STATEMENT OF SAMUEL K. SKINNER

NOMINEE FOR U.S. SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

JANUARY 25, 1989

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

My name is Samuel K. Skinner, and I am the President's nominee to be Secretary of Transportation. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your willingness to schedule this nomination hearing as one of the Committee's first orders of business in the 101st Congress. I also thank you and the Committee's other members for the opportunity to visit with you individually. I believe those were very useful and productive discussions, and I hope our meetings marked the beginning of a good working relationship.

I am particularly honored by this nomination, not just because I have a strong personal interest in transportation, but because a safe and efficient national transportation system is so critical to a strong, vibrant economy.

If confirmed, my principal goal will be to develop a new national transportation policy that strengthens both our national security and our nation's economy. While I have not endorsed or formulated any particular policy blueprint, please know that I intend to fully take into account the views of members of this Committee, the Congress, the public, industry, labor and, of course, the President

before moving forward. But if confirmed, I want to put into place a strategic plan for dealing with this nation's transportation needs into the next century -- across all modes.

If we are to have a policy of this magnitude, I strongly believe we must take advantage of the synergy that exists between the various modes of transportation. Having brought modes together on a much smaller scale in my home state of Illinois, where we have the metropolis surrounding Chicago as well as a great deal of rural area. I am well aware of the competing interests that must be balanced. This will require a strong commitment to intermodalism, because cooperation within the Department as well as cooperation between the Executive Branch and the Congress is vital to success. So that there can be no doubt -- my goals are to make travel safer, more efficient, and less expensive for the American consumer.

The United States has the safest transportation system in the world, but it can and must be improved. This means ensuring that transportation workers who literally hold hundreds of lives in their hands on a daily basis must be tested for illegal drugs. It means adequate staffing of and effective management of our air traffic control system. It means meeting head-on the gruesome threat of international terrorism with all the resources we can muster. I believe that the United States can and will take a leading role in combatting terrorism in the skies.

These are only a few of the numerous challenges we face. Economic deregulation of U.S. airlines has been a dynamic process benefitting millions of Americans in the past 10 years. But with deregulation has come a dramatic restructuring of the airline industry, something predicted but perhaps not fully appreciated back in 1978. The challenge today is to see that both safety and service excellence are preserved in this deregulated environment. Another issue that demands attention is the treatment of aging aircraft. We have to gather the facts and deal with this issue in an expeditious and decisive manner, so the American people can have complete confidence in the safety of our aviation system.

Other issues involving the FAA are familiar to you. Complaints about delays are as old as the airline industry itself. We have an immediate need for additional air traffic controllers to improve safety and on-time performance. And as a pilot, let me say air traffic controllers have one of the most difficult and high-pressure jobs in government; we will need to look at ways to make sure that we provide flexibility and support for the men and women in the tower.

The railroad industry has seen a similar restructuring under economic deregulation. However, we have to balance deregulation with our need to maintain safety and to ensure fair rates for all shippers.

The Coast Guard faces a comparable breadth of challenges. It not only plays a vital role in maintaining our national security, but performs important duties involving law enforcement and drug interdiction; monitoring fisheries and commerce; protecting the marine environment; and preserving the health and safety of boaters and commercial seamen. More and more Coast Guard resources are being devoted to drug law enforcement, which now comprises one-quarter of the Coast Guard's operating budget. I want to work with the Congress to ensure adequate funding of these missions, as well as the Coast Guard's traditional at-sea missions.

I view the merchant marine as another element of defense readiness. I believe that the primary objective of the Maritime Administration should be to ensure that the nation has sufficient sealift capabilities in the event of hostilities. Regrettably, we are experiencing a serious decline of this important link in our transportation system; the downhill slide must end. This Administration is committed to a comprehensive maritime policy with the ultimate goal of restoring the U.S. Maritime industry in the interests of economic and national security.

Regulation of motor vehicle safety and fuel efficiency, as well as working to reduce the carnage wrought by drunken and drugged driving, also deserve the attention of the Secretary of Transportation. While a small agency, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has an impact on the everyday lives of most Americans, even though the public may not realize it.

While not directly within the Committee's jurisdiction, I want to briefly touch on highway and mass transit assistance programs. These programs affect virtually every state and constitute a large portion of the Department's budget. Wise allocation of these funds will be essential to sustaining the nation's infrastructure. At the same time, we must remain mindful of the need to reduce the budget deficit. The President and I both support expenditure of these trust funds for the purposes for which they were intended, consistent with our ability to gradually reduce the deficit.

Another area of transportation policy that deserves high-priority treatment is that of hazardous materials transportation. There are few things more frightening to someone living near a major railroad line than a serious hazardous materials spill. The unknown characteristics of some materials, and the difficulty involved in containing them, only heightens concern. This issue represents part of the safety mission of this Department and will be carefully examined.

The President understands that all of these problems require an energetic, innovative management approach by the Executive Branch, building on the significant progress already made in many of the areas I have discussed. I think that the wide range of issues that we have only briefly covered this morning makes apparent the need for a new national transportation policy.

If confirmed, my first orders of business will be to assemble a management team at the Department, to formulate marching orders on the development of a national transportation policy, and to assist the President in developing this Administration's budget priorities in the transportation area. In doing so, I expect to consult with this Committee and the Congress on how best to accomplish our many transportation goals within a fiscally responsible budget. Some tough choices will certainly have to be made.

My experience in law enforcement at the U.S. Attorney's Office and in the transportation area at the Regional Transportation Authority of Northeastern Illinois have convinced me that even the most daunting problems in government can be resolved. While I realize the national issues facing the Department are far more complex and difficult than those we dealt with in Chicago, I believe the same kind of hard work, long-range planning and spirit of cooperation that succeeded there can achieve similar results at the national level. If confirmed, I hope to bring a full understanding of the complexities of the process, including the need for continuing interaction between the Congress and the Executive Branch, to the job of Secretary of Transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much this opportunity to come before the Committee today, and I am prepared to respond to any questions you or other Committee members may have.

UNITED STATES SENATE

CONFIRMATION HEARING

OF

SAMUEL K. SKINNER

NOMINEE FOR U.S. SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

Before the

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

January 26, 1989

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee is holding its first meeting of the 101st Congress today. The reason is to receive testimony from Samuel K. Skinner, Secretary Designate for the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Skinner's views are of considerable interest to the Committee due to his jurisdiction over the Federal Aid Highway Program and oversight responsibilities for the Federal Highway Administration.

To put things in perspective, FHWA constitutes about half of the DOT budget and over half of the spending of this Committee overseas. The Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee held a confirmation hearing yesterday with the Secretary Designate and has jurisdiction in according his nomination to the Senate.

Mr. Skinner has very kindly agreed to back to back hearings so that we can focus on the highway and related transportation issues with him today.

Once the decision had been reached on who will be nominated to the head of FHWA, this Committee will reassemble to consider that nomination, of course.

The Highway Program is one of the largest

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

and most successful of all federal programs. It is based on a long-standing and solid federal/state partnership. Our system of roads and bridges provides an essential service moving people and goods around this great nation.

The Highway Trust Fund has proved to be a superb financing tool channeling revenues from highway user taxes into highway improvements. There are no deficits, no budget imbalances, no drain on the general fund for this program. It pays for itself and it always has. That is why many of us are so concerned about efforts to divert critically-needed highway funding to other modes or to make cuts in authorized spending levels. Or even more seriously, to turn the Highway Trust Fund into a cash cow for budget deficit reduction.

Even by the Administration's own forecast, we need to spend from \$26 billion to \$31 billion annually just to maintain the current physical condition and operating conditions of our highway system.

In the near future, according to FHWA, annual costs will rise to almost \$40 billion. And those figures don't include needed investments in local roads which the American Association of State

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

Highway and Transportation Officials estimates will be up to \$60 billion a year.

While budgetary matters seem to be of overriding importance right now, there are many other pressing highway issues from rural transportation financing to highway safety to determining the appropriate federal role in the proposed interstate ERA.

The Highway Program is now nearly halfway through its last year authorization cycle. It is my ernest hope that this time as new authorization legislation is developed, Congress and the Administration can work together in shaping the best possible transportation policy for the 1990s and beyond.

In closing, let me just reemphasize the significance of the highway travel. The vast majority of travel from city to city and in urban and rural areas for commuting purposes and goods movement is by highways. While there are many other modes of transportation for which the DOT secretary has significant responsibilities, a well-maintained highway and bridge system is of most importance to the greatest number of Americans.

It is a pleasure welcoming you to the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

hearing today, Mr. Skinner, and I look forward to 1 2 hearing your testimony. I yield to my colleague. 3 THE RANKING MINORITY MEMBER: Well, thank 4 you very much, Mr. Chairman. 5 First of all, I want to say what a delight 6 it is to be with you as we start our first session 7 meeting of this new Congress. And I look forward 8 greatly to working with you as our Chairman and of 9 course with the other members of the Committee. 10 And I also want to join with you, Mr. 11 12 13 14

Chairman, in welcoming Mr. Skinner before this Committee. I've had the privilege of meeting privately with him as I suspect most of us have and came away impressed.

This Committee's primary interest as you noted, Mr. Chairman, is focused on the Federal Aid Highway Program over which we have jurisdiction, where we're spending around \$13 billion a year. And as you said, it affects every locality, every state, every community in our nation and all our citizens.

But also, I would like to point out -- and I think this is really what I want to stress today with Mr. Skinner -- is that this is also the Environment Committee and we have oversight responsibility for the

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

environmental laws. And there are many areas where transportation and the environment intersect, and there are going to be more in the future.

What trucks and buses and automobiles do in contributing to our air pollution of course is well known. And the cities may have to consider various transportation controls in order to meet the air quality standards. Also, there is a growing concern over the diminishing acres of wetlands in our nation. And anytime we build highways, that frequently-nearly always -- impacts on wetlands.

