

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC

-----X
In the Matter of:

H. STREET GRADE SEPARATION
-----X

OFFICE COPY

RETURN TO

PLANNING RESEARCH SECTION
OFFICE OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING
DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC

FILE NO: ^{5133a}
~~31.44~~ b

Wednesday, June 23, 1971

Washington, D. C.

WARD & PAUL, INC.

410 FIRST STREET, S. E.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20003

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC

-----X
:
In the Matter of: :
:
H STREET GRADE SEPARATION :
:
-----X

Savarin Dining Room
Union Station
First and Massachusetts Avenue,
N.E.
Washington, D. C.

Wednesday, June 23, 1971

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to notice, at 7:30 p.m.

BEFORE:

JAMES P. ALEXANDER, Director, District of Columbia
Office of Community Services

1 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Good evening, ladies
2 and gentlemen. If I'm pushing too hard on this microphone,
3 let me know and I'll soften my voice or if you can't hear,
4 also tell me. If you'll please be seated, the hearing is
5 called to order. I am James T. Alexander, Director, District
6 of Columbia Office of Community Services. I am designated
7 by the Mayor to preside at this combined Highway Corridor and
8 Design Public Hearing.

9 The hearing is being conducted to consider the need
10 and alternative designs for a replacement of the underpass on
11 H Street, N.E. between First and Second Streets. The underpass
12 separates H Street from the railroad tracks of the Washington
13 Terminal Company.

14 The Public Hearing will be held in accordance with
15 Title 7, D. C. Code, Title 23, U. S. Code, Section 128, and
16 U. S. Department of Transportation Policy and Procedure Memorandum
17 20-8 dated January 14, 1969.

18 In my capacity as presiding officer, I wish to remind
19 you of the intended purposes for Highway Public Hearings. These
20 hearings are held to:

- 21 1. Ensure that an opportunity is afforded for effective
22 participation by interested persons in the process of determining
23 the need for, the location of, and the major design
24 features of Federal-aid highways.

1 2. Provide a public forum that affords a full
2 opportunity for presenting views on alternate highway locations
3 and on major design features including the social, economic
4 and environmental effects of each alternative.

5 With regard to the H Street project, location is not a consider-
6 ation because the Department of Highways and Traffic is concerned
7 with the replacement of an obsolete facility. A combined Corri-
8 dor and Design Public Hearing is being held, therefore, for the
9 purpose of documenting your views on both the need for a re-
10 placement facility and the alternative designs that could be
11 employed in a new grade separation.

12 Notification of this hearing was published in local
13 and regional newspapers -- The Washington Daily News, The
14 Washington Post, The Evening and Sunday Star and the Afro-Amer-
15 ican. A copy of the legal notice, a certified list of the
16 newspapers that carried the notice, and specific publication
17 dates will be entered into the record at this time. Notifi-
18 cation of this hearing was accomplished also through approxi-
19 mately 300 direct mailings of the notice to other local news
20 media; to professional and civic associations, to government
21 agencies, and to individuals thought to have an interest in the
22 project.

23 As provided for in the hearing notice, a witness list
24 has been prepared from names submitted to the Executive Secretary
25 Office of the Commissioner, D. C. The names of persons and

1 organizations were placed on the list in that order. All others
2 wishing to be heard will follow witnesses on the list. I
3 might interject at this time that anybody who is not on the
4 list and wishes to be added to the schedule of witnesses can
5 do so by contacting Mr. Mike Hartman, who shortly will be
6 sitting in the unoccupied chair at that far, right-hand red
7 table over there. Mr. Hartman will be there.

8 Written statements may be submitted for inclusion
9 in the record on or before Friday, July 9, 1971, at 5:00p.m.
10 Such statements will be received by the Executive Secretary
11 to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, in Room 528
12 of the District Building.

13 A stenographic record is being made of this pro-
14 ceeding. Copies of the transcript may be purchased from the
15 reporter, whose name and address will be furnished to you upon
16 request directed to me or the Department of Highways and Traffic.

17 Although it is not my responsibility to make a de-
18 cision as to the type of structure that is to be recommended
19 for approval, it is my responsibility to see that this hearing
20 is conducted in a fair, orderly, and efficient manner. Only
21 in this way will the responsible officials have a complete and
22 accurate record upon which to base their decision.

23 I wish to reiterate that your views are earnestly
24 solicited. They will be considered in establishing the need
25 for this highway improvement and in selecting a final design.

1 You need not limit yourself to the alternative designs de-
2 veloped by the Department of Highways and Traffic. It is
3 appropriate for you to propose other designs as well.

4 If the hearing is not completed by midnight tonight,
5 I will resume the hearing tomorrow evening at 7:30 p.m. in
6 this building.

7 The first witness is Mr. Leonard A. DeGast, Assistant
8 Director, Office of Planning and Programming, D. C. Department
9 of Highways and Traffic.

10 And if I can get away from the written statement for
11 one moment, I hope that throughout this evening we can keep
12 on the schedule of the scheduled speakers, and at the same
13 time not be too concerned about the time constraints that have
14 been indicated, because we do want to hear and we want people
15 to be free to question and to raise additional points.

16 Mr. DeGast.

17 MR. DEGAST: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. I
18 am Leonard A. DeGast, Assistant Director for the Office of
19 Planning and Programming of the District of Columbia Department
20 of Highways and Traffic. I hope that I can be as informative
21 as possible in explaining to you the need for replacing the
22 H Street underpass and the two designs we have developed for
23 your consideration. I will be brief in view of the availability
24 of our information booklet a month in advance of this hearing.
25 I hope you found it convenient to obtain a copy from either

1 our main office or here at Union Station last week. Additional
2 copies are available here tonight.

3 First, I will describe the existing conditions.

4 The viaduct was completed in 1907. It has been in
5 continuous service for 63 years. Each day it carries hundreds
6 of trains over the thousands of cars and pedestrians that use
7 H Street.

8 Annual inspection by the Department indicates gen-
9 eral deterioration of the structure. Water leakage through
10 cracks in the walls and decks is causing the corrosion of
11 structural steel and, during winter months, the buildup of
12 precarious ice masses on the walls and ceiling. The picture
13 taken in January, 1971 shows this condition.

14 Please allow me to quote a few remarks from the
15 Department's annual inspection report.

16 It says that in the north abutment, "all the concrete
17 bearing stones between the two entrances are cracked vertically
18 and horizontally directly under the floor beams. There is one
19 full-height vertical crack and a number of smaller vertical and
20 horizontal cracks throughout the face."

21 In the steelwork, it is reported, "there is from 30
22 percent to 100 percent loss of section in the top flanges of 10
23 stringers at the bearing points. There is from 70 percent to
24 100 percent loss of section in the bottom flanges of 17 stringers
25 at the bearings."

1 With regard to the south abutment, "there are
2 several larger vertical and horizontal cracks in the face,
3 come of which have heavy water leakage and there are signs of
4 general disintegration throughout."

5 In describing the columns, the report says, "there
6 is heavy corrosion along the box girders for their entire
7 length. This condition is being caused by heavy water seepage
8 through the deck. There is heavy corrosion and scaling in all
9 steel in the bearing area. The end corner plates in most
10 columns are bent due to rust formation."

11 Ladies and gentlemen, this is just a sample of this
12 15 page report.

13 Insufficient lighting in the underpass requires
14 motorists to use headlights night and day. This condition is
15 worsened by almost no light reflection from the walls and
16 ceiling making stalled vehicles or jaywalkers or other obstacles
17 difficult to see. The two rows of columns, dividing the
18 underpass into three sections, make the tunnel lights and on-
19 coming auto headlights look like they are being turned on and
20 off in rapid succession. This makes visibility even worse.

21 Certainly a pedestrian does not feel very secure in
22 the dark, damp and sometimes icy underpass. But these are the
23 conditions under which the existing facility is used. We
24 believe that there is, therefore, an urgent need to build a
25 modern, safe facility in the best interests of pedestrians

1 and motorists alike.

2 Now let me discuss the alternate design proposals.

3 We have studied a variety of possibilities. From
4 among these, the Department has identified two feasible de-
5 signs--an underpass and an overpass. Since either alternative
6 is implementable, the final selection must be based on a com-
7 parison of the benefits and requirements of each. We are
8 asking you to assist in this assessment. Obviously, both
9 alternatives will link the areas to the east and west of the
10 Washington Terminal Company tracks. On the other hand, only
11 one of the two designs will accommodate a new bus terminal
12 at the proposed National Visitor Center. There are other con-
13 siderations as well.

14 The underpass design alternative retains the existing
15 relationship between street and railroad--that is, the eleva-
16 tions of the railroad and street remain essentially as they
17 are. This design permits continued use of all other existing
18 streets and intersections in the vicinity of the project.
19 Actual construction limits are First Street, N. E. and Second
20 Street, N. E. The width includes six traffic lanes separated
21 by a median and sidewalks on each side. No right-of-way pur-
22 chases are required with this plan.

23 One major drawback of the underpass design is inac-
24 cessibility to the inter-city bus terminal planned in conjunc-
25 tion with the National Visitor Center. The Visitor Center is

1 envisioned as a major terminal where people can easily
2 transfer from intercity buses and trains to local buses, Metro
3 service and taxis.

4 Better coordination of transportation modes, par-
5 ticularly the several forms of public transportation, is
6 absolutely necessary in our city if government, business, and
7 tourist activities are to grow as anticipated. Because it
8 is impractical to build bus ramps from the underpass, imple-
9 mentation of this alternative will result in the elimination
10 of a much needed union bus terminal from the Visitor Center
11 Plan. Worse than that, loss of the bus terminal will handicap
12 our efforts to better integrate public transportation services
13 in the city.

