

2

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
EXECUTIVE OFFICE

-----X  
Public Hearing, In Re: :  
DESIGN - INTERSTATE ROUTE 266 :  
-----X

OFFICE COPY  
RETURN TO  
PLANNING RESEARCH SECTION  
OFFICE OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING  
DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC  
FILE NO: 31.376

Tuesday, December 15, 1970  
Washington, D. C.

WARD & PAUL  
410 FIRST STREET, S. E.  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20003

(202) 544-6000

C O N T E N T S

	<u>STATEMENT OF:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1		
2		
3	Reverand Walter Fauntroy, and	
4	Mrs. Polly Shackleton, Model Inner City Community Organization	317
5	Polly Shackleton,	
6	on Behalf of John W. Hechingter, Former Chairman, D. C. Council	328
7	Polly Shackleton	332
8	James G. Deane,	
9	The Wilderness Society	341
10	Reverand Channing Phillips, District Democratic Central Committee	347
11	George Mitchell, Citizen	352
12	Peter S. Craig	354
13	Reverand Joe L. Gipson,	
14	Upper Northeast Group Ministry	407
15	<u>AFTERNOON SESSION (p. 414)</u>	
16	Richard Faraday, Burleith Citizens Association	414
17	Charles Cassell, Member Board of Education	416
18	James H. Rowe, Jr., Citizen	425
19	Lawrence N. Bloomberg, Palisades Citizens Association	428
20	Richard Pardo, Legal Committee, Metropolitan Washington Coalition for Clean Air	439
21	Eugene J. Clifford, Washington Section, Institute of Traffic Engineers	446
22		
23		
24		
25	Pages at which material is to be inserted: 461	



D. C. Interstate  
5-12/15/70  
Ash/bf

C O N T E N T S (Cont'd)

2	<u>STATEMENT OF:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
3	Thomas P. Rooney, Assembly of the Faculty, Catholic University	453
4	Angela Rooney, Citizen	459
5	Charles L. Waddell, Loudoun County Board of Supervisors	462
6	G	
7	General E. R. Quesada, President, L'Enfant Plaza Corporation	467
8		
9	Robert J. Schaeffer, Sierra Club, Southeast Chapter	472
10	Edward W. Russell, Citizen	475
11	Colden Florance, Metropolitan Chapter, American Institute of Architects	477
12		
13	Edward Roberts, Potomac League of Montgomery County	480
14		
15	Werner H. Quasebarth, Atlas Machine and Iron Works, Inc., Arlington, Virginia	481
16		
17	M. G. "Ted" Britt, Virginia Automobile Dealers	485
18	Barbara Russell	490
19	Richard M. Wright, Executive Director, D. C. Metropolitan Subcontractors Association	493
20		
21	Mrs. Hal Magargle, Audubon Naturalist Society of the Central Atlantic States	495
22		
23	<u>EVENING SESSION</u> (p. 499)	
24	Mrs. Louise McClenathan	499
25	Thomas R. Reid, III	509

12/15/70 1  
 Three Sisters  
 Bridge Ash/bf2

C O N T E N T S (Cont'd)

	<u>STATEMENT OF:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
3	Merle J. Van Horne	516
4	Dr. Cal Coh, National Institute of Health	522
5	Johnie D. Wilson	533
6	R. W. Curtis	537
7	John George Lynch	559
8	James L. Govan	565
9	Emila L. Govan	577
10	Maria Worris, Citizen	589
11	Louis S. Clapper, National Wildlife Federation	606
12	Harriet B. Hubbard	612
13	John Morton, George Washington University	618
14	Daniel C. Liddell, Emergency Committee on the Transportation Crisis	622
15	John J. Curtin, Jr., Curtin and Johnson, Inc.	626
16	Harold O. Miller, Board of Supervisors of Fairfax	631
17	Frank Buck, Jr.	638
18	Elizababeth S. Johnson, League of Women Voters of Metropolitan Wash@ngton	640
19	Charles S. Butt, Jr. Washington Lee High School	642
20	James Clark	649
21	Bernard L. Cain, Bookland Citizens Association	651

C O N T E N T S (Cont'd)

12/15/70 1  
The Sisters  
Bridge/Ash/bf2

STATEMENT OF:

PAGE

- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Frederick Heutte

681



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

-----X  
 :  
 Public Hearing, In Re: :  
 :  
 DESIGN - INTERSTATE ROUTE 266 :  
 :  
 -----X

Departmental Auditorium  
 Department of Commerce  
 Constitution Avenue, Northwest  
 12th and 14th Streets  
 Washington, D. C.

Tuesday, December 15, 1970

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing pursuant to notice, at 10:00 a.m., JULIAN R. DUGAS, Director, District of Columbia Department of Economic Development, presiding.

BEFORE:

JULIAN R. DUGAS

---

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 MR. DUGAS: The hearing is called to order.

3 This is the second day of the Joint Designed Public  
4 Hearing on Proposed Interstate 266, held by the District of  
5 Columbia Government and the State Highway Commission of the  
6 Commonwealth of Virginia.

7 My name is Julian R. Dugas and I am the Director of  
8 the Department of Economic Development, District of Columbia  
9 Government.

10 Mr. Thomas F. Airis, the Director of the Department  
11 of Highways and Traffic of the District of Columbia Government,  
12 and Mr. Leonard DeGast, Deputy Director of the Department of  
13 Highways of the District of Columbia are seated at my right  
14 at the table; along with Mr. H. M. Snead, the District Right-  
15 of-Way Engineer for the State of Virginia, and Mr. D. D.  
16 Harris, the Road Design Engineer of the State of Virginia.

17 All of these gentlemen are available to you for the  
18 purpose of answering any inquiries that you may have regard-  
19 ing the several problems as posed in this hearing.

20 Mr. Harris has asked me to tell you that a set of  
21 the detailed design plans for the Virginia approach are  
22 available for viewing at the front of the room. If you  
23 contact him, he will be delighted to show you these detailed  
24 plans.

25 Now, in this instance, the record in this particular

1 proceeding will remain open until December 28, 5:00 p.m. in  
2 the afternoon, and we would welcome any statements from any  
3 of you or any experts upon any of the factors upon which the  
4 public is given the opportunity to comment. Among those  
5 matters that the public must be given the opportunity to  
6 comment, are these:

- 7 1. Fast, safe and efficient transportation;
- 8 2. Its effect on the national defense;
- 9 3. Its effect on economic activity;
- 10 4. Its effect on employment;
- 11 5. Its effect on recreation and parks;
- 12 6. Its effect on fire protection;
- 13 7. Its effect on aesthetics;
- 14 8. Its effect on public utilities;
- 15 9. Its effect on the public health and safety;
- 16 10. Its effect on residential and neighborhood  
17 character and location;
- 18 11. On religious institutions and practices;
- 19 12. On the conduct and financing of government,  
20 including effect on local tax base and social service costs;
- 21 13. On conservation, including erosion, sedimenta-  
22 tion, wildlife and general ecology of the area;
- 23 14. Natural and historic landmarks;
- 24 15. Noise and air and water pollution;
- 25 16. On property values;



- 1 17. On multiple use of space;
- 2 18. On problems of replacement of housing;
- 3 19. Education, including disruption of school
- 4 district operations;
- 5 20. Any displacement of families and businesses;
- 6 21. Engineering rights of way and construction costs
- 7 of the project and related facilities;
- 8 22. Maintenance and operating cost of the project
- 9 and related facilities; and
- 10 23. Operation and use of existing highway facilities
- 11 and other transportation facilities during construction and
- 12 after completion.

13 Now, these are the 23 factors upon which you as  
14 members of the public are given the opportunity to comment.  
15 And on behalf of the District of Columbia and the State of  
16 Virginia, we welcome these comments. For our purpose in  
17 holding these hearings is to insure you an opportunity to  
18 participate in the process of determining the specific align-  
19 ment and major design features of one of the two sections of  
20 I-266.

21 Your comments will be studied along with information  
22 gained from other sources regarding what design should be  
23 pursued from this point on. The Department will make public  
24 announcements of designs finally selected for submittal to  
25 the governments for their submittal and approval.

1           Feel free to offer your own design alternative and  
2 explain, if possible, how the economic, social and environ-  
3 mental impacts of the facility will be altered.

4           Our first witness for the morning session will be the  
5 Reverend Walter Fauntroy. Along with Reverend Fauntroy will  
6 be Mrs. Polly Shackleton. This will be a joint presentation  
7 of the Model Inner City Community Organization by Reverend  
8 Fauntroy and Mrs. Shackleton.

9           STATEMENT OF REVEREND WALTER FAUNTROY

10           AND MRS. POLLY SHACKLETON, MODEL INNER CITY  
11           COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

12           REVEREND FAUNTROY: Thank you, Mr. Dugas.

13           My name is Walter Fauntroy. I am accompanied by  
14 Mrs. Polly Shackleton, distinguished former member of the  
15 D. C. City Council, and likewise a statement from Mr. John  
16 Hechinger, distinguished first Chairman of the Council. They,  
17 too, will have some remarks for the record.

18           As you know, I was Vice Chairman of the D. C. Council  
19 and Chairman of its Transportation Subcommittee in December of  
20 1968 when, together with the Mayor-Commissioner and the  
21 National Capital Planning Commission, we adopted the policy that  
22 additional gateways into the District of Columbia were not  
23 needed in order to achieve a balanced transportation system,  
24 and that such additional gateways -- including the proposed  
25 Three Sisters Bridge -- were not in the best interests of the



1 District of Columbia.

2 That position evolved after numerous studies and  
3 thorough public hearings held jointly by the D. C. Council  
4 and the National Capitol Planning Commission.

5 Residents from all over the District and from both  
6 the Maryland and the Virginia suburbs testified overwhelmingly  
7 in opposition to the Three Sisters Bridge and other gateways.  
8 They cited the enormous social cost of new freeways in the  
9 loss of housing, in the disruption of neighborhoods and  
10 businesses, in further clogging of its streets with automo-  
11 biles, which then require still more space for parking.

12 Studies made by the Planning Commission indicated --  
13 especially regarding the Three Sisters Bridge -- that the  
14 construction of the planned rail rapid transit would amply  
15 satisfy transportation needs arising from population and  
16 employment growth in this city and the region. Those Planning  
17 Commission studies also pointed out that, far from needing  
18 still another freeway into the District of Columbia from  
19 Northern Virginia, the existing Theodore Roosevelt and Memorial  
20 Bridges at present carry far less traffic during rush hour  
21 than their capacities permit, for the very basic reason that  
22 present street networks on both sides of those bridges cannot  
23 absorb as much traffic as the bridges can generate. In fact,  
24 Mr. Dugas, I remind you that Planning Commission figures  
25 showed that Memorial Bridge carries less traffic now than in



1 some previous years.

2           The conclusion is, then elementary that no design  
3 of a Three Sisters Bridge can increase the capacity of  
4 Arlington or D. C. streets to efficiently carry more traffic  
5 than at present, and without such increased capacities, a  
6 Three Sisters Bridge can only further disrupt both the commun-  
7 ity immediately affected -- Georgetown -- as well as the  
8 Central Business District itself.

9           Indeed, Mr. Chairman, as all who have studied this  
10 issue know, building the Three Sisters Bridge will only set  
11 up inevitable pressures to construct an inner city network  
12 of additional freeways to handle the new traffic; thus, if  
13 this bridge is built, we can be certain that the next calls  
14 will be for a "North Legg" across U Street or Florida Avenue  
15 or K Street in order to carry the overload of traffic travel-  
16 ing this Bridge. We all know this. We know from the exper-  
17 ience of working in the Shaw Renewal Area particularly, there  
18 has been an overwhelming objection on the part of the people  
19 of that community of the proposed North Leg Interloop across  
20 the U Street Corridor.

21           As a matter of fact, the plan which has been  
22 developed by the people, approved by the City Council, and  
23 funded by the Federal Government, presently called for a  
24 number of houses being rehabilitated for the people who now  
25 live in that community. Across the U Street Corridor, business

1 development is being planned in a fashion that the possibility  
2 of a North Leg of the Innerloop coming through Shaw is nil.  
3 The fact is, the people who worked so hard to plan the  
4 community, who have resources now at work to rebuild it,  
5 just cannot even conceive of our responding to the pressures  
6 if the Three Sisters Bridge were built, by allowing a freeway  
7 through our area.

8           Those are very serious consequences of the building  
9 of this bridge and we hope you will take them with the  
10 seriousness appropriate for the issue.

11           Lewis Mumford, in his book "The City In History",  
12 said, as far back as 1961, when he formed the Citizens  
13 Committee for Homes and Highways to react to the proposed  
14 Three Sisters Bridge, the North Leg of the Innerloop and the  
15 North Central Freeway, wrote:

16           " . . . Washington has proved a classic testing  
17 station for the question of whether a city dedicated whole-  
18 heartedly to traffic could sufficiently survive for any other  
19 purposes.

20           "Already it is plan in Washington -- and will become  
21 plainer as the city receives the inundations of new express-  
22 ways, which recklessly spoil every view and defile every  
23 approach to its finest urban prospects -- that when traffic  
24 takes precedence over all other urban functions, it can do  
25 longer perform its own role, that of facilitating meeting and



1 intercourse. The assumed right of the private motor car to  
2 go to any place in the city and park anywhere is nothing less  
3 than a license to destroy the city . . . "

4           Ironically, Mr. Mumford goes on in his book to  
5 illustrate that the beauty and attraction of Georgetown as  
6 a favored residential section of our city was fostered in  
7 part because the enticing narrow streets and compact layout  
8 of its "domestic scale" was free of "grand traffic avenues,  
9 with their noise and their poisonous gases."

10           Phillip G. Hammer, former Chairman of the National  
11 Capital Planning Commission and an internationally known  
12 economic consultant, has said that additional traffic con-  
13 gestion will prove injurious to downtown retail business by  
14 discouraging prospective shoppers from contending with the  
15 increased inconvenienced, expense, and chaos of inadequate  
16 street systems and parking facilities.

17           In addition, Mr. Chairman, no design elements can  
18 prevent a Three Sisters Bridge from contributing to a further  
19 serious escalation of air pollution problems, along the  
20 Georgetown Waterfront in particular and in the region generally.  
21 And this at a time when we are beginning to look forward to an  
22 aesthetically and commercially healthy development of the  
23 Georgetwon riverfront.

24           The people of the District of Columbia, black and  
25 white, affluent and poor, have consistently opposed this



1 bridge. They have done so by every means available to them:  
2 by speaking out, by public action, by legal action, by  
3 demonstrations in the streets and testimony in the halls of  
4 Congress.

5 At this very moment, hundreds of citizens in  
6 Arlington, at the other end of this proposed bridge, are  
7 organizing and testifying against the construction of this  
8 very bridge. They are opposed to the damage it will do to the  
9 environment; they resist the noise and air pollution it will  
10 generate; they are trying to save the housing and schools  
11 which will be taken for I-66, the route which is to feed into  
12 this bridge.

13 In fact, Mr. Chairman, if the citizens of Arlington  
14 prevail -- and we pray they will -- I-66 will not be completed.  
15 450 Arlingtonians opposed that freeway in a recent public  
16 hearing and some 600 protested it at a recent citizens' rally.  
17 When the route for I-66 and the Three Sisters Bridge was  
18 postulated 12 years ago, we didn't know what we have since  
19 learned about the import of air pollution on the ecology; we  
20 did not have the prospect of mass rail transit as an alter-  
21 native. Now we know about air pollution and the people of  
22 this region have overwhelmingly endorsed the building of a  
23 subway.

24 Similar citizens' opposition has arisen in the  
25 Maryland suburbs. Representative Gude from Maryland and many

1 citizen groups in Maryland are adamantly resisting the  
2 prospect of a North Central Freeway, which they see as both  
3 unnecessary and detrimental to their county.

4 The City Council heard and heeded the peoples'  
5 voice in December 1968. Although it is widely felt that the  
6 Council faltered in the face of a resurgence of traditionally  
7 callous pressures in a subsequent action, I urge you now to h  
8 ear the people of the District and to see that they are repre-  
9 sented in the decision with respect to the Three Sisters  
10 Bridge. In short, design elements cannot fit the Three  
11 Sisters Bridge where it does not belong.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. DUGAS: Reverend Fauntroy, are there any ques-  
14 tions that you would like to ask of our Highway experts,  
15 particularly on where the traffic will go once it gets across  
16 the bridge, if built?

17 REVEREND FAUNTROY: There are no questions which I  
18 have not asked a thousand times over the past ten years, the  
19 most of recent of which questions were asked during the  
20 hearings by the City Council. For the record, I should like  
21 very much to ask what we propose to do again with the traffic  
22 coming across the Three Sisters Bridge, once it is into  
23 Georgetown and into the City.

24 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Airis.

25 MR. AIRIS: I would like to respond to that,

1 Reverend. The traffic, as you observe on the mosaic, will  
2 come via I-66 from Dulles and I-66 beyond the Beltway, across  
3 the river, or we will go off to the right and thence through  
4 Rosslyn and on down to the existing Roosevelt Bridge. But if  
5 it does come across this bridge, which actually as I under-  
6 stand it your question pertains to, it will go down the  
7 Potomac River Freeway, the laneage is balanced and will not  
8 go into Georgetown at all.

9 It will bypass Georgetown. That is one of the  
10 principal reasons of this particular facility.

11 Then we will go on down into the Potomac River  
12 Freeway, which is already built, has about four lanes in each  
13 direction, in the vicinity of 26th Street and Virginia Avenue,  
14 or it will have the alternative of coming in the K Street  
15 Expressway and N to the inner city.

16 Now, one of the principal reasons for this particular  
17 facility is a direct high-speed, good connection between the  
18 inner city and Dulles Airport without which, of course,  
19 Dulles Airport cannot be put into a competitive position with  
20 National.

belt 2  
21 Now, that generally, in generalities, is the answer  
22 to your question. It is not intended at this hearing as a  
23 subject, but since I was asked the question, I thought perhaps  
24 I should answer it. There are other reasons, but I think that  
25 is sufficient for an answer to your question, sir.



1 REVEREND FAUNTROY: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Airis, is  
2 the import of your statement that the building of the bridge  
3 does not necessitate a North Leg of the Inner Loop?

4 MR. AIRIS: We would only build any facility -- I  
5 will try to get right to your question -- we would only build  
6 any facility in what we refer to as useable segments. In  
7 other words, the facility that we would build can stand on its  
8 own feet and it will function without the North Leg, but I  
9 would have to add that it will function much better with some  
10 kind of a North Leg, either K Street or some other facility  
11 to the north of K Street.

12 Now, as you know, that North Leg has not yet been  
13 fully studied and the location of it has not yet been nailed  
14 down. The Council and the Mayor, of course, have said it  
15 should be K Street. The most recent action of the Council on  
16 the North Leg said it should be K Street or L or N or some  
17 street in that vicinity.

18 REVEREND FAUNTROY: Yes, it is not going to be in  
19 Shaw, for sure.

20 I want to be very clear, Mr. Airis, on what you are  
21 saying. You are saying to us that the building of the Three  
22 Sisters will not require the North Leg and from what you told  
23 me about the egress on the east side of town, it will not  
24 necessitate a North Central Freeway?

25 MR. AIRIS: Yes. In general, I would answer your

1 question, "Yes." These facilities you are looking at up here  
2 can stand on their own feet. They will, of course, not  
3 function to full usage for the City unless the rest of the  
4 Inner Loop is built.

5 REVEREND FAUNTROY: That is a contradictory state-  
6 ment, Mr. Chairman. Yes and no.

7 MR. AIRIS: Well, I can't give you ---

8 REVEREND FAUNTROY: Yes, they will function; no,  
9 they will not function.

10 MR. AIRIS: It will function, but it will function  
11 of course, not to full efficiency until the rest of the  
12 Inner Loop is built.

13 REVEREND FAUNTROY: Then it will be in the same  
14 shape that the Memorial Bridge and the Theodore Roosevelt  
15 Bridge presently are, failing to function to full capacity and  
16 they will function to full capacity, I take it, only when we  
17 pave the city over with a network of freeways.

18 I think, Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting tat we ought  
19 to give serious attention to what the people have stated,  
20 what the Council and the NCPC have after thorough study con-  
21 cluded, and what the Mayor and the Council presented to the  
22 Congress in 1968; namely, that if we are going to deal with  
23 the problem of Dulles, let's get a subway out there. If we  
24 are going to deal with problems of I-66, the rapid transit  
25 system holds our best hope for preserving the quality of life

1 in the city, while dealing on the other hand with the  
2 necessity to move people through the region.

3 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, I didn't, of course,  
4 instigate the questioning. But I think I should say this,  
5 Reverend, just to try to clarify a few points. On Memorial  
6 Bridge, the reason for the reduction in the capacity that you  
7 mention is the fact that we and the Park Service stopped  
8 unbalancing a lane on that bridge some years ago. That is the  
9 reason, and the only reason, for the reduction in the usage  
10 of Memorial Bridge.

11 The Park Service intends eventually to use Memorial  
12 Bridge as a part of the Lincoln Memorial Complex and the  
13 Arlington Memorial Cemetery. In other words, they are attempt-  
14 ing to put the bridge in its monumental usage, for which it  
15 was originally intended.

16 Now, the reason for the lack of full capacity on  
17 Roosevelt Bridge, although it is carrying good traffic at the  
18 present time, it will not reach capacity until the Virginia  
19 Highway Department builds its segment farther than Rosslyn  
20 Circle. And at that time, of course, it will better its  
21 usage.

22 Those are two of the things I would like to just add  
23 to what has already been said here.

24 Thank you.

25 REVEREND FAUNTROY: I would be pleased for Mr.



1 Airis to inform the NCPC staff that the staff of the Council  
2 of D. C. found information to the contrary.

3 MR. AIRIS: I will be very happy to do so.

4 MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

5 Mrs. Shackleton.

6 STATEMENT OF MRS. POLLY SHACKLETON ON  
7 BEHALF OF JOHN W. HECHINGER, FORMER  
8 CHAIRMAN, D. C. COUNCIL

9 MRS. SHACKLETON: Mr. Dugas, I thank you very much  
10 for putting us on bright and early this morning. Unfortunately,  
11 I have Mr. Hechinger's regrets. He had an old colleague,  
12 business colleague, who died and he had to go to Baltimore for  
13 the funeral this morning. He regretted very much that he  
14 could not be here.

15 He has asked me to read his prepared statement,  
16 after which I will have a few brief remarks of my own. This  
17 is Chairman Hechinger's statement:

18 "Mr. Dugas:

19 "I appreciate fully that this hearing has been  
20 called to hear testimony on specific design and engineering  
21 qualities of the Three Sisters Bridge. However, the time has  
22 long past when engineers alone can determine what highways  
23 should be built and the path that these roads should take.

24 "It has been recognized for many years now by those  
25 who are concerned about the quality of urban life that the

1 Interstate Highway Program has created an awareness of the  
2 distressing state of the urban environment which has been  
3 specifically exacerbated by this highway program. It has put  
4 into focus this metropolitan area to the Three Sisters Bridge  
5 project. Through the focus in this metropolitan area on the  
6 Three Sisters project, the plight of the inner city has become  
7 visible. Therefore, for those of us who have been standing  
8 fast against the massive construction that will destroy the  
9 quality of the city, will be thankful this indeterminable  
10 debate on the highway issue has well led off the plight that  
11 exists.

12 "During my time as Chairman of the City Council,  
13 we decided on the approval of the truncated highway plan but  
14 only after most exhaustive research and . . . study. Our  
15 contention was the very simple and the logical idea we do not  
16 want in the 1980's and beyond a title wave of additional  
17 automobiles on the already loaded 1970 street capacity of our  
18 city. We contend there are excellent alternatives open that  
19 will be preferable to help try to manage our transportation  
20 needs. We arrived at a thoroughly adequate and balanced  
21 transportation system that will take care of the growth in our  
22 metropolitan area without any more gateways into the city,  
23 and that is without the Three Sisters Bridge.

24 "Proponents of more highways argue that by the time  
25 the Metro is built, we will be swamped with cars and there



1 will be no balance. But what is forgotten is that it will  
2 take just as long to complete the freeway part of it as it  
3 will to construct the Metro System. True congestion will  
4 continue to exist for a few years.

5 ". . . proposed in our plan are both completed.  
6 But this congestion will persist if the vastly more extensive  
7 Department of Highway solution is adopted. Our highway plans  
8 recognized that the District is approaching a limit on the  
9 number of cars that can be brought into the city and parti-  
10 cularly into the downtown area. Several hundred million  
11 dollars' worth of freeway and parkway improvements are there-  
12 fore designed to improve the continuity and coverage of the  
13 highway networks without bringing in a large number of motor  
14 vehicles through new routes into the District.

15 "Furthermore, these projects are realistic in the  
16 sense they involve very little destruction of the community.  
17 The plans go right to the heart of the concept of balancing  
18 the city. We will not have a balance until we are actually  
19 operating the subway system. After the subway system is  
20 operating, there will be time to consider other transportation  
21 improvements, whether in the form of additional highways,  
22 rapid transit or other means of transportation.

23 "In the downtown area of this city, over half of the  
24 land is taken up by streets, parking lots and parking garages.  
25 Within the city as a whole, over 25 percent of the land is now



1 taken up by roads. Of these, over 1,000 miles of road,  
2 approximately 250 miles are in arterial highways, freeways,  
3 and expressways.

4 "The continuous fallacious argument about the need for  
5 a balanced transportation system is demonstrated by the  
6 fact that only the true way to achieve a balance is to stop  
7 building roads and finish the Mass Transit System. In  
8 arriving at our decision to provide no more gateways into the  
9 City, we were responding like almost every other major city's  
10 municipal body in this country, such as Baltimore, Nashville,  
11 San Francisco, New Orleans, to mention a few.

12 "The Federal Highway Act has been a great boon to  
13 this country, has connected one great city to another. But  
14 everywhere it hits the city boundary, it has become a destroyer  
15 of the urban environment.

16 "It is my contention, full and proper hearings have  
17 been held on the highway system for the District of Columbia  
18 and this plan calls for no Three Sisters Bridge. The reversal  
19 of the Council's decision to build the Three Sisters Bridge  
20 by a later Council was done without full hearings and there-  
21 fore, in my view, is invalid.

22 "The mounting cries of desperation in our suburban  
23 communities supports the District of Columbia City Council for  
24 mass transportation planning. Therefore, in conclusion, I  
25 call for you to reject the further study of the engineering

1 and design qualities of the Three Sisters Bridge as it has  
2 been officially stricken from the Mass Transportation Plan  
3 under the full procedure of Title 23 of the Highway Act."

4 That, Mr. Chairman, concludes Chairman Hechinger's  
5 statement.

6 STATEMENT OF MRS. POLLY SHACKLETON

7 MRS. SHACKLETON: Now, as someone who has been long  
8 involved in the transportation problem of the District, I  
9 will add a few comments of my own.

10 Over the years, I worked with Reverend Fauntroy,  
11 with Mrs. Rowe, with Peter Craig, and with many others opposing  
12 destructive freeway programs, and at the same time all of us  
13 were pushing very hard for a subway system.

14 I served as a member of the Council's Transportation  
15 Committee, which Reverend Fauntroy shared, at the time of the  
16 studies that were made. And as both Chairman Hechinger and  
17 Reverend Fauntroy have noted, the City Council and NCPC in  
18 fulfilling their obligations conducted extensive studies and  
19 hearings prior to issuing the Landmark Comprehensive  
20 Transportation Plan in December, 1968.

21 This fulfilled the legal requirements and had the  
22 full support of the Mayor, the then Secretary of Transportation,  
23 Mr. Allen Boyd, and of the National Democratic Administration.

24 You may recall that at the opening meeting of the  
25 new City Council in November, 1967, Chairman Hechinger said

1/2 b. 3



1 that the Council, his idea of the functions of the Council,  
2 were that the Council would serve as the heartbeat of the new  
3 government and would represent the people and respond to the  
4 needs and aspirations of all of the citizens of the District.  
5 I believe that that first Council, which Reverend Fauntroy  
6 was the Vice Chairman of and I served on, carried out this  
7 resolve of Chairman Hechinger's.

8 And in that 8-to-0 vote for the transportation  
9 plan, which was jointly developed with NCPC, I believe that  
10 they really carried out the responsibilities to the citizens  
11 of the District.

12 Incidentally, on that vote, Chairman Nevius ab-  
13 stained. It was an 8-to-0 vote with his abstaining.

14 When under the pressure a subsequent Council re-  
15 versed the design by a 6-to-2 vote, the City Council in my  
16 view lost its soul. I think from that point on, it ceased  
17 to be a representative heartbeat, responsible to the citizens  
18 of the District. I think it los credibility and gave the  
19 appearance of being simply a puppet organization. I think  
20 it is most regrettable that that happened.

21 Furthermore, I regret that the Council apparently  
22 further copped out on its responsibility by not conducting  
23 the hearing. Whether it feels, as some of us do, that this  
24 hearing is not legally required, that may be, but if that is  
25 the case I think they should have so stated, that they did



1 not feel that it was a legally required hearing. Otherwise,  
2 I think it is the responsibility of the Council to conduct  
3 hearings of this nature. They seem to get into hearings  
4 on almost every other subject that comes along, but when it  
5 comes to a tough one, I am afraid they have copped out on  
6 this one.

7 One other point, as I think Reverend Fauntroy  
8 mentioned, how can one conduct a design hearing when one  
9 isn't talking about where it is coming to and where it is  
10 going? After all, apparently, as I believe I am correct --  
11 Mr. Airis can correct me if I am wrong -- that the going on  
12 the entrances of the bridge and off the bridge on the other  
13 side -- are they included in this design concept here? The  
14 ramps, the exits?

15 MR. AIRIS: Madam, the sections that are included  
16 in this particular design hearing are shown in yellow on that  
17 particular chart.

18 Now, just to reiterate for you, starting at the  
19 D. C. end, it is approximately at the location of MacArthur  
20 and Foxhall, south of that particular intersection, which I  
21 am sure you are familiar with. It crosses the river and then  
22 comes up underneath the present Route 1 Parkway Bridge and  
23 makes a connection with I-66, as shown in yellow on the  
24 mosaic.

25 It is about 2800 feet on the Virginia side and

1 about 1500 feet on the District side.

2 MRS. SHACKLETON: How close on the District side  
3 does that go to the houses in that Foxhall-MacArthur area?

4 MR. AIRIS: How close to the houses?

5 MRS. SHACKLETON: Yes.

6 MR. AIRIS: Of course, I could go up and scale it.

7 I don't have it in my memory.

8 If you would permit me to check a minute ---

9 MRS. SHACKLETON: I just wonder how much that  
10 affects that particular residential area there.

11 MR. AIRIS: It would, in our opinion, have very  
12 little, if any, effect on it.

13 MRS. SHACKLETON: Well, do you think Mr. DeGast  
14 could figure out, so we could have just how close it does go  
15 to the homes in that area?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. DE GAST: It is in the range of 200 feet.

MR. AIRIS: To the closest house?

MR. DE GAST: To the closest house.

MRS. SHACKLETON: How far is that from some point in the room.

MR. AIRIS: It is about from here to the other side of the street.

REVEREND FAUNTROY: Two hundred feet?

MRS. SHACKLETON: Two hundred feet or two hundred yards?

MR. AIRIS: I would be glad to pace it out for you. I used to do a lot of pacing out. If you would like to see it. I can tell you what the distance is to the door out there.

MRS. SHACKLETON: It is approximately 70 yards and ---

REVEREND FAUNTROY: A football field is 300 feet.

MRS. SHACKLETON: Well, I guess that places it in context. It is less than between the goal post and ---

MR. AIRIS: That is 300 feet.

MRS. SHACKLETON: So, what we are talking about is less.

MR. AIRIS: It is about two-thirds of that to the closest house, closest building.



1 MRS. SHACKLETON: How does it impinge on the Spout  
2 Run area over there?

3 MR. AIRIS: Now, I would have to refer that to my  
4 colleagues in the Virginia State Highway Department. They  
5 probably can give you a better answer than I can. Could one  
6 of you?

7 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Harris.

8 MR. HARRIS: Mrs. Shackleton, the approaches on the  
9 Virginia side, as you know, are in the Spout Run Parkway. And  
10 looking at the mosaic, I would say that the closest house --  
11 this scale is one inch equals 100 feet -- it looks around  
12 around t200/250 feet, looking at the mosaic.

13 MRS. SHACKLETON: So that I assume that the point  
14 has been brought up about destructive natural park areas. How  
15 can one not destroy the Spout Run area? What is the width of  
16 that approach?

17 MR. AIRIS: Of the bridge?

18 MRS. SHACKLETON: Of the approaches to Spout Run.

19 MR. AIRIS: In Spout Run? Well, the roadway is what,  
20 34 feet?

21 MR. HARRIS: Thirty-six.

22 MR. AIRIS: Thirty-six feet in each lane and you have  
23 got shoulders -- that is another ---

24 MR. HARRIS: Fifteen feet.

25 MR. AIRIS: The width where there are no ramps, then,

1 is in the neighborhood of 100 feet, would you say?

2 MR. HARRIS: About 100 feet, right.

3 MRS. SHACKLETON: So that would be hard to deny  
4 that that would not effectively destroy that natural Spout  
5 Run atmosphere?

6 MR. AIRIS: There are in the brochure some details  
7 with dimensions on them, which give a pretty good idea of the  
8 details there.

9 MRS. SHACKLETON: So that you feel you are conforming  
10 with all of the highway regulations, even though you are  
11 destroying Spout Run?

12 MR. AIRIS: Well, ---

13 MRS. SHACKLETON: I mean, let's face it.

14 MR. AIRIS: That is a "Stop beating your wife"  
15 question policy. We think that in the section that we have  
16 under this design hearing, we have done our level best to  
17 preserve the aesthetics of the area and preserve the area  
18 generally. We have tried very hard to. And the booklet does  
19 go into some detail on these particular aspects.

20 MR. HARRIS: Mrs. Shackleton, in answer to some of  
21 your questions, we have design detail plans on the Virginia  
22 side up front, that we would be glad to discuss with you.

23 REVEREND FAUNTROY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may  
24 conclude by saying it is very clear to me and people across  
25 this community that there has been no issue in my memory that

1 there has been no issue in my memory that has come before  
2 the people of the city that has had a broader base of support,  
3 a broader recognition than the position which the people  
4 expressed to the Council and which we translated into public  
5 policy and practice two years ago.

6           If democracy is to be meaningful, if self-government  
7 in the City is to be more than an empty phrase, I think we  
8 must recognize that we have here a moral issue. It cannot be  
9 answered by more hearings on design. It cannot be addressed  
10 by more careful testimony. I have carefully testified, I guess,  
11 a thousand times over the last ten years. We have a moral  
12 question before us.

13           It is a time for action on the part of people who  
14 respond for justice and right. It is time for action in the  
15 District Government. It is a time for reasoned action in the  
16 Highway Department. It is a time for action in the Congress.  
17 It is a time for action among the people of good will in this  
18 community. And those who sit back and do nothing about this  
19 crisis are inviting chaos and despair and those who act boldly  
20 to respond to the will of the people, will be recognized not  
21 only right, but reasoned.

22           I certainly hope that out of these hearings the  
23 gong will again be sounded to the people of this community  
24 to respond not simply to the calculations of the technicians,  
25 but more important, to the will of the people. Not to listen



1 to those whose pursuit of private power and property exceeds  
2 their public sense of responsibility, but to make democracy  
3 meaningful for those of us who have been denied so long in  
4 this city access to the command post of power over our lives.

5 Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

8 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, could I just add one short  
9 comment, just to verify one point.

10 Would your group have any feeling one way or the  
11 other on the structures that are proposed in the alternative  
12 plan for this particular design hearing? They are right up  
13 here. Would you have feeling one way or the other?

14 REVEREND FAUNTROY: Yes, we have one feeling, and  
15 that is that neither should be approved. No design for Three  
16 Sisters Bridge is functional in terms of the health and  
17 welfare of the people. The people of the City should be con-  
18 sidered, Mr. Chairman.

19 MR. DUGAS: Our next witness scheduled is the  
20 Reverend Channing Phillips.

21 MR. STROUD: I am Arthur Stroud, member of the  
22 Democratic Central Committee. Mr. Phillips has been delayed.  
23 I would like to ask his testimony be deferred until after  
24 other witnesses.

25 MR. DUGAS: Yes, Mr. Stroud.

1 Is Mr. George Mitchell in the house?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. DUGAS: Mr. James G. Deane.

4 STATEMENT OF JAMES G. DEANE, THE WILDERNESS  
5 SOCIETY

6 MR. DEANE: I am James G. Deane. I am assistant  
7 editor on the staff of The Wilderness Society, a national  
8 nonprofit conservation organization of some 70,000 members  
9 established in 1935. The Society has its headquarters in  
10 Washington.

11 We believe the plan for the Three Sisters Bridge and  
12 its connections conflicts with proper environmental goals for  
13 the National Capital. A fundamental environmental goal for  
14 Washington should be the preservation of the city's strikingly  
15 beautiful natural setting. This includes the Potomac and  
16 Anacostia Rivers and much of their shores, the stream valley  
17 parks that extend inland from the rivers, and the rest of  
18 Washington's exceptional park system. Another fundamental  
19 environmental goal should be the restoration of the once clear  
20 condition of our air.

21 Another fundamental environmental goal should be  
22 the curbing of the noise which is drastically eroding the  
23 livability of this metropolis. Another fundamental environ-  
24 mental goal should be the conserving of the limited space we  
25 inhabit. But the Three Sisters plan seems to us to collide



1 head-on with all these goals.

2           The bridge, its massive approaches, and the huge  
3 traffic flows they would carry would intrude on and blemish  
4 the beginning of the Potomac Gorge, one of Washington's  
5 natural scenic wonders. They would also encroach on the park  
6 lands along both river shores and threaten destruction of  
7 further park land. The traffic growth invited by the bridge  
8 would make our air still dirtier and the din still louder  
9 and would preempt still more of our shrinking living space.  
10 The bridge would press forward a wasteful and destructive  
11 trend, promoting the use of still more motor vehicles when  
12 already we struggle with an automotive glut.

13           The Wilderness Society favors reversing this  
14 destructive trend by providing modern mass transportation for  
15 the Washington metropolitan area. An adequate high-speed rail  
16 rapid transit system will obviate the need for laying countless  
17 rivers of new pavement to provide for the commuter. Since a  
18 high-speed rail transit line is to be tunneled under the  
19 river near the Three Sisters site, in addition to one at  
20 14th Street, a Three Sisters automotive crossing seems to us  
21 not only needless but self-defeating in terms of sensible  
22 planning and public investment.

23           We also view the Three Sisters Bridge project as  
24 unacceptable because of its special threat to the future of  
25 Glover-Archbold Park. Glover-Archbold Park occupies a wooded



1 stream valley which extends for two and one-half miles into  
2 Northwest Washington. The valley starts at the Three Sisters  
3 site. The proposed bridge would point directly up this stream  
4 v alley.

5 For many years, some highway planners have been  
6 eager to construct an express highway up this park. Some  
7 plans have called for making both this park-invading express-  
8 way and the Three Sisters bridge part of an Intermediate Loop  
9 Freeway traversing much other park land in both Washington  
10 and Arlington.

11 In the minds of some engineers, these are not dead  
12 proposals. In fact, there is every reason to expect, if a  
13 Three Sisters Bridge actually is constructed, that it will  
14 quickly bring a revival of the efforts to build a freeway up  
15 Glover-Archbold Park, very likely as part of an Intermediate  
16 Loop.

17 The Three Sisters Bridge would actually be a great  
18 dagger pointing in two directions -- at Washington and its  
19 Maryland suburbs on one side of the Potomac, and at Arlington  
20 and other Virginia communities on the other.

21 The Wilderness Society thinks the Three Sisters  
22 project is obsolete, ill-conceived, destructive, and menacing  
23 to the environment. We think it ought to be dropped.

24 I want to add to the prepared statement a comment  
25 about the booklet called, "I-266 Design Hearing Information"

1 that was prepared in connection with this hearing by the  
2 District and Virginia Highway Departments and was made refer-  
3 ence to a few moments ago by Mr. Airis.

4           There are some statements about conservation  
5 aesthetics, noise, air, and water pollution in this booklet,  
6 which in my opinion bear no resemblance to the facts of this  
7 project. I think these statements are utterly misleading. I  
8 think that the environmental and conservation implications of  
9 this project are all bad.

10           I think the attempt to present these social values  
11 and objectives as being satisfied in any sense in this  
12 booklet are ridiculous and I think that the booklet deserves  
13 to be thrown into the wastebasket from that standpoint.

14           (Applause.)

15           MR. DEANE: I think I will submit a further state-  
16 ment for the record, dealing in more detail with what I have  
17 just referred to in this booklet.

18           I think an even grosser pervision of the oblication  
19 of Government officials to deal frankly and candidly with  
20 the proposals they are presenting to the public is the fact  
21 that we are being given a torso, a trunkated piece of a  
22 highway that is being proposed, or bridge, or whatever you  
23 want to call it. This is described on the cover of the  
24 booklet as "I-266 Design Hearing Information." But as I  
25 understand it, I-266 runs from I-66 over to Rock Creek Park



1 and yet the yellow strip on that aerial photograph up there  
2 stops at the bottom of Glover-Archbold Park.

3 We don't have the full interchange, we don't have  
4 the Potomac River Freeway which runs between the park and  
5 the bridge, up to Rock Creek Park. Why don't we?

6 I don't see that there is any justification for  
7 having this kind of torso presented by the Highway Departments  
8 of the District of Columbia and Virginia, if they seriously  
9 are trying to do something to comply with the law. I don't  
10 think this complies with the law in any sense, moral or  
11 otherwise.

12 As a former nes man, bridle at this kind of  
13 travesty. I think this whole proceeding is a travesty. I  
14 think the Highway Departments had their minds made up long  
15 ago they were going to build a Three Sisters Island Bridge,  
4 16 and they don't really care whether the citizens are opposed to  
17 it, whether the facts contradict the arguments they are pre-  
18 senting in support of it.

19 They are going to go ahead with it anyway. I am  
20 here and I hope a lot of other citizens are going to be here  
21 because we want to take advantage of any opportunity that is  
22 offered to express ourselves and set forth what we think to be  
23 in the public interests. And that is what I have attempted  
24 to do on behalf of the Wilderness Society.

25 I may say I have been a resident of the District for



1 a great many years and have been active in civic activities.  
2 I became active in highway plans a number of years ago because  
3 I wrote a long report for the Evening Star on the subject of  
4 these plans, some of which are still dragging around here.  
5 This bridge was not a part of the series I wrote about in  
6 1952. It came along the following year, but the highway up  
7 Glover-Archbold Parkway was, the intermediate loop, was  
8 born about that time.

9           These are obsolete proposals. They were conceived  
10 at the time when nobody was thinking there was going to ever  
11 be a subway system for Washington. They were conceived at a  
12 time when the real objective of the highway planners was to  
13 try to cope with simply the traffic crush of that time in the  
14 best way they knew how.

15           I give full credit to the engineers, and some of  
16 them are my friends, for their attempts to cope with the  
17 colossal problem. But I think their attempts are just making  
18 the problem worse. I don't think there is any way of solving  
19 the highway problems by building more highways, creating more  
20 traffic.

21           In a growing society of this kind, where we have  
22 more and more people, you can't solve the traffic problem by  
23 creating more traffic.

24           That really is the basic objective of Three Sisters  
25 Bridge, to create more traffic. That is the objective of the

1 plan for Washington, to create more traffic. Anybody who  
2 says otherwise is just misleading himself.

3 I think it is time to forget all of this nonsense  
4 and set about building the transportation facilities that will  
5 solve the problem, and I think the Three Sisters Bridge is  
6 abominable, is a project that should be abandoned and thrown  
7 into the ash can.

8 Thank you.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

11 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder, would you mind  
12 if I just asked the witness if he does have any preference to  
13 either of these two treatments or any other alternative?

14 MR. DEANE: No, sir.

15 MR. DUGAS: The Reverend Channing Phillips.

16 STATEMENT OF REVEREND CHANNING PHILLIPS,

17 DISTRICT DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE

18 REVEREND PHILLIPS: I appear here today both for  
19 myself and for the District Democratic Central Committee. I  
20 am here today to oppose the Three Sisters Bridge just as I  
21 have repeatedly opposed it in the last several years. In  
22 doing so, I am confident that I represent the over 80 percent  
23 of District residents who are Democrats since District  
24 Democrats voted 93,524 to 4,986 or 19-to-1 in 1968 to oppose  
25 all further highway construction unless the highway was



1 previously approved by a referendum. That is precisely my  
2 position today.

3 The Democratic Central Committee first of all objects  
4 to this hearing. We think it is time that the District  
5 Government spoke with one voice on freeways. As I understand  
6 it, the Mayor opposes freeways. Yet, Thomas Airis, the head  
7 of the Highway Department, does his best to pave the city  
8 over from one end to the other.

9 For example, the Department has distributed for this  
10 hearing a booklet named "I-266 Design Hearing Information"  
11 which is the most one-sided description of the Three Sisters  
12 Bridge imaginable. I think that the Mayor should take leader-  
13 ship of the District Government on this vital issue, stop free  
14 construction and stop these hearings. It is time, in other  
15 words, for the District Government to decide once and for all --  
16 does it want to build Three Sisters Bridge and other freeways  
17 or not.

18 There are many reasons why these hearings are im-  
19 proper. First, no hearings should be held pending the deter-  
20 mination of the Court of Appeals in the Three Sisters Bridge  
21 case. As I expect you know, I am a plaintiff in that case  
22 and the District Court has already held that the District  
23 Government proceeded illegally. Rather than to break the law  
24 again, it would seem appropriate for the District Government  
25 to wait until the courts complete their determination.



1           Second, new corridor public hearings are needed in  
2 Virginia. The last such hearing was in 1958. The Department  
3 of Transportation's own rules require a new hearing when the  
4 social, economic or environmental effects of a highway have  
5 changed and this is clearly true over the last 12 years.

6           Third, this hearing does not consider the highway  
7 approach to Three Sisters Bridge. It is impossible to con-  
8 sider the design of the bridge without knowing what the  
9 District approach will be. It is clear what the Highway  
10 Department is doing. As always, it proposes only one piece  
11 of highway at a time so opponents will not join together.  
12 And once the Bridge is built, the approach to the bridge will  
13 be a fait accompli.

14           Let me now turn to the merits of the bridge. I  
15 regard the proper design as a beautiful river and three small  
16 islands. While the river is not now beautiful, we hope that  
17 it will soon be after we meet the Potomac's serious pollution  
18 problem. But it will never be beautiful if it is paved over  
19 by bridge after bridge after bridge to meet the insatiable  
20 demand of the automobile.

21           The defense of the bridge in the booklet is little  
22 short of ludicrous. It says the bridge is good for national  
23 defense but no explanation is given. I don't know who is  
24 attacking us.

25           It says that the bridge will save lives. Maybe so

1 when compared to other highways. But it and all other auto-  
2 bobile transportation is much more dangerous than the subway  
3 will be. So you ought to be comparing it with rapid transit,  
4 not other highwasy.

5 It gives precise figures about cost benefits because  
6 of travel time saved in comparison to other highways. But  
7 again the subway will be much faster.

8 It notes the great economic benefit from building  
9 the bridge in employment. But just as many men could be em-  
10 ployed on other construction of much greater value, like  
11 schools, parks, and libraries, and housing, things people need.

12 It completely neglects the financial and other costs  
13 to the public of the bridge. What will the effect on air  
14 pollution be, including more cars to travel to the city. How  
15 much will this cost in money, in health, in decent living?  
16 What will be the effect on subway fares if more persons drive  
17 their own cars?

18 And, finally, and most important, there is no  
19 indication what will happen to all these cars. What other  
20 freeways will have to be built in the District of Columbia if  
21 this bridge is built. Will the North Leg have to be built,  
22 which will destroy much of the Adams-Morgan and Shaw areas?  
23 Will these cars be handled on existing streest which are already  
24 overcrowded, such as Wisconsin Avenue and M Street? Will more  
25 parking be needed downtown, which will destroy existing small



1 businesses?

2 We think the public deserves all this information  
3 on these problems if any hearings are to be meaningful. The  
4 District Government needs this information if a decision is  
5 to be made based on all relevant factors. As it now stands,  
6 this hearing is a mere window-dressing with a preordained  
7 conclusion. It should be stopped until a meaningful hearing  
8 to carefully consider the numerous severe problems involved  
9 here can be held.

10 Virtually no one in the District wants the Three  
11 Sisters Bridge. It will simply attract the cars of more  
12 suburban commuters. The only argument for it is that it is  
13 the only way to get the subway. But I don't believe we can  
14 bow to this blackmail. When the City Council gave in in 1969,  
15 the blackmailers simply raised their price. In 1969, it was  
16 the bridge, today they want the North Central Freeway, tomorrow  
17 it will be the North Leg, on and on and on.

18 But this year no one surrendered and it appears that  
19 the effort to force the North Central Freeway on the District  
20 has been stopped. I hope that this lesson is remembered by  
21 everyone and especially the District Government. The lesson is,  
22 as I and others argued in 1969 -- don't give in to blackmail.

23 I, therefore, hope that the city will adjourn these  
24 hearings, make no decision concerning the design of the bridge  
25 until after the Court of Appeals decides and a fair hearing



1 can be held, or better yet, forget the whole miserable idea.

2 Thank you very much.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

5 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman,

6 Reverend, I assume you would not prefer to express  
7 a preference or any other alternative to the two that are  
8 shown there for this particular bridge?

9 REVEREND PHILLIPS: Where are the bridges, sir?

10 MR. AIRIS: Right here (indicating).

11 REVEREND PHILLIPS: Those are bridges?

12 MR. AIRIS: That is an identical view to that con-  
13 tained in the pamphlet.

14 REVEREND PHILLIPS: No, sir, I would prefer not to  
15 express a preference. My preference is the river and the  
16 three islands.

17 MR. AIRIS: Thank you.

18 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Reverend Phillips.

19 Mr. George Mitchell.

20 STATEMENT OF GEORGE MITCHELL, CITIZEN,

21 1100 SIXTH STREET, NORTHWEST, WASHINGTON, D. C.

22 MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen.

23 I am George Mitchell, a candidate for the D. C.

24 Delegate seat, and I, too, oppose the design of this bridge  
25 because it is designed to do what all of the other highways

1 that lead in and out of this city are designed to do. They  
2 are designed to get those persons in the high economic strats  
3 in and out of this city at will.

4 We feel that this bridge is just one more indication  
5 of one more effort to make it easy for people who come into  
6 the City of Washington and suck it for all it is worth, and  
7 then rush back out of it at a given time at 5:00 o'clock in  
8 the evening.

9 So we oppose the design for that purpose. We take  
10 the position that it is an affront to the people of this city  
11 to have a hearing as to whether the design is proper, when the  
12 public and the pure sentiment of this city appears to be that  
13 the bridge should not be constructed at all.

14 We, too, would like to voice our objection to this  
15 hearing and state that we feel that it is an illegal hearing  
16 and suggest that the proper thing to do, as has been suggested  
17 by previous speakers, would be to can this matter and put it  
18 on ice and forget it altogether.

19 Thank you.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Mitchell.

22 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman.

23 I would presume, Mr. Mitchell, you would not prefer  
24 to express a preference for this treatment, the two treatments  
25 shown, or any other alternative?

1 MR. MITCHELL: I take the same position that the  
2 design is offensive to me, because it is designed to do what  
3 has been done to this city all along, to take the resources  
4 from this city, to take the people who actually make the  
5 big money in this city back out of it.

6 We feel, the citizens and taxpayers of this city,  
7 sir, that this money should be spent on Seventh Street, it  
8 should be spent on housing in this city. It should be spent  
9 on rehabilitating 14th Street. There are so many things and  
10 so many people who are going hungry in the city and this money  
11 should be spent on things of that sort, instead of a bridge  
12 designed to get the commuter in and out of here at will.

13 MR. AIRIS: But no preference to any particular  
14 design?

15 MR. MITCHELL: No preference.

16 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Mitchell.

17 Mr. Peter S. Craig.

18 STATEMENT OF PETER S. CRAIG, CITIZEN, 3406

19 MACOMB STREET, NORTHWEST, WASHINGTON, D. C.

20 MR. CRAIG: Let me start a little bit with my quali-  
21 fications, because I do appear here as an expert witness, also  
22 as an interested citizen and a trustee of the Committee of 100  
23 on the Federal City..

24 I am a trained economist, having majored in economics  
25 and graduated Phi Beta Cappa from Overland College in 1950. I



1 am also trained as a lawyer, having graduated from Yale Law  
2 School in 1953. I have been practicing law in Washington  
3 since 1953, primarily in transportation law. My clients have  
4 included American Airlines, other airlines, trucking companies,  
5 shipping companies, the Department of Transportation, railroads.

6 I have represented all modes of transportation.

7 In the course of these proceedings, it is important always to  
8 get at the underlying economic policy assumptions and fore-  
9 casting needs and determining what the lawyers usually call  
10 the public convenience and necessity.