And so I hope you, Mr. Skinner, will work with us in assuring that the Federal Aid Highway Program is managed in such a way that it does indeed protect our environment.

And finally, the issue of safety. Fifty thousand Americans are killed on our highways every year. If this was occurring in airplane crashes or ship accidents there'd be revolution in this country. And I just don't think we should tolerate that number of people dying. And that of course correlated directly with a greater number of individuals who are severely injured and permanently injured.

We know that seat belt laws, seat belts, and motorcycle helmets, for example, save lives. And we

know that keeping drunks and drunk drivers off our 1 roads also saves lives. So I hope we can do something 2 to improve not only the fatality statistics but also 3 the injury statistics in this society. 4 So, Mr. Skinner, you're undertaking a job 5 that has great challenges and I think great 6 satisfactions to it. And I know you've made 7 considerable sacrifice personally to come here to take 8 up this job and we look forward to working with you. 9 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 10 THE CHAIRMAN: My friend from Minnesota. 11 SENATOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a 12 pleasure to be here on this first meeting with you and 13 the ranking member and I look forward to a very 14 interesting and exciting 101st Congress. 15

> I too join in welcoming Sam Skinner. I don't know Sam well, but I have the feeling after knowing him a little bit that we're all going to know him really well real quickly. And I think that's not only a compliment to him but to President Bush and his choice of someone with whom he's had a relationship over a period of time and the confidence that he has

> Mr. Skinner, I don't want to ask any specific questions, but I wonder if it wouldn't be

> > **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

in his designee.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3.

appropriate -- if I could just ask one question, I need to excuse myself, Mr. Chairman. Would that be appropriate or is this just the opening statements?

THE CHAIRMAN: Just one.

SENATOR: Basically, this is more a where you come from kind of a question. One of our colleagues on the democratic side here has provided a lot of leadership on this Committee even before I got here on the issue of infrastructure. And while we've paid a lot of attention, nobody else seems to have paid a great deal of attention. It isn't even on the front page of Time magazine any more like it was four or five years ago. But Pat Moynihan has dragged a lot of folks in here to talk about the decaying infrastructure in this country, and a lot of that is in transportation but a lot of it is water works and sewage treatment and hazardous waste disposal. All my hazardous waste comes to your state and gets dumped someplace. I don't know where. But one of these days, Jim Thompson's going to do what the Governor of South Carolina did, I imagine, and issue an edict to throw up the borders.

But I just wondered, in the philosophic sense or where you come from sense, if you might comment briefly on your feelings on infrastructure in

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

this country and the role that you believe that your area of responsibility in making recommendations to us might make some contributions in the future.

MR. SKINNER: Yes, Senator. Thank you.

In 1984, the Governor of the State of Illinois asked me to assume responsibility in Northern Illinois for mass transportation, which was in a serious financial predicament and had been in somewhat chaotic conditions for a number of years.

One of the first things I did when taking over the chairmanship of that second largest mass transit system in the country is begin to deal with two problems: number one, the day to day operating assistance problem or the operating problems, which primarily dealt with some reforms in some financial funds for operation and to put the system on a sound operating basis; and then number two, I quickly recognized as I'm sure some other people did throughout the country that the transportation infrastructure for mass transit in Northern Illinois had not been addressed.

Over the last three years, we've developed a strategic plan for mass transit in Northern Illinois. I think it's probably the most comprehensive plan of any mass transit system in the country. It was

developed with engineers, with industry, and with consultants working with the various service boards within our system.

For the last two years, we have been trying to demonstrate to the public and to the Illinois General Assembly the need for state and local funding for the first phase of that multi-phase infrastructure program. I'm hopeful that this year will be the year that the General Assembly will address that problem and put the first phase into operation.

It became quite clear to me as I went through that process that the infrastructure needs of our nation are not limited to just mass transit. They are throughout the country. They are in all modes of transportation. They are in all major cities, especially the older cities of this country. Our bridges in this country are in serious condition.

And infrastructure, as you correctly point out, is not exciting. It is just the basic ingredients of a sound transportation system. I pledged yesterday before the Committee yesterday that one of our top priorities will be the development of a national transportation policy. And a linchpin of that policy will be to identify and then move forward on an infrastructure rebuilding program across the

country, across all modes.

So that's where I stand. My record, I think, in Northern Illinois shows I recognize infrastructure and am able to put a plan into place, hopefully to replace it. I hope to take that knowledge which I would admit is on a much smaller scale and put it to work at the federal level on the infrastructure problem.

SENATOR: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lautenberg?

SENATOR LAUTENBERG: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

I too want to join our colleagues in welcoming Mr. Skinner to what I think will be the first of many appearances before this Committee. And as you know, I chair the Transportation Subcommittee in appropriations.

As we discussed when we last met, I see transportation as a key ingredient in the future of our country both from the standpoint of the economy as well as the quality of life. If we can't move people and goods, we can't move this country forward.

The infrastructure reference that we just heard is one that commands great attention. It's falling down around us. You've warned about an

infrastructure failure resulting -- that has resulted from federal disinvestment. It's been estimated that we have a shortfall of as much as \$70 billion a year in infrastructure spending. Now, short-sighted policies played no small part in that legacy. Unless that's reversed we face an even bigger problem, our infrastructure's foundation. If it crumbles, so will in my view the cities and the economies that are built upon it.

We want to work with you to turn things around. Over the course of the next few years, we're going to be looking at how we can address this macroproblem, how we build new roads and bridges and repair the old ones, how we make airline travel safer and more efficient, how we keep cities from choking on auto exhaust through the better use of transit, how we develop better rail systems in this country.

So, I've been encouraged by your interest in looking at this problem in what seems to me to be a balanced and a constructive way. And I look forward to a positive relationship between you and this Committee and the entire Congress. You have a formidable task and I look forward to working with you and welcome you here formally.

MR. SKINNER: Thank you, Senator.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

SENATOR REID: Mr. Chairman, I have some 2 questions which will come in an appropriate time. 3 I just wanted to take this opportunity as 4 the other members of the Committee have to welcome you 5 here. I'm impressed with you and your resume, but do 6 recognize as you'll see from the questions that I have 7 and I'm sure other members that you have a burdensome 8 task. And so, I welcome you to this Committee and 9 look forward to working with you. 10 MR. SKINNER: Thank you. 11 THE CHAIRMAN: Senator? 12 SENATOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 13 I do not have a prepared statement, but 14 15 rather a request or recommendation for a point of view in your position. 16 It is easy to become overwhelmed with 17 yesterday's problems. Those need to be dealt with. 18 But I would suggest that one of the greatest 19 challenges that you're going to have is to look 20 futuristically and ask the question, what kind of 21 transportation system does the United States of 22 America need as we enter the 21st century. And we 23 have some major challenges. 24

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Reid?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

Our aviation system, as is true in Europe,

25

is getting further behind the demands that the public is placing upon it. It's going to take some new creative thinking. Our traditional ground transportation system is at the conclusion of a major national effort of the interstate system. Where we will go beyond the interstate is another challenge for leadership to the Department.

And the question of new -- or what to the United States would be new -- technology, such as magnetic levitation and other forms of high-speed rail transportation will be a third example of the kind of futuristic thinking which the nation needs from the person who fills your leadership position.

Your resume indicates that you are comfortable with that kind of visionary responsibility and with the other members of the Committee I look forward to working with you in turning those visions into reality.

MR. SKINNER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lieberman?

SENATOR LIEBERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, may I say at this first meeting that

I've been honored to attend as a new member of the

United States Senate how much I look forward to

serving on this Committee and particularly serving

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

under your leadership.

If I may cite a reference from another culture, they use to in China talk about quotations from the Chairman. I would begin my brief remarks to Mr. Skinner with a quotation of yours, which is, "We have produced a high standard of living, but we are beginning to see cracks in that high standard. And a less than adequate infrastructure has been identified as the cause."

Mr. Skinner, I'm delighted to have the opportunity to meet with you this morning. I come with some of the same concerns that other members of the Committee do. It seems to me that in part what we're seeing is that after your confirmation you will not only be the Secretary of Transportation but in some substantial measure the Secretary of Infrastructure.

I just wanted to add this one note to all else that has been said about that. I spent the end of last week and early this week in the hearings of the Governmental Affairs Committee on the nomination of Richard Darman, speaking about the budget deficit, but also acknowledging the fact that that deficit is symptomatic of larger problems in our economy, a lower savings rate and a lower productivity rate.

I had occasion a while ago to read an 1 2 article quoting a source close to you from the Chicago Fed. Letter, an economist, Davis Ashour, making, I 3 thought, a very compelling argument there, that there is a remarkable correlation between the rate of productivity growth and public sector, non-military 6 infrastructure investment. It comes from Chicago Fed. Letter of last September of '88. 8

> His data actually shows that a one percentage point increase of public infrastructure capital brings forth a one-third of a percent rise in productivity. So, paralleling the decline in our productivity rate over the last decade or two decades is a decline in our non-military public infrastructure investments. So that when we're talking about rebuilding the infrastructure, we're not just talking about it from a safety point of view or a quality of life point of view. We're also talking about it, if this article is correct, and I have no reason to believe it's not, from the point of view of some of the underlying problems of our economy.

> I hope, as you go forward as the Secretary of infrastructure, you will bear that in mind.

> > Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Symms?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

SENATOR SYMMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to be here also this morning to welcome our new members to the Committee, on both sides of the aisle.

But, Mr. Skinner, I think the President has certainly made a good choice in selecting you. There's no question that you face a very challenging task, but I think you certainly come prepared and with the talent to be a good spokesman for Transportation in this country.

