talk about the traffic that is coming into Jersey City, but I don't know if we have ever actually looked at the traffic that is leaving -- that's coming from that Holland Tunnel. Because if they are coming through that Holland Tunnel--

COUNCILMAN FULOP: True.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: --and leaving out, they're going to, most likely, go onto the New Jersey Turnpike -- which really will not be able to take all that traffic -- which will then lead them to Kennedy Boulevard. And where are they going to go from there? Do you have any suggestions for that?

COUNCILMAN FULOP: I don't right now. I think that is a great point. I think that speaks to, kind of, the closure concerns overall.

Right -- you would use Kennedy Boulevard and you could potentially go all the way down to Bayonne venting traffic over there, which would create a logjam all through Jersey City. So those are things that need to be explored, and I think that's why it's important that you guys are here today. And I know it's late in the process but, nevertheless, I think it's important to be explored because the impact could be very, very severe.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: You think that 15X would be something that we could use for leaving?

COUNCILMAN FULOP: I think it's a potential solution. I think it's-- Yes, I do, I do, I do. I think it's a potential solution.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Assemblyman Ramos.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: If you listen to our three elected officials from Jersey City today, basically they all understand the need for the project to get done; I think we all understand that, moving forward.

But there's a concern about the lack of input they've had on this project thus far, and I think what they need and what other Hudson County officials need are-- We know it's going to have an impact on, what Assemblyman Mainor brought up, Communipaw Avenue. Is there a plan for upgrades on Communipaw Avenue? Is there a plan for upgrades to the 1 and 9 Truck route? Is there a plan for upgrades to Jersey Avenue where these other cars are going to -- and these other routes are going to have more wear and tear on those arteries? So I think we're aware of those portions of it, but we're not aware of any plans of DOT to make, say, any infrastructure improvements to these roadways, and they're going to have additional traffic and wear and tear, going forward, for those two- to three-year periods. Because you go through Communipaw Avenue right now -- that's pretty dilapidated. If you go the 1 and 9 Truck route right now, that's dilapidated. So these areas are already in need of work, and that's going to be exacerbated by more wear and tear, more traffic, and more sitting still in traffic.

COUNCILMAN FULOP: And there is construction happening, currently, to some of those access points. So as the construction is ongoing to other access points to Jersey City, the concern of further construction on the Pulaski Skyway only furthers the concern on where that traffic flow is going to come to in an absolute closure. So it's going to come to Jersey City residential neighborhoods.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: So while it's noble for us to ask these elected officials these questions -- again, it's the 11th hour and they're taking part in this process. I think, hopefully, when DOT gives their presentation they can have -- I think they're giving their presentation next --

they could try and give us what they have done already to prepare for these concerns these elected officials have.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Assemblyman Chivukula.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: Thank you, Chairman, Councilman Fulop, it's good to see you.

COUNCILMAN FULOP: It's good to see you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: I know the Pulaski Skyway has been -- whenever I drive on it, I think about General Pulaski saying, "I hope I can get over to the other side of the bridge." This has been around -- this has been in the works for a long time. Why now are all these concerns surfacing? That's one question.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN VAINIERI HUTTLE: Because it's ready to collapse. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: Something's going to happen.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: The other thing is, I know I had this conversation with DOT and the engineers when they did their Route 18 expansion in Essex County. They did a phenomenal job. We don't have the same volume of traffic that you have in this area, but they have done that. I think I have tremendous confidence in DOT to work with local officials, and they will do that.

But as Assemblyman Giblin brought out, the time element -- do you want to get it done in 11 months, or do you want to wait for five or six years -- especially with what is happening in Washington and in New Jersey and in Trenton -- jobs and funding issues. You don't want to belabor and delay at this point.

COUNCILMAN FULOP: I would go back to a couple of things: Number one is the reason that it's coming to the forefront now, from a Hudson County resident standpoint -- is because of the way that I think most elected officials found out about the project. So it was told to us via the *Jersey Journal*, in many ways; and that's how it was communicated. So once we found out about it we reached out and tried to get residents involved, asking for a hearing that, truthfully, should have probably happened a long time ago. I think that Route 18 is, obviously, a highly used highway; but at the same time, it's a totally different scale than the Pulaski Skyway. And look -- going back to the timeframe: I would prefer that the project takes a little bit longer but is done properly to alleviate traffic in Jersey City communities, than to do it in a shorter period of time and create a logjam in Jersey City communities that will also hinder progress that we've seen, moving forward.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Vice Chair Stender.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, Councilman. Welcome and thank you for being here, along with the County Exec and the Mayor.

This issue of how everybody found out locally has now come up a couple of times. I'm curious about the New Jersey Transportation Planning -- the NJTPA -- North Jersey. Usually that's the agency that big projects go through, and that they get into the queue, and there's a lot of planning and all of these aspects that you've been raising here is part of that. Do you know why it is that this didn't go through that process?

COUNCILMAN FULOP: I do believe it did. The County Executive sits on that board; he and I communicated this week. I believe

that the Mayor has an appointee on that board as well. He's actually a Councilman who sits up there. I think that there has been a communication gap through the whole process. So while some aspects of government -- maybe the county government has been engaged in the process; I don't think that the residents or the City Council -- for certain, in Jersey City -- were aware of an absolute closure happening.

You know, truthfully, I think that if this hearing was at 6 o'clock on a Thursday or a Wednesday, you'd probably see 500 or 600 people here. The difference is that it's 9 o'clock on a workday. So the reality is that people are very, very concerned just because they didn't have information on it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: Okay, thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I'll just make this observation, because one of the discussions from the County Exec to Mayor Healy to yourself and the members of the Committee -- we keep talking about where will the traffic go. We're going to close two lanes in one direction, and those cars are not going to just stay home. They're going to go someplace else. And every single route that everybody has talked about -- and many of you have more intimate knowledge of the names of the roads; and I won't try to repeat the names -- but with every single one of those roads, somebody has said, "Well, that one needs work; and this one needs rehabilitation; and that one has certain defects." And I think it's important for us as a legislative body to understand that what we are witnessing is our inaction as a Legislature to fully fund transportation in the fashion that it should have been funded over the years. So we have the Pulaski Skyway at age 80-plus. I was looking at some of the Facebook

comments that somebody just sent me that said, "Tear the thing down because it's a deathtrap." But the fact is that we have to fix it. And we have all these other roads that we have to fix. And so we are now, as a State, engaged in an unfortunate game of triage. We don't have enough money, we haven't had enough money, we don't have enough resources. So we're, essentially, pushing cars from one bad road to another bad road so we can fix the bad road and, hopefully, get it fixed in time so that we can start fixing the other bad roads. I think the elephant in the room, if you will, is the fact that we have underfunded transportation, not just this year, not just last year, but over the last 20 years. And one of the things that we, as a Legislature, in a bipartisan fashion have to agree on is we need to find money to pay for transportation infrastructure. We have to find more money than we're, quite frankly, spending today. Otherwise these exact discussions -- about closing two lanes of a major road for a long period of time -- are just going to become the norm. We're going to continue to have the same discussion over and over again.

With that, Councilman, thank you for your testimony.

COUNCILMAN FULOP: Thank you; thank you very much.
Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Now I'm going to call up the guys who are responsible for all of this (laughter) -- the New Jersey Department of Transportation.

Commissioner Simpson was invited; could not make it. In his place we have Anthony Attanasio and Rick Hammer who will do an overview, and then they have an audio-visual presentation that they will do. And then they'll be available for questions by the Committee.

And there are a lot of folks who have signed up to testify, and every one of you -- Dr. Maher from the Rutgers Center for Advanced Infrastructure, and everybody else -- will get an opportunity to testify.

But Rick, Anthony -- please come on up. The hot seat is yours.

Please begin.

ANTHONY J. ATTANASIO: Thank you.

Good morning, Chairman and Committee members. My name is Anthony Attanasio, Assistant Commissioner of Government and Community Relations, New Jersey Department of Transportation.

On behalf of Governor Christie and NJDOT Commissioner Jim Simpson, I thank you for this opportunity to discuss the immensely important and complex project of rehabilitating the Pulaski Skyway. I look forward to providing information that helps each of you understand the need for this \$1 billion rehabilitation project, but, perhaps more important, helps you appreciate how we arrived at key construction decisions that will affect commuters and residents during the critical phase of this project.

I also plan to outline -- and I hope we have the opportunity to discuss this in detail -- the important work that is already underway with key stakeholders -- including emergency responders, mayors, and other elected officials, transportation planning experts and community groups -- to develop consensus around traffic mitigation and communication strategies to minimize negative impacts.

Sitting with me is Rick Hammer, the NJDOT Assistant Commissioner for Capital Programs Management. His knowledge of this project, and of every major project built by the Department, is broad and deep.

Also here is the NJDOT State Transportation Engineer Dave Lambert, and our project team.

I thought I would start my testimony with an overview of the Skyway and the rehabilitation project. I'll keep this very brief, because there has been a lot of media coverage since we announced the project details at a public officials' briefing in Newark last month. We have included the January 10 press release in our handouts to the Committee members, and that document has much more detail than I will provide now since we do have a PowerPoint presentation for the benefit of the Committee and the audience.

The Pulaski Skyway is a 3.5-mile-long elevated highway that carries two lanes of Route 1 and 9 traffic in each direction between Newark and Jersey City. It opened in 1932 and serves as an express lane to Jersey City and the Holland Tunnel each morning, and to Newark and other destinations each afternoon. It currently handles approximately 67,000 vehicles a day.

The work we will be performing includes: repairs and rehabilitation of the piers and steel structures that support the roadway; complete reconstruction of the deck, or driving surface; rehabilitation of the Newark, Kearny and Broadway ramps; seismic retrofits to strengthen the structure against earthquakes; improvements to lighting and drainage; and finally, repainting of the structural steel. This work will be carried out through 10 contracts. Work under the first contract started last year and the repainting of the Skyway under the final contract should be completed in the year 2020.

The Skyway is structurally deficient and functionally obsolete. There is no disagreement from any quarter about the need to invest in a complete overhaul. The discussions have appropriately focused on how best to perform this work to minimize impacts on commuters, residents, and businesses and, as mentioned, to do it in the most economically feasible fashion for the taxpayer.

I now wish to turn your attention to the process that got us to where we are today. The Department considered several different options, including simply demolishing the structure and diverting traffic to other existing roadways -- known as a no-build -- which clearly was not a satisfactory alternative.

Another option was to build a parallel structure; but the fact is, we do not own the property to do so, and acquiring it would be prohibitively expensive. Ultimately, after working through the pros and cons of several options, we selected the current plan to rehabilitate the existing structure.

Developing a plan for replacing the Skyway decks that carry Route 1 and 9 northbound and southbound traffic was difficult because there is simply no way to take a few lanes out of service and adequately accommodate the traffic demands. We studied many alternatives, including doing the work only at nights and weekends, but that would add a minimum of four years and more than \$210 million to that phase of the project -- just that phase. In addition, the overall quality of the final product would suffer.

We considered closing one side of the Skyway at a time, and converting the other side to handle one travel lane in each direction.

However, due to the narrow width of the Skyway, we could not safely provide one lane in each direction.

Contra flows, or reversing the travel direction to match peak flows each day, also presented operational concerns. This option would require full closure in both directions of the Skyway during the switching periods, resulting in significant detouring of traffic into and through Jersey City and Newark during off-peak periods.

Ultimately, we selected the option that requires diverting traffic in one direction for two years during the deck reconstruction phase. Closing the northbound lanes towards New York is necessary for a variety of reasons, including the desire to avoid backups on the Jersey City streets and into the Holland Tunnel, and the fact that there are more options for motorists heading toward Jersey City and New York than there are coming out of the Tunnel.

The closure of the Skyway's northbound lanes will begin in early 2014. We'll be working around the clock to finish this critical phase of the project as quickly as possible and to reopen those northbound lanes.

We noted last month at our press conference in Newark that the Department is keeping a close eye on dozens of roadway projects that are scheduled to take place before, during, and after the closure of the Skyway's northbound lanes. These projects include, but are not limited to: the Port Authority's Lincoln Tunnel helix project; the Port Authority's Bayonne and Goethals bridge projects; the New Jersey Turnpike's Newark Bay-Hudson County Extension deck reconstruction project; and NJDOT's Route 7 Hackensack River Wittpenn Bridge replacement project.

We continue to work with local officials and stakeholders on a transportation management plan that will likely involve a menu of options for motorists, including public transportation, car pooling, flexing of work start times, and alternate routes. However, it is worth noting that we've already announced the significant strategy to help handle displaced northbound traffic -- which has been discussed. The New Jersey Turnpike will be converting a shoulder along its portion of Interstate 78 -- also known as the Newark Bay-Hudson County Extension -- adding a full lane of travel capacity that takes motorists to Jersey City and the mouth of the Holland Tunnel, the same destinations as the northbound Skyway lanes. This additional capacity will be available during morning peak period and possibly at other times during the day. During the morning peak hour the Skyway's northbound lanes toward New York handle approximately 3,500 vehicles. The additional lane on the Turnpike Extension will be able to handle 1,900 vehicles.

The Department recognizes that serious challenges remain to minimize travel delays and inconvenience, not only for commuters but for residents along those routes. We are committed to continue to work and meet with stakeholders to listen to their ideas and concerns as we develop a transportation management plan. Already, in just seven weeks since we announced the project details, the six subcommittees of this project have held a total of 12 productive meetings. These subcommittees are addressing a wide range of concerns including: incident management, travel demand management and transit, traffic control and operations, intelligent transportation systems, construction and contracting, and public information. Through these meetings we're benefitting from the local

knowledge of traffic conditions on local roads. We're devising plans to facilitate traffic flow at known bottlenecks. We will continue to meet with local officials in the coming months and during the closure period to address emergent or unanticipated consequences.