11 Since 1960, I have had occasion in the community  
12 interest to be intensely interested in transportation planning  
13 in the Washington Metropolitan Area. I believe I spent more  
14 time studying the transportation needs between Virginia and  
15 the District of Columbia than any other individual, including  
16 any member of the District and Virginia Highway departments.

17 I testified in hearings in November, 1961; I again  
18 testified in hearings in November, 1964; and I would invite  
19 anyone concerned about my credentials to compare my testimony  
20 there with what has happened subsequently, and they will find --  
21 and this is confirmed by my Exhibit No. 1 which I handed to --  
22 that of the various forecasts that have been made of rush-hour  
23 commuting traffic from Virginia to Washington, D. C., only I  
24 have come within the ball park of actual trends, actual growth  
25 patterns.

1           On the first page of my Exhibit No. 1, I reproduced  
2 an exhibit I submitted in the hearings in November, 1964, which  
3 constitute the comparison between the actual trend which is  
4 shown by the bottom line, which at that time was for a  
5 suburban population of about 625,000 and projected into future  
6 years based upon the growth in Suburban Virginia population.

7           The numbers at the top reflect the Suburban Virginia  
8 Population of Arlington, Alexandria, Fairfax County, City of  
9 Fairfax, and Falls Church. We have now passed the 100,000  
10 mark on that chart.

11           By the Mass Transportation Survey Forecast of 1959,  
12 which the Highway Department has frequently cited as authority  
13 for this bridge, the number of commuters in Virginia through  
14 the District of Columbia should have been over 78,000 by  
15 today. It is not. It is under 50,000.

16           The National Capital Transportation Agency in 1962,  
17 under mandate from Congress, reviewed and modified the Mass  
18 Transportation Survey forecast of 1959. The line indicated  
19 NCTA was the NCTA forecast. By their forecast, we should  
20 have today in excess of 58,000 people from Virginia to the  
21 District of Columbia during the morning peak hour. We are far  
22 below the NCTA's forecast.

23           Then if you will notice to the left, that DCHD, that  
24 is the D. C. Highway Department's so-called updating of the  
25 NCTA forecast, which was submitted at the hearings in November,



1 1964. This forecast that by the year end 1985, or when the  
2 Suburban Virginia population in this area exceeded 1.200  
3 million, there would be 97,000 people at the morning peak  
4 hour from Virginia to the District of Columbia.

5 Now, it would save you some time if I can get agree-  
6 ment from the D. C. Highway Department through Mr. Leonard  
7 DeGast, that the 1964 forecast submitted at the last hearing  
8 has now been abandoned by the D.C. Highway Department.

9 Can you answer that, Mr. DeGast?

10 MR. AIRIS: This is a question ---

11 MR. CRAIG: For Mr. DeGast.

12 MR. AIRIS: I am sorry, is this a question to the  
13 Highway Department?

14 MR. CRAIG: It is a question to Mr. DeGast.

15 MR. AIRIS: I would prefer to handle that, if it is  
16 permissible to the Chair.

17 MR. DUGAS: He is the Director of the Department.  
18 I suppose he ought to be able to speak for the Department.

19 MR. CRAIG: He can speak for the Department, but we  
20 had a hearing before Judge Sirica. It is quite evident Mr.  
21 Airis doesn't know what he is talking about.

22 MR. DUGAS: We ought to give him the opportunity to  
23 be wrong again.

24 MR. CRAIG: Mr. Airis, you give an answer and then  
25 I would like an answer from Mr. DeGast.



1 MR. AIRIS: I would prefer to answer this. Mr.  
2 DeGast did not talk and did not testify at the hearing before  
3 Judge Sirica. I did. And if you will bear with me, I will  
4 give you an answer to your question.

5 I did not raise this issue; you did. So I will try  
6 to answer you the best I can.

7 I would like to point out that all of your statistics --  
8 and I haven't had a chance to study them ---

9 MR. CRAIG: I don't want to waste time with a speech.  
10 I want a yes or no answer. Are you not relying on the traffic  
11 forecast submitted in the November 1964 hearings?

12 MR. AIRIS: I will get to that point.

13 MR. CRAIG: I want a yes or no answer. I don't have  
14 time for speeches. I want to testify.

15 MR. AIRIS: Please, sir, you are going to testify  
16 and it will just take me about one second. All of your  
17 statistics are on the basis of rush hour.

18 Now, I pointed out in that testimony before Judge  
19 Sirica, that one of our 14 points here on the control of  
20 traffic in the city is to attempt to cut down parking as one  
21 of the criterions in the downtown area. Another is to stagger  
22 work hours. Now, by doing those things here, in cooperation  
23 with every other governmental agency, we have increased the  
24 rush hour to not a rush hour any more. It is a rush, period.  
25 It is not an hour any more of the time of 1958, it is a rush

1 period of about two hours.

2 Therefore, these statistics that you have got here  
3 are erroneous because the vehicles that are funneled into the  
4 city in this rush period have to be taken care of. You are  
5 relying solely with a one-hour rush.

6 Now, in answer to your question on 1964 ---

7 MR. CRAIG: Could Mr. DeGast answer my question,  
8 please? It is very simple. Does the D. C. Highway  
9 Department still rely, or has it abandoned, the traffic fore-  
10 cast submitted at the hearings in November, 1964?

11 MR. AIRIS: Now, on the 1964 forecast, it was  
12 correct as of that time for rush hour. Not for anything else.

13 MR. CRAIG: I am only interested in the peak-hour  
14 forecast of 97,000 person trips from Virginia to the District  
15 of Columbia.

16 MR. AIRIS: And I answered your question.

17 MR. CRAIG: No. May I have an answer from Mr.  
18 DeGast, please.

19 MR. AIRIS: You can only address them to the  
20 Department and I will speak for the Department.

21 MR. CRAIG: I was told by Mr. Dugas at the beginning  
22 of this hearing, that each of these gentlemen at the table,  
23 questions could be directed to them. I am directing a question  
24 to him.

25 MR. AIRIS: I don't really care, Mr. Chairman. If

1 it would help things, I would be glad to let Mr. DeGast speak.

2 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Craig, I believe the orderly way to  
3 proceed would certainly be to let the man who is responsible  
4 ultimately for the decision of the Highway Department to make  
5 the answer, if he so desires. I believe he has answered the  
6 question. I think a more orderly way to proceed, Mr. Craig --  
7 and I don't suggest as to how you should do it, but in order  
8 that we may get out of here sometime today -- is that you  
9 perhaps finish your testimony and then address such questions  
10 as you may have to the gentleman on the right.

11 MR. CRAIG: Mr. Airis, what is your present forecast  
12 for the year 1990 of the total number of persons entering the  
13 District of Columbia at the a.m. peak hour from the State of  
14 Virginia?

15 MR. AIRIS: I don't have it here. We will have to  
16 put it in for the record.

17 MR. DUGAS: He says he does not have it, Mr. Craig,  
18 and he will furnish it for the record at a later time.

19 MR. CRAIG: May we turn to my Exhibit No. 2, Mr.  
20 Dugas. It has been six years that the District of Columbia  
21 Highway Department hasn't had any records. Under date of  
22 November 13, 1964, I addressed a letter to Mr. Albert Grant,  
23 Mr. DeGast's predecessor, asking for information which in my  
24 judgment was necessary to evaluate the plans that were the  
25 subject of a November 1964 hearing. That information was not



1 supplied in 1964 or 1965, or 1966 or 1967 or 1968 or 1970.

2 And I commented upon it again before Judge Sirica  
3 in May of this year that information, in six years the D. C.  
4 Highway Department has been unable to supply the information.

5 After that letter, you will find a letter dated  
6 December 7, 1970, addressed to Mr. Thomas F. Airis, in which  
7 I asked for information necessary to evaluate the design  
8 proposal for this hearing. Attached to that letter are ten  
9 questions, all bearing the date of December 7, 1970. Mr.  
10 Airis' reply is the last page of that exhibit. He responds to  
11 the first four of my questions and says in the last sentence,  
12 "We are unable to provide the other data requested because of  
13 the limited time available."

14 If in six years this information is not yet avail-  
15 able, I would like you to find out from Mr. Airis when the  
16 balance of the information I requested will be available.

17 MR. AIRIS: Is that a question, sir?

18 MR. CRAIG: Yes.

19 MR. AIRIS: Your letter came to me about a day  
20 before the time, the deadline you gave me to get it back to  
21 you. Two days before. Now, we did our level best to get this  
22 data for you, Mr. Craig, and I did give you an answer. The  
23 other data is available, we are compiling it, we will have it  
24 to you very shortly.

25 MR. CRAIG: My question is, when will we have it.

1 When will the public have it?

2 MR. AIRIS: Well, it is a most voluminous letter,  
3 as you well know, and I have been talking with Mr. DeGast  
4 here of the Planning Bureau. We will try to get it to you.  
5 And while I can't get an indicator right here of exactly when  
6 all of it will be available, we will start on it and we will  
7 give it to you pretty soon. That is the best I can do right  
8 offhand here.

9 MR. CRAIG: Mr. Dugas, consistent with the require-  
10 ments of Title 23 U. S. Code, provisions regarding hearings,  
11 I would appreciate once this information, which is vital to  
12 this type of hearing, is publicly available and is available  
13 to all of the public, not just myself, that there be 30 days'  
14 notice and a resumption of this hearing so we can get at the  
15 actual facts and not fantasy.

16 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Craig, we had this hearing on  
17 notice, and we had preliminary notice long before it. If you  
18 desired some detailed data, I would have done the very best we  
19 could to get it for you, if you had given us a little bit of  
20 notice. You, yourself, as an economist and a good one and a  
21 good lawyer know that you simply cannot pull all of these  
22 figures together on the spur of the moment. I don't intend  
23 to give you figures that are not exact.

24 MR. CRAIG: I don't want figures that are not exact,  
25 Mr. Airis, but I am surprised you claim lack of notice. Isn't



1 six years' notice enough? You have known since November,  
2 1964, I wanted this data. You have known since the initial  
3 decision by Colonel Israelson in 1965, it was vital to look  
4 at this kind of data. You have known since the hearings  
5 before Judge Sirica that I wanted this data. The letter of  
6 December 7, Mr. Airis, is not your first notice that this  
7 information is vital to the public of the District of Columbia  
8 and to any fair appraisal of your findings.

9 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Craig, I know you are a very  
10 competent lawyer and a very good one. I notice, however, that  
11 your technique calls to send letters direct to Bureau Chiefs.  
12 Your letter of November 13, that you have here, 1964, is to  
13 Al Grant, who was at that time the head of our planning.

14 Now, if you for sure want to get an answer out of  
15 the Department, you send the letter to the Director of the  
16 Department and I will guarantee you, we will give you prompt  
17 service on it.

18 MR. CRAIG: It was addressed to Mr. Grant at the  
19 Highway Department's request. I asked for the information  
20 orally and they would not supply it unless I put it in a  
21 letter and they said, address the letter to Mr. Grant.

22 Now, please, Mr. Airis.

23 Can you make a ruling on that, Mr. Dugas?

24 MR. DUGAS: What is the requested ruling?

25 MR. CRAIG: That once the information requested in



1 Items five through ten of my letter dated December 7 are pro-  
2 duced and available to the general public, that there be  
3 further notice of at least 30 days to allow the interested  
4 public to present testimony and views on the basis of the  
5 actual data.

6 MR. DUGAS: The Chair rules in this instance, sir,  
7 that the first notice of this hearing appeared in the local  
8 press as of Saturday, November 14, 1970, and that your request  
9 to Mr. Airis on December 7, 1970, giving him only two or  
10 three days to answer the rather voluminous questions as posed  
11 in your letter of December 7, would be unreasonable.

12 Therefore, I would overrule your objection and the  
13 hearing will be continued.

14 MR. CRAIG: Before I proceed further, I wonder if  
15 Mr. Airis would prefer Mr. DeGast to answer the question.  
16 Apparently, I was misinformed. Mr. DeGast is not permitted to  
17 speak; is that correct?

18 MR. DUGAS: No, that is not correct, sir. Mr.  
19 DeGast has not been ordered not to speak.

20 MR. CRAIG: May I address questions to him and  
21 expect an answer from him?

22 MR. DUGAS: You ought to direct your questions to  
23 the Highway Department and if Mr. DeGast is the proper one to  
24 answer it, Mr. Airis will indicate that, sir.

25 MR. CRAIG: Mr. Airis, on the map in front of us,

1 there is a wiggly yellow line which I think is the proposed  
2 Three Sisters Bridge. That stops being yellow around the  
3 base of Glover-Archbold Park.

4 My questions relate to the total highway lanes and  
5 right of way at that northern terminus of the bridge and the  
6 bridge approaches.

7 Can you tell me what the total highway right of way  
8 is from those roadways which appear to be relocated Canal Road  
9 and the Three Sisters Bridge and roads coming in from Canal  
10 Road to the Palisades Parkway?

11 What is the total width of that highway right of wa ,  
12 including both pavement and non-pavement ---

13 MR. AIRIS: Please look on page seven, at figure 12.  
14 It shows in detail.

15 MR. CRAIG: What does it show? I couldn't find it  
16 in the brochure.

17 MR. AIRIS: It shows the width of the roadway, the  
18 laneage, and the width of the shoulders, the width of the  
19 median and the width of the outside shoulder.

20 MR. CRAIG: Which figure are you speaking of?

21 MR. AIRIS: The one entitled, "I-266", north of  
22 Three Sisters Bridge.

23 MR. CRAIG: That just shows the bridge length. The  
24 map in front of us, sir, -- and my question relates to the  
25 total ---

1 MR. AIRIS: You are looking at the wrong figure.  
2 Look to the right on page seven, figure 12.

3 MR. CRAIG: That is the one I am looking at, sir.  
4 Can you just state -- perhaps it is and perhaps it isn't,  
5 perhaps I just can't read a brochure. But could you state for  
6 the record the total width of the right of way for relocated  
7 Canal Road and the Three Sisters Bridge approach at the base  
8 of Glover-Archbold Park?

9 MR. AIRIS: This figure does not contain the re-  
10 located Canal Road. I think in order to give you t e width  
11 of Canal Road, we would have to get up there -- of course,  
12 this is available, but it takes a little time to work it out --  
13 but I would have to get up there and scale that off on the  
14 relocated Canal Road. If the point is that it stays out of  
15 the Glover-Archbold area, it does.

16 MR. CRAIG: Don't anticipate my questions, Mr. Airis.  
17 Just please try to answer them. I am interested in the total  
18 width of the right of way of the relocated Canal Road.

19 MR. DUGAS: I think Mr. Airis indicated presently he  
20 is unable to give you that information. But I assume he will  
21 make it available for the record at a late time.

22 MR. CRAIG: All right. I understand, Mr. Dugas.

23 What is the total width of the right of way, exclud-  
24 ing relocated Canal Road?

25 MR. AIRIS: Just one second.



1 The out-to-out dimension, there is 108 feet.

2 MR. CRAIG: One hundred feet right of way?

3 MR. AIRIS: Yes, sir. That is a cross-section  
4 there. It includes the shoulder.

5 MR. CRAIG: How many total traffic lanes are there in  
6 this area?

7 MR. AIRIS: Six lanes, sir.

8 MR. CRAIG: And on relocated Canal Road?

9 MR. AIRIS: Two in each direction, sir. Four lanes.

10 MR. CRAIG: So that thus far, it is ten lanes?

11 MR. AIRIS: Well, there are four lanes on relocated  
12 Canal Road, the same as Canal Road at the present time, and  
13 then the I-266 has six lanes on it, and they go into a tunnel  
14 as noted up there.

15 MR. CRAIG: Are there also highways coming in from  
16 the Palisades Parkway at that point?

17 MR. AIRIS: Yes, there is a lane in each direction  
18 that is provided for in the 1968 Act, as connecting with -- no,  
19 I am wrong, I take that back. There is a lane in each  
20 direction that comes into the Potomac River Freeway, which is  
21 just beyond that yellow section you were talking about, and  
22 connects in along with the three lanes in each direction from  
23 the bridge.

24 MR. CRAIG: So it then becomes four lanes in each  
25 direction.

1 MR. AIRIS: Four lanes in each direction on the  
2 Potomac River Freeway.

3 MR. CRAIG: Plus four lanes total relocated Canal  
4 Road. A total of 12 lanes in that section?

5 MR. AIRIS: Yes. Of course, I want to point out,  
6 as you can see up there, the eight lanes of the Potomac  
7 River Freeway are in tunnel.

8 MR. CRAIG: They go into tunnel at a point east of  
9 that?

10 MR. AIRIS: Yes, so that all that appears on the  
11 surface is relocated Canal Road.

12 MR. CRAIG: Where is the first exit for traffic  
13 entering on the District of Columbia on that bridge?

14 MR. AIRIS: It would be not in Georgetown, but it  
15 bypasses Georgetown and would be down in the vicinity of 26th  
16 Street, sir.

17 MR. CRAIG: Am I correct that the driver entering  
18 the District of Columbia on the Three Sisters Bridge would  
19 have a choice of exiting at K Street, on the K Street  
20 Expressway, or on the west leg of the inner loop?

21 MR. AIRIS: Yes, he could also turn off on some of  
22 those streets down there that tie into Virginia Avenue.

23 MR. CRAIG: His first choice, though, as a motorist,  
24 does he take the K Street exist or the West Leg exist? Is  
25 that correct?

1 MR. AIRIS: I think that is a first choice but he  
2 has several subsidiary ones.

3 MR. CRAIG: After that he can make other choices,  
4 but this is a first choice?

5 MR. AIRIS: Yes.

6 MR. CRAIG: So all of this traffic is going to  
7 designations east of Rock Creek?

8 MR. AIRIS: Yes.

9 MR. CRAIG: And from points in Virginia.

10 MR. AIRIS: Including Dulles Airfield, yes.

11 MR. CRAIG: On the Dulles Airport point, Mr. Hearing  
12 Examiner, I am tired of hearing the claim that this facility  
13 is required for Dulles Airport. I think, first, it should be  
14 pointed out, historically, that Dulles Airport was planned and  
15 approved before consideration was given the Three Sisters  
16 Bridge. Some claim could perhaps be made as to I-66 and  
17 Theodore Roosevelt Bridge and Dulles Airport. But I-266 has  
18 no relevance whatsoever to Dulles Airport.

19 Furthermore, as to Dulles, there are existing  
20 express routes today from Dulles Airport to downtown. Both  
21 the Beltway and the George Washington Memorial Bridgeway on  
22 the Virginia Side, or the Dulles Access road and the Dolly  
23 Madison Highway, which are coming across the Maryland side on  
24 down.

25 The indicated future needs for Dulles, also, in



1 addition to the rapid transit plan that has been described,  
2 the Civil Aeronautics Board has already approved from Dulles  
3 to Downtown Washington. Whether or not that would be under-  
4 operated is controversial. But there is no lack of access or  
5 will be no lack of access to Dulles Airport. I think that  
6 should be made crystal-clear.

7 Dulles was not located there or planned or in any  
8 way related to this bridge being built and any claim to the  
9 contrary is false.

10 MR. AIRIS: Is that a question to me?

11 MR. CRAIG: No question, a statement.

12 MR. DUGAS: Just a statement.

13 MR. AIRIS: Thank you.

14 MR. CRAIG: Going back to the Highway Forecasting,  
15 Mr. Dugas, I would like to point out for the record that I  
16 have made two very exhaustive analyses of this traffic fore-  
17 cast made by the D. C. Highway Department in November, 1964,  
18 which we submitted to the Highway Department at the time, and  
19 which are not contained in the listing of pertinent information  
20 available for public inspection and comment on the Three  
21 Sisters Bridge.

22 I see the Highway Department has included the study  
23 that I submitted at the November 1964 hearing, entitled  
24 "Rush-Hour Commuting from Virginia to Washington," and my  
25 supplementary report. But these are not my most recent studies

1 in the field.

2 MR. DUGAS: I would be very happy at this time,  
3 Mr. Craig, to receive and make a part of this record any reports  
4 or any statement or any memoranda that you may want to present  
5 for the purpose of copying or exhibiting or for whatever  
6 purpose you may deem necessary, sir.

7 MR. CRAIG: I would like permission -- I am sure  
8 the Government has copies, because I have submitted these  
9 several times before -- I would like to make reference to fore-  
10 casting of 1985 transportation.

11 MR. DUGAS: I don't want to interrupt you, but if  
12 there is something you believe will be helpful to the  
13 Commonwealth of Virginia and the District of Columbia in this  
14 regard, I would hope that you would submit it, because, you  
15 see, although you have submitted it to the District of  
16 Columbia, I sit here also on behalf of the Commonwealth of  
17 Virginia and I would like to make it available to them, in the  
18 event it is not made available to them by any other source.

19 MR. CRAIG: On the transcript of these hearings,  
20 Your Honor, let me name these studies. They are very  
21 voluminous. If either the Virginia Highway Department or the  
22 D. C. Highway Department do not have copies, I will undertake  
23 to reproduce them at my own expense.

24 The first is called, "Forecasting 1985 Transportation  
25 Requirements," dated February 26, 1966. The second is called

1 "The 1965 Gravity Model Forecast and the Transportation  
2 Survey Forecast Versus Actual Traffic Growth," dated February  
3 15, 1966.

4 In the course of preparing these two analyses, I  
5 discovered a number of rather shocking things about the  
6 traffic forecast submitted in 1964. One of the assumptions  
7 used by the D. C. Highway Department was that several  
8 hundred thousand school children in Suburban Virginia and  
9 Suburban Maryland would commute daily into the District of  
10 Columbia, principally in the Federal Triangle area, to attend  
11 public schools. This helped swell their projections of  
12 traffic to the Central City.

13 Now, this was typical of the type of garbage that  
14 was fed into the computers to produce the gospel facts that  
15 came out.

16 MR. DUGAS: I am not sure. Would you mind going  
17 over that again?

18 MR. CRAIG: One of the assumptions that they used  
19 in developing their traffic forecast submitted in November,  
20 1964, was that decisions on traffic would not be affected in  
21 any way by such considerations as boundaries of school  
22 districts. In other words, that a child residing in  
23 Arlington would have the option of attending any school  
24 throughout the Washington Metropolitan area. And the gravity  
25 model forecast that they produced ended up by assigning



1 several hundred thousand suburban school children to District  
2 schools, many of them located in the Federal Triangle area.  
3 I don't quite know why they assumed so many school trips in  
4 the Federal Triangle.

5 This is the type of arbitrary assumption that went  
6 into that traffic forecast.

7 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Craig, are these students that you  
8 refer to students in the public schools, or are we talking  
9 about the various universities, or what is it?

10 MR. CRAIG: All students, all ages.

11 MR. DUGAS: I see. Including the use of the public  
12 schools?

13 MR. CRAIG: Including first-graders residing in  
14 Arlington County, yes. Any layman would be shocked if they  
15 looked at the way these forecasts were put together. That is  
16 why I think the public-at-large should have this kind of  
17 information.

18 MR. DUGAS: This information is contained in the  
19 documents that you have described to us?

20 MR. CRAIG: In the document I described to you, I  
21 go over step by step the factors that created this monstrous  
22 and impossible traffic corridor.

23 Now, at the time -- and I want this to be put on  
24 the record, because it is not contained in the written report --  
25 I discussed this thoroughly with Arthur D. Little, Inc, which

1 was reviewing the forecasting at the time, and Mr. Tom Dean  
2 of Allen M. Voorhees and Associates, who had been retained by  
3 the D. C. Highway Department to evaluate the D. C. Highway  
4 Department's traffic forecasting.

5 Both of these persons told me that they had been  
6 told by the D. C. Highway Department that the D. C. Highway  
7 Department recognized its traffic forecast was invalid and had  
8 abandoned it.

9 I would like Mr. Airis to state whether or not that  
10 was correct, that both Arthur Little and Allen M. Voorhees  
11 and Associates had been told when they were appraising the  
12 traffic forecast of the Highway Department, that the traffic  
13 forecast submitted in the November '64 hearing had been  
14 abandoned by the D. C. Highway Department.

15 MR. DUGAS: Can you answer that question, Mr. Airis

16 MR. AIRIS: I am trying to rejuvenate my memory ont  
17 what happend back there. As far as we can recall, and in  
18 consulting with my Chief here of the Bureau, that is not  
19 correct.

20 MR. CRAIG: Well, it is rather strange that both  
21 Arthur D. Little, who was retained at the direction of  
22 President Johnson to review your traffic forecast, and Allen  
23 M. Voorhees, and Wilbur Smith Associates, retained by your own  
24 Highway Department to review your own traffic forecast, that  
25 neither of these mentioned your forecast in any way whatsoever

1 in their published reports.

2 MR. AIRIS: This was which forecast?

3 MR. CRAIG: The one submitted in November, 1964.

4 MR. AIRIS: For what year?

5 MR. CRAIG: For 1985.

6 MR. AIRIS: 'Eighty-five?

7 MR. CRAIG: Yes, sir.

8 MR. AIRIS: I don't recall of any such thing. As  
9 you well know, these forecasts are done with the data at hand,  
10 and they never turn out exactly right. They are either high  
11 or low. It is not an entirely exact science. I will be free  
12 to agree with you that the forecasting is not an exact science.  
13 The specific things that you mentioned, I have no recollection  
14 of, and if you are pointing out to me that the forecasts at  
15 that time were in error, I probably will agree with you.  
16 Because it is easy to determine whether they are in error or  
17 not, just check them with the existing crossings on the bridge,  
18 which we keep right up to date.

19 But I would like to point out, though, that if you  
20 are merely comparing the rush hour, that is easily manipulated  
21 by the things I mentioned. You should take the rush period or  
22 ADT.

23 MR. CRAIG: I would appreciate it, once Mr. Airis  
24 is able to check on this, if he would advise the record, one,  
25 whether in early 1966 when the Wilbur Smith Associates and



1 Alan M. Voorhees studies were undertaken, that the Highway  
2 Department recognized its 1985 forecast was invalid and had  
3 abandoned it and was, instead, relying on the NCTA forecast  
4 of '62 and the Mass Transportation Forecast of 1969.

5 MR. AIRIS: I would like to check that out.

6 MR. CRAIG: I would like to know whether Arthur D.  
7 Little was advised of the same thing. Having been told by  
8 both planning consultants, whom I consider to be reputable,  
9 having been so advised by the Highway Department, I would like  
10 to see the Highway Department's version of the facts.

11 MR. AIRIS: I will be happy to check this out. You  
12 catch me cold here and I just don't have it.

13 MR. CRAIG: If these consultants were advised con-  
14 trary, I would like to be informed why neither the Arthur D.  
15 Little report nor the Allen M. Voorhees and Wilbur Smith report  
16 made any reference whatsoever to the Highway Department pro-  
17 ject forecase.

18 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Craig, I wonder if we could put that  
19 burden on Mr. Airis, as to why these companies didn't include  
20 something in their reports?

21 MR. CRAIG: They were consultants employed by the  
22 Highway Department.

23 MR. DUGAS: I would hope when we hire consultants,  
24 Mr. Craig, we would not tell them what to put in reports, but  
25 rather seek their judgment and their expertise as to what they

1 finally report<sup>t</sup> to us. Otherwise, consultants do us no good.

2 I certainly hope Mr. Airis won't be able to speak  
3 for Arthur D. Little and the other company you spoke of;  
4 otherwise, we won't need them any more.

5 MR. CRAIG: I would agree with your observation.  
6 But that is not the way Highway consultants have worked in  
7 this area. They are told what to put in their reports.

8 MR. DUGAS: Are you suggesting that Arthur Little  
9 and the Voorhees companies do what they are told in this  
10 regard and they are not professionals?

11 MR. CRAIG: I do know as a fact before the Smith-  
12 Voorhees report was issued, it was submitted to the D. C.  
13 Highway Department for review and editing and approval for the  
14 publication. It was not true of the Arthur D. Little report.

15 MR. DUGAS: Do you know whether or not changes were  
16 made by the Highway Department and incorporated in the final  
17 report as submitted by the one who submitted it for editing?

18 MR. CRAIG: Yes, that is a fact.

19 MR. DUGAS: Changes were made?

20 MR. CRAIG: Yes.

21 MR. DUGAS: And were the errors in judgment or errors  
22 in fact?

23 MR. CRAIG: That is a matter of argument. I don't  
24 have available to me the draft prepared before submittal to  
25 the D. C. Highway Department.

1 MR. DUGAS: That is why I suggest we not get into  
2 that type of situation unless we have the Voorhees Company  
3 and the Arthur D. Little Company here to defend themselves.

4 MR. CRAIG: I want nothing I said to be an adverse  
5 reflection on those consulting firms. The studies conducted  
6 by all of them confirm there is no need for this farce.

7 MR. AIRIS: I take exception to that.

8 MR. CRAIG: Can you cite one, then, Mr. Airis?

9 MR. AIRIS: You looked at the A. D. Little report.  
10 You saw their table on their findings on it.

11 MR. CRAIG: Are you claiming the Arthur D. Little  
12 found a need for the Three Sisters Bridge?

13 MR. AIRIS: No, but it gave the Department a very  
14 close, clean bill of health on this particular bridge, on the  
15 very things we are looking at today.

16 MR. CRAIG: Is that your reading, sir, of the Arthur  
17 D. Little report?

18 MR. AIRIS: Yes, sir; indeed.

19 MR. CRAIG: And you are the head of our Highway  
20 Department?

21 MR. AIRIS: You know the answer to that question.

22 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Craig, I know you have a great deal  
23 that you want to tell us. I would hope you and Mr. Airis would  
24 not continue ---

25 MR. CRAIG: I would like to talk about this growing



1 rush hour. I don't know how many minutes it is according to  
2 Mr. Airis, but this is a rather fundamental thing. If you  
3 would pull out Exhibit 4, I would like to discuss that.

4 This shows the traffic entering the District of  
5 Columbia on all bridges from Virginia by half-hour periods  
6 from midnight to midnight on an average weekday in May, 1970.  
7 And you will see that from an average of a few hundred  
8 vehicles of half-hour and the night-time hours, you get a  
9 rapid buildup in the early morning, reaching its peak from  
10 7:30 to 8:30 a.m. It has peaked in this way from 7:30 to 8:30  
11 a.m. since before World War II.

12 There is now and always has been a peak hour for  
13 traffic entering the District from Virginia. And whether or  
14 not that peak actually extends into other hours is irrelevant  
15 from the planner's point of view. He is only concerned with  
16 the peak demand period. The peak demand period on the exiting  
17 bridges from Virginia to the District of Columbia is and  
18 consistently has been from 7:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m., with slightly  
19 lower totals if you take 7:00 to 8:00, or 8:00 to 9:00. The  
20 a.m. peak hour is and always has been 7:30 to 8:30.

21 Mr. Airis has had trouble understanding this, but  
22 it is rather fundamental before you can look at any traffic  
23 plan.

24 On the second page, I show the average hourly  
25 traffic, graphically on Key Bridge, entering the District of

1 Columbia in 1965 and 1970. This is current and five years  
2 ago. And you will notice from this exhibit, that there has  
3 been a substantial decline in traffic on Key Bridge from 1965,  
4 which is the top line, to 1970, which is the bottom line.  
5 The decline has been greatest at the morning and evening  
6 peak hours.

7 There has been virtually no change in the night-time  
8 traffic. It has been daytime hours, particularly at the peak  
9 hours, that this traffic has declined.

10 Now, I hope this gives some concept to what I am  
11 talking about, when I say a.m. peak hour and what the planners  
12 are talking about when they discuss a.m. peak hour. That is  
13 the relevant criteria in determining design capacity of your  
14 transportation system. And anyone who doubts any other criteria,  
15 I suggest it is hardly competent to be director of the D. C.  
16 Highway Department.

17 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out  
18 here, if I could, that these statistics Mr. Craig has just  
19 shown, clearly show that there is a rush period of about two  
20 hours on every bridge there. Some of them go up to three  
21 hours. And this is the direct result of effort on the part of  
22 the City to stagger these hours, and other efforts.

23 MR. CRAIG: Mr. Airis, if you will compare your  
24 files of traffic for 1970 to 1965, they are exactly the same.

25 MR. AIRIS: We have, sir.



1 MR. CRAIG: I would like now to turn to Exhibit 3,  
2 which I think ---

3 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Craig, let me ask you, in arriving  
4 at this does the construction of the Theodore Roosevelt  
5 Bridge and the enlargement of the 14th Street span have  
6 anything to do with how this reflects itself on this chart?

7 MR. CRAIG: I will be looking at the bridges as a  
8 system later on.

9 Right now, I am going to look at the specific area  
10 immediately involved.

11 MR. DUGAS: Right.

12 MR. CRAIG: And the problem this presents.

13 MR. DUGAS: Would you remember it?

14 MR. CRAIG: I will try to come back to it. If I  
15 don't, I hope you will ask me.

16 I have tried to detect graphically in Exhibit 3,  
17 the total pattern of traffic at the a.m. peak hour on the  
18 roads in the Georgetown waterfront. I have the 1954 graph,  
19 or chart, which was prepared by Wilbur Smith and Associates.  
20 The 1963 chart was prepared by the National Capital Transportation  
21 Agency. The present chart was prepared by me, from information  
22 supplied by the D. C. Highway Department. The 1990 chart is  
23 prepared by me. Lacking any information supplied by the D. C.  
24 Highway Department, I took the most recent announced estimates  
25 that they had made of the peak hour traffic on Three Sisters



1 Bridge and Key Bridge, which was three years old, in  
2 December of 1967, to the House Public Works Committee and  
3 have simply -- the other numbers are picked out of the air.  
4 I believe they proved to be lower than the numbers that the  
5 Highway Department will produce pursuant to my request. To  
6 show the problem, I have included them.

7 Now, look at 1954 and 1963. In that period, there  
8 was a bu dup of traffic on the Key Bridge, and why? Between  
9 1954 and 1963, Key Bridge was widened to six lanes from the  
10 pre-existing four lanes. And this attracted more traffic  
11 from Virginia headed toward downtown into the Georgetown  
12 waterfront and this has reflected both increased loads on M  
13 Street and increased loads on the Whitehurst Freeway.

14 But let's look at what happened from 1963 to 1970,  
15 or '69. You will notice that the peak-hour traffic on Key  
16 Bridge declined from 3600 vehicles to 3660 vehicles. And  
17 there is a sharp decline on the traffic on the Key Bridge  
18 headed for downtown.

19 The traffic destined for Whitehurst Freeway has  
20 declined 27 percent of inbound traffic on Key Bridge.

21 MR. DUGAS: Is this a good time for me to ask my  
22 question?

23 MR. CRAIG: In part, this is reflection of the  
24 opening of Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, but there is one other  
25 very important development and this is shown on the 1969

1 chart, if Your Honor please. Third page.

2 The most recent available are apparently April-May  
3 1969. There has been a steady increase, as Your Honor knows,  
4 of traffic from D. C. and Maryland origins to downtown,  
5 traversing the Georgetown waterfront, the Whitehurst Freeway.  
6 This traffic enters this area from Foxhall Road, MacArthur  
7 Boulevard, Canal Road, merges immediately west of Key Bridge  
8 and has a choice of using either M Street or the Whitehurst  
9 Freeway.

10 This traffic from Northwest Washington, joining  
11 Montgomery County, probably will continue to grow in the  
12 future. It is vital for valuation of the Georgetown Waterfront,  
13 that this traffic have a continued and safe route to the down-  
14 town. The National Capital Planning Commission, recognizing  
15 this need, recommended a tunnel throughout the length of the  
16 Georgetown Waterfront to accommodate this traffic headed  
17 toward downtown. That would also permit restoration of the  
18 Georgetown Waterfront.

19 This traffic is going to grow. This traffic has  
20 no alternative. There is no rapid transit line proposed  
21 through the area that this traffic comes from. It will depend  
22 on the motor vehicle, bus and automobile. The Virginia  
23 commuter will have two rapid transit lines to downtown. The  
24 Virginia commuter will have five bridges to downtown, one,  
25 the Theodore Roosevelt, one at Memorial, three of the 14th



1 Street Bridges. Why should the Virginia commuter be pumped  
2 into the Georgetown Waterfront to mix with this traffic?  
3 The practical fact is that this plan can't work and if you  
4 look at the 1990 chart, I will show you why.

5 Trying to mix this major traffic flow from Northwest  
6 Washington with an artificial traffic flow from Virginia,  
7 whose first exit is going to be downtown on the Georgetown  
8 Waterfront, cannot work. The design capacity of the Potomac  
9 Freeway eastbound is four lanes.

10 Mr. Airis, what do you estimate to be the maximum  
11 peak hour capacity of the Potomac Freeway eastbound?

12 MR. AIRIS: I don't know offhand just what the peak-  
13 hour volume is, Mr. Craig.

14 MR. CRAIG: Let Mr. DeGast answer my question.

15 ME. DUGAS: Can you answer it, Len?

16 MR. DE GAST: The capacity on freeway lanes varies,  
17 of course, much with speed. Normal design capacity in urban  
18 areas is used as 1500 to insure free flow. However, the  
19 freeway facilities, including the bridges, we have applied  
20 capacities of 17 and 18 hundred per lane, which on a four-lane  
21 facility, with four lanes, would give us 6800 at 17, or at 18,  
22 some 7200 vehicles per lane, for four lanes in the peak hour.

23 MR. CRAIG: Would you say the 7200 is the maximum,  
24 sir, maximum capacity?

25 MR. DE GAST: Much higher volumes per hour have been



1 recorded.

2 MR. CRAIG: Well, what is your testimony, position,  
3 with respect to the maximum capacity of the Potomac Freeway  
4 east of the junction of Three Sisters Bridge and Palisades  
5 Parkway? And this is, bearing in mind this inundated nature  
6 going down and up and down and up for a mile and a half before  
7 it reaches Rock Creek.

8 MR. DE GAST: Maximum capacity, Mr. Craig, on this  
9 situation would range between seven and eight thousand per  
10 hour.

11 MR. CRAIG: You can't be more definite than that?

12 MR. DE GAST: It varies with the facility, it varies  
13 with the mix of the traffic.

14 MR. CRAIG: I am talking about your facility and  
15 your mix of the traffic. We will find out what that traffic  
16 is and what that mix is later.

17 MR. AIRIS: That is a reasonable answer, Mr. Craig.

18 MR. CRAIG: You have no more precise estimates than  
19 that; is that correct?

20 MR. AIRIS: That is good enough.

21 MR. CRAIG: And what is the maximum capacity of  
22 M Street east of Key Bridge, inbound, per hour?

23 MR. AIRIS: Well, you are asking us specific  
24 questions that you have been able to do a little research on  
25 and we are catching it cold here. Now, we can supply that

1 information to you. I would have been glad to talk it over  
2 with you ahead of time, and dig out the M Street capacity.  
3 I suppose that I could say that M Street capacity is about  
4 what it carries right now.

5 MR. CRAIG: Well, it presently carries, if the  
6 figures supplied me last Friday are correct, 01790 vehicles  
7 east of Key Bridge.

8 MR. AIRIS: This is per lane, per hour?

10 MR. CRAIG: Total. I am considering the total  
11 capacity of M Street. And if we add to that, the capacity of  
12 1700 on the Potomac Freeway, we would have total capacity for  
13 about 9,000 vehicles eastbound.

14 MR. AIRIS: Well, it might be a little higher than  
15 that.

16 MR. CRAIG: Well, I don't want to be definite. I  
17 am always accused of pulling numbers out of thin air and I  
18 have to do that after six or seven years, when the Highway  
19 Department doesn't know.

20 MR. DUGAS: At this point in the record, Mr. Craig,  
21 I would ask that Mr. Airis furnish you as exact figure as he  
22 can for insertinn in the record at this time.

23 MR. AIRIS: I would be glad to.

24 MR. CRAIG: By my preliminary -- and bear in mind  
25 these are out-of-the-air estimates -- but I think conservative,  
they are the traffic flows on the D. C. side -- if we add to

1 that the flows from both Three Sisters Bridge and Key Bridge,  
2 we would have 3500 vehicles moving eastbound on M Street east  
3 of Key Bridge, instead of 1700 today.

4 Now, to accommodate this volume of traffic on M  
5 Street, we bear in mind all of the traffic from Foxhall Road  
6 and MacArthur Boulevard will have to use M Street, because  
7 this design plan would sever the connections with Whitehurst  
8 Freeway for Foxhall Road and MacArthur Boulevard. M Street  
9 would be carrying traffic from Key Bridge. M Street would be  
10 carrying traffic from the Palisades Parkway, Canal Road.

11 The only facility that would not dump traffic on  
12 M Street, Key Bridge, would be Three Sisters Bridge. But  
13 everything else would. Traffic would also be backed up on the  
14 Potomac Freeway, because it would be so preempted by the  
15 Three Sisters Traffic there wouldn't be room for D. C. and  
16 Maryland motorists.

17 It is going to be a terrific traffic jam. This  
18 will be demonstrated by the data that the Highway Department  
19 has refused to disclose for six years. It has known for six  
20 years it is proposing something that won't work. This has  
21 been pointed out to them by highway engineers for the last six  
22 years. And, of course, they haven't supplied the information.  
23 It would ban them. It would prove conclusively that the  
24 proposing of the facility which from the standpoint of design  
25 and traffic servicability cannot work.



1 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, I would have to say this  
2 is ridiculous.

3 MR. DUGAS: These are opinions of these two men.

4 MR. CRAIG: Now, if you look at the back of my  
5 chart, I summarize the total traffic volume in the Georgetown  
6 Waterfront. From 1963 to 1999, at the a.m. peak hour, there  
7 was a decline of traffic in the Georgetown Waterfront from  
8 7700 to 7600. Not much of an improvement, but a slight im-  
9 provement.

10 Under the design planned, in front of you, the  
11 traffic on the Georgetown Waterfront, in my judgment, the  
12 Highway Department's figures will show that it will be about  
13 21,000 at the peak hour. The traffic in the overall Georgetown  
14 Waterfront, including this bridge and every other related  
15 facility on the District side -- Canal Road, M Street, Key  
16 Bridge -- will be three times the traffic volume that they are  
17 today. And moving at far slower speeds than they move today.  
18 Because of the underdesign of the highway to accommodate the  
19 traffic forecast, which means not just three times the air  
20 pollution of the day, but five to six, to seven times the air  
21 pollution of the day. Because, as Mr. Airis so eloquently  
22 pointed out, the slower moving cars emit much more exhaust.

23 And he will have one of the world's largest parking  
24 lots in operation here on the Georgetown Waterfront. There  
25 won't be red lights stopping cars, there will be bumper lights

1 ahead of them. And this will be demonstrated by their traffic  
2 forecast data.

3 Turning back to Exhibit 1, Your Honor, the second  
4 page, I summarize all of the traffic forecasts that have been  
5 made in the last 11 years. As I previously noted, only the  
6 two that I have made have been close to being correct. All  
7 of the others have exaggerated traffic increase from Virginia  
8 to Washington by some 66 percent to 351 percent. Millions and  
9 millions of dollars have been spent on this kind of traffic  
10 forecasting.

11 Overlooking the fact that the National Capital  
12 Planning Commission, the D. C. Highway Department, Washington  
13 Metropolitan Transit Authority, and so on, have all exagger-  
14 ated traffic trends, the fact remains that none of these  
15 traffic studies that I am looking at here recommended a bridge  
16 from Virginia to downtown Washington, such as is being pro-  
17 posed here this morning.

18 None of them except this fraudulent -- and I claim  
19 it is fraudulent -- 1964 for D. C. Highway Department forecast.  
20 All of the others shown on this page found no need for addi-  
21 tional bridge capacity from Virginia to downtown Washington,  
22 which is what the proposal is in this area.

23 And by "central area" on this exhibit, I mean the  
24 so-called Metro Center in planner terminology, that area east  
25 of Rock Creek and generally south of Florida Avenue. The



1 Mass Transportation Survey did not. It recommended circum-  
2 ferential bridges but the Highway Department isn't proposing  
3 circumferential bridges.

4 Now, the two most recent of these forecasts of the  
5 Planning Commission's -- issued in 1969 -- I think that should  
6 be '68, December 1968, if I am correct ---

7 MR. DUGAS: Instead of '69?

8 MR. CRAIG: Instead of '69.

9 Which forecasts 81,000 peak-hour traffic from  
10 Virginia to Washington, the most recent word from the Highway  
11 Department is that contained in the September 1967 testimony  
12 to the House Public Works Committee, where they claimed they  
13 were adopting and following the Washington Metropolitan Area  
14 Transit Authority Forecast for 1990, and they claim that that  
15 study showed a need for Three Sisters Bridge because that  
16 either was a deliberate lie or the result of total misinforma-  
17 tion by Mr. Airis when he testified before Congress.

18 I want this record to contain the correct information  
19 and therefore will you turn to Exhibit 6. This shows  
20 graphically the forecast of the Washington Metropolitan Area  
21 Transit Authority. More correctly, the computations were made  
22 by Allen M. Voorhees Associates, showing by geographic  
23 location the forecast 1990 travel lines for a.m. peak-hour  
24 auto driver trips from Virginia to the District and Maryland.

25 This is related to capacity of these bridges.



1           If you will look at the left-hand side at Chain and  
2 Key Bridges, you will see that the actual forecast of WMATA  
3 found that in 1990, the traffic demands of Key Bridge would  
4 be less than half of the capacity of the Three Sisters Bridge.  
5 There is no need found there whatsoever for any crossing at  
6 any place north of Theodore Roosevelt Bridge.

7           The Highway Department is correct, the WMATA  
8 figures found a need for additional crossing, and if you will  
9 look at the right-hand side of the map, you will see what that  
10 data showed. That between the 14th Street Bridge and Woodrow  
11 Wilson Bridge, there would be substantial inadequate bridge  
12 capacity. There are, of course, no bridges there now, but the  
13 desired lines for traveling in 1990 indicated a need for a  
14 crossing somewhere in the area of, say, from the Airport to  
15 the Anacostia area in the District of Columbia. And, indeed,  
16 if there is to be any I-66 or I-266, the most recent forecast  
17 data, if you accept it at face value, would be perhaps a  
18 freeway or parkway or something along the WNOB right of way,  
19 for a crossing to the Anacosita portion of the District of  
20 Columbia.

21           That would provide service that rapid transit lines  
22 wouldn't provide. This would be building bridges where the  
23 need is, if you accept this data, but I don't.

24           As is shown in greater detail in the discussion of  
25 tables on the WMATA forecast, the WMATA forecast made the same

1 mistake which has been made by every traffic model forecast  
2 since 1959, of exaggerating the demand for suburban travel.  
3 I don't have -- somewhere in here I give the actual per-  
4 centage. It is a rather staggering percentage of all of the  
5 traffic forecasts on the first page to move from Virginia to  
6 the District of Columbia would not be destined for the  
7 District of Columbia, but would be traffic originating in  
8 Virginia, usually frequently outside of the Beltway, destined  
9 for Maryland destinations, frequently outside of the Beltway.

10 MR. DUGAS: Page seven.

11 MR. CRAIG: And having neither origin or destination  
12 in the District of Columbia.

13 MR. DUGAS: Page seven of the March 1, 1968, memo-  
14 randum, forecast for demand of additional -- I think you will  
15 find the percentages there.

16 MR. AIRIS: What was that page?

17 MR. CRAIG: Page seven of the detailed discussion.

18 MR. DUGAS: Of the WMATA forecast dated March 7,  
19 1968.

20 MR. CRAIG: Close to hand, in other words, of the  
21 traffic Mr. Airis has been using and beating Congress over the  
22 head with for reasons to build the Three Sisters Bridge is not  
23 traffic which has any business whatsoever in the District of  
24 Columbia. I don't know, I doubt professionally, and this has  
25 certainly been experienced in the past, this traffic will



1 ever materialize. But if it does, clearly sound planning  
2 principles would require that the crossing be built in the  
3 area that would serve that traffic with the least inconven-  
4 ience to existing residents, parks and so on.

5 That would mean an outer beltway of bridges, cer-  
6 tainly not a highway going from the Beltway in Virginia,  
7 right through Arlington, right through Georgetown, right  
8 across the North Leg, and right up the North Central Freeway.  
9 If you look at the actual planning data on which the Highway  
10 Department is relying for its travel, it is to build a short-  
11 cut for Beltway traffic that they are proposing to build this  
12 monstrous freeway through Arlington, Georgetown, Downtown  
13 Washington, and the North Central Freeway Corridor.

14 Practically all of the traffic that that freeway  
15 would serve by the AMV forecast data is traffic with neither  
16 origin or destination in the District of Columbia.

17 If you will look at the actual needs -- the Planning  
18 Commission, sir, has been through this extensively, and this  
19 goes to underlying some of the reasons for their final compre-  
20 hensive plan -- the newspaper, I believe, for reasons best  
21 known to them have chosen not to publicize these facts, but  
22 they have been known to the reporters for many years.

23 There are various ridiculous claims in the I-266  
24 brochure about time saved, cost saved, lives saved, and so on,  
25 which I would like to address myself to. All of that is



1 absurd nonsense, because the most important thing about any  
2 major transportation facility, such as the proposed I-266, is  
3 it is going to change all of that. The construction of a  
4 freeway has a direct bearing on the trips that are made.  
5 Trips become longer than they were before. If someone wants  
6 to live 30 minutes from downtown, and a new freeway is con-  
7 structed, he may take his time savings, and usually does take  
8 his time savings, and move further out.

9 He may be driving twice as far. You donot have the  
10 same trip patterns through the construction of any transporta-  
11 tion facility, because the transportation facility always  
12 changes them.

13 So you can't assume a static number of vehicles or  
14 number of trips or statis origins and static destinations,  
15 because all of this is changed by the transportation facility  
16 itself. So the analyses they give in here are meaningless.

17 MR. DUGAS: You are really balancing the convenience?

18 MR. CRAIG: If they want to make this kind of  
19 analysis, all they need to do is look at the last ten years.  
20 Now, where has 100 percent of the transportation capital  
21 investment gone in terms of operational facilities in the  
22 last decade, two decades, three decades? It has been in more  
23 highway capacity, more expressways, and so on.

24 Well, how much time has it saved? How many lives  
25 has it saved? Let's get the views of the people who know.

1 I would like to read from a Traffic Safety Report, published  
2 by the District of Columbia Government, October 1970 issue.  
3 Bear in mind, this is after millions and millions of dollars  
4 of new highway and free construction which is always to save  
5 lives. And this is what had had happened:

6 1,000 dead, 100,000 wounded, \$270 million of equip-  
7 ment and manhours lost. Sounds like a Vietnam casualty  
8 report? It is not. It is the District of Columbia traffic  
9 casualty report for the 1960's. "Slaughters in the Sixties"  
10 might well be the title of the ten-year survey of traffic  
11 accidents in the District, conducted by the Office of Traffic  
12 Safety of the Department of Motor Vehicles.

13 Here are the figures for the ten years, 1960 to '69,  
14 inclusive, and it lists them in detail:

15 The average D. C. death rate for the decade was  
16 3.8 deaths per 100 million miles of travel. Totals from all  
17 accident categories leaped upward during the ten-year period  
18 from 1959 to 1969, with a single exception of pedestrian  
19 injuries. The greatest increase was the economic losses which  
20 jumped from 15 million in 1959 to 38 million in 1969, a 150-  
21 percent rise.

22 The category that more than doubled since 1959 was  
23 traffic fatalities. Death on the streets and highways of the  
24 District rose from 63 in 1959 to 127 in 1969, a 102 percent  
25 increase.

1           The total number of accidents in the District rose  
2 75 percent from 22,000 in 1959 to 38.5 thousand in 1969.  
3 Injuries were up 25 percent. Pedestrian deaths increased 27  
4 percent.

5           And the article goes on, I won't read it all. It  
6 has all been submitted for the record. This is the actual  
7 record we will have. Because traffic patterns, traffic  
8 changes when you build a transportation facility and when you  
9 build a freeway like this, it means longer trips, more deaths,  
10 more pollution, higher use. Let's not kid ourselves.

11           I would like to confirm my impression, I understand  
12 the Mayor-Commissioner is not present at this hearing?

13           MR. DUGAS: He is not present.

14           MR. CRAIG: And no member of the City Council is  
15 present at these hearings?

16           MR. DUGAS: I see no member of the City Council  
17 present.

18           MR. CRAIG: And no member of the National Capital  
19 Planning Commission is present at these hearings?

20           MR. DUGAS: I can't speak for that group. I don't  
21 know them all.

22           MR. CRAIG: If any member of the Planning Commission  
23 is present, would you please make yourself known for the record?

24           (No response.)

25



1 MR. CRAIG: I assume from the silence, no member of  
2 the National Capital Planning Commission is present at these  
3 hearings.

4 I would like to make a few legal suggestions.  
5 First, I, too, believe that these hearings are inappropriate.  
6 Not only is the information necessary to appraise the design  
7 that has been supplied, but it seems to me, also important  
8 these hearings be in compliance with Title 7 of the D. C.  
9 Code and the requirements of the location hearing. There has  
10 been no attempt to comply with Title 7 of the D. C. Code.