As you know, I've had the privilege of serving both as the Chairman and the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee which includes the Highway Program. During that time I've heard a lot about our transportation system and have had the opportunity to see many of our transportation facilities on a first-hand basis.

I don't think that it could be argued that we don't have the best transportation system in the world, and probably Americans are the most mobile people in the world and I think that's a credit to the cooperation we've had, federalism if you will, between the federal, state and local governments, and of course a strong private sector that's been able to pay for it, which has provided the leadership with that

partnership to make this system possible.

Having said that, I think we've come to a point in our decision-making that's critical for the future of the transportation system and mobility of our citizens. And much of our infrastructure has already served more time and more traffic than it was designed to move, as you're well aware of. It's wearing out.

Travel forecasts show that car and truck travel will increase by an average of two to three percent per year just to maintain the highway system we have. And it will probably require a capital investment of \$35 billion to \$40 billion a year just to keep even with where we are currently. This means no improvements.

So as coming from a state where highways are so critical as we try to get our products from the farms to the markets primarily in the urban areas, most of which goes by truck, it's part of everything that people in my state do. And I think that's pretty much true around the country. It's involved in every business in the country, going to work, recreation, food, shelter, national defense. And we simply can't allow this to weaken.

So I hope that when we get to the question

period you'll have an opportunity to address the \$9 1 billion surplus that's in the Highway Trust Fund. And 2 I hope that you will be an advocate within the 3 Administration to promote the idea that we are deceiving the taxpayers by taking in dollars that are 5 dedicated to highways and then keeping them on balance 6 to make the budget deficit look better, when in fact then it detracts and expands the -- and makes the 8 problem worse in the long run on the highway program. 9 So I really look forward to working with you 10 and wish you the very best of success. It will be, I 11 think, a challenging four years for you. And I hope 12 that we'll be able to be successful to return those 13

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

dollars back to the states and get on with the

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Nice to be back after a lapse of two years.

Why is that funny? Mr. Chairman laughs. The witness laughs.

Well, let me pick up on what Senator Symms said. I think it's an important point. We have, as I understand -- by the way, in the intervening two years I can't see anything anymore -- we have a surplus of

program.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 \$8.8 billion in the Highway Trust Fund and a surplus of \$6.9 billion in the Aviation Trust Fund. If we're 2 going to collect taxes in the name of improving 3 highways and transportation safety, including air 4 safety, then we ought to spend them for those purposes and not impound them. 6 By the way, this isn't entirely the fault of 7 the Executive. I think the Congress has only been too 8 9 willing to play this game. Well, let me ask you your view. What do you 10 11

think about this situation?

I beg your pardon. We're not in questions? THE CHAIRMAN: We're not in the question period yet.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I beg your pardon. Maybe I need a hearing aid as well.

All right. Well, you get my drift. I have no further statement, besides which I need to make a phone call at 10:00.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Jeffers?

SENATOR JEFFERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a pleasure to be here on this Committee, following in the footsteps of distinguished predecessor, Senator Stafford. Whether I'll be able to fill his shoes, only time will tell.

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But I have many of the same interests that he does and it's a pleasure to be here, especially representing a small state in the Northeast corner of the United States, one of the most rural in the country, with serious problems with railroads and roads.

I certainly want to work with you as we try
to make sure that all of the country gets some good
care out of our programs. We'll be interested in your
work as time goes by. I have heard such wonderful
reports about you that I have nothing but great hopes
for the future.

MR. SKINNER: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Breaux?

SENATOR BREAUX: I just have some questions.

SENATOR BAUCUS: Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Senator from Montana.

SENATOR BAUCUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Skinner, I have just two basic points to make to you. One, somewhat following along the statements of the Senator from Idaho, Senator Symms, of the importance of highways in rural states. As you well know, a lot of us rural states have talked to you about essential air service and the importance of transportation in so far as the airlines are concerned in rural states. I want to make the same point when

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

it comes to highways and highway funding.

There are always rumblings that the Administration might attempt to change formulas or change allocation of highway funds which are disadvantageous to rural states. And I want to very strongly leave the impression with you that would be very firmly resisted by many of us in the rural states.

My state of Montana is the fifth highest in its gasoline tax. We pay, I think, over 20 cents a gallon in the State of Montana for gasoline tax. And that's to pay for the highways we have in our state. So any formula that takes money away from rural states means an even higher gasoline tax in those rural states, which is obviously unfair when you compare it with the federal gasoline tax which today as you know is about nine cents a gallon. So I strongly urge you to resist efforts to change formulas at the expense of rural states.

The second point goes to ironically the environment. I say ironically because it may be that the new Transportation Secretary will in effect make the Administration's first major pronouncement with respect to the environment. That's because of the cafe standards.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

23 As you know, your potential predecessor, 1 Secretary Burnley, recommended rolling back the cafe 2 standards from I think 27.5 miles per gallon on the 3 corporate fleets to 26.5 miles per gallon. The effect 4 of that would be to increase the emissions of carbon 5 dioxide in the air and other emissions in the air 6 which would have an adver effect on global warming. 7 Each tank of gasoline emits about 400 pounds 8 of carbon dioxide, each tank about 400 pounds of 9 carbon dioxide. And so I strongly urge you when you 10 review that decision which will come to you from the 11 Department of Energy to not agree to roll back -- not 12

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

27.5 to 26.5 miles per gallon.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions now?

recommend that the cafe standards be rolled back from

Do you want to be heard? Proceed.

MR. SKINNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a brief statement and then we'll get into questions.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, it is a pleasure for me to appear before you this morning on the occasion of my nomination to be the 10th Secretary of Transportation. I am honored that

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

President Bush has asked me to serve in his Cabinet, and if confirmed by the Senate I intend to work very hard to justify his faith in me. I am eager to return full-time to public service and to earn the confidence of the people I will serve.

Mr. Chairman, I will keep my remarks brief, mentioning just a few items of concern to me so that I might answer any questions that you or members of the Committee might have.

As Chairman of the Chicago Regional Transportation Authority of Northeastern Illinois, I am aware of many of the challenges in the transportation area. It will not be an easy task to meet our vital and growing transportation needs in this time of fiscal restraint. However, I assure you that I will endeavor to work with each of you to find solutions to the problem we face.

If confirmed, my principal goal in consultation with the Congress, the public, and industry, will be to develop a national transportation policy that enhances our public security and strengthens out national economy.

Your Committee is the architect and conservator of the Federal Aid Highway Program, one of the most successful public work efforts ever

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

undertaken. It serves as a model for cooperative efforts between the states and the federal government.

There has been great progress. The Federal Interstate System is nearing completion. And because of an increased financial commitment during the 1980s, the decline in our nation's highways and bridges has largely been arrested.

However, all of us must realize urban congestion is increasing and out rural communities face special transportation needs. A modern, well-maintained infrastructure of highways and bridges is absolutely critical to this country's well-being. I am committed to make sure that our investment is preserved.

I am aware that we are approaching an important juncture in this program. Although we do not face re-authorization until 1991, the debate and discussion over the future of the Highway Program has already begun. You have my pledge to work with you to develop an effective, long-range plan to deal with our infrastructure needs into the next century.

What is required is a careful and thoughtful examination of the legitimate role of the federal government and the states and new and efficient ways to finance the expanding needs of our nation's

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

infrastructure to insure a greater transportation return on every dollar spent. I intend to work with you and the transportation community in this effort.

In the meantime, I am committed to the completion of the Interstate Highway Program. Over the long-run, I am like President Bush committed to the expenditure of highway trust funds for the purpose for which they are intended, with ultimate expenditure of the balances as we make continued progress on deficit reduction.

I share this Committee's great concern over highway safety and I will make it one of the highest priorities of my tenure as Secretary. Safety is dependent on many factors including highway design, vehicle safety standards and maintenance, driver training, inspections, law enforcement, and the elimination of drunk or drug driving. The President and I are committed to make every effort we can to rid our nation's highways of the danger posed by drug or drunk drivers.

One important area of mutual interest is the national maximum speed limit law. I personally believe that the states are in a better position to evaluate the many factors relative to setting speed limits such as terrain, weather conditions, traffic

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

congestion, accident statistics, and police resources.

However, I am aware that the first of three annual reports has just been released on the effect of the increase in the speed limit on rural interstates. I will give careful and thoughtful consideration to this report. I will also dedicate the resources of the Department to aid the states in managing their law enforcement resources to better address the danger of excess speed. I am also very interested in assisting law enforcement efforts to recognize drug-impaired drivers and to remove them from our roadways.

I also share this Committee's commitment to protecting our marine environment. The Coast Guard has two major statutory marine environmental protection goals: to respond to oil pollution incidents and prevent accidental discharges. A patchwork of domestic statutes and international agreements form the legal basis for the Coast Guard's environmental programs.

I am part of an Administration that has pledged greater attention to the environment, so I assure you that I will work with this Committee to review the need for stronger measures to strengthen and consolidate oil spill liability and compensation to provide better protection for our environment and a

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

faster system for compensating the victims of oil pollution.

I look forward to your guidance and cooperation in this very important effort. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the Committee and I anxiously await your questions so that I can respond to the best of my ability.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Senator Moynihan is stuck in the Rules Committee right now. He would appreciate it if I would publicly express his regrets for not attending to Mr. Skinner, and announce that Mr. Moynihan will submit written questions for the record.

Do you have an opening statement, Mr. Simpson?

SENATOR SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, no thank you, sir.

I welcome the nominee and I've had a very fine opportunity to visit with him. I think he's going to do an excellent job. I'm impressed with his background and strength of purpose, which he will require in this task.

I might have a question or two, but I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your courtesy.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

THE CHAIRMAN: Apropos to what I said a minute ago, would there be any objection to having a five minute rule so everybody could be heard this morning? If not, it will be the rule.