14 Now lets look at the overpass alternate. This plan
15 places H Street on a bridge above the Washington Terminal
16 Company railroad facilities. First Street, N. E. and Second
17 Street, N. E. are bridged by the ramped approaches to the
18 overpass. This design alternative, therefore, assures con-
19 tinued use of all existing streets, but the intersections of
20 H Street with First and Second Streets are replaced by grade
21 separations. The extent of actual construction is from North
22 Capitol Street to Third Street, N. E.

23 Access to the combined National Visitor and Trans-
24 portation Center is a significant attribute of the overpass
25 design. The design permits the operation of buses, as well as

1 automobiles, into the Center from the overpass alternate.
2 The design also facilitates an escalator connection and
3 moving sidewalk for Metro patrons wishing to transfer to and
4 from bus routes on H Street.

5 But this, incidentally, would also be true if the
6 underpass alternative were selected.

7 The proposed overpass is wide enough to accommodate
8 turn slots so that through traffic can move freely over the
9 structure.

10 To gain the advantages of the overpass, however,
11 property acquisition is required because the height will pro-
12 hibit continued access from H Street to several abutting
13 properties.

14 On the north side of H Street between North Capitol
15 and First, three buildings are affected--the National Savings
16 and Trust Company, Quinn Patent Drawing Service, Inc., and
17 the Northeast Capitol Auto Wash, Inc. Two vacant parcels with
18 156 foot frontages and one parcel leased to the Ken Jones Cor-
19 poration with a 40 foot frontage are also affected. Access
20 to the 801 North Capitol Street Office Building will remain.

21 On the opposite side of H Street to the south, the
22 impact is not as severe. The motorcycle shop and the liquor
23 store now located there are not permanent tenants and will be
24 relocated in the future in any case as part of the Urban Re-
25 newal Plan.

1 On the south side of H Street (between Second and
2 Third Streets, N. E.), 14 row houses and one gas station will
3 lose access to H Street. The Little Sisters of the Poor
4 Nursing Home will be minimally affected by the overpass design.

5 I want to emphasize that the Department of Highways
6 and Traffic is committed to the policy of withholding all
7 property acquisition until each property owner and tenant is
8 assured of quarters meeting health and safety standards and
9 comparable to his vacated premises. This policy is without
10 exception. We are especially pleased to administer a reloca-
11 tion program that authorizes financial compensation for vir-
12 tually every cost associated with moving. If the overpass
13 alternative becomes the approved design, a complete relocation
14 plan will be developed by the Redevelopment Land Agency prior
15 to any property acquisition. Relocation will be discussed in
16 further detail by an RLA representative following my presenta-
17 tion.

18 The social, economic and environmental effects of
19 rebuilding the H Street grade separation deserve the utmost
20 consideration. We have spelled out the results of our
21 analyses in the information booklet.

22 Certainly, safer conditions for pedestrians and
23 motorists will result. Modernizing this facility will not
24 conflict with efforts to rejuvenate H Street corridor activity--
25 indeed, it should complement these efforts. Our traffic

1 analyses indicate that six lanes is sufficient to serve
2 both local traffic and intercity traffic destined to the
3 Visitor Center. We look very expectantly toward virtually
4 clean-air vehicles from the assembly lines at about the same
5 time the H Street project could be finished--around 1975--
6 either alternative is a four and one-half year job. We are
7 not quite as confident about the reduction of noise levels
8 in the future, but Federal government studies corrently under-
9 way promise some heretofore non-existent noise standards.
10 They will probably be applicable to our highway facilities as
11 well as to vehicles. To the extent they apply, and as tech-
12 nology permits during our design process, we will undertake
13 measures to reduce traffic noises.

14 As reflected in our information booklet, both alter-
15 natives involve the detouring of traffic while construction
16 is underway. We know that overpass construction will limit
17 detours to not more than three years--perhaps less time if
18 we can work out the appropriate construction stages during
19 the final design.

20 The estimated cost of the underpass is \$3.6 million
21 more than for the overpass. But our Federal-aid funds would
22 cover the entire cost of the underpass whereas the District's
23 Highway Fund would have to underwrite an estimated \$700,000
24 share of the right-of-way cost to build the overpass.
25

1 I wish to re-emphasize Mr. Alexander's request for
2 your comments and for any design variations you may wish to
3 present at this time. The Department will analyze the com-
4 plete hearing transcript in selecting the type of grade
5 separation for which we will prepare construction plans. Your
6 testimony will involve you in the process of determining the
7 major design features of the replacement H Street grade sep-
8 aration.

9 Our choice for this project, based on transcript
10 evaluation and information assembled from other sources, will
11 be announced in local newspapers at the same time we submit our
12 recommendation to the Federal Highway Administration. It is
13 only after approval by that agency of the U. S. Government
14 that final plans can be prepared.

15 The Public Hearing Information H Street Grade Sep-
16 aration booklet, which addresses in detail the preliminary
17 plans and profiles of the two alternatives, will be inserted
18 into the record at this time.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

H STREET GRADE SEPARATION

14

PERTINENT INFORMATION AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION AND COPYING

Brochures

1. Public Hearing Information H Street Grade Separation. D. C. Department of Highways and Traffic, 1971.
2. Relocation Information for Residents located on Highway Projects in the District of Columbia. D. C. Department of Highways and Traffic and Redevelopment Land Agency, 1970.
3. Relocation Information for Business and Non-Profit Organizations Located on Highway Projects in the District of Columbia. D. C. Department of Highways and Traffic and Redevelopment Land Agency, 1970.

Reports

4. The Feasibility of a Combined Intercity Bus and Rail Terminal At the National Visitor Center. The Offices of Seymour Auerbach, A.I.A., June 19, 1970.
5. Union Station Transportation Center Study. Conklin & Rossant, October 29, 1970.
6. Report to Model Cities Committee Regarding H Street at National Visitor Center. D. C. Department of Highways and Traffic, Response to questions of meeting on July 1, 1970.
7. Impact of Parking and Union Bus Facilities at National Visitor Center. Alan M. Voorhees & Associates, Inc., October 1969.
8. Annual Bridge Inspection Report. D. C. Department of Highways and Traffic, February 3, 1967.
9. Urban Renewal Plan for the H Street Urban Renewal Area. National Capital Planning Commission, June 25, 1970.
10. The National Register of Historic Places 1969. United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Washington, D. C., 1969.
11. Urban Renewal Plan for Northeast Urban Renewal Area Project No. 1. D. C. Redevelopment Land Agency, October 10, 1963.

Letters, Memoranda, Statements
and Transcripts

12. Recommendations of District of Columbia Model Cities Commission. Physical Planning Standing Committee, June 2, 1970.
13. Letters Reflecting Community Participation. Model Cities Commission to District of Columbia Government and National Capital Planning Commission, June 4, 1970.
14. Correspondence between Department of the Interior and Department of Transportation regarding Visitor Center. January 27, 1970.
15. Authorization for Preliminary Engineering for Survey and Plan Preparation. Department of Transportation to D. C. Department of Highways and Traffic, April 23, 1964.
16. Approval of a Revision of a Federal-Aid Secondary Highway System in the District of Columbia. Bureau of Public Roads to D. C. Department of Highways and Traffic, November 1, 1961.
17. Questions and Answers, National Visitors Center Plans. National Capital Planning Commission and Community.
18. Correspondence between the Washington Terminal Company and the District of Columbia. January 23, 1970.
19. Correspondence between National Capital Planning Commission and Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority regarding issues involving Metro Station with entrances from H Street. May 14, 1970.

Guidelines

20. A Policy on Arterial Highways in Urban Areas. American Association of State Highway Officials, 1957.
21. Clean Air Amendment of 1970
22. Control of Air Pollution from New Motor Vehicles and New Motor Vehicle Engines. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968.
23. Relocation Assistance and Payments (IM 80-1-68). U. S. Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration, 1968.

24. Public Hearings and Location Approval (PPM 20-8). U. S. Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration, 1969.
25. Federal Laws, Regulations and Material Relating to the Federal Highway Administration. U. S. Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration, 1970.
26. National Visitor Center Facilities Act of 1968.

Displays for Public Inspection

27. National Visitor Center Model.
28. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Rapid Transit Development Program. General Plan.

1 I hope you have found time to look at some of the
2 exhibits placed to my right. They are large-scale drawings
3 of the exhibits found in the information booklet with a bit
4 of dressing up to help you to understand them better. Now,
5 if you should have questions concerning any of these exhibits,
6 I or members of my staff, Mr. Hartman, Mr. Cornwell will be
7 happy to respond, hopefully to your satisfaction. Thank you.

8 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Thank you, Mr. DeGast.
9 I assume you will be standing by. For the benefit of those
10 who came in late, I might point out that we have on the agenda
11 right now one more government witness and nine public
12 witnesses who indicated a desire to make statements earlier.
13 Anybody who desires to make a statement tonight or to raise
14 questions tonight only needs to check in with Mr. Mike Hartman
15 at the far red table, and it will be on a first-come first-
16 serve basis added to the list we presently have. Other persons
17 who still desire to put in additional written statements may
18 submit them on or before Friday, July 9.

19 The next witness is Mr. James A. Brown, and he will
20 speak with Mr. Larry Press in tandem, representing RLA view-
21 points at this time. Will you please be seated in front of
22 me and as a matter of sequence, gentlemen?