11 The Court of appeals has clearly indicated in his  
12 two opinions, D. C. Federation of Civic Associations versus  
13 Airis in 1968, and the same plaintiff against Volpe in 1970,  
14 that Title 7 of the D. C. Code, more particular, the Highway  
15 Act of 1893, as amended, and its requirements as to public  
16 hearings and its limitations as to right of way, are applicable  
17 for this project.

18 Title 7 of the D. C. Code was not repealed by  
19 Section 23 of the Federal Highway Act of 1968. The Court of  
20 Appeals makes that clear in Footnote 50 of its opinion of  
21 April 1970.

22 MR. DUAGS: Footnote 50?

23 MR. CRAIG: Fifty, I believe.

24 Footnote 50, it points out the decision of 1968 was  
25 not "to the contrary" and in its decision of 1968, it points

1 out for the District of Columbia to build a facility of this  
2 type, it must have a hearing in compliance with Title 7 of  
3 the D. C. Code, which hearings, by the way, require the  
4 person preside, not the hearing officer, and that a sub-  
5 stantive limitation of the right of way be no wider than 160  
6 feet. And perhaps my eyeballing is not very accurate, but I  
7 am positive that right of way at the top end of that yellow  
8 line, the highway if the north side would relocate the Canal  
9 Road to the south edge of the right of way, is more than 160  
10 feet.

11 I think, further, that it is preposterous to hold  
12 the hearing unless the entire route is the subject of the  
13 hearing. Since the traffic assignments will show the traffic  
14 utilizing this bridge is traffic primarily extending from  
15 Beltway to Beltway, it seems to me the entire route should be  
16 examined so that all feasible alternatives can be looked at.  
17 And I mean the route from Beltway to Beltway. From I-66 in  
18 Virginia, Three Sisters Bridge, Potomac River Freeway, the  
19 North Leg, the North Central Freeway.

20 Let's not get this piece by piece. This in the  
21 Highway Department Plan is a single integrated facility to  
22 provide a shortcut right through the heart of Washington,  
23 suburb to suburb, and I think the hearing should be on the  
24 whole thing, not a trunkated section such as this, so that the  
25 total impact can be looked at, so the total air pollution can

1 be looked at and all of the social and economic consequences  
2 can be looked at, instead of fragmented, which is what we  
3 have had so far.

4 May I ask, Mr. Dugas, if you intend to issue a  
5 written decision?

6 MR. DUGAS: I am not required to issue a decision  
7 in this case, Mr. Craig.

8 MR. CRAIG: You will not be issuing any recommended  
9 decision?

10 MR. DUGAS: I will not be making any recommendations,  
11 nor will I issue any decision.

12 MR. CRAIG: Who will?

13 MR. DUGAS: The decisions will be made jointly by  
14 the State of Virginia's Highway Department and the Department  
15 of Highways of the District of Columbia, based upon their  
16 consultant reports, and all of the information that we have  
17 brought before us by members of the public, including you, sir,  
18 and any other information that may be submitted for the record  
19 on or before December 28, 1970.

20 MR. CRAIG: In the event, Your Honor, that I do not  
21 receive the request in time to file a statement by December 28,  
22 can I have ten days after the receipt of such information to  
23 submit a statement?

24 MR. DUGAS: Let me ask them how long it is going to  
25 take.



1 MR. AIRIS: I didn't quite understand Mr. Craig's  
2 question.

3 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Craig has asked that he be given  
4 10 days beyond the 28th of December, in the event that you  
5 have not furnished him with the answers to the questions as  
6 posed.

7 MR. CRAIG: That is not quite correct.

8 MR. DUGAS: Would you restate it?

9 MR. CRAIG: My question is, ten days after receipt  
10 of the information that Mr. Airis still has to prepare, if I  
11 can have ten days after receipt of that.

12 MR. DUGAS: Whatever it is. Conceivably, it could  
13 be by the 28th.

14 MR. CRAIG: It might be tomorrow, I don't know. To  
15 submit my statement.

16 MR. DUGAS: That seems reasonable to me. Is that  
17 reasonable?

18 MR. AIRIS: I think that is a reasonable request.  
19 I can't guarantee that we do just that. All that we will try  
20 to do is follow the dictates and the spirits of this 20-8,  
21 which is what we are trying to comply with right here.

22 MR. DUGAS: I would suggest for the record, Mr.  
23 Craig, that you will be given an additional ten days after  
24 receipt of the information from the Highway Department.

25 MR. CRAIG: This is the information contained in

1 Item 5 through 10 of my letter of December 7, 1970?

2 MR. DUGAS: That is correct, sir.

3 MR. CRAIG: I see my time has run out. I would  
4 like to say I do have to move on to the Interstate Commerce  
5 Proceeding, and I appreciate very much the courtesty of hearing  
6 this rambling, and I am afraid not too well organized, pre-  
7 sentation.

8 Thank you very much.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. DUGAS: Thank you very much.

11 MR. CRAIG: I think Mr. Airis has a question.

12 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Airis.

13 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out  
14 a number of things that Mr. Craig has raised get into the  
15 philosophy of what is a proper balanced transportation system  
16 in the District, or anywhere for that matter. And the matter  
17 is not one of easy solution.

18 The controls we find on the number of vehicles in  
19 the Center City, instead of being the roads leading into it,  
20 are practically the amount of parking downtown and this, plus  
21 other considerations, get into the very complicated situation  
22 that Mr. Craig has attempted to base solely on the rush-hour  
23 capacity of the different lanes on the different bridges.

24 I would just like to point out to Mr. Craig, that  
25 this is something that has been a long-time discussion in the

1 entire country and the District of Columbia, as well. And  
2 the ultimate transportation system which we in the Highway  
3 Department has been attempting to get here involves very much  
4 the rail rapid transit system that I have personally testified  
5 for in the District. But it only deals with the 35 percent  
6 of the traffic that is commuter-oriented.

7 Now, you have all of these other things that must  
8 be taken care of that are not just the commuter. Put it this  
9 way. We must have a good movement of people and goods here,  
10 in order to keep our downtown in a viable position. We must  
11 not give it over to parking just for the commuter. That is  
12 one of our aims. And I would just like to leave it that there  
13 is a good deal of sense in some of the things you bring up,  
14 but I can't agree at all with some of the detailed statistics  
15 whereby you attempt to detail the rush-hour capacities of the  
16 various bridges into a denial, or rather no need for any more  
17 bridges on the river.

18 Any large city, Mr. Craig, in Europe many of the  
19 people have traveled and they come back here and bring up  
20 these matters, and they all have many more bridges than we  
21 do over the Potomac River here. London, Paris, Rome, other  
22 large cities. And I think it is a little disservice to the  
23 public for you, a very good economist, to come in here and  
24 attempt to prove this particular bridge is not needed by  
25 virtue of some of the details of a rush-hour statistic.



1 I would like to point out on accidents, that the  
2 accidents you quote are over a ten-year period, not just one  
3 year. And in the time that is covered in that particular  
4 document, we have experienced here in the District a three to  
5 seven percent per year increase in traffic with very little  
6 additional plant and this is one of the reasons that we are  
7 garnering more statistics.

8 It is not because of the freeway accident rate;  
9 because of increased traffic in neighborhood streets. If you  
10 look at your location of your accidents, you will find this  
11 to be so.

12 So I want to point out in that regard, that the  
13 number of accidents in here, we have been experiencing in  
14 the District, point very much to the need for this additional  
15 traffic capacity on a limited access facility.

16 Lastly, Mr. Craig, I wonder, would you have any  
17 preference for the treatment that is shown on these two  
18 artists' renderings here.

19 MR. CRAIG: If I can answer your question in reverse  
20 order, Mr. Airis.

21 First, looking at these two drawings up there, if I  
22 personally had to choose between the left hand and the right  
23 hand, I would think the right hand would make a better  
24 facility. I, however, do not think that either of those  
25 designs is a desirable design. My own studies, the studies of

1 the National Capital Planning Commission, the studies of the  
2 National Capital Transportation Agency, the studies of  
3 Wilbur Smith and Associates, the study of Allen M. Voorhees  
4 and Associates, the study of Arthur D. Little, the studies  
5 of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Authority,  
6 in fact, the studies of everyone with whom I am familiar,  
7 with the exception of your Department, is in agreement that  
8 there is no additional bridge capacity needed between Virginia  
9 and Downtown Washington.

10 That being the case, I would think the preferable  
11 design would be to go back to the original design of the  
12 Three Sisters Bridge as it existed at the time of Pierre  
13 L'Enfant. As you may or may not know, when Mr. L'Enfant came  
14 to Washington to develop his plan for the National Capital  
15 City, there was a bridge at Three Sisters Island. It was a  
16 pedestrian bridge, a suspension bridge from the North Shore to  
17 the South Shore, permitting pedestrians to go from the Rosslyn  
18 area to the Georgetown area, to school and to shop.

19 I think it would add quite a bit to the scenic  
20 quality of that area to reconstruct that suspension bridge as  
21 it existed in 1790 to 1880, when it was unfortunately washed  
22 away with a flood. And that bridge could be designated I-266.  
23 It wouldn't really bother me, although it -- (drowned out by  
24 laughter).

25 But it would fully serve all of the vehicular needs



1 of 1990.

2 MR. AIRIS: Well, Mr. Craig, this is where we  
3 disagree, of course. I have viewed at times past the same  
4 L'Enfant Bridge as one of the locations for the Three Sisters  
5 Bridge. There is some question as to just exactly what it was  
6 and whether it was built or not built. But they did, it was  
7 true, have a bridge at this precise location.

8 MR. CRAIG: Now, let me move on to the disservice  
9 question. I have attempted to bring out, Mr. Airis, for your  
10 benefit, for the last hour and a half, the fact that you, sir,  
11 don't know what you are talking about. You keep spouting the  
12 same cliches of annual increase in traffic and have been doing  
13 so since I first heard you. And whenever asked questions,  
14 you never seem to know, and whenever consultants look at it,  
15 they all seem to agree that you don't seem to know.

16 I think that a great disservice is being done to  
17 this community when the Director of its Highway Department goes  
18 before the House Public Works Committee, in December 1969, and  
19 acting contrary to all sound planning advice, acting contrary  
20 to the will of the Mayor-Commissioner, acting contrary to the  
21 studied judgments of the City Council and the National Capital  
22 Planning Commission, he quotes these same meaningless dribble  
23 of statistics such as you have.

24 Look at our own data. Get familiar with our own  
25 traffic forecasting. Talk to some of these planners who have



1 gone into it. Why don't you even talk to me?

2 MR. AIRIS: Well, Mr. Craig, I guess we understand  
3 each other.

4 MR. CRAIG: If you read the Examiner's Report of  
5 January, 1945, he seemed quite impressed with my testimony  
6 and the testimony of and other exhibits of the witnesses and  
7 he recommended that the D. C. Highway Department look into it  
8 and study it. Not once in the last six years, sir, have you  
9 or any other member of your Department bothered to find out  
10 where your computers are going wrong. Instead, you go up to  
11 Congress and put us under blackmail.

12 And either, sir, this is malevolence or it is  
13 ignorance. I choose to think you were ignorant and not  
14 malevolent. But you, sir, more than anyone else, are respon-  
15 sible for a Congressman Broyhill, a Congressman natcher, a  
16 Congressman Kluczynski, a Congressman Fallon, a Congressman  
17 Cramer, pulling the type of blackmail tactics they have on  
18 this community within the last four or five years.

19 If anyone, sir, is doing a disservice to the public  
20 of the District of Columbia, it is having a highway director  
21 who doesn't know what he is talking about. It is time -- and  
22 I would make this recommendation to the Mayor-Commissioner and  
23 the City Council -- to put the Highway Department under the  
24 supervision who knows what they are talking about. I could  
25 submit 10 or 15 names, if you would like.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

3 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have that  
4 for the record. That brings it out exactly where it is  
5 between Mr. Craig and myself.

6 MR. DUGAS: Reverend Joe L. Gipson.

7 STATEMENT OF THE REVEREND JOE L. GIPSON,  
8 UPPER NORTHEAST GROUP MINISTRY

9 REVEREND GIPSON: Mayor Washington and Members of  
10 the City Council, National Capital Planning Commission, and  
11 there should be some officials from Virginia, somewhere. Mr.  
12 Fugate, maybe.

13 As I understand it, this is a hearing and although,  
14 Mr. Dugas, I respect your ability in this area, I feel that I  
15 ought to say before I make my comment, that I do not believe  
16 since you aren't going to give us a written statement, that  
17 I can really feel that anything I am going to say is going to  
18 make any real difference in the design of this bridge.

19 So to comply with my better wishes, I will speak to  
20 it but inside my feeling is that it is really a waste of time,  
21 and that to consider a design for a bridge you must begin  
22 first -- and I have watched "Sesame Street" long enough to  
23 know it is better to say it quickly and shortly and use a lot  
24 of props and we might communicate the message quite simply.

25 Let me start first, Mr. Airis, with the letter

1 "N." The letter "N" stands for "Neighborhoods," and we hear  
2 a lot of talk about neighborhoods and how highways and bridges  
3 create a more working relationship economically and socially  
4 between people. And I want to stand on record as being for  
5 neighborhoods, and that we would try and find ways to create  
6 living and exciting neighborhoods that are not run over by  
7 this great influx of automobiles.

8 We will talk about the Georgetown Community and  
9 take that neighborhood and allow it to exist for people. And  
10 if we follow that flow of traffic down and try to see where  
11 it would go, we see to the right of Rock Creek Park, the fact  
12 that somewhere in there that traffic has got to spill. We  
13 know it is not going to spill in the Downtown Washington  
14 directly, but it is going to unite somewhere and probably  
15 follow Florida Avenue over to "U", and we know the process  
16 from there. Because the "U" Street-Dupont area is all slated  
17 to be changed and turned over and it is a predominantly black  
18 neighborhood and there are just not many places for them to  
19 move to.

20 So I would say if "N" stands for "Neighborhood,"  
21 let's let Neighborhoods stand and eliminate this horrendous  
22 approach by a bridge that will take traffic that will destroy  
23 neighborhoods.

24 "O" then would stand for "Open Space." Which you  
25 can say the bridges create open space, providing no one else



1 can get to it except for automobiles, and no one can get off  
2 at any particular area except the spaces designed and allowed  
3 by egress and ingress to that bridge. Then there could be  
4 some open space somewhere along that line.

5 We need to think in terms of open space and try to  
6 create a living environment in a city which already has too  
7 many people in terms of the kind of living possibility that  
8 ought to be there. We ought to preserve our natural  
9 recreational spots, such as Glover-Archbold and Rock Creek  
10 Park and, of course, the Three Sisters Island.

11 So part of the process, then, is to create some  
12 kind of open space, instead of destroying it by bringing more  
13 automobiles and we ought to try to find a way to open it up.

14 "B" in my dialogue would stand for "Blackmail."  
15 And part of the process of the black mail has been that the  
16 City has been forced to create a design by Congress, due  
17 partly to the testimony of Highway officials in our city, and  
18 due partly to the fact that there is a tremendous amount of  
19 dollars and cents to be made by a lot of industry that profits  
20 on the building of highways and bridges. And, consequently,  
21 to unite and make this a possible thing in Washington, we are  
22 being blackmailed into a piece-by-piece building of an inter-  
23 locking freeway system in our city that absolutely cannot be  
24 tolerated.

25 It wouldn't be so bad to have highways if in every

1 highway system there were not people removed from their  
2 homes. While we can't say that race is a clear and an open  
3 issue, it seems often, though, that the communities that  
4 suffer most from any building of a highway or any bridge, the  
5 communities that suffer most are black communities. And we  
6 look at the tremendous growth of our suburbs, we know that  
7 those people have moved from the heart of the city out further  
8 to more what they call desirable places to live.

9           Let me make it very clear. I have no opposition  
10 inside myself to whites moving anywhere they want to in the  
11 community. They can move 30 miles, 50 miles, 100 miles from  
12 the heart of the city, if they want to, and I don't mind that.  
13 But it offends me a little when a man who lives 25 miles away  
14 wants to get to his job as quickly as I do, and I live only  
15 16 blocks from my job. That offends me a little because it  
16 means that not only do I live in the concentrated area of the  
17 city, but that he is able to drive up highways, rapidly pass  
18 where I live and not even have to deal with the problems that  
19 are created by it.

20           So I would say that maybe it is not an overt act of  
21 racism, but subtly locked into this is an attempt to try to  
22 find a way for people to live in isolated communities and  
23 then to be at the heart of the city without any problems of  
24 dealing with the real interiors of that city.

25           The blackmail that is heaped on us by a Congress that



1 says it cares about us and yet does not take steps to make  
2 life really exciting here in the Nation's Capital.

3 "R", Renewal. Renewal, yes. Rapid Transit, maybe.  
4 I think I could sit still for a bridge that was bringing the  
5 transit rail across and allowing people to move goods and  
6 services if necessary, but mainly people, and to rid some of  
7 our streets of the automobile traffic.

8 If you look at the Mixing Bowl down at 14th Street,  
9 if you look at the Beltway, if you look at any of these from  
10 just a merely lay point of view, you can see that it does not  
11 move people rapidly. What we really need to do is utilize  
12 the space in a wise way and move people as quickly as possible.  
13 The real task is to try to get people in and out of the city.  
14 Why don't we concentrate on that and not talk about a balanced  
15 system, but build some kind of balance into the system that we  
16 have.

17 It could be ignorance, ignorance of the fact that  
18 people are really kind of ignorant of the fact that somehow,  
19 in all designs for what we do, even members of the families  
20 of our officials find that highways are undesirable in their  
21 own community. And if it is undesirable in one's own community,  
22 why is it not undesirable in someone else's community?

23 I-266 demonstrates insensitivity of government to  
24 people's needs and what they really desire.

25 "D", Downtown Detroit, San Diego. It is kind of



1 dumb to think that highways solve transportation problems.  
2 Any looking at the highway system of Los Angeles and San Diego  
3 and Detroit and all of our major cities, where every time a  
4 new highway is built, all we get is people feeling in their  
5 heads they can get their personal automobiles now in that  
6 traffic and they begin to add to it.

7 We decry the ability of buses to move and therefore  
8 people won't ride buses, they take their personal automobiles.  
9 It begins to be rather difficult. So, "D", let's don't make  
10 a dumb city out of the District. Let's try to think about it  
11 more wisely.

12 "G", then, for Government. Concern itself with the  
13 general welfare of people and not just the general welfare of  
14 concrete people, tire people, auto people, gasoline people,  
15 but to give the whole process of what it takes to operate a  
16 city and to live in it, some real serious concern.

17 "E", which completes my little group of letters.  
18 The environment itself being responsible, trying to find a way  
19 to make this environment healthy and stable. We would prob-  
20 ably do very well if we didn't have a bridge at all. And yet  
21 I don't feel that I could stop and say that we don't need to  
22 build bridges. Maybe the real point of it is that instead  
23 of talking about bridges, bridges of concrete and bridges of  
24 stone, to go across our rivers and congest our communities,  
25 let us start talking about bridges of understanding. Bridges

1 of communication, bridges of new life styles that create  
2 health and excitement in a city so long gone wrong by planning  
3 being done by people not most directly affected. By sham  
4 hearings that don't really get to the heart of things, that  
5 compile information to be stored on the shelves, that won't  
6 make one iota of difference for the men who have already made  
7 up their minds we are going to have a bridge, it is going to  
8 be in this location, and the choice we have is between this  
9 picture or that picture, 22 million or 25 million.

10 And the real difference doesn't make any difference  
11 if we don't need the bridge at all.

12 Mr. Chairman, apart from the fact that I really only  
13 came to make the point we would like to make from the Upper  
14 Northeast Group Ministry and myself as the President of the  
15 group, that we don't really believe we need a bridge at all.

16 Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

19 I think we will break now for lunch and try to get  
20 back about a quarter of 2:00, so that we won't throw Mr.  
21 Cassell and the other participants too far out of line.

22 (Whereupon, at 12:57 p.m., the public hearing in the  
23 above-entitled matter was recessed, to reconvene at 2:00 p.m.,  
24 this same day.

## AFTERNOON SESSION

1:40 p.m.

1 MR. DUGAS: Back on the record.

2 Mr. Richard Faraday, Burleith Citizens Association.

3 STATEMENT OF RICAHRD FARADAY, BURLEITH  
4  
5  
6 CITIZENS ASSOCIATION

7 MR. FARADAY: Mr. Dugas, Members of the D. C. and  
8 Virginia Departments of Highways.

9 I am Richard Faraday, President of the Burleith  
10 Citizens Association of the District of Columbia. At our  
11 regular December meeting held last night, our members author-  
12 ized my presentation of this statement on behalf of the  
13 citizens of our community.

14 We sense that this meeting here today is a sham.  
15 The District evidently has no intention to listen to its  
16 citizens, or it would not be holding this hearing while  
17 appeal of Judge Sirica's decision is on the ground it should  
18 not hold this very hearing. Indeed, we can only conclude that  
19 the District Government is only responsive to political  
20 pressure from Congress and not to Court Order.

21 If the responsible District and Virginia authorities  
22 were genuinely interested in having full public debate and  
23 discussion on this structure, they would have attempted to  
24 comply with the spirit of Judge Sirica's order by preparing  
25 information about the design alternatives, study by the



1 District of Columbia, rather than the brief 15-page booklet  
2 which is hardly designed to represent the Highway Department's  
3 entire thinking on this subject. Or is it?

4 We are appalled by the lack of economic, socio-  
5 logical and especially environmental statement which either  
6 indicates disregard of the factors or lack of in-depth study.  
7 We are further surprise about the brevity of the initial  
8 presentations of the District of Columbia and Virginia  
9 Highway Departments at the opening of these hearings yesterday.

10 Our Association has attempted to take a substantive  
11 position on the structure. However, the lack of rebuttable  
12 information provided and the hasty short-term notice of the  
13 hearing has cut short our substantive comments. We shall,  
14 therefore, concentrate on the procedural aspects, i.e., the  
15 design, if you will, of this hearing.

16 First, the comprehensive transportation plan for the  
17 region should be presented. We are appalled at how highway  
18 hearings divide a community against itself. In addition,  
19 the hearing should at least be presented with information on  
20 the bridge approaches as well as the bridge itself.

21 Second, we feel that no design hearing is appropriate  
22 until the location hearing is held, because circumstances have  
23 drastically changed since 1964, especially as regards the  
24 rail rapid transit.

25 Three. We feel that since both highway departments

1 involved have not made a comprehensive disclosure of all of  
2 the facts considered, that this cannot constitute the required  
3 design hearing. Substantially, from what little information  
4 we have been able to require, we must comment the design of  
5 the bridge is inadequate, as is the design of these hearings.

6 Under these circumstances, we defend our sensitiv-  
7 ities as citizens and taxpayers. We oppose any bridge or  
8 design thereof at the Three Sisters location.

9 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, sir.

10 Mr. Cassell.

11 STATEMENT OF CHARLES CASSELL, MEMBER,  
12 BOARD OF EDUCATION

13 MR. CASSELL: My name is Charles Cassell. I am a  
14 citizen in Washington, D. C. I am an activist in important  
15 activities in the city and have been for quite some time. I  
16 am Vice President of the Emergency Committee of the  
17 Transportation Crisis, one of the vice chairmen; and member  
18 of the D. C. School Board.

19 I would like to point out that I speak to you in  
20 each of these capacities, most importantly as one of the few  
21 public officials elected to office in Washington, D. C., and  
22 therefore I hope that my testimony will carry strong weight  
23 with you.

24 I would like to state, first of all, that I am very  
25 much concerned about and I want to protest the fact that, with

1 all due respect to you, Mr. Dugas, that this very important  
2 hearing is not being presided over by those individuals who  
3 have the responsibility to make a decision. That much, it  
4 seems to me, at issue at this moment requires the attention  
5 and witness of the Commissioner of Washington, D. C., as well  
6 as the entire City Council.

7 I am assuming that their absence does not mean they  
8 are disinterested. I am assuming, also, since they are not  
9 present -- and let me ask, are any members of the City Council  
10 here or is the Mayor here, Mr. Chairman?

11 MR. DUGAS: I don't see the Mayor.

12 MR. CASSELL: I want to be accurate.

13 MR. DUGAS: And I don't see any members of the City  
14 Council.

15 MR. CASSELL: All right. I am assuming that the  
16 Commissioner of Washington, D. C., and each member of the  
17 Council will read the transcript of this hearing very care-  
18 fully. And, therefore, with all due respect to you, as I say,  
19 I will address my remarks to Mr. Washington, and to Mr. Hahn  
20 as the Chairman of the City Council and the representative  
21 and the spokesman for that group.

22 I don't know whether you have seen a copy of the  
23 ECTC's paper that was prepared for this hearing but that, I  
24 think, states our position generally.

25 The paper is entitled, "What is the real design of



1 these design hearings on the Three Sisters Bridge," and it  
2 is addressed to the Citizens of the Washington Metropolitan  
3 Area. And that, of course, includes, I hope, all of the  
4 public officials who are in attendance here.

5 We are very much concerned, as the paper indicates,  
6 over the fact that we are talking now about the design of a  
7 bridge and a route which has no support anywhere in the  
8 Metropolitan Area from anybody, except those vested interests  
9 who will reap a material reward therefrom. I think this is  
10 perhaps the only issue in the history of the city in which  
11 there has been this kind of unified opposition to any plan  
12 proposed by the officials of the city.

13 It seems to me that we should really not be  
14 talking about the design of something that unpopular. We  
15 should be really talking, and I think that the City Council  
16 and the Mayor should be concerned now about the desirability,  
17 even though they have committed themselves to the construction  
18 of this bridge. I think this is necessary because the kind  
19 of reaction that this kind of arbitrary planning has generated  
20 in the past has certainly not brought about the kind of  
21 cooperation that is necessary.

22 I would like to point out, also, this hearing is  
23 held involuntarily by public officials. This is the second  
24 time, to my knowledge, that it was necessary for citizens to  
25 force such a hearing or any kind of hearing in public when

1 the city itself was unwilling to provide that kind of oppor-  
2 tunity. Since the city now finds itself in an i oluntary  
3 position, and since the city laws indicate that even though  
4 the City Council and the Mayor are appointed, they do indeed  
5 represent the best interest of the public, it seems to me  
6 that it is time now for the Mayor and for the City Council to  
7 find the courage to base their remarks and their reactions  
8 from here on, on the kind of response that has come from the  
9 public.

10 I am not going to deal with facts and figures. I  
11 am not even going to claim the bridge is a bad thing on tech-  
12 nical grounds. I think that has been covered very well. I  
13 would just like to refer to some information on the reverse  
14 side of the pamphlet that was produced for this occasion by  
15 ECTC, and it is entitled "The Court Says the District of  
16 Columbia's Freeway Program is Unlawful."

17 You know, this refers to the 1968 decision. And  
18 even though that is two years away, there are some pertinent  
19 things in there, which I think need to be reiterated and  
20 which I would like to read in the record, and hope that the  
21 Mayor and City Council will examine that record very carefully.

22 From the United States Court of Appeals to the  
23 District of Columbia Circuit, No. 21416. This is the case of  
24 the D. C. Federation of Civic Associations, Inc., et al,  
25 Appellant, versus Thomas F. Airis, Director of District of



1 Columbia Highways and Traffic, et al, Appellees. That was  
2 an appeal from the U. S. District Court for the District of  
3 Columbia, decided February 15, 1968.

4 These things, I think, are pertinent, and I think  
5 we should keep these in mind. "It should also" -- this is  
6 from the Court decision -- "It should also be recognized that  
7 the procedures outlined in Title 7 are designed to protect  
8 the property rights by insuring that the highway plans are  
9 evolved democratically rather than arbitrarily."

10 My contention is that these highway plans have not  
11 been developed democratically and they have been developed  
12 arbitrarily. We only have an opportunity now to make comments,  
13 and belatedly, and in an involuntary session.

14 "The public hearing required by Section 7-15 offers  
15 the public an opportunity to participate in the administrative  
16 decision."

17 I don't think we have had that opportunity.

18 "It forces the administrators to spell out the  
19 reasons for their decisions."

20 I point out that the Court language is "Force the  
21 Administrators to spell out the reasons for their decision."

22 A check on balance basic to our entire system of  
23 government. The basic procedure established by Section 7-109  
24 and Section 7-115, whereby the District Commissioner, now the  
25 Commissioner, and the City Council are directed to hold a



1 public hearing before approving a highway plan and the  
2 District Commissioners are to approve the plan before sub-  
3 mitting it to the National Capital Planning Commission, is  
4 also very significant.

5           Although the District Commissioners are appointed  
6 rather than elected, their primary interest is the District  
7 of Columbia. And, therefore, they are likely to be more  
8 responsive to a group of District residents than is the  
9 National Capital Planning Commission, whose duties are  
10 Federal in nature and whose jurisdiction extends throughout  
11 the Metropolitan Area.

12           Now, I don't know whether that assumption is  
13 warranted at this time now. To my understanding, 99 and  
14 44/100ths percent of the testimony at all hearings that has  
15 been held, and certainly at this hearing, have developed the  
16 fact that the citizens in the District of Columbia consider  
17 that this bridge is detrimental. Now, if the Court indeed  
18 was warranted in making that assumption as the basis for a  
19 hearing, it seems to me you have no choice now, not simply to  
20 hear what we say, take it under advisement and proceed with  
21 one of these designs, but there is no choice for you, Mr.  
22 Mayor and Mr. City Council Chairman, to indicate that after  
23 listening to the citizens, after examining the process by  
24 which this design or these designs were derived, that you have  
25 no choice now but to recommend against construction of the

1 bridge, and a re-examination of the whole highway planning  
2 facility.

3 I think we also need recognize there is a require-  
4 ment in law that no highway plan can proceed without having  
5 been performed by a transportation planning agency, which we  
6 don't have in Washington, D. C. As I see it, the transporta-  
7 tion planning officer in Washington, D. C., is Mr. Thomas  
8 Airlis, and my understanding is that his specific interest is  
9 in highways. This is hardly an objective source for planning  
10 transportation.

11 Let me continue. That is, it is probable that a  
12 group of District residents would have more leverage on the  
13 final decision, if their opinions represented to the District  
14 Commissioners, a local interest group, before the plans were  
15 officially approved by the Commissioners or the National  
16 Capital Planning Commission. Are we to have that kind of  
17 influence? Not only have we said that we disapprove, but I  
18 think the previous speaker and those before him have given  
19 substantial socio-economic and technical reasons for not pro-  
20 ceeding with any bridge.

21 Is this a warranted assumption on the part of the  
22 Court and does, indeed, the Mayor and those of the City  
23 Council respect this conventional assumption of the Court?

24 It is possible the Commissioners might endorse their  
25 views and recommend them to the National Capital Planning



1 Commission, or is it really possible that the Mayor and the  
2 City Council will endorse the views that are heard here, thus  
3 giving added significance to the citizens' opinions?

4 Finally, the provision in Section 7-109, requiring  
5 District Commissioners to report immediately with the surveyor  
6 the plan finally approved by the District Commissioners and  
7 the National Capital Planning Commission, serves final notice  
8 to the public, thereby facilitating public cooperation in  
9 planning.

10 Let me repeat that last phrase -- thereby facilitat-  
11 ing public cooperation in planning.

12 There has been to date no public cooperation in  
13 planning. There is probably not likely to be any if this  
14 decision is not reversed.

15 I have repeated some of the rationale stated by the  
16 United States Court of Appeals in halting the Freeway planning  
17 back in 1968. And I think this same rationale applied to the  
18 decision that this hearing be held.

19 I hope that you, Mr. Mayor, and you, Mr. Chairman  
20 of the City Council, will be sufficiently alert to the fact  
21 that the kind of negligence, the kind of turning off of  
22 community and citizen and metropolitan area demands, will not  
23 prevail.

24 On August 9, 1968, many of us here witnessed the  
25 terrible spectacle of the City Council of this city standing



1 behind its podium, watching officers of the law physically  
2 assaulting unarmed citizens who stood at another forum  
3 attempting to make the same point, just prior to that ill-  
4 fated decision regarding that bridge.

5           The feelings of the public have not abated. In  
6 fact, there is more widespread interest now and more widespread  
7 determination that this undemocratic, that this selfish and  
8 this detrimental plan, shall not be foisted upon the city.

9           Mr. Mayor and Mr. Chairman of the City Council, I  
10 urge you now to forget about the details of this and recognize  
11 that you have no choice now but to honor, as the Court seems  
12 to think that you might, the desires of the majority of the  
13 citizens in the city, as opposed to the special interests  
14 who are pushing for this.

15           I might say one more thing. I mentioned to you my  
16 own qualifications. One of the credentials that I think any  
17 public official has, is he has a constituency and he has a  
18 constituency that has a point of view and certain desires.  
19 I think as a public official, the one credential I do not have  
20 is material wealth, which is the only credential that the  
21 supporters of this have, and that is something to bear in  
22 mind.

23           Thank you.

24           (Applause.)

25           MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Cassell.

1 Mrs. James Rowe.

2 STATEMENT OF MRS. JAMES H. ROWE, JR., CITIZEN,  
3 3207 HIGHLAND PLACE, NORTHWEST, WASHINGTON,  
4 D. C.

5 MRS. ROWE: Mr. Dugas, my former adversary is at  
6 the other table.

7 My name is Elizabeth Rowe and I am appearing today  
8 in opposition to the proposed designs of the Three Sisters  
9 Bridge. I speak as a private citizen, a taxpayer of the  
10 District and an individual plaintiff in the Three Sisters  
11 suit. I might add that I speak as an indignant citizen.

12 A number of witnesses have challenged the legality  
13 of these proceedings -- I agree with them, but I am not going  
14 to go into the details.

15 It does seem to me, though, the height of folly and,  
16 incidentally, an extravagant misuse of public funds -- to have  
17 these hearings at all. Certainly, no one believes these  
18 "Design Hearings" are carrying out the intend of the Federal  
19 highway legislation. The safeguards to communities and parks  
20 written into the Federal aid highways laws aren't intended to  
21 be limited to architectural judgments of the beauty of an  
22 unsupported as contrasted to a supported span over the Potomac.  
23 Who are you kidding? What is the design when the bridge  
24 reaches the banks of the Potomac?

25 What is going to happen at the Virginia end of the



1 bridge where the citizens of Arlington are challenging the  
2 plans to bring I-66 past the Beltway? Why the haste to build  
3 a bridge when the roads on both sides of the river are un-  
4 determined? These aren't rhetorical questions for those of us  
5 who have been concerned with freeway planning over the years.  
6 The answer is easy. Build the bridge and then you must have  
7 the roads to connect it. The first inch projects the next  
8 mile.

9           Where are are that next mile or miles going to be  
10 in the District? Where are the plans for the East-West  
11 Freeway connection to Three Sisters Bridge -- the so-called  
12 North Leg? Certainly no one thinks that six lanes of freeway  
13 traffic is going to disappear under the Georgetown Waterfront  
14 and stay there. It will have to come out somewhere and that  
15 somewhere is the heart of the city.

16           If this first link is built, we can be sure the  
17 North Leg will follow. The displacement and devastation  
18 resulting from that freeway -- the pollution to lung, ear and  
19 eye -- make the proposed North Central Freeway look like a  
20 community blessing. I am quite serious. I believe it.

21           So the citizens of the District and Virginia are  
22 being given and opportunity to be heard on the design of a  
23 bridge without connections -- and we are supposed to be satis-  
24 fied that we have been heard. Well, we are not.

25           From 1961 to 1968, when I served as Chairman of the



1 National Capital Planning Commission, I heard and I believe  
2 I listened to the voices of the citizens from both sides of  
3 the river. And they all said the same thing -- "No more  
4 Freeways, no more bridges." No more freeway entrances to the  
5 city.

6 There are many city issues on which Washingtonians  
7 are divided. But there is one -- transportation -- on which  
8 they are united. I hate to disagree with Mr. Cassell, but I  
9 think the rich and the poor alike, north, south, east, west  
10 in the City, the black and the white residents of the city,  
11 are opposed to freeways. They support good public transporta-  
12 tion, mass transportation.

13 How can the special pleaders speak more convincingly  
14 than the citizens? That is, how can they speak and get the  
15 ear of the District Government. I would be dismayed to think  
16 our city government would be persuaded to build this bridge  
17 because travelers to and from Dulles Airport are in a hurry  
18 or because interstate trucks could save miles by going through  
19 the city rather than around the Beltway. I would be even more  
20 dismayed if, because of the noise made by the highway lobby,  
21 supported and magnified by most of the Washington press, our  
22 Mayor and City Council were deafened to the sound of the  
23 voices of the people of this city.

24 Mr. Dugas, please take this message back to the city  
25 government: "Keep faith with the people of Washington. Don't

1 let us down. Don't build the bridge."

2 Thank you very much.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Holscher?

5 (No response.)

6 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Lawrence Bloomberg.

7 STATEMENT OF LAWRENCE N. BLOOMBERG,

8 PALISADES CITIZENS ASSOCIATION

9 MR. BLOOMBERG: Mr. Dugas.

10 My name is Lawrence N. Bloomberg. I live at 2307  
11 Chain Bridge Road, Northwest, in the District. I am President  
12 of the Palisades Citizens Association and am testifying for it.  
13 The boundaries of the area represented by the Association are  
14 the Potomac River, Foxhall Road, Loughboro Road and the  
15 District Line. Approximately 5,000 people reside within this  
16 immediate area. Our Association is among the oldest in the  
17 City, having been established more than 50 years ago. We have  
18 had occasions many times to appear before District and other  
19 authorities on highway and other questions.

20 In a sense, we are here today under protest testify-  
21 ing solely on the design features of a bridge that we believe  
22 should not be built.

23 We do not believe that a hearing so limited as this  
24 does justice to the full scope of citizen concern and interest.  
25 The river crossing at Three Sisters cannot be properly



1 considered in an isolated context, removed from the whole  
2 highway and rapid transit plan for the District.

3 If government, whether it be Federal, State, or  
4 local, wants the support and full confidence of its citizens,  
5 then the citizens must be taken into government's confidence.  
6 Here we are today being asked to testify on a bridge without  
7 knowing the full consequences of its construction. While we  
8 have some idea of the immediate approaches we do not know the  
9 relationship, for example, to the proposed Palisades Parkway,  
10 a matter of deep concern to our area.

11 Accordingly, our testimony is directed toward the  
12 design features and immediate approaches of a bridge that we  
13 do not believe is needed or warranted.

14 The bridge will aggravate the traffic congestion  
15 and parking problems in downtown and elsewhere in the  
16 District; it will detract from an open and uncluttered natural  
17 view of the Potomac Valley and it will increase and aggravate  
18 the pollution problems now facing Washington and its environs.

19 Mr. Dugas, I would also like to submit for inclusion  
20 in the record a statement expressing the Palisades Citizens  
21 Association's views on some of the pollution problems pre-  
22 sented by Mr. William G. Smith for our Association at a public  
23 hearing on proposed air pollution standards of November 30, 1970,  
24 if I may, for the record, also.

25 MR. DUGAS: It will be received, Mr. Bloomberg.



1 Would you want to have it marked now or after you have  
2 finished?

3 MR. BLOOMBERG: I will present it to you after  
4 speaking.

5 MR. DUGAS: All right, sir.

6 MR. BLOOMBERG: And it will be a bridge forced upon  
7 us at a time when the subway is under construction, thus not  
8 permitting an opportunity for the need for the bridge to be  
9 studied in the light of a transportation system which includes  
10 a subway which is completed and in operation. We are against  
11 the construction of the bridge and we are against a decision  
12 to go forward with it before the subway is completed and in  
13 use and a sensible highway plan that is of benefit to the  
14 District -- not just for commuters -- is adopted.

15 We do not believe that all alternatives to the  
16 bridge have been fully explored. For example, it has been  
17 pointed out many times that if the Roosevelt Bridge is opened  
18 to truck traffic a major reason cited for the need for the  
19 Three Sisters Bridge would be obviated.

20 But, if in opposition to the wishes of the people  
21 of the District and, indeed, those of ARLINGTON County in  
22 Virginia, the terminals of the bridge, it is indeed built,  
23 then we do want some say in its design features.

24 In many ways our concerns with design are the same  
25 as other areas and citizens of the District but we also have

1 several special interests:

2 (a) The District end of the proposed bridge would  
3 be in or very near the southeastern point of our area;

4 (b) Access to downtown and southwest Washington  
5 for the residents of our area could be adversely affected by  
6 the bridge and its approaches at the District end; and

7 (c) Our area starts at the river's edge and, in  
8 much of the length of our area, ascends steeply to a level  
9 several hundred feet above the water level. Where there is  
10 this steep ascension, nearly all the residents are at points  
11 high above the river. The District of Columbia end of Chain  
12 Bridge is at a point where there is steep ascension. The  
13 design of the bridge, in particular its height, in relation  
14 to the water level, is of special importance to our area.

15 The bridge, if constructed, should be as low, that  
16 is, as close to the water level, as possible. A low-level  
17 bridge would be more attractive, or less unattractive, I  
18 might say, than a high one. Construction costs would be lower.  
19 And, of special importance to the Palisades Association, a  
20 high-level bridge would pose the threat of a high-level  
21 highway along the Palisades and might revive the threat of a  
22 high-level span at the Chain Bridge area. Either would do  
23 great harm to the residential character of our community.  
24 Our primary concern, therefore, is that the bridge, if it is  
25 built, be built at a low level, that is, at the level of Canal



1 Road.

2 Our second concern is that the bridge and its  
3 approaches should not be so designed and constructed as to  
4 cut off or adversely affect, rapid access to Downtown and  
5 Southwest Washington for the residents of our area.

6 The present plan for the bridge and its approaches  
7 have this effect. To force upon us a bridge which we do not  
8 want is bad enough. To do so with an approach system which  
9 denies Palisades and other D. C. residents ready access to  
10 Downtown while affording such access to those in the suburbs,  
11 and beyond, simply cannot be justified, nor tolerated. What  
12 we have is a ridiculous proposal that would make it easier to  
13 get downtown from the suburbs than from within the District.  
14 A quick look at the map before us shows we are effectively  
15 blocked from the Freeway Downtown into other areas of the  
16 City. It would be also very nice if someone would point out  
17 to us how we get on this silly bridge.

18 Unless we go almost all of the way down to  
19 Washington Circle, and come back up.

20 In closing, we wish to reiterate that we hope never  
21 again to be forced to testify in such a narrow context on a  
22 major public so-called improvement. It is our understanding  
23 that this hearing purports to be in compliance with the  
24 requirements of the Highway Act. Our examination of the Act,  
25 however, raises serious questions as to the validity of this



1 position. In fact, we believe that this hearing, limited  
2 as it is to design, violates not only the letter but also  
3 the spirit and intent of the law.

4 Thank you very much.

5 MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

6 (The prepared statement of Mr. William G. Smith, on  
7 behalf of the Palisades Citizens Association, above-referred  
8 to, follows:)

9 "Good evening, I am William G. Smith, live at 2315  
10 Chain Bridge Road, Northwest, and have been a resident of the  
11 District for almost 30 years. I testify tonight on behalf of  
12 the Palisades Citizens Association, which has about 2500  
13 members. Our area is the last three miles along the Potomac  
14 River from Foxhall Road to the D. C. boundary.

15 "The Palisades Citizens Association has been involved  
16 for years in the vital issues affecting pollution. Our most  
17 recent national issue was the court action we brought against  
18 the Civil Aeronautics Board. That case started with adminis-  
19 trative proceedings before its hearing examiner and ended up  
20 with a decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.  
21 The CAB was directed by the Court to take environmental con-  
22 siderations into its proceedings. We pointed out at length  
23 the potential harmful noise effects of helicopters on schools  
24 and hospitals, as well as the general public.

25 "This statement is a broad view of air pollution --

1 because the issue is bigger than particulates. Solutions  
2 must be found before 1985. We recognize that pollution takes  
3 many forms, and that it has come to mean all those things  
4 which we are against. Perhaps it will help our discussion if  
5 I try to describe some of those forms and then show how  
6 they can hurt people and things in the District.

7 "Noise is a particularly offensive form of pollution.  
8 When jets were first introduced to National, the airlines and  
9 the Federal agencies all explained that noise would be  
10 acceptable and that it would be widely dispersed throughout  
11 the City, so that none would be particularly bothered. They  
12 went to great pains to be scientific about their measurements,  
13 and then violated all scientific principles in taking measure-  
14 ments to prove their points. They have stopped such nonsense,  
15 but our suffering grows worse. We know all too painfully the  
16 damage of noise, because every plane using National Airport  
17 either takes off or lands on an airway over our ares.

18 "Results are:

19 "1. We cannot hear anything during such an over-  
20 flight.

21 "2. Our television programs are distorted and dis-  
22 rupted.

23 "3. Our school days are reduced by 15-30 minutes  
24 while the overflights prevent communication.

25 "4. Our sleep is disrupted early and late.



1 "Particulates create unusual damage, which is subtle,  
2 pervasive, and corrosive. We consider particulates to be  
3 those elements injected into the air and gradually descending  
4 to the ground. Perhaps particulates are the most common form  
5 in which people think about pollution. We do not need to  
6 develop at length the adverse effects of particulates, but I  
7 will enumerate a few:

8 "1. Smog or the haze which overhangs our city while  
9 the surrounding countryside is bathing in sunlight, even as  
10 recently as this morning.

11 "2. Eye, nose and throat irritants, which are some-  
12 times so pervasive as to cause acute discomfort. But what  
13 damage do these irritants do normally?

14 "3. Kerosene dumping. You have read about the  
15 Eastern Airlines pilot who was fired because he refused to  
16 discharge his surplus fuel. We have members who have had that  
17 same kerosene identified by experts, and have seen it eat  
18 through five coats of paint within a two-year period. One  
19 of these residents is considering resurfacing his house be-  
20 cause he cannot keep the paint on his wood siding.

21 "Particles constitute another form of air pollution.  
22 We do not normally consider the air to contain particles or  
23 items which are too heavy to float, but they are part of the  
24 problem. The airpaths are like highways, only airplanes are  
25 not generally recognized to be litterbugs. When they drop



1 their particles, they are worse than the ordinary litterbug,  
2 because of the potential damage of the falling object. One  
3 of our members has taken the trouble to pursue with the  
4 Federal Aviation Administration the identification of the gunks  
5 of grease dropped on his lawn.

6 "When the FAA investigated, the inspector stood on  
7 our member's sidewalk and told our member that planes could  
8 not have dropped the grease because they never flew over his  
9 house. He had difficulty making this point because of the  
10 noise of the overflying airplanes. FAA sent the gunks to the  
11 FBI for identification, and received a report confirming our  
12 resident's complaint.

13 "Low-flying planes over heavily populates areas con-  
14 stitute a serious danger because of the particles dropping,  
15 particularly when preparing to land, or taking off.

16 "I have emphasized throughout these notes the im-  
17 portance of airplanes as contributors to pollution. My  
18 emphasis is not designed to indicate that buses and trucks are  
19 not a major source of pollution, but instead to indicate the  
20 wide scope of the problem, and also to explain some of the  
21 experiences we have daily from these pollutants.

22 "It would be inappropriate to ignore a fundamental  
23 source of pollution -- the commuter. These residents of our  
24 suburbs exhaust tons of pollutants each trip, and because of  
25 their concentration in mornings and evenings leave most of it

1 in our air. We hope that the subways and improved mass  
2 transit systems will bring relief, and perhaps we would  
3 suggest a couple of interim steps. Why not require commuters  
4 to get a special D. C. permit? Then we could have their cars  
5 inspected for air pollution potentials, and then the permits  
6 would not be issued to defective cars. Perhaps we could limit  
7 permits to those having more than one person per car, which  
8 would substantially reduce the number of commuting cars, or  
9 we could increase the permit fee for single person commuter  
10 cars.

11 "In closing, I would like to thank you and the  
12 District Government for tackling this tremendous task. The  
13 fact that it has not been attempted before does not excuse us  
14 from attempting to control our environment. By the same  
15 token, the fact that it is untried ground, does not mean that  
16 we must forever endure pollution particularly when we have  
17 growing evidence that toleration of pollution may shorten  
18 our lives."

19 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Airis, I wonder if you might answer  
20 Mr. Bloomberg's question as to where citizens in his particular  
21 civic association might get on the bridge, other than at  
22 Washington Circle. That is an interesting question.

23 MR. AIRIS: Well, would Mr. Bloomberg like to hear  
24 me on this?

25 MR. BLOOMBERG: Yes.



1 MR. DUGAS: I think he asked that question.

2 MR. AIRIS: I see. Well, an access that we have  
3 cranked into this design is a connection at Arizona Avenue  
4 in the Parkway, in order to get on downtown. Now that would  
5 not get you, the citizens of your area, to the bridge ---

6 MR. BLOOMBERG: I am limiting my question to access  
7 to the bridge now.

8 MR. AIRIS: All right.

9 The first is downtown. You did mention that other.  
10 Maybe it wasn't a question. But as to the bridge, you would  
11 not have a direct connection from your neighborhood to this  
12 bridge. If you wished to proceed out on I-66 toward the  
13 Beltway, your quickest route would be -- and I might just show  
14 it here -- Len, would you step up there and do it -- to go out  
15 I-66, would be by the Arizona connection onto the Palisades  
16 Parkway. The Potomac River Freeway, on down the Potomac River  
17 Freeway to the Roosevelt Bridge. The Roosevelt Bridge on  
18 over I-66, and then out I-66 to the Beltway.

19 Now, that is a detour of about a mile and a half.  
20 The purpose of that is to prevent the placing of more ramps  
21 and roadways in the vicinity of MacArthur and Foxhall, which  
22 is one of the objectives of the design, is to hold that to a  
23 minimum, which your own society has ordered me to do.

24 This is the answer to your question.

25 Now, if it is really a desire of the citizens who



1 live in that general area, that a connection could be made  
2 at the Foxhall and MacArthur intersection, of course, it is  
3 a legitimate request. It can be cranked in when the hearing  
4 of the Potomac River Freeway is held. I would advise against  
5 it, but again, there are many solutions to various details  
6 like this, and if it is the desire of the citizens in the  
7 area that this be made, it can be made.

8 MR. BLOOMBERG: May I answer that?

9 MR. DUGAS: Surely.

10 MR. BLOOMBERG: No, it is not the desire to have  
11 access of that range. We talked about this many times. I  
12 was simply pointing out that this facility has no use to the  
13 citizens in our area. There is nothing that we can use, nor  
14 that we want. And, certainly, we don't want to destroy our  
15 area by access to a bridge which we don't think we need.

16 MR. AIRIS: I didn't think you wanted to, really.

17 MR. BLOOMBERG: I just wanted to be clear on it.

18 MR. AIRIS: Right.

19 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Richard Pardo.

20 STATEMENT OF RICHARD PARDO, LEGAL COMMITTEE,

21 METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COALITION FOR CLEAN

22 AIR

23 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, I am Richard Pardo, a  
24 member of the Legal Committee of the Metropolitan Washington  
25 Coalition for Clean Air, a nonprofit citizen group of more than

1 70 organizations and hundreds of individual members dedicated  
2 to the elimination of air pollution in the Metropolitan  
3 Washington Area.

4 My testimony today concerns the applicability of  
5 Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act to the  
6 Three Sisters Bridge project. It is the contention of the  
7 Coalition Legal Committee that this law requires:

8 1. Preparation of a detailed environmental impact  
9 statement on the Three Sisters Bridge project by the U. S.  
10 Department of Transportation under provisions of the above law.

11 2. Submission to DOT by the District of Columbia  
12 Government of a draft environmental impact statement in  
13 accordance with guidelines issued by the Environmental Quality  
14 Council, and related regulations of the Department of  
15 Transportation.

16 3. The undertaking of a comprehensive study of the  
17 potential air pollution effects of the bridge and related  
18 freeway projects before either of the above statements can be  
19 in compliance with applicable Federal laws and regulations.

20 Public Law 90-190, The National Environmental Policy  
21 Act -- 83 Stat. 853 -- was signed into law on January 1 of  
22 this year. The relevent portions of Section 102 for the  
23 purpose of my testimony are as follows:

24 "Section 102. The Congress authorizes and directs  
25 that, to the fullest extent possible: (2) all agencies of the



1 Federal Government shall ---

2 "(C) include in every recommendation or report on  
3 proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions  
4 significantly affecting the quality of the human environment,  
5 a detailed statement by the responsible official on ---

6 "(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action,

7 "(ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot  
8 be avoided should the proposal be implemented,

9 "(iii) alternatives to the proposed action,

10 "(iv) the relationship between local short-term  
11 uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement  
12 of long-term productivity, and

13 "(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commit-  
14 ments of resources which would be involved in the proposed  
15 action should it be implemented."

16 As a part of the Interstate Highway System the Three  
17 Sisters Bridge project is financed in large part by Federal  
18 funds administered by the Federal Highway Administration of  
19 the U. S. Department of Transportation.

20 Under Executive Order 11514 of March 4, 1970,  
21 President Nixon directed that all Federal agencies proceed with  
22 actions required by Section 102 of the Act.