Mr. Skinner, the State of North Dakota is currently de-mapping some of the local roads because state and local funding is so limited. Those roads are not eligible for federal funding. Many other rural states are in the same fix. The problem is compounded with the elimination of many railroad branch lines and the discontinuation of general revenue sharing.

What solutions do you see for rural highway and bridge problems in the days ahead?

MR. SKINNER: Senator, you've identified what is clearly a problem not only for your state, but for virtually every state in the nation.

As I indicated in response to an earlier question, one of the things that has come to my attention and really surprised me is that as a federal government we really have no national transportation policy in place for the long range. I indicated to you earlier that in Illinois that was one of my top priorities.

We put a program into place and a plan into

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

place that looks 30 to 50 years out, and then we are beginning to talk about the steps necessary to implement that policy and plan. Some state and local governments have done the same thing, but I find that at the federal government we really don't have that integrated policy.

It's quite clear that our nation's infrastructure is in need of substantial funding and substantial repair. But before we find ways to solve those problems we've got to have a policy that lets us look out long-range as to what our needs are going to be, identify the short-range steps and the areas that need immediate solution, and then begin to implement those steps as part of the long-range plan.

One of my top priorities as Secretary of Transportation will be to develop that national transportation plan. Obviously highways and bridges, given the role they play in our nation's transportation system, is going to be an essential and very, very important part of that policy. Once we've identified how big a problem we have, where that problem is, then we can begin to find solutions working with this Committee, not only for the rest of this century but into the next century, and not only for your home state but for all 50 states in our

1]

country.

THE CHAIRMAN: On the related rural transportation issue, what are your plans for implementing the essential air service program on which so many small communities depend?

MR. SKINNER: I've now completed most of my Hill visits. I've talked to most members of the Committee. I haven't been able to see all of them, but I hope to shortly. It's quite clear to me from those visits that essential air service is at the top of many Senators' lists.

I have pledged yesterday to work with the Senate and the House in coming up with a solution to maintain the essential air service subsidy level this year and get it back up to what was initially intended.

It is quite clear to me that there is sentiment in the House and Senate for that. It is clear to me that a supplemental appropriation or reprogramming bill will pass. The sooner that passes, the better off we're going to be. And I have agreed to advocate strongly to the Administration that when that bill is passed, which I believe it will, that it be signed.

I am also anxious to work with the House and

Senate, if I'm confirmed, in finding the way that these funds -- finding the source of these funds if it's going to be a reprogramming. And I believe that some members of the Committee who have expressed their concern are satisfied that the Department of Transportation will work in tandem with the House and the Senate in solving this problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that pleasant note, I'm going to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

SENATOR CHAFEE: Well thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Let me just say I don't share the enthusiasm the witness has for some of these subsidized airlines. I'll admit I don't come from a rural state, although we have been cut-off to some extent in transportation. But I would approach that with some caution.

I don't want to get in the middle of a large state, small population situation with you. I'm bracketed here on each side with tigers on the subject. But I read the other day that one of these subsidized airlines was carrying a passenger a day. That might be a vital service to that passenger, but we're in an era of tight funds and we've got to look everywhere if we bear in mind the realization that this budget deficit is a whale of a problem. But

we'll leave that for a little later.

Mr. Skinner, there are two issues that I would like to bring up in connection with the greenhouse effect. Obviously, you know what that is and the problems of global climate change.

The first has to do with the so-called "cafe standards," in other words the auto mileage standards for the year for the fleet. Now last year the Secretary of Transportation decided to relax those standards. In anything, I think they should be tightened if we realize as Senator Baucus pointed out what the emissions are doing to the atmosphere and the greenhouse effect.

My question to you is pretty straightforward. Do you plan to relax the cafe standards like your predecessor did?

MR. SKINNER: Senator, let me say that it is quite clear from everything that I have seen that the President is committed to a very aggressive program dealing with the environment. Part of that program will obviously include the Department of Transportation working not only with the Department of Energy but the Environmental Protection Agency on that environmental policy.

I would assume that a key ingredient of that

are going to be the standards that you mention. I come to the table with a clean slate on that issue. I have never had to make a decision on that issue. I have agreed to look at it from all perspectives, but especially with the environmental concerns in mind.

I am the President's wing man on transportation issues. I clearly plan to be his wing man on his pledge to protect the environment. And I will give serious consideration to environmental concerns when it's appropriate to make such a decision, after I've had a chance to look at all the information that's available. I do promise a clean look at it. I don't consider myself in a position to prejudge that issue at all.

SENATOR CHAFEE: All right. Well, I do want to stress that this Committee not only deals with highways, but it also is the environment committee. I encourage you in your support of the President, President Bush's comments in connection with the environment.

Now for example, he also has been a vigorous supporter of alternate fuels. And thus, we get into the ethanol/methanol situation. Now we've seen some reports that show that using methanol made from coal will actually increase the carbon dioxide emissions

and add to the greenhouse effect. And I'd be interested in having you take a look at that and reporting back to us on your views on that particular problem if you could.

MR. SKINNER: Well, I certainly will do -- I know that, having watched the President in Illinois, he's a strong supporter of gasohol. So I would hope that we can look at that. I know that he's committed to alternative fuels, but he's also committed to the environment. But we'll look at that as we look at these environmental concerns within transportation.

SENATOR CHAFEE: Yes. It's the methanol that --

MR. SKINNER: I understand, but I'm just-I didn't want to let the occasion pass without mentioning an Illinois product, ethanol.

SENATOR CHAFEE: Now the last question, Mr. Skinner, deals with the protection of the wetlands. The President has indicated that he wants to pursue a policy of what they call "no net loss." And that would involve what we call mitigation. If he's going to destroy some wetlands here, somehow he's got to attempt to restore wetlands, which is an extremely difficult and untested problem or solution on the other side.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

There's a recent report from the Interior 1 Department called "The Impacts of Federal Programs on 2 Wetlands." I would commend this to you or your staff 3 if they could take a look at that, particularly on pages 31 and 96. They deal with -- do you have 5 somebody here that --6 MR. SKINNER: Yes, sir, I just turned to 7 8 them. SENATOR CHAFEE: Yes. You'll learn to do 9 that automatically. That was pretty quick. 10 Pages 31 to 96, the report deals with the 11 current highway program and concludes that it's a 12 significant part of the problem of diminishing the 13 wetlands. I would appreciate it if your folks would 14 take a look at that. And if they could report back to 15 this Committee, I would appreciate that also. 16 MR. SKINNER: Thank you, Senator. 17 SENATOR CHAFEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I 18 19 see my time is up. THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lautenberg? 20 SENATOR LAUTENBERG: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. 21 Mr. Skinner, you heard the concerns 22 expressed by those from the rural states. I'd point 23 out to you that the structure of this Committee is 24 such that there isn't, as I quickly think about it, 25

not one New England state without representation here.

And we get to the Middle Atlantic states, New York and

New Jersey, very quickly. So we're talking about a

deep concern for the urban centers. The mass transit,

obviously, is an integral part of how we move -- maybe

not in parts of New Hampshire or Vermont.

But the fact is that if you take the region as a whole, we are very much concerned about rail service. And while our colleagues from the other states, the more rural states, are placing rural air service on a high priority list, you know that -- and we've had this talk already that Amtrak mass transit assistance is very important to me.

How do you see your advocacy developing vis a vis those programs? You come from having had some experience with a transit system.

MR. SKINNER: Well, I think that if one looks at my background, Senator, they will see that recently I have had a great deal of experience in mass transit, and I think I understand the problems of mass transit.

I grew up in the central part of the State of Illinois, which is farmland and has a rural setting to it. And of course, I went to school at the University of Illinois in Central Illinois, which is

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

similar. So I think I am able to identify with some of the problems in the rural area as well as the problems in the metropolitan area.

I am on record, as I believe we discussed, that I think in the area of mass transit that it's a partnership between the federal government and local government.

You come from an area in the country, especially in your neighboring state, New York, which has put together a very significant infrastructure rebuilding program funded by state and local government funding in conjunction. They have done an excellent job, as you know, in New York in rebuilding an infrastructure that was in serious need. But that was done as a partnership with the state and with the federal government. Both have a role to play.

I think the federal government cannot just pull the rug out from underneath mass transit while the local mass transit funding is obtained. On the other hand, I think we've got to provide incentives and inducements to have the local governments play a significant role and not rely totally on the federal government.

So I think that you will find that I am a proponent of mass transit funding. I am a proponent

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

of state and local share in that mass transit funding.

And I am a proponent of coming up with new and innovative ways to fund mass transit infrastructure particularly.

As to Amtrak, I would look forward to the day that this very important system is self-funded. They have done a good job of going from approximately 50 percent to a fare box recovery ratio of 70 percent. As you know from your experience in mass transit, a 70 percent fare box recovery ratio is a good ratio. We're proud of a 50 percent in Chicago, which we're now achieving.

On the other hand, it's a little different service than urban commuter mass transit, and I think we have to do everything we can to get that as self-sufficient as possible. Because, the day that happens we'll have additional resources available to fund the other areas that are of so vital interest to you and to other members of the Committee.

And as a member of the Board of Amtrak, I'm going to be examining all of the alternatives that can be taken to get them self-funded as soon as possible. The Administration, as you know, supported funding at approximately -- to OMB, the Department of Transportation did -- with a number of about \$300

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

million. That was rejected in terms of no funding.

We don't know quite where the Bush Administration

stands.

But that's basically where I stand on those two issues.

SENATOR LAUTENBERG: The self-funding is, I really believe, wishful thinking. The fact is -- and you and I concur on this -- that at 70 percent they're doing pretty well. Coming from a far worse position, not just the ratio of 50 percent, but from a totally bankrupt system to within some let me say modest proportional funding from the federal government they're doing a pretty good job. They could do an even better job if they were able to invest in capital goods, the capital equipment necessary.