23 Mr. Press.

24 MR. PRESS: Mr. Chairman, I am Lawrence Press, Dir-
25 ector of the Redevelopment Land Agency's Office of Planning

1 and Design and I have a statement on behalf of the Agency
2 concerning the impact of the proposed H Street Grade Separ-
3 ation on the abutting urban renewal projects - the Northeast
4 Urban Renewal Area Project No. 1, to the west of the railroad
5 tracks, and the H Street Northeast Urban Renewal Area to the
6 east of the tracks.

7 The public documents provided by the D. C. Highway
8 Department show that the construction of an H Street Grade
9 Separation or Ramp rather than the rebuilding of the existing
10 H Street tunnel would result in lower construction costs and
11 also provide a means of auto and bus access to the north end
12 of the parking garage which is to be built in conjunction with
13 the National Visitor's Center to be located at Union Station.

14 We have reviewed the materials and discussed the
15 proposal and its effect on these projects with the Highway
16 Department and find that the proposed H Street Ramp would
17 cause two major, but not necessarily insurmountable, problems
18 with respect to the Northeast No. 1 Urban Renewal Area. The
19 first issue would be the need to modify the Urban Renewal Plan
20 to carry out the Ramp proposal and the timing of such a Plan
21 change. The second problem deals with the disposition of those
22 properties in the Northeast No. 1 project that will have to be
23 acquired by the Highway Department in order to carry out the
24 Ramp proposal.
25

1 It should be noted that the alternative proposal -
2 the rebuilding of the existing H Street underpass - would have
3 no direct impact on abutting land uses and consequently would
4 cause no major problems for the Agency in carrying out these
5 renewal programs.

6 As noted in the informational material prepared by
7 the Department of Highways and Traffic, implementation of the
8 overpass alternative would affect five property owners along
9 the north side of H Street in the Northeast No. 1 Urban Renewal
10 Area. The properties in question are (1) the Small-Chatelain
11 Office Building; (2) the National Savings and Trust Company
12 Bank; (3) the Quinn Patent Drawing Service, Inc., Building;
13 (4) the Northeast Capitol Auto Car Wash; and (5) the Ken
14 Jones Corporation. Of these, only the Small-Chatelain Building
15 would remain, although it would probably be necessary to mod-
16 ify access to its parking facilities either from H Street or
17 North Capitol Street.

18 The Small-Chatelain Building, the bank building, and
19 the Quinn building were constructed on the building line. The
20 car-wash building is set back about 20 feet from the building
21 line. Ken-Jones Food Service has not yet started construction.
22 The proposed ramp would occupy the entire right-of-way space
23 up to the front of the bank and Quinn's and eliminate their
24 existing access from H Street. In the case of the Small-Chate-
25 lain building, the ramp would begin approximately at the

1 eastern wall of the building and be elevated at a grade of
2 about 2 - 3 feet above the parking area and its entrance.

3 Building the Ramp along H Street at the proposed
4 grade would result in street elevations that would bisect
5 the existing building frontage of the bank and Quinn's, and
6 the new street would actually be above the car-wash and the
7 Ken-Jones property. Thus, with the exception of the Small-
8 Chatelain building, the remaining properties would have to
9 be acquired and the affected owners relocated.

10 The Agency's General Counsel and the Corporation
11 Counsel for the District of Columbia have determined that
12 implementation of the Ramp proposal would necessitate a Plan
13 change to the Northeast No. One Urban Renewal Plan, and that
14 this change would, in accordance with Section 5-711 of the
15 D.C. Redevelopment Act of 1945, require the written consent
16 of all the affected property owners.

17 At a meeting held at the Agency on April 13th the
18 staff of the Agency and the Highway Department explained the
19 Ramp proposal, as well as the rights of the affected property
20 owners. At this session, the major concerns expressed by
21 the owners dealt with the adequacy and timeliness of com-
22 pensation for any property acquisition required by this pro-
23 posal, and also with the adequacy of relocation assistance.

24 However, Section 5-718(a) of the District of Columbia
25 Redevelopment Act of 1945 denies any Federal or District

1 government Agency the "power to . . . depart from any feature
2 or detail of an approved redevelopment plan . . . unless such
3 . . . departure be adopted by the Planning Commission and
4 approved by the District of Columbia Council . . . or unless
5 the . . . departure be approved by Act of Congress". We
6 believe that this requirement means that no definitive de-
7 cision on the overpass alternative can be made until the
8 required Plan change to Northeast No. One Urban Renewal Plan
9 has been completed. Such a Plan change would have to be
10 adopted by the National Capitol Planning Commission and,
11 after a public hearing approved by the City Council, and
12 would have to be proceeded by the written consent of the af-
13 fected redevelopers.

14 The second issue is the reuse of acquired properties.
15 The property to be purchased by the D.C. Highway Department
16 in the Northeast No. 1 Project, together with an existing
17 large uncommitted Agency-owned parcel along the north side
18 of H Street, amounts to approximately 100,000 square feet of
19 land with a 430 foot H Street frontage. The purchased pro-
20 perties will not be dedicated for highway use and accordingly
21 will be available for future redevelopment. We are therefore
22 concerned, with the future reuse of these properties and with
23 the mechanism through which these properties will be disposed
24 of for development.

25 The Northeast No. 1 development controls would still

1 apply to the properties purchased by the Highway Department
2 and, further, we believe that this property should be turned
3 over to this Agency for disposition. This would assure both
4 the inclusion of the renewal plan controls in the future
5 development, and an appropriate utilization of the purchased
6 property by its assembly with existing uncommitted land al-
7 ready owned by the Agency. This leads to a second issue; the
8 technique by which the Agency would receive the property for
9 eventual disposition.

10 There is indication that because of limited funds,
11 the Department of Housing and Urban Development would be
12 unwilling to provide any new project funds toward the purchase
13 of these affected properties by the Agency. Therefore, the
14 Highway Department would have to transfer these properties to
15 the Agency for an amount not to exceed the expected disposition
16 proceeds from Agency resale. If the proceeds from the future
17 resale of this land were less than the cost of acquisition,
18 this loss would have to be borne by the Highway Department
19 and not by the Agency. We think that it is important that
20 this funding constraint be noted, as it may pose a major
21 problem for the Highway Department.

22 Finally, the overpass alternative would require the
23 taking of properties in the H Street Urban Renewal Area, along
24 the south side of H Street between 2nd and 3rd Streets, N.E.
25 This frontage is not within a designated action area, however,

1 the Agency would like to note that any reuse of this affected
2 area should be consistent with the H Street Urban Renewal Plan
3 and with the general land use objectives established therein.
4 The Agency is committed to a process of citizen participation
5 in the Urban Renewal Program, and representatives from the
6 various involved community organizations will present their
7 positions during the course of these hearings.

8 With respect to the Northeast #1 problem, if, after
9 appropriate consultation with the community and with the
10 consent of the affected redevelopers and after agreement on
11 other steps discussed above, should the District of Columbia
12 Government decide to proceed with the Ramp proposal, the
13 Agency would do everything it could to expedite the required
14 Plan change and to assist in any way that would be meaningful.

15 Mr. James Brown, the Agency's Assistant Executive
16 Director associated with the Office of Relocation Assistance,
17 will identify the anticipated relocation impact which the
18 Ramp proposal would generate, and will summarize the reloca-
19 tion services and benefits available to affected residents
20 and businesses.

21 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Thank you, Mr. Press.

22 Mr. Brown.

23 MR. BROWN: My name is James A. Brown and I am
24 Assistant Executive Director, associated with the Relocation
25 Assistance Office of the D. C. Redevelopment Agency.

1 The Relocation Assistance Office, consisting of
2 separate Family and Business Branches, was established within
3 the Agency under the terms of the D. C. Relocation Act of
4 1964. The primary function of the Office is to assist
5 families, individuals and businesses required to move as a
6 result of any public action taking place in the District of
7 Columbia. Such public action, of course, includes highway
8 projects.

9 Representatives of the Family Relocation Branch
10 assist families and individuals in finding decent, safe and
11 sanitary housing and also provides referrals for social
12 services conducted by both public and private agencies, such
13 as welfare services, employment counseling, job training,
14 health services and the like.

15 The Business Relocation Branch assists businesses
16 required to move as a result of public action in finding
17 alternate locations for their operations and also offers help
18 in contacting the Small Business Administration and other
19 public and private organizations providing services to
20 businesses.

21 In order to ease the burden of moving, financial
22 assistance is also authorized for eligible occupants in the
23 form of relocation payments of various types which will be
24 discussed later. Claims for these payments are administered
25 by the Relocation Assistance Office.

1 Staff members of our Office have conducted an
2 exterior survey of the properties on H Street, east of the
3 Railroad Bridge Site, which would be involved or may be
4 involved in the project under consideration, if it is approved.
5 I should amend this to say if the overpass is approved.
6 From the survey, we judge that there are approximately twelve
7 to sixteen households and three businesses in this area, de-
8 pending upon the number of structures to be included in the
9 project. Precise information regarding numbers of families,
10 individuals and businesses, family sizes, income levels and
11 other information is not known at this time. However, before
12 any acquisition of land in this area could proceed for this
13 project, it would be necessary to conduct individual inter-
14 views with all of the residential occupants to determine
15 their precise characteristics and needs and assurances would
16 have to be provided that decent, safe and sanitary housing
17 would be available to these occupants before they were re-
18 quired to move.

19 In general, the relocation payments authorized
20 under the new Uniform Relocation Act of 1970, which would
21 be available if families and individuals are required to
22 move from this area, are as follows:

23 The first is moving expense payments.

24 Eligible residential occupants are entitled to
25 either:

1 a. direct reimbursement for actual and reasonable
2 moving expenses, or

3 b. a fixed amount determined by a schedule, not to
4 exceed \$300, plus a dislocation allowance of \$200.