23 On April 30, and under the mandate of the Act and  
24 Executive Order 11514, the Council on Environmental Quality  
25 issued a set of interim guidelines. These guidelines state



1 in part that:

2 "Before undertaking major action . . . that  
3 significantly affects the environment, Federal agencies will,  
4 in consultation with other appropriate Federal, State and  
5 local agencies assess in detail the potential environmental  
6 impact in order that adverse affects are avoided, and  
7 environmental quality is restored or enhanced, to the fullest  
8 extent practicable."

9 These guidelines further state that:

10 "The statutory clause 'major federal actions  
11 significantly affecting the quality of the human environment'  
12 is to be construed by agencies with a view to the overall  
13 cumulative impact of the action proposed -- and of further  
14 actions contemplated. Such actions may be localized in their  
15 impact, but if there is a potential that the environment may  
16 be significantly affected, the statement is to be prepared."

17 Further, the CEQ interim guidelines state that "To  
18 the fullest extent possible the Section 102(2)(c) procedure  
19 should be applied to further major Federal actions having a  
20 significant effect on the environment even though they arise  
21 from projects initiated prior to enactment of Public Law  
22 91-190 on January 1, 1970." And, "It is also important in  
23 further action that account be taken of environmental conse-  
24 quences not fully evaluated at the outset of the project or  
25 program."

1           Clearly then, any further Federal action in connec-  
2           tion with the Three Sisters Bridge project requires the sub-  
3           mission of a Section 102 statement by the Department of  
4           Transportation.

5           Although the National Environmental Policy Act  
6           applies to Federal agencies, under Department of Transportation  
7           Order No. 5610.1, dated October 7, 1970, each applicant for  
8           a grant, loan, permit or other DOT approval, and here, again,  
9           I quote . . . "will be required to submit, together with the  
10          original application, either a draft 102(2)(c) statement", or  
11          a negative declaration that the proposed action will not have  
12          a significant impact on the environment, whichever is appro-  
13          priate.

14          Paragraph 4a of definitional guidelines issued as  
15          an attachment to Order 5610.0 states: "Any of the following  
16          actions should be considered significant and a statement  
17          should be prepared: (1) any action that is likely to be  
18          highly controversial on environmental grounds." (Emphasis in  
19          original.)

20          These DOT guidelines also state that "Where there  
21          is doubt whether or not to prepare a statement it should be  
22          prepared. Where the environmental consequences of a proposed  
23          action are unclear but potentially significant, a statement  
24          should be prepared."

25          Mr. Chairman, under these conditions there seems



1 little doubt that the responsible District of Columbia  
2 official is required to submit a statement assessing in  
3 detail the environmental impact of the Three Sisters Bridge  
4 project before any further Federal activity in connection  
5 with the project can proceed.

6 The Three Sisters Bridge has one primary purpose;  
7 providing automobile access to and from the District of  
8 Columbia. I have some figures here in my statement, but I  
9 think yesterday Mr. Winder in his testimony provided ample  
10 justification for my further statement here, that there is  
11 an obvious relationship between automobiles and their pollution.  
12 Therefore, we feel that any detailed assessment of environmental  
13 impact must take into account the potential air pollution  
14 effect of the bridge and the freeway segments, not only their  
15 location, but their design and construction as well.

16 Unless and until a thorough study of potential air  
17 pollution is made, there can be no compliance with Section 102  
18 of the National Environmental Policy Act, and without com-  
19 pliance, no further Federal action on the project can legally  
20 be taken.

21 Furthermore, the statement requirements are new and  
22 the technology is evolving. It would be unreasonable to expect  
23 those who have traditionally administered the Highway Acts to  
24 be able to fully explore the environmental issues. Clearly,  
25 the help of third parties is necessary to meaningful analysis



1 under Section 102.

2 Such a comprehensive air pollution study has been  
3 requested by the Metropolitan Coalition for Clean Air, as out-  
4 lined in Mr. Winder's testimony yesterday and by others. We  
5 understand that the proposal for such a study is being formulated.

6 We, therefore, urge the District of Columbia  
7 Government to make it clear to the people of the District  
8 that construction of the Three Sisters Bridge, or any other  
9 unconstructed segment of the freeway system will not proceed  
10 until such a study has been completed.

11 We echo the resolution adopted by the National  
12 Capital Planning Commission on August 6 of this year which  
13 stated, in part, "In view of the unique Federal presence at the  
14 seat of government, a special effort should be made by the  
15 Federal and District of Columbia Governments in the National  
16 Capital Region to implement the National Environmental Policy  
17 Act of 1969."

18 Such an effort will only be made when the people of  
19 the District are told what the proposed freeway system will  
20 mean to them in terms of the air they breathe, as required by  
21 both the spirit and the letter of the National Environmental  
22 Policy Act.

23 That concludes my statement. Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

1 Has Mr. Holscher come in? Mr. Dirck T. Holscher?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Eugene J. Clifford.

4 STATEMENT OF EUGENE J. CLIFFORD, WASHINGTON  
5 SECTION, INSTITUTE OF TRAFFIC ENGINEERS

6 MR. CLIFFORD: Mr. Chairman. My name is Eugene J.  
7 Clifford. I am the President of the Washington Section of  
8 the Institute of Traffic Engineers, and this statement is  
9 presented in behalf of that organization.

10 The Washington Section represents the traffic  
11 engineering profession in the Washington Metropolitan Area,  
12 including that portion of Virginia within 50 miles of the  
13 District of Columbia, and the State of Maryland. Our section  
14 has about 270 members, most of whom are working in transporta-  
15 tion fields, including highway, air, and rail. Through our  
16 Civic Affairs Committee, we have taken positions on local key  
17 transportation issues in the past and we are now pleased to  
18 give our recommendations regarding alteraative designs for  
19 I-266.

20 Traffic engineering deals with the planning, design  
21 and operations of streets and highways, their relationships  
22 with abutting lands and other modes of transportation for the  
23 achievement of safe, efficient and convenient movement of  
24 persons and goods. We are obligated by our code of ethics to  
25 have due regard for the safety and health of the public who



1 may be affected by the work for which we are responsible and  
2 to endeavor to extend public knowledge and appreciation of  
3 engineering and its achievements, and to oppose any untrue,  
4 unsupported, or exaggerated statements regarding engineering.

5 We commend the local and Federal officials who have  
6 had the foresight and wisdom to support this much-needed  
7 facility and who have approved its general location. The  
8 final design should now be selected which will best achieve  
9 those objectives for which the facility is intended:

10 (1) to play a key role as part of the overall  
11 transportation system of the District of Columbia serving  
12 private auto, truck, and mass transit traffic; and

13 (2) to provide an attractive structure which will  
14 complement the appearance and function of the surrounding  
15 area.

16 In regard to the social, economic, and environmental  
17 effects of the proposed alternatives, we will limit our  
18 comments to eight of the 23 examples identified by the Federal  
19 Highway Administration in its Policy Memorandum 20-8, listed  
20 under paragraph four, Definitions.

21 Although we are deeply concerned with all such  
22 effects on the community and road users, we will -- in the  
23 interest of time -- confine our remarks to those factors  
24 directly related to traffic engineering. The first of these  
25 factors as listed under paragraph four, is the Fast, Safe and



1     Efficient Transportation.

2             Both proposed alternatives fulfill the requirement  
3 of providing fast, safe, and efficient transportation. When  
4 we speak of "fast" in terms of urban freeway design, we are  
5 not referring to high speeds of 70 to 80 miles per hour;  
6 but rather, traffic movement without interruption by traffic  
7 signals and cross street traffic. Elimination of such inter-  
8 ruptions not only serves traffic better, but also materially  
9 reduces exhaust emissions and consequent air pollution.

10            The report containing information for this hearing  
11 indicated that the proposed designs were adequate if the  
12 lowest traffic forecasts were experienced, but that some  
13 congestion would occur if the higher forecasted volumes  
14 should occur. Extensive use of bus transit on this facility  
15 as suggested in the report will be needed, not only to reduce  
16 congestion, but also to complement the rail rapid transit in  
17 providing greater mobility to the area residents. This de-  
18 sired mobility will require our best, most imaginative  
19 efforts, and include all modes of transportation.

20            The modern design features of Interstate highways  
21 result in the lowest accident rate of all types of highways.  
22 Accident statistics are often read and then ignored; but,  
23 we suggest that serious accidents, which disable or kill  
24 human being, have far greater significance to society than any  
25 one other social, economic, or environmental factor.

1           The proposed alternatives provide the best features  
2 of efficient highway transportation, offering savings in  
3 travel time and highway user costs as noted in the informa-  
4 tional report. The reduction of traffic congestion on  
5 existing routes, especially local streets, is a most desirable  
6 feature, not only in terms of better efficiency on those  
7 streets but also in terms of eliminating the hazards of  
8 through traffic in residential areas.

9           The second of the factors listed in the PPM is  
10 National Defense.

11           We can only conjecture about the possible require-  
12 ments which may be placed on this facility in regard to  
13 national defense. Hopefully, no such requirement will occur.  
14 But one thing is clear, of the 42,500-mile Defense Highway  
15 System, no other segments are of greater importance than those  
16 in the National Capital area.

17           The sixth item listed in the PPM is Fire Protection.

18           I-266 would not adversely affect the existing fire  
19 department facilities. However, either of the proposed  
20 alternatives would serve a very important role in regard to  
21 fire protection, as well as other emergency services, such as  
22 ambulances and rescue equipment. Optimum traffic service  
23 must be provided to emergency vehicles both on existing  
24 streets and new facilities. Existing streets, however, have  
25 inherent limitations in the service which they can provide,



1 both in terms of speed and safety.

2 Factor No. 9, as listed in the PPM, is Public  
3 Health and Safety.

4 The need to separate auto traffic and pedestrians  
5 for protection of the public's safety is obvious. The pro-  
6 posed alternatives provide for this separation as well as  
7 separation of opposing flows of traffic. Traffic engineers  
8 have the obligation to recommend those types of transporta-  
9 tion facilities which are designed to maximize the general  
10 public's safety; we feel either alternative for I-266 meets  
11 this objective.

12 Factor 15, the Noise, Air, and Water Pollution.

13 There are no apparent differences between the pro-  
14 posed alternatives concerning noise, air, and water pollution.  
15 We would agree that the selection of the bridge site minimizes  
16 the effects of highway noise. Further, we suggest that no  
17 highway noise is greater than that of blaring horns in  
18 bumper-to-bumper traffic, and no air or water pollution from  
19 autos is greater than that which occurs in traffic at a  
20 standstill. These undesirable forms of pollution should not  
21 occur when I-266 is completed.

22 Item 7, the Multiple Use of Space.

23 The potential use of the Potomac River for  
24 recreational purposes must be fully considered in the  
25 selection of the final design. The decision, of course, will



1 be based on many trade-offs among conflicting considerations;  
2 however, we feel that construction of either proposed alter-  
3 native, through improved access, would encourage full  
4 utilization of the recreational potential offered by the  
5 Potomac.

6 Item 23, the Operation and Use of Existing  
7 Facilities During Construction.

8 The hearing information report indicates that  
9 traffic will be maintained on existing streets during the  
10 construction period. We urge those agencies and individuals  
11 involved in developing procedures for traffic flow near the  
12 construction site to give careful consideration to this  
13 aspect in terms of safety and convenience to motorists and  
14 minimizing disruption to the local area.

15 Item 22 from the PPM concerns Construction and  
16 Maintenance Costs.

17 We feel the true picture of costs must reflect both  
18 construction costs and maintenance costs. The initial cost  
19 difference between the two alternatives is \$7.2 million, of  
20 which about \$720,000 would be paid by local governments. On  
21 the other hand, the less expensive structure could well  
22 require more maintenance and this cost must be paid entirely  
23 by local governments. From a local viewpoint, therefore,  
24 the cost difference for the two alternatives may not be as  
25 critical as it appears initially.

1           The Washington Section of the Institute of Traffic  
2 Engineers urge the local and Federal officials to approve  
3 the three-span alternate of prestressed concrete. Although  
4 either alternative will satisfy the need for this required  
5 transportation facility, it is our opinion that the three-  
6 span design is the most desirable in consideration of those  
7 factors previously discussed.

8           I would like to briefly refer to an excerpt from  
9 Traffic Engineering Magazine for November, 1970, which con-  
10 cerns an article entitled, "Validity of Urban Freeways,"  
11 written by S. S. Morris; the subheading, "The Urban Organism  
12 and Adaptive Change."

13           "First and above all, the attitude of mind which  
14 regards the construction of a freeway or any other road as an  
15 end in itself must be abandoned. The grafting of a freeway  
16 network on to the complex fabric of a city cannot but have a  
17 profound effect on every aspect of urban life. A city is a  
18 living social organism, constantly changing, but concomitantly  
19 displaying a dynamic balance of aesthetic as well as physical  
20 elements; virile and hardy, yet extremely sensitive to dis-  
21 cordant stimuli; quick to react, but slow to adapt. Imbued,  
22 in a sense, with the collective consciousness of its citizens,  
23 it remains at the same time largely controlled by the uncon-  
24 scious reflexes of its socio-economic structure.

25           "It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that



1 changes in the pattern of urban layout and activity should  
2 not be wrought haphazardly, but only after careful and  
3 sympathetic analysis of the planning problem in all its many  
4 aspects."

5 We believe, Mr. Dugas, that is the process that is  
6 taking place here today and, again, we appreciate the oppor-  
7 tunity to be heard.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Clifford.

10 Has Mr. Holscher come in yet?

11 (No response.)

12 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Thomas P. Rooney.

13 STATEMENT OF THOMAS P. ROONEY, ASSEMBLY  
14 OF THE FACULTY, CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

15 MR. MR. ROONEY: I can't help but agree with the quote  
16 that the last gentleman quoted for us, the engineer, and  
17 fortunately, we have such a plan in hand. The National  
18 Capital Planning Commission adopted a plan that took into full  
19 cognizance all of the economic and social impact roads would  
20 have. And, unfortunately, that is not why we are here.

21 I wish to state for the record, as many others have,  
22 that these remarks of mine in no way constitute a recognition  
23 of the legality of these hearings. I would like to add, also,  
24 or add to a remark Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe made about the expense  
25 involved in these proceedings.

1           As a resident of the District of Columbia, -- I  
2 almost said citizen, I don't mean to imply that to anyone  
3 living in the District of Columbia -- as a resident of the  
4 District of Columbia and taxpayer supporting one of the  
5 largest and most expensive police forces in the country, I  
6 wish to register the strongest possible objection to the  
7 presence of a special police task force in the rooms behind  
8 this auditorium.

9           I assume that because last night as I was leaving  
10 these hearings, when they were held across the street in the  
11 Department of Commerce Auditorium and with a contingent of  
12 15 to 20 policemen in the hall outside the hearing room.  
13 They were going off duty because the hearings were over for  
14 the day.

15           How much does it cost the D. C. taxpayer to pay a  
16 force of 20 men for 12 hours a day for two and a half or  
17 three days, to keep an eye on taxpayers at an open public  
18 hearing? And if there is a force of 15 or 20 in the back  
19 room, how many plain clothesmen are in the audience?

20           Policemen in hearing chambers, large task forces in  
21 the back rooms, and agents in the audience are recent  
22 developments in city government-citizen relationships in  
23 this city and they bear directly on this hearing.

24           The same conditions existed for the first time on  
25 August 9, 1969, when the City Government, anticipating a strong



1 citizen opposition to reversal by the City Council of this  
2 vote on the Three Sisters Bridge, which we are here to  
3 discuss, lined the City Council hearing room with 18 police-  
4 men and a special force of 15 men in the back room, had two  
5 large vans right outside the District Building with motors  
6 running, and had by my count 22 squad cars in conspicuous  
7 view around the District Building at various points.

8 All of this for an open public meeting to which the  
9 public was invited, and all arranged long before the meeting  
10 began.

11 In spite of this intimidation, the Council was  
12 asked for five minutes in which to register citizen objection  
13 to this coerced reversal on the bridge and when no one was  
14 allowed to speak and strong objections were raised, the public  
15 was violently ejected from the hearing room and 14 citizens  
16 were arrested. Some day I am going to look into the business  
17 of what constitutes legally a definition of entrapment.

18 The news media, the big business interests and the  
19 local Congressmen loudly expressed shocked indignation at this  
20 unseemingly behavior of the citizens. They remained remarkably  
21 silent on the vote itself, focusing itself on law and order  
22 in the Council Chamber. They remained remarkably silent on  
23 citizen rights in this matter. They said very little indeed  
24 on the National Metro Fund blackmail.

25 They were truly a silent minority when they came to

1 Mr. Broyhill's blackmail of holding a whole Federal payment  
2 to the District. There was not in '69 one sweep of righteous  
3 indignation from the press. Earlier they expressed not one  
4 word of outrage when Mr. Airis of the D. C. Department of  
5 Highways and Mr. Fletcher, Deputy Mayor, trotted off to  
6 Capitol Hill, not the Diserict Building, to work with  
7 Representative Klucynski, former Representative Fallon,  
8 seeking a solution to the freeway controversy. The contro-  
9 versy was, of course, that the official legally adopted trans-  
10 portation plan didn't include the Three Sisters Bridge, the  
11 North Central Freeway, the North Leg, and other such rejected  
12 plans on the Department of Highway's drawing boards.

13 There was barely more than any of this from the  
14 news media, the big business interests and the local  
15 Congressmen. One could almost adduce from all of this, that  
16 they are for these roads and intend to see that they are  
17 built, regardless of unanimous citizen opposition expressed  
18 over and over again in hearings, and the fact that an official  
19 transportation plan that neither includes these new gateways  
20 to the City nor encourages the automobile into them.

21 The cast of characters during these many hearings  
22 and presentations remain generally the same. The lobbyist,  
23 large business and commercial interests, the House Public  
24 Works Committee, and D. C. Department of Highways on one side,  
25 and Federations of Civic and Citizen Groups, individual



1 citizens and the conservationist and environmental groups on  
2 the anti-freeway side. However, one important addition to  
3 the cast of characters has been made since the August 9,  
4 1969, fiasco, and that is a large police force placed between  
5 the interest group and the citizens opposing them.

6 From that August 9th to this day, every contro-  
7 versial public hearing has been heavily policed, indeed.  
8 The day of the police state is with us in the District here  
9 and now, right out there, probably, in the back room.

10 One repeated impression promoted by the press and  
11 the other side is the Three Sisters Bridge somehow exists in  
12 an interstate freeway vacuum. The bridge is part of the  
13 system which the Department of Highways is going to build  
14 piecemeal, a segment at a time, and contrary to the existing  
15 legal D. C. Transportation Policy and Plan.

16 If the bridge is built, obviously, the North Leg,  
17 North Central Freeway, Northeast Freeway, as well as the  
18 connections at either end in Virginia and Maryland will have  
19 to be built and this is the tactic. And you know and I know  
20 how things are going with the citizenry of these States,  
21 especially since they have a vote and can voice their opinions  
22 politically.

23 I testified often in the past and don't intend to  
24 repeat that testimony again. I refer you to the record of  
25 the NCPC Hearings on the Transportation Section of its 1985

1 plan, held on June 14 and 15, 1967, when I testified for  
2 myself as a private citizen. I refer you to testimony I  
3 submitted for the Graduate School of Catholic University at  
4 hearings on the D. C. Budget on December 16, 1967. I refer  
5 you to testimony presented on behalf of the Assembly of the  
6 Faculty, which represents the total faculty of Catholic  
7 University, at hearings on Representative Kluczynski's bill,  
8 H. R. 16,000, before House Subcommittees on Roads on April 3,  
9 1968.

10 I refer you to testimony presented on behalf of the  
11 Assembly of the Faculty at hearings held by NCPC and the  
12 City Council on the new comprehensive plan for transportation  
13 for the District of Columbia on December 5, 1968.

14 And here we are again. This illegal hearing seems  
15 to be an application of the theory expounded by a speaker at  
16 a convention of the American Association of Highway officials,  
17 on how to handle citizen opposition to road construction.  
18 His advise was never to give the citizens full information.  
19 "Let sleeping dogs lie." Give them plenty of alternative  
20 plans to fight over and simply wear them out with hearings.

21 It is not going to work here.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

24 Mrs. Rooney.  
25



1 STATEMENT OF MRS. ANGELA ROONEY, CITIZEN,  
2 3425 - 14TH STREET, NORTHEAST, WASHINGTON, D. C.

3 MRS. ROONEY: I am Angela Tooney, 3425 - 14th  
4 Street, Northeast. I am speaking as a private citizen.

5 Let the record show that my presence in no way  
6 constitutes a recognition of this hearing as legal. Let the  
7 record show further that this so-called public hearing is a  
8 cheap trick to evade responsibility on the part of the  
9 morally bankrupt City Government.

10 I strongly object to the design hearing on the  
11 Three Sisters Bridge for the following reasons:

12 1. A design hearing on a bridge cannot be held  
13 when the question of a location hearing is in the courts, when  
14 the whole issue of forcing the bridge against the will of the  
15 citizens by political pressure and blackmail is still in the  
16 courts, and when said bridge is not part of the comprehensive  
17 transportation planning of the District of Columbia.

18 2. The Mayor and the City Council are the only  
19 duly authorized persons to conduct a hearing. Mr. Dugas, you  
20 simply do not count. This hearing is, in fact, not being  
21 heard.

22 3. The complete lack of any environmental studies  
23 concerning the pollution of air, water, noise and even man.  
24 These are requirements demanded not only by law, but by the  
25 ecological imperative. Puny unsubstantiated claims by the

1 Highway Department amount to eco-pornography.

2 4. The intentional effort to deceive the black  
3 community as to the true effects and the true paths, the  
4 roads leading from this bridge would take and would have on  
5 black communities. I charge concealment and brainwashing  
6 concerning the full impact of this bridge on those communities  
7 ultimately to be most affected. This bridge points straight  
8 at U Street and Brookland, and I would like to enter into  
9 the record the map which the Emergency Committee on  
10 Transportation Crisis had to print because no one else would  
11 tell the truth.

12 (Applause.)

13 MRS. ROONEY: I think Mrs. Rowe referred to this.  
14 Thousands of people will be thrown out of their homes by the  
15 U Street Corridor and, ultimately, the North Central Freeway.  
16 Thousands more businesses will be destroyed and communities  
17 will be wiped out.

18 I am entering this into the record so that those of  
19 you who are not familiar with the bridge and the freeway  
20 system, apparently, can do a little home study.

21 Therefore, my real purpose in appearing here today  
22 is not simply to oppose the Three Sisters Bridge, but to focus  
23 on the fraudulent circumstances under which this hearing is  
24 being held.

25 As Jane Jacobs, author and city planner, said -- and



1 her credentials are listed in Who's Who, and they include  
2 ten years as Associate Editor of "Architectural Forum,"  
3 three books, "Downtown is for People," "The Death and Life  
4 of Great American Cities," and "The Economy of Cities."

5 As she has said, and I quote, "There is a quality  
6 even meaner than outright ugliness for disorder and this  
7 meaner quality is the dishonest mass of pretended -barrier  
8 achieved by ignoring or suppressing the real order that is  
9 struggling to survive. The real order is that of self-  
10 determination for those in the ghettos or students or everyone."

11 Now, if that is too subtle, Mrs. Jacobs also said  
12 two years ago in New York City, at a so-called freeway hearing,  
13 and I again quote, "This," said that great and highly intel-  
14 ligent lady, "is a phony fink hearing."

15 (Applause.)

16 (The map above-referred to, follows:)

17  
18 (GOVERNMENT INSERT.)  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Charles L. Waddell.

2 STATEMENT OF CHARLES L. WADDELL, LOUDOUN  
3 COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

4 MR. WADDELL: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen.

5 My name is Charles L. Waddell. I am a member of  
6 the Board of Supervisors of Loudoun County, Virginia, repre-  
7 senting Broad Run District, which encompasses Dulles Airport  
8 in Loudoun County. I have been authorized to speak for the  
9 Board at this hearing.

10 The Loudoun County Board of Supervisors appreciates  
11 this opportunity to appear before this joint hearing of the  
12 District of Columbia and Virginia Highway Departments in  
13 support of the three-span alternate design for the Three  
14 Sisters Bridge. We extend our congratulations to both of  
15 these agencies and to the Federal Department of Transportation  
16 for this excellent design which will blend in aesthetically  
17 with the historical character of the area.

18 In reviewing the proposals for this interstate  
19 facility, we have come to the conclusion that the design  
20 provides a means of fast, safe and efficient transportation  
21 to and from the Washington Federal business district. The  
22 modern features of interstate facilities result in the lowest  
23 accident rate of all types of highways. The proposed bridge,  
24 as a part of the interstate system, will greatly enhance the  
25 highway safety capability of the metropolitan area.



1           We have noted that there will be minimum of resi-  
2           dential displacement with the construction of this facility.  
3           We also note that in relation to noise pollution, the  
4           approaches to this bridge on the Virginia side will pass  
5           through a naturally low-lying area within the Spout Run  
6           Parkway and, as such, will serve as a barrier and deterrent  
7           to noise pollution. And in regard to the Spout Run Valley,  
8           we also note that the Virginia Department of Highways will  
9           provide hiking and bike trails in portions of the project's  
10          right of way, further enhancing the recreational character-  
11          istics of the area. We also note that the three-span  
12          alternate design has received the approval of the Fine Arts  
13          Commission.

14                 Therefore, after careful consideration, we feel  
15                 that the three-span alternate will provide the best in modern  
16                 highway facilities as well as retain the environmental  
17                 character of the Potomac Palisades.

18                 Although the Three Sisters Bridge and, for that  
19                 matter, Interstate 66, is obviously not within our County, it  
20                 is one of our most vital traffic arteries into the urban and  
21                 suburban areas of Metropolitan Washington. The Dulles  
22                 Access Highway will tie into Interstate 66 between Falls  
23                 Church and its present termination point at Dolly Madison  
24                 Boulevard near Tyson's Corner. Interstate 66 will eventually  
25                 become Loudoun County's main east-west corridor into

1 Washington, D. C., and its immediate surroundings.

2  
3 We would also like to mention that the proposed  
4 United States Exposition of Science and Industry has selected  
5 a site in Loudoun County approximately three miles north of  
6 Dulles International Airport. The proposed \$500 million  
7 facility is anticipated to attract 15 to 20 million people  
8 annually, most of whom will approach the site from Washington  
9 and its immediate surroundings. Although recently four-laned  
10 from Tyons's Corner to Leesburg, we realize that State Route 7  
11 will never be capable of handling the projects traffic needs  
12 of Loudoun County to serve Dulles International Airport and  
13 the proposed Exposition as an east-west corridor. On the  
14 other hand, the eight-lane design for Interstate 66 will  
15 handle the traffic evolume projected by the Highway Department  
16 for the immediate future.

17 Another factor that we would like to mention is that  
18 the Interstate 66 design concept suggested by the Virginia  
19 State Highway Department assumes that a high-speed, rapid-rail  
20 system envisioned for the Washington Metropolitan Area will  
21 be placed within this transportation corridor. The rapid-rail,  
22 incidentally, is expected to eventually serve Dulles Airport  
23 and the Exposition of Science and Industry.

24 Based on careful consideration of the design of the  
25 proposed Three Sisters Bridge, the emphasis of the abatement



1 of noise pollution, enhancement of recreational  
2 characteristics due to hiking and bike trails, the  
3 aesthetic nature of the bridge, and the need to complete the  
4 Interstate 66 East-West Corridor to and from the Washington  
5 Metropolitan area to provide a safe, fast, and efficient  
6 means of transportation, the Loudoun County Board of  
7 Supervisors supports the three-span alternate design for the  
8 Three Sisters Bridge as suggested by the District of Columbia  
9 and Virginia State Highway Departments, and urges its imme-  
10 diate construction.

11 Mr. Chairman, just briefly in response to the lady  
12 that just spoke, I haven't been for all of the hearings, but  
13 in order to better serve Dulles International Airport and  
14 perhaps relieve the noise pollution in the Northern Virginia-  
15 Washington area from Washington National Airport, we feel that  
16 the relocation of the outer Beltway -- and we have supported  
17 this before the Maryland State Government, Virginia State  
18 Government and Fairfax County and Montgomery County -- our  
19 Board is unanimous in its report of the relocation of the  
20 outer Beltway four or five miles further west to better serve  
21 Dulles International Airport.

22 This, in my opinion, should tell you that we are not  
23 imposing or attempting to impose a bridge or a structure that  
24 will displace people in the Metropolitan Washington Area; that  
25 we are also advocating that a structure of this nature be

1 located in our own county, tying in the State of Maryland  
2 and State of Virginia to include the outer Beltway.

3 Certainly in our county, I am certainly not con-  
4 sidered an enemy of conservation efforts. I fought the  
5 relocation of the rendering plant from Georgetown to the  
6 Dulles Airport area in Loudoun County. I led the fight for  
7 the total resource management study of the Bradman(?)  
8 Watershed in our county, which is the first major watershed  
9 that will be developed in our county.

10 Already, we have three planned communities underway  
11 there and more to come. We want to prevent what happened in  
12 Arlington and Fairfax and their related problems with Four-  
13 Mile Run and Emmitt(?) Run. We want to prevent development  
14 in these watersheds and I have fought very hard for this and  
15 right now we have this total resource planning study underway  
16 And under Public Law 566, we hope to seek Federal and State  
17 funds to complete this project.

18 We also just purchased our first sanitary landfill  
19 for the county. We are trying to eliminate our dumps in  
20 Loudoun County. We have purchased the land for that. It is  
21 certainly not Loudoun County's fault, Dulles International is  
22 located there. It took 10,000 acres of Western Fairfax and  
23 East Loudoun. Those people who would like to see traffic  
24 shifted out from Washington National Airport should certainly  
25 help us get people back and forth. We feel ultimately that



1 the rapid transit system will be best, but right now the  
2 most immediate problem is the completion of Interstate 66.

3 We also led the fight for an air pollution control  
4 unit in our county which, unfortunately, was defeated  
5 yesterday at a Board meeting. The vote was 5-to-1. But I  
6 did support it and will continue to support it, because air  
7 pollution, noise pollution, water pollution, none of these  
8 environmental problems stop at county lines. We have to work  
9 together for the betterment of our environment.

10 This concludes my testimony, Mr. Chairman. I  
11 appreciate, again, the opportunity of being present.

12 MR. DUGAS: Thank you very much, Mr. Waddell.

13 Our next witness will be General E. R. Quesada,  
14 President of the L'Enfant Plaza Corporation.

15 STATEMENT OF GENERAL E. R. QUESADA, PRESIDENT,  
16 L'ENFANT PLAZA CORPORATION.

17 GENERAL QUESADA: Sir, I appear here represent  
18 myself. My name is Quesada, the initials are E. R.

19 In representing myself, I would like it to be known  
20 I am a citizen born and bred of Washington, D. C., and hold  
21 that factor with great pride.

22 In respect to the design of the bridge as we see it  
23 here, I have to compliment all persons who are involved in it  
24 and I would like to give you, as Hearing Officer, some history  
25 that otherwise might not be available to you.

1           In 1958-59, I had the honor of serving as Special  
2 Assistant to the President, Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower. And  
3 at that time, the President was asked by Congress to recom-  
4 mend a site to serve as a third airport serving the  
5 National Capital Area.

6           You may recall there had been eight years of contro-  
7 versy over a site that would serve that purpose. There was  
8 opposition to a site referred to as Burke. And in order to  
9 put the problem to rest, and to recognize the necessity of a  
10 third airport to serve the Capital area, the President was  
11 asked to resolve the issue and to proceed with the selection  
12 of a site.

13           As a special assistant to the President, I was asked  
14 to conduct the necessary studies and make a recommendation  
15 for a site to serve the third airport, to serve the Nation's  
16 Capital, and I did so.

17           After a prolonged study, technical in nature in a  
18 large part, and after prolonged public hearings, the site of  
19 Chantilly, as it was then known, was selected and it is now  
20 referred to as the Dulles International Airport. The Airport  
21 is in being and serving the purpose for which it was designed.

22           The history to which I refer, which might be helpful  
23 to the deliberations here, is quite simple. In the course of  
24 making up my mind as to what I should recommend to the  
25 President as a site for this airport, consideration was given



1 to the requirement that we had established for ourselves for  
2 an airport that would be within 30 minutes or less of a  
3 downtown point in the City of Washington. Arbitrarily, we  
4 selected 16th and K Streets as a point from which we wished  
5 to be within 30 minutes of travel at U. S. Highway speeds.

6 When attempting to reach this objective, consider-  
7 ation was given, and I might say serious consideration was  
8 given and influenced consideration was given to the then  
9 planned U. S. Highway System, which was admittedly not precise,  
10 which provided for a bridge crossing the Potomac River up-  
11 stream of Key Bridge.

12 We were well aware of that proposed site for a  
13 bridge to cross the Potomac.

14 The fact that that was then in the planning stage  
15 was an influencing factor in the selection of Dulles as an  
16 airport site.

17 I should add, sir, that the precise location of  
18 Highway 66 was then unknown. Taking that into consideration,  
19 we built. I might add, I was later the Administrator of the  
20 Federal Aviation Agency, which in fact did build Dulles  
21 International Airport and also built the access highway lead-  
22 ing to it. That access highway, by design and by intent is  
23 a very lovely, rural monument to good planning, at least so  
24 I think, and I hope you will forgive me for any suggestion of  
25 unpridable pride. The fact remains it is a very lovely

1 boulevard and it is my fondest hope that it will remain so.

2 We acquired a right of way of some 21-1/2 miles,  
3 but we did not construct the access road over the last mile  
4 and a half or two miles because we did not know the precise  
5 location of the U. S. Highway 66, nor did anyone else. But  
6 we did acquire a right of way to permit us to join it  
7 wherever it turns out to be.

8 We had in mind and were influenced by the then  
9 projected bridge across the Potomac, that our access highway  
10 would continue east and intersect 66, move to the north, and  
11 meet this proposed bridge, which was then an influencing  
12 factor in the selection of the site.

13 That bridge is turning out to be what is referred  
14 to as the Three Sisters Bridge. It is my fondest hope that  
15 the design of the bridge, as I see it in front of me, will  
16 be accepted, and the bridge will be constructed and the  
17 objectives that we then sought, 30 miles travel time to  
18 Downtown Washington, can then be met.

19 As conditions are today, sir, we cannot get from  
20 Downtown Washington, or a person cannot get from Downtown  
21 Washington to Dulles Airport in the required 30 minutes. A  
22 bridge such as I have described, such as I have seen here,  
23 and a highway system upon which we relied is an essential  
24 factor to that objective and I hope it is met. If it is met,  
25 it will bring a great relief to the already overtaxed National



1 Airport.

2 And, sir, that was one of our primary objectives.  
3 We knew then and everyone knows now that Washington National  
4 Airport is heavily overtaxed. I can't help but note, reading  
5 this morning's paper, that a suit has been filed on that  
6 basis, that the National Airport is overtaxed. And I can  
7 assure you that it is overtaxed.

8 If the Dulles Airport could reach the objectives  
9 that it sought when it was selected, 30 minutes' travel time  
10 from Downtown Washington, using abbridge upstream of Key  
11 Bridge, this City will be well served. And it is my fondest  
12 hope that you will accept the architecture as it is now  
13 visible and proceed with the construction of the bridge and  
14 give to Washington an airport that it deserves and relieve the  
15 congestion that is now evident at National Airport.

16 In closing, I would like to make one comment. The  
17 City of Washington in respect to its size requires transporta-  
18 tion facilities that are not proportionate to its size. The  
19 movement of people in and out of Washington, because it is  
20 the Nation's Capital, far exceeds the demands of other cities  
21 of equivalent size. This city cries for better transportation  
22 than is now available. I hope you proceed with the bridge  
23 that is now conceived.

24 Thank you so much for letting me come here.

25 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, General.

1 We will give the reporter about a ten-minute break.

2 (Whereupon, there was a brief recess.)

3 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Robert J. Schaefer from the Sierra  
4 Club.

5 STATEMENT OF ROBERT J. SCHAEFER, SIERRA  
6 CLUB, SOUTHEAST CHAPTER

7 MR. SCHAEFER: I would like to also state, as some  
8 others have, my presence here doesn't constitute the recogni-  
9 tion of the legality of this hearing.

10 The Sierra Club is a nation-wide conservation  
11 organization with over 100,000 members. I am Chairman of the  
12 Southeast Chapter of the Sierra Club, with approximately 3500  
13 members, and I represent the Southeast Chapter here today.  
14 My comments will deal with the environmental effects of the  
15 bridge and its connecting roadways.

16 First of all, it is not clear to me why we should  
17 be discussing the design of the bridge while it is still not  
18 certain that it will be built. However, since the question of  
19 whether the bridge is built may depend on the adequacy of the  
20 design, I will present my opinions of the bridge plans.

21 Perhaps as important as the bridge itself are the  
22 approach roads through Spout Run, the C and O Canal, and  
23 Glover-Archbold Park. While the designers may have attempted  
24 to minimize the areas to be taken in these parks, the bridge  
25 ramps would nonetheless intrude severely. The C and O Canal



1 would be engulfed in overpasses and tunnel openings. The  
2 foot of Glover-Archbold Park would be paved, by the relocated  
3 Canal Road if not by the bridge itself. And the area of  
4 pavement in Spout Run would be greatly increased.

5 And with regard to Spout Run, I might point out one  
6 of the previous speakers mentioned that there would be nice  
7 trails in here. But he also mentioned that the area would  
8 serve as a noise buffer for the traffic, using the highway.  
9 It doesn't seem to me trails in an area that is supposed to  
10 be a noise buffer would be very useful as recreational  
11 facilities.

12 The bridge itself would span the Potomac at an  
13 extremely scenic point. For visitors approaching Washington  
14 along the George Washington Parkway, the view down the gorge  
15 of the Potomac River provides a dramatic view of the city in  
16 its natural setting. Either of the proposed bridge designs,  
17 and especially the massive three-span structure, would  
18 destroy the dramatic aspect of the approach. The City of  
19 Washington should stand out as an example of intelligent  
20 planning with proper protection of the City's natural environ-  
21 ment. The proposed bridge would be a blot on this environment.

22 Living here in the City where tourism is a very  
23 important business and is a source of many jobs, I think it  
24 would be foolish to allow the environment to become degraded,  
25 to reduce the attractiveness of the City.

1           The environmental effects of the bridge must be  
2 considered to include the effects of the traffic which would  
3 use the bridge. This traffic would bring additional noise  
4 and exhaust fumes to an area which is already heavily burdened.  
5 This would mean the end of the areas around the bridge as use-  
6 ful parkland, even though they might be theoretically desig-  
7 nated as parkland.

8           The environmental effects of the bridge would not,  
9 of course, be limited to the immediate area of the bridge  
10 itself. The Three Sisters Bridge would pour a tremendous  
11 volume of traffic into the District of Columbia. There can  
12 be no doubt that this traffic would have a completely harmful  
13 environmental effect. Some time ago I testified at hearings  
14 before the City Council on the proposed South Leg of the Inner  
15 Loop.

16           This destructive road was being justified by the  
17 Highway Department partly on the basis that it would be needed  
18 to handle the traffic coming from the Three Sisters Bridge.  
19 The bridge is in fact the opening wedge for a huge program  
20 of freeways in the city, disrupting homes, businesses, and  
21 parks. We can scarcely believe that Glover-Archbold Park  
22 would last long if this bridge were aimed directly at it.

23           Downtown streets are already saturated with traffic  
24 during rush hour. It would be folly to try to create a  
25 mechanism for bringing in yet more automobiles and exhaust



1 fumes.

2 As I mentioned just as we took our break, I heard  
3 one of the earlier speakers who was speaking on behalf of the  
4 bridge, saying that he had to leave because he was parked  
5 illegally. I wonder where he is going to find a parking  
6 place when there are many more cars in here.

7 Because of the disruptive appearance of the bridge,  
8 the intrusion of the ramps into parkland, the noise and  
9 pollution of the bridge traffic, and the introduction of more  
10 traffic into the already overloaded District of Columbia, we  
11 believe that any plan for a bridge at Three Sisters Islands  
12 is unsatisfactory. We recommend that no bridge be built at  
13 this point.

14 Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. DUGAS: Thank you very much.

17 Mr. Frederick Gutheim.

18 (No response.)

19 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Russell.

20 STATEMENT OF EDWARD W. RUSSELL, 2601

21 FOXHALL ROAD, NORTHWEST, WASHINGTON, D. C.

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

23 My name is Edward Russell and I have lived many  
24 years on Foxhall Road.

25 MR. DUGAS: Would you give us your full name.

1 MR. RUSSELL: Edward W. Russell. 2601 Foxhall Road.

2 I would like to call your attention, Mr. Chairman,  
3 to a rather strange circumstance. This is the second time in  
4 the last few years when citizens have been asked to approve  
5 the design of a bridge which had no exit or entrance at one  
6 end.

7 Some years ago, I represented the Foxhall Road  
8 Association at a hearing across the river, which was called  
9 the "Scenic Position of the Bridge." I noticed whatever  
10 position it was in, it had to exit on the District side. I  
11 asked the consultants why this hadn't been taken in, and they  
12 said that the terms of reference stopped within 100 feet of  
13 the river bank on the District side.

14 Well, now, in the beautiful brochure we have just  
15 had, the bridge stops short. I don't know if it is 100 feet  
16 from the river bank or a little further away, and I feel that  
17 this hearing, whether it is legal or not, is premature.  
18 Because I feel the design of a bridge before it can be properly  
19 considered by any group should include the complete plan to  
20 the entrances and exits at both ends. When those have been  
21 decided, it may influence the structural design.

22 You may have to have side feeders, like you have on  
23 the Whitehurst Freeway. So I feel it is very premature to ask  
24 anybody to comment on the design of the bridge. Quite honestly,  
25 as we don't know how the traffic is going to get on or off on



1 the District side, I am wondering whether we are considering  
2 a bridge or a parking lot. If the traffic is going to back  
3 up there for hours and hours, it will probably need a  
4 different kind of bridge.

5 So I am merely suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that it is  
6 premature and not really fair to the citizens to ask them to  
7 comment on a design when the details of this operation have  
8 not been worked out.

9 Thank you for filling me in.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. DUGAS: Thank you very much.

12 Mr. Gutheim?

13 (No response.)

14 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Florance.

15 STATEMENT OF COLDEN FLORANCE, METROPOLITAN  
16 CHAPTER, AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

17 MR. FLORANCE: My name is Colden Florance and I  
18 represent the Washington Metropolitan Chapter of the American  
19 Institute of Architects. In the past, we have provided  
20 commentary on the Three Sisters Bridge, as well as the entire  
21 system for the District of Columbia on a number of occasions  
22 before the City Council. Most notably, the AIA provided an  
23 analysis of the District of Columbia Highway System dated  
24 January 2, 1968, at the request of the then Chairman, John  
25 Hechinger. I will summarize briefly our position regarding

1 the bridge.

2 The original selection of the Three Sisters site  
3 was based on the use of the Glover Archbold Park as a route  
4 forming part of the Fort Drive Inner Beltway, but this loop  
5 has since been abandoned. As a consequence, there remains no  
6 logic in branching off from Route 66 across the Potomac at a  
7 point just above Georgetown. Traffic siphoned from Route 66,  
8 then must flow through congested Georgetown, finally reaching  
9 practically the same point at which this traffic would have  
10 arrived had it remained on Route 66 and crossed the Theodore  
11 Roosevelt Bridge.

12 Further compounding this error, the bridge will  
13 sever Foxhall Road from the Whitehurst Freeway and will force  
14 all that traffic, plus traffic from the proposed Palisades  
15 Parkway through Georgetown on already crowded M Street. The  
16 AIA position remains substantially the same and we continue  
17 to oppose construction of the bridge.

18 With regard to the present design hearing, our  
19 organization takes issue with the statement appearing on  
20 page nine of the Design Hearing Brochure, which I quote:

21 "The Potomac Palisades are a vegetation-covered  
22 sheer rock face formed by progressive erosive action of the  
23 Potomac River. They represent a geological remnant of a  
24 dynamic process of historical and natural significance.  
25 Although not formerly classified as a landmark, the National



1 Park Service considers them to be a notably historic area.  
2 They would not be affected by either of the proposed alternate  
3 designs for the bridge or its approaches." We cannot agree  
4 with this conclusion.

5 In rebuttal, I quote from the Report of the Potomac  
6 Planning Task Force prepared by the Department of the  
7 Interior in 1967:

8 "A major threat to the scenic value of the lower  
9 Palisades is presented by the possibility of a new bridge at  
10 Three Sisters Islands. The construction of the proposed bridge  
11 would be completely incompatible with the type of development  
12 we recommend for this sector of the urban Potomac. Every  
13 effort to effect the transition of the Potomac from an urban  
14 to a wild river at Key Bridge, and to save the Palisades, will  
15 be justified. An appreciation of scenic and urban values has  
16 not been a part of earlier bridge-planning for this area, and  
17 the results have been costly. There should be a restudy of  
18 the human and public interests that would be affected by the  
19 proposed Three Sisters Bridge and its related highway elements  
20 before a final decision is made."

21 We strongly endorse this position.

22 In our opinion the Three Sisters Bridge should not  
23 be built at all and we are reluctant, therefore, to even discuss  
24 design of the bridge itself. We do propose the following  
25 course of action:

1 Any further consideration of the Three Sisters  
2 Bridge should be delayed until:

3 1. Route 66 has been extended to Roosevelt Bridge,  
4 allowing rapid access to and from Dulles Airport, and improving  
5 commuter traffic from Virginia;

6 2. Until the Metro System has been completed and  
7 reliable statistics on traffic needs can be generated, and

8 3. Until the Whitehurst Freeway has been removed  
9 or modified in order to handle heavy traffic volume in a way  
10 which will permit the recapture and proper development of the  
11 Georgetown Waterfront.

12 Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, sir.

15 Mr. Gutheim?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Markert.

18 STATEMENT OF POTOMAC VALLEY LEAGUE OF  
19 MONTGOMERY COUNTY, BY EDWARD ROBERTS

20 MR. ROBERTS: My name is Edward Roberts. I am a  
21 deligate totthe Potomac Valley League. I have been asked to  
22 present this statement by Mr. Markert, Prs ident of the  
23 League, who is unable to be here this afternoon.

24 The League is an organization of 20 citizens  
25 associations containing approximately 7,600 homes located in



1 Maryland between River Road and the Potomac River from  
2 Western Avenue well beyond the Beltway Highway 495.

3           The Potomac Valley League has in the past encour-  
4 aged all logical methods of improving the transportation  
5 systems leading into and out of Washington. Our city is not  
6 only the Nation's Capital but also the central city of one of  
7 the largest urban areas in the United States. Attention must  
8 be given to all systems, including highway as well as im-  
9 proved mass transportation.

10           We believe that Interstate 266 will be an integral  
11 part of a sophisticated transportation network and should be  
12 implemented immediately. We approve of the three-span, pre-  
13 stressed concrete design endorsed by the D. C. Highway  
14 Department which has also met with the approval of the Fine  
15 Arts Commission.

16           Thank you.

17           MR. DUGAS: Thank you, sir.

18           Mr. J. A. Israelson.

19           (No response.)

20           MR. DUGAS: Mr. Norman A. and Werner H. Quasebarth.

21           STATEMENT OF WERNER H. QUASEBARTH, ATLAS

22           MACHINE AND IRON WORKS, INC., ARLINGTON,

23           VIRGINIA

24           MR. QUASEBARTH: My name is Werner Quasebarth. I  
25 am a native Washingtonian. I am also President of Atlas

1 Machine and Iron Works, a manufacturing business that was  
2 founded in 1931 near the Washington, D. C., Navy Yard. We  
3 now employ about 300 people and are a part of the building  
4 construction industry.

5 In 1961, we built a manufacturing plant on the then  
6 proposed Interstate Route 66. This plant is designed to  
7 accomplish that part of our manufacturing that requires large  
8 amounts of acreage. Its location was ideally suited to high-  
9 way and area economic and social planning that existed in 1961.  
10 Among other things, this planning called for completion of  
11 Interstate Routes 66 and 266 by 1966.

12 Had the localities involved stuck to their plans,  
13 we could have created an additional 100 to 150 jobs, over  
14 and above those we have already created. Because the local-  
15 ities changed their minds and elected to not yet connect up  
16 the already completed portions of the area's Interstate  
17 Highway system, we have not been able to hire and train anyone  
18 from Washington, D. C., to work in this plant, and have been  
19 forced to depend solely on less populated areas west and  
20 southwest of that plant for manpower.

21 Efforts to attract Washington, D. C., residents have  
22 at times included free training and free transportation from  
23 Washington, D. C., provided by us. But, if one looks at the  
24 road map that the last nine years have created, one will find  
25 that even with free busing, the time required for a Washington,



1 D. C., resident to travel from his home to our plant in  
2 Gainesville, Virginia, is ridiculously prohibitive to him.  
3 Had original highway plans been followed, our plant would  
4 have been approximately 25 minutes from the Theodore Roosevelt  
5 and Three Sisters Bridges driving due west from the City. As  
6 it stands now, Washington, D. C., residents must drive almost  
7 due south all the way to I-495, then northwesternly before  
8 they can head due west on the completed portion of I-66.

9 We do not ask that a road be built just for us.  
10 However, we feel there are many companies like us who can  
11 provide solutions to Washington's many problems if given a  
12 chance. We feel we carried out our responsibilities to the  
13 community with a lot of hard work and dedication to our  
14 Gainesville facility which we created in harmony with the  
15 highway, social and economic planning of Washington, D. C.

16 We respectfully request that the community now do its  
17 part by completing the planned I-66 and I-266 highways.

18 As an added part of this report, we see nothing  
19 beautiful in long lines of autos waiting to cross the  
20 inadequate number of bridges that exist. These long lines of  
21 autos which pollute the air while idling and waiting to cross  
22 have in turn been created by the big masses of people moving  
23 into the heart of Washington, D. C., every day. When I was  
24 born, this area had less than three-fourths million people.  
25 This will at least quadruple. These people must have places

1 to live, schools for their children and ways to get to places  
2 of employment. These things all require following through  
3 with the planned system of highways.

4 Another point I wish to make is that Washington,  
5 D. C., is not like Manhattan Island. It is not long and  
6 narrow. It is not possible to put subways within walking  
7 distance of every resident. While subways can possibly serve  
8 50 percent of Washington's residents, the other 50 percent  
9 are going to have to drive.

10 The choices therefore are:

11 (a) Move people out.

12 (b) Build the roads the people require.

13 (c) Put up with the long lines of autos and  
14 resulting pollution.

15 Atlas Machine and Iron Works believes that the proper  
16 choice is to build the roads that have already been designed  
17 and started.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, sir.

20 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder, would the  
21 witness have -- did you express any preference for either one  
22 of these treatments, or didn't you see fit to choose between  
23 them?

24 MR. QUASEBARTH: I am a steel fabricator; one of the  
25 bridges is built of steel.



1                   However, from an aesthetic point of view, I think  
2 I would favor the bridge that has already been selected,  
3 which is of concrete, which gives me no financial interest in  
4 the bridge.

5                   MR. AIRIS: Thank you, sir.

6                   MR. DUGAS: Mr. Britt, Virginia Automobile Dealers.

7                   STATEMENT OF M. G. "TED" BRITT, VIRGINIA

8                   AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

9                   MR. BRITT: Mr. Chairman.

10                   Northern Virginia is the first area in the  
11 Commonwealth to experience acute traffic congestion problems.  
12 For this reason, the automobile dealers in Virginia look upon  
13 it as something of a proving ground for reasonable solutions  
14 for urban transportation problems that may develop elsewhere  
15 in the State.

16                   It is obvious that we have an economic interest in  
17 the continued health of motor vehicle transportation in  
18 Virginia and throughout the country. Not only do we market  
19 and service motor vehicles as a means of livelihood, but most  
20 automobile dealerships are in urban areas and represent sub-  
21 stantial real estate investments.

22                   Furthermore, many dealerships are in or very near  
23 the "downtown" or central business districts of our cities.  
24 Like any other retail merchant, we benefit from the concen-  
25 tration and wide variety of consumer traffic afforded by these

1 locations. And, like any other property owner of urban  
2 property, we have a definite interest in the continued  
3 economic health of urban areas.

4 Of course, we are aware of the massive efforts by  
5 many interests throughout the country to discredit the motor  
6 vehicle and highway transportation. Many detractors of this  
7 type are to be found right here in the metropolitan area.  
8 Quite frankly, however, we feel that -- for the foreseeable  
9 future at least -- there will continue to be a strong, healthy  
10 demand for automotive transportation.

11 In Virginia, there are 20 entire counties and 68  
12 percent of the State's populated communities that depend  
13 entirely on motor vehicles for all land travel. Also, every  
14 responsible study on the subject indicates that Americans  
15 still consider it the most ideal form of transportation. A  
16 recent study commissioned by the Highway Research Board  
17 emphasizes this point. The study said, "The automobile is by  
18 far the most important mode of travel to the American house-  
19 hold, and represents a uniformly important facet of our way  
20 of life and general values. It will become even more im-  
21 portant in the immediate years ahead.

22 "Most respondents feel that improvements should be  
23 made in both automobile and public transportation, not one to  
24 the exclusion of the other.

25 "Attitudes toward the automobile are generally



1 positive and the value placed on the automobile is extremely  
2 high. There appears to be close ego-involvement with the  
3 automobile as a way of life.