I just want to be certain that if you say self-funding that that's not a code word for no support. I mean, self-funding -- if we withdraw all the subsidy, of course, they'll have to fund themselves.

MR. SKINNER: Well, Senator, I would only say this, that I'm going to look for guidance from the Administration on that. As you know, we have a budget on the Hill now that was prepared by the previous Administration. The new Administration will address

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

that issue shortly. I will examine the Department position and deal with that. But I'm going to have to at some point get some real direction from the Administration on it.

And let me just point out another problem what I think has to be dealt with as part of our national transportation policy, and that's the issue of infrastructure within Amtrak. We talk about operating subsidies at the level of approximately \$600 million. But as you know, because you live in that environment and represent the people that use that system, railroad infrastructures also need rebuilding. Mass transit does not have a monopoly on infrastructure.

So we have to deal and identify long-range with the infrastructure within Amtrak just as we have to deal with the rest of our nation's infrastructure and identify that and come up with a program to rebuild that infrastructure. When we do that, we can insure that Amtrak will have a future that will go beyond the end of this century, and I'm pledged to do that.

SENATOR LAUTENBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Simpson?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

SENATOR SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I particularly appreciate your sensitivity towards the issue of speed limit in your remarks. When we're in the area of transportation, I think it is very true as Senator Chafee says, he's bracketed by two senators who represent small states in population and yet huge in expanse. Without adequate highway systems, we really lack the necessities of life. The air service is very poor or nonexistent. And without interstates -- and I think North Dakota and Wyoming have the largest percentage of interstate highways of any state. We have three in Wyoming and I think North Dakota has a tremendous expanse. So, I appreciate that and setting the speed limits in that area.

Infrastructure rehabilitation, the issue as Senator Chafee speaks of, subsidized essential air service, I think we do have to look at carefully. The problem is that whether it's one passenger per day on the air or in Amtrak it's usually a Congressman who's the one passenger I find. And that makes it difficult. But let me tell you, the abuses within the subsidies of Amtrak are just as abusive as the subsidies within essential air service. So it's something we ought to look at honestly.

I do favor keeping the Northeast Corridor

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

have no problem with that. It's carrying a tremendous number of people. But certainly four passengers a day out on Amtrak just so you can take your kids in the bubble car once a year is not my idea of economy. Nor is one or two or five passengers a day in a 40 seat aircraft. So I'm ready to help with that, but let's realize it's a serious problem all around.

There's another issue that we'll address later. My state is a bridge state. With regard to tonnage allowances, we've resolved that at least until the year '90 or '91. When it returns again, I hope that you'll be cognizant of how important that is. We certainly can't be lesser in requirement than the states all around us. The Department of Transportation has been very helpful in the past and we appreciate that.

So those are just some things that I note, provincial things like we all do address here, and important things. I look forward to working with you. I assuredly do. I really don't have any questions. I thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Breaux?

SENATOR BREAUX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Skinner, once again. For the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

last two days you've been before the Senate Commerce Committee, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. You've heard Senators express to you their wishes, their desires, their needs for their respective states, and also a number of suggestions on how you should run your Department.

After hearing all of that, are you sure you still want this job?

MR. SKINNER: I think I'm pretty well committed.

SENATOR BREAUX: An absolute commitment.

Well, we're glad that you're here. And as I said yesterday, we're pleased that you're willing to make the sacrifice, and indeed it is, to take the job. We're glad that you're willing to do it.

There was a commission last year that made a recommendation that called for doubling the amount the nation spends on public works each year. Much of that money would go to roads, bridges, highways, and rail systems. That was the commission's recommendation. As the new incoming Secretary of the Department which would really be responsible for overseeing that type of a proposal, what are your general thoughts about the need for the type of extra building and improvements in the areas that the commission made a

recommendation for?

MR. SKINNER: Well, Senator, it's quite clear that we have begun to educate the American people on infrastructure and the need for increased funding for infrastructure. But I don't think that education process is complete.

As I indicated yesterday, infrastructure is not sexy. It doesn't sell. It doesn't go to the front page. We take infrastructure for granted. We take our roads and bridges for granted. And then one day when one collapses, we have a very serious situation that should have been dealt with.

It appears to me that when the national transportation policy is developed it is going to identify some very, very significant capital needs for infrastructure and some additional funding needs. Until we identify the problem, how big a problem it is when that problem really takes hold — in other words, what is the timing of that problem — it's hard to predict with any degree of certainty what our fund needs are going to be and when.

So I think there's been some short-range planning reports like the one you talked about. I think it's essential that we fit those into the long-range, then make sure --

(Tape change.)

3

4

5 6

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

MR. SKINNER: Once we do that, and if we do it across the board, with all modes of transportation, and if we build constituent support from users across the board as well as state and local officials, then we can create the national consensus necessary to find the funding necessary for that program. That program is obviously going to be tied in closely when the plan is done and when the reauthorization bills are up for the various modes. I know that's at the top of my list of things to do and I look forward to working with Congress on it.

SENATOR BREAUX: How do we address the problem that I think Senator Humphrey began to speak to with regard to the huge surpluses that are building up in the User Fee Program with the American people? I think the American people are willing to pay a user fee if the money, in fact, is being used for the purpose in which they're willing to pay it. When you show the surpluses that we have in the Aviation Trust Fund, the surpluses that are rapidly building up in the Highway Trust Fund, people start beginning to question shouldn't we maybe not be paying so much if we're not going to use it.

I guess my question really goes to the

Highway Trust Fund. Do you see a need down the line
to expand construction of highways and the repairs of
bridges and roads in the system? What are your
philosophical thoughts about what we're going to be
doing with the Highway Program?

I know we had a study authorized last year

I know we had a study authorized last year for extending an interstate segment from Kansas to Shreveport, Louisiana. Everybody says it's feasible and technically doable, but it's not in the program now and as it comes to an end, what are we going to be doing with it in the next decade?

MR. SKINNER: Well, obviously, we really have three trust funds that we're dealing with. Each of them has a little different twist to it. The Highway Trust Fund, on a current spending basis, if you'll forget the balance that's been building up, they've been spending the Highway Trust Fund basically at full funding and the balance has dropped several billion dollars over the last several years.

In many respects, Mass Transit, the real problem is Mass Transit cannot design and build some of the projects that are top priority projects as fast as they should. That's also true in aviation. So, it runs in parallel.

Number one, we should spend money. We

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

should get as soon as possible into an environment that allows us to spend the money in the trust funds for the purpose for which the money is collected. We should do that consist with law. The deficit reduction and budget balancing problem must be solved if we're going to convince OMB to allow us to spend that money to the degree that we want to spend it and need to spend it.

That, in fact, is probably not enough. We've got to identify, as I've indicated to you earlier, just what is enough. What is realistic to do and where are we going to raise that additional funding? The Reauthorization Bill is coming on line, so to speak, for consideration. Next year would probably be the perfect timing to address that. In the meantime, hopefully the Administration and the Congress will address the deficit and budget balance problem. But I'm going to do everything I can to make sure that to the degree funding is available, it's spent wisely and sufficiently and as quickly as possible.

SENATOR BREAUX: I have one short comment, Mr. Chairman. I know my time has expired.

Dealing with some of the states with regard to the Highway Program, prosperity has not reached all

of the states and mine is a particular example of where it has not. We have had trouble maintaining our roads to come of the conditions because of the economic situation down there, the lack of funding for the state.

One of the procedures that the Highway Department has used, the Federal Highway Administrator, is when a state is not doing the job, for whatever reason, if it's because of a lack of money, the penalty becomes taking away or withholding federal money, which makes it a lot more difficult for the state to ever get back on track in bringing the roads up to stand and the bridges up to standard.

So, I wish, as you take office, to look at that with an understanding of the fact that the penalty in many cases is not helping the state to ever overcome the problem. That's one of the concerns that we have in Louisiana.

MR. SKINNER: Well, let me say that incentives and penalties are for the purpose of insuring states that have the responsibility to make sure that they fulfill that responsibility. Now, that doesn't mean that there may be extenuating circumstances in a particular situation that would cause, I would think, the Department of Transportation

to be more realistic in its assessment of whether

penalties are appropriate, the ability of the states

to make movements along those lines.

You know the difference. The difference is they're just not doing the job. That's one thing. If they're incapable of doing the job for reasons beyond their control, that fits into a different category of problem and we ought to look at that with a little different perspective. I'll try to make sure we do.

SENATOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be a little bit provincial this morning. Being my first day on this committee, I want to make sure the people back home know I care about what's going on.

The first part will be just a statement of a situation which exists in Massachusetts or Vermont with respect to Amtrak, especially in view of Mr. Simpson's comments about the ridership.

We've had a failure of that line due to the fact that the infrastructure failed, a bad accident and then in combination with the railroad's desire to turn all the traffic south instead of north. We had a serious problem and had to get appropriation of funds, et ceterA, to redo a line and now we're in the process of trying to reroute.

So, the Montrealer, which had one of the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

ridden for a long time now, but is in the process of being restored. However, it is being terminally delayed. We've had delay after delay and now it's off into April before it will start running again. I just want to make you aware of that because I'm sure we'll be bugging you if there's another delay on that. It was one of the best, but due to problems it has had some difficulties in getting restarted.

My second question though is a little bit more difficult in that sense. It has to do again with Vermont and I'm sure it's true of other states, that the problems with our highways has resulted in serious problems for us trying to be able to keep track of the falling bridges. We're in the process now of raising our gasoline tax to one of the highest in the nation, as well as a diesel tax. They're also considering a weight distance tax for trucks. Our concern as to whether the federal government will be excited about such things or whether they would want to, as a national transportation policy, preempt and try to outline a taxation structure for the states such that if we get going in that direction we may find ourselves having to redo things because of preemption.