5 Other payments available are Replacement Housing
6 Payments. Eligible occupants who own their homes may receive
7 an amount not to exceed \$15,000 to assist them in purchasing
8 replacement housing. The amount of this payment may vary
9 according to the circumstances in each case and the eligibility
10 requirements and the amount to be paid will be determined
11 after each owner-occupant is interviewed.

12 Rent Replacement Housing Payments are also available.
13 Tenants, as well as some homeowners who do not qualify for the
14 Replacement Housing Payment described above, may be eligible
15 for an amount not to exceed \$4,000 over a period of four years
16 to help them pay rent or to make a downpayment on a replace-
17 ment dwelling. The amounts and the manner of payment may
18 vary according to circumstances in each case to be determined
19 after each occupant is interviewed.

20 With respect to businesses, the new law provides for
21 reimbursement for actual reasonable moving expenses, direct
22 losses of tangible personal property and certain reasonable
23 expenses in searching for a replacement business location.
24 It also provides, under certain circumstances, for a payment
25 in lieu of all reimbursable expenses at the option of the

1 businesses involved. This payment shall not be less than
2 \$2,500 nor more than \$10,000 and is based upon the average
3 annual net earnings during the two taxable years immediately
4 preceding the taxable year in which the business moves. In
5 order to be eligible for this payment, the business must
6 establish the fact that it cannot relocate without substantial
7 loss of patronage. In addition, it cannot be part of a
8 commercial enterprise having at least one other establishment
9 not being acquired by the United States.

10 There are certain technical eligibility requirements
11 involved in making any or all of the above payments. If
12 the project is approved, relocation counselors will provide
13 written information regarding such requirements and offer
14 explanations and assistance in filing claims.

15 Obviously, no one should plan to move at this time
16 until further word is received regarding action to be taken
17 on this project. Of course, if the highway project is not
18 approved, or if the underpass is approved, rather than the
19 overpass, you will continue to be informed by our H Street
20 Project Office of the progress of the H Street Urban Renewal
21 Project. I'd like to add at this time that brochures
22 amplifying the statements that I've made regarding the re-
23 location services and payments have been prepared and are
24 available at the table to my right. And I would like to
25 request that these brochures -- one for families and one for

1 businesses -- be incorporated into the record at this time.
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

RELOCATION INFORMATION
FOR
BUSINESSES AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS
IN HIGHWAY PROJECTS

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BUSINESS RELOCATION ASSISTANCE OFFICE
815 Mt. Vernon Place, N. W.

Telephone: 382-6507

Hours: 8:15 A.M. - 4:45 P.M.
Monday through Friday
or by Appointment

RELOCATION INFORMATION FOR
BUSINESSES AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS
IN HIGHWAY PROJECTS
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

If the proposed plan for the H Street Grade Separation Project is approved by the Federal Highway Administration, businesses and nonprofit organizations required to move may be entitled to receive relocation services and payments available through the Business Relocation Office of the Redevelopment Land Agency. If the project is approved, occupants will be so notified in writing and will be visited by a counselor from the Relocation Assistance Office who will explain in detail available services and payments and eligibility requirements. Time schedules for acquisition of properties and relocation of occupants would then also be made available. Occupants are urged to make no plans for moving at this time.

Authority

Services and payments are authorized by the "Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1971."

* * * * *

Described below is a summary of the services and payments which would be available through the Business Relocation Office.

RELOCATION SERVICES

Help in Finding A New Location

The Relocation Assistance Office finds and maintains a list of available spaces for stores, offices and other commercial spaces to which site occupants can be referred that meet their needs and zoning requirements.

Loans and Advisory Service

If business concerns are required to move from the area they may be eligible for special financial assistance, such as low-interest loans and lease guarantees by the Small Business Administration.

In addition, technical assistance, market analyses, and management training programs are offered by the Inter-racial Council for Business Opportunity and the Small Business Guidance and Development Center of Howard University. The Relocation Office would provide more detailed information on these programs to any businesses that are interested.

RELOCATION PAYMENTS

Several types of relocation payments are available to businesses and nonprofit organizations. There are certain eligibility and timing requirements on each of these payments which will be further explained if the plan is approved.

Moving Expenses

Businesses and nonprofit organizations that meet certain occupancy requirements may be reimbursed for their actual and reasonable expenses for moving their personal property, including goods for sale, trade fixtures and equipment.

Direct Loss of Property

Reimbursement is available for actual direct losses of tangible property involved either in moving or discontinuing a business or nonprofit organization, not to exceed the cost of moving such items.

- 3 -

Expenses For Searching For a New Location

Actual reasonable expenses in searching for a new location such as travel costs, meals away from home, and payment for time spent in search, are reimburseable.

Payment in Lieu of Moving Expenses

(Nonprofit organizations not eligible.) In place of all the above expenses, a businessman may claim a payment equal to the net earnings of two taxable years prior to the date of moving, provided he can establish 1) a substantial loss of existing patronage, 2) that the business is not part of a commercial enterprise having at least one other establishment not being acquired by the District, and is engaged in the same or similar business, 3) the operation contributes materially to the businessman's income. This payment may be not less than \$2500 nor more than \$10,000.

Appeals

When a claim for a relocation payment is submitted, the Relocation Assistance Office determines its validity for payment. If a claimant is not satisfied with the initial decision, he has the right to appeal and to receive a prompt decision on his appeal.

RELOCATION INFORMATION
FOR RESIDENTS AFFECTED BY
HIGHWAY PROJECTS

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Family Relocation Assistance Office
614 H Street, N. W.

Telephone: 382-7981

Hours: 8:15 A.M. - 4:45 P.M.
Monday through Friday
or by Appointment

RELOCATION INFORMATION
FOR RESIDENTS OF
HIGHWAY PROJECTS
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

If the proposed plan for the H Street Grade Separation project is approved by the Federal Highway Administration, families and individuals required to move from the site will be entitled to receive relocation payments and services available through the Family Relocation Assistance Office of the Redevelopment Land Agency. If the project is approved, site residents will receive a written notice and will be visited by a counselor from the Relocation Office who will explain in detail the services, payments and the eligibility requirements. Time schedules for acquisition of properties and relocation of occupants would then also be made available. Occupants are urged to make no plans for moving at this time.

Authority

Services and payments are authorized by the "Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1971."

RELOCATION SERVICES AND PAYMENTS

Described below is a summary of the services and payments available through the Family Relocation Office.

RELOCATION SERVICES

Housing Services

When a project is approved, no one is required to move until he has ample time to find or has been offered other ^{COMPARABLE} housing that is standard, adequate to his needs, within his means and convenient to his employment, public transportation and other public facilities.

Relocation Counselors offer assistance in finding sales or rental housing on the private market. Those who qualify and so desire, will be given a priority for admission to public housing or to other government-assisted housing for moderate or low-income families. Help can also be given to eligible families in applying for government assisted mortgages at low interest rates.

Social Services

Individuals and families in need of emergency relief or other financial assistance, help with employment training or retraining or other social services, would be referred to appropriate public and private agencies for assistance.

RELOCATION PAYMENTS

Moving Expenses

If families or individuals are required to move, they may be eligible for reimbursement for their actual moving expenses or they may choose to receive a fixed payment, based on the number of rooms they occupy, plus a \$200 dislocation allowance. Eligible occupants must have been site residents on certain required dates, or at the time they received a written notice that the District

- 3 -

intends to acquire the property where they live, or they must have received a written order to vacate. Claims must be filed within 6 months of the move.

REPLACEMENT HOUSING PAYMENTS

Eligible Owner Occupants

Other occupants who have been in occupancy for at least 180 days before the initiation of negotiations to acquire their property and meet certain other residency requirements may receive:

1. The difference between the acquisition price of their site property and the amount necessary to purchase a comparable replacement dwelling in the community, or the amount they actually pay for a replacement dwelling, whichever is less, and
2. An amount to compensate for the difference between certain interest payments in the old and new mortgage, and
3. Certain closing and incidental costs incurred in purchasing a replacement dwelling.

The combined amount for all replacement housing payments may not exceed \$15,000. To be eligible for these payments, the owner occupant must purchase and occupy a standard dwelling, adequate for his needs, within one year from the date of the initiation of negotiations to acquire his site dwelling or one year from the date he moves, whichever is later, and files a claim within 18 months from the date he moves.

RENT REPLACEMENT HOUSING PAYMENTS

The following site residents are eligible to receive a rent replacement housing payment to assist in the payment of rent in

a standard dwelling, not to exceed \$4000, to be paid over a period of four years:

1. Site occupants
2. Owner occupants, who rent replacement housing
3. Owner occupants who are not eligible for the Replacement Housing Payment described above.

To be eligible the occupant must have resided on site at least 90 days before the initiation of negotiations to acquire the property.

The payment is determined by multiplying 48 X the difference between the monthly economic rent at his site dwelling and the amount necessary to rent a comparable, standard unit in the community.

DOWNPAYMENT ON A REPLACEMENT DWELLING

An owner occupant who did not occupy his site dwelling for 180 days before initiation of negotiations to acquire his site dwelling, but did occupy his dwelling for 90 days before that date and a tenant who meets this 90 day requirement may claim the following: The amount necessary to make a downpayment on a standard dwelling plus reimbursement for certain incidental costs incurred in purchasing a replacement dwelling. The total combined payment may not exceed \$4000. If the claim exceeds \$2000 the claimant must pay 50% of the cost over that amount.

APPEALS

When a claim for a relocation payment is submitted, the Relocation Assistance Office determines its validity for payment. If a claimant is dissatisfied with the initial decision, he has a right to appeal and to receive a prompt decision on his appeal.