4 "In metropolitan areas, public transportation is  
5 recognized as a vital part of our way of life, and worth  
6 continued and accelerated emphasis. However, the attitudes  
7 toward present public transportation services tend to be  
8 generally negative rather than positive."

9 What this means, then, is that as automobile dealers,  
10 we will still have a healthy market for our product. The  
11 question is where?

12 Thomas Mann, President of the Automobile  
13 Manufacturers Association, recently put the question in this  
14 framework: ". . . the problem of the central city today  
15 is not how to take care of an ever-greater number of cars  
16 desiring to come downtown but how to attract business estab-  
17 lishments and the affluent middle class in the suburbs to the  
18 downtown shopping, industrial and residential areas -- how to  
19 prevent the central city from becoming a place of stagnating  
20 commerce and increasing joblessness and soaring relief rolls.  
21 If this is indeed the problem, then it would seem clear that  
22 one of the things that should be done is to make the central  
23 city accessible to the fast-growing suburbs. There is nothing  
24 to be gained and much to be lost if the ghettos and the  
25 businesses of the inner city are isolated."

1           While our business establishments need to be  
2 located in places providing heavy and varied exposure to  
3 shoppers, they must also have accessibility. If the downtown  
4 areas become choked with traffic and shoppers turn to other  
5 more convenient locations, we must, in turn, leave the down-  
6 town areas.

7           The idea that by making downtown undesirable for  
8 automotive traffic will help the public transit systems and  
9 thereby create a rebirth of the "good old days" of foot  
10 traffic shopping to which customers will flock has proven  
11 time and again disastrous to downtown areas. As Mr. Mann  
12 pointed out, the contrary is true. It seems to be a rule of  
13 thumb for most cities that where automobile movement is re-  
14 stricted by congestion or artificial means, experience has  
15 shown an eventual stagnation of business activity and a sub-  
16 sequent migration to other locations.

17           It is our opinion that if Northern Virginia is to  
18 be saved from economic chaos, the total transportation plan  
19 recommended by the Virginia and District of Columbia highway  
20 agencies must be completed at the earliest possible date.  
21 Arlington County and other localities in Northern Virginia  
22 cannot afford to turn its back on reality and watch taxpaying  
23 private businesses being driven out in search of more  
24 accessible locations.

25           Every responsible study shows that the freeway plan



1 as well as other forms of transportation development will be  
2 needed to solve just a portion of our traffic problems in  
3 this area. One essential part of the freeway plan is the  
4 Three Sisters Bridge on which this hearing is being held.

5 Both of the bridge designs being considered seem to  
6 offer adequate solutions to the present economic and environ-  
7 mental needs of the area providing the remainder of I-66  
8 connecting with I-266 is completed at the earliest possible  
9 date.

10 It appears to this association that both structures  
11 are aesthetically pleasing; however, one, -- the three-span  
12 structure -- has received the enthusiastic endorsement of the  
13 Commission of Fine Arts. In view of this high recommendation  
14 from this and other interested groups, our group feels this is  
15 the one that should be constructed.

16 In closing, I would like to point out that conges-  
17 tion knows no political boundaries. The bottleneck for  
18 traffic in the District of Columbia backs up into Virginia,  
19 and vice versa. The two jurisdictions cannot reach two  
20 different and varying solutions to the problem because the  
21 economic health of both are fused in the matter of traffic.

22 It seems to our organization that the Virginia and  
23 District of Columbia and all other State and Federal agencies  
24 concerned have taken great care to design the Three Sisters  
25 Bridge and the I-266 approaches in a way to complement the

1 area's environment while at the same time reaching a real-  
2 istic solution to the traffic problem.

3 In other words, the Bridge design answers the need  
4 of the locality from all reasonable aspects and we feel it  
5 should be built now without further delay.

6 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Britt.

7 Mr. Richard M. Wright.

8 (No response.)

9 MR. DUGAS: Mr. William Treanor.

10 (No response.)

11 MR. DUGAS: Colonel Israelson?

12 (No response.)

13 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Gutheim?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. DUGAS: Colonel Israelson was to appear at 4:20.  
16 We are now ahead some 20 minutes of our schedule. I wonder  
17 if there is anyone in the room not on our list who would  
18 desire to be heard at this time?

19 If so, you may come forward and state your name and  
20 be heard.

21 STATEMENT OF MRS. BARBARA RUSSELL,

22 2601 FOXHALL ROAD, WASHINGTON, D. C.

23 MRS. RUSSELL: I am Mrs. Barbara Russell, and I also  
24 live at 2601 Foxhall Road. I don't think my husband would  
25 like it if I said I was the oldest living inhabitant, but I



1 think I just about am. We have been here now for the third  
2 generation on Foxhall Road and my family moved there because  
3 they liked the beauty of the trees and the natural surround-  
4 ings.

5 I have seen the trees being chopped down all around  
6 us, and the wildlife disappearing very rapidly.

7 I can't say -- and all of our beautiful dogwoods  
8 are now dying on the banks because of the pollution. So I  
9 can't be enthusiastic about any more cars, pollution by the  
10 cars, anywhere, unfortunately. And I feel very badly about  
11 saying this in front of the Highway Departments, who have been  
12 so very considerate to us and helpful in trying to explain  
13 their point of view, and I can quite see that.

14 But I think it is a pity to put more cars in the  
15 City that is already so congested. We were an hour late in  
16 getting here because we were milling around trying to find a  
17 parking space or parking garage to get into. So I can't say  
18 that I think it is a good idea for more cars to be funneled  
19 into this congested area.

20 I am highly in favor of a Metro System. I think the  
21 sooner, the better. The design, I think, is relevant to what  
22 happens when it gets off the bridge as well as when it gets  
23 on the bridge. And, therefore, I would like to see what  
24 happens in the design of the avenues and roads leading off it,  
25 before I could vote favorably on the design of the bridge

1       itself.

2               Thank you very much.

3               MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mrs. Russell.

4               MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, if it would reassure Mrs.  
5       Russell any, I would like to point out that her Highway  
6       Department is also in favor of only permitting essential  
7       traffic in the City, and controlling the parking problem to a  
8       large extent in the City, which will be the control of  
9       traffic.

10              MRS. RUSSELL: It still seems to me the more bridges  
11       you have, the more traffic you have. That is just inevitable,  
12       unfortunately.

13              MR. AIRIS: We just hope it doesn't work out that  
14       way. We intend to take steps to prevent it.

15              MRS. RUSSELL: It has always in the past in every  
16       other city. Unfortunately, this is the fate of a bridge, that  
17       more people use it.

18              MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mrs. Russell.

19              Are there others who would care to testify at this  
20       time?

21              MR. WRIGHT: I am Richard Wright.

22              MR. DUGAS: Richard M. Wright, you are next.  
23  
24  
25



1 STATEMENT OF RICHARD M. WRIGHT, EXECUTIVE  
2 DIRECTOR, D. C. METROPOLITAN SUBCONTRACTORS  
3 ASSOCIATION

4 MR. WRIGHT: I am Richard M. Wright, Executive  
5 Director of the D. C. Metropolitan Subcontractors Association.  
6 Our Association includes subcontractors, of all trade, doing  
7 approximately 70 to 80 percent of all the construction  
8 industry work in the Washington Metropolitan Area.

9 The subcontractors strongly support the construction  
10 of the Three Sisters Bridge and its approaches.

11 A bridge at this location would provide immediate  
12 social and economic benefits for the Metropolitan Area. It  
13 would provide employment for the construction industry labor  
14 force directly engaged in this project.

15 In longer term, it would facilitate the movement of  
16 the labor force from area to area. This would increase  
17 employment of workers on projects that are now difficult to  
18 get to.

19 Also, an economic benefit would be the reduction in  
20 the costs of construction. Factors in the cost of building  
21 are the cost to the subcontractor of getting his men, tools  
22 and equipment to the job, and the cost to the suppliers of  
23 delivering materials to the job. With the improved routing  
24 that would be possible with the new bridge, these cost factors  
25 would come down. As costs of construction are reduced, more

1 buildings will be built and more jobs will be provided.

2 An environmental benefit, also, would accrue from  
3 the building of this bridge. It would permit the faster  
4 movement of our vehicles. With increased speed, there would  
5 be fewer vehicle-hours and a concomitant reduction in air  
6 pollution from exhausts. A reduction in air pollution would  
7 result also from the mere fact of higher speeds and reduced  
8 stop-and-go type operation.

9 The argument that the existence of a new bridge  
10 would result in more traffic if, of course, not valid. The  
11 number of vehicles will be the same either way, bridge or no  
12 bridge. However, if there is no bridge, the traffic will go  
13 more slowly and more interruptedly over the existing routes,  
14 and produce more air pollution.

15 Thus, for the reasons given, economic, social, and  
16 environmental, the subcontractors of the Washington  
17 Metropolitan area are very much in favor of this proposed  
18 bridge.

19 Thank you very much.

20 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Wright.

21 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman.

22 I wonder would Mr. Wright, could I impose upon you  
23 to just ask one simple question here. Does your Association  
24 have any preference as to the treatment which was outlined,  
25 as shown in these two artists' renderings?



1 MR. WRIGHT: No, sir, I think we didn't undertake  
2 to address the preference between the two. It is merely we  
3 think there should be a bridge.

4 MR. AIRIS: I see. Thank you very much.

5 MR. DUGAS: Is Mr. Treanor in the house yet?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. DUGAS: How about Colonel Israelson, has he come  
8 in?

9 (No response.)

10 MR. DUGAS: We find ourselves approximately 15  
11 minutes ahead of our schedule. Is there someone else in the  
12 audience not on our list who would care to testify at this  
13 time?

14 If there be none, then we will be in recess until  
15 approximately 4:20.

16 (Whereupon, there was a brief recess taken.)

17 MR. DUGAS: Mrs. Hal Magargle.

18 STATEMENT OF MRS. HAL MAGARGLE, AUDUBON  
19 NATURALIST SOCIETY OF THE CENTRAL ATLANTIC  
20 STATES

21 MRS. MAGARGLE: I am Mrs. Hal Magargle. I appear  
22 in behalf of the Audubon Naturalist Society of the Central  
23 Atlantic States, a nonprofit organization established in 1897,  
24 with a current membership of approximately 2,200. The Society  
25 encourages conservation activities, environmental education

1 and natural science studies.

2 I understand that we are invited to present state-  
3 ments concerning any alternative designs for the proposed  
4 Three Sisters Bridge and its approaches in Virginia and the  
5 District of Columbia, including the social, economic and  
6 environmental effects.

7 I propose that the best design, considering the  
8 social economic and environmental effects, is a cleaned-up  
9 Potomac River, minus another bridge structure of any kind,  
10 with the Parkland along the shoreline life intact, not cut  
11 through with more roads.

12 In considering a design for anything -- a bridge,  
13 road or building of any sort -- we should think not only of  
14 how it will look when brand new, but how will it stand the  
15 test of time and use?

16 The design proposals under consideration today will  
17 encroach upon existing shore line parkland, and poses a  
18 serious threat to residential areas and parks outside of the  
19 immediate location. This is an undesirable social effect.

20 The more bridges and roads we build, the more we  
21 seem to need. Using past experience as reference, as long as  
22 we continue to encourage the use of the private automobile,  
23 we can be sure that before long, another bridge and more  
24 approaches will be "needed." This is an undesirable economic  
25 effect.



1           It is a proven fact that our automobiles are one of  
2 the major sources of air pollution, if not the No. 1 source  
3 in our cities. To encourage an increase in automobile traffic  
4 at this point in time is very poor design. That it will have  
5 an undesirable effect on our environment, there can be no  
6 doubt.

7           It is such an obvious question that it should not  
8 be necessary to ask it, but why don't we get on with the job  
9 of building a decent mass transportation system in this  
10 metropolitan area instead of wasting precious time arguing  
11 about more roads and more bridges to bring still more cars,  
12 with their attendant problems of air pollution, traffic con-  
13 gestion, noise and dirt into the city? It just doesn't make  
14 sense.

15           Let us produce a design which will be sound socially,  
16 economically, and environmentally; a mass transportation  
17 system which will:

18           1. Make it possible for the poor as well as the  
19 rich to move about.

20           2. Make it desirable and easy for people to come  
21 into the city to shop, go sightseeing, out to dinner, to  
22 enjoy the many forms of entertainment available in the metro0  
23 politan area, and above all, to commute to work.

24           3. Which will not adversely affect our environment  
25 with increasing air pollution, noise pollution, and the

1 destruction of irreplaceable parkland.

2 Let's get on with it.

3 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mrs. Magargle.

4 Is Mr. William Treanor in the house yet?

5 (No response.)

6 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Treanor is our last witness  
7 scheduled for the afternoon session and he is not due until  
8 5:05. I wonder if there is now present anyone in the audience  
9 who would like to testify at this time, not listed?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. DUGAS: If not, we will have to go into recess  
12 until approximately 5:05.

13 (Whereupon, there was a short recess.)

14 MR. DUGAS: Ladies and Gentlemen, we just had a  
15 telephone message from Mr. Treanor, indicating that he is out  
16 on an emergency matter and that he probably will not appear  
17 at this time. We will, therefore, adjourn the hearing at this  
18 time, to reconvene at 7:00 o'clock, in this place.

19 Thank you very much.

20 (Whereupon, at 4:50 p.m., the public hearing in the  
21 above-entitled matter was recessed, to reconvene at 7:00 p.m.,  
22 this same day.)

23

24

25



1 (THE HEARING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT APPROXIMATELY  
2 7 P.M., 15 DECEMBER 1970, AND THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE  
3 RECORDED:)

4 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: The meeting will now  
5 come to order. We shall hear from Mrs. Louise McClenathan.  
6 WHEREUPON,

7 MRS. LOUISE McCLENATHAN,  
8 2001 N. ADAMS STREET, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA, APPROACHED  
9 THE PODIUM AND TESTIFIED, IN SUBSTANCE, AS FOLLOWS:

10 MRS. McCLENATHAN: I am Louise McClenathan residing  
11 at 2001 N. Adams Street, Arlington, Virginia. I wish to  
12 state at the outset that I favor a balanced transportation  
13 system for the area, including several alternative plans  
14 suggested by my fellow Arlingtonians at the I-66 Hearings  
15 on December 7, 8, and 9, 1970. These alternates include  
16 above ground rail transportation on the existing right of way,  
17 underground transit systems, and the use of express bus lanes  
18 on existing highways.

19 I have had thirteen years of experience in public  
20 school work. During that time I have seen the vital im-  
21 portance -- I repeat, vital importance of play and recreation  
22 in the total learning process of children. In this regard, I  
23 would in no way favor construction of I-266 and 66 which  
24 construction would destroy any large amount of land currently  
25 used for free recreation by citizens from the ages of 5 to 75.

1           Frederich Froebel, a European educator, has put it  
2 this way:

3           "Play is the purest, most spiritual activity of the  
4 child. It gives, therefore, joy, freedom, contentment, inner  
5 and outer rest, and peace with the world. A child that plays  
6 thoroughly with self active determination, perseveringly until  
7 physical fatigue forbids, will surely be a thoroughly de-  
8 termined man, capable of self-sacrifice for the promotion of  
9 the welfare of himself and others."

10           My following comments, however, are directed to  
11 specific design changes requested when and if I-266 and I-66  
12 are constructed.

13           Gentlemen, I would like to point to you on the  
14 aerial map the place where I live and to which I will be re-  
15 ferring in my testimony (approaching the map and indicating).  
16 You can see that the highway is very, very close behind this  
17 area. You will also see other high density, dwellings, right  
18 here, apartments, too, and turns at Adams Street.

19           According to proposed design plans for I-266,  
20 According to proposed design plans for I-266 made available  
21 for public inspection in advance of this hearing, the geogra-  
22 phic point in Arlington where eastbound I-266 would diverge  
23 from I-66 is approximately due north of the northern terminus  
24 of North Adams Street. At such point of divergence from I-66  
25 eastbound I-266 would proceed underneath I-66 on its way to a



1 Three Sisters Bridge.

2 This passage of I-266 under I-66 readily lends it-  
3 self to inexpensive implementation of the request for an  
4 appropriate pedestrian facility which I made at the I-66  
5 September 29, 1970, design hearing on behalf of residents of  
6 my area. The brief statement then made in explanation and  
7 support of that request for a pedestrian facility I later will  
8 repeat.

9 But first I refer to a related aspect of the proposed  
10 highway design plans. So-called ramp "K" will feed into I-66  
11 at the same geographical point previously mentioned, and it  
12 will be necessary for the requested pedestrian facility to  
13 overpass ramp "K" at that point. The embankment and related  
14 retaining wall proposed to parallel I-66 at that point will  
15 facilitate construction of an inexpensive anchorage for the  
16 south end of the proposed overpass of ramp "K".

17 After spanning the very short distance over ramp  
18 "K", the north end of the requested overpass would be anchored  
19 on a structure which would include stair steps or a ramp lead-  
20 ing down to the grade level of I-266. At the foot of such anchor  
21 structure the pedestrian would enter a narrow corridor pro-  
22 tected on either side by woven wire fencing of such height  
23 and protective design as would preclude scaling. This pro-  
24 tected pedestrian corridor would be located to the right of  
25 and alongside eastbound I-266 for the distance it passes

1 underneath I-66. Upon emerging from the cover of that bridge  
2 the indicated pedestrian corridor immediately would connect  
3 with Spout Run parkland which extends an approximate half mile  
4 down to the Potomac River. This wooded area of natural beauty,  
5 consisting of several acres, is not -- I repeat not -- earmarked  
6 for highway use by I-266, and is the hiking area referred to in  
7 my previously-mentioned request of September 29.

8 I now repeat that request omitting introductory  
9 matter and copy of the petition in support of such request  
10 signed by 337 persons, which petition already is part of the  
11 record of the indicated I-66 hearing. I quote:

12 The proposed location for the requested pedestrian  
13 facility is "in the vicinity of the northern terminus of  
14 North Adams Street." No land acquisition cost would be in-  
15 volved because Arlington County still retains title to land,  
16 dedicated for Adams Street, which land extends all the distance  
17 down to the right-of-way of the former Washington & Old  
18 Dominion Railroad. That former railroad bed will be utilized  
19 for construction of U.S. 66.

20 Across U.S. 66 at that point is open land in Spout  
21 Run Parkway on which hiking paths already exist which could be  
22 extended to connect with a hiking trail along the Potomac River.  
23 A side trail, which already exists in Spout Run Parkway, leads  
24 to a 100-foot long well-preserved Civil War trench which was  
25 part of the Fort Strong earthworks.



1           The facility proposed in our petition is described as  
2 "pedestrian." The word "biking" purposely is not used in  
3 connection therewith because differences in elevation in the  
4 area in question might preclude satisfactory bicycle travel.  
5 Hiking conditions, however, are ideal. This hiking potential  
6 justifies construction of the requested facility irrespective  
7 of the biking angle.

8           A word about my neighborhood and its future: We are  
9 located close in, being but a mile from Rosslyn. Potomac  
10 Towers and the Circle Apartment at the northern terminus of  
11 Adams Street are both high rise with several other apartments  
12 nearby.

13           There also are nearby single-family dwellings.  
14 The Arlington County planning staff repeatedly has recommended  
15 that such private home area, as well as certain contiguous  
16 dwelling areas, be earmarked for high density development.

17           The further fact that we are located within the geo-  
18 graphical limits of the Rosslyn-Ballston rapid rail transit  
19 corridor, now under comprehensive study by the Arlington  
20 County planning staff, is an additional indication of the  
21 eventual high population density which is destined for our  
22 area. This ever-growing population now needs, and henceforth  
23 urgently will need, ready access to open space. Granting  
24 this petition would afford that opportunity. Citizens generally  
25 also would find the indicated pedestrian facility an excellent

1 gateway to the Congressionally authorized hiking trail along  
2 the Potomac River. We respectfully urge that the petition be  
3 granted.

4 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, might I just inquire of  
5 Miss McClenathan?

6 MISS McCLENATHAN: Yes?

7 MR. AIRIS: Did you have any preference that you  
8 cared to express on the two alternative treatments for a  
9 bridge which are the primary point of the hearing. They  
10 are displayed right here. One is a three-span, that's the  
11 long concrete arch across the river. And the other is a  
12 steel span with an added pier in the center of the river.

13 MISS McCLENATHAN: I was under the impression that  
14 the hearings also were being held in regard to I-266, and I  
15 do feel that my request touched on that.

16 MR. AIRIS: Yes, that's true - but in addition to  
17 that.

18 MISS McCLENATHAN: Yes.

19 MR. AIRIS: This is I-266 across the bridge.

20 MISS McCLENATHAN: I do not have at this point any  
21 opinion as to which design would be best gentlemen. I believe  
22 that my request and my testimony should stand as it now is.

23 MR. AIRIS: Thank you very much.

24 MISS McCLENATHAN: You are welcome.

25 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mrs. Philip G. Fortune?



1 League of Women Voters?

2 MRS. MALAKOFF: I am not Mrs. Fortune but I am  
3 going to testify.

4 HEARING OFFICER: Mrs. Malakoff, you are going to  
5 testify instead of Mrs. Fortune?

6 MRS. MALAKOFF: Yes. Would you like it now?

7 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Please.

8 MRS. MALAKOFF: I would like to open this with a  
9 slightly lighter statement. I feel our statement is rather  
10 solemn as Leagues often are, and I would say that perhaps we  
11 feel that we are here more by accident than by design. That's  
12 pretty bad. I think we are all gathered here because of the  
13 extended citizen activity for the past two years and this of  
14 course is one of a long series of League position papers. I  
15 hope that you gentlemen who are looking to the Hearing record  
16 will go back to League positions in previous times.

17 The League of Women Voters of the District of Colum-  
18 bia is opposed to the design proposals submitted for I-266.  
19 The proposals do not specify the nature of the traffic service  
20 for which they are offered, and consequently they defy direct  
21 evaluation in terms of suitability for service needs to be met.  
22 For such evaluation, trip purposes and number would have to be  
23 estimated. Furthermore, an explicit statement of the relation  
24 of these designs to the total transportation system of the  
25 region would be important to proper evaluation. A statement of

1 that relationship is also essential to carry out the Inter-  
2 governmental Relations Act of 1968, which requires regional  
3 coordination and balanced transportation systems.

4 A review of the hearing record of 1964 reveals that  
5 the designs do not appear to reflect the influence of citizen  
6 opinion expressed at that time. The fears expressed then have  
7 grown more urgent with each passing year. Citizens at that  
8 time objected to the prospective environmental blight, neigh-  
9 borhood disruption, and the cost of the project. They wanted  
10 resources allocated to alternative forms of transportation.  
11 They recommended specifically that truck traffic prohibited  
12 from the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge be channeled to the new  
13 14th Street span. They challenged traffic forecasts. All  
14 these objections appear to be fully justified at this time.

15 These designs for massive traffic carriers are totally  
16 out of keeping with our interest in encouraging the use of mass  
17 transit, investing available resources in improving mass  
18 transit, and reducing auto use with its consequent clutter of  
19 gas stations, parking lots and garages, and the thousand miles  
20 of roads already in service in the 69 square miles of the  
21 District of Columbia.

22 They are out of keeping with a spirit of concern for  
23 the unique natural features of our Capitol location. In our  
24 region, there is only one Potomac shoreline. Thousands of us  
25 enjoy its use for hiking and biking. Many thousands more could



1 do so if its natural attractiveness were protected and en-  
2 hanced. To route a major traffic carrier along this nearby  
3 area of the Potomac shore is to destroy our most important  
4 natural asset, to threaten the vegetation, and to destroy the  
5 small measure of hope for achieving the possible - a pleasant  
6 urban habitat.

7 We do not believe the D. C. Department of Highways  
8 and Traffic is responsive to the clear wishes of the citizens it  
9 pretends to serve. We recommend the withdrawal of these plans  
10 by the Department.

11 Are there any questions?

12 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Any questions?

13 MR. AIRIS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Miss  
14 Malakoff has any preference for either of the two treatments  
15 that was described in the booklet and which are shown on these  
16 two artist renderings up here - the two different types of  
17 bridges, or any other type of bridge?

18 MISS MALAKOFF: Yes. Well, my own reaction to the  
19 alternative proposed was that in the very narrowest sense  
20 alternative - that they are artistic alternatives - aesthetic  
21 alternatives. My own estimate would be that the real meaning  
22 of design alternatives perhaps ought to be a little bit broader  
23 in the sense of different sizes, directed to different carrying  
24 purposes and things of that sort. I certainly think that  
25 aesthetically the simpler bridge has the more pleasing appeal.

1 but that's a personal, and a very narrowly aesthetic design  
2 consideration.

3 MR. AIRIS: Which one would be the more simpler?

4 MISS MALAKOFF: Well, aesthetically speaking, I  
5 would say the single arch.

6 MR. AIRIS: The single arch. I see. You would have  
7 some slight preference towards the single arch?

8 MISS MALAKOFF: Oh, yes.

9 MR. AIRIS: As you recall, just as an aside, really,  
10 one of the comments at the '64 hearing was from the folks  
11 who indulged in river sports, that they did not wish to have  
12 piers in the river. That is, if they had their druthers they  
13 would rather not have piers in the river, and, of course, this  
14 is just one point that we have tried to be responsive to.

15 MISS MALAKOFF: Right.

16 MR. AIRIS: The single arch. I am glad to hear you  
17 say that you favor the single arch, if you have to have a  
18 bridge.

19 MISS MALAKOFF: Well, the basic objection is to this  
20 massive facility, which, of course, is far more than the bridge.  
21 It includes the tunnel, with the necessary venting of carbon  
22 monoxide, which has a life of what, 100 years or so?

23 MR. AIRIS: I would quite agree there.

24 MISS MALAKOFF: In any event, the output is so drastic  
25 that the concentration can be expected to be very, very high.



1 I have been strolling up and down Connecticut Avenue today,  
2 and I would hate to have that Sunday hike on the Potomac. It  
3 would be the same experience.

4 MR. AIRIS: I appreciate your being very forthright.  
5 If there is a bridge, you prefer the single arch.

6 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you very much, Miss  
7 Malakoff.

8 MISS MALAKOFF: You are welcome.

9 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

10 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Thomas R. Reid, III?

11 WHEREUPON,

12 MR. THOMAS R. REID, III,

13 CITIZEN - 1409 30th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.,

14 approached the microphone and testified, in substance, as  
15 follows:

16 MR. REID: Sir, I don't have a prepared statement but  
17 I thought about what I was going to say as I rode my bike  
18 over here. My name is Thomas Reid, and I have come to present  
19 a bicycle commuter's view of the Three Sisters Bridge. Do you  
20 ever ride a bicycle, Mr. Chairman?

21 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Yes, sir.

22 MR. REID: Good. Then you probably know that I  
23 represent a large number of people, perhaps larger than many  
24 of you think. They are 77,000 registered bicycles in the  
25 District, and, of course, that figure doesn't include all of the

1 bicycles that are registered, and hundreds of thousands  
2 of bicycles in the suburbs on either side.

3 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: There are three owned by me.

4 MR. REID: Oh, good. I am glad to hear it, sir.  
5 Of those thousands of bicycles, the most conservative estimate  
6 I have seen is that a thousand people ride their bicycles to  
7 work everyday in the Washington area. A large number of those  
8 people, including myself, commute across the river by bicycle  
9 on the way to work. I am not here in any official capacity  
10 but I think my views are probably representative of bicycle  
11 commuters in the Washington area.

12 I am particularly pleased to be here tonight. I  
13 want to commend you all, you and your committee for your  
14 energy and perserverence in staying here this long. I know  
15 it has been a long, long hearing. I might suggest it wouldn't  
16 have been so difficult for you if you had found a less contro-  
17 versial alternative. But since you have apparently chosen this  
18 one, I commend you for sticking it out this long. I am  
19 pleased to be here especially because I made suggestions be-  
20 fore to the D. C. officials about the design of this bridge.  
21 Perhaps Mr. Aixis remembers it was on August 12th, 1969 that  
22 I made a suggestion about the design of the bridge, and was  
23 told at that time that wasn't up to the citizens, it was  
24 completely up to the architects of the bridge and it wasn't  
25 my province to even suggest. For that reason, it is a pleasure



1 to be here. Now I have come to discuss strictly the design  
2 of the bridge, but since people are apparently taking tallies  
3 and some people, although not including Congressman Natcher,  
4 are concerned about what the public thinks of this bridge, I  
5 thought I would tell you my opinion. In my opinion, the Three  
6 Sisters Bridge is an abomination. We have got a lovely city  
7 here, a national treasury, I think, and we have turned it into  
8 a used car lot. It's choked to death with cars, more cars  
9 per square mile than any city in the Nationa, and now you want  
10 to build this huge facility to bring thousands more cars into  
11 the city everyday. Ludicrous, Mr. Chairman. Preposterous.  
12 But if you are going to go ahead with this abomination, I  
13 would like to suggest two things about the design: In the  
14 first place, on the point of view of the single-span versis  
15 the double span bridge, I think asking you that question is  
16 equivalent to asking an innocent man whether he prefers the  
17 guillotine or the gallows, because in my opinion we shouldn't  
18 have either. If we are forced to have one, I take the guillo-  
19 tine being simplier in the form of the single-span bridge. It  
20 is not as attractive as Three Sisters, but it is more attrac-  
21 tive than the other.

22 My other suggestion on the bridge is that the de-  
23 signers of the bridge put in adequate sidewalks both along the  
24 bridge and along the approaches to the bridge so that people  
25 can walk across the bridge and ride bicycles across it safely.

1 Experience for me, I ride across Memorial Bridge everyday,  
2 proves that if there is an adequate sidewalk on the bridge and  
3 its approaches people will use it. And I think even the pro-  
4 ponents of the bridge agree that we have got to find some way  
5 to cut down automobile traffic coming into this city. Bicyclists  
6 can't cut it down a great deal, but it's a step forward. It is  
7 a relatively easy step forward to take and I think experience  
8 has proven that if we provide adequate sidewalks, both on the  
9 bridge and the approaches, people will use them on bicycles to  
10 go to work. In addition, you know that people use bicycles a  
11 great deal for recreation purposes and I am sure that the  
12 recreation cyclists would use the bridge as well, if there  
13 were a safe way to do it.

14           Memorial Bridge is relatively safe, there being side-  
15 walks. I work over in Arlington. I came to this hearing today  
16 by bicycle from my office and made the mistake of coming across  
17 14th Street Bridge which had totally inadequate bicycle faci-  
18 lities. Frankly, it's a miracle I am here. I was almost killed  
19 several times on that bridge tonight because there is just no  
20 provisions for bicycles on the approach on either side of the  
21 bridge. Somebody at least was smart enough to put a sidewalk  
22 on the bridge, but I don't know how you are going to get there  
23 because you have to risk death a thousand times on the approach  
24 on either side getting to it. Therefore, my suggestion for  
25 the Three Sisters Bridge is that it be built with adequate



1 bicycle facilities, not only on the bridge but on the  
2 approaches on either side. Finally, the irony of this whole  
3 hearing, I think, is that we are going ahead asking people how  
4 the bridge should look, and as far as I know we don't know what  
5 the citizens think of the bridge at all. You see the figures  
6 85% opposed to the bridge, twice as many opposed yesterday in  
7 the hearing as was in favor, but I don't know how much faith you  
8 can put in those. There has never been an official tally, to  
9 my knowledge. I, therefore, propose the following: I suggest  
10 that residents of the District be given a public referendum on  
11 the bridge to be included in the balloting on the non-voting  
12 delegate next spring. It's a very simple thing; you just type  
13 one more line.

14 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

15 MR. REID: You type one more line of the ballot,  
16 and, frankly, the majority of people in the city go along,  
17 if they go along with building this thing I'll go along. I  
18 suggest that you follow that up, Mr. Chairman. I am pretty busy  
19 and won't have time. But I would like to see that done. I  
20 think it's only fair. It doesn't seem to be too difficult a  
21 legal problem; it can't be very expensive since they are print-  
22 ing ballots anyway, and I am going to do everything that I can  
23 to see that it's done.

24 The second point of my summary is that I would like  
25 to see bicycle facilities on the bridge. Thanks very much for

1 giving me this opportunity.

2 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you.

3 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman?

4 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Reid?

5 MR. REID: Yes, sir?

6 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Reid?

7 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I believe Mr. Airis wants to  
8 ask you a question.

9 MR. REID: Sure.

10 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Reid, I just wondered, since we have  
11 wide sidewalks--

12 SAM ABBOTT: You can't ride bicycles on sidewalks!

13 A SPECTATOR: It's against the law.

14 MR. REID: You have to break the law to do it anyway,  
15 Mr. Chairman, but I do. I would rather break the law than die.

16 MR. AIRIS: -- since we have wide sidewalks on the  
17 Key Bridge here and we do have a guard rail that leads perhaps  
18 close to a 6 foot walk that is not very heavily used by pedes-  
19 trians, would there be any merit in connecting up some of these  
20 hiking, biking trails on this side -- with, say, the C&O  
21 Canal pathway?

22 MR. REID: I think that's a good suggestion, sir, but  
23 let me say this: If you walk along Key Bridge, they have those  
24 big supports for the light stands, and it's very difficult to  
25 ride a bike around the support. You practically have to stop



1 unless you want to "T" around the curve and risk falling into  
2 the traffic. For that reason, I didn't mention Key Bridge as  
3 one of the bridges in the city that has adequate sidewalks for  
4 bikes. Memorial Bridge is the only one I think that does. I  
5 would certainly recommend that you include in the present con-  
6 struction on the bridge widening of those sidewalks for bi-  
7 cyclists.

8 MR. AIRIS: Well, that's what I am talking about.  
9 You would have to build some kind of a pedestrian or biking  
10 structure here and over here (indicating). Where it would go  
11 I don't know. We never really studied it, but I was curious  
12 whether this had any merit. I know this young gentleman  
13 (indicating Mr. Reid). I have talked with him before.

14 MR. REID: Yea, I think it's a good point. I think  
15 the present sidewalks on Key Bridge just aren't quite wide  
16 enough. You know what you could do is just put in less bulky  
17 standards for the street light if you had a stronger structural  
18 steel. At present, it is kind of hard to ride around those.

19 MR. AIRIS: Do you think if you could get clearance  
20 it would have some merit there?

21 MR. REID: Yeah, I think that's a good idea. The  
22 point about the approach is well taken. You can't ride your  
23 bike - if you can't ride your bike to the sidewalk, like 14th  
24 Street Bridge, why have the sidewalk? I want to get across  
25 the river anyway, and I still suggest Key Bridge or no, that

1 since we are starting afresh on the Three Sisters Bridge,  
2 it seems to me it's smart to put the sidewalks on Three  
3 Sisters Bridge now than later. Thank you, very much.

4 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Reid.

5 MR. REID: I say asking me what kind of bridge we  
6 should have is like asking me or an innocent man if he should  
7 go to the gallows. I am against the bridge.

8 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

9 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mrs. Merle J. Van Horne?

10 A VOICE: Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding Women's  
11 Liberation, ADA does permit on occasion that it be represented  
12 by the male of the species.

13 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Merle J. Van Horne. I am  
14 sorry.

15 WHEREUPON,

16 MR. MERLE J. VAN HORNE,

17 APPROACHED THE PODIUM AND TESTIFIED, IN SUBSTANCE, AS FOLLOWS:

18 MR. VAN HORNE: My name is Mr. Merle J. Van Horne,  
19 and I represent the Greater Washington Chapter of Americans for  
20 Democratic Action, a nonprofit, nonpartisan political action  
21 organization. The Greater Washington Chapter consists of about  
22 1500 ADA members living in the District of Columbia and the ad-  
23 jacent parts of Maryland and Virginia.

24 We are presenting this testimony under protest.  
25 First of all, it is an insult to the City of Washington to call  
a hearing to discuss the design of the Three Sisters Bridge --



1 a structure repugnant to our city's purposes and overwhelming-  
2 ly rejected by its citizens. Furthermore, it is improper to,  
3 not to say illegal, to hold a design hearing when the question  
4 of whether the bridge should be built at all is in litigation.  
5 Finally, any hearing on this project is improper in the absence  
6 of the responsible decision-makers.

7 In the case of the District of Columbia I refer to the  
8 Mayor, the City Council, and the National Capital Planning  
9 Commission. Mr. Airis, please note: The relative merits of  
10 the proposed design alternatives are not an issue of interest  
11 to Americans for Democratic Action.

12 The issue here is the future of the City of Washing-  
13 ton. The Three Sisters Bridge is the keystone of the mon-  
14 strous William H. Natcher Memorial Freeway System - a system  
15 which would, if completed, commit our city to the total, perma-  
16 nent domination of the automobile.

17 That system would condemn those of us who live in  
18 the District to the total tyranny of the automobile over our  
19 environment and our way of life.

20 What are the implications of such a commitment? The  
21 terrible consequences of such a massive freeway program have  
22 been presented again and again in every possible public forum.

23 These freeways would worsen the imbalance and deepen  
24 the injustice of the present transportation system.

25 These freeways would dump thousands of additional  
cars into a city core choked with congestion and plagued by

1 noise and air pollution.

2           These freeways would seriously impair the livability  
3 of this city and endanger the health and safety of its resi-  
4 dents -- especially the ill and the aged.

5           These freeways -- with associated parking facilities  
6 -- would commit a grossly excessive share of the District of  
7 Columbia's limited land area to the movement and storage of  
8 the automobile.

9           These freeways would reduce this city's severely  
10 limited tax base still further through the acquisition of  
11 valuable land.

12           These freeways would displace thousands of people  
13 from their homes -- mostly poor, black people who have no  
14 decent alternative housing available to them.

15           These freeways would destroy hundreds of businesses  
16 and thousands of jobs in a city beset by severe unemployment  
17 of the poor and the black.

18           These freeways would divide the city and split its  
19 neighborhoods --especially black neighborhoods which are  
20 struggling to unit for their own protection and betterment.

21           These freeways would be white men's roads through  
22 black men's homes. They would predominantly serve persons  
23 who neither live in the District of Columbia nor bear their  
24 just share of its burdens, problems, and costs -- while impos-  
25 ing grave harm on inner-city dwellers and others least able to  
secure redress.



1           These prospects are nightmarish enough, but we must  
2 deal with something far worse. More scandalous than the Natcher  
3 Memorial Freeway System's baleful effects is the nefarious per-  
4 vision of the American political process which brought about  
5 the decision to build the system and the stubborn refusal to  
6 reconsider that decision.

7           I will pass over the shameful details. Everyone in  
8 this room knows that the Three Sisters Bridge is the result  
9 of a long and determined effort by the alien, greedy, perni-  
10 cious forces of the highway lobby. Abetted by Washington's  
11 big business interests and the editorial pages of the Post and  
12 the Star, these enemies of our city have used practically every  
13 disreputable trick in the book to inflict this environmental  
14 and social atrocity on an unwilling District of Columbia.

15           How unwilling? Consider the following:

16           More than 95% of 98,330 persons voting in the 1968  
17 Democratic primary favored a proposal to submit all freeway  
18 projects to referendum. Since the full Natcher Memorial System  
19 was on the books at that time, this can only be interpreted as  
20 a massive anti-freeway mandate.

21           In the 1969 Council of Governments Transportation  
22 Preference Survey, only one out of twenty D. C. residents  
23 polled (and one out of ten suburbanites) chose "more freeways"  
24 over alternative transportation improvements.

25           In the unofficial D. C. Citizens Referendum of

1 December 4, 1969, 84% of 11,669 persons voting registered  
2 their opposition to the Three Sisters Bridge and associated free-  
3 ways.

4 At hearings and in all manner of public forums,  
5 practically every citizens association and neighborhood group  
6 in the District plus a great many health and environmental  
7 associations have gone on record in opposition to the Natcher  
8 Memorial System.

9 The overwhelming majority of suburban citizens  
10 groups support us in this position. Connecting freeways in  
11 Maryland and Virginia are gravely threatened by citizen  
12 action, and political supports of those freeways are now  
13 feeling the wrath of suburban votes on Election Day.

14 Only one conclusion can be drawn from all this: The  
15 City of Washington is anti-freeway, and its citizens are un-  
16 alterably opposed to the construction of the Three Sisters  
17 Bridge.

18 At this point, I would like to quote from Americans  
19 for Democratic Action's national policy statement on transpor-  
20 tation which was adopted at the ADA Convention in May of this  
21 year. I would like at this time to enter the full statement,  
22 for the record.

23 (STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD TO BE  
24 ATTACHED AS PRESENTED BY AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION,  
25 EXHIBIT FOR MR. MERLE J. VAN HORNE.)



*Submitted for  
the Record*

*Witness # 76* 520  
*Mr. Merle J. Van Horne*  
23rd Annual ADA Convention  
May 1, 2 and 3, 1970

Americans for Democratic Action  
1624 16th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

TO: CONVENTION  
FROM: URBAN POLICY COMMISSION  
SUBJECT: TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS  
PROPOSAL: Development of a national transportation policy.

TEXT:

The automobile promised universal mobility and access to the good life for all Americans. The private car has helped many people to achieve a better life, but it has failed to keep its promise. Two of its more serious failures are:

1. The private automobile enabled affluent Americans to travel more miles per year -- and then imbedded them in an amorphous mass of urban sprawl where they had to drive longer distances under increasingly unpleasant conditions in order to enjoy the same diversity of opportunities they had before.
2. About 40 million Americans live in households which do not own a motor vehicle of any kind. These people have not shared in the benefits of private automobile transportation, but they have borne its burdens of noise, stench, ugliness, physical danger, impaired health, and community disruptions. This substantial non-motorized minority includes large numbers of the aged, the poor, single women, handicapped persons, and residents of densely-populated urban cores. Far from liberating them, our automobile-dominated society has inflicted on many of these Americans a degree of unfreedom bordering on imprisonment. No other civilized nation treats its non-motorized citizens so badly.

ADA recognizes that all Americans are entitled as a matter of right:

1. To healthful, attractive environments in which to live, work and recreate.
2. To a broad diversity of opportunities for housing, jobs, services and life-enrichment.
3. To access to these environments and opportunities by safe and convenient transportation.

We recommend, therefore, that a National Transportation Policy be established as a guide to comprehensive planning in the service of articulated social goals.

Any such policy should include the following points:

1. Transportation planning must be part of a comprehensive planning process

guided by humane goals. Plans and policies must be updated frequently to meet our society's changing needs.

2. All current transportation construction projects should be reviewed in the light of the new national transportation policy.
3. The most destructive projects -- core city freeways in particular -- should be abandoned.
4. The remaining needed projects should be replanned and constructed with a deep respect for human values and community goals. Builders and operators of transportation systems must minimize social and environmental harm, and they must repair or pay full compensation for such harm where it is unavoidable. In particular, no American should be displaced from his home by a transportation project until fully comparable alternative housing is available to him.
5. We are a diverse people. The national transportation policy should encourage communities and regions to plan their transportation systems to serve their diverse goals, values, and life-styles. Americans should be able to choose to live in an automobile-dominated town, a pedestrian- and-transit-based community, or in any of the broad spectrum of environments in between.
6. Mobility is not an end in itself. Transportation systems must not be permitted to despoil the environment. Aesthetics and human scale are fully as important in transportation planning as passenger-miles. The development of clean, quiet sources of motive power is a critical necessity if our environments are to remain livable. The supersonic transport would inflict intolerable noise on millions of Americans for the convenience of an overprivileged elite. The SST should be abandoned.
7. The Highway Trust Funds on the national and state level are a prime cause of our present transportation imbalance. Legislation should be enacted to require federal and state governments to allocate revenue from gasoline taxes for development of adequate mass public transportation systems in urban areas to minimize automobile traffic into the inner cities and reduce the level of pollution. On the federal level a transportation trust fund should be established in the Federal Treasury. States and communities should be permitted to allocate their shares of trust fund monies between the various transportation modes in accordance



with their own comprehensive plans. A fixed percentage of annual trust fund revenues should be earmarked for transportation research and development. State gas taxes should be allocated fairly between city and rural areas.

8. Transportation planning must be responsive to the will of the people. Local communities should be involved in the planning process from the outset. Ultimately, the people themselves must be permitted to control the transportation decisions which will affect their lives.
9. Considerations of social equity, environmental sanity, and America's present grievous imbalance in favor of the automobile require that the new national transportation policy be biased in favor of public transportation. Our nation must devote greatly increased resources to public transportation research, development, and operation. Our goal should be a transportation system which is multimodal, safe, dependable, fully integrated, and socially just.
10. The history of public carriers as regulated private monopolies has been a social and economic catastrophe. As with other utilities, public transportation systems should be operated by public authorities at the appropriate levels of government. Where this is unfeasible for the present, stringent regulation in the public interest must be assured.
11. America needs a fully integrated, dependable, nation-wide rail passenger service system as an alternative to the rigors of intercity and long-distance travel by bus and automobile. This system should be operated by a public authority even if the railroads themselves remain in private hands.
12. Local public transit systems provide a service so essential and so life-enriching that no one should be excluded from using these facilities because of poverty or any other circumstance. For this reason -- as well as to minimize automobile traffic -- fares should be held low by public subsidy. Certain communities should be encouraged to experiment with a zero transit fare.

1 I quote:

2 "Transportation planning must be responsive to  
3 the will of the people. Local communities should be involved  
4 in the planning process from the outset. Ultimately, the  
5 people themselves must be permitted to control the transporta-  
6 tion decisions which will affect their lives."

7 Americans for Democratic Action asserts the right of  
8 every American city to embrace the Interstate Highway System  
9 fully, to accept it partially, or to opt out of that system  
10 altogether. As you well know, the citizens of the District  
11 of Columbia are not now permitted to make such choices. But  
12 if a carver crosses the Three Sisters Bridge or enters the  
13 District on the North Central Freeway, the time for choice  
14 will be gone. We insist, therefore, that no options be closed  
15 and that no freeways be built until the democratic process  
16 has been restored to this city.

17 Gentlemen, quite apart from the merits of Mr.  
18 Hatcher's pet project, any attempt to inflict such a profound  
19 environmental and social change on any city in the face of  
20 overwhelming citizen opposition is a despotic act of mind-  
21 boggling enormity. It is an act more cynically destructive of  
22 faith in the American system than a hundred flag burnings. We  
23 in ADA are determined that this tyranny shall be stopped.

24 You who would build the Three Sisters Bridge may  
25 say that you are just following orders -- just doing your job.



1 Adolph Eichmann said that as have thousands of henchmen through-  
2 out history. ADA, however, upholds the Nurenberg Doctrine which  
3 judges a man responsible for inhuman acts regardless of the  
4 auspices under which those acts may be committed.

5 Gentlemen, we would remind you that, if you act as  
6 henchmen for the highway lobby and cooperate in the destruction  
7 of this city as a decent human environment, generations of  
8 Washingtonians will curse your memory.

9 (Disclaimer:) By appearing and presenting testimony at this  
10 time, the Greater Washington Chapter of Americans for Democra-  
11 tic Action does not express recognition or approval of this  
12 hearing, nor does it waive its right to challenge the legality  
13 and/or propriety of this proceeding.

14 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

15 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you very much, Mr. Van  
16 Horne.

17 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

18 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Dr. Coyn?

19 WHEREUPON,

20 DR. CAL COH ,

21 NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH, APPROACHED THE PODIUM AND  
22 TESTIFIED, IN SUBSTANCE, AS FOLLOWS:

23 DR. COHN: I am submitting two documents to the  
24 Chairman, one of which is my verbal statement for the evening  
25 and the other, which is galley proof of an article that I

1 co-authored, that will be appearing in the Catholic University  
2 Law Review on the subject of the medical, legal aspects of  
3 air pollution.

4 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Doctor, would you move the  
5 mike up just a little.

6 DR. COHN: I am sorry. I am sorry. Is that better?

7 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: That's better.

8 DR. COHN: The second, which is a document that will  
9 be appearing in the Catholic University Law Review on the  
10 subject of the medical, legal aspects of air pollution.

11 (STATEMENT BY CAL K. COHN, MICHAEL SCHNEIDERMAN,  
12 AND GLENN PAULSON, ATTACHED TO THIS RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS,  
13 AS EXHIBIT FOR DR. CAL K. COHN.)

14 DR. COHN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appear before  
15 you today as a private citizen. I am a member of the Air  
16 Pollution Subcommittee of the Scientists' Committee for Public  
17 Information, a non-partisan group of physicians and scientists  
18 dedicated to the objective presentation of medical and scienti-  
19 fic information concerning man's interaction with his environ-  
20 ment.

21 I am a Doctor of Medicine and received my medical  
22 degree from the Cornell University Medical College. I have  
23 served as a Fellow of the College of Medicine of Cornell  
24 University and have held the position of Guest Investigator in  
25 the Department of Metabolism and Human Behavior at the Rocke-



#5  
 Air Pollution and Urban Freeways:  
 Making a Record on Hazards to  
 Health and Property

MICHAEL SCINEIDERMAN

CAL K. COHN

GLENN PAULSON

Urban freeways carry vehicles powered by the internal combustion engine. The exhaust emissions produced can have substantial and serious effects on human health, but the possibility of such harm is virtually ignored in highway location proceedings today. Basic data telling the air pollution story is never assembled. Instead, highway planners rely on incomplete and unsophisticated generalizations. The ingredients of an adequate record on air pollution effects of a proposed new urban freeway are available. Only with such facts on health hazards can the legal and psychological momentum of the freeway be overcome.

*Health Effects of Highway Air Pollution*

*The Pollutants*

The primary dangerous substances produced by internal combustion engines are carbon monoxide (CO), unburned hydrocarbons, oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), lead, partial oxidation products, and particulate matter.<sup>1</sup> These emissions contribute 50 to 80 per cent of urban air pollution.<sup>2</sup> Some, such as CO and hydrocarbons, are emitted most heavily when the engine is idling and at low speeds;<sup>3</sup> others, such as NO<sub>x</sub> and lead, are produced most heavily at high speeds and during rapid accelerations.<sup>4</sup>

These substances are harmful and impair human ability to function normally. Auditory discrimination deteriorates significantly at CO concentrations as low as 50 parts per million (ppm).<sup>5</sup> Ability to perform simple mathematical tasks is impaired at 100 ppm,<sup>6</sup> and athletic performance declines as CO concentrations increase.<sup>7</sup> The visual function is adversely affected by concentrations between 50 and 250 ppm.<sup>8</sup> Measurable toxic effects on humans have been reported at as low as 10 ppm,<sup>9</sup> and toxic effects in the cardiovascular system and central nervous system have been reported at high concentrations of CO.<sup>10</sup> People with coronary heart disease or emphysema may be particularly susceptible to CO exposures.<sup>11</sup> Animal studies show that chronic exposure to relatively low concentrations of CO (15 ppm) hastens the process of arteriosclerosis.<sup>12</sup>

Little is known about toxic effects of NO<sub>x</sub>. They may cause increased susceptibility to respiratory infections.<sup>13</sup> There is evidence that nitrogen oxides can cause damage to lung tissue.<sup>14</sup> Hydrocarbons, by themselves and in reaction products with NO<sub>x</sub>, are not well understood in their effects on humans. Eye irritation and changes in pulmonary function have been associated with these substances.<sup>15</sup> Most effects have been measured at very high concentrations over 100 ppm. Hydrocarbons combine with other substances in the atmosphere to produce a variety of acids which can harm metal. However, effects on humans, even at concentrations found near busy highways, is not known. Other exhaust products cause damage. Ozone, lead and asbestos are known to cause serious illness under some conditions. On the other hand, little is known about numerous other exhaust emission products.

To admit ignorance of health effects is not to say that no effects exist. Extreme caution is required; medical science is continually discovering unsuspected hazards in air pollutants. Particularly where substances are known to cause damage in animals, or to vegetation, the lack of available data on humans cannot be interpreted as an "all clear" signal.

*Concentrations*

The average automobile in 1968 produced approximately 53 grams of CO per mile.<sup>16</sup> Vehicle and speed variations produce individual deviations

... information is required; medical science is continually discovering unsuspected hazards to air pollutants. Particularly where substances are known to cause damage in animals, or to vegetation, the lack of available data on humans cannot be interpreted as an "all clear" signal.

