

to the extent contemplated under the original legislation. Extension of the project, if funded as set forth, would allow for catching up on the research and development, which is really the most significant part of the entire High Speed Ground Transportation project.

Although originally contemplated, the project was to consist of demonstrations within the Northeast Corridor, it was recognized that such demonstrations would have application elsewhere in the country. Unless the legislation is extended as set forth in the bill which I have mentioned, there will be no possibility for extending the demonstrations or even passing on the information gained to other parts of the country.

It is my understanding that you have been quite fully apprised of the technical difficulties with the demonstrations both between Washington and New York, and between New York and Boston, which have delayed the actual operation of new railroad equipment between those points. We, on Illinois Central, had similar setbacks when installing on our commuter operation what was then the first fully operational automatic revenue collection system (ARCS).

The booklet attached entitled "Private Breakthrough for a Public Cause" details rather candidly the history of the ARCS system, with its setbacks and pitfalls, as well as its accomplishments. In early 1967 the system was functioning so badly, with thousands of ticket failures each day, the Illinois Central was at a point of making a decision on whether to rip out the entire installation.

At the eleventh hour, a new read-write mechanism was developed by the manufacturer, solving the ticket rejection problem, and the automatic revenue collection system has now been extended to practically the entire 49 stations of the commuter operation and is doing a superior job. We have had days with as few as three ticket failures out of 100,000, which is much lower than might be expected.

My point is that there is a parallel here between the High Speed Ground railroad demonstrations and the ARCS pioneering. As a private enterprise, it would probably have been easier for us to reach a decision to rip out the equipment and write it off as a failure, but we stick with the project and really gained because of our fortitude. It is my sincere recommendation that similarly the time for the High Speed Ground tests be extended so that the demonstrations can be carried out as planned.

With the accelerating disappearance of long-distance intercity passenger trains in this country, there may be a tendency on the part of some interested parties to involve the High Speed Ground Transportation Legislation with the passenger train issue. I emphatically urge that the Congress not be so tempted and rather continue the development of high speed ground transportation systems on its present legislative base. The question of whether or not to provide passenger train service to some particular town in one of our states, has not any relationship to the High Speed Demonstration. To attempt to weave such an issue into the High Speed Project would only result in dilution of effort and, in my opinion, absolutely nothing would be accomplished from what otherwise appears to be a rather promising project.

Our Committee has given some consideration to the impending transfer of Urban Transportation Administration from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Department of Transportation. We felt that some of the research that was being carried out in the urban transportation areas, particularly having to do with access to airports, might also be applicable in the intercity ground transportation arena and vice versa. I suggest that no definite steps be taken at this time to merge the research and development efforts in the two areas of Urban Transportation and High Speed Ground Transportation. There should first be an assimilation of the Urban Transportation Administration in its new department. Administratively, coordination has been effected and will continue with both of these administrations now being in one department. At the end of the recommended extension of the High Speed Ground Transportation Legislation, the two important areas of urban transportation and intercity ground transportation can perhaps then be folded together based on the working knowledge that will be gained.

Finally, I wish to comment on the decision which will be facing Congress on this legislation. If the High Speed Ground Transportation Legislation is not extended, the Congress would in effect be pre-judging the merits of this type of transportation, without giving it the benefit of a full investigation through the demonstration program which, considering all factors, has been proceeding quite well. It is easy to set target dates that are too ambitious and perhaps prove to