1 If there are any questions regarding relocation
2 assistance, when and if the project is approved, no one should
3 hesitate to call our office.

4 Thank you.

5 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Will you make certain
6 that the reports referred to are in the record.

7 And thank you, Mr. Brown and Mr. Press.

8 I take it for granted that as government witnesses
9 you are going to be available for subsequent questioning
10 during the evening.

11 Thank you very much.

12 The next public witness is Congressman Kenneth
13 Gray, of Illinois, who is here representing the Public
14 Works Committee. I know the Congressman had a scheduling
15 problem tonight and we are pleased to have him with us.

16 Congressman Gray.

17 CONGRESSMAN GRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
18 apologize for my tardiness. We had a roll call vote on Food
19 Stamps and I might be out of work sometime. So I wanted to
20 make sure that I got to vote on that.

21 First, Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen, let
22 me thank you and your co-workers for scheduling these hearings.
23 Because as you know, this is required under public law and
24 will have the effect of expediting the project.

25 As a member of the Public Works Committee of the

1 House of Representatives and a member of the National Visitor
2 Facilities Advisory Commission, I have a personal interest in
3 the development of the proposed and fully authorized Visitor
4 Center for Washington. Also, I have sponsored as Chairman of
5 the House Sub-Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, many
6 pieces of legislation to authorize public buildings in the
7 District of Columbia which will benefit the community and
8 the visitors alike.

9 The new convention center is, henceforth, the arena
10 that is proposed for Washington is a good example of projects
11 we are working on now.

12 The replacement of the existing H Street structure,
13 Mr. Chairman, is long overdue, as anyone who drives or walks
14 through it can testify to this fact. As a driver, or pedes-
15 trian, you do not feel safe. It is a depressing experience,
16 which serves to separate two of the most viable business
17 communities in Washington - the downtown area and the H Street
18 corridor. Therefore, with the Federal funds already earmarked
19 and available for use to improve this blight, I encourage the
20 Department of Highways and Traffic to move ahead with an
21 elevated H Street overpass.

22 There has been, and is, concern on the part of
23 individuals, who I'm sure are here tonight, who might need to
24 be relocated due to this development.

25 Now, Mr. Chairman, as the one who helped co-sponsor

1 the relocation legislation, I want to reemphasize what
2 officials of the Redevelopment Land Agency have said -- that
3 is, that any relocation of families and businesses will be
4 done in advance so that the needs and the requirements of the
5 individuals involved will be met before this project can be
6 undertaken.

7 From the very beginning of the National Visitor
8 Center project, I have felt very strongly, that in addition to
9 providing information and programs for the out-of-town
10 visitors, we should do other things: (1) provide the Visitor
11 Center with the mass transportation. This overpass proposed
12 for H Street will help do that. (2) We should have adequate
13 parking near by -- this will help do that. Thirdly, we
14 should be acceptable to the principal points of visitor
15 interest. This will do that since the National Visitor Center
16 will be located in this building. Fourthly, we should bring
17 added economic vitality to this part of the city.

18 All of these projects are designed to do that. I
19 believe the completed design including the elevated H Street,
20 does address itself to these points; as well as the social,
21 economic and environmental concerns that we all have.

22 As a part of the National Visitor Center project,
23 we have developed plans for a parking facility for approximate-
24 ly 4,500 automobiles and over 200 buses in the air space over
25 the railroad tracks to the rear of this facility.

1 The elevated H Street will permit additional
2 access to this \$11 million dollar parking facility. And
3 it also permits inter-city buses to use the terminal. I might
4 say at this point, I met here just last week -- last Friday --
5 with a group to try to put together a package of making this
6 not just a train terminal, but a major transportation facility
7 to bring together our buses, trains, and Metro -- the subway --
8 and enabling residents and visitors alike to be able to get
9 around in the city.

10 This kind of inter-mobile terminal makes sense to
11 me. As the designe

12 As the designs developed for the National Visitor
13 Center it seems advantageous to gain an entranceway to it from
14 H Street on the North. The designers found that by elevating
15 H Street they could design and build this access in a way that
16 would be less disruptive to street traffic and to rail
17 operations.

18 The design for H Street is approximately 4 million
19 dollars less costly, that is the over pass, Mr. Chairman, than
20 the underpass. The savings certainly could be spent to good
21 use in other areas of the city.

22 I feel that it can be constructed in a shorter
23 period of time, that is the overpass, and that it offers the
24 best possibility of keeping at least part of H Street open to
25 traffic most of the time.

1 Every consideration should be given to keep the
2 traffic flowing on H Street so that the street is not closed
3 for the four to four and one half years during the construction
4 period.

5 The advantages to the immediate surrounding community
6 would seem extremely attractive. It would connect the H Street
7 renewal area with downtown Washington by an attractive, well-
8 lighted landscaped street with wide sidewalks. It provides a
9 direct and attractive link with the economic vitality of the
10 new Visitor Center and transportation facilities that I
11 mentioned earlier. This street, designed in connection with the
12 Visitors Project, is one more step in bringing vitality to
13 the city of Washington and knitting all parts of the City
14 into one fabric.

15 And I'm sure this is something we all desire.

16 And in closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you
17 and your co-workers in the great city of Washington, for your
18 vision and foresight in moving ahead with clearing out the
19 street impediments that I think has been part of the growth
20 of this part of the city, and even more importantly, will
21 allow us to move forward with the Visitor Center and all of
22 the other projects that we have designed -- the
23 Convention Center and the Sports Arena, that
24 are now proposed for the Mount Vernon Square area, very close
25 to here, and I'm sure we can make this a city that will be

1 envied around the world.

2 Thank you very much.

3 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Thank you very much,
4 Congressman.

5 Before we go on to the next public witness, I
6 should say, as I said before, that anybody that came in late,
7 who wishes to be put on the witness list can do so simply by
8 checking in with Mr. Mike Hartman at the far right hand side
9 of the room and you will be added -- first come, first serve --
10 to the witness list. Or a written statement may be submitted
11 for the record before Friday, July 9th.

12 The next public witness is Mr. Sutton Jett of the
13 National Visitors Facilities Advisory Commission.

14 We welcome, Mr. Jett.

15 MR. JETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and
16 Gentlemen.

17 My name is T. Sutton Jett. I'm Assistant to the
18 Director of the National Park Service. I am authorized to
19 submit and to read a statement, signed by the Secretary of
20 the Interior -- Secretary Rogers Morton -- and the Chairman
21 of the National Visitors Advisory Commission.

22 The Unique educational opportunity which Washington
23 should offer to American and foreign visitors alike is largely
24 lost without perspective on the historic, political, and
25 symbolic significance of the places and institutions to be

1 visited. This is particularly a Federal concern. The prime
2 attraction of Washington is the presence here of the Federal
3 Government. Here one can observe its immediate day-to-day
4 workings, can visit its buildings and shrines, and can examine
5 the records of the past. As a Nation, we are properly
6 interested in fostering through visitors to our Nation's
7 Capital a better appreciation of our democracy.

8 The local community has long been aware of the need
9 to assist visitors to Washington. Citizens and businessmen
10 have expressed their concern and have contributed time and
11 services to the National Visitor Center plans for aiding
12 visitors. The Washington Post commented in its editorial pages
13 that, "The National Capital has an obligation to 20 million
14 or so Americans who visit here every year. It is an obligation
15 that has been wretchedly neglected. Our visitors are left
16 to find their own way around a city in which driving is not
17 easy and many of the monuments are difficult to locate."

18 The Evening Star in its editorial pages said, "It
19 is good to see this project finally move into high gear.
20 Washington's inability to provide adequately for its growing
21 numbers of tourists under present conditions grows more appar-
22 ent year by year." In 1970, more than 16 million persons
23 visited the Washington area; by 1980, the number may reach 35
24 million.

25 In November 1966, the Congress authorized the National

1 Visitor Center.

2 On March 12, 1968, Public Law 90-264, authorizing
3 Union Station for a National Visitor Center and creating the
4 National Visitor Facilities Advisory Commission, was approved.
5 It Provides, "owners ... to make such alterations to the
6 Union Station Building as the Secretary of the Interior
7 determines necessary to provide adequate facilities for
8 visitors..."

9 "... owners ... in consultation with the Secretary
10 of the Interior, shall construct a parking facility ... to
11 accommodate as nearly as possible 4,000 motor vehicles in the
12 airspace northerly of and adjacent to the existing Union
13 Station building ..."

14 "... lease ... shall commence on a date to be
15 mutually agreed upon contingent upon when such facilities are
16 available for public use ... for a term of not more than 25
17 years."

18 "... in connection with the construction of the
19 parking facility ... the District of Columbia shall ... pro-
20 vide vehicular access to public roads and highways in the
21 immediate area of such facility ..."

22 "... The National Visitor Facilities Advisory
23 Commission ... is directed to make a continuing study of needs
24 of visitors to the Washington Metropolitan area, including
25 the necessity and desirability of different or additional

1 visitor facilities, and of altering existing visitor facilities,
2 and to recommend ... the acquisition, alteration, or construction
3 of such facility."

4 On December 18, 1968, the Secretary of the Interior
5 and the owners of Union Station signed a Lease Agreement pro-
6 viding for an annual lease payment and option to buy upon one
7 year's notice. If the lease runs for the full 25-year term,
8 the property will be deeded to the United States in fee
9 simple.

10 On June 5, 1969, the owners advanced \$500,000 for
11 planning, and shortly thereafter entered into an architectural?
12 engineering contract with Seymour Auerbach for this project.
13 The National Park Service has received appropriations in
14 fiscal years 1970 and 1971 of \$200,000 and \$600,000,
15 respectively, for the planning and production of program
16 elements in the National Visitor Center.