I can report through this process of local outreach that we earned the support of several elected officials, including but not limited to State Senator and Union City Mayor Brian Stack and, as we heard today, from Hudson County Executive Tom DeGise. After having met with the County Executive and local elected officials from Jersey City, Kearny, Hudson County, and several other organizations several weeks ago at the request of the County Executive, I can report to you that we are going to expand and add a separate subcommittee of regional partners which will include Jersey City, Kearny, Hudson County officials; Hoboken is welcome, as are others. We are open -- the Hudson Latino Chamber of Commerce-- We're open to having a larger voice in that regional subcommittee so that more voices are heard.

You may recall that we announced the survey for motorists to express their concerns and thoughts on how they will adjust their travel patterns during northbound closure. We are pleased to announce that more than 5,000 individuals filled out that survey, including about 4,600 who use the Skyway daily. We're analyzing the results and will publicize them when that process is complete.

We've provided each member with a copy of the PowerPoint presentation you'll see today, my written remarks, as well as the January 10 press releases and our most recent newsletter that we'll be updating as work progresses. We've also created a webpage for the project on the NJDOT

website. It contains a wealth of project information. The easiest way to navigate the page is through a website we created: www.pulaskiskyway.com.

In conclusion, we have no alternative but to rehabilitate this vital highway. We have explored all feasible options. The construction plan we are advancing significantly minimizes the duration of the inconvenience for motorists, residents, and businesses, compared to other alternatives. We are working collaboratively with regional and local stakeholders on the Transportation Management Plan. The end result of this massive investment will be a virtually new Skyway that will provide the mobility that will benefit employers, workers, residents, and visitors for many decades to come.

That concludes my prepared remarks, Mr. Chairman. I'll gladly respond to comments and questions after we present our presentation to you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Would you like to take questions now, or you want to wait until you do the--

MR. ATTANASIO: I think it would be very helpful to put on the presentation, because it will answer a little bit more into the weeds of the project.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay, sure.

RICHARD T. HAMMER: Good morning.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce Mr. Anthony DeJohn. He works for Parsons Brinckerhoff; he's the Design Project Manager for our project.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you.

ANTHONY DeJOHN: Good morning, everyone.

The Pulaski Skyway Corridor, as was defined earlier, is a 3-and-a-half-mile-long corridor. It does link Newark with Jersey City at the Tonelle Avenue circle.

The unique part of the structure is that it has center ramps that provide local access -- the Broadway ramp and the Kearny ramp do provide access to the facility. To give you an idea of the length of the facility and how it varies: This is a profile view of the roadway. The elevations rise and fall as it makes river's crossings. It is composed of a number of individual spans and it does-- Basically, it's elevated its entire 3-and-a-half-mile length.

The superstructure -- or the part of the bridge that is above the foundations that you see from the roadway and as you're driving through the area or riding through the area -- is composed mainly of the deck truss structures -- the black metal structures. The main three trusses are probably the most visible features of the bridge. They span the rivers. But there are a number of multi-girder spans, as well as some truss bridges, over the railroad sections.

The substructure -- the part that actually carries the load, the foundation -- is made up of a couple of different elements: reinforced concrete piers are very visible; there are also some that are encased in concrete. There are some actual steel bent piers along the way, and steel columns and cross frames that support the structure.

One of the problems that we face is that the existing condition of the superstructure, as well as the substructure, is very poor. These are some photos that depict problems with the bridge as they exist today. Loss of 100 percent of the structural capability of some of the lacing bars; hole-

through gusset plates in the lower cords; cases where there is section loss and holes on the hangers that support the ramps; and floor beam members -- 100 percent section loss; you can see daylight through the bottom right corner picture.

This is some of what we're finding as we're taking the concrete encasement off. These are the floor beam stringers which support the deck. You can see in both pictures where there are holes in the left-hand side of adjacent web panels, and on the right-hand side the entire right web next to the beam is gone -- you can see right through that. You can also see -- probably just off to the side -- there is some temporary support that's been added there, so we are aware of the fact that there are some issues there and supporting is being and bracing is being put in place as we uncover problems.

The substructure -- the part that carries the load -- is mainly reinforced concrete and it does have issues as well. There is a lot of exposed and rusted rebar; the concrete is delaminating -- it's falling off, it's cracking. As you can see, there are many chipped and spall conditions where the rebar is in plain view. There are horizontal and vertical cracks from one-eighth inch to a quarter inch along many elements of the structure. In some cases even the anchor bolts -- which hold the whole thing together at the base -- are up to 50 percent to 60 percent eroded and gone from being able to carry the overall load.

The deck itself -- the underlying deck-- About five or six years ago -- these are examples of severely deteriorated deck conditions. There are holes, there are patches; there are not too many elements of the deck that were really in satisfactory shape. The entire deck is the original deck

from 80 years ago; and the fact that it has made it this long is really amazing. But it is in very poor condition and it is in need of complete replacement along the entire structure.

As was mentioned, DOT has made investments over the years to try to keep the Skyway as operational as possible. One of the investments was to deal with the fact that the deck was in such poor condition. The first two contracts took a look at how to do some emergency repairs on the spans, as well as provide an overlay over the entire deck which would allow it to provide a decent riding surface. That was done about five years ago; the expected life of that interim repair was about five to seven years -- so we're coming to the end of that life cycle.

There have been priority repairs made throughout the process to try to take care of whatever they find on the bridge through the inspection reports that are out there every two years. There has also been a job that's still underway -- just about completed -- to deal with the drainage protection repairs. One of the problems you saw from all the steel was the fact that a lot of water just drips down onto the steel -- it's very corrosive material and it does impact the steel. There's a project underway right now -- almost completed -- that will allow that water to be funneled away from draining directly on to the steel.

As was mentioned, the Skyway carries about 67,000 vehicles a day. In the morning, the peak hour northbound direction carries 3,500 vehicles; in the evening, the southbound peak hour carries about 3,000 vehicles. The balance on the Skyway is not as directional as some of the other facilities -- it's about a 60/40 split from the a.m. and p.m. periods in terms of the flow directions. So it's a fairly balanced facility.

We took a look at the alternatives to arrive at what is the best solution at rehabbing this entire structure. Back in 2005 a task force was assembled. The task force was charged with looking at the various elements that would allow us to really handle this very complex structure. And to keep it in perspective, this is a three-and-a-half mile elevated structure; it is an old structure; it is a structure that you have to be careful with how you go about doing the repairs and the process. It does take a lot of effort to figure out the best way to do that in the most safe and efficient manner.

The members of the task force included DOT, the FHWA, the State Historic Preservation Office, the Turnpike, the Port Authority, DEP, NJ Transit, and TRANSCOM. And the first meeting, as I mentioned, was held back in November 2005. And then they had to figure out the best way to proceed with developing the basis for the concept development alternative process.

That process was started back in 2007, where a concept development program was kicked off. During that process there was an extensive public involvement program; there were local and official agency meetings; there were public information centers; newsletters, fact sheets, and the website -- which is still in force and has been updated throughout the process; there was actually a library program in this area where we presented the history of the Skyway and some of the alternatives that would be looked at during the rehabilitation process. And we developed a stakeholder database to help us extend the outreach to the people who would be using the facility and impacted by it.

As I said, there were local official and agency meetings. There was a street-to-street walkthrough to try to figure out what the impacts

potentially were. Members of the county and local communities were invited, as well the transportation agencies.

Throughout the process we heard a few of the alternatives that we considered. We looked at every way we thought we could possibly address the fact that the Skyway needed to be repaired. As was mentioned, the first one we looked at is if we close the bridge, what would happen -- and make no provisions for displaced traffic. The second alternative was if we close the bridge but make improvements to alternative routes, what would happen then? What would that cost and what would be the overall impact? We did look at a new parallel structure, and then rehab the existing structure to have two structures in place. We looked at building a new structure and then demolishing the existing structure. And then we finally looked at rehabilitating the Skyway in a couple of different ways: one to rehabilitate and relocate the center ramps; one to rehabilitate and widen the Skyway; and one, finally, the preferred alternative, to rehabilitate the Skyway in the current configuration. And there are reasons why each of these alternatives allowed us to arrive at the conclusion that the best way to go was to rehab the Skyway in the current condition.

The ability to do that was selected based on a couple of things: one, the ability to roll out safety improvements sooner. One of the benefits of the reconstruction project and replacing the entire deck is we'll have a whole new safety-tested rail system and barrier system put in place. We'll be replacing all the lighting on the bridge. We'll be adding ITS devices along the bridge. We can do that in two years as opposed to six or seven years.

We also, through the constructability review process-- One of the reasons why it took us a while to figure out the best way to go about this is it took a lot of engineering to see what is the best way to overall reconstruct this bridge, maintain the integrity of the bridge, and have a quality finished product when you were done. And the ability to do that is really through allowing the contractor to have two lanes -- half the bridge at a time -- for full access. We provide a number of access points in the Skyway by doing it that way. It does reduce the overall costs because the contractor is out there a shorter period of time. There is less time spent in adjusting to opening and closing of the lanes because of nights and weekend traffic.

The right-of-way costs are relatively low because we're basically building it in place. The overall construction costs -- because of the efficiencies we can afford the contract, and the amount of time that we save is the least amount of value and, overall, the less amount of environmental impacts. And throughout the entire process the design needed to make sure that, any work that we did, the rehab would allow for another 75 years service life of the structure.

We looked at various ways of reconstructing a deck -- because a deck reconstruction is the phase that will impact traffic. Most of the other work will be done, usually, from underneath the bridge or during off-hours and won't impact traffic flows. The deck will impact traffic flows. Whenever you totally redeck a three-and-a-half-mile-long structure, you're going to have traffic impacts.

We looked at various ways of doing it. One was an overnight and weekend construction. If we did that, we could maintain peak period

capacity. The night and weekend construction would close one bound -- so one direction of the bridge would be closed each night and every weekend. The estimated construction cost was nearly \$600 million and the duration would be at least six years. We think that could even grow beyond that because of the inefficiencies of having to reopen the bridge every day to traffic.

We also looked at, then, if we closed one bound full-time, what would happen. We looked at whether we should close northbound or southbound direction. We looked at options for the maintenance of traffic on the bound that was open -- what can we do if we keep one lane in each direction? Should we do a reverse of the lanes? How should we do that? We estimated the construction costs would be a considerable savings just by having the contractor have that one side of the bridge available; and through, I think, a pretty good feat, being able to totally redact the bridge in 24 months was possible going with the full closure of one side at a time.

Due to the quality of the construction, the overall ability to move the project safely along, provide for motorist safety, as well as worker safety, the minimum duration and a minimum amount of costs, we decided that the best way to proceed was to close one bound.

We then looked at how to analyze and how to determine what is the best way to use the one bound that would remain open. The first thing we looked at was the northbound direction full-time closure. This is the plan that we are doing, and are advancing today. This plan does better facilitate the evacuation of Jersey City/New York City; as it was mentioned, it does provide choices because the northbound direction has traffic options

closer to the point of decision than you do if you are travelling in the southbound direction.

We also looked at the southbound direction full-time closure. The main concern was the ability that we would probably back up traffic through the Tunnel into New York City and into Jersey City streets. The concern of impeding access in Newark Airport was also a large consideration. And also, this project would compound the conflict with the Turnpike westbound construction where they are going to be actually taking one lane out in the westbound direction, resulting in additional impacts to Jersey City streets.

We then looked at closing one bound and maintaining one lane in each direction. The problem is, the Skyway is just too narrow to be able to do that safely.

We looked at closing one bound and reversing the peak period flow -- in the morning you would have flow in the northbound directions, and in the evenings you would have flow in the southbound directions. The problem is that operationally that presents a lot of obstacles. First of all, from motorist expectations -- when the bridge would be going which direction, how it would change, what time it would change would cause confusion. A lot of operational concerns and the actual cost and ability to move the barriers twice a day -- it would be very difficult to maintain any kind of ramp access during that period. And for two periods during the day we would lose all capacity during those switching periods -- which would probably take at least an hour to accomplish. That means that, basically, significant detouring of traffic would occur through Jersey City and Newark

during those periods when we were moving the barriers from one side to the other.

The choice, as I mentioned, at the end was to go with the northbound full-time directional closure.

Closing the northbound directional will be accomplished; we'll be building and redecking this in two contracts. Contract 3, we maintain a southbound and directional and traffic at all times leaving Jersey City/New York. It's basically closing the northbound side. Contract 4 reverses it. We keep the traffic still flowing in the southbound direction; we just switch what side of the bridge it is on.

We can complete the entire process with a construction impact of about 24 months starting in March 2014, as you heard. And, very importantly for us, we'll be able to provide then the full capacity of the Pulaski Skyway for the duration of the project when there is a lot of other construction activity going on in the region, including it will be done before the beginning of the Route 7 roadway construction with the Wittpenn Bridge replacement project -- will have traffic impacts. So Pulaski will be back online fully and able to support traffic flow.

We looked at a lot of information in terms of what the impacts would be. We went out and did an extensive origin-destination survey. We had aerial surveillance. We determined that-- And actually this information has been verified, from the survey that was just completed, to a large degree. In the morning, 80 percent of the traffic originates from the south and from the west. And in this same morning period, 62 percent of it is destined for the Jersey City waterfront and New York City; about 24

percent of it goes to the Tunnel; the rest is destined for downtown Jersey City.

Understanding that there will be traffic impacts, we looked at a number of ways to try to reduce the impacts as much as possible through traffic mitigation. One of the things that is very important and was mentioned -- and we'll show in a few minutes -- there is a lot of activity going on in this area over the next several years in terms of construction. Coordinating with those other construction projects is key to keeping traffic flowing as smoothly as possible. There is going to be some work on the Pulaski eastbound approach; the Wittpenn Bridge will be under construction; the Newark New Jersey Turnpike/Hudson County Extension will also be under construction. Coordinating those projects all together to have the least amount of impact overall is one of our concepts and one of our goals.