#### *Concentrations*

The average automobile in 1968 produced approximately 53 grams of CO<sub>2</sub> per mile.<sup>16</sup> Vehicle and speed variations produce individual deviations from the average. Mean CO concentrations of 15 ppm are typical on busy streets.<sup>17</sup> Eight hour average concentrations of 40 ppm have been estimated for some off-street central urban areas, 75 ppm for the worst arterial streets, and 115 ppm for the worst city streets.<sup>18</sup> Garages, tunnels and loading docks tend to show higher concentrations.<sup>19</sup> Nitrogen oxides have not been extensively measured. Levels of from one to three ppm are sometimes reached in polluted atmospheres.<sup>20</sup> Similarly, hydrocarbon concentrations rarely exceed one ppm.<sup>21</sup>

#### *Use of Air Pollution Data in Highway Location and Design*

Highway planners ought to have a complete record of the air pollution effects of a proposed road. They should also be told what to do with the information. Under existing practice, the record on air pollution is never adequate; air pollution is rarely considered seriously; and, air pollution factors are given virtually no weight in decision-making.<sup>22</sup>

#### *An Adequate Record*

The Federal-Aid Highway Act,<sup>23</sup> and the regulations under it,<sup>24</sup> set no standards for the minimum information on air pollution which must be assembled by a highway planner before approval of a project. The Act requires the state highway department to consider "its impact on the environment" of the proposed route.<sup>25</sup> Federal Highway Administration guidelines, set forth in Policy and Procedure Memorandum 20-8, define the "environmental effects" to be considered to include: "Noise, and air and water pollution."<sup>26</sup>

The only guidelines for the facts which form the basis for consideration of air pollution are these:

Consideration of social, economic, and environmental effects shall include an analysis of information submitted to the State highway department in connection with public hearings or in response to the notice of the location or design for which a State highway department intends to request approval. It shall also include consideration of information developed by the State highway department or gained from other contacts with interested persons or groups.<sup>27</sup>

PPM 20-8 also requires location study reports to contain

[d]escriptions of the alternatives considered and a discussion of the anticipated social, economic and environmental effects of the alternatives, pointing out the significant differences and the reasons supporting the proposed location or design.<sup>28</sup>

Minimum standards for the information to be assembled to inform these required considerations of environmental effects are nowhere prescribed.



Vague guidance produces vague results. One highway report submitted under PPM 20-8 disposed of the air pollution problem in the following way:

An expressway along any route will reduce per-car exhaust emissions by permitting faster and more efficient vehicle operation. Other methods of reducing air pollution impact on adjacent land use include the use of an elevated alignment or the provision of planted park strips along the edges of depressed alignments.<sup>29</sup>

In the report and supporting materials no evidence appears of specific analysis of the impact of the proposed highway on air pollution at any particular adjacent location. Nor is there evidence of consideration of the impact on the total air pollution burden of the city or neighborhood.<sup>30</sup> We have found similar treatment of air pollution problems in the records on other urban freeways.<sup>31</sup> Such cursory disposition of complicated air pollution problems reflects an almost totally bankrupt record in the highway department. The rationale that higher freeway speeds actually reduce pollution is misleading and incomplete. It overlooks substantial risks of harm to human health and increases in pollution which may also result from the freeway.

While it is true that automobiles travelling at high speeds emit less carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons per mile than vehicles travelling at lower speeds,<sup>32</sup> emissions of oxides of nitrogen and of lead increase with higher speeds.<sup>33</sup> Furthermore, a new high speed corridor tends to generate entirely new automobile traffic entering the city, making up for some reduction in per-car emissions with more cars.<sup>34</sup> Even if a new road merely transfers existing traffic from other routes, air pollution effects are serious. The outputs of certain pollutants from a freeway may be less than the total accumulation of outputs from a large number of arterial streets; but, the freeway, as a single line source of concentrated pollutants exceeds the emissions from any one of the arterial streets. The implications for surrounding land use is clear; it is particularly alarming for joint and multiple use projects which are located over, under and immediately adjacent to the freeway.

Critical facts such as these are repeatedly overlooked by highway planners, primarily because the information is never assembled. This performance is inconsistent with the Congressional intent behind the Urban Impact Amendment in the 1968 Act.<sup>35</sup> The purpose of the Amendment was to "insure that proper consideration will be given to the needs of communities through which highways are to be constructed."<sup>36</sup> It grew out of extensive hearings, one premise of which was:

We must provide those who make the decisions with more accurate information regarding the effects on the local areas, on their neighborhoods, and their people.<sup>37</sup>

Methods exist for creating an adequate record on air pollution more consistent with Congressional intent. On such a record, highway planners can decide intelligently whether and where to build the road. Reasonably sound measurements can be made of the amounts of pollutants produced by each automobile. Traffic estimates, required to be made by State highway departments seeking federal approval,<sup>38</sup> can then be used to estimate total pollution on the highway. Forecasts of altered traffic patterns can be used to estimate the total increase or decrease in pollution burden for the entire city, or broad regions within it. Mathematical tools, based on observations of the dispersion of pollutants from sources such as freeways, can be used to estimate pollution concentrations at any distance from the road.<sup>39</sup> The latest medical research can be consulted to determine the effects on human health of concentrations estimated in this way.

This sort of record should be made before any urban freeway is approved. It can be guaranteed if standards for the information to be assembled are included in the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) regulations in something like the following form:

State highway departments shall obtain and consider the following information in considering the air pollution effects of the proposed location:

- 1) Concentrations of each of the following substances measured at intervals of 50 feet horizontally and vertically from the center line of the proposed highway to a distance of 2500 feet from the center line:

(a) carbon monoxide

state highway departments shall obtain and consider the following information in considering the air pollution effects of the proposed location:

1) Concentrations of each of the following substances measured at intervals of 50 feet horizontally and vertically from the center line of the proposed highway to a distance of 2500 feet from the center line:

- (a) carbon monoxide
- (b) oxidants
- (c) nitrogen oxides
- (d) hydrocarbons
- (e) asbestos
- (f) lead
- (g) particulate matter.

Such estimates shall be based on estimates of traffic contained in FHWA Form PR-1, and shall employ the method set forth for estimating diffusion from line sources in D. TURNER, WORKBOOK OF ATMOSPHERIC DISPERSION ESTIMATES (Public Health Service Pub. No. 999-AP-26 1967). Such estimates shall be made for the various climatic conditions prevailing in the area throughout the year;

2) Measurements of existing concentrations of pollutants for each fifty foot intervals shall be made for the proposed route of the highway. Such measurements shall be made under the various climatic conditions prevailing in the area throughout the year and shall be made on a 24-hour, 8-hour and peak hour basis;

3) Existing average concentrations and estimated concentrations after construction of the highway of each of the pollutants listed in section (1) for the metropolitan area as a whole and for each geographical sub-region of the metropolitan area through which the proposed highway will pass;

4) Existing land use in each fifty foot interval for which estimates and measurements are made under subsections (1) and (2) and land use shown on any official regional or metropolitan plan;

5) The most recent medical and scientific research of the effects upon humans, animals, vegetation, and property of the estimated concentrations of the substances at each fifty foot interval.<sup>40</sup>

This method has been tried. Data of this sort was assembled in a limited way for hearings on the proposed Lower Manhattan Expressway in New York City.<sup>41</sup> A simple dispersion model was used; meteorological effects were, for the most part, ignored.<sup>42</sup> The following estimates were made for carbon monoxide concentrations on the assumption of 15,000 vehicles per hour:

roadway surface . . . . .	90 ppm
adjacent streets . . . . .	60 ppm
covered roadway . . . . .	300 ppm
streets adjacent to covered roadway . . . . .	300 ppm

This sort of data is particularly critical for joint and multiple use projects. Each such project is, by definition, in close proximity to the freeway. Many of these projects have been planned and completed without a study of air pollution problems. Among the many joint use projects are the following: a medical center (over a road), a high school (adjacent), a public library (over), an exhibition and convention center (over), apartments (over), and office buildings (over and adjacent).<sup>43</sup>

The Lower Manhattan Expressway study projected CO concentrations at the location of a proposed school over the roadway to be at least 60 ppm. A study after the fact of the George Washington Bridge Apartments, constructed over an interstate highway in New York City, shows carbon monoxide levels as high as 22 ppm inside third floor apartments, and 24 hour average concentrations of 14 ppm.<sup>44</sup> Similar levels were found in apartments on the 30th floor. These levels could have been predicted with an adequate study in advance of approval of the highway and the joint use air rights project.<sup>45</sup> Air pollution data such as this is plainly relevant. It is available to any highway planner who seeks it. He should be required to assemble this material and, if necessary, he should be explicitly instructed to think about the air pollution facts which are produced.<sup>46</sup>

#### *Weight of Air Pollution Factors*

The importance of air pollution health hazards in highway decision-making is not prescribed in existing law. No threshold of unacceptability tells the planner when he must return to his drawing board and eliminate the hazardous effects. States are required only to "consider" air pollution; no standards dictate which highways cannot be built. The Secretary of Transportation is guided only by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.<sup>47</sup>

In view of its potential for havoc in human health, air pollution arguably requires an absolute rule, barring a proposed highway until its harmful effects are eliminated. It is difficult to conceive of any benefits of the road which are sufficiently great to outweigh properly defined and adequately proved health hazards.<sup>48</sup> Under such a rule, where harm to human health caused by air pollution is clear, the road would have to be redesigned, relocated or eliminated.

But most air pollution information is not totally clear and distinct. Health effects on humans at concentrations found near highways are shown in a relatively small proportion of the medical studies. Only recently have studies begun to emerge which reveal effects upon humans at commonly encountered levels of concentration.<sup>49</sup> The result is that literature often shows studies of effects on animals or humans at concentrations far higher than those to which humans are normally exposed. Extrapolations to human health hazards at normal highway concentrations are uncertain. Thus, the record before the State highway department, even if developed in accordance with the standards suggested above, will show a series of risks of varying intensity, and only a few clear instances of harm.<sup>50</sup>

Commitment of evaluation of these uncertainties to administrative decision without guidelines fails to give adequate protection to what should be an important issue of public health. Not only is the administrator more or less free to ignore the risks, but reviewing courts have no usable standards for examining his action.<sup>51</sup> Regulations should prescribe the quantum of proof which requires the proponent of the highway to change the project. Models for such regulations exist, covering the spectrum from a very high burden of proof to a very low one. Under the traditional tort rules for proving causation in a suit to abate a nuisance, the burden is comparatively high—proof of cause in fact by a preponderance of the evidence.<sup>52</sup> Most highway air pollution proof may not rise to this rather high tort standard:

The uncertainty inherent in relying on medical studies of health hazards is accommodated in the food additive amendments to the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, by establishing a very low burden of proof as the trigger to banning proposed action. The Act provides:

[N]o additive shall be deemed to be safe if it is found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal, or if it is found, after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of the safety of food additives, to induce cancer in man or animal.<sup>53</sup>

Under this standard, food additives are banned even though the studies



...is a very low one. Under the traditional tort rules for proving causation in a suit to abate a nuisance, the burden is comparatively high—proof of cause in fact by a preponderance of the evidence.<sup>52</sup> Most highway air pollution proof may not rise to this rather high tort standard.

The uncertainty inherent in relying on medical studies of health hazards is accommodated in the food additive amendments to the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, by establishing a very low burden of proof as the trigger to banning proposed action. The Act provides:

[N]o additive shall be deemed to be safe if it is found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal, or if it is found, after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of the safety of food additives, to induce cancer in man or animal.<sup>53</sup>

Under this standard, food additives are banned even though the studies which show inducement of cancer involve laboratory situations which offer little basis for extrapolation to humans. This gap between evidence and administrative action is explicitly recognized by enforcement officials. In restricting cyclamates, one official said:

We can in no way at this time extrapolate the new data from rat experiments to human beings. Nevertheless, we in this Department—whether from a legal or from a scientific point of view—cannot afford to ignore any possibility of the rat data being applicable to human population. As long as this possibility exists, a prudent concern for the health of the public dictates that precautionary action be taken.<sup>54</sup>

This enforcement philosophy has been upheld in court, where a food additive ban was upheld despite the fact that the amounts used by humans were relatively small.<sup>55</sup>

The range between the tort standard's "cause in fact" and HEW's "possibility" test, offers many options for design of a regulation which provides explicit protection from new air pollution dangers caused by urban freeways. Given the nature of the medical evidence, however, any test requiring substantially more than a showing of a possibility of harm will offer relatively little protection.

#### *Required Action*

When the record shows an air pollution hazard with sufficient certainty to meet the applicable test, the highway planner must respond by changing his plans. He may have several options, although many of these may be freighted with such enormous social or economic costs that they are alternatives in theory only.

Elimination is required when no other device will avoid the air pollution hazard. This is most likely to occur when the new highway will encourage so much new traffic into the city that the total air pollution burden in the city, or a region of it, will be increased. Even with reductions in per-car emissions that accompany higher freeway speeds for some pollutants, the offsetting effect of the increase in amounts of other pollutants and new traffic may produce a new hazard. It is a hazard which cannot be avoided easily by simply redesign or relocation.

Highway engineers claim that air pollution effects of urban freeways can be reduced substantially through the use of such devices as elevating the road and planting green belts around it.<sup>56</sup> Such solutions may create problems of their own. An elevated roadway is likely to be extremely offensive to the eye.<sup>57</sup>

When air pollution dangers can be localized in particular adjacent properties, acquisition of these properties solves the health problem. The Highway Act provides, as it must, for acquisition of land within the path of the road.<sup>58</sup> Acquisition of land for other purposes, such as scenic enhancement of the road<sup>59</sup> and fringe parking,<sup>60</sup> is also authorized. Control of adjacent land is encouraged through incentive payments to bar billboards on nearly private land,<sup>61</sup> and to screen and control junk yards.<sup>62</sup> Relocation assistance is provided for a "displaced person" whose property is acquired "in whole or in part" for a highway.<sup>63</sup> But neither acquisition nor relocation is provided to persons faced with air pollution hazards as a result of the new road. It is one of the uncompensated non-construction costs of the highway.<sup>64</sup> Acquisition of adjacent properties exposed to new air pollution hazards would solve the problem. However, extending the sweep of land acquisition may cause social and economic disruption exceeding that already considered undesirable in urban freeway construction.<sup>65</sup> The result may be that the highway simply cannot be built because the costs are too high.

Use of the completed highway can be controlled to meet pollution control standards. Access controls have been authorized on federally-financed highways, although for different reasons.<sup>66</sup> Limiting the number or type of vehicles using the highway will limit pollution. A toll, or special tax, to use the highway would provide an economic incentive to limit road use. Such a charge would also impose an appropriate assessment on the automobile owner for his use of the air to dispose of his engine combustion wastes. The highway might be restricted to vehicles complying with strict standards on emissions.<sup>67</sup>

#### Conclusion

Ignorance of air pollution effects of proposed highways is common and inexcusable. Information which can form the basis for an intelligent estimate of the new risks to human health is available. On the basis of such information, highway planners should be required to eliminate hazards to health. While some area for dispute may exist as to how much proof is necessary to require redesign, relocation or elimination of a road, the current practice of refusing to see the air pollution problem should stop.

1. Hurn, *Mobile Combustion Sources*, in 3 AIR POLLUTION 56-63 (2d ed. A. Stern 1968).

2. NATIONAL TUBERCULOSIS AND RESPIRATORY DISEASE ASSOCIATION, AIR POLLUTION PRIMER 34 (1969).

3. 3 AIR POLLUTION, *supra* note 1, at 57-60.

4. *Id.* at 60-61. See also Hirschler, *Particulate Lead Compounds in Automobile Exhaust Gas*, 49 INDUS. & ENG'G CHEM. 1131 (1957).

5. Beard & Wertheim, *Behavioral Impairment Associated with Small Doses of Carbon Monoxide*, 57 AM. J. PUB. HEALTH 2012 (1967).

6. *Id.* at 524.

7. NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCE AND NATIONAL ACADEMY OF ENGINEERING, EFFECTS OF CHRONIC EXPOSURE TO LOW LEVELS OF CARBON MONOXIDE 55 (1969).

8. Beard & Grandstaff, *CO Exposure and Cerebral Function*, Paper presented to Conference on Biological Effects of Carbon Monoxide, New York Academy of Sciences, January 12-14, 1970.

9. NATIONAL AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION, AIR QUALITY CRITERIA FOR CARBON MONOXIDE 10-6 (Dep't of HEW Pub. No. AP-62, 1970); Schulte, *Effects of Mild Carbon Monoxide Concentration*, 7 ARCHIVES OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH 524-30 (1963).

10. AIR QUALITY CRITERIA FOR CARBON MONOXIDE, *supra* note 9, at 8-52.

11. *Id.* at 8-31.

12. Goldsmith, *Carbon Monoxide and Coronary Heart Disease*, 71 ANNALS OF INTERNAL MEDICINE 199-200 (1969).

13. Blair, *Chronic Toxicity of Nitrogen Dioxide*, 18 ARCHIVES ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH 186 (1969).

14. Ehrlich & Henry, *Chronic Toxicity of Nitrogen Dioxide*, 17 ARCHIVES OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH 860 (1968).

15. NATIONAL AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION, AIR QUALITY CRITERIA FOR HYDROCARBONS 7-19 to 7-26 (Dep't of HEW Pub. No. AP-64, 1970).

16. AIR QUALITY CRITERIA FOR CARBON MONOXIDE, *supra* note 9, at 4-2.

17. Bove & Siebenberg, *Airborne Lead and Carbon Monoxide at 45th Street, New York City*, 167 SCIENCE 986 (1970).

18. AIR QUALITY CRITERIA FOR CARBON MONOXIDE, *supra* note 9, at 6-22.

19. *Id.* at 6-23.

20. AIR POLLUTION PRIMER, *supra* note 2, at 41.

21. AIR QUALITY CRITERIA FOR HYDROCARBONS, *supra* note 15, at 3-1 to 3-15.

22. Highways do not cause air pollution; they are places where polluters congregate. Although air pollution can be eliminated from a proposed highway corridor by eliminating the highway, cleansing vehicle emissions has the same effect. The propriety of relying on improved emission control technology, and therefore the relevance of this article, depends in substantial part on the likelihood that vehicle emissions will be eliminated within the foreseeable future. Current enforcement programs will not reduce vehicle air pollution in the long run. S. REP. NO. 91-64, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. 31 (1970). Standards are being tightened. Compare 45 C.F.R. § 85.21 (1969) with proposed amendments to § 85.21 in 45 Fed. Reg. 11339 (1970). New legislation pro-



FOR HYDROCARBONS 7-19 to 7-26 (Dep't of HEW Pub. No. AP-64, 1970).

16. AIR QUALITY CRITERIA FOR CARBON MONOXIDE, *supra* note 9, at 4-2.

17. Bove & Siebenberg, *Airborne Lead and Carbon Monoxide at 45th Street, New York City*, 167 SCIENCE 986 (1970).

18. AIR QUALITY CRITERIA FOR CARBON MONOXIDE, *supra* note 9, at 6-22.

19. *Id.* at 6-23.

20. AIR POLLUTION PRIMTR, *supra* note 2, at 41.

21. AIR QUALITY CRITERIA FOR HYDROCARBONS, *supra* note 15, at 3-1 to 3-15.

22. Highways do not cause air pollution: they are places where polluters congregate. Although air pollution can be eliminated from a proposed highway corridor by eliminating the highway, cleansing vehicle emissions has the same effect. The propriety of relying on improved emission control technology, and therefore the relevance of this article, depends in substantial part on the likelihood that vehicle emissions will be eliminated within the foreseeable future. Current enforcement programs will not reduce vehicle air pollution in the long run. S. REP. NO. 91-64, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. 31 (1970). Standards are being tightened. Compare 45 C.F.R. § 85.21 (1969) with proposed amendments to § 85.21 in 35 Fed. Reg. 11339 (1970). New legislation proposing stricter standards has been introduced. See, e.g., H.R. REP. NO. 19024, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. (1970); H.R. REP. NO. 18980, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. (1970); S. REP. NO. 3229, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. (1970). The chances for a "clean" automobile are extremely cloudy. Predictions range from very soon to very far away. See, e.g., Hearings on S. 3229, S. 3466, S. 3546 Before the Subcomm. on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. 197 (1970); STAFF OF SENATE COMM. ON COMMERCE, 91st Cong., 1st Sess., REPORT ON THE SEARCH FOR A LOW-EMISSION VEHICLE (Comm. Print 1969); AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY, CLEANING OUR ENVIRONMENT: THE CHEMICAL BASIS FOR ACTION 46-56 (1969). "No significant reduction in automotive air pollution is expected to result in the next decade from the advent of vehicles with unconventional power sources." *Id.* at 56. Substantial amounts of research money are being devoted to the search for a cleaner automobile. Hearings on S. 3229, *supra* at 360-62. See also NAAPCA Announces Incentive Program for Unconventional Power Sources, 1 ENVIRON. RPTR. 282 (1970). When the uncertainty that alternative technology will be developed soon is combined with the problems of phasing out old vehicles even after new technology is available, and the problems of policing the efficacy of pollution control devices, the propriety of relying on emission control technology to solve urban highway air pollution problems is doubtful.

23. 23 U.S.C. §§ 101-511 (Supp. V, 1970).

24. 23 C.F.R. §§ 1.1-1.38 (1969).

25. 23 U.S.C. § 128(a) (Supp. V, 1970).

26. Policy and Procedure Memoranda are statements by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), issued under 23 C.F.R. § 1.32 (1969).

Policy and Procedure Memorandum 20-8, § 4c(15) (1969) [hereinafter cited as PPM].

The Administrator shall promulgate and require the observance of such policies and procedures, and may take such other action as he may deem necessary for carrying out the provisions and purposes of the Federal Laws and the regulations in this part.

27. *Id.* § 9.

28. *Id.* § 10b(1).

29. CROSSTOWN ASSOCIATES, CHICAGO CROSSTOWN EXPRESSWAY—ROUTE LOCATION: MIDWAY/SKYWAY—ADDENDUM ON SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS 12 (1970). The letter transmitting this document states that "this material is designed to meet the requirements of paragraphs 10b of PPM 20-8." Letter from Crosstown Associates to George T. March, Feb. 2, 1970.

30. Something more of the learning available to the highway officials responsible for the Chicago Crosstown Expressway can be seen in a letter from the Commissioner of Public Works to a citizen seeking information about the air pollution effects of the proposed highway. He replied:

The question of air pollution has been investigated with the Department of Air Pollution Control. Generally speaking, research into air pollution and highways indicates that the amount of pollution produced by automobiles and trucks is less on limited access highways than on arterial or local streets. For example, hydrocarbons produced by the exhaust of automobiles on expressways are reduced by 25 to 50 per cent over arterial streets, and 50 to 160 per cent over local streets. This reduction is even more dramatic for carbon monoxide emissions. It should also be noted that the Motor Vehicle Air Pollution Control Act of 1965 required that all new automobiles be equipped with air pollution control devices which conform to standards set forth in this Act. As a result, the total volume of pollutant emissions will be reduced.

Letter from Milton Pikarsky to Citizen, July 20, 1968. Letters such as this are part of the public record maintained in the Division 10 office of the Illinois State Highway Department.



31. We did not make a careful sample. We inspected files covering urban freeways in several states. The treatment of air pollution found in the Chicago Crosstown report appeared everywhere. For example, in the District of Columbia, complaints about air pollution effects of proposed freeways were handled as follows:

Air pollution has been cited as a reason for not building freeways. The fact is this: We're going to continue having air pollution even if not a single mile of freeway is built. . . . Stopping freeway building would simply keep vehicles on surface streets where stops and starts make engines burn the dirtiest, instead of on higher speed freeways, where they burn the cleanest. . . . The way to reduce pollution produced by motor vehicles is by attacking the cause: the engine emissions.

D.C. DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A FREEWAY IN THE NORTHERN SECTOR AND RELATED POLICY 24 (1970). This District of Columbia report was not submitted under PPM 20-8.

32. See 3 AIR POLLUTION, *supra* note 1, at 57-60.

33. *Id.* at 60-61.

34. BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS, HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL (1969).

35. Act of Aug. 23, 1968, Pub. L. No. 90-495, § 24, 82 Stat. 828, amending 23 U.S.C. § 128(a) (1964).

36. SENATE COMM. ON PUBLIC WORKS, REPORT ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1968, S. REP. NO. 1340, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. 28 (1968).

37. *Hearings on Urban Highway Planning, Location, and Design Before the Subcomm. on Roads of the Senate Comm. on Public Works*, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. 185 (1968) [hereinafter cited as *Senate Urban Highway Hearings*].

38. See 23 U.S.C. § 109(b) (Supp. V, 1970); PPM 21-1 § 8b(3). See also Bureau of Public Roads Form PR-1.

39. See, e.g., AIR QUALITY CRITERIA FOR CARBON MONOXIDE, *supra* note 9, at 6-26 to 6-27; METEOROLOGY AND ATOMIC ENERGY (Atomic Energy Comm. Pub. No. TID-24190 1968); OTT, CLARKE & OZOLINS, CALCULATING FUTURE CARBON MONOXIDE EMISSIONS AND CONCENTRATIONS FROM URBAN TRAFFIC DATA (National Air Pollution Control Administration Pub. No. 999-AP-41 1967); D. TURNER, WORKBOOK OF ATMOSPHERIC DISPERSION ESTIMATES 40, 53 (Public Health Service Pub. No. 999-AP-26, 1967). The mathematical models described in these and similar sources account for the following factors: quantity of emissions, velocity of emissions at the source, turbulence of the atmosphere, and height of the source relative to the surrounding landscape. These methods have significant limitations. They fail to account for other nearby sources of pollution with the result that they frequently tend to underestimate true concentrations at given distances from the pollution source being measured. AIR QUALITY CRITERIA FOR CARBON MONOXIDE, *supra* note 9, at 6-26 to 6-27, which notes that diffusion models usually predict CO concentrations one-half to one-tenth of those actually measured. Diffusion models also fail to account for the wide variations in urban landscape, including tall buildings. Even so, these mathematical tools provide enough information to be an improvement over a complete absence of information. See AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY, CLEANING OUR ENVIRONMENT: THE CHEMICAL BASIS FOR ACTION 44 (1969). "Diffusion" refers to the mixing of pollutants with surrounding air by means of random particle or molecular motion. "Dispersion" refers to transport of pollutants by atmospheric currents. Despite their technical distinction, these words are often used loosely and interchangeably.

40. In the absence of a regulation, this prescription serves as a model for the evidence which should be assembled for presentation at location hearings required by § 128(a). A similar procedure should be followed for noise, producing estimates of perceived noise at 50 foot intervals from the proposed highway.

41. The study was conducted by the New York City Department of Air Resources.

42. Failure to consider meteorological factors was probably not fatal to the study's usefulness. The proposed road was to be in a sunken trench in which the movement of pollutants to adjacent areas most probably is dominated by true diffusion, rather than by wind and heat dispersion.

43. FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, HIGHWAY JOINT DEVELOPMENT AND MULTIPLE USE (1969). This publication contains a complete catalogue of joint development projects in connection with federal-aid highways in the United States.

44. NATIONAL CENTER FOR AIR POLLUTION CONTROL, SPECIAL CO SURVEY, (George Washington Bridge Apartments, New York City, July 3-14, 1967). It is ironic that joint use projects may create serious new urban freeway problems. The Senate Committee on Public Works is particularly fond of such projects as a solution to urban freeway problems. "We encourage the Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration, and individual state highway departments to give continued strong support to this so-called 'joint development' concept." 70 SENATE COMM. ON PUBLIC WORKS, REPORT ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1968, S. REP. NO. 1340, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. 8 (1968).

45. Noise pollution requires similar pre-study. "Schools neighboring busy airports and roadways in this country have reported severe disturbances in classroom activities from intruding noises from these transportation activities." *Hearings on S. 3229, S. 3466, S. 3546 Before the Subcomm. on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Comm. on Public Works*, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. 203, 207 (1970) (Statement of Dr. Alexander Cohen, Chief, National Noise Study, Bureau of Occupational Health and Safety, Dept. of HEW).

46. Such well-tested devices as mandatory findings of fact encourage the decision-maker to process the information presented to him. See FED. R. CIV. P. 52(a). Shifting the burden of proof also works. If the proponent of a new road is required to prove the absence of air pollution effects, evidence of air pollution must be dealt with carefully. See *Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference v. FPC*, 354 F.2d 608 (2d Cir. 1965), cert. denied, 384 U.S. 941 (1966); *Texas E. Trans. Corp. v. Wildlife Preserves, Inc.*, 48 N.J. 261, 225 A.2d 130 (1966); Tarlock, *Recent Natural Resource Case*, 8 NATURAL RESOURCES J. 1, 5 (1968). See also H.R. REP. NO. 1125, 88th Cong., 2d Sess. 1964; Krier, *Environmental Litigation and the Burden of Proof: Some Comments and Suggestions*, Sept. 11-12, 1969 (paper given at Conservation Foundation Conference on Law and the Environment).

47. 42 U.S.C. §§ 4331-47 (Supp. V, 1970). DOT has awarded a \$228,594 contract for assisting it in making its planning more responsive to environmental considerations. 2 CLEAN AIR & WATER NEWS No. 30 at 4 (1970). DOT considers the Act to be "the criterion for evaluating environmental and ecological considerations." *Id.*

48. This contrasts with Congressional policy on disruption of parkland for highways. Section 138 of the Highway Act bars invasion of parks unless "there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such land." 23 U.S.C. § 138 (Supp. V, 1970). Congress has stated that this section is not "a mandatory prohibition against the use of the enumerated lands, but, rather, is a discretionary authority which must be used with both wisdom and reason." CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3418, H.R. REP. NO. 1799, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. VI (1968). *Committee Minutes, Environmental Policy*

Conference on Law and the Environment).

47. 42 U.S.C. §§ 4331-47 (Supp. V, 1970). DOT has awarded a \$228,594 contract for assisting it in making its planning more responsive to environmental considerations. 2 CLEAN AIR & WATER NEWS No. 30 at 4 (1970). DOT considers the Act to be "the criterion for evaluating environmental and ecological considerations." *Id.*

48. This contrasts with Congressional policy on disruption of parkland for highways. Section 138 of the Highway Act bars invasion of parks unless "there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such land." 23 U.S.C. § 138 (Supp. V, 1970). Congress has stated that this section is not "a mandatory prohibition against the use of the enumerated lands, but, rather, is a discretionary authority which must be used with both wisdom and reason." CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3418, H.R. REP. NO. 1799, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. 32 (1968). Compare Michigan Environmental Protection Act of 1970, Enrolled House Bill No. 3055 § 3(1) with ME. REV. STAT. ANN. tit. 38, § 484 (1964). "The commission shall approve a [commercial or industrial] development proposal whenever it finds that . . . the proposed development has made adequate provision for fitting itself harmoniously into the existing natural environment and will not adversely affect existing uses, scenic character, natural resources or property values in the municipality or in adjoining municipalities." *Id.*

49. Hodgson, *Short-term Effects of Air Pollution on Mortality in New York City*, 4 ENVIRONMENT SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY 586:89 (1970).

50. The certainty of the evidence is further undermined by the imprecision of traffic estimates, pollution estimates, and diffusion models. See note 39 *supra*.

51. Courts willingly seize upon statutory standards if there are any. See, e.g., *Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference v. FPC*, 354 F.2d 608 (2d Cir. 1965), *cert. denied*, 384 U.S. 941 (1966). The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 may provide the statutory peg for judicial protection of the environment. However, explicit statutory protection is probably required. One lawyer suggests that the ninth amendment may provide judges with a basis for deciding cases in favor of environmental protection. Roberts, *An Environmental Lawyer Urges. Plead the Ninth Amendment*, NATURAL HISTORY Aug.-Sept., 1970 at 18.

52. See G. PROSSER, LAW OF TORTS 245-47 (3d ed. 1964). The plaintiff "must introduce evidence which affords a reasonable basis for the conclusion that it is more likely than not that the conduct of the defendant was a substantial factor in bringing about the result. A mere possibility of such is not enough." *Id.* at 247.

53. Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act § 409(c)(3)(A), 21 U.S.C. § 348(c)(3)(A) (Supp. V, 1970). Identical language appears in the Color Additive Amendment, Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act § 706(b)(5)(B), 21 U.S.C. § 376(b)(5)(B) (Supp. V, 1970). A similar standard is in effect under the pesticide provisions of the Act. Section 408 provides that "the Secretary may establish the tolerance applicable with respect to the use of any pesticide chemical in or on any raw agricultural commodity at zero level if the scientific data before the Secretary does not justify the establishment of a greater tolerance." 21 U.S.C. § 346a(b) (Supp. V, 1970). The regulations under § 408 provide that a zero tolerance may be established because:

- (a) A safe level of the pesticide chemical in the diet of two different species of warm-blooded animals has not been reliably determined.
- (b) The chemical is carcinogenic to or has other alarming physiological effects upon one or more of the species of the test animals used, when fed in the diet of such animals.

21 C.F.R. § 120.5 (1970).

54. Statement of Jesse L. Steinfeld, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Health and Scientific Affairs, Oct. 18, 1969.

55. See *Bell v. Gouddard*, 366 F.2d 177 (7th Cir. 1966).

56. See, e.g., CHICAGO CROSSTOWN EXPRESSWAY, *supra* note 29, at 12.

57. The planners of the Chicago Crosstown Expressway, who suggest "an elevated alignment" as one method of reducing air pollution, *id.*, should be familiar with this problem. Part of the Crosstown was originally planned as an elevated alignment and was severely criticized as an eyesore "siltway."

58. 23 U.S.C. § 109(f) (Supp. V, 1970).

59. *Id.* § 319. See also PPM 21-17 (Feb. 18, 1966); PPM 21-4-6 (Jan. 24, 1966).

60. Act of Aug. 23, 1968, Pub. L. No. 90-495 § 11(a), 82 Stat. 820-21, amending

23 U.S.C. § 120-21 (1964).

61. 23 U.S.C. § 131(b) (Supp. V, 1970).

62. *Id.* § 135.

63. *Id.* §§ 501-11.

64. *Hearings on Urban Highway Planning, Location, and Design Before the Subcomm. on Roads of the Senate Comm. on Public Works*, 90th Cong., 1st & 2d Sess., pt. 2, at 313, 343, 352 (1968) (Report by Anthony Downs). Whether excessive air pollution constitutes a "taking" of land for constitutional purposes is beyond the scope of this article.

65. With respect to § 138 of the Highway Act which attempts to preserve parklands, Congress has said: "The Congress does not believe, for example, that substantial numbers of people should be required to move in order to preserve these lands." CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3418, H.R. REP. NO. 1799, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. 32 (1968).

66. See *Statement of Position of the Federal Highway Administration on the Reservation of Freeway Lanes for Buses*, INSTRUCTIONAL MEMORANDUM 21-13-67 (Aug. 1967); AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURER'S ASS'N, THE POTENTIAL FOR BUS RAPID TRANSIT (1970).

67. Presumably such restrictions would not be illegal under the federal pre-emption of state emission control activity provided by 42 U.S.C. § 18571-6a(a) (Supp. V, 1970). See Currie, *Motor Vehicle Air Pollution: State Authority and Federal Pre-emption*, 68 MICH. L. REV. 1083, 1096 (1970).



1 Department of Internal Medicine of the New York Hospital-  
2 Cornell Medical Center.

3 I have held research fellowships at the Worcester  
4 Foundation for Experimental Biology and the Marine Biological  
5 Laboratories, Woods Hole, Massachusetts.

6 I am currently a Research Associate in the Labo-  
7 ratory of Clinical Pharmacology, National Institute of  
8 Mental Health and a Lieutenant Commander in the United States  
9 Public Health Service

10 I have lectured frequently on problems of the en-  
11 vironment and air pollution in particular. I have co-authored  
12 articles on medical and medical-legal aspects of air pollution.

13 I have been closely examining the problems of air  
14 pollution and air quality for seven years. I testified in  
15 October 1969 at hearings on the proposed standards for air  
16 quality for the District of Columbia and again in February  
17 1970 before the D. C. City Council at the hearings on the  
18 "Recommendations for a Freeway in the Northern Sector and  
19 Related Policy."

20 I have taught a "seminar at the National Institutes  
21 of Health entitled "The Ecological Effects of Air and Water  
22 Pollution." Let me diverge just a moment from my written  
23 statement, if I may. Is Mr. Airis one of you gentlemen?  
24 I have not had the pleasure of meeting him.

25 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: That's him over there, sir.

1 DR. COHN: Mr. Airis, I am very glad to be able to  
2 meet you. I have read on several occasions in the past, as I  
3 have noted the statements on air pollution that have been pre-  
4 sented by you as representing the Department of Transportation,  
5 I assume, its policy, on the question of automobiles and their  
6 relationship to air pollution. And please correct me if I do  
7 mistake you, but if I understand it correctly, the statement  
8 says something to the effect that at higher speeds, automobiles  
9 produce less pollutants, is that appropriately summarized?

10 MR. AIRIS: This is a question to me?

11 DR. COHN: Yes, sir.

12 MR. AIRIS: Yes, I think I have generally said  
13 something along that line, that at higher speeds there is less  
14 -- extremely less carbon monoxide. The internal combustion  
15 engine is more efficient at running speeds than it is at idling  
16 speeds.

17 DR. COHN: Yes? Yes. Yes, and it's very true with  
18 respect to carbon monoxide and with respect to hydrocarbons.  
19 There are a number of documents, several of which are coming  
20 out of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare relating  
21 to automobile speed and pollutant ignitions and others of which  
22 are covered in the three-volume - entitled "AIR POLLUTION -  
23 A. C. STERN," the editor of that, which is one of the seminal  
24 texts on the subject of air pollution, and it is true for carbon  
25 monoxide and hydrocarbons, in particular for carbon monoxide.



1           For example, automobiles travelling at 60 miles per  
2 hour will produce approximately half the amount of carbon  
3 monoxide as an automobile travelling at 30 miles an hour or so,  
4 and the table that actually gives those figures is contained  
5 in the HEW document, entitled "THE COMPILATION OF AIR POLLUTION  
6 EMISSION FACTORS." This only covers, of course, two of the air  
7 pollutants, and the data that is available, for example, on  
8 nitrogen oxides or on lead, shows that at increased speeds the  
9 amount of nitrogen oxides produced is markedly increased  
10 approximately to the same proportion that carbon monoxide is  
11 decreased; and the amount of lead is also markedly increased  
12 although, of course, lead is sort of up for grabs because there  
13 may be elimination of lead from gasoline. So, if one postulates  
14 that carbon monoxide is decreased--that is, only on a per car  
15 basis; but if one is proposing the construction of a new en-  
16 trance egress route to the city which may entice more people  
17 to bring their cars into the city, it may on a pound for pound  
18 basis offset the effect of the individual car decreasing  
19 carbon monoxide that may occur as a result of more rapidly mov-  
20 ing vehicles, and this is assuming that the vehicles do move  
21 consistently more rapidly and that one does not have traffic  
22 jams and so forth on a newly constructed bridge.

23           MR. AIRIS: Is this a question, too?

24           DR. COHN: No, sir, that's a statement.

25           THE AUDIENCE: (laughter)

1           The subject of my testimony is air pollution, already  
2 a serious problem in the District of Columbia, and caused in  
3 large part by automobiles (75% by weight).

4           It is proposed that the construction of the Three  
5 Sisters Bridge will facilitate access by automobiles to downtown  
6 Washington. It has been estimated that the Three Sisters  
7 Bridge will be able to carry 26,000 cars to and from the city  
8 each day.

9           It is a well-accepted maximum among highway econo-  
10 mists that, under saturation conditions, "people follow roads."  
11 In other words, under the present circumstances of a maximally-  
12 utilized roadway system, the construction of an additional  
13 access-egress route will not divert vehicles from the already  
14 saturated roadways. Instead, additional people will be en-  
15 ticed to use their vehicles, taking advantage of the new  
16 roadway. In other words, as many as 26,000 additional vehicles  
17 will, thanks to the Three Sisters Bridge, be able to gain access  
18 to the city. How will they get on and off the new roadway? How  
19 will they be accommodated on the city's streets? Where will  
20 they park?

21           These additional automobiles will mean more air  
22 pollution. In Washington, D. C., the automobile is, in  
23 quantitative terms, the primary air pollution problem.

24           These additional automobiles will mean increased  
25 amounts of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, oxidants, nitrogen



1 oxides and lead as well as asbestos, trace metals and other  
2 particulate components which will be spewed into the Washington  
3 atmosphere - already one of the most polluted in the nation.

4 A vast literature implicates air pollution in the  
5 exacerbation of bronchitis, emphysema, heart disease, asthma,  
6 and in the production of a variety of forms of cancer. It is  
7 known to worsen symptoms of the elderly and debilitated. It  
8 has been shown to increase the mortality among people suffer-  
9 ing from heart attacks.

10 Levels of carbon monoxide capable of causing physio-  
11 logic changes have been measured on busy city streets as well  
12 as in housing projects in proximity to highways. The inside  
13 of vehicles caught in traffic jams can attain carbon monoxide  
14 concentrations of near-lethal levels.

15 I seriously question that a bridge or highway causing  
16 such effects can be certified as "safe" as is required by  
17 Federal law.

18 The auto industry has made vague claims that they  
19 are capable of altering the internal combustion engine so  
20 that it will be non-polluting. Nevertheless, the prototype  
21 vehicles that have initially met stringent California standards  
22 have rapidly deteriorated so that by 10,000 miles the majority  
23 of the cars no longer have met the standards. At the same time  
24 that the automobile industry was saying that it could do the  
25 job, it was mobilizing a crass and callous lobbying blitz to

1 forestall federal legislation requiring that a relatively safe  
2 car be available by 1975. Thus, the auto industry on the one  
3 hand claims that it can deal with its own emissions and, on the  
4 other, says that it cannot possibly stop gassing us within the  
5 next five years.

6           It would be folly to assume that our air pollution  
7 problems are going to be solved for us by the automobile  
8 industry.

9           The construction of the Three Sisters Bridge will  
10 bring thousands of additional cars through the Georgetown area,  
11 past the nearby Georgetown Hospital and the numerous area  
12 schools.

13           Because of the serious health effects of placing  
14 people in juxtaposition to freeways, the Committee on Environ-  
15 ment of the American Institute of Architects in New York City  
16 has recommended that all utilization of air rights above and  
17 along throughways be halted until the completion of a  
18 Federally-funded study currently in progress in New York City  
19 to extensively measure for the first time the concentrations of  
20 automobile pollutants near roadways.

21           When New York City was considering the construction  
22 of the Lower Manhattan Expressway in 1968, a prospective study  
23 was undertaken to predict the potential health effects of the  
24 proposed roadway and the additional vehicles it would bring in-  
25 to the city. To our knowledge, no such study has been undertaken



1 concerning the Three Sisters Bridge. The New York studies,  
2 conducted by the New York City Department of Air Resources,  
3 predicted greatly increased carbon monoxide levels which  
4 reached, depending upon traffic volume, as high as 300 parts  
5 per million or more. This level is sufficient to cause  
6 unconsciousness in some people.

7 A study conducted by the National Air Pollution  
8 Control Administration measured the concentration of carbon  
9 monoxide in a housing project above IS95 in Manhattan. On a  
10 twenty-four hour average, levels above those known to be  
11 physiologically harmful were consistently found.

12 Yet it is proposed that we bring as many as 26,000  
13 cars additionally per day into downtown Washington to further  
14 gas the city's residents and workers. I would like to commend  
15 the City Administration as well as the Department of Transpor-  
16 tation for this novel solution to the population problem.

17 For those who cherish living things and natural  
18 beauty, it should be mentioned that plant life along the  
19 thoroughway would be significantly endangered - the beautiful  
20 Potomac Palisades and the quaint and cherished green-bordered  
21 pathway along the Georgetown section of the C&O Canal.

22 Thus the construction of the three Sisters Bridge  
23 presents an instance of the general problem of national  
24 priorities. Should we continue to exploit natural resources  
25 and the health of people under the misnomer of improving the

1 functioning of our megalopolis and the well-being of industry?

2 I have enclosed for the record a preprint of an  
3 article appearing in Volume XX of the Catholic University  
4 Law Review, entitled "AIR POLLUTION AND URBAN FREEWAYS." In  
5 this article I have listed the types of information that should  
6 and must be developed before any future urban freeways such as  
7 that under construction here are approved by state or federal  
8 highway authorities. This record should include the following  
9 information:

10 "1) Concentrations of each of the following sub-  
11 stances measured at intervals of 50 feet horizontally and  
12 vertically from the center line of the proposed highway to a  
13 distance of 2500 feet from the center line:

14 The proposed substances include -

- 15 (a) carbon monoxide  
16 (b) oxidants  
17 (c) nitrogen oxides  
18 (d) hydrocarbons  
19 (e) asbestos  
20 (f) lead  
21 (g) particulate matter.

22 Such estimates shall be based on estimates of traffic  
23 contained in FHWA Form PR-1, and shall employ the method set  
24 forth for estimating diffusion from line sources in D. Turner,  
25 Workbook of Atmospheric Dispersion Estimates (Public Health



1 Service Publication No. 999-AP-26 1967). Such estimates shall  
2 be made for the various climatic conditions prevailing in the  
3 area throughout the year;

4 "2) Measurements of existing concentrations of  
5 pollutants for each fifty foot interval shall be made for the  
6 proposed route of the highway. Such measurements shall be  
7 made under the various climactic conditions prevailing in the  
8 area throughout the year and shall be made on a 24-hour,  
9 8-hour and peak hour basis;

10 "3) Existing average concentrations and estimated  
11 concentrations after construction of the highway of each of  
12 the pollutants listed in section (1) for the metropolitan area  
13 as a whole and for each geographical sub-region of the metro-  
14 politan area through which the proposed highway shall pass;

15 "4) Existing land use in each fifty foot interval  
16 for which estimates and measurements are made under subsections  
17 (1) and (2) and land use shown on any official regional or  
18 metropolitan plan;

19 "5) The most recent medical and scientific research  
20 of the effects upon humans, animals, vegetation, and property  
21 of the estimated concentrations of the substances at each fifty  
22 foot interval."

23 Air pollution data such as this, is clearly relevant  
24 and necessary. It is available to any highway planner who  
25 seeks it. Before the proposed bridge and accompany highway

1 system is approved here, the District of Columbia government  
2 and the Federal Highway Administration should insist that  
3 similar data is developed immediately. Thank you, Mr.  
4 Chairman.

5 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you, Dr. Cohn.

6 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

7 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Wilson?

8 WHEREUPON,

9 MR. JOHNIE D. WILSON,

10 CITIZEN - 201 RITTENHOUSE STREET, N.E., WASHINGTON, D. C.,

11 APPROACHED THE PODIUM AND TESTIFIED, IN SUBSTANCE AS FOLLOWS:

12 MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman?

13 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Wilson?

14 MR. WILSON: Thank you.

15 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Good to see you.

16 MR. WILSON: It is awfully nice to see you, but not  
17 under these circumstances though. My name is Johnie D. Wilson.  
18 My name is spelled with one "n" and they have two "ns" here.  
19 My address isn't necessary, is it.

20 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: We have it on the agenda.

21 MR. WILSON: Okay, good. First, I would like to  
22 say that I object to this Hearing plus what Mr. Airis is  
23 attempting to do to the city. I did have some notes, or was  
24 attempting to pass some notes to talk here tonight but even  
25 sitting here, my first time coming in, even sitting here



1 listening, I think some of the things I might have said have  
2 already been said, so I don't think there is no point in me  
3 talking about the merits of the road, as to what it is going to  
4 do to the city, and what not. I think I would like to talk  
5 a little bit about the highway, the part that you and Mr. Airis  
6 are not holding hearings on.

7           The Three Sisters Bridge is a part of a network of  
8 highways. Now in order to talk about design hearings on the  
9 Three Sisters Bridge is like telling your wife that you are  
10 going down to the store to buy an automobile and say "I will  
11 buy the snow tire first." And, of course, if you bought the  
12 snow tires somebody would want to know what you are going to  
13 put it on.

14           So here, you are talking about a bridge. Now where  
15 is this bridge going. You know, you just don't build a bridge.  
16 Now I think that you and Mr. Airis know where this road is  
17 planning to go and what it is going to do to the city. But at  
18 this particular time that isn't under discussion. Now, some  
19 time ago, even before the reorganizayion of the City Government,  
20 we questioned Mr. Airis. We asked for Mr. Airis to be removed  
21 because what Mr. Airis was doing to this city wasn't in keeping  
22 with our democratic process. You know, when you ask people to  
23 come in and voice their opinion as to what they want and what  
24 they don't want, Mr. Airis always came up with the wrong  
25 answer. His answer was never in keeping with what the people

1 of the city wanted. We asked for Mr. Airis to be removed and  
2 for some reason Mr. Airis is still here.

3 Now, I notice Mr. Airis has gone through the Mayor-  
4 Commissioner, not the Mayor-Commissioner, but the Three  
5 Commissioners; and Mr. Airis has gone through one set of  
6 appointed delegates of councilmen, and now he is working on  
7 the second set; and I notice now he is down to you.

8 THE AUDIENCE: (laughter)

9 MR. WILSON: So?

10 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

11 MR. WILSON: I think there is one thing that we are  
12 going to have to do: we are going to have to either abide by  
13 our so-called democratic process, or we are going to destroy  
14 ourselves as all other governments have done who did not respond  
15 to the needs of the people that it is supposed to be governing.  
16 Now, we have had referendums, which if you ask your democratic  
17 process for people to come out and vote, we will vote it, and  
18 everybody voted down the highway, and we still have Mr. Airis  
19 here pushing highways and he is still on the payroll doing such.  
20 Now for some reason Mr. Airis, or the government who allows him  
21 to do that, is going to destroy the city.

22 We see what the Viet Nam war is doing to the country,  
23 and I think quite a few of us can see what Mr. Airis is doing  
24 to the city. We are going to have to make up our mind as to  
25 what we are going to do. Now here he is starting a part of



1 a jig-saw puzzle. He is starting up the Three Sisters Bridge.  
2 Some time ago we was supposed to have had a hearing talking  
3 about the other parts of this route as it will go through the  
4 city. For some reason, they came up with a plan that left  
5 quite a bit of it out. Mr. Airis took quite a bit of it out,  
6 and there was some talk about going down "U" Street, which --  
7 or "K" Street, and Mr. Airis is always vague as to where these  
8 places are going until he gets the authorization for them. Now  
9 I feel that a man in your position, in the city government --  
10 and I am under the opinion that you were sent here to represent  
11 the people. Now, I hope that what you have heard from the  
12 people, since you don't vote, and we have another problem.  
13 Now as important as this issue is, I can't see why the people who  
14 are going to make the decision wouldn't come here and sit, be-  
15 cause this hasn't just started. It has been going on for quite  
16 a few years. But since you are here, I am hoping that you  
17 can convey to the people you are supposed to report to, if the  
18 people in this town do not want the highway. Now I would like  
19 to say that maybe some of our problems will be cleared up if  
20 you get another another highway man here that will respond to  
21 the wishes of the people that he is supposed to be responding  
22 to. It appears where money is concerned it seems that every-  
23 body seems to think in that particular way. Even you have Mr.  
24 Airis and quite a few people around him. We told him about  
25 the bridge some time ago. The court ruled against him. And you

1 see, you still have this man here, still bumping you up against  
2 the bad decisions that he is making. So, I would like to say  
3 that if there is some way that we can get a responsive type of  
4 D. C. Government I think we will clear up quite a few of our  
5 problems. As far as Mr. Airis is concerned, I think this state-  
6 ment has been made to him before, and each time he gets vaguer  
7 and vaguer. That's about all I would like to say because I  
8 think all the other points have been covered, and I just hope  
9 that you will tell the Council and the Mayor that issues this  
10 important, as far as people are concerned, I think it would be  
11 nice if they would sit if they intend to represent the people  
12 as I understand they were appointed to do. Thank you.

13 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Wilson.

14 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

15 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. R. W. Curtis?

16 WHEREUPON,

17 MR. R. W. CURTIS,

18 CITIZEN, 2513 N. Quebec Street, Arlington, Virginia, approached  
19 the microphone and testified, in substance, as follows:

20 MR. CURTIS: Gentlemen, I thank you for the considera-  
21 tion of scheduling me for a definite time, and I didn't have to  
22 waste two days from my work like I did for the I-66 Hearings.  
23 I waited 10 hours to speak for that one. My name is Robert  
24 W. Curtis, Captain, U. S. Navy, Retired. I live at 2513  
25 N. Quebec Street, Arlington, Virginia. I am the Past President



1 of Arlingtonians for the preservation of the Potomac Palisades,  
2 founded in 1952; and I am presently a member of the Executive  
3 Committee. I have learned that you have to fight for your  
4 home every day of your life. I have lived in Arlington over  
5 19 years, and I drive the Beltway everyday. And if there is  
6 ever a monstrosity by the Cabin John Bridge I have yet to see  
7 it.

8 My remarks today will consist of a series of  
9 questions, trying to find out some of the facts with regard  
10 to this road, and I would appreciate if any one of the high-  
11 way representatives here would respond to the questions.

12 My first question: When, on what date, did the  
13 Bureau of Public Roads approve I-266 as part of the interstate  
14 system?

15 MR. AIRIS: Sir, I think that's in the booklet.

16 MR. CURTIS: I question whether that's in the book,  
17 an accurate statement in the book, and I would like you to put  
18 it on the record as to when it was approved.

19 MR. AIRIS: We'll put it on the record. I just want  
20 to verify when it was.

21 MR. CURTIS: Someone must know. It says "1960."  
22 What is the date that the Bureau of Public Roads approved I-266  
23 as a part of the interstate system?

24 MR. AIRIS: In June 1960, the Bureau of Public Roads,  
25 which is now the Federal Highway Administration, approved Route

1 266 as a part of the Interstate system. Since then they have  
2 reaffirmed it.