17 With the concurrence of the National Visitor
18 Facilities Advisory Commission, appropriate approvals were
19 sought and obtained as planning progressed through the con-
20 ceptual and schematic design phases. In reviewing the plans
21 for the conversion of Union Station into the National Visitor
22 Center, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation felt
23 that the esthetic and historic integrity had been respected.
24 The Council approved the plans.

25 Early in 1967, the National Capital Planning

1 Commission approved the location of, and access to, the
2 rapid transit station at the National Visitor Center. It was
3 the Commission's understanding, "... that the Metro station
4 design should allow flexibility for future connections into
5 a consolidated transportation terminal ... if further
6 development makes this appropriate."

7 In June 1970, the National Capital Planning Com-
8 mission approved the project design. Concern was expressed
9 that the Metro station provide convenient access for travelers
10 and visitors and aid the potential future development of the
11 air rights over the railroad tracks north of H Street. The
12 Commission found that the concept of replacing the existing
13 H Street with an overpass to provide additional access to the
14 passenger terminals, the bus loading platforms, secondary
15 entrances to the garage, and access to potential future air
16 rights development north of H Street had several advantages.
17 It would greatly assist in separating and distributing the
18 various types of traffic by providing separate entrances for
19 travelers and buses. It would also provide safer and more
20 attractive linkage between businesses on H Street, N. E., the
21 Stanton Park community, and downtown.

22 The project was presented to the Commission on Fine
23 Arts for informational purposes in November 1969. The Com-
24 mission expressed concern about the traffic impact in the
25 Columbus Plaza area. In July 1970, the Commission approved

1 plans for the conversion of Union Station, raising some
2 questions on garage building materials and design. In April
3 1971, the design of the parking facility, including the rail-
4 road?bus terminal, was enthusiastically approved by the Com-
5 mission.

6 As planning for the National Visitor Center proceed-
7 ed, and with the introduction of other elements in this
8 vicinity, notably, the development of a combination railroad?
9 bus intermodal transportation terminal, and appropriate Metro
10 access provided from the Visitor Center parking facility,
11 transportation terminal, and H Street, and the advantages
12 interface between city buses and H Street pedestrian traffic,
13 the need that H Street be elevated became more critical. In
14 fact, without the elevated H Street, the intermodal trans-
15 portation terminal designed to compliment the National Visitor
16 Center activities, cannot be built! Additionally, the
17 elevated roadway would provide urgently needed additional
18 access to the proposed adjacent 4,454 car parking garage which
19 is an important and essential element of the National Visitor
20 Center project. It would also provide appropriate access to
21 the air rights over the railroad tracks north of H Street
22 where future developments might be located.

23 In view of the immediate and possible long range
24 benefits to visitors and residents of the Washington Metropol-
25 itan area, the National Visitor Facilities Advisory Commission

1 endorses and strongly recommends the construction of the H
2 Street overpass design.

3 Signed, Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the
4 Interior as Chairman of the National Visitor Facilities
5 Advisory Commission.

6 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

7 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Thank you very much,
8 Mr. Jett.

9 Now, if you don't mind we are trying to time the
10 use of this air conditioner so that the noise isn't always
11 with us, and we can get it a little bit cool -- and relax with
12 it, and then turn it off and on. So if my timing is bad --
13 and it begins to get a little bit too warm -- wave a handker-
14 chief or something at me and I will get it on again.

15 The next public witness is Mr. Monroe Clay, the
16 Special Assistant for the National Park Service.

17 Mr. Clay.

18 MR. CLAY: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen --
19 I am Monroe A. Clay, Special Assistant to the Director of the
20 National Capital Parks. We certainly welcome and appreciate
21 the opportunity to make this statement on behalf of the National
22 Park Service.

23 It has always been the intent of the National Park
24 Service to provide a quality experience for the national
25 visitor. In pursuit of this objective, the proposed National

1 Visitor Center at Union Station will provide a facility for
2 visitor orientation and parking. This facility will, in turn,
3 alleviate the severe vehicular congestion and circulation
4 problem which presently exists in the Mall area, by providing
5 a parking facility to the north of Union Station over the
6 railroad tracks which would accommodate approximately 4,500
7 cars. The visitor complex then would become a central collec-
8 tion and distribution point for the national visitor. As
9 access to the parking facility is essential to the intended
10 purpose of the center, the National Park Service recommends
11 that H Street, N. E., be reconstructed as an overpass structure
12 with appropriate access to the proposed parking facility.

13 Thank you.

14 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Thank you, Mr. Clay.

15 The next public witness listed represents the
16 National Capital Planning Commission, and is Mr. Robert Harris
17 for Mr. Charles Conrad.

18 MR. HARRIS: I am Robert W. Harris, Chief of the
19 Office of Transportation Planning for the National Capital
20 Planning Commission. I appear tonight to describe the policies
21 and actions of the Commission with respect to the reconstruction
22 of the H Street grade separation at the Washington Terminal
23 Company yards.

24 As the central planning agency for the District of
25 Columbia Government pursuant to the National Capital Planning

1 Act of 1952, the Commission reviews plans for highway construc-
2 tion projects at "preliminary and successive stages" under
3 Section 5(a) of the Act.

4 In its review of District of Columbia capital improve-
5 ment programs in 1964 and 1966, the Commission recommended
6 favorably the reconstruction of the H Street viaduct. Sub-
7 sequently, in February, 1969, the District of Columbia
8 Department of Highways and Traffic submitted a design for the
9 reconstruction of the underpass for review by the Commission.
10 This design plan was withdrawn because the total context for
11 the project, particularly the National Visitor Center at Union
12 Station, had not been fixed at that time. The project to
13 date has not been resubmitted to the Commission as required
14 by the Act.

15 In the development of plans for the National Visitor
16 Center and its associated parking garage and railroad terminal,
17 the concept of an H Street overpass was developed as a means
18 of providing additional access to the development above the
19 rialroad tracks behind Union Station. Partly as a result of
20 work done by the Commission on the consolidation of terminals
21 for intercity transportation, the developers of the National
22 Visitor Center negotiated for the inclusion of a bus terminal
23 combined with the new railroad terminal as part of the Visitor
24 Center development. It was felt that an elevated H Street was
25 vital to bus access to such a bus terminal, as well as for

1 passengers arriving and departing the combined terminals so
2 as to avoid undue conflict with visitor traffic using the
3 accesses at the front of Union Station.

4 At its meeting on March 5, 1970, the Commission
5 approved the following development concepts for the National
6 Visitor Center at Union Station:

7 1. Renovation and conversion of Union Station as an
8 orientation and information center.

9 2. Construction of a parking facility for 4,000
10 cars and a railroad passenger terminal over the tracks behind
11 Union Station.

12 3. Location of an interstate bus terminal to
13 function in conjunction with the railroad terminal and Metro
14 station.

15 The Commission requested the National Park Service
16 and the Washington Terminal Company and its consultants to
17 explore ways of providing access to the passenger terminal
18 from the north, including, as alternatives, an H Street over-
19 pass, a combination overpass-underpass, or access ramps from
20 K Street and/or New York Avenue. The Commission also requested
21 the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority to adjust
22 the rail rapid transit station location and access at Union
23 Station to provide more direct and convenient access to the
24 passenger station and future development north of H Street.

25 At its meeting on June 4, 1970, the Commission

1 approved preliminary site and building plans for the Visitor
2 Center complex at Union Station. Included in these plans was
3 an elevated H Street, which provided direct access for autos
4 to the north side of the railroad bus terminal and parking
5 garage and for buses to the loading platforms of the bus
6 terminal. The Commission recommended, with respect to H
7 Street, that, in the preparation of final site and building
8 plans, the Park Service, the Washington Terminal Company, and
9 the District of Columbia Government:

10 1. Eliminate one of the three intersections on the
11 proposed H Street overpass between First and Second Streets;

12 2. Provide for access ramps from K Street and the
13 New York Avenue Corridor with direct access to the H Street
14 overpass to provide more efficient traffic circulation around
15 the Visitor Center Parking and Terminal facility;

16 3. Provide a formal plaza development at the H
17 Street overpass level to establish an appropriate setting for
18 the Terminal entrance, as well as turn-off and pick-up areas
19 out of the main stream of traffic.

20 Final site and building plans for the Visitor Center
21 have not yet been submitted for review of the Commission. The
22 Commission's comment on "Public Hearing Information, H Street
23 Grade Separation" dated May 1971 is based upon previous
24 Commission reviews and recommendations on the Visitor Center.
25 The Comments are as follows:

1 1. The Commission favors the overpass alternative.

2 2. The provision of an exit ramp for buses, which
3 passes under, and connects to, the north side of H Street,
4 appears to eliminate one of the three intersections between
5 First and Second Streets, as recommended by the Commission.

6 3. The plan does not provide for connection of
7 future ramps to and from the north side of H Street. However,
8 it is assumed that such ramps could be built in conjunction
9 with future development to the north of H Street and could
10 intersect H Street opposite ramps serving the National Visitor
11 Center.

12 4. Provision has been made in the H Street design
13 for connections to turn-off and pick-up areas at the front
14 door of the terminal at the National Visitor Center, as
15 recommended by the Commission.

16 Since its approval of the preliminary site plan for
17 the Visitor Center, the Commission has received a number
18 of letters reflecting the concerns of affected property owners
19 in Northeast Urban Renewal Area, Project No. 1, about the
20 impact of the overpass design on their properties. We under-
21 stand that an urban renewal plan change would probably be
22 required for the development of the overpass and that the
23 Department of Housing and Transportation -- I don't think
24 Housing is supposed to be in these -- and the Redevelopment
25 Land Agency are currently attempting to resolve the financial

1 and legal questions related to the urban renewal project.