We are really going to try to make sure, if we can, to promote transit and transportation measures to help eliminate some of those peak period trips. We believe we can at least eliminate 5 to 10 percent of the peak hour -- trip reductions, getting people out of their cars, getting people out of the peak hour. It is impacting only the morning commute, for the most part; in the evening peak commute, the southbound direction will be fully available. But we do think that there are enough incentives and enough options that we're looking at to try to get some people out of their single-occupant vehicles.

On the other networks -- and you'll hear about this in detail in a few minutes -- we are going to try to optimize flow, recognizing that we're taking up the northbound capacity from the Skyway. We're going to try to

optimize flow on I and 9T, for instance, in the northbound direction to help accommodate some of the traffic that will be diverted. And as you heard, one of the primary ways we are going to accommodate that direction is by utilizing the northbound shoulder on the Newark-Hudson County Extension as an additional travel lane.

This is difficult to read, and I apologize. But this gives you an idea of the magnitude of what we're talking about in terms of regional construction projects. This is showing, for the year 2014 and 2015, all of the local construction projects on the left-hand side. And the middle bar that's in yellow is the 24-month duration that Pulaski will also be under construction. There are a lot of things going on, and fitting all these pieces together has been a very intricate process, but we are aware of them; we've been working with the other agencies regarding their schedules; and we are trying to fit this piece of the puzzle in at the most opportune time and in the shortest period of time as possible. And that coordination would be ongoing throughout the process as well.

This is a robust transportation network, and it is a congested network. We all recognize that. But there are alternative routes available. As I mentioned, some of those primary routes will also be under construction, but if the timing works out right, according to the plan we have today, we can avoid some of those dual impacts. But we do have a number of facilities that are able to absorb some of the traffic that we diverted from the Pulaski Skyway northbound closure.

This is an indication of where we expect those roadway diversions to occur. So far, it's been borne out by the results from the survey. Most of the people will utilize the Newark Bay-Hudson County

Extension. We're assuming about 1,900 vehicles -- or more than half the vehicles -- would utilize that. We've analyzed the intersection; we've analyzed what happens at the end of that facility, and we're able to re-time a lot of the lights because the Skyway will no longer be feeding traffic through into the critical intersections, providing more green time for traffic coming from the Bay Extension. We're pretty confident that 1,900 vehicles will be able to be accommodated by that lane.

We're also going to divert some traffic to I and 9T. And about 20 percent of that diverted traffic, or about 700 vehicles -- we think we can get through more in the peak hour. And I know a lot of people believe that roadway is very congested, but we're going to talk about some improvements to that road that will help facilitate that flow. But people will also use the Turnpike Eastern Spur. We believe some will use Route 7. Some will go down as far as, maybe, even the Goethals Bridge -- not a lot -- but there are a lot of choices that can be made, particularly in the morning, because most of traffic is coming from the west and from the south.

The two primary strategies that we believe will handle most of the traffic is the Route 14 to 14C Turnpike shoulder lane, as well as optimizations of the network to favor the northbound flow on I and 9 Truck.

Some of the things that we're looking at on I and 9 Truck is signal optimization and adaptive signal control; the ability to allow the signals to adjust to what traffic is occurring out there -- recognizing, again, the peak period when everything is as congested as it is, you're not going to buy a lot with that; but for the rest of the hours of the day that adaptive

signal control will provide a lot more capacity on I and 9T to help divert the traffic flow through smoothly.

We're also going to be making some improvements -- some geometric and signing and striping improvements at Hackensack Avenue and Newark Avenue. Looking at improving a signal phasing; removing some of the turn phases -- where they don't have a lot of traffic, they take green time away from the primary northbound direction. We're going to be doing that at Duncan Avenue. So we'll be making some intersection improvements along the way to try and facilitate as much throughput in the northbound direction on I and 9T as we possibly can.

We also know we have to feed that additional traffic on to I and 9T, and there's going to be an additional ramp. Because the Skyway is closing, we'll have the ability to add an additional ramp lane from the I and 9 local to the I and 9 Truck, creating, essentially, a two-lane ramp where a one-lane ramp exists now.

Throughout the process and ongoing, we are developing a Transportation Management Plan to try to address and mitigate the traffic impacts. The Transportation Management Plan is a comprehensive effort to minimize the impacts to the region. It is being coordinated with the other regional agencies to make sure that we have all the planned projects in place and also to make sure that we have all the stakeholders at the table. We're looking at ways, as we explore-- Instead of looking at decreasing capacity add diversionary routes, not only I and 9T, but some of the other ones, we're looking at methods to increase the transit share and options that are available to commuters.

The survey was very helpful in helping us gather information of what their choices are -- where they would prefer park-and-ride locations, what mode they would take during the closure, which alternative route would they take. That information has been very helpful, and has actually proven to be that what we thought would happen is being borne out.

The task force has developed to really allow the locals and the regional agencies to develop and help implement this Transportation Management Plan.

The Transportation Management Plan had six subcommittees formed: Incident Management; Travel Demand Management and Transit Options; Traffic Control and Operations; Intelligent Transportation System Management; what we can do, actually, through the construction and contracting process; and how we're going to keep the public informed of what's going to go on when the construction begins and throughout the construction.

So far, in January and February, there have been a number of meetings -- 15 meetings have been held of the group. Attendees have included the transportation agencies, Hudson County, Meadowlink, individuals from Jersey City engineering, the Mayor's Office, the County, NJTPA -- a number of people participating in these coordination meetings.

We have a whole list of things that have been developed -- and I won't take the time to go through all of them today. But I wanted to provide you some of the highlights of what we're hearing from the TMP -- mitigations strategies and the ones that are advancing.

As you've already heard, the addition of the third lane eastbound on the Newark Bay-Hudson County Extension; and the adaptive

signal controls on Route 1 and 9 Truck, and other key intersections and corridors as they are identified in it.

We're also going to be providing, temporarily, full coverage cameras along the length of the Skyway so we can keep an eye on what's going on, and also at key intersections on the diversionary routes.

We're going to provide a coordinated command center for first responders so that we can provide a quick and coordinated response to any incidents that occur in the area.

We are also looking at expanding shuttles and adding van pools running from selected locations, and publicizing all available transit options.

Again, this is a sampling of what we're looking at right now.

An important one is, during construction, the use of Dynamic Message Signs, or Variable Message Signs, to provide real-time travel information and alternative route selections. So when people arrive at a decision point, let them know if you go this way, it's going to take you 10 minutes; if you go this way it's going to take you 20. Having that information will help them decide what is their most efficient route. And we'll be using all of that information in the Open Reach System and on New Jersey 511 to provide as much information as we can to the motoring public.

We are going to retime the signals at Jersey Avenue to favor the throughput on to Newark Bay-Hudson County Extension. Because the Pulaski will be closed we can accommodate greater volume from the Extension that is diverted from that corridor.

And we will have an extensive information site available for construction alternative route/mode information on DOT's website, www.pulaskiskyway.com

It will be a continuing coordinating process. Currently there are eight subcommittee meetings scheduled for March; there is a new subcommittee, as you heard, that will be formed for Jersey City, Kearny, and Hudson County. Additional committee and subcommittee meetings will be added as we see that they're necessary. And we will have additional meetings with local officials and regional agencies that will be scheduled.

We're also anticipating that Jersey City 1 TV will be added as a voice to the project in the near future.

With that, the www.pulaskiskyway.com website provides a host of information; and that will be available to everyone throughout the course of this project.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Can we get the lights back up?

Thank you for that presentation.

I had a couple of questions, and I'm sure that there is no end of questions from members of the Committee. The notion of not being able to use one direction -- to split it into a two-way road. Why couldn't you just place a Jersey barrier down the center and separate the lanes?

MR. HAMMER: If I could explain that, Chairman.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Sure.

MR. HAMMER: The Pulaski Skyway is quite narrow. To put that into specifics: The roadway width ranges anywhere from 23-and-a-half feet wide -- from median barrier to the curb -- to as narrow as 20 feet, 3

inches in certain locations. A physical separation, such as a Jersey Barrier, would require a foot-and-a-half to 2 feet of that width. So you would basically be providing lane widths that are 9 feet or narrower, and you will have people hitting mirrors. You'll have a real safety concern out there.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: How does 9 feet compare to the standard lane width?

MR. HAMMER: A standard lane width is 12 feet at its desirable state. Right now on the Skyway we have some narrow lanes. At the end of our project we will be providing 11-foot lanes on the Skyway.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Because I'm familiar with, before you did the Driscoll Bridge, the lane width on the Driscoll Bridge was, I think, about 9 feet -- because you added a lot of additional lanes. So how does that compare to not being able to do 9 feet on this bridge?

MR. HAMMER: Well, I say 9 feet-- It will be 9 feet of available pavement, but in terms of a lane width, it will be something less than that. You will be approaching 8 feet -- in opposing traffic, too. You're really going to create a hazardous situation for motorists; it would not be safe. Also a concern, if anybody were to break down or if anything were to occur, it would be really difficult or next to impossible to get emergency vehicles up to that location.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: The other question I had is your start date is March 2014 -- a year from now. Why not start sooner? Why delay the start? Is there a particular reason why you're waiting until March 2014?

MR. HAMMER: No reason at all. Basically, the project would go out to bid in June of this year. There's a tremendous amount of lead

time for a contractor to get ready for this project. The deck replacement is going to be done using prefabricated panels. And there is along lead time for getting all of those panels manufactured. The contractor probably wouldn't be ready to actually do the work until, perhaps, January or so. And we wouldn't want to begin this work in the depths of winter; it wouldn't make any sense to give the contractor one direction on the Skyway, only to have a snowstorm hit or something and he's not even able to work. So the opportune time to start would be March 1.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Why would you-- Oh, go ahead.

MR. ATTANASIO: If I could just expand on that answer.

One of the other reasons that the timing is done this way was to allow for a year -- to announce it a year in advance so that there would be time for substantive local input on the traffic management plan. We didn't want to announce closure next month -- which would have been untenable.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Understood. But you're leaving a year-- There's probably a median point somewhere between a year and a month that would make sense. And you say you're putting this out to bid in June?

MR. HAMMER: The actual advertisement date will probably be in late May, and we're hoping to award a contract by around the end of June.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. Is there any reason why that can't be expedited so that the process can be started a lot sooner?

MR. HAMMER: That actually is an expedited schedule, sir. We have been in the final design phase for some time, and we're going as quickly as we possibly can to wrap that up.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay, good.

Questions, Committee?

Assemblywoman Vainieri Huttle.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN VAINIERI HUTTLE: Thank you.

How safe is the Skyway today? Because looking at those photos, you know, speaks volumes. I would be afraid to drive on it right now after looking at that. And with that in mind, the task force started in 2005? It took eight years to decide to fix-- I mean, am I right? I don't know if I'm -- 2005, eight years later, and the new proposal-- You're looking at a 75-year plan; it's already 81 years old. Are we over the 81 years without-- I mean, I know you've done some emergency repairs, but over eight years from the task force, and is it safe today, I guess, are my questions.

MR. HAMMER: Well, first, let me assure you: The bridge is absolutely safe. Inspections go on, on a regular basis. You heard Tony, during his presentation, mention every two years. Every two years a regular inspection cycle kicks into gear. But we have inspectors on that bridge at all times. In fact, right now we have a contractor doing work underneath the Skyway in the vicinity of Tonnel Avenue. He's removing the concrete that's covering the steel to expose the steel for the first time in 80 years to see what its actual condition is. And we have inspectors there, side-by-side with the contractor.

Some of the areas that are uncovering concern -- we're putting up temporary supports to make sure that it's safe. And these are going to be some of the areas that we're going to be attending to first as part of the deck contract.

We're calling it a *deck contract*, but it does include key steel replacement as well. A lot of the steel that we know we need to replace or want to replace is directly underneath the deck and comes in contact with it. So we need to remove the deck to get at the steel. That's why the deck work has to go first.

And again, some of the steel members that we're concerned with -- where we've put temporary supports in place -- we're going to go in there and replace those steel members as part of the second deck contract -- which is known as *Pulaski No. 4*.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN VAINIERI HUTTLE: But am I right -- 2005 -- this task force started?

MR. HAMMER: That was the beginning. The bottom line is we look at the Skyway constantly. The Skyway has been a concern of the Department for a long period of time in terms of the amount of money it would take to address it and how would we exactly go about doing that.

In 2005 we got all of the transportation agencies together -- there was a lot of work that was planned or ongoing in this region -- and began to talk about that. They spoke about what they were doing, we spoke about the Skyway; and we were basically developing strategies -- how would we go about handling the Skyway? But I assure you, the Skyway is absolutely safe. We mentioned on the presentation, \$6 million of steel

repairs were done as emergencies as a result of bridge inspections. That's an ongoing process.

But the time to really attend to the Skyway is now. And the funding is in place to address it in an 8-year period of time; where I can tell you, years ago, we were concerned with whether or not we would have the funding in place to do it over a 20-year period of time. So the key is really to use the available funds and to attack it now.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN VAINIERI HUTTLE: And right now it's beyond the 75-year warranty of the new construction? It's 81 years.

MR. HAMMER: Seventy-five years is--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN VAINIERI HUTTLE: I mean, I look at that as-- It will last 75 years.

MR. HAMMER: Yes. Actually, I can tell you our engineers believe it's going to last far more than 75 years. We generally never predict more than that; that's engineering lingo. That's a service life estimate for any type of a new structure to meet current standards. But there are going to be elements of the rehabilitated Skyway that we believe will ensure a very long life.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Assemblyman Ramos.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: You conducted surveys, and it wasn't too clear -- where were these surveys conducted? Who were they conducted with, as far as commuters go? What information did you ascertain from that, as people are preparing to take alternate routes to get in? Did they say they would limit their travel time, or just limit traveling altogether, somewhat, coming into the affected area, which is Hudson County?

MR. ATTANASIO: The survey was available online, and we announced it both at our public officials' briefing and press conference in January, and then through outreach to elected officials, media, and we tried to publicize it as much we could.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: I was unaware of the survey.

