

between the railroads who have deadlines to make as they run 40 trains a day, full of coal, east and then bring them all back through. We have blocked roadways and crossings and interferences particularly with the agricultural economy. It creates some hard feelings. The public becomes very frustrated because often they don't know where to go, don't know how to deal with that. Consequently, I get a lot of phone calls on that and I spend a lot of time certain months of the year as an intermediary between the public and the railroad. I don't think that is my job. I am happy to do it to the extent my time allows but I think the public really deserves some place to go to address their concerns. So what my amendment does is it proposes that when a member of the public has a problem with railroad operations that they think affect either safety, convenience or their own business, because sometimes the interests of the railroad conflict with the interests of, say, an agricultural pursuit, that member of the public can issue a written complaint to the Public Service Commission. The Public Service Commission can then go investigate that complaint. If the Commission decides that this person is just harassing the railroad, or whatever, they don't have to proceed any further. But if they do feel that the member of the public has brought a legitimate concern, the Public Service then is empowered to go ahead, hold a hearing and make a determination at that hearing whether there should be some regulatory action and the regulatory action that I have proposed is that they can then issue orders to require a manned caboose as they think is necessary. I think that is particularly important in terms of what I perceive as the role of a caboose and a two-mile or even a one-mile coal train in terms of crossings, which is a major problem out there. I think what may also be the result of adopting such an amendment would, hopefully, be that before the Public Service Commission had to take such a drastic action, that perhaps some communication and some efforts to resolve that dispute before it really comes to a head would occur and consequently we might be able to avoid some head-on clashes. Now, some folks have said, well, you don't really need to do that because you have the FRA and the public can go deal with that. All I ask you, folks, if you know your constituents as I know mine, are your constituents really going to go to a group like the FRA and deal with those kinds of problems? Mine are not. I suspect yours are not. They are going to want to deal with a group closer to home that responds quickly to their concerns and I think this gives the public an opportunity to go address those concerns. So, with that, I would urge you to support the amendment. Thank you.