2 The Commission would be pleased to consider such a
3 plan change, if necessary, and to review the design for the re-
4 construction of H Street under Section 5(a) of the Act at the
5 appropriate time after the Department of Highways and Traffic
6 has selected a recommended design.

7 Thank you for the opportunity to present this state-
8 ment. If you have any questions, we will be pleased to try to
9 answer them.

10 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Thank you, Mr. Harris.
11 Can I persuade you to be here longer?

12 MR. HARRIS: Yes.

13 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Before we go on to the
14 next witness, I wanted to say again, for those of you who have
15 come in late -- that Mr. Mike Hartman, at the far right table,
16 is available if you wish to have your name added to the
17 witness list for this evening's hearing.

18 Other persons, of course, may submit written state-
19 ments on or before July 9th.

20 The next public witness is Mr. Robert Morris of
21 Alan M. Voorhees and Associates.

22 MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23 I am Robert L. Morris, Vice President of Alan M.
24 Voorhees Associates. We were responsible for developing the
25 access and circulation concepts for the Visitors Center under

1 the general supervision of the architect, Mr. Seymore Auerbach.

2 In developing our plans we had two basic objectives.
3 First, to minimize a Visitor's Center -- related traffic on
4 adjacent streets and within adjacent neighborhoods.

5 And second, to provide for easy access for tourists
6 to the center.

7 In light of these objectives, it became clear that
8 it would be highly desirable not to rely exclusively on
9 ingress and egress solely by way of Columbus Plaza. Such
10 a limitation would not only result in high concentrations of
11 traffic in a limited area at peak periods with the resultant
12 burden on adjacent neighborhoods to the east.

13 But it would also require mixing of large buses with
14 private automobiles. -- an ineffective and inefficient method
15 of operation.

16 We tested many concepts for alternative access to
17 the Visitor's Center site. The fortuitous plans of the D. C.
18 Department of Highways and Traffic to reconstruct the H Street
19 Underpass as either a new underpass or a bridge presented
20 clearly the best opportunity for resolving this access
21 problem.

22 We evaluated the underpass vis a vis the overpass,
23 and our conclusions were unmistakable.

24 I shall not consume your time this evening with
25 details of our traffic analysis. But it is clear that the

1 overpass would be far superior in every respect. Not only
2 from the point of view of the Visitor's Center, but in our
3 opinion, from the point of view of the Center's neighbors.
4 Here are some of the reasons.

5 First, an overpass would permit lowering the grade
6 of the Metro subway, which would, in turn, permit relocation
7 of the station platforms for better service to the area.

8 Second, direct access for busses would be available
9 by way of H Street from the Center Leg Freeway. During the
10 peak period, some 30 to 60 busses per hour would be on this
11 route.

12 Without the overpass, the busses would have a more
13 circuitous routing, with inherent delays because of left turn
14 conflicts and additional traffic signals.

15 Third, the overpass will reduce traffic circulation
16 within the residential areas to the east.

17 Fourth, there is a cost saving of approximately
18 three and a half million dollars for the overpass compared with
19 the underpass.

20 Fifth, the bridge provides for more pleasant travel
21 with nice air and visibility.

22 The best designed underpass inevitably appears dark,
23 forbidding.

24 Sixth, figuratively speaking, a bridge is a link,
25 whereas an underpass and a tunnel is a barrier. One thing we

1 badly need in the District of Columbia is links, rather than
2 barriers.

3 Seventh, a bridge will provide a dramatic entrance
4 to the forthcoming new H Street business community.

5 In summary, in our opinion, the overpass, or bridge,
6 would be a far greater asset than would the underpass. The
7 bridge would best solve the traffic problems related to the
8 Visitor's Center.

9 It would have a positive aesthetic value and it would
10 have no adverse effects on the adjacent neighborhoods. Indeed,
11 it seems to me that the neighborhoods will benefit from the
12 bridge just as well as will the Visitors' Center.

13 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

14 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Thank you, Mr. Morris.

15 The next public witness will be Mr. Joseph Hennigues,
16 President of Crown Automotive, Incorporated, 221 H Street, N.E.

17 VOICE: Mr. Hennigues is not able to be here tonight.

18 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Is he going to send a
19 statement?

20 VOICE: Yes.

21 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: The next public witness
22 then will be Mr. Robbins of the law firm of Grossberg,
23 Yochelson, Fox and Beyda, representing Albert Small, owner,
24 801 North Capitol Street. Mr. Robbins.

25 MR. ROBBINS: Mr. Chairman, after listening to what

1 I have heard so far, I have tentatively changed my position
2 from opposition to the overpass to tentative opposition to
3 the overpass.

4 It is quite clear that there are many reasons, and
5 I'm not an engineer, for the overpass over the underpass. I
6 think it's unfortunate -- if I might interrupt myself --
7 hindsight being so much better -- that despite the fact that
8 the Planning Commission recommended the rebuilding of this
9 structure seven years ago -- that an urban renewal plan was
10 allowed to go into effect, that developers came into the
11 area relying on that plan, and that now we have a change.

12 My remarks are going to be briefer than I had
13 intended because most of them are going to be legal in nature.

14 I am very pleased that the Redevelopment Land Agency
15 and the Corporation Counsel's office, as expressed by Mr.
16 Press, have forthrightly stated what our position is.

17 That is, if there is to be the overpass, it will be
18 a change, or as the law calls it, a modification, in the urban
19 renewal plan, which will require not only the concurrence
20 of the Planning Commission, the District Government, but also
21 the written consent of the property owners, the developers,
22 who are affected by the change.

23 It is our firm position that this cannot be put into
24 effect as an overpass without those three things happening, and
25 that once, if as a result of this hearing, determination is

1 made that the overpass is the method to be used, that will
2 then have to go, pursuant to the Act, to the Planning Commission
3 to the District Government, and then, and I repeat and stress,
4 the written consent of the property owners affected will have
5 to be secured.

6 I will close on that and just say that on the basis
7 of what I have heard tonight, our position may be slightly
8 changed.

9 We are not quite sure. One of the problems in this
10 is that -- these are the problems that were alluded to -- what
11 is going to happen to this area if there is an overpass. What
12 changes will be made in the factors that led the developers
13 to come into this area, and if so whether or not the change
14 in these factors is significant enough for them to oppose it,
15 and I will, in accordance with the information put out, request
16 permission to supplement with a formal statement, which will be
17 submitted by the ninth.

18 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Thank you, Mr. Robbins,
19 and we will be glad to see your statement by the ninth, and I'm
20 certain that in the interim any questions that you have -- if
21 you have additional questions -- and if we can help you -- we'll
22 be glad to.

23 The next public witness will be Mr. C. W. Shaw, Jr.,
24 manager of The Washington Terminal Company. Mr. Shaw.

25 MR. SHAW: Mr. Chairman, friends and neighbors,

1 ladies and gentlemen.

2 First I'd like to apologize for the very untimely
3 failure of our air conditioning system here.

4 My name is C. W. Shaw, Jr. I'm the manager of the
5 Washington Terminal Company.

6 On March 12, 1968, Congress approved Public Law
7 90-264, authorizing Union Station to be altered for use as a
8 National Visitor Center. In conjunction with the Visitor
9 Center, a new parking garage to accomodate over 4,000 motor
10 vehicles and a new railroad station are also proposed to be
11 constructed.

12 Present plans, plans which have the approval of the
13 necessary commissions, including the Fine Arts Commission and
14 the National Capital Planning Commission, call for a combined
15 railroad and intercity bus terminal to be located in the
16 northern part of the parking garage just to the south of "H"
17 Street.

18 It is of great concern to us, therefore, that
19 vehicular traffic flowing to and from the Visitor Center
20 Parking Garage and the Transportation Center has the advantage
21 of additional access roads to these facilities from H Street,
22 rather than being limited to an entrance and exit from
23 Columbus Circle.

24 Columbus Circle traffic today is quite congested,
25 and, unless this additional access is provided, and it can only

lmo

1 be provided if H Street is constructed as an overpass, the
2 added volume of traffic put into Columbus Circle will
3 make it unmanageable.

4 Of further concern to us is the disruption of
5 railroad passenger train traffic that will result if an
6 underpass is constructed. We believe there will be long and
7 serious delays to these trains necessitated by the detouring
8 and reconstruction of the track layout.

9 This, of course, can all be avoided by the con-
10 struction of an overpass. An overpass will eliminate all
11 delays to train traffic account of detouring and I would also
12 think require considerably less detouring for vehicular
13 traffic than that resulting from the construction of an
14 underpass.

15 Only an overpass will allow for the construction of
16 an entrance to the Metro service from H Street for the
17 convenience and use of the Mass Transit System, as well as
18 allow the intercity busses to use the proposed terminal,
19 making the complex a true transportation center.

20 It is for these reasons and the benefits, which
21 we can foresee accruing to visitors and residents alike, that
22 we, at the Washington Terminal Company, highly endorse and
23 recommend the replacement of the H Street grade separation
24 be done by using the overpass design alternative.

25 Thank you very much.

1 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Thank you very much,
2 Mr. Shaw.

3 Before we continue, I would like to remind everyone
4 present that we have two basic questions in the hearings
5 being held.

6 One, to ensure that an opportunity is afforded for
7 effective participation by interested persons in the process
8 of determining the need for, the location of, and the major
9 design features of federal aid highways.

10 And, two, to provide a public forum that affords
11 a full opportunity for presenting views on alternate highway
12 locations and on major design features including the social,
13 economic and environmental effects of each alternative.