MR. ATTANASIO: Okay, yes, as far as the mechanics of the survey -- Rick, do you want to talk about some of the options that were available?

MR. HAMMER: Well, the bottom line was that we wanted people to--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Just one question on that.

MR. HAMMER: I'm sorry.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So you have a local elected official who was unaware of the survey. So how thorough was the survey if your local elected officials don't know about it?

MR. HAMMER: Well, we did have 5,000 respondents, and 4,600 of them were daily riders -- commuters -- on the Pulaski. So there is a healthy sampling size. We apologize if not everybody was aware. That's why we had a public official briefing in January to try to amplify the message that that survey was available. And we are in the process of analyzing that data, and as soon as we compact it -- gotten that data analyzed, we're going to share it publicly and we'd be happy to sit down with you.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: The reason I bring that up is we have lots of a.m.- p.m. peak hour driving times. But if you live in the area you'll also notice on a Friday night at 7 o'clock going into Manhattan --

Holland Tunnel/Lincoln Tunnel -- and traffic is backed up normally, as it is now. And this is going to exacerbate that problem. On Friday nights, on Saturdays, Sunday afternoons -- you'll be shocked that the weekend traffic going in and out of New York City and into the area -- the waterfront that we discussed here, and I don't think that was part of the survey -- is-- Now, if you're living in Linda Stender's district, you're going to commute to Hudson County, to New York City, you may not take that drive at all now. And now that exacerbates businesses losing out. I think we learned that when the PATH station was down in Hoboken and people had to take different travel routes to get into New York City where they took the PATH everyday. Now they had to take the bus everyday. You saw those businesses suffer. And I think the weekend -- those businesses on the waterfront rely on out-of-town commuters, out-of-town traffic, out-of-town business shoppers and restaurateurs visiting restaurants. I think that's going to be lost because they don't want to deal with that traffic potentially.

MR. ATTANASIO: Right. And one of the things that-- On the first point of the survey, that's one component of information gathering; obviously, the ongoing subcommittee meetings -- we're doing officials briefings continually. We're meeting with Mayor Healy in the next week, amongst others. So that was one component of outreach, and the outreach continues. And we continue to work with the communities.

Another thing to point out about weekend and night disruptions was that if we didn't do it this way, one of the other main ways to do the projects was night and weekend closures. So the reality-- And that would have been, once again, for a minimum of six to six-and-a-half years -- minimum. So all of this gets down to trying to do it the best way

possible, both for quality of product and in the quickest manner possible -- which is two years versus six-and-a-half years.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: And the other reason -- I'm sorry, Chairman -- is that the Lincoln Tunnel, the construction on the helix is going on there -- renovations right now as well, and that, also, overlaps with this construction time for them as well. They're doing construction on nights and weekends for the most part. So you're going to compound that even further on the weekends.

MR. ATTANASIO: Right. And the Port Authority is, obviously, supportive of this project, and a partner, and we're working with them on coordination, as well as New Jersey Transit of course. Because we're looking at-- Well, one of the things that we would like to do -- not just because of this project, but in general in our state -- is get more people out of their cars and into mass transit. I mean, we have an underutilized mass public transportation system.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: There is a plan to do that.

MR. ATTANASIO: So New Jersey Transit stands ready -- once we understand how we can get people out of their cars -- to possibly supplement service, whether it be bus or rail. We're looking at all of those options to try to absorb that.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Just before I go to Assemblywoman Munoz -- how many extra rail cars can you add to your trans-Hudson crossing to accommodate people who would say, "I'm not going to drive. I'm going to take the train."

MR. ATTANASIO: I would have to get back to you on that. I would have to consult New Jersey Transit on the specific capacity issues.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: It was somewhat of a rhetorical question, because we know that one of the reasons we were looking at the ARC Tunnel was we were out of capacity on our trans-Hudson crossing -- or almost out of capacity. And so, again, just talking about how years of not doing the right thing in transportation planning has led us to a point where we don't have the capacity to really add a lot of new rail cars going under the Hudson; we don't have the roadway capacity, because a lot of them, as the Assemblyman just pointed out -- the helix is undergoing construction at the same time. And so we've boxed ourselves into a very untenable position.

Gentlemen, it's not your fault. It is a collective fault of decision making over the last 20 years that has led us to a point where we don't have a lot of good options.

Assemblywoman Munoz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: Thank you.

You know, as a person who has taken the Pulaski Skyway hundreds of times, in the issue about safety I agree that it will -- it's not going to fall down before this project is complete. But the other part of the safety issue is the actual width of the Skyway and those left-hand entrances. And when I saw your presentation -- and you're not changing that -- to me, that is an issue. My husband, as you know, was a trauma surgeon. It's a trauma surgeon's -- not dream, but it's a feeder -- is the people who get maimed and killed and everything on that Pulaski Skyway.

So my question really is: I saw that you're not expanding -- making it wider, you're not changing the left-hand entrances. You didn't put any calming techniques in. Because when I come across and I see that

left-hand entrance there, I don't know how those people make that. This was built for 1935 cars that went 35 miles an hour. And now that entrance there is-- I would personally close that entrance; that's crazy to me. Because you can't make that -- get up to speed fast enough. I mean-- I know you don't want to, but I'm just saying, there should be some kind of-- There are traffic calming techniques available now. These cars go-- Like, I drive the speed limit. These cars are going, like, 20 miles over the speed limit on a road that should be, really, 35 miles an hour where those entrances are coming in.

Any thought to how you are going to calm the traffic?

MR. HAMMER: Well, I can tell you -- and this is the Broadway ramp that you're referring to?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: Yes.

MR. HAMMER: I know that when you come up that ramp, immediately you find yourself in the left lane.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: Exactly.

MR. HAMMER: So it is certainly a very scary situation for any driver who's been there -- particularly those who might have to do it every single day. That is actually one area in the Skyway where we can widen the ramp structure. So our intention is to widen that opening and to provide some acceleration lane distance to make it a lot safer than it is today.

I'm not going to pretend that it's going to be the optimum, but it's certainly going to be something a lot better than what you have today. You will have some room to accelerate, versus being thrust into that left lane.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: Because you have to go from zero to 65 -- and not everybody has a high-powered car to do that kind of thing. I'm just concerned about, not so much-- Assemblywoman Vainieri Huttle's concern is whether it's actually going to fall down. My concern is the safety, going forward -- which is, we need to slow down this traffic. I mean, I know they don't want to put in speed bumps, but even some kind of -- because it's a highway. But maybe we should give some thought to how we could slow that traffic.

MR. HAMMER: And there are other points along the Skyway where we will widen things where we can. They're just limited, unfortunately. But wherever we have an opportunity to widen the merge where a decel lane is coming into play or an exit ramp, we're going to do that to make it safer.

The structure itself, as you saw, is a truss structure. And, unfortunately, that type of structure does not lend itself to widening. And even if one were to undertake that mammoth task of doing such a thing, you would need to close the entire facility. You couldn't allow traffic to drive on it while you were undertaking something like that.

But recognizing that, we are looking to provide widened entry and exit points -- accel and decel lanes -- wherever it is possible to do so.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I'm going to go to Assemblyman Chivukula next, but-- So there is no way to widen this road structure?

MR. HAMMER: And maintain traffic on it? There is not.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: No, no, assuming that you're going to close two lanes in one direction -- assuming that's a given --

there is no way-- You said that the road width is 20 feet, or 22 feet in some places. There's no way, while you're doing this work, to make it 30 feet?

MR. HAMMER: No, there is not, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Wow. Not even by putting in an additional set of piers, or anything? It just-- The structure just won't allow it?

MR. HAMMER: It just will not allow it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

Assemblyman Chivukula.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

After 80 years we have new technologies available and new structural designs that are available. Why are you sticking to the same structural design? You are keeping the same foundations. Why is that? This is an opportunity for us to go forward, not look back 80 years.

MR. HAMMER: It is a National Historic Structure -- please understand that. We did look at building a brand new bridge alongside of the existing structure. But that would be an amazing undertaking. We don't own any land up there. We own the aerial rights where the Skyway sits today, but we own no property at all underneath it.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: So are you are going to replace the foundations for the bridge?

MR. HAMMER: We are going to replace members where replacement is necessary; or just simply restructure them where that's appropriate. But when we're done with this program, we will have a sound

substructure and foundation supporting this bridge, as well as a sound superstructure and riding surface.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: For how many years?

MR. HAMMER: Seventy-five-plus. I'll put a *plus* on the end of that.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: Using the existing foundation that was built 80 years ago? You're going to have 75 years?

MR. HAMMER: Much of the existing foundations are in tremendous shape. What you see visually is not necessarily affecting the load-carrying capacity. We do need to repair what you see in the spalling and whatnot, but the foundations are in very good condition and we are going to strengthen them where they need strengthening.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: Some of the pictures I saw, they were showing a lot of the water drainage that is causing the rust. Is that what you're saying, that the steel reinforced concrete is in good shape?

MR. HAMMER: Well, where it's not in good shape we're going to repair it.

The drainage-- We had all kinds of drainage systems out there on the Skyway. There were some closed drainage systems that became clogged over time, as well as open drainage systems where the water would freely flow through the deck joints. And, basically, that water was flowing on top of the structural steel for decades. So what we've done now, during one of our interim contracts, is to at least capture the drainage and put it into piping and not allow it to just dump onto the steel any longer -- not to allow the corrosion to get any worse than it already is. And a lot of that piping that we're putting in place today would be part of the permanent fix,

and then we will complete the drainage system adequately for proper drainage away from the structure. But right now we've at least taken the drainage off the steel.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: I see. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Assemblyman Mainor.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: I just want to say, first and foremost, I know you said that the bridge, at this time, is safe. But I'm going to be honest with you. I looked at that, I was afraid. And I said to myself, "I am not going on that bridge anymore." (laughter)

I've been a cop for 25 years, and I can't tell you the amount of accident reports that I have taken from that left lane entrance. It becomes a race, because you're sitting there watching, wondering when you can get out there -- and it never happens. It's terrible with that left lane. I'm happy that you guys are looking into that.

Another thing I want to say. I know you said you had meetings and you met with local officials. I want to be honest. I've never heard of any meeting. And I know you said you had meetings in Newark. I truly believe that a meeting in Jersey City is definitely necessary -- even for the people who may not travel that -- just because of the amount of traffic that is going to come into the area. They need to be made aware of it, and I think it's best to let all of us be a part of. I know you met with the mayors and the elected officials in Jersey City. I also think it's important -- and I know you also met with the police chief; is that correct? We need to meet with the fire chief, and we really need to meet with the Jersey Medical Center. Because we have to understand that they have to get around and they may have to situate their ambulances in certain areas because it

becomes a health hazard. And what you're going to find is that there is going to be so much frustration because in a major rain storm Route 440 is shut down. Where do they go? A major rain storm, over there by the Holland Tunnel -- it's flooded. Where do they go? And these are the things that we have to look at, because it's going to be a major problem. When that snow hits, we don't know.

And in closing, I just want to say that I know right now you say the bridge is capable of carrying the 3,500 cars each way. But the Super Bowl -- we're going to have a lot of cars. Are we-- Will that bridge be able to support the cars that are going to go on it during Super Bowl?

MR. ATTANASIO: Yes -- and Rick can just nod. Yes, it can. And, specifically, to your talking about local official meetings and where they need to be: We did meet three weeks ago in Jersey City at the County Administration Building with the County Executive, the Mayor of Kearny, multiple members of the Jersey City administration, OEM directors, City Engineer. And we will continue to do these meetings. Mayor Healy is coming in next week to discuss this, and we're happy to have more meetings with public elected officials, first responders. And the subcommittees already have members from Jersey City's first responders on it. We are always open to dialogue.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: So the Medical Center is--

MR. ATTANASIO: I can't speak to the Medical Center, specifically. But, once again, this is where we would absolutely encourage dialoguing.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: You'll jot that down? You'll-- Okay.

MR. HAMMER: Already jotted, and I know the Project Team is jotting. (laughter) So yes, we'll continue to work with you on all of these discussions.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: Let me see you write it.

MR. HAMMER: Absolutely.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: In Secaucus, too.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I see they're all taking notes.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: I'd appreciate that, please. I appreciate that. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Chairman.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Assemblyman Rumpf.

ASSEMBLYMAN RUMPF: Yes, thank you.

For Assistant Commissioner, if I may: This is over a \$1 billion project. Can you describe for us where the money is coming from?

MR. ATTANASIO: The Transportation Capital-- The Governor's Transportation Capital Program. It involves the contribution from the Port Authority. Out of that contribution from the Port Authority, these funds are coming to the project.

ASSEMBLYMAN RUMPF: Good. And the Chairman mentioned the ARC Tunnel. Is any of the money that was originally dedicated for the ARC Tunnel going to the Pulaski Skyway?

MR. ATTANASIO: I don't know the answer to that.

ASSEMBLYMAN RUMPF: All right. One final question on the issue of costs. We've been presented with the two alternative plans. If the DOT were to change its mind and adopt the longer life plan, which

would cost the additional \$235 million, is that money-- Obviously it is not appropriated; is it available?

MR. ATTANASIO: First of all, we won't be going to the other alternative. And one misconception that is out there is that the savings that we referred to -- how much it costs less -- that there is a piggy bank with cash in it that there's going to be a leftover \$200 million in cash. It's not. What we're talking about is the actual reaching that cost and finding that money to make that cost. So it's not like there's cash left over; it's that we're not going to be seeking those funds to do the more expensive project.

MR. HAMMER: And just to understand: That longer approach-- Their rough estimates, based on what we believe would be the production time of a contractor-- The inefficiencies it would bring to a contractor are enormous. In essence, versus having a 24/7 operation, we would be reducing actual work on the Skyway to six hours a day, Monday through Friday. And if we went to the full closure plan over the weekend, then he would get the 24/7 for the weekend. But the fact that you went from a 24/7 operation to six hours a day, and the risk of not getting done what you need to get done in those six hours so that you can open it up safely to traffic and all of that -- that adds a cost element that we can't even calculate.

