

sorts of things. So that's what we did through the summer. Through the summer, what occurred was that this is not something that through one summer you can just say, here's the policy we're going to do. We need to begin to examine how does the process work and how do you bring these entities together, because there's a vast group of interests here. That committee, after we met, recommended this study group and this is more or less a group that begins to narrow down how the process should occur. This group isn't going to make those decisions. They can't implement them unilaterally. They're going to have to report back. The group goes out of existence January 1 of 1997. But the group recommended the Public Service Commission not have a spot on that. That's how the green copy of the bill was drafted. That's how the green copy was presented in committee. That's how the green copy came out of committee. That's how the copy got onto General File, and, quite frankly, I...Senator Withem, I don't believe there is a controversy here, but for...and I understand a representative of the railroad, not of the companies, but of United Transportation and, I'm sorry, I don't know the proper terms, has...UT, thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens, has raised the concern. But I will tell you what happened is the people who were directly involved, the locomotive, the engineers, the people who actually are involved in the collisions who suffer the trauma because of this were on this bill. They also, as a group, were here. They testified in favor of the bill as it was written. And during the hearing I think it was very interesting that the Public Service Commission, the Chair of the Public Service Commission when we began to question them...by the way, they came in neutral on the bill, said, no, we've always been used as a type or as an appellate type of court for local entities and railroads and landowners, which they have some statutory authority, but they're sort of the person, they're supposed to be the court in the middle right now under our statutory theme. And the policy reason for not putting them in is they're supposed to be the independent, impassionate judge. But to put them on to the group of studying closure sort of begins...because there are going to be sides taken in this, and to preserve the Public Service Commission's independence, we didn't put them on the group. Will the world end if they get on? No. Do I think it's good policy? No. Do I think that the people who were really involved with the railroad in terms of the union representation, the ones who are directly involved, were here, did participate in the process and decided that they, too, would support a bill that did not have the Public Service Commission in there. There