14 The alternatives presented earlier were the
15 alternatives involved in the question of an underpass versus
16 and overpass.

17 If there's anybody here who came in following the
18 introductory comments and you want to get on the agenda for
19 presentation of testimony, will you please check in with
20 Mr. Mike Hartman at my far right.

21 The next public witness is Mr. Burton W. Johnson,
22 Fire Marshall of D. C. Fire Department. Mr. Johnson.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen,
24 good evening.

25 I am Burton W. Johnson, Fire Marshall for the

1 District of Columbia.

2 Mr. Chairman, the D. C. Fire Department is indeed
3 pleased to have had the opportunity to review the alternate
4 designs for a replacement of the H Street, N. E. grade
5 separation at the Washington Terminal Railroad Yards between
6 1st and 2nd Streets.

7 It is felt that Fire Department operations would
8 not be affected in either design if certain minimum height
9 and/or width provisions are met.

10 The existing fire hydrants, if not blocked or
11 barricaded during construction, would provide adequate
12 water service during any fire condition that may arise.

13 If the underpass design is selected, the clear
14 height of the underpass should not be less than 14 feet to
15 allow our ladder trucks to safely pass through.

16 If the overpass design is selected, the width
17 of access roads to businesses and buildings on H street
18 must be a minimum of 20 feet for Fire Department vehicles to
19 safely operate on.

20 Whichever design is selected, the D. C. Fire
21 Department can and will continue to provide the fire protection
22 this "Class A" rated department is capable of.

23 Thank you.

24 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

25 The next public witness is Mr. Osborne of 820 H

1 Street, N. E., a local businessman. Mr. Osborne.

2 MR. OSBORNE: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen.
3 I'm Osborne, representing the businessmen on the CIC Board
4 here in Northeast.

5 Our main concern would be if you would give a little
6 consideration of the closing down of H Street Freeway -- how
7 it will affect the businesses and how much of this do you
8 think would affect the business on H Street since the
9 insurrection or riot has passed.

10 Most of the spaces are vacant now and if you close
11 down, or cut the traffic down somewhat, it would hurt us
12 considerably.

13 We would like to meet with a group or with someone
14 to give us really a better picture of the time that it
15 would require the closing down or how we can really plan our
16 businesses accordingly.

17 We would certainly appreciate all the help that we
18 could and if we could meet with you in your offices, or any-
19 place where we can find the maximum information, we would be
20 very grateful.

21 And if you would plan to give us in detail how much
22 would this really affect us in the coming years.

23 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Thank you, Mr. Osborne.

24 I'm going to ask Mr. DeGast to make certain that
25 there is a follow up and will you check, Mr. Osborne, for a

1 meeting for such discussion.

2 The next public witness is Mr. John Anthony of 102
3 G Street, N. E.

4 Mr. Anthony represents the people of the community
5 and Region 3, if I recall right. Mr. Anthony.

6 MR. ANTHONY: Thank you for this opportunity to
7 speak with you this evening, with a problem that terribly
8 affects Northeast.

9 The citizens of Near Northeast have been quite
10 concerned and involved in the question of the Visitors' Center
11 and the effect that it will have on our community.

12 From the beginning, I wish to state that we do not
13 oppose the Visitors' Center itself. We are very concerned
14 about the closing of H Street because we realize that it would
15 severely affect the economy of H Street.

16 I am quite dismayed that all of the previous speakers
17 have attempted to focus your attention only on the question of
18 the overpass versus the underpass.

19 To the best of my knowledge, they have not mentioned
20 the social and economic impact that the Visitors' Center will
21 bring to this area.

22 I would like to point out to you that we should
23 first consider the effect that whatever takes place will have
24 on the taxpayers of this city.

25 Before the riots, H Street, N. E. was the second

lmo

1 highest sales area in the city, which meant that they were
2 second only to downtown Washington in the contribution of
3 taxes to the city.

4 I can say also at this moment, with all the depressed
5 areas on H Street, it is still second only to downtown in
6 tax returns to the city.

7 We are very disturbed that the possible
8 future development of H Street -- will be severely hindered
9 because -- and if -- the H Street overpass is built.

10 H Street depends on transit customers who travel
11 or have travelled from all over the city to shop at H Street
12 because of the variety of stores and the variety of goods
13 available. If this overpass is built, we citizens can see
14 no way of saying that it would not create a traffic bottleneck
15 somewhere along H Street between the Central Freeway and
16 any other section of H Street itself.

17 Now we are aware of the minor traffic jams that
18 are created during the rush hour, morning and evening, in
19 the vicinity of the tunnel.

20 Basically, the traffic backs up on North Capitol
21 Street momentarily each morning with changes of lights.

22 Now if we combine the visitors of 1,000, or more,
23 or 1,500, a day, coming in, and meeting with the local traffic,
24 the commuters, as well as the shoppers, there is no way that
25 there will not be a traffic jam almost constantly.

1 We're also thinking about 100 or more commercial
2 busses that will be used -- using this overpass.

3 As a result, they have to make turns, and even a
4 single bus creates a minor pause in the flow of traffic.

5 We also have to consider the hundreds of tour busses
6 that will be directed to this center, which have not been
7 mentioned, and have not been mentioned in any report that I
8 have read.

9 We also have to consider the economic impact that
10 whatever follows --and we're sure that commercial development
11 will follow in this area if the Visitors' Center is created --
12 what effect will that have on the residential sections of
13 Near Northeast.

14 You cannot avoid the spectrum of high-rise
15 commercial facilities being created somewhere in this area
16 to support the visitors and tourists, since they would be
17 coming into the city.

18 It would cast a light upon the residential sections
19 and would raise the cost of the residential buildings to the
20 extent that absentee landlords would be very anxious to sell
21 and get out from under at a profit, while the tenants who
22 must reside in the District, have no resources other than to
23 find places to live that are at the moment not available.

24 RLA itself should readily admit that they have many
25 many replacement problems now for facilities for large families

1 Just this week -- there was a meeting where they
2 indicated to the citizens of our community that because there
3 was a family that needed four bedrooms, they could not acquire
4 that property for redevelopment.

5 This is how severe the problem appears to us in the
6 community.

7 The community has speculated on how to avoid the
8 creation of the overpass and leave the underpass open for a
9 free flow of traffic along H Street as a benefit not only to
10 merchants but to residents of the city, and they propose to
11 the National Capital Planning Commission and all others
12 involved, that a ramp should be built from New York Avenue
13 paralleling the railroad and bringing that northern flow of
14 traffic into the Visitors' Center and over H Street so as to
15 keep the two flows of traffic separated.

16 This is a trend all over the nation where it's
17 possible to do things in this manner, so that whatever ever
18 happens do not infringe adversely on a neighborhood.

19 Our concern really is to maintain our neighborhood
20 in such a way that we can live properly, develop economically
21 so that all of us can benefit from the development -- the
22 businessman, the resident, and the city.

23 If this overpass, as we envision is built -- and we
24 really basically envision it -- because we recognize that other
25 development is going to follow the visitors' Center -- already

1 it has previously been mentioned the Convention and Sports
2 Arena adjacent to the Visitor's Center. That's been mentioned.
3 An Avenue of States along that development. These things will
4 create a barrier between Northeast Washington and downtown.

5 Also, taking into consideration that it's quite
6 possible -- it is possible that with the overpass going over
7 the railroad tracks, and 20 or more feet above the transporta-
8 tion system on the railroad tracks, your street level is raised
9 about 60 feet, which means it's quite possible for developers
10 to proceed to build upwards to 60, 90 feet, whatever the
11 building code is. With a 40 foot start, those buildings too
12 will create a barrier between the community and downtown
13 Washington.

14 We are very disturbed that all of the previous
15 speakers attempted to focus your attention to this one single
16 issue, but we have quite a few things that we have talked and
17 discussed with the various agencies, and, in conclusion, I
18 want to point out to you that we have had several meetings with
19 the National Capitol Planning Commission's staff. We have
20 discussed the pros and cons and alternatives of transportation
21 planning in this area, and our proposal of a ramp from New
22 York Avenue met with their approval. They agreed with us that
23 it was superior. They said the only problem was the cost, and
24 who would pay for such a ramp.

25 It is our contention that regardless of the cost, we

1 have to build -- we have to consider the impact of other
2 developers and that if we do not build the ramp now when it's
3 practical and feasible, at some point in the future, it's going
4 to have to be, because the traffic will increase so drastically
5 that the overpass is not going to be able to take care of the
6 traffic and it seems to be that the powers that be would con-
7 sider the implications in building a traffic pattern just for
8 one facility when it's almost positive that other facilities
9 of similar nature will follow.

10 Thank you very much.

11 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: Thank you, Mr. Anthony.

12 I would like to point out that, as we indicated
13 earlier, the written statements by individuals and organizations
14 on this matter before us may be submitted for inclusion in the
15 record on or before Friday, July 9, 1971 at 5:00 p.m. The
16 statements shall be received by the Executive Secretary to the
17 Commissioner of D.C. in Room 528 of the District Building.

18 For those of you who came in late, if there is any-
19 body who still would like the opportunity to be heard or if
20 any earlier witness would like an opportunity to supplement
21 what you indicated, then certainly we can continue the hearing
22 to hear you.

23 Are there any further comments or additions?

24 (No response.)

25 HEARING OFFICER ALEXANDER: IN that event, this

1 hearing is closed, and we thank you very much, ladies and
2 gentlemen.

3 (Whereupon, at 9:05 p.m., the hearing in the above-
4 entitled matter was concluded.)

5 - - -
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