So we put numbers on there because that's the best we can do is go by production rates. But I would say the numbers would be much higher. You'd have many, many bad mornings. Because the contractor was not able to open things up that you thought would open up -- because things happen in construction all the time. If a contractor is out there and has that width and room to operate, then you're not going to run into those

kinds of problems. So that's another consideration as well that everyone needs to understand.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN RUMPF: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: Follow-up question about the time--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Nancy, go ahead.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: Yes, thank you.

Are you going to write into the contract that they have to complete it within that timeframe, with penalties if they don't do that? You know, people do that with home projects. "If you don't finish it within X time period, we'll start to fine you." Will you do that to make sure that your contractor stays on target for time?

MR. HAMMER: It's a very aggressive contract, and we will be putting in milestones and penalties -- correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Just a follow-up on Assemblyman Rumpf's question: Where is the money coming from? It's coming from-- All of it's coming from the Port Authority? Fifty percent is coming from the Port Authority? Can you be more specific as to the funding sources. Because we have the General Fund sources, we have Transportation Trust Fund sources, and we have Port Authority sources. Can you define that part?

MR. HAMMER: Yes, this funding is coming from the Port Authority source.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: One hundred percent?

MR. HAMMER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay, okay.

And the other -- and you can pick up in a second, Ruben -- the other question is, as we've been talking about what the cost would be if we did not close the lanes and did the one lane in each direction. And you've articulately covered what that additional cost may be, in terms of construction. Has there been a flipside analysis done of what the cost to local businesses or commuters in additional commute time that will be caused by closure for two years?

MR. HAMMER: I don't know that I have--

MR. ATTANASIO: There are certain requirements as part of the EIS process that have--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: EIS is the environmental impact statement?

MR. ATTANASIO: Well, it was not-- No, the environmental document process covers sociological impacts and things of that nature, so we did address those to the extent that was necessary for a job like this. This is not a project that's on the ground where you're running in front of businesses, you're shutting down their driveways, you're not allowing people to get there. That takes on a totally different approach in terms of analysis -- versus a bridge.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Well, I would just offer that it actually does. Because if you're routing traffic onto streets that normally don't have that much traffic, you essentially will be keeping people from getting to certain places as quickly as they would like and they'll make alternative choices. So if you could, I didn't see it in the material that was provided to us; if there is that portion of the EIS that talks about the

sociological impacts of this project, I would like to see the cost of this choice in terms of saying, "We're going to close the bridge for two years in one direction, the savings in doing that outweigh the costs to the community of having to deal with the traffic." That may have been done; the numbers may work out. I haven't seen it; I think it would be good to share with the Committee.

Assemblyman Ramos.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: Yes, I just want to piggyback onto what Assemblyman Rumpf was saying earlier as far as costs go.

Now, Jersey City obviously is worried about policing the road and things like that, and alternate routes for the road through Kearny. Are Kearny and Jersey City and Hudson County going to be supplemented as part of the budget, as well, for their extra police force that's going to be out there in those communities?

MR. HAMMER: Our plans right now--

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: Or will they have to just pay for that out of their budgets as it is. Will they be supplemented through that?

MR. HAMMER: Our plans right now are to address-- All the police needs are going to be done using State Police.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: Okay -- which works out even better.

Now, the Port Authority is paying for this 100 percent, you stated, correct? Is that through a loan program, or is that 100 percent coverage a grant program? And is their funding coming from the toll -- the riders and their tolls recently?

MR. ATTANASIO: It's part of the Transportation Capital Plan that the Governor presented, that we're in the third year of -- third?

MR. HAMMER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: So it's tolls?

MR. HAMMER: Their revenue sources -- yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: Okay, thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Assemblyman Mainor.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: First, I just want to say that you said the State Police will come in and, possibly, do the traffic within Jersey City, instead of having the local police department working?

MR. HAMMER: No, not exactly, sir -- and I apologize for that. Basically, on our roads -- yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: Your road is closed down.

MR. HAMMER: Route 1 and 9 Truck is our road as well.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: Okay. So when they come on Communipaw, who's going to be there -- and 440?

MR. HAMMER: Route 440 is also our road.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: Okay. Then if they go onto Communipaw and cross into Jersey City, will you then be utilizing any type of local police?

MR. HAMMER: I don't know if those conversations have happened at this point. I mean, obviously, that's part of the mitigation discussions that are ongoing.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: Okay. And I just want to-- I understand that you said you were going to utilize the State Police. I don't see that happening -- I'll be honest with you. I don't see that happening.

And I think that conversation of trying to assist the cities with this traffic is going to go-- Monies need to be put in place to get this done -- number one. And we also need to look at monies that might have to go to the hospitals because they're going to have to relocate; they are going to have to do something. And it's going to be a cost factor in a lot-- A lot of things are going to happen when this closes down. And I don't think we see it yet, and I don't want to wait until it happens and then we have to reshuffle and get things together. But we have to look at everything.

I think the roads -- the traffic is going to be tremendous and the State Police is going to definitely need help. There is no way they're going to be able to do it, because you have to remember: The traffic is going to be on that extension, the traffic is going to be down there by the Holland Tunnel; coming in from 15E; coming in from Newark; coming in from all other ways. It's going to be an issue, and I think we really need to look at that and try, when you have your conversation with the police, fire, and emergency, to situate monies aside to help them help us help you. Fair enough?

MR. ATTANASIO: Sure. Two points -- just really reiterating -- but one is that two years of impact versus six-and-a-half or more, obviously, what you discussed. The other is that the subcommittee meetings, which are happening now to try to come up with the best plan possible -- they don't stop the moment that the roadway is shut down -- the portion of the road that's going to be shut down. Those subcommittees and that dialogue with the regional stakeholders and partners will continue. So it's before the project happens and during the project as well. So there will be an ongoing conversation.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Assemblyman Giblin.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: The flipside of the point that was raised by Assemblywoman Munoz -- the time element is very important. The two years, I know, it kind of has a way of flying by quick, but I think it's going to be a little bit more pronounced in this case. Is there any thought about trying to give incentives to the potential contractor to finish the work ahead of time? They did that -- maybe not on the same scale as this project -- but I did do it with the flyover on the Garden State Parkway in Union. Any element given to that?

MR. HAMMER: We're looking at all possibilities in putting together this contract. The contractor does have the room to do the work. And it's somewhat repetitive work, and once the contractor gets going with these prefabrication panels and the steel members that are being replaced, it's going to move at a fairly rapid pace. We're looking at, right now, any way possible to add something to the contract that could, perhaps, make it even better. We'll provide incentives, if that's necessary; but we are looking at all that, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: With the contractors themselves, there have been a lot of foreign companies doing bridge work here in the United States recently. They're going to have an opportunity to bid on this work?

MR. HAMMER: Yes, assuming that they're prequalified with the State of New Jersey -- yes. But we have excellent in-house contractors -- New Jersey contractors -- that are all anxious for this work to come out.

And I'm confident that we're going to have good competition and a good bidding environment.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: And what about potential cost overruns for unanticipated things that might crop up? I mean, you have some money to play with on this -- because it always seems to happen on projects of this magnitude.

MR. HAMMER: We're trying to get as much of the Skyway work done within budget as we possibly can. We have a budget that we're working with right now.

As was mentioned here, the painting of the Skyway was the final step. Clearly, there's going to be some painting of the Skyway that will occur as we're replacing steel -- particularly beneath a lot of the joint areas. We would like, when all is said and done, to be able to paint the entire Skyway -- give it a new paint job. We'll have to see how the budget goes as to whether or not we'll be able to handle that work when we would like to be able to handle it, or whether that might have to be delayed. Obviously we need a robust capital program to continue to do the work we need to do, but right now we believe we have enough of a budget to get all of the rehabilitation work done that is necessary to get done.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: The Port Authority is a big contributor to this project, in terms of resources. Has any thought been given to truck traffic to try to give them, perhaps, reduced tolls to get them into New York at an earlier time? I mean, how are you going to deal with this issue of trucks -- maybe reduce the flow or, in some ways-- I mean, I know in New York they have some type of incentives to do deliveries at night.

MR. ATTANASIO: We can raise that point, but that would have to be something with the Port Authority -- they would have to adjust that on their tolls.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: Well, the only thing is that I'm getting confused. If Port Authority's paying the lion's share of this project, I don't know why they're not here -- I'll be frank with you. I mean, that's only one person's opinion. But if I'm writing the checks, generally I should have a little say about the project. Because people are going to associate with that agency. I don't know that it's accurate, or is it a really truly a DOT project?

MR. HAMMER: It's truly a DOT project. The Port Authority has contributed to the capital plan -- to the capital program that invests in all of our transportation needs. And, basically, the amount of work that we're performing on the Skyway -- the bulk of that money is really available because we do have that Port Authority piece to the entire capital program. But this is a New Jersey DOT-run program; it is our project.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: Well, I don't have to tell you how critical the employment picture is. What provisions are you going to take to ensure that local residents, persons of colors, women, get an opportunity to work on this project? You're talking about a \$1 billion project. Are there any goals that have been established as far as that is concerned?

MR. HAMMER: Yes.

MR. ATTANASIO: Yes. I mean, our Division of Civil Rights and Affirmative Action analyzes all projects, the work that needs to go into them, and, realistically, what realistic goals can be set. We have the

MBE/SB (*sic*) programs, and those goals will be a part of this project as they are in all of our projects.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: And you've sat down with local organizations to get their input and to try and get their help at recruiting apprentices and journeymen so that people of all types are involved in this project?

MR. HAMMER: That's some of the work that we will be undertaking during the next year, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN GIBLIN: Okay, thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Vice Chair Stender.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Good afternoon -- I think.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: It's afternoon -- almost.
Oh, no -- still morning. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: Almost? Okay.

Going back to-- You pointed out that the existing traffic flows are 67,000 vehicles per day. When this was first designed and opened, what was it designed to carry at that time -- do you know?

MR. HAMMER: We probably do have that data; I don't have it on me at this moment.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: I mean, do you have any idea?

MR. HAMMER: In terms of the volumes of traffic that were using the Skyway?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: Yes, I mean, I was just wondering what the-- Because, obviously, it was built for the 20th century and they must have seen the future.

MR. HAMMER: We can certainly get that information to you -- I apologize. We know how much traffic was utilizing the Skyway; we have a lot of data on it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: And at the present, 67,000 vehicles per day. Did you do any analysis of what the go-forward capacity is going to be? I mean, once you fix it is it going to continue to carry-- Is it a static load, or are you anticipating and preparing for additional capacity?

MR. HAMMER: We're not preparing for additional capacity, but we want the people who travel the Skyway to have a more predictable drive. I mean, right now, it is a white-knuckle ride on the Skyway. And if you haven't driven it lately, you probably should hop on it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: Contrary to what Assemblyman Ramos said, I do avoid that. It's not a trip I try to make too frequently.

MR. HAMMER: I think when we're all done, I think people who avoid the Skyway today may not avoid it tomorrow. I mean, we're going to upgrade it; it's going to be to current standards. It's going to have bridge railings that are built to current crash standards, because what we have out there today is not. It's going to have a median barrier built to current crash standards. It's going to have a brand new lighting system for the 21st century. Today, the lighting system on the Skyway is horrible. And, in fact, during Superstorm Sandy much of it was destroyed. So there are a lot of safety elements that are going to be incorporated as part of this

very first contract. So two years from now, you're going to have a much better ride. And I hope people who avoid the Skyway today will use it. Because I can tell you, coming to this hearing today, I'm on the Turnpike looking up at the Skyway -- and I don't know if anybody was coming by that route and did happen to look up -- but it looked like traffic was flowing great on the Skyway. I didn't see anybody on the Skyway. I certainly saw a lot of people getting off for the Lincoln Tunnel at 495 because the George Washington Bridge had issues, but there was nobody on the Skyway. I think a lot of people who avoid it today because of its current condition might come back to it afterwards.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: In which case, that means that then the 67,000 vehicles per day it's carrying now will increase -- but you don't know to what point.

MR. HAMMER: I can't tell you. I mean, a free flowing lane can only handle so much traffic. You can only fit so much.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Could you get that data for the Committee?

MR. HAMMER: I would gladly get that data.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: We would like to know that.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: Because here is one of my concerns-- And then, look: It needs to be done; we know that the safety demands it, we know that our economy needs it, and that the needs of the people to travel safely is so important and, in fact, it's the key to our economic development. But what I'm hearing is, is that we're taking on a \$1 billion project, and we are building something that, as you had said

earlier, is functionally obsolete. So it's not preparing at all for a future -- for our economy which continues to grow, and the amount of people continues to grow.

Was any aspect of that considered when you were making these decisions about how to plan for the future and what our transportation infrastructure should look like?

MR. HAMMER: Quite frankly, the key here is, is that we have a safe Pulaski Skyway. Right now, we're concerned about the Pulaski Skyway's future. It's safe today, but we're concerned about it. Through this undertaking we will have a safe facility that will last for generations to come. So I think that's our mission: to maintain the Skyway. If there were a way to widen it or provide additional capacity to it and to do so in an efficient manner, we would certainly be here today talking about that. But right now, our focus is to make sure that it's here for the next generation and that we build it right today. If we take any shortcuts today or do anything wrong there will be, a generation from now, people sitting with this same problem.

So our focus is to make sure this thing is strong and will give us another 75-plus years. Because, quite frankly, it was built incredibly well. And what has also helped the Skyway is the fact that we haven't had truck traffic on it for many of those years. When the Skyway first opened, trucks were allowed on the Skyway. Within just a couple of years of its opening, there were so many traffic accidents caused by trucks that they were banned. And they remain banned to this day.