I wondered if you would give us your

feelings on the rural states and the transportation policy, especially in developing innovative or new measures of taxation in order to sustain and to improve our highways.

MR. SKINNER: Senator, it appears to me that it's fundamentally fair that if we ask states to assume a greater responsibility in rebuilding their infrastructure and they make the courageous decision, and I've been in the process of trying to convince the state legislature and an administration to impose some additional taxes for infrastructure. So, I know how hard it is to get there.

If we're going to encourage them to do that, we can't then be developing a policy that undercuts their funding, which obviously is a linchpin of any state involvement. We give lip service to state and local environment, unless we recognize they're going to have to find ways to fund it. It probably cannot come out of general revenues in most states. It probably has to come out of some other creative financing technique. If we now encourage them to do that, they are doing it. They are contributing to solving the infrastructure problem. I would hope and I would work to make sure that we don't, as a part of a national transportation policy, undercut the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

linchpin of the state and local cooperative effort.

So, that's basically where I stand. I think it's a sharing thing anyway. I don't think in some areas that the federal government should assume as great a role as it has traditionally. In other areas, given the nature of the problem, it may be as that policy develops that the federal government may play a slightly greater role. But in the areas you're talking about, my indications would be along the lines that I've said.

SENATOR: I would assume that it would also fall -- and I'm sure you've answered this question, but I have not heard your answer to it. That is that you would not look with great delight on utilization of the federal highway tax as a general revenue source --

MR. SKINNER: No.

SENATOR: -- for taking care of the federal deficit.

MR. SKINNER: Yes. I answered that yesterday, but I'll answer it again today. Congressman Rostenkowski, from my state and who I had the honor of being introduced by yesterday, as you know, has proposed that. One of the times we were flying back to Chicago, he and I had what I'd call a

somewhat heated discussion over that issue. He and I
have agreed to disagree over that issue.

I am not in favor of raising the tax period at this time. That is also the President's position. It would be difficult for me to understand from my personal viewpoint and from the Department's viewpoint, using funds that were intended for infrastructure or for highway, mass transit and transit, to use those funds for general revenue purposes when we've got the dire needs that we do.

So I think you'll find that I would be a strong advocate of using taxes like the taxes you're talking about for the purposes -- and that's what the President is committed to, consistent with, as you know, the budget reduction problems.

SENATOR: I would certainly agree with you. With all the infrastructure needs we have, as exciting as that may be to some people, it's certainly not very exciting in my state.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Reid?

SENATOR REID: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Initially, Mr. Designee, I am glad that you, in your opening statement, talked about drunk driving.

I think it's something that we don't talk enough

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

about. As we all recognize, 24,000 people were killed 1 last year by drunk drivers. I have a lot of other 2 questions I want to go into, but I would hope that you 3 would, in writing as soon as you get settled, give me 4 some ideas that you and your agency, your department, 5 will have regarding drunk drivers. As far as I'm 6 concerned, 24,000 people are murdered each year by 7 drunk drivers and we have to do something about it. 8 9 Okay? MR. SKINNER: Let me just give you -- one of 10 the first questions -- go ahead. Maybe I don't have 11 to answer it. 12 13 SENATOR REID: Okay. MR. SKINNER: I'll be glad to answer where I 14 stand on that if you want because --15 SENATOR REID: How long will it take you? 16 MR. SKINNER: I won't use your time. I'll 17 figure another time to do it. Okay. 18 SENATOR REID: First of all, do you know how 19 much nuclear waste is now stored in the United States? 20 MR. SKINNER: I do not know, but I know that 21 your state, along with a couple of other states, are 22 big depositories of nuclear waste. 23 SENATOR REID: Well, they're not yet, but 24

they're looking to us. But there's 70,000 tons

waiting to be hauled someplace. There are only two ways it can be transported, highways or railroads. At Yucca Mountain, the place that they're talking about putting it, they're trying to characterize now, there's no railroad. So that only leaves the highways.

Your predecessor, when asked some questions, said it could only be hauled on interstates. Now, if that's the case -- he didn't testify in person, he sent me a letter indicating that was the case. If that is the case, then it's going to be interesting how it's going to get to Yucca Mountain because we now have 146,000 truckloads ready to be hauled someplace. Plus, just to keep up with the amount that's produced each year, it's 3 to 4,000 truckloads.

So, if it has to be hauled on the interstates to come to Nevada, it's going to have to go through San Bernadino, California, Salt Lake. Utah, places like that, San Francisco. It's a real concern that hasn't been addressed in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and it leaves the responsibility to the Department of Transportation.

In the past, states have tried to stop shipments of hazardous wastes through their borders and the courts have said you can't do that. Only the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

Department of Transportation can determine what is hauled. So, I give this brief statement to you to 3 ask, first of all, have you looked into the nuclear 4 5 waste problem? MR. SKINNER: I'm aware that there is not a 6 unified policy regarding that and how we're going to 7 8 regulate that over the long-haul and that's one of the top priority projects also within the Department to 9 10 address. SENATOR REID: Well, it really should be. I 11 don't know -- and I say this respectfully, I don't 12 know that the Department is capable of doing that. I 13 can remember when the Secretary appeared last year, he 14 indicated that they were going to get a grant of 15 \$300 -- I'm trying to find it here. I don't know if 16 it was \$300 million or \$300,000. 17 MR. SKINNER: I don't think it was \$300 18 million, I hope, because we haven't got that. 19 SENATOR REID: The point of the matter is, 20 21 it should be. MR. SKINNER: I will say, Senator, you're 22 absolutely right. It's an expensive proposition from 23 what I understand to regulate that type of system. 24 Who is going to do that is also an important part. So 25

you've identified --

SENATOR REID: Well, you're going to do it.

That's the way the law now stands. So, you can't lateral the ball to anybody unless the law is changed, the way I understand it. It's a serious situation. We have now — in one of these buildings in the Senate side of the Capitol we have the Senators of Idaho, Colorado and I don't know what other states, all there saying, "We don't want it, take it someplace else." In fact, Governor Andress of Idaho has situated state personnel to stop, forcibly if necessary, train loads of nuclear waste coming from Colorado. It's even low-level, as I understand it.

So, it's a serious problem. The Office of Technology Assessment has told us that hazardous wastes alone, there are 6,000 incidents each year, accidents involving hazardous waste. But they told us that only about half of them are reported, so that means 12 to 15,000 incidents involving the transportation of hazardous wastes.

We know now that most nuclear waste is not being transported. It's stored. It's not being moved. When we start getting nuclear waste into this, we're going to have San Bernadino, California, Salt Lake City, Utah, as I mentioned, maybe San Francisco,

any place there's an interstate, thousands and thousands truckloads of nuclear waste each day being transported. And we have no monitored retrievable storage system which would cool it down. So we're going to have the most volatile, dangerous, toxic substance known to man, plutonium, being hauled through the streets of our cities.

It is your responsibility, and I would really hope that this Administration understands that it has a tiger by the tail. The mere fact that they're going to try to force the location of this on Nevada doesn't mean that Nevada has all the problems. We only have a little bit of the problem because you have to figure some magical way to get it there.

MR. SKINNER: Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR REID: I would just end by saying that I would ask that in addition to the drunk driving question that I asked, that as soon as you get seated in your office, if you would ask some of your staff to give us what they've got on how transportation of nuclear waste is going to take place, I would appreciate that.

MR. SKINNER: All right. We'll do that.

SENATOR REID: My time is gone. I have some other questions about essential air service, but we'll

that to some subsequent time, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lieberman?

SENATOR LIEBERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Skinner, yesterday in your testimony before the Commerce Committee on a couple of occasions you referred to yourself as a team player. Generally speaking, that's obviously appropriate because as a member of the Cabinet you are clearly a member of a team.

But it does seem to me too that there's a balance to be struck there. Perhaps part of the reason why, for instance, we've had a drop in investment in infrastructure funds is because some of your predecessors have not been willing not only to be members of the team, but to step up to the plate and swing, to be advocates for the needs to the Department of Transportation and the programs it oversees.

Are you prepared to be an advocate in that sense?

MR. SKINNER: Senator, I did talk about a team player yesterday. I talked about it as being a team player not only with the Administration, but with the Congress. So, I talked about looking at it as a team across the board.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

Number two, also in that testimony I talked for a moment about my advocacy. I indicated that I had spent the first eight years of my life, as I told Senator Lautenberg, as a salesman, selling a product for IBM, a very technical product. My strategy -- and I was somewhat successful because I got my case together and then with some tenacity I continued to advocate a position.

As United States Attorney and as a trial lawyer, I've been doing that, as you know, for many, many years. You really have to have the facts and then you go out and sell them. I think my record in that regard is also quite good. I have been a strong — no one has ever accused me of being a shrinking violet. I promise you I will not be shrinking violet when it concerns infrastructure.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN: I appreciate that. That heartens me because I think that is going to be an important part of fulfilling your statutory responsibilities.

If I may, this was touched on somewhat by Senator Breaux and Senator Jeffers, but as so many others, and I'm sure yourself, are troubled by the use of some of those Highway Trust funds derived from user fees for other than highway purposes. And accepting

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

somewhat parochial, I can tell you that in Connecticut right now where we do have a serious highway congestion problem, OMB's policy has meant that in fiscal year '88 we didn't receive approximately \$45.5 million in authorized federal aid highway funds. Our current backlog, and we're a small state of course, is \$166 million, which again is all money collected from users with the understanding and commitment that it go to improve our highways.

precedent that Senator Jeffers generally said to be

Are you prepared to do battle with OMB on that matter to make sure that the users get what they're paying for?