3 MR. CURTIS: When did they reaffirm it?

4 MR. AIRIS: Well, I think the date I have here, and  
5 it might bear some checking, is in August 29th, 1968. I have  
6 the date August 29th, but it's in 1948 but put a question mark  
7 after August 29th. I would have to double check that.

8 MR. CURTIS: Okay. So the brochure said it was  
9 approved in 1960. Has any corridor location hearings been  
10 held at that time?

11 MR. AIRIS: Corridor location?

12 MR. CURTIS: For I-266? You said it was approved in  
13 1960, originally but has any corridor locations been held by  
14 the time it was approved?

15 MR. DeGAST: The initial approval did not require  
16 a corridor location hearing with which to consider as part of  
17 the interstate system. The reaffirmation in 1968 and 1969  
18 was, of course, subsequent to the equivalent of a corridor  
19 hearing.

20 MR. AIRIS: This was Mr. DeGast.

21 MR. CURTIS: Can an Interstate highway segment be  
22 approved without a location hearing?

23 MR. AIRIS: Sir, the project itself cannot. That is  
24 true. But the initial layout of the interstate system was done  
25 some time around 1960.



1 MR. CURTIS: I see. When was the first location  
2 hearing on I-266 held?

3 MR. AIRIS: In 1964. There have been earlier hear-  
4 ings but the one that is for this location is 1964.

5 MR. CURTIS: I see. Then the one in 1962 was just  
6 an ad hoc sort of rehearsal, is that correct? I spent an  
7 awful long time at that one, and it seems to me that was  
8 advertised as a location hearing for I-266, is that not correct?

9 MR. AIRIS: I don't know this of my own knowledge  
10 but I am advised here that in 1962 there was also a hearing  
11 on the Three Sisters Bridge.

12 MR. CURTIS: Well, perhaps the Virginia highway  
13 people could elucidate on this matter. They were there, as I  
14 recall.

15 MR. SNEAD: That's right, Mr. Curtis, we had a loca-  
16 tion hearing on Spout Run in 1966.

17 MR. CURTIS: Was adequate notice given concerning  
18 the 1966 location hearing?

19 MR. SNEAD: What's your question again, Mr. Curtis?

20 MR. CURTIS: Was adequate notice given concerning the  
21 1966 location hearing?

22 MR. SNEAD: 1960 what?

23 MR. CURTIS: 1962 location hearing - was adequate  
24 notice given?

25 MR. SNEAD: Mr. Curtis, I am not familiar with the 1962

1 Public Hearing.

2 MR. CURTIS: Well, I am, and we got the word through  
3 the Washington Star the day before the Hearing, and supposedly  
4 it was advertised in the Northern Virginia Sun, which nobody  
5 buys anymore because it doesn't give out the word very well,  
6 and what happened, for your information, was that the neighbors  
7 found this the day before the hearing and we marshalled every-  
8 body to go over to the Hearing. The remarks of the highwayman  
9 who was holding the hearings was that this is strange, he  
10 thought the only people that were interested in hippopotamuses  
11 were hippopotamuses; and he thought the only people interested  
12 in highways were highway people. Well, he found out differently .  
13 Anyway, I was going to ask the question: In what newspapers  
14 were the announcements made of the '62 hearing, which apparently  
15 you don't know the answer to that.

16 MR. DeGAST: Mr. Curtis, we can produce that for the  
17 record.

18 MR. CURTIS: Okay, it would be good to put it in the  
19 record, because I think it was a short fused hearing.

20 MR. DeGAST: I believe the notices as issued then  
21 were in conformance with the then legal proceedings.

22 MR. CURTIS: That may be true, I grant you that.  
23 This is four years after the I-66 Hearing - the I-66 Location  
24 Hearing, the 1962 Hearing was four years after the I-66 location.  
25 If as its stated in the history of I-266, the Bureau of Public



1 Roads approved I-266 in 1960, why was the first hearing on  
2 its location delayed two years until 1962?

3 MR. AIRIS: Is this a question to me now?

4 MR. CURTIS: No, it's a question to anybody who  
5 cares to answer, sir.

6 MR. AIRIS: Well, the system was laid out prior to  
7 the time that the--well, it's just a systemat--that is, the  
8 general location, just general. And until the hearings are  
9 held it's not nailed down as to an exact location.

10 MR. CURTIS: Well, apparently, then, there was some  
11 urgency to hold the '62 location hearing. Can you give us  
12 any information as to why the hearing suddenly became urgent?  
13 It was just dropped on us.

14 MR. AIRIS: Well, that's two years.

15 MR. CURTIS: Why were three alternatives - locations -  
16 considered at the Public Hearing in 1964 when we had already had  
17 this hearing?

18 MR. AIRIS: The three locations in 1964 were as a  
19 result of recommendations made by the National Capitol Planning  
20 Commission, and what was then called "policy advisory committee"  
21 that was appointed at the suggestion of President Kennedy to  
22 advise the District Commissioners--

23 MR. CURTIS: --Yes, I recall that.

24 MR. AIRIS: --and out of that group came the request  
25 that a study be made. And the study indicated three recommended

1 locations for the Hearing in 1964.

2 MR. CURTIS: Is the present location for which this  
3 design hearing is being held one of those three alternatives?

4 MR. AIRIS: Yes, sir, it is the middle location. The  
5 first location was downstream of Key Bridge; the upper location  
6 was just downstream of the reservoir on the D. C. side; and the  
7 Spout Run location is substantially the same location that we  
8 have after this time. Now at that Hearing, sir, there were a  
9 great number of comments made and this location reflects the  
10 recommendations that were made in the 1964 Hearing plus other  
11 detailed study recommendations.

12 MR. CURTIS: But what you say is that this location  
13 is not exactly one of the three alternatives that were presented  
14 in '64?

15 MR. AIRIS: It is not exactly; if you are coming down  
16 to the foot.

17 MR. CURTIS: Is it very much the same as the 1962  
18 Location Hearing?

19 MR. AIRIS: Very close.

20 MR. CURTIS: Exactly. Let's go back to the date the  
21 Bureau of Public Roads gave approval for I-266, which includes  
22 the Three Sisters Bridge. What was the date again - did you  
23 say?

24 MR. AIRIS: Well, I think the initial date was 1960.  
25 It was somewhere thereabouts, and I have the 1960 date.



1 MR. CURTIS: Well, the final approval was given in  
2 1969? 1959?

3 MR. AIRIS: I told you in 1968, I think.

4 MR. CURTIS: Yes. Had construction started prior to  
5 that date - the 1968 date?

6 MR. AIRIS: Had construction started prior to the 1968  
7 date?

8 MR. CURTIS: Yes.

9 MR. AIRIS: On the bridge?

10 MR. CURTIS: Yes.

11 MR. AIRIS: No.

12 MR. CURTIS: Well, how come the court stopped con-  
13 struction in January 1968? Which is what you said in your  
14 brochure, I think.

15 MR. AIRIS: Well, I think someone is reading something  
16 a little wrong here.

17 MR. CURTIS: I quote, I read: "The Court of Appeals,  
18 however, ordered work to cease in February 1968," right out  
19 of the brochure. So, you started construction before you had  
20 approval, is that correct?

21 MR. AIRIS: Well, all this says, sir, is the Court  
22 of Appeals, however, ordered work to cease in February of 1968.

23 MR. CURTIS: Well, then, work must have been started  
24 at that time.

25 MR. AIRIS: Well, if you say so.

1 THE AUDIENCE: (laughter)

2 MR. CURTIS: Well, I certainly do, and I can't see  
3 how the Court of Appeals could order you to stop if you hadn't  
4 started.

5 MR. AIRIS: Well, what you are referring to--that is,  
6 what the court was referring to is design functions not actual  
7 construction work. I think you used the word "construction."

8 MR. CURTIS: All right, if you want to weasel out of  
9 it, that's okay. (laughing)

10 MR. AIRIS: Well, sir, I don't want to weasel out of  
11 anything, I want to be completely fair. (laughing).

12 MR. CURTIS: Okay. All right. I understood from  
13 this thing that work had actually started, not just design.  
14 Okay.

15 Another question: When did the National Park Service  
16 agree to give up the Spout Run Parklands?

17 MR. SNEAD: I have got a copy of the agreement here,  
18 Mr. Curtis, just a second. "George G. H... 's" letter to Mr. <sup>or</sup>  
19 F.. - Fugat - Air Commissioner, Virginia Department of Highways.  
20 "October 1st, 1969."

21 MR. CURTIS: "October 1st 1969." That's last year,  
22 just a little over a year ago.

23 MR. SNEAD: Yes.

24 MR. CURTIS: All right, is the Theodore Roosevelt  
25 Bridge part of I-66?



1 MR. SNEAD: Theodore Roosevelt Bridge?

2 MR. CURTIS: Yes.

3 MR. SNEAD: It is a part of I-56; yes, sir.

4 MR. CURTIS: Was it ever closed to truck traffic?

5 MR. AIRIS: Would you repeat that, sir?

6 MR. CURTIS: Was the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge ever  
7 closed to truck traffic?

8 MR. AIRIS: Yes.

9 MR. CURTIS: Why?

10 MR. AIRIS: It was, as I recall, in the law - in its  
11 enabling legislation - in the enabling legislation it was  
12 stated it would not be utilized for truck traffic.

13 MR. CURTIS: Has that enabling legislation been  
14 rescinded?

15 MR. AIRIS: "Has it?" No.

16 MR. CURTIS: Then how come the bridge is open for  
17 truck traffic today?

18 MR. AIRIS: I don't believe it is.

19 MR. CURTIS: It certainly is. There's a sign on it.  
20 There's a sign on it. It's always been open. Was the decision  
21 to push for I-266. . .?

22 MR. AIRIS: May I clear this up here. Have you  
23 actually seen trucks on it?

24 MR. CURTIS: I have seen the sign that say "Trucks  
25 have to turn off when they get to Constitution Avenue."

1 A SPECTATOR: "Left Lane."

2 MR. CURTIS: Left Lane.

3 MR. AIRIS: Well, what you are referring to is the  
4 sign that says, coming south on the Potomac River Freeway,  
5 that all trucks must turn left on "D" Street Expressway.

6 MR. CURTIS: That may be, but I know from a letter  
7 from Mr. Udall, when he was Secretary of the Interior, that he  
8 said that trucks could use the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, and  
9 at the same time he said that you had built an extra lane on  
10 George Washington Parkway from Theodore Roosevelt Bridge to  
11 Spout Run cutoff, which it never happened. But that's what he  
12 said, and he said there was no reason the trucks couldn't use the  
13 bridge. Anyway, was the decision to push for I-266---

14 MR. AIRIS (interposing): Mr. Chairman, could we  
15 clear this up? I just want to be sure that I don't leave  
16 something dangling here.

17 MR. CURTIS: Yes, sir? I am open to your questions.

18 MR. AIRIS: Well, it's not a question. I would just  
19 like to point out that there has been a good deal of newspaper  
20 talk and talk about the advisability, pro and con, of lifting  
21 the restriction on trucks on Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, but to  
22 my knowledge, it has not been lifted.

23 MR. CURTIS: Well, I have two letters that I would  
24 like to read at this stage. One that is in answer to a letter  
25 I wrote to the Bureau of Public Roads in 1962; and this is a



1 letter signed by Robert Giles, who is the General Counsel,  
2 Department of Commerce, that had to do with the roads at  
3 that time:

4 "Dear Captain Curtis:

5 "This is in reply to your letter dated September  
6 5th 1962 in which you asked for information  
7 in response to three specific questions regard-  
8 ing interstate highway system in the National  
9 Capitol region. I have referred your letter  
10 to Bureau of Public Roads and the answers to  
11 the questions -- three questions you raised  
12 are as follows:

13 "Question: Has official approval been given  
14 to this segment, I-66 in Arlington County?

15 "Answer: Interstate Route 66 has been approved  
16 as to general and specific location by the  
17 Bureau of Public Roads following public hearings  
18 in 1958.

19 Question: How can Theodore Roosevelt Bridge  
20 qualify for 90-10 Highway funds?

21 "Answer: Theodore Roosevelt Bridge is part  
22 of the approved interstate system and as such  
23 is eligible for federal aid interstate partici-  
24 pation. South of the exit to Key Bridge it is  
25 proposed to restrict interstate route 66, in-

1 cluding Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, to passenger  
2 vehicles. This was done at the request of the  
3 National Park Service and other officials with  
4 whom we were in sympathy. It would be highly  
5 undesirable to permit truck traffic in the  
6 area of Iwo Jima Memorial, Arlington National  
7 Cemetary, Lincoln Memorial, the Washington  
8 Monument, and the Jefferson Memorial. It was  
9 therefore necessary to provide another connec-  
10 tion, Interstate 266, between Interstate Route  
11 66 and the Inner Loop so that mixed traffic  
12 approaching the Metropolitan Area from the  
13 West could reach its destination by way of the  
14 north and west legs of the Inner Loop and thus  
15 connect Interstate Route 66 with Interstate  
16 Route 95 to the northeast. All the data show  
17 that the percentage of truck traffic is to be  
18 small. Nevertheless, the planning for this  
19 area made such a facility mandatory in view  
20 of the desirable decision to restrict the  
21 Theodore Roosevelt Memorial route to passenger  
22 vehicles.

23 "Question: Can the Arlington County segment  
24 of I-66 qualify for 90-10 funds without  
25 another Potomac Crossing?



1 "Answer: The Interstate system in this area  
2 includes as part of an integrated system, the  
3 segment of I-66, I-266, and the north leg and  
4 the west leg in the District of Columbia. If  
5 through deletion of individual segments of  
6 this system, the results of lack of integra-  
7 tion, it would become necessary for the  
8 Bureau of Public Roads to reexamine the  
9 entire system designation in the area. It  
10 is my hope that these comments will provide  
11 you the information you desire. Sincerely,  
12 Robert E. Giles."

13 Now, another letter which I would like to read, and this is  
14 from the Department of Interior, Office of the Secretary,  
15 signed by Mr. Udall, to Mr. Fisher, who is Chairman of the  
16 Arlington County Board:

17 "April 23rd 1965: We appreciate the opportunity  
18 to express the President's appreciation for the  
19 views of the County Board of Arlington County  
20 concerning the proposed Potomac River crossing  
21 for I-266. As you know, Director H. of the  
22 National Park Service is one of the two members  
23 of the District's Policy Advisory Committee who  
24 voted against the planned three site in a re-  
25 cent meeting. The position taken was actually

1 that of oppositbn to construction of any bridge.  
2 There can be no doubt that any new highway  
3 crossing the river between Chain Bridge and  
4 Roosevelt Island will seriously impair the  
5 scenic and recreational values along this por-  
6 tion of the river. We think that before a  
7 site is selected for any highway bridge in  
8 this area this impact must be fairly weighed  
9 along with traffic forecast data, economic  
10 considerations, expediency of design and  
11 construction funds. It was with this view in  
12 mind that the compromise proposal was made  
13 by Director Hertzog, which would hopefully  
14 provide for the traffic needs and traffic  
15 forecasts for the period of perhaps 10 to  
16 15 years, without the intolerable loss of  
17 truly important scenic values that more and  
18 more contributes substantial although in-  
19 tangible benefits to the modern urban en-  
20 vironment developing in the Metropolitan  
21 area. In order to recommend this proposal,  
22 it was necessary to determine; what if any  
23 parks values could most appropriately be  
24 sacrificed to meet the needs of both view  
25 points. This was not easily done. It was



1 necessary to recognize that similar decisions  
2 would have to be made by other agencies in  
3 order to make the compromised solution work.  
4 The details of the compromise proposal have  
5 not been worked out since they involved  
6 highway traffic design problems and criteria  
7 in which we will seek advice from the high-  
8 way agencies, but in general the following  
9 points are covered: Widening of existing  
10 George Washington Memorial Parkway Roadway  
11 in the section from Spout Run to the  
12 Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. Removing any  
13 restrictions on truck use of Theodore  
14 Roosevelt Bridge. Permitting Washington-  
15 bound non-stop bus use of George Washington  
16 Memorial Parkway during peak hour traffic.  
17 Constructing necessary ramps on both ends  
18 of Theodore Roosevelt Bridge to handle trucks  
19 and buses. Reconstructing approaches and  
20 providing additional capacity for Chain and  
21 Key Bridges. Providing appropriate connec-  
22 tions between Highway 50 and the Jefferson  
23 Davis Highway to facilitate the flow of all  
24 traffic to the new 14th Street Bridge and  
25 points south. We would hope to be able to

1 meet with officials from various offices to  
2 work out details, which would be agreeable to  
3 all parties. Please be assured that this de-  
4 partment will as always be glad to cooperate  
5 with local jurisdictions and highway planning  
6 agencies in any appropriate way we can.

7 Sincerely yours, - Udall, Secretary of In-  
8 terior." Addressed to Mr. Joseph Fisher,  
9 Chairman of the County Board, Arlington,  
10 Virginia.

11 Now I have some other questions. For a long time the National  
12 Capitol Transit Authority opposed this route and the bridge.  
13 Could you tell us why?

14 MR. AIRIS: The National Capitol what authority?

15 MR. CURTIS: Transit Authority.

16 MR. AIRIS: They opposed the bridge?

17 MR. CURTIS: Yes.

18 MR. AIRIS: Well, I know they opposed it.

19 MR. CURTIS: Why?

20 MR. AIRIS: Out of all the agencies that have studied  
21 this location they were the only ones to oppose it.

22 MR. CURTIS: Why did they oppose it?

23 MR. AIRIS: I never really could find out.

24 MR. CURTIS: Well, I can tell you: I have it from  
25 several of the people from the authority that said "Look, if



1 you knock out this bridge then our chances of having Metro  
2 are pretty, pretty good. But if you don't knock out the  
3 Bridge our chances of having Metro are pretty slim." At that  
4 time they felt that the number of riders on Metro would be  
5 very severely reduced if you built this bridge, and, therefore,  
6 you couldn't justify the subway system because it would not  
7 pay for itself.

8 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I wonder if we could limit  
9 your testimony for 5 more minutes. We are running just a little  
10 behind.

11 MR. CURTIS: I have extra time, if it's allowed. If  
12 I run over, you just remind me and I will call on other people  
13 who have relinquished their time.

14 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Sir, your time was up at  
15 about 8:05. It is now about 8:25.

16 MR. CURTIS: I am trying to get to the facts.

17 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I would be delighted, sir.  
18 Could you limit your testimony for another 5 minutes?

19 MR. CURTIS: I will.

20 MR. AIRIS: Sir, just to answer your question there:  
21 Of course this was one of the reasons advanced but it was  
22 shot down and the subsequent agency retracted NCPA's position,  
23 you know that?

24 MR. CURTIS: Oh, yes, I know it. Why after long  
25 opposition to the bridge did the Washington City Council

1 suddenly, in August '68, resolve to commence construction?

2 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I don't think Mr. Airis is  
3 the proper authority - appropriate authority to ask that.

4 MR. CURTIS: I am just asking anybody who can give me  
5 the answer, sir.

6 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: There is no member of the  
7 City Council here, sir, so we can't answer for them.

8 MR. CURTIS: I can answer it. Mr. Natcher put a  
9 pistol to their heads and withheld their funds - blackmail!

10 MR. AIRIS: Sir, that's your reasoning.

11 MR. CURTIS: All right, nobody else would give me an  
12 answer. Another question: Has the Arlington County Board,  
13 the third party to the agreement concerning Spout Run, signed  
14 by the President and the Governor of Virginia, given its con-  
15 sent to using this land for I-266? Has the Arlington County  
16 Board given its consent?

17 MR. SNEAD: As far as the Arlington County Board,  
18 I don't know, Mr. Curtis, but I have a letter to Mr. Bart John-  
19 son from Mr. P..., relative to the use of the land and a letter  
20 from -- well, let's see, I don't have the letter from Bart  
21 Johnson but I have the letter from Francis Turner, and parts  
22 of. As far as the Arlington County Board, I don't know, sir.

23 MR. CURTIS: Yes, but the agreement in accordance  
24 with the...Crampton Act that devoted this land to National  
25 Parklands, partly paid by Arlington County funds, there was an



1 agreement signed by President Roosevelt and President Truman,  
2 and the County Board, and the Governor of Virginia, which  
3 stated until the County Board agreed this land shall be for-  
4 ever parkland, and I know of no consent that the Arlington County  
5 Board has given for taking this land for the highway.

6 MR. AIRIS: As I understand it, we have been informed  
7 that this arrangement has been worked out with the Board.

8 MR. CURTIS: The Board changes the 1st of January.  
9 Anyway, such consent has not been given as yet, is that correct?

10 MR. AIRIS: My understanding is it has; yes.

11 MR. CURTIS: In writing?

12 MR. AIRIS: Well, I can't say, I don't know the de-  
13 tails of the arrangements.

14 MR. CURTIS: Were there any conditions? You don't  
15 know what the conditions were to the agreement?

16 MR. SNEAD: Yes, I know what they are.

17 MR. CURTIS: What are they?

18 MR. SNEAD: The conditions are that the Virginia  
19 Department of Highways will provide funds to replace, on an  
20 acre by acre basis, the 31.6 acres of parklands in Spout Run.

21 MR. CURTIS: May I ask what is the status of acquiring  
22 replacement parkland?

23 MR. HARRIS: Mr. Curtis, at this particular time  
24 The Right of Way Division of the Culpepper District of the  
25 Virginia Department of Highways is in the process of appraising

1 these replacement lands for the National Park Service and for  
2 the Federal Government.

3 MR. CURTIS: I would like to read into the record  
4 a short letter to Mr. Lester Logan, signed by Bert Johnson,  
5 County Manager:

6 "Dear Leslie:

7 "Because of legal agreements --- because the legal  
8 requirements have not been fully met for either  
9 I-66 or I-266, there has been no definitive  
10 action taken on the exchange parcels by the  
11 State Highway Department in this process of  
12 taking alternate appraisals. When decisions  
13 can be made, we will keep you fully advised.  
14 Sincerely, Bert Johnson."

15 A SPECTATOR: What's the date?

16 MR. CURTIS: The date was November 19th, 1970.

17 I know my time is short, but I just would like to say that we  
18 have in our possession a letter addressed to the speaker of  
19 the house, signed by the Secretary of the Department of  
20 Transportation, saying that none of these D. C. Highway  
21 Projects are essential for the completion of the Interstate  
22 network. Is that your contention today as implied in the bro-  
23 chure, which says they are essential? That's my last question.  
24 Is this highway essential for the national system.

25 MR. AIRIS: Well, we think so; yes, sir.



1 MR. CURTIS: Sorry I have run out my time.

2 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Go right ahead.

3 MR. CURTIS: Well, at a hearing just the other  
4 two days ago one of the gentlemen present said that the  
5 I-266 is not essential for the completion of I-66, and I  
6 thanked him very much because I don't think it is. I don't  
7 think we need it. Goodbye.

8 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

9 MR. CURTIS: I would be willing to answer any  
10 questions if you have any.

11 MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman?

12 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Harris?

13 MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Curtis has asked a  
14 question relative to the agreement that the National Park  
15 Service had with the Division of the Department of Highways  
16 relative to the use of the land, and I replied by stating  
17 October the 1st, 1969. I would like to clarify that. The  
18 original agreement for the use of Spout Run Parkway was signed  
19 by the National Park Service and our Air Commissioner, Mr.  
20 D..., and Mr. Duke, then the District of Columbia Director of  
21 Highways. On May the 25th, 1966. On May the 25th, 1966.  
22 The date that I previously gave you reaffirms the agreements  
23 with all its intent of October 1st, 1969.

24 MR. CURTIS: I think you will find if you review  
25 all the correspondence that Mr. Udall and various people in

1 the department and the interior rescinded Mr. H....agreement.

2 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you, Captain,

3 Mr. and Mrs. Govan?

4 (Mr. Lynch requested that he speak first.)

5 WHEREUPON,

6 MR. JOHN GEORGE LYNCH,

7 APPROACHED THE MICROPHONE AND TESTIFIED, IN SUBSTANCE, AS  
8 FOLLOWS:

9 MR. LYNCH: My name is John George Lunch. I am a  
10 professor of theology and urban ministry at St. Paul's  
11 college in Washington, D. C., 7th and Hamlin Street, N. E.  
12 I am testifying on my behalf and on behalf of the administra-  
13 tion, the student government, and the president of the college.  
14 And I request that my testimony be submitted as a part of the  
15 record.

16 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: It may be so admitted.

17 MR. LYNCH:: Thank you. I take as the point of de-  
18 parture in my testimony this paragraph from page 1 of the book-  
19 let "I-266 Design Hearing Information": "A Design Public Hear-  
20 ing is held after a route location is established and approved,  
21 but before the design of a Federal-Aid Highway is finally adopt-  
22 ed. . . .It provides a full opportunity to present views on  
23 major highway design features including the social, economic,  
24 environmental and other effects of alternate designs." It is  
25 because "route location" -- especially of feeder roads and access



1 roads -- has NOT been legally "established and approved" that  
2 we are opposed to this bridge, no matter what the design.  
3 Furthermore, because of the "social, economic, environmental,  
4 and other effects" of this bridge or of any alternate bridge  
5 that we are opposed not only to this design but to any design  
6 of any highway bridge over the Potomac.

7 Let me explain by commenting on paragraphs also on  
8 page 1 of this design hearing information booklet - paragraphs  
9 which I judge to be misleading and deceptive.

10 "In September 1967, the Commission of Fine Arts  
11 unanimously and enthusiastically approved a design concept  
12 for the proposed Three Sisters Bridge. In December of the  
13 same year, the Metropolitan Washington Council of Govern-  
14 ments, representing fifteen local governments, determined that  
15 the project was consistent with comprehensive planning in that  
16 region."

17 I would like to note that we are now in December  
18 1970, still holding hearings about the design concepts --  
19 which apparently had been approved in 1967. What follows  
20 from this booklet will perhaps explain why:

21 "The Court of Appeals, however, ordered work to  
22 cease in February 1968. Leg Legislation was subsequently  
23 provided in Section 23 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968  
24 requiring the design and construction of Interstate 266, the  
25 Three Sisters Bridge and other portions of the Interstate System

1 in the District of Columbia. Although a major thoroughfare  
2 plan, which did not (emphasis mine) include the Three Sisters  
3 Bridge, had been adopted by the National Capital Planning  
4 Commission and approved by the City Council of Washington in  
5 December 1968, the City Council resolved in August 1969 to  
6 comply with Section 23 of the 1968 Act. With the approval of  
7 the Federal Highway Administration, construction commenced in  
8 September 1969 when excavations for the river piers of the  
9 Three Sisters Bridge were started.

10 "Construction was halted in August 1970 after the  
11 U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia ruled that a  
12 Design Public Hearing should be held for this interstate pro-  
13 ject."

14 Why is all this misleading and deceptive? Permit  
15 me to analyze with you these paragraphs from the design hearing  
16 booklet: First of all, what is reported in here simply as "The  
17 Court of Appeals, however, ordered work to cease in February  
18 1968," in reality has this background of scandal and power  
19 politics. Late in 1967 the then Secretary of Transportation,  
20 Alyn Boyd, provisionally vetoed the bridge. Then, in February  
21 1968 the U. S. Court of Appeals enjoined construction of the  
22 bridge until hearings required by law were held. The New  
23 York Times, February 21, 1968, called the decision of the court  
24 not just a "however," as does the design hearing booklet, but  
25 a "deserved rebuke to the pressure tactics of the highway



1 lobby and its Congressional errand boys." That is point number  
2 one about the misleading and deceptive character of this book-  
3 let.

4 Point number two has to do with the Federal-Aid  
5 Highway Act of 1968 and its infamous, scandalous section 23,  
6 which reported in the booklet simply as "requiring the design  
7 and construction of Interstate 266, the Three Sisters Bridge  
8 and other portions of the Interstate System in the District of  
9 Columbia." Section 23, a clear violation of House Rule XI, 15  
10 ("...it shall not be in order for any bill providing general  
11 legislation in relation to roads to contain any provision for  
12 any specific road, not for any bill in relation to a specific  
13 road to embrace a provision in relation to any other specific  
14 road.") and of Section 128, Title 23, U. S. Code (calling for  
15 public hearings on highway projects) was denounced by Life  
16 magazine, August 23, 1968, as follows:

17 "Worst of all, the final bill--this is the Federal  
18 Highway Act of 1968--retains an unprecedented order by the  
19 House to the District of Columbia requiring it to build three  
20 much disputed downtown express highways and a bridge over the  
21 Potomac in locations dictated by the House. (emphasis mine)  
22 Senator John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky refused to sign this  
23 conference report. "The location and planning of highways is  
24 not within the competence of the House Committee or the  
25 Congress," he said. Life added: "We hope the President  
vetoes this misbegotten bill." That's point number two in

1 my pointing out the misleading and deceptive character of this  
2 booklet.

3 Point number three refers to the booklet's report-  
4 ing that in August 1969, after the NCFPC and the City Council of  
5 Washington had excluded the bridge from its plans, the City  
6 Council "resolved" "to comply with Section 23 of the 1968 Act.  
7 What the booklet does not say is that the City Council, on that  
8 9th of August 1969, succumbed to the pressures the New York  
9 Times had already identified and denounced in February of 1968--  
10 pressures to withhold subways funds until the scandalous section  
11 23 of the 1968 act was adopted. The pressure was denounced as  
12 "blackmail" in the House (C.R. Aug. 11, 1969 H7211) and as  
13 "coercion" in the Senate (C.R. Oct 3, 1969, S 11880). The  
14 Washington Post reported accurately when, on February 24, 1970,  
15 they reported that the bridge was being built "by congressional  
16 edict."

17 As an ordained minister charged with responsibility  
18 in matters of justice both in the public and the private  
19 sphere, I must testify that the people of the District of  
20 Columbia do not want this bridge -- under any design -- because  
21 they do not want the network of freeways that will funnel into  
22 it. What they want is their right -- a city in which to live,  
23 not a city through which to travel. It is because of the over-  
24 whelming testimony of the people last February against the  
25 freeways that will feed this monstrous bridge and the 9-0 vote  
of the City Council of Washington confirming that testimony that



1 I must, in conclusion, object to the very existence of these  
2 hearings on design until the basic moral issues as outlined  
3 on page one of the design hearing booklet are heeded to: "the  
4 social, environmental, economic, and other effects." I and  
5 those for whom I speak, the administration and student govern-  
6 ment of St. Paul's college, are convinced that there is neither  
7 design nor bridge that can respond to the basic social, en-  
8 vironmental, economic, and political moral issues at stake here  
9 and now. We are not living in the days of Prince Machiavelli or  
10 the Renaissance popes; nor are we living in the days of coerced  
11 congressional edict. We are, we are told, living in a demo-  
12 cracy, and the voice of the people has said over and over  
13 again: "We do not want this bridge."

14 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

15 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Any questions?

16 MR. AIRIS: I might ask the Father if he has any  
17 preference for either one of the two alternatives shown in  
18 the brochure?

19 THE AUDIENCE: (laughter)

20 MR. AIRIS: I am serious, really, and I would like  
21 to have any opinions that the citizens have or any other al-  
22 ternatives.

23 MR. LYNCH: Well, I guess if I were the "devil" I  
24 would drag them both down to hell with me, but I am not the  
25 "devil."

1 THE AUDIENCE: (laughter and applause)

2 MR. AIRIS: Thank you.

3 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you.

4 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. and Mrs. Govan?

5 (no response)

6 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. James L. Govan?

7 WHEREUPON,

8 MR. JAMES L. GOVAN,

9 APPROACHED THE MICROPHONE AND TESTIFIED, IN SUBSTANCE, AS  
10 FOLLOWS:

11 MR. GOVAN: I am James L. Govan, a resident of  
12 Arlington, 1423 North Buchanan Street, Arlington, Virginia,  
13 and tonight I speak on behalf of ACT, The Arlington Coalition  
14 on Transportation. ACT is a non-partisan, voluntary citizen's  
15 organization which has been formed to give voice to the views  
16 of thousands of Arlingtonians who are concerned about the  
17 impact of Interstate 66 and 266 on our community. We have  
18 pledged ourselves to obtain more effective citizen participa-  
19 tion in transportation planning so that as we work to solve  
20 our transportation crisis we will do so through means that  
21 will enhance, not destroy, the quality of life in our community  
22 ACT and its members also believe that our transportation  
23 priority must be reordered to give top priority to the public  
24 mass transit both rail and buses. We believe these alternatives  
25 -- alternative modes of transit -- should be developed first



1 before another major highway is constructed in Arlington, or  
2 another bridge across the river. Tonight we are to address  
3 ourselves to the design of I-266, but in my view the design  
4 of I-266 cannot be isolated from the larger issues which are  
5 raised by the plans to construct the bridge in its approaches.  
6 For example I-266 cannot be viewed separately from the proposed  
7 I-66, in Arlington County. In fact, this is made clear by  
8 several references to both projects in the material presented  
9 as the I-266 Design Hearing Information. Together the two  
10 interstates raise fundamental issues about the kind of  
11 community we desire to have in Arlington as well as in the  
12 District. Therefore, it is relevant to consider the larger  
13 issues related to and beyond design. The recent coalition -  
14 formation of the Arlington Coalition on Transportation is  
15 symbolic of a trend that is merging throughout the metropoli-  
16 tan area, in Maryland, the District, and now Virginia, citizen  
17 groups are organizing to challenge the underlying assumptions  
18 and purposes of creating an interstate system of freeways to  
19 the core of this metropolitan area. Growing numbers of citizens  
20 are recognizing that our urban conditions have changed  
21 drastically since the 1950s when this local network was  
22 planned. We have recognized that social and environmental  
23 conditions are inevitably affected by transportation systems  
24 and we have recognized that freeways can easily destroy the  
25 fabric of a community. Our sincere view is that I-266, as well

1 as I-66, will destroy the character of the communities we are  
2 seeking to develop. In the preface of the pamphlet provided  
3 for this Hearing the statement is made that the purpose of this  
4 hearing is to obtain citizen participation pertaining to the  
5 project design so that it will, quote, "Preserve the community  
6 and regional values," end of quote. I would like to know what  
7 is meant by that statement. My own experience in the recent  
8 hearings on I-66 in Arlington leads me to believe that the  
9 statement is totally gratuitous and without serious intent.

10           The District and Virginia Highway Departments have  
11 no intention to listen to us tonight if we should discuss  
12 community and regional values. They would consider it irrele-  
13 vant to the proceedings. Last week in Arlington, dozens of  
14 citizens spoke continually of the relationship of I-66 location  
15 and design to community goals. At the end of the hearings one  
16 official told us most of the testimony was not relevant to the  
17 hearing. I suspect they will say the same of our concerns  
18 about I-266. On the other hand, I presume if we talk about  
19 whether we would like the Three-Span concrete bridge painted  
20 pink or green, our views would be totally relevant and would  
21 have to be seriously weighed. In short, the present situation  
22 is somewhat ridiculous. It is practically impossible for  
23 citizens to have a meaningful role in this hearing if they wish  
24 to discuss important subjects related to the I-266 projects.  
25 The highway departments of Virginia and D. C. neither know what



1 our community values nor do they care to know. In the  
2 District, the record is clear that I-266 violates community  
3 values as expressed by the public. Public authorities and the  
4 District City Council and the National Capitol Planning  
5 Commission have supported and reflected the views of the  
6 public by deleting the project from D. C. thoro fare plan. The  
7 City Council, however, has bowed to legislative fiat under  
8 circumstances all of us know are far from reasonable and fair.  
9 The refusal of highway officials to bend to popular will in  
10 the District is a measure of their unwillingness to hear us  
11 tonight.

12 In Virginia, the public has had even less chance to  
13 express its views on the project, but what record exists of  
14 public opinion is clearly one of opposition to the project.  
15 Local feelings were registered by the Arlington County Board  
16 several years ago when the county sought to halt the project  
17 through legal action. Unfortunately, the County Board with-  
18 drew its suit contrary to public sentiment when it struck a  
19 bargain over parkland. That action was a cruel mistake in  
20 the views of many Arlingtonians, and it is no way diminishes  
21 our public views in opposition to the project. More than ever  
22 before Arlington citizens are expressing their outrage at  
23 public authorities who are trying to force I-266 and I-66  
24 upon us, against our community interests and values. As in  
25 the case of I-66, Arlington Citizens have not had an opportunity

1 to weight their community values concerning I-266, against  
2 arbitrary and bureaucratic decisions of urban planners and  
3 highway technicians. Supposedly, these interstate plans are  
4 harmonious with local development plans. Nothing could be  
5 further from the truth unless public views are always to be  
6 considered as artificial. Currently, Arlington officials are  
7 reviewing the county's master land use development plan. The  
8 original plan did not exist until 1961, one year after I-266 was  
9 decided upon as part of the interstate system. Today there is  
10 considerable citizen opposition in Arlington to the interstate  
11 links to be built in the county. The current county plan does  
12 not reflect a community census on transportation goals in  
13 particular. However, the public will not have an opportunity  
14 to consider revised planning goals until this Spring when  
15 there will be public hearings on the county plan. Citizen  
16 participation in those hearings may stimulate changes in the  
17 county plan and the plan may be revised and weighed inconsistent  
18 with the state's outdated freeway proposals. Therefore, it  
19 would be premature to assume that I-266 is harmonious with  
20 community development plans in Arlington.

21 In this respect, I would like to quote from a  
22 speech made recently by a leading Department of Transportation  
23 official. He said, quote:

24 "Citizen participation should start with a  
25



1 definition. The articulation of community  
2 goals and values, and the relationship of the  
3 transportation plans to those goals."

4 To me this means that citizens have a right to suggest that a  
5 transportation project should be realigned or not built at all  
6 if it conflicts with current community values.

7 Highway officials can, if they wish, proceed to  
8 construction of I-266 after this hearing, but if they do I  
9 suggest that they drop all pretense of concern for public atti-  
10 tudes. Clearly, citizens' views are in opposition to the  
11 highway project, and this Department of Transportation and  
12 official's comments, have a very special relevance for this  
13 case.

14 The Interstate proposals supposedly are also con-  
15 sistent with regional planning efforts. Again, the situation  
16 with respect to I-266 and I-66 leaves something to be desired.  
17 I-266 has been included in the plans endorsed by the Metropoli-  
18 tan Council of Government. This is a body to which transporta-  
19 tion officials turn for advisory planning guidance. There is  
20 no harm in such a review procedure, in principle; however,  
21 there is harm in presuming that this body reflects the consensus  
22 of community views. In fact, the council is dominated by non-  
23 elected officials. While there is one elected Arlington  
24 official who is appointed to the council, it is presumptuous to  
25 assume that he reflects citizens' views at this time. There

1 has been no public discussion of I-266 and I-66 in many years,  
2 for the purpose of ascertaining public views. In fact, only  
3 in the recent design hearings on I-66 has there been any  
4 public discussion of these projects during the tenure of the  
5 present county board in Arlington, and sentiments that those  
6 hearings were overwhelmingly opposed to I-66, and by implica-  
7 tion to I-266. Therefore, if citizens' interest are to be  
8 considered by the council at all today they have to be weighed  
9 as negative to the proposals. Otherwise, the council must  
10 be in a position of giving priority to silent citizens who  
11 do not register an opinion and to artificial planning concepts  
12 which perhaps reflects statistical data in an orderly way but  
13 which are not related at all to people and their community  
14 values.

15 In short, I have argued that in the case of both---  
16 I-266 and I-66---the official rhetoric about public participa-  
17 tion is empty rhetoric. Nevertheless, I do believe that the  
18 dual concept of location and design hearing is a useful con-  
19 cept and can be meaningful. However, the present situation  
20 with respect to design hearings on both interstate links,  
21 render the process ineffective. Both I-266 and I-66 were  
22 decided upon in the 1950s. A corridor was approved for I-66  
23 in 1958 and for 266 several years later, but the more relevant  
24 date is the first one. Since the decision on I-266 was ob-  
25 viously made to tie the bridge into I-66, the case for the



1 bridge also rests on the case for I-66. What has happened  
2 in the intervening period between corridor and design hearings  
3 --what has happened, is that the intervening period between  
4 corridor and design hearings has been much too long. In the  
5 intervening years, there have been significant changes in our  
6 urban environment. These changes are now being reflected in  
7 new directions in national transportation policies emerging  
8 at the federal level. These changes reflect not only greater  
9 technological and scientific awareness of transportation  
10 options, but more importantly reflect changing citizens' views  
11 about how to shape transportation plans so that we can regain  
12 a desirable quality of life in our urban center.

13 Not to take cognizance of these changes and a design  
14 hearing or some other appropriate form is blindness and a mis-  
15 application of useful procedure. The Head of the Federal  
16 Highway Administration has said that he doubts any more urban  
17 freeways will be built after the ones currently underway are  
18 being planned or built. This is a tacit admission that urban  
19 freeways are to become a page of the past. If federal officials  
20 recognize this trend then it is reasonable to start plans for  
21 all urban freeways where there is substantial citizen  
22 opposition until it can be determined and publicly accepted  
23 that the freeways are still the best answer to our trans-  
24 portation and environmental problems of the 1970s. As I  
25 stated earlier, I-266 cannot be considered an isolation. It is

1 true I-66 will have a direct, and in my view detrimental im-  
2 pact on the aesthetic environment of the Potomac River and  
3 adjoining shores. Without a doubt, the proposed pre-stress  
4 concrete design alternative will be a massive, heavy intrusion  
5 on the light, green and open vista of the river.

6 I guess I simply don't understand architectural  
7 design, but I have yet to see a vast concrete structure that  
8 looks anything but oppressive.

9 In any event, the river's natural beauty at the  
10 proposed crossing point is far beyond any human capability to  
11 enhance. The I-266 cannot be viewed in this limited per-  
12 spective. In reality, I-266 must be viewed as an appendage  
13 of I-66 and it is this linkage which reveals the full impact  
14 of what our highway officials and bureaucratic planners have  
15 in mind. I-266 and I-66, together, pave the way for nearly  
16 total destruction of Arlington as it now exists, and renders  
17 future development of Arlington as a desirable urban community  
18 impossible. I-66 will have a devastating, social and environ-  
19 mental impact on Arlington. It will destroy existing and  
20 potential parkland. It will jeopardize the continued existence  
21 of four schools and it will contribute to the deterioration  
22 and eventual destruction of many neighborhoods in the community.  
23 All of this will happen, and in its place will rise many more  
24 new Rosslyns which will be, no doubt, like the present Rosslyn,  
25 absolutely devoid of community life and vitality. Last week I



1 gave a lengthy statement on the design hearing on I-66 in  
2 Arlington in which I described the harmful effects of I-66  
3 and stressed the need for reconsideration of the highway. I  
4 will enter that statement, for the record, here.

5 I argue that I-66 was planned and designed with ab-  
6 solutely no consideration of its social, economic and environ-  
7 mental impact on Arlington as a community, and I-266 is a part  
8 of the same process. It is furious reasoning on the part of  
9 highway officials to assert, as they do in their brochure,  
10 that the design is harmonious with all relevant considerations  
11 from traffic needs to environmental effects. The bridge does  
12 harm enough to the natural beauty of the river valley, but it  
13 should not in any way be viewed separately from I-66, which is  
14 an incredibly designed highway. If state and federal officials  
15 proceed with plans to construct the two interstates they have  
16 tacitly admitted that Federal legislation and policy concerning  
17 the environment are meaningless. They will have forfeited their  
18 right to our credence in their concern to help us solve trans-  
19 portation and environmental problems. Tonight I am speaking  
20 from a sense of outrage. I say "outrage" because I have almost  
21 given up the belief that our state officials have any serious  
22 intent to consider citizens' views seriously. I have almost  
23 reached the point where I believe it is impossible for meaning-  
24 ful citizen participation to occur within the present transpor-  
25 tation planning process. The state is not prepared to accept

1 to accept any view short of consent to its proposals. There  
2 is apparently no appeal within the bureaucratic process for  
3 reconsideration of the state's proposal. Our only recourse  
4 appears to be other channels either to elected officials or to  
5 the courts. Unfortunately, the process of citizen participa-  
6 tion remains one of confrontation instead of cooperation. This  
7 need not be. If federal state authorities would honor existing  
8 legislation and policy; the choice is their's. My views to-  
9 night are being echoed increasingly by citizens all over  
10 this metropolitan area, and what we are saying is quite positive  
11 and really quite simple. We the nameless thousands of con-  
12 cerned citizens in this wonderful area of our Nation's Capitol  
13 sincerely believe that the system of urban interstate freeway,  
14 which is now planned for this city and suburbs, will have an  
15 irrevocable harmful effect on each and every community  
16 affected by the highway. We do not deny that there is a  
17 transportation crisis, and we don't deny that they are legi-  
18 timate interests to be served by providing transit to our  
19 airports, transit for our commercial establishments, and  
20 transit for the distance of suburban commuters. We are agreed  
21 that we must maintain mobility if our urban community is to  
22 be vital. However, we are strongly convinced that the present  
23 freeway plans are not the appropriate solution and we see no  
24 justification offered for those plans other than that they have  
25 the non-elected planners and impersonal institutional interests.



1           If Governor Holton or Secretary Volpe told the  
2 planners and bureaucrats that their plans were inadequate  
3 and that other more acceptable plans had to be developed  
4 the planners and highway technicians would throw their plans  
5 in the bottom drawer and start over. However, the rising  
6 crescendo of citizen protest seems not to have the same  
7 relevance, but with all sincerity all we citizens are trying  
8 to say is that we want a different and a better transportation  
9 system in this our nation's capitol, and we believe our  
10 officials and planners can produce that system if they have  
11 but the will. Their deficiency is not a lack of competence, but  
12 rather a crisis of will. Our president has said this decade  
13 will be known as the time when man regained productive harmony  
14 with nature. If that is to be, then our officials and planners  
15 are going to have to accept their responsibility, to help  
16 citizens who are seeking to respond to the President's call.  
17 Se cannot rebuild our cities if they do not care to exercise  
18 their moral obligation to respond to our pleas. In essence,  
19 all that we are saying is that we must rethink our transporta-  
20 tion plans in the terms of the crisis of the 1970s. I-266 and  
21 I-66 are the product of the 1950s. What we need is a moratorium  
22 on all freeways plans for this area until there is a proper  
23 reconsideration of those plans and of other more efficient  
24 transportation options and a willingness of local communities  
25 to accept those plans. Thank you very much.

1 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

2 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you very much.

3 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mrs. Govan?

4 WHEREUPON,

5 MRS. EMILIA L. GOVAN,

6 APPROACHED THE PODIUM AND TESTIFIED, IN SUBSTANCE, AS FOLLOWS:

7 MRS. GOVAN: My name is Emilia L. Govan. I reside  
8 at 1423 N. Buchanan Street in Arlington. Although the witness  
9 list does not show this, I did ask to speak tonight on behalf  
10 of the Arlington Project of the Metropolitan Washington  
11 Planning and Housing Association, a citizens' body which seeks  
12 to maintain and develop housing for all income groups in the  
13 metropolitan area. My statement is also endorsed by the  
14 Arlington Coalition on Transportation (ACT), of which I am  
15 co-chairman. ACT is a citizens' group which seeks to promote  
16 proposals that solve the area's transportation problems for  
17 preserving and enhancing the environment.

18 We are opposed to the construction of I-266, the  
19 Three Sisters Bridge, on the following grounds:

20 1. I-266 - the Three Sisters Bridge - is a key  
21 link in a network of freeways which includes I-66. Without  
22 I-66, there is no need for I-266. These freeway projects would  
23 have enormous social costs for the communities they affect.

24 Construction of I-66 from Glebe Road to Rosslyn would  
25 dislocate more than 400 persons and would destroy irreplaceable



1 low and moderate-cost housing.

2 For example, 90 units of the Fort Bennett apartments  
3 would be demolished by this I-66, which connects into the  
4 Three Sisters Bridge.

5 At least 9 homes in the Maywood area would be de-  
6 stroyed. This is in violation of an agreement between the  
7 Arlington County Board and the Virginia Highway Commission that  
8 no more homes would be taken.

9 The Virginia Highway Commission has refused to make  
10 public the plans for the portion of I-66 west of Glebe Road,  
11 but there are indications that more housing will be destroyed  
12 in that corridor.

13 Arlington County cannot afford to lose a single  
14 housing unit. The AAUW report on "Low and Moderate Income  
15 Housing Needs in Arlington," August, 1970 states: "There is an  
16 acute shortage of housing for these large, low-income families  
17 in Arlington. Housing problems are also severe for young  
18 families, in broken families, the elderly, the handicapped and  
19 blacks." (p. 2) "Houses for rent in the metropolitan area and  
20 expensive and few in number. The demand for apartments is  
21 high, but construction has declined and the vacancy rate for  
22 apartments in the suburbs is less than 1%. It is hardest  
23 to rent a good apartment--high-rise or garden apartment--  
24 in suburban Virginia."

25 I would like to ask the highway officials how they

1 plan to find replacement housing that is decent, safe and  
2 sanitary in the Arlington County for the connecting I-66  
3 that goes into Three Sisters Bridge? What provisions have  
4 been made for this kind of replacement housing? What provi-  
5 sion has been made for replacement housing?

6 MR. SNEAD: You are talking about I-66?

7 MRS. GOVAN: Yes, sir, this is the part that goes  
8 right into I-266 and can't be considered separately.

9 MR. SNEAD: Well, we have taken steps in accordance  
10 with the law. We find that these safe and sanitary facilities  
11 are those affected by the acquisition in accordance with our  
12 laws, policy and procedures, in accordance with regulations.

13 MRS. GOVAN: Have you found such housing in  
14 Arlington County?

15 MR. SNEAD: Yes, so far we have been successful.

16 MRS. GOVAN: Well, that's interesting, in view of the  
17 AOW findings that such housing is there - let me say that the  
18 situation today is in sharp contrast to a statement made in  
19 the Howard Needles location studies for I-266, in September  
20 1964, which stated "relocation does not appear to be a  
21 problem to families residing in multi-family housing projects,  
22 since such families can readily find housing in alternate  
23 locations through Arlington." This is simply not true today,  
24 if it ever was true, and no location or design of this freeway  
25 network can alter that fact. Second, the economic, social and



1 environmental costs to those persons who live in the vicinity  
2 of the proposed I-66 and I-266, as well as to the community at  
3 large, cannot be compensated by any location or design of these  
4 freeways.

5           These roads would cause deterioration of many neigh-  
6 borhoods due to untenable conditions such as noise, air and  
7 visual pollution. A consultant's report done for ACT by ESL,  
8 Inc. of California shows the projected noise and air pollution  
9 levels to well above acceptable standards and a potential  
10 threat to the community's health. Those who remain in the  
11 vicinity of these roadways will receive no compensation for the  
12 health hazards incurred, nor will they be able to obtain  
13 comparable housing at today's market costs.

14           These economic, social and environmental factors  
15 which highway officials are required to consider in accordance  
16 with Policy and Procedure Memorandum 20-8 have not been con-  
17 sidered by the Virginia Highway Commission and D. C. Depart-  
18 ment of Highways. The booklet called "I-266 Design Hearing  
19 Information" is totally inadequate for this purpose and provides  
20 absolutely no justification for the construction of this bridge  
21 or connecting highways. This so-called analysis was done by a  
22 consulting engineering firm - Howard, Needles - which is totally  
23 unqualified to discuss social, economic and environmental factors.  
24 Their insensitive, uninformed approach is indicated throughout  
25 the report, but especially their statement that "The proposed

1 Virginia approach will have no significant impact on the  
2 character of these two residential neighborhoods" of Woodmont  
3 and Highland in Arlington County. The effects will, in fact,  
4 be tremendous.

5 Virginia Highway officials at the I-66 hearing  
6 held last week admitted they had no knowledge of the Section  
7 102 requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act  
8 of 1969. That section requires State and local agencies to  
9 cooperate with the Federal agencies in assessing environmental  
10 effects of projects involving Federal action. Yet, Virginia  
11 and D. C. have made no attempt to engage environmental con-  
12 sultants who have the appropriate tools to study these factors.  
13 Very late in the process on I-66 Virginia called in a landscape  
14 architect. On I-266, we have the report of an engineering firm.  
15 This is clear evidence that highway officials are totally un-  
16 interested in, and insensitive to, any factors but inflated  
17 traffic projections. Human and environmental needs have no  
18 place in their calculations.

19 3. The public hearing process, as carried out in  
20 the case of I-266 (and I-66) is a farce. This farce has un-  
21 fortunately had the cooperation of State, District, Federal  
22 and local officials and has also been sanctioned by some of  
23 the lower courts.

24 It is unthinkable that design hearings on this  
25 project would be held despite irrefutable evidence that the



1 citizens of Arlington County and the District of Columbia  
2 have expressed their unalterable opposition to the construc-  
3 tion of this bridge and freeway in every conceivable manner.  
4 The Arlington County Board is also on record in opposition to  
5 this bridge, a project which is in clear violation of an inter-  
6 governmental agreement on preservation of parklands.

7 This fact is not altered by the County Board's  
8 withdrawal of its suit against the bridge under threats of Metro  
9 fund blackmail by certain Congressmen and under promise of  
10 false concessions by the Commonwealth of Virginia, one of which  
11 concessions has already been violated in the case of Maywood  
12 homes.