When you talk about functional obsolescence, that has to do with a lot of your clearances and a lot of your coming up on the Broadway

ramp. That is a deficient feature that classifies the bridge as *obsolete* in some manner. So we are addressing as many of those obsolete features as we possibly can. But when we are done, it will not be structurally deficient. This will be a sound bridge.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: But it's still not planning for additional growth in the area, or in the economy, or for the fact that the population is more concentrated, more compact, I think, than at any other time; and that we will continue to see movement back into the cities, back into these areas, and that there are people who just can't get around. And that's not anticipated in this at all.

I mean, I agree with you that we have to make it safe; I agree with you that it needs to function. But the fact that there is no planning or no anticipation of our needs for the next hundred years, other than to maintain the status quo, seems shortsighted to me.

Onto another issue: You talked about the budget -- the \$1 billion budget. The Transportation Management Plan that you identified didn't seem to take into account some of the issues that were raised by both the County Manager (*sic*), the Mayor, the Councilman in terms of ways to actually help people who live here move around, because the focus is on getting people through here. But there are still a lot of people who live here who need to survive this and would like to be able to move in an efficient manner. What is the budget for that, and out of your \$1 billion have you identified what the specific budget is and how that's going to be allocated? Is there room for any of these other options that have been raised here today?

MR. HAMMER: We're willing to sit down and to understand everyone's issues. And if there is something that can be delivered in the timely manner that it would need to be delivered, given our pending schedule, we will look upon those types of things favorably if it makes sense. Lots of ideas that people have talked about, I'll be honest with you, are very long-ranged -- they might take 10 years to build, but that's not going to help us for Skyway. It might help for future generations. We're going to listen to everyone's ideas -- because there are all kinds of ideas out there -- on what we can do.

But to actually sit here and say, "I have a planned budget for that," certainly, right now, we're looking to try to put together the best mitigation plan we possibly can. So if something makes sense and truly will make a difference, it's going to get our consideration.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: So you don't know what the budget is currently for the mitigation that you are planning? You haven't identified what that part of your budget is?

MR. ATTANASIO: Correct. And that's because the Transportation Management Plan is growing; it's a living, breathing plan. And when you look at what we've presented as some of the components of that plan-- Once again, that was a starting point. That was based on our analysis with transportation agencies, regional partners, and our knowledge. But the subcommittees we talk about, the expansion of the subcommittees with the regional subcommittee that we're creating, we continue to populate that plan with local input. And so it's a living, breathing process.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: So it's fair to then say that there is no budget at this point for things like additional park-and-ride

parking facilities, or mass transit -- moving people around on high-speed buses or any kind of buses, for that matter -- to get people from point *A* to point *B* to help the local people move through; or to get to the access points to mass transit to the city.

MR. ATTANASIO: Correct. There is no line item, per se. But, once again, one of the things we would love to do is utilize existing structures. I mean, the County Executive just mentioned looking at things like utilizing the Meadowlands during the week -- their parking lots which are empty during the week -- to see if-- And these are discussions we would want to have with various folks around the region. What we'd like to do is utilize assets that currently exist without having to build new things. I mean, I know a lot of folks would like to see us build a new park-and-ride, but if we have existing assets, or if we have partners that have existing assets that we could utilize, we would try to do that, too, so that way we protect the money that we have so it's spent as wisely as possible.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: I agree with that and it makes a lot of sense. But I also think that the issue of the budgeting for movement of people who are here, not just for the people who are minding the traffic of the people moving through, certainly needs to be a priority as you go forward.

Thank you.

MR. ATTANASIO: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you, Vice Chair.

Assemblyman Mainor.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: I just wanted to piggyback. I believe the Assemblywoman is 100 percent right. The bridge that we have

right now, I would honestly believe that we have outgrown it. And I believe what she's saying is that if we have already outgrown it, and it's suitable for what we have now, once it's fixed up and more people get on, we'll be back here in about, maybe, 10 more years trying to figure out how we can make this bridge accommodate the amount of traffic that should come through, okay? And then also with that there, you said you stopped the trucks from going because of the accidents; years ago, right? So what we're doing now is we're causing the cars and the trucks to come together again. So it goes back to what Assemblyman Giblin said. Is there any type of incentives to have the trucks try to move at earlier times to avoid so many trucks with the cars? And is there a possibility that that can flow down some access that may occur? That's just something that we really need to look into.

And my last point is, I know you said that you've met with local groups in reference to jobs and trying to get the community to work. I haven't heard of any group in Jersey City that met with you in trying to help facilitate getting people to work. And if you do have that information, I'm quite sure Hoboken, of course, and my office-- If you can just forward the information to us and allow us to help get the word out that we may be looking for workers. I'm sure you would want that information to get-- Because people are looking for jobs. I don't know what groups you met with, but apparently in Jersey City those groups are not doing anything as of yet. So if we can-- If my office can help I would love to do so, okay?

MR. ATTANASIO: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you, gentlemen.

Just one point of clarification: When I was talking about the sociological impact -- the impact on the surrounding neighborhoods -- one of you made reference that that was included in the environmental impact statement. I'm looking at an e-mail that I got from the DOT saying that "Because this project is not Federally funded, there is no environmental impact statement." It says "It's not required; that a EO215 Environmental Document would be developed, but is not yet done."

MR. HAMMER: It's just about completed. We're within weeks of its completion.

The E0215 is just a terminology, based on where funding is coming from. The EIS document -- that was a misspeak, quite frankly. This type of project does not qualify generally for an EIS-type of a review. But as part of any environmental analysis there are socioeconomic reviews done. It's to what level that they're done based on what you're doing, is really the point here. So certainly--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I just wanted to clarify the record, because in response to the question, the answer was, "Yes, that's done; it's required to be done as part of an EIS." And that's not exactly what's happening here.

MR. ATTANASIO: Let me apologize for that. There is that type of analysis done in any project. I misspoke with the actual terminology of what document was being created. So Rick, thank you, for clearing that up.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But it's not done yet.

MR. HAMMER: Much of the work is done. We're wrapping up the document at this point. The actual finalization of it is what's underway right now, but all of the work that went into it is completed.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: All right. I would just suggest that knowing what the cost to the community is, prior to putting a contract out to bid where you say we're going to save \$200 million-- But you don't know what you're going to cost the community. I think you ought to have that document; that number ought to be known so that we legislators can understand the cost-benefit analysis, as well as the Department. I think you'd be putting the cart before the horse to award a contract positing a savings of a certain amount, but not knowing the cost to the community on the other side of the equation.

Gentlemen, if you would stick around. We have a lot of other folks who would like to testify. I appreciate your presentation and the PowerPoint, and I'm sure we may need to call you back up just to answer some questions that may be raised by other witnesses.

MR. HAMMER: If I may, one moment.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Sure.

MR. HAMMER: For Assemblywoman Stender: When the Pulaski Skyway opened there were 5,500 vehicles a day on it. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: That's all that existed.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you.

I'd like to call Dr. Ali Maher up.

Dr. Maher is from the Rutgers Center for Advanced Infrastructure and Transportation. And for the members who are here, the Legislature did legislation that helped the Rutgers Center qualify for some

Federal funds a couple of years back. And they're doing great transportation work that is not only helping New Jersey, but is actually leading the nation.

Dr. Maher.

A L I M A H E R, Ph.D.: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Committee members.

I just want to make a few comments about the final design option that was proposed by the consultant for NJDOT. Well, obviously, there is consensus here about the need to have radical rehabilitation for this bridge, so I won't be preaching to the choir here about the need to do that.

The recently completed interim repairs conducted by DOT are basically keeping the bridge safe. But the remaining life of the bridge is in such condition that we need major rehabilitation in order to extend the life beyond what we expect now.

So the bridge needs radical surgery, basically, if I may use a medical analogy here. A review of the current approach to the rehabilitation, that the consultant presented today, essentially talks about a number of key elements. These are replacement of the entire deck where the rubber basically hits the concrete. That's basically what provides the functionality for the bridge. Repairs to the structural steel superstructure, repairs to concrete columns, ramps, piers and abutments -- the foundation for the bridge -- and strengthening of the superstructure for seismic retrofit. I've been listening to some very interesting conversations here. I am the principal investigator for the long-term bridge performance program for the Federal highways, and we have been interviewing, surveying all the 50 states and many, many stakeholders -- bridge stakeholders -- all over the country.

And I can tell you one thing: Most of the concerns and a majority of the bridge maintenance funding goes to repair of bridge decks. So foundations are basically sound, and if they are maintained well they can live indefinitely if they are maintained properly. But from an engineering point of view, concerning the elements that were presented by the consultant, the elements selected by NJDOT for fundamental rehabilitation are the key elements that hold the bridge up and essentially held it together, so that's what really will enable traffic safety to be handled properly. The rehabilitation plan is, therefore, a sound plan covering what needs to be covered. It's an optimum plan from an engineering point of view.

In my view, some of the unique features of the rehabilitation program -- I had a chance to review the plan -- such as using full-depth, lightweight concrete panels -- deck panels. These are precast panels. The adopted approach that they had -- that they are using now to quickly remove the existing deck slabs, where reinforcements are, in fact, welded to cross beams; and also the use of advanced exothermic lightweight panels near key ramps -- these are all techniques-- These are the gold standards in design. And these are the key elements that will help accelerate the construction process. Otherwise these two years would be extended to more than, probably, about four or even more.

On the other hand, the use of stainless steel rebars, advanced ultra-high performance concrete for joints, modular joints as opposed to finger joints, and high performance polymerconcrete overlay will ensure that the bridge will live much longer and it will be much easier to maintain for the future.

So from a brief overview of this plan, from an engineering standpoint and from what we have seen all over the country, experiencing issues that all these stakeholders are facing in maintaining their bridge inventory, I think the design is essentially sparing no efforts in coming up with the optimum plan and using golden standards of the elements that would be employed by the design.

So I just wanted to make these points from my own overview and some of my colleague's overview of the plan that was presented to day.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So just to put in layman's terms, you looked at what they're planning; in many respects, you find what they're doing is, from a professional standpoint, appropriate -- the right way to go.

DR. MAHER: Yes. From an engineering and from bridge design perspectives.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

Questions?

Assemblyman Chivukula.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: Yes. What about the noise level, the decibels, with the concrete polymer? A lot of the times the bridge is very noisy as is.

DR. MAHER: Absolutely, yes. The polymer that-- I don't have the data on this particular polymer, but any polymer coating and overlay that is put on concrete will reduce the decibels significantly. And there is a threshold that we need to maintain but, definitely, a polymer overlay would definitely help.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: Another question on the foundation. You said the seismic level-- What number on the Richter Scale will this foundation withstand?

DR. MAHER: Well, you know, in the Newark, New Jersey area, we are fortunate; we don't anticipate a very large--

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: But that's today, that's today.

DR. MAHER: But the way we look at these -- we look into peak acceleration of the ground during earthquakes as the input for our design. And I believe it's about 0.2 or 0.5 acceleration -- about 0.5, basically, square feet per second. So that's, I think, what they would be considering for this. And with that kind of acceleration -- peak acceleration values -- you could, essentially withstand anything above 6 -- 6 to 6.5 on the Richter Scale for this bridge.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: Okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Any other questions? (no response)

Dr. Maher, thank you very much for your testimony. We appreciate you being so kind to wait so long.

DR. MAHER: Thank you very much; thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Next I'd like to call Kay LiCausi.

K A Y L i C A U S I: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. Thank you so much for being here today for this most important issue.

I am a proud resident of Hoboken and a constituent of Assemblyman Ramos.

I commend the DOT for addressing the Skyway. We all agree that it's a safety issue and it's a hazard, and it needs to be improved.

Hudson County is an economic engine for the State of New Jersey. Jersey City is the home of the Gold Coast. Businesses and residences are booming in Hudson County. There are 25,000 approved residential units yet to be in Jersey City alone. There has to be a better way.

Closing the two lanes of the Skyway will bring our region and our growth to a halt for two long years. Approximately two to three days a week my business is in Hoboken; I walk to work four blocks most days. But about two to three days a week I have to leave Hudson County and commute into Central Jersey, and come home to Hoboken at rush hour. And as it stands today, I have a minimum of a 30 minute delay coming home. What will happen when all the traffic from Skyway is forced onto the Extension and the local streets? I've been told that the closure's the most economical way to fix the Skyway. It might be, but the most economical for the State -- but it's certainly not economical for the residents and businesses in Hudson County. I pay \$15 an hour in overtime for child care services. This will not be economical to me. That's \$45 a week that I'm going to have to incur in overtime. And I ask you and I beg you to look at other options to find the money to fix this traffic nightmare.

I agree with Chairman Wisniewski -- we need to make hard decisions to accurately fund the Transportation Trust Fund. Is it a gas tax? Is it a toll? I don't know, but I'm willing to pay more. It has to be cheaper

than the \$45 a week that I'm going to be facing in overtime for childcare services.

I agree with Assemblyman Ramos -- we need to fix the arteries into the region first. Route 440 desperately -- desperately -- needs repairs. The City of Jersey City has a plan to widen Route 440 and separate the truck traffic from the residential traffic. We have so many of the trucks coming from the Port of Bayonne, and Port Jersey, and over at Global. And they're competing with residents on these roads. We need to have a plan to widen it. The city does have a plan -- let's build that first. Let's look at traffic signalization to ease this traffic.

Public transportation is not an option for me. Many of you know me; I'm a lobbyist. And to get to the State House, I'd have to take a taxi from my house to the PATH station, take two different PATH trains to get to Newark, to take a New Jersey Transit train down to Trenton, to take a taxi to the State House. That just can't work. It's just not possible.

I had a meeting in central Jersey yesterday in Florham Park. There is no way to get here on public transportation. I can't do a park-and-ride from 15X. I need my car at home. I have a toddler. I need the car seat. I don't know what I would do.