MR. SKINNER: I think that I am clearly-and do battle is, I guess, a proper word. But as I indicated a moment ago, the President made a commitment and he is a man that keeps his commitments. He wants to get those funds available for the purpose for which they were intended.

He has asked me as Secretary of Transportation to carry out his campaign promises, his commitments, and I'm going to do what I am told as a team player and advocate and remind the Office of Management and Budget that we are committed to this, that the President is committed to it. I am committed

to him and I think the Office of Management and Budget is also committed to him. So, I would hope with that kind of commitment we can reach that point in the not too distant future.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN: Thank you. I appreciate that answer.

advocacy in the area of mass transit. I know based on your background that you understand the strong connection between investment and mass transit and economic development. I gather that here in Washington is the handiest example. A substantial part of the economic growth that's occurred here in the last decade, as much as half of it has actually occurred in relative proximity to the Metro stations. So, there's a clear connection there.

In Connecticut, we have a similar situation. In fiscal year '90, we hope to receive approximately \$25 million in Section 9 formula funds, and \$90 million in discretionary Section 3 capital funds, aside from the operating assistance. We've got many priorities, including restoration of a bridge in Bridgeport and comprehensive bridge restoration along the New Haven Line and track maintenance, new facility improvements.

My question is this, the outgoing budget that the Reagan Administration submitted cut transit spending by nearly two-thirds. Are you prepared, and I know it's a short time frame, in the time between now and February 9th when President Bush comes before Congress, to argue within the Administration, particularly to OMB, that those cuts be diminished or eliminated?

MR. SKINNER: I have not had a chance, because I've been involved in confirmation hearings and Director Darman has also been involved in conformation hearings. I've not had a chance to sit down with him on the Bush budget. The biggest problem I face immediately is dealing with the budget, given the previous actions of Congress in the areas of mass transit funding and in Amtrak subsidies.

Given the commitments that I have made and the President has made in the area of the FAA and the Coast Guard, which I've heard from a number of members on the Hill, how we're going to handle this on various scenarios, and it appears to me what we're going to have to do is we're going to be operating under certain constraints from the Office of Management and Budget on a total picture and then I'm going to have to work with not only our Administrations but with the

Hill in seeing how we can satisfy it.

We can't be everything to everybody this year. I want to be as fair as I can in helping make those decisions with the Congress, in making sure that once they are made that at least the Congress is fully informed of all the implications. And hopefully, working with the key members of the committees, we'll at least reach an understanding as to where we have a disagreement. Eventually, obviously, the Congress will impose their desires on that budget and I will try to be as reasonable as possible addressing it all.

But it's on the screen, Senator, for next week, and it's going to be an all day session. It's not one I look forward to.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: What do you see as major highway issues now and in the near future and reauthorization legislation next considered? What will be regarded as the priorities in the Federal Aid to Highways Program as we renew the act?

MR. SKINNER: Well, I think the reauthorization, when it comes up, we're number one going to have to look at -- do some validation of the results. We want to learn from the experience of the act as it currently stands. By then we'll have

identified how big a problem we have out in the future. We'll then be in a better position to take a look at what any reauthorization should be.

It's clear to me that these programs over the years -- General Eisenhower, President Eisenhower, identified the Interstate Highway Program as a national defense program. I think we've gotten away a little bit from the importance of highways for national defense purposes. We're going to have to begin to remind people of that.

We've talked about -- our situation is changing. Our plan is going to identify a new economic environment or a predicted economic environment in the years 2020 and beyond, whether it be a system that allows us to handle safely and transport safely hazardous waste or move people on the Northeast corridor in modes of operation other than air, maybe with some kind of system that we don't-you know, high speed trains we don't even have today.

So, I think in those areas, and as well as the basic highway problems, the priority is going to be identifying how big a problem it is, what we want our system to look like and how we're going to get there.

THE CHAIRMAN: I've got another good

question for you.

MR. SKINNER: I'm ready.

THE CHAIRMAN: You ready?

MR. SKINNER: I hope.

THE CHAIRMAN: Former Secretary Dole and present Secretary Dole had a vigorous program for recruiting and promoting qualified women, minorities for positions within DOT. Do you share her views? If so, what are your plans.

MR. SKINNER: Okay. I've had the opportunity to meet with Former Secretary Dole and Secretary Designate and confirmed almost Secretary Dole. I spent an hour and a half with her recently. She was kind enough to give me some time to discuss her service as Secretary of Transportation where she had so many accomplishments.

One of the things she brought up and we discussed at some length was her program to increase the representation of women in the work force at the Department of Transportation. It's moved up slightly.

Let me just tell you where I stand on that issue briefly. As United States Attorney, I think I was the leading United States Attorney in the country in making employment opportunities available to women and minorities. I had on a percentage basis and a

total basis more women Assistant United States 1 2 Attorneys in trial lawyer positions and in supervisory positions than any in the country. 3 At the Regional Transportation Authority, I 5 have women in significant -- and one in particular--6 in a significant management position. 7 I fought as a trial lawyer as United States Attorney for equal opportunity within public 8 employment in very controversial law suits against the 9 Chicago Police Department and the Chicago Fire 10 11 Department and we were successful working with the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. 12 13 14 15

The President is committed to that involvement. My record shows I believe a level of commitment. So, I think my record on that area, where I have a clean slate in others, on that one it's pretty clear. My commitment is total and complete.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Do you have a question?

SENATOR: A couple, if I might, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Skinner and I have some similarities of background in that your service with the Transit Authority in Illinois and mine with the Port Authority in New York. You were a salesman, I was a salesman.

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We bought what you sold in my former life.

MR. SKINNER: You were more successful too.

SENATOR: I don't know about that. Well, you had an easier product to sell.

In any event, just going back to Senator Lieberman's comments about the advocacy role. Mr. Skinner, nothing is going to happen unless we get funding for our programs. Since I'm the Appropriation's Subcommittee Chairman, it's very tough if we have a pie of a given size to divide up and give enough pieces that exceed the size of that pie. We have Coast Guard and the environmental concerns, of course, are now a significant part of their agenda. Highway support, air, rail, you name it. There's a lot of competition.

The fact that you are going to be a major player on the Bush team obviously got you to this point. How do you view your responsibility as a secretary based on the laudatory comments that you got coming in here? I mean you've got a pretty good shot at this, I'd say. How do you determine how hard you push? When you go into the meeting with Mr. Darman, what's your position?

MR. SKINNER: Well, I think that -(Tape change.)

MR. SKINNER: -- similar responsibility.

Not only our days in the computer business and our days in public service in the local sector, but now you will be involved as a key member in the appropriations side in transportation. I will be involved, hopefully, as Secretary of Transportation. I do hope it looks pretty good. I'll be working with my people.

But the first thing I have to do, because you're on the power curve -- you're ahead of the power curve, Senator. You've been through this process and you know how this balancing takes place. I still know a little bit about the problems, but my first budget meeting, which will be next week, just to balance that, I've got to come up with a strategy and a scenario that makes sense given all these competing needs and given the restraints I've got.

Until I've sat down with my people, looked at their various budgetary needs, looked at various scenarios based upon a prediction of what we think might happen in the House and the Senate, then I can be in a position to advocate what we're going to do on the short-range and what we're going to do on the long-range. I don't think we're going to have a whole lot of movement on the short-range. There's not going

to be major revenue inflow on the short-range into 1 this year's budget. We've got to look at little bit 2 3 beyond that, but I've also got a short-term problem as to what's our strategy as a Department going to be.

> Once I make those decisions, and all I can promise you -- I don't know how they're going to come out. I want to listen to everybody. Whatever success I've had in government in the private sector is because I will listen and be fair. I will hopefully ask penetrating questions, be able to identify with good staff the right areas, what really has to be done, what can be put off and the impact of putting that off. Then we can come up with the scenario that, frankly, you and I will sit down with and try to work this out.

> I don't think you and I are going to agree on everything, but I think you and I have agreed to have open dialogue, in your office when we met, on a continuing basis on this problem with you and your committee and I'm going to do the same thing with the House. But you'll understand, at this point I don't --

> SENATOR: No, and I appreciate -- it's a balanced response. Don't always like to hear a balanced response when you're an advocate, but the

> > **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

fact is I also sit on the Budget Committee and that's coming up very soon. That review is coming up very soon and I hope that President Bush will interject into that program that the Reagan Administration left, the budget program, and that we'll be able to deal with it.

I would just, before leaving the subject, urge you to have a fairly narrow focus on this because the person who sits in a Secretary's seat who doesn't support the largest share of the budget they can get, in my view, is not upholding the responsibilities of that office. You're not an extension of the Budget Office and I think you've got to have to, as they say, let their mother worry about that.

and I really must tell you that I respect your constant reference to the longer range, to the balance. The system doesn't work well in that regard. The system here doesn't work well. The system there doesn't work well. The system there doesn't work well. You turn over FAA Administrations with administrations and decisions that maybe take 10, 12, 15 years to implement, just get switched in the middle and that's too bad. We see the results of that kind of change. But I would urge you to be as thick-Skinnered as you can.

6 7

9 10

8

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

25

23 24

Lastly, what I would say, Mr. Skinner, is this. You've made very clear your view of the speed limit thing. You know that I lost a battle on retaining the old 55 as a maximum speed limit on the federally involved highways. The initial report says that fatalities have increased. You say that states are best equipped to set those limits. Is there any point at which you would say, "Hey, wait a second. We're seeing too much destruction, too much death on the highway that, maybe coincidentally or otherwise, follows the increase in the speed limit."

MR. SKINNER: Yes, absolutely. I discussed that a little bit this morning in preparation for this hearing because my position is the state and local governments, and particularly the states, are in the best position. I give them the presumption that they want to protect the lives of their citizens, just as we do.