DOT testified that they might make the shoulder more accessible during the morning rush hour, and I think that's great. But I think we need it all the time. I do the reverse commute. The morning rush hour into New York City -- that's not my problem. My problem is at night. And as Hudson County resident I have to tell you that I feel, from listening to everything and taking that survey, that the priority has been the New

York commuters. And I understand that. But New Jersey residents and New Jersey Hudson County residents -- they need to be a priority, too.

I would urge the State to build a parallel bridge and replace the Skyway completely. I agree with Assemblywoman Munoz -- it is unsafe. It is very unsafe. A car pulled out in front of me yesterday. There was a car waiting, the guy didn't want to wait for him, so he pulled out in front of that -- right into my car. And I slammed on my brakes and almost hit him. It is completely unsafe.

As we've heard, it was built for 5,500 cars that only went 35 miles an hour many, many years ago. It's a raceway; it is unsafe; and I'm urging you: Do what New York did in rebuilding the Tappan Zee Bridge: Build a parallel bridge and replace it. We'll have wider lanes, we'll have better access. When you're coming into Jersey City, if there's traffic getting off at Tonelle Avenue, it closes-- You have a bottleneck and it stops both lanes going into Jersey City because people want to cut over. They don't want to wait in the lane.

I urge the State to please rebuild the bridge completely. Please make wider lanes. Please make it safer -- and safer travel for generations to come.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you very much, Kay.

Does anybody have any questions? (no response)

Thank you very much.

From the Tri-State Transportation Campaign, Janna Chernetz.

J A N N A C H E R N E T Z, ESQ.: I was prepared to say good morning, but I'll say good afternoon.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes, just under the wire there -- yes.

MS. CHERNETZ: Chairman Wisniewski, Vice Chair Stender, and members of the Committee, I thank you very much for holding this very important hearing today.

My name is Janna Chernetz; I am the New Jersey Advocate for Tri-State Transportation Campaign. We are a nonprofit policy advocacy organization working for a better transit and transportation policy in the tri-state area.

I do have a very brief prepared statement, but I would be remiss if I didn't address some of the very important observations that have been made here today by members of the Committee and members of the public.

The way we fund transportation in New Jersey is flawed. The way we invest in transportation in New Jersey is flawed. We need to return to a fix-it-first approach when prioritizing transportation investment and funding. I've been before this Committee before, and I will say it again: New Jersey DOT has accelerated its road widening projects. In 2009, they were about 3.6 percent of the capital program; in 2012 it was 11.4 percent. And I point this out because this is money spent on investing in new roadways and this is taking away money that can be spent on maintaining our existing roadways, which is definitely an issue here in New Jersey.

If we don't stop to take a look and reprioritize projects and problems, problems like the Pulaski Skyway will become the norm. I know that there is very little appetite in Trenton right now for an increase in the gas tax. But a lower gas tax in comparison to other states while we find ourselves in this situation is absolutely nothing to boast about. This sends a

strong message that the way we invest in transportation is broken. What we should be questioning and addressing is how we got here in the first place.

So with that said, if I just may speak briefly on my prepared statement.

The rehabilitation of the Pulaski Skyway is an important project for New Jersey commuters, and attention to this bridge is long overdue. A 2010 report by my organization found that the Pulaski Skyway received a sufficiency rating of 2 percent; was ranked as the least sufficient bridge in the state by NJDOT. While focus on rehabilitating is welcomed, we cannot overlook the disruption commuters will face while work is being done. Unfortunately, rerouting vehicular traffic to New Jersey's other already congested roadways will not be sufficient to mitigate congestion. The rerouting will only add congestion, hours of frustration to already long commutes -- as we heard today by one resident -- and add wear and tear on our roads. And the increase in local traffic -- let's not forget what's going to happen with the local roads around this project. This is going to threaten the physical safety of residents in nearby communities -- something that I haven't heard addressed, and if I did I apologize. We have to think about the pedestrians that are out there on these local roads and have not seen the increased traffic that's going to be as a result of this project. You have elderly, you have young children; and anybody walking around or even riding a bike in this area -- their safety is very much in question here.

Instead, the Port Authority, New Jersey Department of Transportation, and the Turnpike Authority, New Jersey Transit, TMAs, local businesses will all need to work together to minimize the impact to

commuters and residents in the region. To start, NJDOT will need to build upon its recently concluded commuter survey that seeks to identify solutions to address the anticipated disruptions. For example, the information gathered from the survey will help guide key decision makers as to where bus service can be enhanced, where new bus routes can be created, and also where rail service frequency can be increased. Increasing the frequency of rail and then expanding bus service with priority lanes on area roadways are all improvements that can be implemented for the short term. Other considerations include the implementation of a variety of shuttle services, park-and-rides, carpools and vanpools in key locations.

The DOT should also look at the recent efforts in New York City in the days following Superstorm Sandy for additional ideas how to deal with the upcoming disruptions. The days after the storm, New York City DOT and MTA provided bus bridges for commuters that were given lane priority as a way to move people as efficiently as possible into and out of the central business district of Manhattan. This system was organized in just two days and was hailed a success. NJDOT, with 11 months to prepare, should build upon this model to provide a full bus rapid transit between New York, and New Jersey, and also locations within New Jersey.

There is no one-size-fits-all answer to managing the closing of the Pulaski Skyway eastbound for two years, and all options must be on the table and remain flexible for the duration of the project. Given how congested the Pulaski Skyway is already, and also the area in general, the enhancements implemented to weather the renovation may prove beneficial in the long run and even remain once the renovations are complete.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify this morning.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you -- thank you for your testimony.

Questions from the Committee? Comments? (no response)

Thank you; thank you for your advocacy.

Next, I'd like to call, from Jersey City Medical Center, Robert Luckritz. Did I get that name right?

ROBERT LUCKRITZ, ESQ.: Yes, thank you.

Good afternoon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman; thank you, members of the Committee.

As was mentioned, my name is Robert Luckritz. I am the Director of Government Relations for Jersey City Medical Center. I appreciate you all taking the time to come up to Hudson County today. This is certainly an issue for all of us, and it's something that's very important to the Medical Center.

Jersey City Medical Center is Hudson County's tertiary care hospital. We provide critical services to the County, including serving as the regional trauma center, the regional perinatal care center, and the regional cardiac surgery center. We employ nearly 3,000 employees, of which about 25 percent travel in from west of the Hackensack River.

Let me start by assuring you that we support the renovation of the Pulaski Skyway. Its role as a critical piece of infrastructure cannot be understated, as evidenced by today's discussion here and the amount of time that we've spent already.

We share many of the same concerns as our local employers about the affect it will have on our employees -- many of whom commute to the Medical Center from outside the County. However, one of our greatest concerns lies with the impact on our ability to provide services to Hudson County.

In addition to our role as the tertiary care provider, Jersey City Medical Center is the State-designated paramedic service for all Hudson County east of the Hackensack River, as well as the EMS provider for the City of Jersey City. Our EMS department responds to over 90,000 requests for assistance every year. On a daily basis our paramedics deal with some of the most congested traffic in the nation in an effort to maintain response times and administer quality care.

Our system is designed with a state-of-the-art computer system that assists our units in determining the best route of travel, and ensuring that we maintain adequate staffing levels.

Unfortunately, no computer system will be able to compensate for the vast increase in congestion that we're going to experience as a result of this project. It's critical that, as we move forward with this project, we ensure that all stakeholders, including the Medical Center, are included in the planning and preparation and that as many safeguards are in place as possible to mitigate the impact on Hudson County.

The impact that we face goes well beyond the day-to-day impact of people being late to work and so forth. This really could be life-and-death for some of the residents of Hudson County.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you very much for your testimony.

Any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: I have a question -- yes.

Assemblyman Mainor.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: I don't know if you heard, but when I spoke to the transportation -- DOT -- I had asked them to include you -- the Medical Center--

MR. LUCKRITZ: Yes, thank you very much, Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: No problem. My question to you is, do you believe that the two years that the bridge may be closed, that it may be-- First and foremost, will you be able to give them some type of idea of what might be needed for the Medical Center? Do you have an idea?

MR. LUCKRITZ: Absolutely. I think as part of the planning process we're going to have to be heavily involved in determining how it is that we're going to redirect this traffic -- much of what we talked about today; figuring out how it is we're going to handle staffing levels, as you discussed earlier. That's going to be a significant impact on us as to how we're going to afford to increase the number of ambulances that are on the streets. It costs money; we're a private, nonprofit. We certainly-- We're a safety net provider. And it's ultimately not only going to cost the County and the City money, but it's going to cost us money because each of our ambulances are going to have a higher time on task on day-to-day responses.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: I understand that, and that's what I was concerned about.

But I'm quite sure that the Port Authority will cut a check and we'll be able to-- (laughter) They're not here. So I'm quite sure they've given them a blank check, and we'll take care of the Medical Center and put you guys in position to be able to better serve Hudson County.

MR. LUCKRITZ: We'll look forward to that; thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Assemblyman Ramos.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: You said 25 percent of your employees live west of the Hackensack River. Have you guys started discussing alternate scheduling for those individuals coming in?

MR. LUCKRITZ: Yes, we have. We've looked at a number of different options already as to how this is going to impact us. For our clinical employees, we've examined various work schedules -- adjusting their shifts to be separate from rush hour. So whether it be shifting the nurses and some of the patient care technicians to earlier schedules so that they're not coming to work during rush hour and they're not going home during rush hour. For our noncritical employees, we're also looking at other options, including telecommuting, alternate work weeks, reducing the number of days of the week that they're going to come in. Unfortunately, that's going to have an additional impact on the economy of the county if we're not bringing in people on a day-to-day basis. We're in a growing area of the city; we have a lot that's going on. And we certainly want to do the best that we can to be good neighbors to the restaurants and the different areas that our employees patronize.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Any other questions? (no response)

Thank you for your testimony. I appreciate it.

MR. LUCKRITZ: Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Next, I'd like to call Michael Kumba (phonetic spelling); I saw him a moment ago. I will come back to Michael, if he's, maybe, gone out for a moment,

Maria Nieves, Hudson County Chamber of Commerce.

M A R I A L. N I E V E S: Thank you. Good afternoon.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Good afternoon.

MS. NIEVES: Mr. Chairman, members of the Assembly Transportation, Public Works, and Independent Authorities Committee. My name is Maria Nieves, and I am President and CEO of the Hudson County Chamber of Commerce, a regional business association representing 350 businesses and organizations in Hudson County.

We count among our members both the Hoboken Chamber of Commerce and the Bayonne Chamber of Commerce. And, by extension, we represent close to 800 members.

Thank you for holding this hearing this morning -- this afternoon, and also thank you for coming up to Hudson County to do this and allowing us to weigh in on a matter of critical importance to Hudson County.

Our members understand that while the Pulaski Skyway is an iconic roadway, it is also an aging asset in need of major rehabilitation, as we've heard throughout this session. So we commend the New Jersey Department of Transportation for making investments in this critical artery

so that it will stand for decades to come and will be upgraded with current safety standards.

That said, we are concerned about DOT's plan to completely close the northbound lanes of the Skyway beginning February 2014. With 67,000 vehicles traversing its span daily, and 62 percent of that traffic bound for the waterfront of Jersey City, the brunt of the impact will undoubtedly be felt by the residents and businesses of Hudson County, and particularly by Jersey City -- which has been an economic driver for the State over the last decade -- and by Bayonne and Hoboken.

Thus, the Chamber is recommending that studies be conducted to understand what will be the impacts to the local streets, what new traffic patterns will likely emerge, and what those new patterns will mean for the health, safety, and quality of life for residents and businesses in the area. Nearly 3,500 vehicles utilize the northbound lanes during peak hours in the a.m., according to the DOT's own studies. How will those vehicles be diverted onto the Turnpike, other arteries, and local streets, and what does this mean for parking, public transportation resources, and the area's major employers? What stress points will develop in the system and how will local municipalities be aided to mitigate against that impact?

How will emergency and incident management on the Skyway itself be handled with the northbound lanes closed? Emergency planning in particular will be of critical importance to the business community on the waterfront. Many of those firms are financial services companies that have a great need to understand emergency planning from a regional level.

We also recommend an economic impact study to ensure that the approximately \$200 million projected to be saved by a two-year, full-

time closure of the northbound lanes is not offset by adverse economic impact to Hudson County -- and we've had some discussion about that this morning as well. Perhaps this project represents a unique opportunity to consider funding roadway projects which are long overdue and which provide for the continued development of Hudson County infrastructure. An example, which Mayor Healy pointed out this morning, is the completion of Jersey Avenue in Jersey City, which will connect the waterfront and Liberty State Park areas, and provide an alternative access to downtown from the Turnpike -- which is expected to absorb more than half the peak traffic that uses the Skyway.

And perhaps, as the Chairman himself has noted and mentioned earlier, perhaps this is the start of taking real action on sustainable funding for the State's Transportation Trust Fund. We invite the DOT and Commissioner Simpson to tour the County with us to consider current existing conditions. There is no better way to understand what's going on than getting feet on the ground and to identify solutions such as which projects could potentially be rolled into this larger endeavor to rehabilitate the Skyway.

We welcome the opportunity to dialogue with their project team and to ensure plans are adequately developed. Next month, the Lieutenant Governor is coming up to Hudson County for a Hudson ELC luncheon and many of our members will be there. I'm sure that this is going to be a topic that we will be trying to engage her in at that session as well.

As we all have so much riding on Hudson County's economic future, we certainly all need to collaboratively work on creative solutions to fix the Skyway.

Thank you very much for your time.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you for your testimony.