If there comes a point in time when the statistics and support is clear and they are ignoring that and they are just basically taking positions that clearly are contrary to fact and they are doing it in a way that has a significant disregard for the safety of citizens, then I think it's time for the federal government to give them some real incentives to get

involved in that. When I talk about giving them authority, I assume and presume that they have the same care for safety that we do. When I see that's gone, and heaven forbid they ever have a disregard for

that, then I think it's time to reassess.

SENATOR: I'll close, Mr. Chairman, I promise you, without too much delay.

I sense your indignation at the loss of life as a result of drunk driving on the highway and I get the feeling that you're going to be with us, those of us who care about that issue 100 percent of the way. I take pride in the fact that I was the Senate author of the 21 drinking age bill and we look at the statistics with a degree of some satisfaction. Over 1500 lives a year, young lives, are saved from death on the highways. I'd like to see us do better. That still leaves some 3, 4,000 getting killed from alcohol and driving.

We have another program that's in place, Administrative Revocation of Licence and so forth. I would hope that we could count on the DOT to pursue that vigorously and give us an assessment as to whether or not the incentive program that we've proposed does the same job as the punitive program that we proposed with the 21 drinking age when we took

away highway funding. That got a response, not always quick, but got a response.

MR. SKINNER: Well, this is probably a good point to take a minute. I think it was Senator Reid that didn't want me to take into his time. I do feel strongly, you are absolutely right. I do feel strongly about this. I feel strongly that it's a safety issue. It's a safety issue not only on the road but in the cockpit.

I have inherited a very strong drug policy, as you know, including a very strong random drug policy. The number of people that have alcoholic problems in this country is significant, those over 18. Those people should not be on the road, they should not be in the cab of a train and they should not be in the cockpit. We've got to provide the leadership role and I think they go hand in glove.

I don't want to be so arbitrary and capricious as to come up with an unenforceable program. But I think we at the federal government have to send a significant message to the states that we're not going to tolerate drunk driving. It is a callous disregard for the lives of others and I am going to be a very strong advocate.

SENATOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

Good luck.

MR. SKINNER: Thank you very much, Senator. Thank you for your time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lieberman?

SENATOR LIEBERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

May I state for the record that unfortunately I have never been a salesman, although I was involved in a political campaign last year, so in that sense --

MR. SKINNER: You did a pretty good job.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN: That was a year of sales. You and I, however, share another experience is that we've both been lawyers and in law enforcement. I want to ask you, if I may, two questions that come out of experiences that I had in Connecticut on transportation related issues as Attorney General.

The first relates to tandem trucks. Connecticut had a long-standing desire to prohibit tandem trucks on our highways based on the belief that they were unsafe, particularly on our congested, urban highway system. The Surface Transportation Act came along, we took it to Court. At least from my previous perspective I would say unfortunately the preemption clause remains strong and vital and we lost that

battle.

But Congress then came back and passed a Tandem Truck Safety Act which authorized states to apply for exemptions on certain highways at certain times. Our state department of transportation did that for I-95 between Greenwich and New Haven. I don't know if you've ever been on that highway, but it's extremely congested during the rush hours. Our application was for exemption during the rush hours. Frequent exits, average exits coming about one every mile, exits and entrances.

We lost that application primarily on a technicality and we're going back to bring it up again. I wonder, as a general statement, how you feel about tandem trucks on the highways and then, secondly, will you keep an open ear to applications for these exemptions when the facts justify them?

MR. SKINNER: Well, I promise to keep an open ear. You and I have been on both sides of cases, as you know, over the years and I've been able to advocate both sides. And on occasion, as an Attorney General or as a United States Attorney, we're required to make decisions, so we also kind of serve as judges in that regard. I think over the years I've learned to be open-minded and fair.

I start with no record, pro or con, in the issue of tandem trucks. I do feel that safety on the highways involving trucks is very important. I think there may be an increasing apprehension among people in this country about truck safety. I think we have to have, working with the states, a very realistic program in enforcing truck safety and safety on the highways in general. How tandem trucks fit into that over our policy, I don't know.

But I think the American people have a right to feel, just as they have a right to have confidence in their aviation system, they have a right to have confidence in the safety of their highway system. We've got to come up with a fair approach to this and a fair policy to this that recognizes the importance of trucking to our economy, but at the same time recognizing that our obligation to safety of our citizens, there's no greater concern than that. I think the balance of that, I'll try to do just to the best of my ability.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN: Thank you for that answer. We believe that tandems, based on the evidence that the state put together, have a higher propensity to be involved in serious accidents. We look forward to the opportunity to put that before

you.

2 3

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

MR. SKINNER: And as I say, I have no opinion, pro or con. I'll be glad to look at the facts and the briefs.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN: I appreciate that.

MR. SKINNER: I am pro pre-exemption now, you understand that, preemption. I'm now a preemption man. I think you probably might be too now.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN: Right. The last word that one of the Assistant Attorney Generals in Connecticut said as I walked out of the office on the last day was, "Don't forget the Preemption Clause," from the state's point of view.

May I say I appreciate your comments about truck safety generally because there's, apart from tandems, tremendous apprehension in our state and I assume throughout the country about the number of highway accidents involving trucks and a fear that that has something to do with the deregulation of the trucking industry and the fact that there are a lot more independent operators on the road, driving for long periods of time, perhaps not with the capital to maintain the vehicles in the best condition.

So I thank you for your interest in that subject and the priority that you are going to give

truck safety.

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

If I may, Mr. Chairman, ask one question from Connecticut.

Another case that we were involved in, this one we appreciated DOT's reaction. Going back to Senator Reid's question, it has to do with the transportation of nuclear wastes. I wouldn't be surprised if you faced this in the coming years with more frequency.

This was a case in which New York wanted to truck nuclear waste from Brook Haven Labs on Long Island, wanted to keep that waste out of New York and therefore to break the established DOT routing system which seems to say take it across the interstates and take it on the shortest distance between two points. This stuff was meant to go from Brook Haven on Long Island to Idaho. Our neighbors in New York had the ingenious idea of taking it north, across Long Island Sound, up through Connecticut and then west on 84 on its way out to Idaho, on the argument essentially, and I hope I'm doing it justice, that there was less congestion and fewer people in Connecticut than in New York and therefore risked fewer people.

But, needless to say, Connecticut densely populated state, particularly along the roads that this material was going to go and we thought that that break in the national routing system would be a very bad precedent because any jurisdiction with some more congestion and more people than a neighboring one would naturally want to get this nuclear waste off their highways.

The Hazardous Materials Transportation Section of DOT ruled in our favor. It was bounced back as the result of a technical question that courts had. It's now back at DOT. I generally wanted to bring that to your attention, ask you if you have any position on it and hope that you'll enforce that routing system.

Incidentally, this is not one of those Nimby cases. We have a lot of nuclear waste going across our highways from Northern New England because it's the most logical way for it to go, getting to depositories. But it didn't seem fair to us for New York to come up north and then west.

MR. SKINNER: I don't have any opinion. I just haven't gotten into the factual basis, obviously. The transportation of hazardous waste in a safe manner is going to be, as one of your colleagues pointed out, a very important part of the Transportation Department's responsibilities. To the best of our

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

ability, given that charge, we're going to do that. 1 But on this particular case, I didn't know, and I 2 3 assume under the normal process if it belongs or by 4 law it comes up to the secretary, it will eventually come up and I'll take a look at it. 5 SENATOR LIEBERMAN: Appreciate it. Let me 6 7 just say, the general point I want to make is that this -- no state, no jurisdiction will want this 8 9 material across its highways given a choice. This is 10 a classic area where there is a need for federal leadership and decision making, just straight ahead 11 without any favoritism either way. 12 13 MR. SKINNER: Thank you, Senator. SENATOR LIEBERMAN: Thank you. 14 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I want to thank the 15 witness for appearing here today, spending his time. 16 17 We thank you, Mr. Skinner. 18 The record will remain open until 5:00 today 19 so other members might submit questions. 20 MR. SKINNER: Thank you, Senator. THE CHAIRMAN: I hope that you can get 21 22 replies back -- how soon? MR. SKINNER: Soon. 23 THE CHAIRMAN: Two or three days? 24 MR. SKINNER: Two or three days. That's how 25

soon. Thank you. I want to thank your staff also. They've been helpful and I appreciate all your staff that's here and the others that already left. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: The meeting is adjourned.

1	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER
2	MATTER: U.S. SENATE CONFIRMATION HEARING OF SAMUEL K. SKINNER, NOMINEE FOR U.S. SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
4	DATE: JANUARY 26, 1989
5	I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE ATTACHED TRANSCRIPTION OF
6	PAGES 1 TO 83 INCLUSIVE ARE TO THE BEST OF
7	MY BELIEF AND ABILITY A TRUE, ACCURATE AND COMPLETE
8	RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS AS RECORDED ON TAPE
9	PROVIDED TO US BY THE AGENCY.
10	Judy Hadley 1-30-89 Transcriber Date
12	
13	
14	
15	

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005





Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs Washington, D.C. 20590

Contact: Bob Marx Tel.: (202) 366-5580

STATEMENT BY TRANSPORTATION SECRETARY-DESIGNATE SAMUEL K. SKINNER ON HIS CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE January 31, 1989

I am deeply honored and gratified by the overwhelming vote of confirmation today by the Senate. I look forward to serving the President and to working with the Congress, the public, industry and all concerned interest groups in developing a new national transportation policy for the 1990s and beyond.

The safety, efficiency and the future of our nation's transportation system will be among my highest priorities as I take this job. I will work hard to make all modes of transportation safer, more efficient, and less expensive for the American consumer.

#