Does anybody have any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: Yes, I think it's very important to try and communicate with your businesses -- the businesses you represent in the Hudson County Chamber. They have information from their patrons who aren't from the area that visit the area -- that shop in their shops, they eat in their restaurants. That they may have businesses with other parts of the area, clients who they represent in other parts of the state -- (indiscernible) clients all across the State of New Jersey. So I think that that's vital information on how it impacts because, to your point earlier, Chairman, to how it's a monetary impact that's going to take place there. And I think this question isn't for you; I think the speaker from Jersey City Medical Center brought this up, you brought this up as well. Now, these peak hour traffic times -- is it 6:30 to 8:30 right now, or 9 o'clock right now -- it's probably going to be extended from 6 to 9, 9:30, because now we also have-- You have the employees of Jersey City Medical Center, living on the other side of Hackensack River; teachers from Jersey City who live on the other side of the river and are trying to get to school on time. So you have all of these other factors that really need to be factored in, as we take this conversation forward, that I don't know if they have, in fact, (indiscernible) at this time. So that the information you can provide -- the monetary information you can provide from your members you represent, to the DOT, could be vitally important in the decision making process, going forward.

So I appreciate your testimony today.

MS. NIEVES: Oh, sure. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you for your testimony.

Next, I'd like to call Brett Harwood, Harwood Properties and Square Parking.

Thank you, Mr. Harwood.

BRETT HARWOOD: Mr. Chairman, Committee members -- I'll be brief. I've given copies of my prepared statement, but I'd like to talk about some historic context here.

My family came to Jersey City -- specifically, Journal Square -- shortly after the opening of the Skyway. They came from Newark, they opened a parking business on Journal Square, and I'm the fourth generation of my family to be in business in Journal Square. Hopefully, my kids may follow me. We own properties there. We are developers there.

Right now, as you sit here, and as the DOT sits here, there's \$1 billion of future development being discussed for Journal Square. There are developers looking at projects. There are investors looking at investment. And the message that you may be sending is that Jersey City and Hudson County are closed to business for the next two years.

Part of your economic plan has to be a campaign to make sure that it's open for business; that people aren't -- their lives aren't disrupted; that employees have to get to work; that small shopkeepers in Journal Square who have to open when commuters come to Journal Square at 7 o'clock in the morning -- have to be open for business -- that their employees have to be there.

And I'm suggesting that a little more time be taken to look at the specific impacts of this. Specifically, I recommend a couple of things. I've travelled the Skyway at least twice a day for the last 35 years. I'm like, in the Hair Club for Men -- I'm a user. (laughter) I consider myself an inexpert transportation expert. In fact, yesterday the Broadway ramp was flooded, which backed up the Skyway a half an hour to Newark, I want you to know. And there's a drain there that needs to be cleaned, and I told the Deputy Commissioner to please clean that drain. (laughter)

But there are some specific suggestions I have. Communipaw Avenue, which people have discussed here, which comes off the truck route, which goes directly to downtown Jersey City via Grand Street -- it needs to be made an express route: no parking, traffic lights coordinated. It's an alternative route to the downtown of Jersey City. Right now, it's basically one lane -- unless that lane is blocked by a double-parked truck in the morning.

Tonnelle Avenue -- the same way. Sipp Avenue -- the same way. Broadway, Newark Avenue -- you have to keep the streets open so that people can get to and from work when they need to get to work. People will make adjustments as they can, but some people, unfortunately, can't do it.

And the last thing I'd like to say, and what prompted me -- I started writing letters shortly after the public announcement, and what bothered me is the linkage of this project to the Super Bowl. Now, all of us Jersey folks who've lived here most of our lives -- all of my life -- know that the Super Bowl is a one-time event which will certainly pass into history. And we're all going to be here after this. And putting New Jersey -- or

Jersey City and Hudson residents -- secondary to the importance of the Super Bowl, which is going to attract -- 90 percent of the people are going to be from other states, other places; and most New Jersey residents aren't even going to go. Linking this project to having that event was certainly an insult to me, and many other people who I know.

I respectfully request-- I'd like to be part of this. I'm a Chamber member. I'm former Chairman of the Jersey City Medical Center. My family has been involved in civic affairs in Jersey City. We will be there as long as it takes to make Jersey City a better place to live, and it's gotten much better over the years. I just want your diligence on this, your concentration, and the State's diligence and concentration, because you're affecting lives, you're affecting businesses, and you need to be very careful how you do this.

Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Harwood.

Any questions? (no response)

Thank you for your testimony.

And the last witness -- William Wissemann, Newport Associates Development.

WILLIAM F. WISSEMANN: Mr. Chairman, Committee members, thank you for the opportunity to speak.

I do have a prepared statement, which I did provide a copy to the Committee.

Before I get into my prepared statement, I would just like to comment on a few things I heard this morning.

Early on this morning I heard a lot of talk about trans-Hudson commuters -- people going to Manhattan. I believe that the last few speakers talked about people in Jersey City and Hudson County. According to the DOT figures, almost three-quarters of the traffic on the Pulaski Skyway is going to and from New Jersey -- the New Jersey waterfront, Hudson County, and beyond. Only 28 percent is destined for New York City, yet the DOT consistently focuses on getting traffic to New York City.

I'd also like to ask a question of New Jersey Transit. They're going to save \$200 million to \$300 million by doing a two-lane closure. I'd like to know and verify something I heard them say earlier -- that the DOT is going to work 24/7 on this project during that two-year period. I think that if I mistook what I heard then they certainly should consider doing that in order to minimize the time of the outage, and to use some of that money that they're saving -- all that money they're saving on doing a two-lane closure.

I'm the Senior Project Engineer at Newport Development in Jersey City. I'm very familiar with the Pulaski Skyway and Hudson County in general. Over the past 25 years the development of the Jersey City waterfront has elevated Jersey City to the 13th largest office market in the nation, with over 23 million square feet of office space; and saw the construction of over 15,000 new apartment units. But during all of this time there has been no roadway infrastructure improvement to serve this rapid expansion.

Access to the waterfront suffers from congestion caused by the mixture of waterfront-bound commuters and cross-Hudson commuters using the Holland Tunnel. This congestion is a detriment to further growth

of the waterfront, interferes with access to the waterfront, movement of goods and services and emergency service, and causes unhealthy and dangerous congestion on Jersey City streets.

The Pulaski Skyway project proposal to close the eastbound and northbound lanes for the two years will exacerbate these problems because it will result in significant diversion of traffic to the Turnpike's Hudson Bay Extension, creating an intolerable increase in an already bad situation. According to the NJDOT, 34,000 vehicles a day use the eastbound lanes of the Skyway; 70 percent, or 23,000 of these vehicles, are bound for the Holland Tunnel or Jersey City, and will divert to the Hudson Bay Extension; 17,500 of them are expected to travel to the terminus of the Extension; with the remaining 5,500 diverting into local streets -- a huge influx of additional traffic. The closure of the Pulaski Skyway requires mitigation to the maximum extent possible of this additional burden being placed on this alternate route and on Jersey City .

There is one mitigation alternate which would have long-term benefits even after the Pulaski Skyway project is complete: the waterfront access ramp. This new access ramp for the New Jersey Turnpike Extension would separate waterfront-bound traffic from trans-Hudson traffic, all before the choke point of the Jersey Avenue terminus of the Turnpike Extension, speed traffic to the waterfront and take traffic off of local Jersey City streets.

The waterfront access ramp would also serve as a relief valve that can mitigate a good deal of the impact of the closure of the Pulaski Skyway. Building the waterfront access ramp would result in a smoother traffic flow at the terminus of the Hudson Bay Extension and a time savings

that will reduce overall travel time for the anticipated 70 percent of vehicles detoured around the Pulaski Skyway closure. It will also provide an alternate to city streets being used as a way around traffic congestion.

In 2008 the Turnpike Authority studied the waterfront access ramp and found it feasible and constructible, with no fatal flaws, but declined to move ahead with the project because it did not meet the Turnpike Authority's internal cost-benefit formula for justifying its construction.

There is a disconnect here between the decision matrix of the Turnpike Authority and the larger needs of the State and its cities. Not only is the Turnpike Authority's rejection of the waterfront access ramp project at odds with the economic development interest of the State, now it is also at odds with the larger needs of the State's transportation infrastructure itself.

The Turnpike Authority's formula for justifying expenditures should not be the deciding factor in New Jersey's decisions about upgrading road infrastructure. The Jersey City waterfront is the biggest economic generator in the state, and the need to reinvest in the infrastructure to serve and preserve it should not be subservient to the narrow box parameters of the Turnpike Authority. The Pulaski Skyway dilemma is a victim of that kind of thinking.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you for your testimony.

Any questions from the Committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: I have one question.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Assemblyman Ramos.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: Where would the waterfront access point begin from?

MR. WISSEMANN: The waterfront access point would diverge from the Turnpike Authority before the old cold storage building in Jersey City, and would connect to the existing 11th Street viaduct constructed by Newport in the 1980s.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: Okay, thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Seeing no other questions, thank you for your testimony.

MR. WISSEMANN: You're welcome. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I just have one concluding question for DOT. Rick, I don't know if you can answer this question.

What's the cost of this project that we're currently talking about?

MR. HAMMER: (off mike) The deck replacement project?

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Right.

MR. HAMMER: Basically, it's two contracts, as was pointed out during the presentation. One is known as *Pulaski Skyway No. 3*, and one is *Pulaski Skyway No. 4*. *Pulaski Skyway No. 3*, which is replacing what is now the northbound side of the Skyway -- that is estimated at \$200 million.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But that's not going to be the complete fix--

MR. HAMMER: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: --for the Skyway.

MR. HAMMER: The entire Skyway?

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes. So the discussion about when this is done, this bridge will have a 75-year-or-greater useful life and will have new decking and new lighting and new drainage-- So when you do the whole project, what are we talking about?

MR. HAMMER: Well, in addition to the contracts 3 and 4, we would be doing major superstructure repair to the steel; there will be seismic retrofits done to the bridge, which was touched on earlier, which will be putting brand new bearings on top of all the piers to better handle a seismic event; there will be major substructure repairs and upgrades; there will be a total reconstruction of each of the ramps -- the Broadway ramp and the Kearny ramp. When all is said and done, our estimates right now show the entire cost-- and that's design and construction -- approaching \$1 billion. The amount of that work that would be construction is probably in the neighborhood of \$875 million to \$900 million.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. And we had at least one person, maybe more, who came up and said, "You ought not rehab this; you ought to build a new bridge." What's the estimate on building a new bridge?

MR. HAMMER: The estimate to build a new bridge -- and the last time we actually developed an estimate was about six or seven years ago -- and at that time it was estimated at over \$3 billion, minimum. But we really feel it's a number that could approach \$5 billion, and probably take at least 20 years to happen.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: is that largely because of the acquisition of properties and the studies that have to be done?

MR. HAMMER: A lot of that--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Because you would just be-- You would be acquiring property to put your piers on, but air rights for most of the rest?

MR. HAMMER: That's correct. And there are so many environmentally sensitive properties underneath -- there are a lot of areas where-- Let's face it, there's a lot of dirty land underneath, so there would be a lot of remediation and environmental issues.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: In New Jersey, really?

MR. HAMMER: That would go on for year and years -- just to clean up the property, much less purchase it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I have no other questions.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: You talk about the northbound lanes; you're doing both north and south right?

MR. HAMMER: Yes, I'm sorry. The first contract is actually going to do the northbound side.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: Okay.

MR. HAMMER: And when the first contract is done -- about nine months from when it begins -- then the southbound traffic will be moved over to what are now the northbound lanes. Because they're going to be brand new, so they get to enjoy the new pavement; and then they'll be doing what is now the southbound side.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: So when you're doing the southbound, the northbound will be open?

MR. HAMMER: No. The southbound lanes will be driving on the northbound side. So throughout the two years of construction, there will be two southbound lanes on the Skyway.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: Oh, so you're not closing it completely.

MR. HAMMER: No, the southbound lanes will be available at all times.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: Okay. So you can get out of the city (laughter) but--

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: You just can't get back in. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: You have to pay a toll to get back in.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: It's the opposite of a roach motel.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: So at all times, one direction will be open.

MR. HAMMER: At all times.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: So that's better than I thought.

MR. HAMMER: The major problem is going to be for the a.m. rush hour. It's like a three- to four-hour problem in terms of diverting traffic. All of these roads--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Well, if there's going to be a major problem with the a.m. rush hour, can all of those commuters get a note from the Governor, "It's okay that he's late because the bridge was being repaired?"

MR. ATTANASIO: No comment.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: No comment? Okay.

Thank you very much, gentlemen. We appreciate it.

We have one last piece of business. We have Assembly Bill 3529, sponsored by Assemblyman Prieto and Assemblywoman Jimenez, designating a portion of the Paterson Plank Road bridge in Secaucus as the Joseph F. Tagliareni Memorial Bridge.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: Motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Motion.

Second?

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: Second.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Second

Any discussion?

MR. ATTANASIO: Chair?

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes, sure. This is on the bridge?

MR. ATTANASIO: Yes, on the bill.

I just wanted to let you know there was some question about jurisdiction on the bridge that we have worked out. It is State jurisdiction, so we have no opposition to this Bill, and we look forward to working with the sponsors on the Bill.

What we did want to point out is that we may need to make a technical revision or two -- which we'll work with OLS on -- when it comes to actual mileposts in the legislation; just because we think there might be a discrepancy on the mileposts. So we'll be happy to work with OLS on this.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: We can work that out in a floor amendment afterwards.

MR. ATTANASIO: Okay, great.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you.

Motion made and seconded.

There are no amendments. We'll do a roll call, please.

MR. BUONO: Assemblyman Wolfe. (no response)

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: He's absent.

MR. BUONO: Assemblyman Rumpf indicated yes.

Assemblyman Rudder absent.

Assemblywoman Munoz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNOZ: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Assemblyman Ramos.

ASSEMBLYMAN RAMOS: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Assemblyman Mainor.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAINOR: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Assemblyman Giblin indicated yes.

Assemblywoman Vainieri Huttle indicated yes.

Assemblyman Chivukula.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHIVUKULA: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Assemblywoman Caride. (no response)

Vice Chair Stender.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN STENDER: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Chairman Wisniewski.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

The Bill is released.

The meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)