13 The public hearing on this bridge in 1964 gave clear  
14 evidence that the public did not think this bridge and its  
15 approaches were needed. Judge Sirica in the case of D. C.  
16 Federation v. Volpe admitted in his decision of August, 1970,  
17 that "The transcript of the 1964 hearings...shows that the majority  
18 of the witnesses voiced their opposition to any new Central  
19 Potomac crossing." If the citizens are already on record as  
20 opposing this bridge, why has this project progressed to the  
21 design stage? Why is a design public hearing being held at  
22 this time? Why do highway officials and other public servants  
23 continually ignore the expressed wishes of the citizens whom  
24 they supposedly serve and represent?

25 Would any of the highway officials care to answer

1 that? Judge Sirica said that he had examined the transcript  
2 of this '64 hearing and the majority of the witnesses voiced  
3 their opposition. Why has anything further been done?

4 MR. AIRIS: Well, I might try to answer that. The  
5 '64 hearings were held and your Departments had tried to be  
6 responsive to the testimony that was given. Now it is true  
7 there were a lot of folks that were against the bridge, period.  
8 But then again there were a lot of folks that wanted a facility  
9 there and had certain constructive criticism about the manner  
10 in which the bridge would be placed. I think we have been  
11 responsive to those criticisms.

12 MRS. GOVAN: But, sir, if Judge Sirica says that the  
13 majority of the witnesses at the '64 hearing voiced their  
14 opposition to any new central Potomac crossing, how is it being  
15 responsive? I mean, what do you use? Do you use the minority  
16 sentiment as your criteria?

17 MR. AIRIS: You can't very well take a count of the  
18 witnesses because the rhetoric and the actions of the populace  
19 are different.

20 MRS. GOVAN: But, sir, what other form do the citizens  
21 have?

22 MR. AIRIS: Well, the citizens have by their deeds,  
23 their actions, they pretty well speak in that form.

24 MRS. GOVAN: For example?

25 MR. AIRIS: For example, here in the District, right



1 in the District itself the population has gone down but the  
2 number of vehicles is increased.

3 MRS. GOVAN: Well, do vehicles cast a vote in these  
4 matters?

5 THE AUDIENCE: (laughter) (applause)

6 MR. AIRIS: The people that own the vehicles are  
7 the ones that do the counting, and may I point out that this  
8 highway department in the District has, for a long time, ad-  
9 vocated the close control of parking in the downtown area to  
10 limit the number of commuter vehicles that come over here.

11 MRS. GOVAN: How many more vehicles will be coming  
12 over the bridge?

13 MR. AIRIS: Huh?

14 MRS. GOVAN: How many vehicles will be coming over  
15 the bridge?

16 MR. AIRIS: Well, the design capacity of the bridge  
17 is somewhere in the neighborhood of 70 to 90,000 vehicles a  
18 day.

19 MRS. GOVAN: Is that a way to control parking?

20 MR. AIRIS: Well, let me finish, please, ma'am. But  
21 this is not a one-way flow in the morning, and a one way flow  
22 back at night. This is a continuous flow. Now if all these  
23 vehicles are some kind of a mass carrying facility there would  
24 be no more cars in the District. Now some how there has been  
25 gotten the feeling here that it is your highway departments that

1 make the vehicles. It isn't at all. We are simply responding  
2 to the actions of the people.

3 MRS. GOVAN: To the vehicles.

4 MR. AIRIS: Well, this, of course, is the problem.  
5 When such things occur as the people down in the Department  
6 of Transportation setting aside something like 2,000 parking  
7 spaces for the use of their employees, that the city fathers  
8 here in the District encourage a McClean Gardens development  
9 that will have something like 2,000 vehicles parked there. The  
10 sister development across Massachusetts Avenue that will have  
11 an additional 1,000 vehicles parked there. That these recent  
12 developments along L Street and M Street and K Street, huge  
13 traffic generators, something like 3 or 400 buildings gone up  
14 in the last 5 years -- 5 to 10 years. The Watergate Apartments.  
15 The terrific development down in Southwest where we are  
16 scheduled here in the District to have 100,000 employees. Now  
17 all of these are the traffic generators that must be satisfied.  
18 Now about 35% of our traffic is commuter-oriented traffic.  
19 That is what we are trying to encourage, to go into mass  
20 transit--that is, a very much enhanced bus system and the  
21 subway system. I personally have testified to try and get  
22 these facilities going and I tried very hard to do it. I  
23 tried very hard to limit parking in the downtown area, but these  
24 are the things that your Highway Department must work with. It  
25 is not just what people say; it's what they do.



1 MRS. GOVAN: Well, Mr. Airis, thank you. I think  
2 what you have said, then, is that the Highway Department, al-  
3 though it does not initiate these actions, what it does is  
4 respond to the actions of those - of the developers, of the  
5 automobile manufacturers and other people who want economic  
6 profit from these kinds of projects as opposed to the citizens.

7 MR. AIRIS: Each person would like to live like  
8 the Land of Gentry. This is the bottom of it.

9 MRS. GOVAN: Okay. Thank you for your answer. I  
10 understand what you are saying, but I think it makes it quite  
11 clear to what interest the Highway Department is responding  
12 and what interest it is not, sir, responding to.

13 MR. AIRIS: It is to the people, ma'am. No highway  
14 department, ma'am, could exist by not providing what the  
15 people demand, but the demands of the people come to us in  
16 so many different forms. This is one of them. What you are  
17 saying tonight is one of them, but only one.

18 MRS. GOVAN: Okay. Well, it's interesting. I suppose  
19 then we will have to find out how these other people make their  
20 demands since they don't seem to make them at public hearings.  
21 That's why I say the public hearing process is a farce. Then  
22 I guess that's why you are holding a design hearing at this  
23 time because you feel that you are responding to some kinds  
24 of people who want this road.

25 MR. AIRIS: Yes, ma'am.

1 MRS. GOVAN: Even though the record is clear the  
2 people do not. The fourth point is that this design hearing,  
3 despite what you have said, is illegal and invalid. It is  
4 a fraud perpetrated on the public, because officials have no  
5 intention of responding to the views expressed at this or any  
6 other hearing. In addition, there are clear legal arguments  
7 against the holding of this hearing.

8 Judge Sirica admitted in his decision that "There  
9 is no question that the present bridge project is not going  
10 forward--and this I think will answer Captain Curtis' question  
11 a little more clearly than was answered before--at any of the  
12 locations proposed in the Howard Needles Report" on which the  
13 1964 hearing was based. Holding this design hearing is  
14 therefore in violation of Section 6a1 of PPM 20-8 which  
15 states that "Both a corridor public hearing and a design  
16 public hearing must be held with respect to each Federal-aid  
17 highway project that is on a new location." This question  
18 is currently under appeal in the courts. If any hearing is  
19 required at all in this case, it must be a corridor hearing.  
20 Furthermore, a corridor hearing is required on I-66, which  
21 connects with and feeds into this I-266, because of Section  
22 682 of the PPM, which calls for corridor and design hearings,  
23 if the project--and I quote--"would have substantially different  
24 social, economical, environmenteffects." The change in these  
25 factors from the 1959 location approval of I-66 was documented



1 at the I-66 design hearing last week. Therefore, I-266 cannot  
2 proceed if a new hearing is held on I-66 which might determine  
3 that there is no need for I-66.

4 You remember from the PPM that a corridor hearing is  
5 held to give full opportunity for public participation in de-  
6 termining the need for as well as the location of the Federal  
7 Aid highway.

8 In addition, the holding of hearings on only one  
9 segment at a time of these freeway projects is totally  
10 contrary to the stated goals of Federal regulations that there  
11 be "effective public participation" in the consideration of  
12 highway proposals. (PPM Sec. 1) What is approved in one part  
13 of a project predetermines what will be in on other portions of  
14 the project. This removes any public options and makes im-  
15 possible public participation. This method of holding one hearing  
16 on a 3-mile segment of I-66, another on one segment of I-266 and  
17 so on, makes a mockery of the provisions in Federal statutes  
18 which call for projects based on comprehensive planning and  
19 community goals. Planning one segment of an interdependent  
20 road network in isolation from other segments shows that this  
21 process is not operating.

22 In conclusion, the Arlington Project of MWPFA and  
23 the Arlington Coalition on Transportation submit that construc-  
24 tion of I-266 and of I-66 must not proceed because:

25 This interstate would aggravate transportation problems

1 and compete with needed mass rapid transit.

2 The effects of these projects would be devastating  
3 of the social, economic and environmental values of the  
4 affected communities, because proper and legal procedures have  
5 not been followed.

6 Any action to construct these projects would be an  
7 arbitrary and capricious defiance of expressed community senti-  
8 ment and of national goals to preserve the quality of life and  
9 the environment in these United States. Thank you.

10 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

11 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mrs. Maria Worris?

12 WHEREUPON,

13 MRS. MARIA WORRIS, CITIZEN,  
14 2235 N. Columbus Street, Arlington, Virginia, approached  
15 the podium and testified, in substance, as follows:

16 MRS. WORRIS: My name is Mrs. Maria Worris, I reside  
17 in Arlington, Virginia.

18 The statement was made last night that the Three  
19 Sisters Bridge is for suburbanites. But I want you to know  
20 something: We in Arlington don't want it either.

21 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

22 MRS. WORRIS: And the proof for that was at the  
23 hearings on I-66 held last week where several hundred citizens  
24 spoke loud and frequently in opposition to I-66, I-266, and free-  
25 ways in general. I have some questions, but I would like for



1 you to answer them at the end because I don't want to reduce  
2 the time I have for speaking. I will briefly mention these  
3 questions now and then repeat them at the end:

4 How much land acreage is going into the construction  
5 of the freeway through Spout Run?

6 How much of the acreage is parkland?

7 How much is privately owned?

8 How much parkland is left?

9 The environmental aspects of this design plan could  
10 not have been considered by the Highway Departments because,  
11 if they were, the project would have been abandoned. Anyone  
12 can see that I-266 will destroy the country and scenic atmos-  
13 phere of Spout Run and surrounding neighborhoods, especially  
14 the interchange with I-66 of which no mention has been made.  
15 The proposed Route I-66 shows -- does not show the connection  
16 on I-266 because presumably it is not a part of it - I-66, so,  
17 therefore, it just shows the rounded edge where you see on  
18 the demonstrated photograph up there, where it says Spout Run  
19 Parkway. On this presentation, I assume there is some kind of  
20 connecting roads there. This is also true of the connections with  
21 the bridge and the abuttment of the bridge as it joins land  
22 over and adjoining George Washington Memorial Parkway.

23 Everytime I attend a public hearing on freeways, I  
24 have to sit through the first part of it listening or the first  
25 evening of it, listening to the propaganda of the automobile

1 associations, the trucking associations, and chambers of  
2 commerce, who stand to gain financially with I-266.

3 We are not intimidated by the preferential treatment  
4 accorded the lobbyists. It is natural that the Highway  
5 Department give those who back the I-266 design first crack  
6 at the anti-freeway forces and arrange the agenda to suit the  
7 best interest of the highway lobby.

8 Today we are here to talk, presumably about design  
9 plans for I-266 but know that the Department of Highways in no  
10 way care what we think of their plans. They are merely carry-  
11 ing out a formality. They want to get it over with so that they  
12 can start construction. The true reason we are here at all is  
13 that the Federal Government decided to subsidize the highway  
14 lobby in passing the Federal Highway Act of 1956. Since then,  
15 every city and state government has tried to get its 90% share  
16 of federal funds. At first highway departments were content to  
17 build roads from one state to another. But soon after, they  
18 took their 8-10-12-14 and more lanes of concrete through cities,  
19 parks, and in some really destructive moods, stretched clover-  
20 leafs and ramps inside city limits.

21 What other group is the darling of the Federal  
22 legislators as the trucking and automobile lobby? What other  
23 group has billions of dollars set aside in their own federal  
24 trust fund which is used to enhance the fortunes of these  
25 lobbying industries? This funding for freeways has been the



1 biggest pork barrel legislation of my generation. Somehow it  
2 has not yet been considered unethical. However, why are mass  
3 transit funds for the District of Columbia tied up until the  
4 cement industry gets its large share of the Federal Highway  
5 Fund?

6           Where is the "balanced" transportation that we are  
7 promised? Have you seen any working rail transit? I will  
8 answer that myself: "No." Have you seen many highways? Yes,  
9 they surround us already. So, what balance are you talking of?  
10 There is no balance. Freeways overweigh the balance. To  
11 correct the overload, we have to build rail transit, now.  
12 Billions of dollars are spent every year to help provide right  
13 of way for airplanes and trucks, while railroads not only get  
14 nothing to aid or maintain their rights of way but in fact pay  
15 out heavy state and local taxes on these facilities. I-266  
16 is a clear example of the discriminatory practices against  
17 railroads and in favor of freeways and airports. The design  
18 plan of I-266 is a clear example of the imbalance in transporta-  
19 tion planning. Compare the acreage used and traffic volume  
20 potential and actual of rail transit with the massive land  
21 consumed and one-person-per-car usage of the freeway. A re-  
22 ordering of values seems in order because it is obvious and  
23 evident that rail transit is the more efficient method of  
24 transport. We cannot give into blackmail and release our land  
25 for freeways in order to get rail transit.

1           The Virginia and District of Columbia Departments  
2 of Highways are scared of the advent of rail transit. They  
3 want to beat it down before the first rail is driven in.

4           They would have us believe that rail transit is not  
5 enough, that we need freeways, and we only need to build one  
6 tiny rail spur. But, the answer is to build rail transit lines  
7 and more as we need them -- not more freeways. Rail transit can  
8 do it alone, and that is what the Highway Department and high-  
9 way lobbyists are afraid we will find out. It takes a courageous  
10 public official to come out solely in favor of rail transit,  
11 solely, with no reservations. They want to protect their  
12 political future and not jeopardize their standing by inciting  
13 the wrath of the Automobile Association, the truckers associa-  
14 tions, the tire and rubber, gasoline and oil firms, real estate  
15 developers, and the automotive industry in Detroit. So, if we  
16 cannot get the politicians to throw out I-266 and to withhold  
17 construction funds, then we ought to elect ourselves Governors,  
18 Senators - Representatives, boardmembers and delegates who  
19 will.

20           Four years ago the National Park Service made its pact  
21 to give up our parkland for freeways, providing the Highway  
22 departments returned the land in kind. Is that agreement with  
23 the Park Service still in effect?

24           MR. AIRIS: Yes, it is.

25           MRS. WORRIS: Where is the land located that you



1 are giving in exchange for park land used from Spout Run parkway  
2 area?

3 MR. SNEAD: The replacement lands that are now being  
4 replaced by the Virginia Department of Highways is in the  
5 vicinity of Spout Run Parkway. Does that answer your question?

6 MRS. WORRIS: Is in the vicinity of Spout Run Park-  
7 way? That is, the land that is being used now?

8 MR. SNEAD: The Virginia Department of Highways is  
9 only appraising these lands to determine the cost of the  
10 replacement of Spout Run Parkway.

11 MRS. WORRIS: Is this land now privately owned? If  
12 it isn't, you can't give them parkway for parkway, so apparently  
13 it's owned by someone. Can you give us who are the owners of  
14 this land? Whose property is it that you would be giving?

15 MR. SNEAD: Mrs. Worris?

16 MRS. WORRIS: Yes?

17 MR. SNEAD: These lands which we do have under  
18 consideration there are privately owned. These are lands which  
19 the Right of Way Division of the Virginia Department of High-  
20 ways is in the process of appraising from an evaluation stand-  
21 point for information to be turned over to the National Park  
22 Service and the Federal Government.

23 MRS. WORRIS: Are these lands owned by specific  
24 families, or private industry, or is this school land, or what  
25 is it?

1           Can we have the owners' names of that? Is it  
2 public record? Can we give that out? Can we have that out  
3 for the public record?

4           MR. SNEAD: I don't consider that pertinent to the  
5 thing.

6           MRS. WORRIS: Is the land going to be condemned?  
7 I have seen some beautiful homes up there. I don't know who  
8 wants to give up that land. If I lived in the vicinity of  
9 Spout Run Parkway I would want to stay there because it is a  
10 beautiful area as it is now.

11          MR. SNEAD: Let me answer this question: We, the  
12 Virginia Department of Highways is in no way involved in the  
13 acquisition of replacement parkland.

14          MRS. WORRIS: I see.

15          MR. SNEAD: The Federal Government is.

16          MRS. WORRIS: Well, who is replacing the land use  
17 for freeways?

18          MR. SNEAD: Mrs. Worriss, may I please say this, please  
19 man. The Spout Run Parkway is owned by the United States of  
20 America in conjunction with Arlington County, whose interest in  
21 Spout Run Parkway stems from an agreement which we have already  
22 made you aware of by means of which the original monies were  
23 appropriated for the construction of the parkway and the ac-  
24 quisition of this land. Neither the National Park Service  
25 that controls the parkway nor Arlington County will release the



1 land we need to build I-266, unless we agree to put up the  
2 replacement value of that land so that Public Park Service  
3 will not be imperiled. The Virginia Department of Highways  
4 will have no part in the acquisition of this land. This will  
5 be the responsibility of the Federal Government. The only  
6 thing that the Virginia Department of Highways is attempting  
7 to do is give them an evaluation in connection with the re-  
8 placement facility.

9 MRS. WORRIS: In other words, the United States  
10 Government has to replace the land that you are using; it has  
11 to give back to its own Park Service, is that correct?  
12 What agency of the United States Government would be buying  
13 the property to give to the Park Service?

14 MR. SNEAD: The Federal Government.

15 MRS. WORRIS: I mean, the Federal Government is a  
16 great number of agencies. What agency?

17 MR. SNEAD: National Park Service.

18 MRS. WORRIS: Well, the National Park Service would  
19 be buying the land to give to its ownself, is that it?

20 MR. SNEAD: What the Federal Government does about  
21 this money, with this money - that the Virginia Department of  
22 Highways proposes to put up in connection with this replacement  
23 is entirely up to the Federal Government.

24 MRS. WORRIS: Well, I think this is very confusing  
25 to me and I think it's confusing to everyone else here. In

1 1966, the National Park Service made this agreement, this pact,  
2 and I remember it very clearly. I was at the hearing - the  
3 National Capitol Planning Commission - when it was exposed  
4 and it was understood that the Park Service would give up its  
5 opposition to the freeway system and the Three Sisters Bridge  
6 was in question at this time also, providing that the land was  
7 returned in kind.

8           Apparently this is not very clear to me yet. The  
9 Park Service itself is replacing its own land. I thought the  
10 Park Service was to have the land replaced by those who would  
11 be making use of the land, such as the Virginia Highway  
12 Department would have to find the land and replace it. Some-  
13 however, your answers are not very clear to me.

14           MR. SNEAD: We only put the money up in this group  
15 for the National Park Service; we do not acquire the land.

16           MRS. WORRIS: I see. You only pay for it in dollars.

17           MR. SNEAD: That's right. Put the money up, after  
18 we make a determination of what the value of Spout Run Parkway  
19 in monies is.

20           MRS. WORRIS: I see. Now, my question was, what  
21 land are you using for the appraisal, the land that would be  
22 running through Spout Run --- the freeway running through Spout  
23 Run?

24           MR. SNEAD: This is not relevant to this project be-  
25 cause we only put in escrow the amount of money that we



1 determine to be the value of Spout Run Parkway.

2 MRS. WORRIS: I see. Money cannot replace the  
3 value of Spout Run Parkway, and I know the people who live in  
4 that vicinity probably will feel very much cheated to think  
5 that not even anymore parkland will be acquired in that  
6 vicinity for their use.

7 Has the National Park Service seen these design  
8 plans for I-266? I think you answered that before.

9 MR. SNEAD: Yes, they have.

10 MRS. WORRIS: And they have given approval to these  
11 specific design plans - the specific design plans which are  
12 the subject of this hearing?

13 MR. SNEAD: The attended an inspection about two  
14 months ago with representatives of the Virginia Department of  
15 Highways in Arlington County.

16 MRS. WORRIS: Have they given approval to these de-  
17 sign plans?

18 MR. SNEAD: Not in writing; no.

19 MRS. WORRIS: The you are holding a design hearing  
20 for land which you not only do not own but land - freeway -  
21 which has not been approved by the National Park Service.

22 Are any officials of the National Park Service or  
23 the Interior Department present to indicate their interest in  
24 this design or to hear that the people resent their giving up  
25 their parkland for freeways? If they are not present, the

1 record should show that the directors of Spout Run Parkway  
2 which now is the National Park Service and the Department of  
3 Interior are not present at this hearing which is concerned  
4 with the design and deposition of land under their jurisdic-  
5 tion.

6 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

7 MRS. WORRIS: To the best of your knowledge, does the  
8 policy of the Interior Department change with regard to the  
9 National Park Service pact when a new Secretary takes office?

10 MR. SNEAD: I have no knowledge of that one.

11 MRS. WORRIS: To the best of your knowledge, is any  
12 new Secretary of Interior bound by pacts made by the National  
13 Park Service under his predecessor or predecessors?

14 MR. AIRIS: I don't understand the question.

15 MRS. WORRIS: All right. To the best of your know-  
16 ledge, does the policy of the Interior Department change with  
17 regard to the National Park Service pact when a new Secretary  
18 of Interior takes office?

19 MR. AIRIS: Well, I think you should direct that to  
20 the Park Service, they probably can answer that better than  
21 anyone.

22 MRS. WORRIS: To the best of your knowledge is any  
23 new Secretary of Interior bound by pacts made by the National  
24 Park Service under the preceding Secretary of Interior?

25 MR. AIRIS: Well, you should direct that question to



1 the Secretary.

2 MRS. WORRIS: Well, then, apparently you are holding  
3 design hearings about which you are not sure are approved by  
4 the present Interior Secretary or the preceding Hickel. Do  
5 you have any knowledge of what the policy of Former Secretary  
6 Hickel was towards the National Park Service Pact and the use  
7 of Spout Run Parkway for a freeway?

8 MR. AIRIS: Well, I have never dealt with Secretary  
9 Hickel at all on the Route 266.

10 MRS. WORRIS: Is it true that Secretary Hickel had  
11 become so conservation minded, that he was not a puppet and,  
12 therefore, might have decided not to give parkland for free-  
13 ways? I have come to the conclusion that former Secretary  
14 Hickel was getting in the way of the environmental destructive  
15 forces and pressure from these sources caused his removal.

16 The designs for I-266 are unaesthetic. The notable  
17 architect who spoke last evening gave a rather erudite and  
18 professional appraisal of the I-266 design. He also commented  
19 that the Fine Arts Commission is a joke in highly reputable  
20 circles. The comments of such a knowledgeable architect are  
21 worth a great deal more than those of the trucking, automotive  
22 and Board of Trade lobbyists. After all, who wants to have  
23 bridges and freeways designed by truckers and real estate land  
24 grabbers? They would settle for anything, as long as it is  
25 called "freeway."

1           In connection with the Interior Department section  
2 of my statement, I would like to read the article in the  
3 Washington Post this morning, Tuesday, December 15th, 1970,  
4 The Washington Merry-Go-Round.

5           "MORTON'S TIES TO POLLUTERS NEED AIRING," by Jack  
6 Anderson:

7           "Six-foot-seven Rogers C. B. Morton will be  
8 installed in the Interior Department next month  
9 like a tall Christmas tree strung with glittering  
10 baubles from the special interests.

11          "As Republican National Chairman, he raised  
12 money from the polluters and exploiters for the  
13 GOP campaign chest. He held on to enough of this  
14 campaign greenery to get himself reelected to  
15 Congress.

16          "Now the oil, lumber and bill-board interests  
17 are cheering Morton's appointment as Interior  
18 Secretary in charge of the nation's natural  
19 resources, parks, rivers and lakes. His past  
20 coziness with the despoilers of nature, mean-  
21 while, should be aired by the Senate Interior  
22 Committee at his confirmation hearings."

23 The statement goes on:

24          "\*\*\*Morton also picked up \$250 from Spiros  
25 Skouras, a shipping tycoon, whose freighters



1 and tankers help foul the waters and beaches  
2 that the Interior Department is supposed to  
3 protect from oil spills.

4 "\*\*\*\*The amiable, 250-pound giant has usually  
5 put his mouth where his money is. He has battled  
6 against air pollution control, upheld the oil de-  
7 pletion allowance and voted with the billboard  
8 lobby to knock out highway beautification funds.

9 "The League of Conservation Voters claims Morton  
10 has voted wrong, or not voted at all, on just  
11 about every conservation issue that has come be-  
12 fore the House. He was so uninterested in  
13 Interior affairs that he gave up membership on  
14 the House Interior Committee to serve on the  
15 Ways and Means Committee.

16 "Morton's office told us that 'Rog' has taken  
17 nothing with strings attached. He'll go  
18 into this Interior job as free as the mountain  
19 air." The spokesman reminded us that we had  
20 raised a big ruckus over Walter Hickel's nomi-  
21 nation. Despite his ties with the despoilers,  
22 he turned out to be the best Interior Secretary  
23 since the late Harold Ickes."

24 How much land acreage is going into the construction of the  
25 Freeway through Spout Run?

1 MR. SNEAD: As far as the construction, including  
2 the hiking and biking trails along the fringe area, 31.6  
3 acres.

4 MRS. WORRIS: How much of the acreage is parkland?  
5 And how much is privately owned? Is it all parkland?

6 MR. SNEAD: It's all parkland. 31.6 acres is  
7 parkland.

8 MRS. WORRIS: I see. That's all. Thank you.

9 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Worris.

10 MR. AIRIS: Thank you.

11 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

12 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I have been requested  
13 now by at least two or three people who have been listed on  
14 the agenda for approximate times for presentations. Now, I  
15 am prepared to sit here all night. I think out of courtesy to  
16 those who have appeared here and who have written in and  
17 requested times and have been given times, this is going to  
18 have to be requested from each of the participants, an approxi-  
19 mation of how much time it would take -- that we ought to with-  
20 in some bounds of propriety, stay within the time limit. Now  
21 I am prepared to sit here but apparently there are those who  
22 are not.

23 A SPEAKER: Mr. Dugas?

24 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Yes?

25 A SPEAKER: I asked for ten minutes last night and



1 I used twenty-one minutes. You have been very kind, and I  
2 appreciate it. I want to make it a part of the record.

3 Mr. and Mrs. Hutchings, for family reasons, and  
4 Mr. Hislop, for health reasons, couldn't be here tonight and  
5 asked me to convey a message for them. First of all,  
6 Captain Curtis asked me to convey a message for the association

7 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I am not sure that I under-  
8 stand what you are saying.

9 A SPEAKER: First of all, I will thank you for the  
10 cooperation yesterday.

11 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I understand that.

12 A SPEAKER: And make that a part of the record.  
13 Mr. and Mrs. Hutchings and Mr. Hislop couldn't be here.

14 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Yes, I understand that.  
15 What is it that you are asking me to do?

16 A SPEAKER: To relinquish ten minutes to three  
17 people. Captain Curtis asked me to convey a message.

18 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Captain Curtis has already  
19 spoken.

20 A SPEAKER: Yes, he asked me to convey a message  
21 from the association of which he is a member; he forgot to do  
22 it. A physicist, Dr. Fernando, and Mr. Springman, and I think  
23 I can commit them to not more than 10 minutes.

24 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I am afraid I won't be able  
25 to do that, doctor.

1           A SPEAKER: I would like to inquire through the  
2 Chair, Mr. Chairman, does this gentleman propose or is he ask-  
3 ing of the Chair to recognize witnesses who were not assigned  
4 time to appear here this evening?

5           HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: That is correct.

6           A SPEAKER: If so, I strenuously object to this  
7 procedure, sir, inasmuch as I followed the procedure set forth  
8 by the Mayor and Council. I asked for an assignment. I was  
9 given an assignment for 9:30 - from 9:30 to 9:40, sir. I  
10 respectfully request the Chair to follow the time assigned  
11 me as nearly as he possibly can. I object to anyone who has  
12 not been assigned a time, preceding me.

13           HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Your name, sir?

14           MR. CURTIN: Curtin. John J. Curtin, Jr, sir.

15           A SPEAKER: Maybe the gentleman misunderstood me.  
16 These people had assigned time.

17           HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: They will have an opportunity  
18 when we get to them, sir. I am going to follow the agenda.

19           A SPEAKER: They are not here now.

20           HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I am sorry. Mr. and Mrs.  
21 Hutchings are not here, doctor.

22           A SPEAKER: Yes; yes.

23           HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: And I am going to pass on to  
24 Mr. Hislop at this time. Is Mr. Hislop here?

25           A SPEAKER: No, he asked me to speak for him.



1 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Then I am going to move on  
2 to Louis S. Clapper, Doctor. When we finish this list you  
3 may come in and speak on their behalf.

4 A SPEAKER: I have to leave.

5 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Tomorrow we will make  
6 additional time for you, sir.

7 A SPEAKER: Not for me, Mr. Dugas.

8 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: For Mr. and Mrs. Hutchings  
9 and Mr. Hislop.

10 A SPEAKER: Yes.

11 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: We will make time for them  
12 tomorrow. I will now hear from Mr. Clapper. We are running  
13 at least an hour behind time.

14 A SPEAKER: I can't make it tomorrow; they can't  
15 make it tomorrow.

16 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Then we will make it on  
17 Thursday then, Doctor, whenever you make it, because I am going  
18 to be here if it takes until Christmas.

19 Come right on, Mr. Clapper.

20 WHEREUPON,

21 MR. LOUIS S. CLAPPER,

22 NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, APPROACHED THE PODIUM, AND  
23 TESTIFIED, IN SUBSTANCE, AS FOLLOWS:

24 MR. CLAPPER: I hope I will not be, sir.

25 (THE AUDIENCE: laughter))

1 MR. CLAPPER: Mr. Chairman, I am Louis S. Clapper,  
2 Conservation Director for the National Wildlife Federation  
3 which has its national headquarters at 1412 Sixteenth Street,  
4 N. W., in the District of Columbia. Ours is a private, non-  
5 profit organization which seeks to attain conservation goals  
6 through educational means. The Federation has independent  
7 affiliated groups in all 50 states and the Virgin Islands.

8 These Affiliates, in turn, are made up of local  
9 groups and individuals who, when combined with associate  
10 members and other supporters of the National Wildlife Federa-  
11 tion number an estimated 2½ million persons.

12 As one of the amici curae in the case of the D.C.  
13 Federation of Civic Associations, et al v. John A. Volpe et  
14 al, in the "Three Sisters Bridge" case, we are exceedingly  
15 pleased to have this invitation and opportunity to comment  
16 and express our views on the effects of this proposed facility  
17 and its approaches in Virginia and the District of Columbia.  
18 As we have contended, we are of the firm belief that Section  
19 128(a) of Title 23 of the U. S. Code requires public hearings  
20 to be held to consider the impact of the bridge project on the  
21 environment as well as its consistence with the goals and ob-  
22 jectives of urban planning. We have been convinced that the  
23 bridge construction was initiated before these required hearings  
24 were held and are unlawful. Consequently, we are pleased that  
25 we are now being given the opportunity to express our views,



1 both on location and design.

2           Our concern about this situation is of a long-stand-  
3 ing type. On April 2, 1968, the Executive Director of the  
4 National Wildlife Federation, Thomas L. Kimball, testified  
5 before the House Committee on Public Works to express the  
6 opposition of our organization against a bill which directed  
7 the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge and interstate  
8 highways "notwithstanding any provisions of law or court de-  
9 cision or administrative action to the contrary." In that  
10 statement, Mr. Kimball posed this question: "First, while  
11 everyone is interested, in moving people in and out of the District  
12 of Columbia with the greatest speed, comfort, and safety, why  
13 is this highway system being pushed at breakneck speed when  
14 the rapid transit system is just getting started?"

15           Later, when the Senate considered a conference  
16 committee report on the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968,  
17 important legislative history was made in that body. Sen.  
18 Mike Mansfield (Mont.) expressed his concern saying: "I  
19 am not convinced that members of the Congress are the proper  
20 ones to be planning and dictating the construction of highways  
21 and freeways in the District of Columbia." Also, in response  
22 to a question, Sen. Jennings Randolph, W. Va., Chairman of the  
23 Senate Committee on Public Works, declared. . . "There will be  
24 no encroachment on Glover-Archibold Park."

25           On November 15, 1968, in a letter to the Federal

1 Highway Administrator in response to proposed additions to  
2 Title 23, CFR, proposed regulations relating to the public  
3 participation in the location and designs of highways financed  
4 in part by Federal funds, our organization expressed the belief  
5 that "all too often, highway planners make decisions without  
6 giving considerations to any other values." We also pointed  
7 out that some highway planners appear to deliberately seek  
8 out publicly-owned lands, especially undeveloped natural  
9 areas, as route for roads, in a desire to keep land acquisition  
10 costs at a minimum. As a consequence of these attitudes and  
11 opinions, we expressed our support of the two-step hearing pro-  
12 cedure on both the corridor or location of a highway and/or  
13 pertinent facilities such as bridges and on design after a  
14 route has been determined.

15 In light of the foregoing, Mr. Chairman, we believe  
16 that the record is clear and complete about our long-standing  
17 belief that these public hearings should have been held at a  
18 much earlier time.

19 As a conservation organization interested in preserva-  
20 tion of the environment, our primary concern in this case has  
21 been about preservation of the environment, our primary concern  
22 in this case has been about preservation of natural areas and  
23 historic locations. As we see it, few places in the entire  
24 world can even equal the record of preserving outstanding park  
25 lands and historic locations in the manner presently existing



1 in the District of Columbia and its environs in Virginia and  
2 Maryland. Historical places and natural areas with highly  
3 important national significance are located along the entire  
4 Washington waterfront, extending from Chairn Bridge past  
5 Georgetown, along the Lincoln Memorial area, and in the Tidal  
6 Basin region. Many additional roads and tunnels and approaches  
7 are tied in with an ambitious "major throughway plan" which  
8 has been altered and revised extensively, with parkways replac-  
9 ing interstate highways in some instances. Of course, a  
10 bridge across the Potomac in the so-called "Three Sisters Area"  
11 is a key facility for any highway plan of this sort.

12           Opposition to the Three Sisters Bridge has been ex-  
13 pressed for at least a decade, in my personal memory. Wide-  
14 spread opposition was expressed in public hearings held in  
15 1964 and this sentiment came from citizen groups in both  
16 Virginia and the District of Columbia. Again, overwhelming  
17 opposition was recorded in 1969 when voters rejected it in an  
18 informal poll. Then, as now, citizens expressed the concern  
19 that the project will damage and impair the beautiful view  
20 upstream from Georgetown, one of the unique scenic assets which  
21 allows Washington to be in the forefront of all national capitals  
22 in beauty. Through approaches, construction of the bridge would  
23 destroy park land rich in recreational and educational values.  
24 Despite assurances to the contrary, ramps in the District of  
25 Columbia would pose a distinct threat to the unique Glover-

1 Archibold Park and an important residential region nearby.

2           As we indicated earlier, we are interested in moving  
3 people to and from the innermost parts of the District of  
4 Columbia with the greatest ease--but without damaging other  
5 values. As a consequence, we are of the firm opinion that the  
6 Three Sisters Bridge proposal and the attendant highway system  
7 should not be constructed until the mass rapid transit mode of  
8 operation is given an opportunity to meet these needs. We all  
9 know of the great threats to human health and safety which are  
10 posed by air pollution resulting from autoemissions and it is  
11 our understanding that the Congress, prior to adjournment this  
12 year, probably will set an early deadline for the achievement  
13 of certain standards on the curtailment of auto emissions.  
14 However, it would seem ill-advised at this time to begin  
15 construction of a system which will bring even more automobiles  
16 into the downtown Washington, D. C. area at a time when serious  
17 consideration is being given to reducing air pollution from  
18 automobile engines.

19           Finally, we are distressed and concerned about  
20 reports in the metropolitan press which indicate that the  
21 Three Sisters Bridge project and attendant highways are being  
22 forced upon the District by some members of the Congress as a  
23 means of getting the mass transit system. If these press re-  
24 ports are accurate, nowhere else in our experience has a city  
25 been faced with such a bald attempt at directing its program



1 and we are of the strong opinion that this case, like all  
2 others, should be decided upon its merits rather than on what  
3 types of political pressures the highway lobby can generate.  
4 In this respect, it is our expectation to develop a nationwide  
5 campaign to inform citizens throughout the country of this  
6 important and precedent-setting problem.

7 We offer our thanks for the opportunity of expressing  
8 these viewpoints.

9 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Clapper.

10 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

11 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mrs. Hubbard?

12 WHEREUPON,

13 MRS. HARRIET B. HUBBARD,

14 Citizen representing the 19th Street Association, Approached  
15 the podium and testified, in substance as follows:

16 MRS. HUBBARD: You know, when you speak about the  
17 pressure that is behind putting this freeway up, I did a  
18 little research into the real estate values out in this area,  
19 out in Fairfax County and Loudon County; Arlington County. You  
20 all might remember when the so-called FREE-HILL AMENDMENT  
21 was passed. Remember, that was a court decision which allowed  
22 the subdivisions to be made in a different way. That was  
23 about March 1959. I have some figures that I got out of the  
24 files out there that show that between 1960 and 1966 some of  
25 the property in Fairfax County close to Route 66 has increased

1 one thousand percent in value, without anything having been  
2 built on it at all. So, that's worth a lot of hard hearings,  
3 worth a lot of pushing. Beyond that, there is Loudon County,  
4 Prince William County, and the developers out there when you  
5 look to see who they are: Stewart DuBell; and people who were  
6 on the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors. Some of them have  
7 been prosecuted for conflict of interest. They are quite a lot  
8 of familiar Virginia names that are in our rotary file as  
9 owners of District property. And it leads me to believe  
10 that somewhere in our District Government, as I have reason to  
11 have noted before in my connections with the District Govern-  
12 ment, that they are influenced by other considerations than  
13 what you might call public good. And you know that's true,  
14 Mr. Dugas. Or the absolute application - rigorous applica-  
15 tion of the laws of the District of Columbia. Now the pressure  
16 I think behind building all this stuff is really not highway  
17 lobbies or anything like that. It comes from the landowners  
18 especially those landowners right around the District of  
19 Columbia where like enormous inflation has occurred. We have  
20 the highest inflation of real estate of anywhere in the entire  
21 country, and that's where the pressure is coming from.

22 Now, Mr. Airis, you work for the District of Columbia.  
23 You do not work for anybody in the counties, and I think that a  
24 person who thinks that the District needs these freeways should  
25 have his head examined.



1 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

2 MRS. HUBBARD: These people who are coming in and  
3 out of the District of Columbia do not spend their money there.  
4 When you see what the Mayor will listen to sometimes about  
5 improving the tax base of the District of Columbia, the kind  
6 of things he okays on the zoning commission; the little stories  
7 we hear about how somebody is forcing Mr. Airis to accommodate  
8 the automobile. In the case of McClean Garden, for example,  
9 the two and a half percent mortgage that they had on that  
10 thing, which they got -- they practically got it from the  
11 government for nothing. It doesn't even expire until 1975.  
12 All these things you know the citizens are looking at and  
13 wondering what our government is really trying to do to us.

14 I would hope that all of the officials of the  
15 District of Columbia would think of nothing but the good  
16 of the District of Columbia. The reason why we are going  
17 bankrupt in our city is because the money that is earned there  
18 is not spent there and it will not be spent there as long as  
19 our transportation plans are all designed to take the people  
20 who have a lot of money out in the country and to leave the  
21 people in town who just don't have that much. I think right  
22 inside the District of Columbia - the Division of Property  
23 Taxes and the assessments is not right - you really have to  
24 do a lot of thinking down there in the District about how to  
25 correct that situation, but we do not need this freeway. If I

1 were to read you here a list of the names that I got out of  
2 the property rosters, you would see some familiar ones.

3 THE REPORTER: Would you spell the complicated ones  
4 for the record.

5 MRS. HUBBARD: What?

6 THE REPORTER: Spell them for the record.

7 MRS. HUBBARD: Oh, I am not going to read them. It  
8 is just too embarrassing. Now, if you allow the bridge to be  
9 built or encourage it to be built you will be adding to the  
10 pollution problem of the Potomac River. When you look out  
11 into this problem of curious way out here in Virginia that they  
12 have their sanitary districts, you just look at Sanitary  
13 District #12, for example, where the sewage goes in the  
14 Occaquan Creek, and all their sewer bond performances -  
15 at one point 7 million dollars, and everything else they had  
16 out in Fairfax County, you will see that anyone who enables  
17 these people out in the suburbs to make these enormous profits  
18 on their real estate without having done anything at all except  
19 traded among themselves, they will build and get these sewer  
20 taps. A lot of that stuff goes into the Blue Plains Plant and  
21 it helps to pollute the Potomac River. As you know, there is  
22 a lot of our sewage system which hasn't been completed. In  
23 order to realize that all of this money went on the land, to get  
24 that money back they have to build. If you provide the trans-  
25 portation, with the automobile, then they will be able to build.



1 Then we will have more pollution, and the Potomac River will  
2 be worse than it is now. Occoquan Creek will be ruined.  
3 The other thing: None of these plans, the freeway, or the  
4 sewage plants, have been coordinated with the power situation  
5 in this area. We are sick and tired in the District of Colum-  
6 bia of being threatened by a power shortage: that we can't  
7 have electricity, we can't do this, we can't do that; there's  
8 something wrong with the oil around here; they can't get enough  
9 oil, they can't get enough electricity. How anybody in the  
10 District of Columbia that wants to help the Nation's Capitol  
11 can utterly promote suburban development, before these  
12 questions of pollution and power have been solved, I just don't  
13 understand. The same thing applies to the water supply. There  
14 is no provision for all this development. If you look at the  
15 zoning plans and see the amount of acreage that has been re-  
16 zoned. On the basis of the rezoning, money has been lent;  
17 people have trusts; they are getting appraisers and going to  
18 insurance companies to try and get the money for building.  
19 They just cannot do that if they don't have the transportation.  
20 If you allow them to have any kind of transportation, they will  
21 be able to get this money that makes the pollution problem  
22 worse; it makes our water shortage greater. And I hope if  
23 you are really devoted to the interests of the District of  
24 Columbia you will not encourage this. We are just sick in  
25 tired in the District of hearing about all the shortages.

1           The other thing is the curious inability of the  
2 District Government, our Federal Government, to keep to some  
3 of their stated agreements that they have made in the past.  
4 For example, when they put in Dulles Airport it was said --  
5 the FHA -- that they would not finance any housing that was not  
6 within a certain distance away from those cones, you know,  
7 where planes come in. However, they are, so you find right  
8 now that you are going to create another situation out there  
9 around Dulles Airport somewhat similar to the one that is  
10 around National Airport. As you notice, the citizens are suing  
11 National Airport.

12           HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mrs. Hubbard, could we  
13 conclude it in about three minutes?

14           MRS. HUBBARD: Yes, you certainly can. The other  
15 thing I would like to ask you, Mr. Dugas, if you are going to  
16 communicate any of this to the Mayor? You know all of us  
17 citizens for a long, long time have wanted to a map, a big  
18 map that has on it the subway, the bus system, and the freeway  
19 system, all on one map in the District, and we have never been  
20 able to find such a map. I wonder if the Mayor has the power  
21 to ask Mr. Airis to prepare such a map for the citizens? We  
22 would like to see our transportation--a thing that's called  
23 "a balanced transportation system," all put on one map so we  
24 can really see what it looks like. When I asked the people in  
25 your office, he said he had one that was made just for himself



1 and it was not official, and he didn't have any copies. It  
2 does not have the bus system on it.

3 MR. AIRIS: Mrs. Hubbard, the next time you are in  
4 my office I will show you a map that has the overlays of the  
5 various transportation features.

6 MRS. HUBBARD: We want it all in in hundreds and  
7 hundreds of copies, so we can show it to everybody to see what  
8 balanced transportation really means. We can't even get around  
9 in our city and we want to see where the "balance" really is,  
10 and the bank balance.

11 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you, Mrs. Hubbard.

12 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

13 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Morten?

14 WHEREUPON,

15 MR. JOHN MORTON,

16 GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, CREW TEAM, APPROACHED THE  
17 PODIUM AND TESTIFIED, IN SUBSTANCE, AS FOLLOWS:

18 MR. MORTEN: First of all, my name is John Morton,  
19 and it's spelled M o r t o n, as in the salt company - not  
20 necessarily the former Congressman, and also the George  
21 Washington University "Crew" not "Crew Team." Anyway, I am  
22 the Assistant Coach at George Washington for the crew. I have  
23 been at GW since 1965, and have rode on this river for five  
24 years as a college student, and I have rode several times as a  
25 high school student competing against the area high schools.

1 So, I feel I know the river pretty well. Actually, I only  
2 have two points to make, as specifically our position applies  
3 to the bridge. First of all, the 6 span alternate is really  
4 rather unacceptable as far as crew is concerned in the Wash-  
5 ington Metropolitan area. Principally, because of point one:  
6 the hazards involved for the carsman--namely, the air pollution  
7 that might be involved in that area. The airplanes are  
8 enough. Also, the hazards to navigation, which actually are  
9 more important as far as the bridge itself is concerned. With  
10 the 6 span alternate there will be abutment right in the middle  
11 of the river, as you can see there. The theory is that we feel  
12 that this will cause a sufficient amount of funneling, as far  
13 as the current is concerned in that area.

14 In the spring time the current is pretty bad. In  
15 many cases, sometimes after the melting of the snow and the  
16 rain, and what not, in the spring. So the current does begin  
17 to pick up in the spring. In addition to the fact that you have  
18 got this obstacle right there in the middle of the river. But  
19 we are not really too sure what the effect will be, but we  
20 do know that the current will be sped up considerably, on the  
21 Virginia shore particularly. And, as I said, during the  
22 spring this will be more evident than at any other time.

23 Point Number Two: As far as the course is concerned,  
24 I think this will be delved into in more detail later on this  
25 evening by another gentleman who testifies as far as the crews



1 are concerned. So, I will defer details on the course to him.  
2 With the six span alternate, it will reduce the number of lanes  
3 in the course from six to four; and that's a considerable dis-  
4 advantage. Most crew courses are six lanes; at least on the  
5 east coast, Philadelphia, and has been that case here, and  
6 also in some other areas.

7           There are three courses for colleges. A college  
8 course is a mile and a quarter long, as it is here (indicating).  
9 And there is an upstream course, a middle course, and a down-  
10 stream course. The upstream and the middle course will be  
11 affected by this bridge. As I say, there's an abutment, now,  
12 and the six span alternate will be in the middle and will  
13 eliminate two of those lanes. As far as any viable alterna-  
14 tive, as far as courses are concerned, as opposed to the one  
15 already to allow us to have six lanes, it's not viable at all  
16 anywhere else in the river for anybody that knows the river,  
17 that this is about the only straight way we have got here, and  
18 it is useable, except of course down river, further down from  
19 Theodore Roosevelt Island--however, in that area it's very  
20 unaccessible from the various boat houses. It can be done, but  
21 at the same time, you have got a lot of river traffic which  
22 presents quite an inconvenience since the river is not patrolled  
23 adequately enough anyway. Of course you have problems with  
24 marking down there, spectators, and what not.

25           Thirdly, this is pretty important to us, because as

1 far as the colleges are concerned particularly we are trying  
2 to bring more regattas here to the Washington area. Parti-  
3 cularly we are concerned with the regattas in the spring time,  
4 the Cherry Blossom Regatta, which we are tying into for the  
5 third year with the Cherry Blossom Festival, and we are trying  
6 to attract as many crews as possible to make this a major event  
7 early in the crew season. Also, the area championships which  
8 do come about usually in the first weekend, in May; also it  
9 has been expanding to include more crews in the areas than  
10 previously.

11 In the interest of "crew" this six span alternate  
12 particularly will not be terribly advantageous for any kind  
13 of expansion, and certainly as far as it would limit the course  
14 lanes from six to four, it would be an inconvenience. More-  
15 over, the problem of hazard, I have not really delved into ex-  
16 tensively, but I assume by the 10-day limit we should have a  
17 written statement in somewhat more specifics on what the hazards  
18 will be that are presented to us. The thing that disturbs me  
19 principally is this unknown effect it will produce on the  
20 current because it is rather hazardous up there, as it is,  
21 further up the river, and particularly when you people will be  
22 doing your dredging and what not and having a construction  
23 proceeding it will interfere considerably with the crew. I do  
24 feel that a crew is a very important asset to have in the  
25 area, and certainly well presented and well represented as far



1 as high schools, and I feel also colleges. That's all I have  
2 to say.

3 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, I know the time is very  
4 late, but just would like one very brief little question here.  
5 I take it you favor the three span alternate facility for your  
6 crew purposes?

7 MR. MORTEN: In my capacity as a crew coach I would  
8 like to make a further statement as far as the other bridge  
9 is concerned. But as far as the crew is concerned, the six  
10 span alternate is definitely an impediment to the sport and  
11 I wish I could say the same for the other bridge. It is  
12 unknown what affect that abutment will have on the Virginia  
13 side. I myself am not so sure how far off shore that abutment  
14 is, but I am sure it will have some affect that's due to the  
15 current. But I will say this: it won't have any affect as  
16 far as the lanes are concerned.

17 MR. AIRIS: Thank you.

18 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you.

19 Mr. Liddell?

20 WHEREUPON,

21 MR. DANIEL C. LIDDELL,  
22 EMERGENCY COMMITTEE ON THE TRANSPORTATION CRISIS, APPROACHED  
23 THE PODIUM, AND TESTIFIED IN SUBSTANCE AS FOLLOWS:

24 MR. LIDDELL: My name is David Liddell. Live at  
25 2201 42nd Street, Northwest. My bedroom and living room look

1 out on Glover-Archibald Park, which is as I understand from  
2 some testimony tonight may soon become a feeder for the  
3 McClean Gardens Apartment complex to the Three Sisters Bridge.  
4 So, I am one of the last people to have that view. For the  
5 record, I wish to make it clear that my appearance here as a  
6 citizen at this forum in no way constitutes a recognition that  
7 this design hearing is a legal hearing.

8           The Provisions of Title 7 of the D. C. Code for  
9 hearings have not been met. Until such a time when the pro-  
10 visions have been met, the Mayor and Council cannot legally  
11 or more important, ethically decide whether or not the Three  
12 Sisters Bridge is to be designed and built. There is another  
13 problem: One of the issues in the citizen lawsuit before the  
14 Appeals Court is the need for another hearing at a new loca-  
15 tion for any projected new bridge. This fact makes it pre-  
16 mature to discuss the design of the bridge. If, and I hope  
17 the time never comes, a legal design hearing is held, the design  
18 hearing on Route 266 should consider the whole project from  
19 the intersection with Route 266 in Arlington to the Potomac  
20 Expressway and the small inconsequential feeder routes includ-  
21 ing the inevitable, Glover-Archibald Park Consumer Expressway,  
22 the U Street-Natcher Freeway, and the North Central Broyhill  
23 Freeway. The whole project must be considered before we build  
24 a bridge that will more easily allow consumers to work on K  
25 Street and buy tea in Georgetown and more easily provide trans-



1 portation for District slaves to work in the hunt country of  
2 Virginia. The people of the District certainly know that good  
3 help is hard to come by these days, for the people of the  
4 District are now refusing to say, "We are just shuffling our  
5 feet, boss." Time is running out. A METRO is hopefully being  
6 built which will shift the transportation of people from their  
7 private automobile to the Metro. Even if you take the position  
8 that another bridge might be needed, and I believe another  
9 bridge will never be needed if we keep our priorities straight,  
10 it has not yet been determined whether people will shift from  
11 the car to the METRO. Until that time comes, it is economically  
12 ethically irresponsible to talk about a design for the Three  
13 Sisters Bridge. Doesn't it make much more sense to ban in  
14 the future the use of the private automobile at certain times  
15 of the day and have people utilize total transportation system  
16 of subways, buses, and mini-buses?

17           Why do we have to clog our cities with cars, noise  
18 and air pollution and build another road for the most famous  
19 plantation in the United States, the District of Columbia?

20           Wouldn't it be better if the estimated 50 million  
21 persons who will be in D. C. for the 1976 celebration could  
22 happily walk and ride mini-buses around the city rather than  
23 experiencing future shock and acting out territorial aggression  
24 in private automobiles?

25           Contented, curious tourists will buy more because they

1 will be free of the anxiety caused by the private polluting  
2 automobile. The best bridge Americans will see in Washington  
3 in 1976 will be Three small islands in the Potomac River. They  
4 will be happy that Washington came up with such an original de-  
5 sign for a beautiful bridge.

6 The people of Washington want the present design of  
7 the Three Sisters Bridge, the one that is in the river now.  
8 The present design is spoiled by a few concrete blocks and  
9 dredging machines but these can be removed, and they will be  
10 removed.

11 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

12 MR. LIDDELL: The people of Washington are saying  
13 emphatically to those who govern us from the marble plantation  
14 houses on Pennsylvania Avenue, "We ain't shuffling our feet  
15 no more, boss."

16 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

17 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you.

18 MR. CURTIN: Mr. Chairman?

19 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Curtin?

20 MR. CURTIN: May I leave and ask the Chair's per-  
21 mission to submit my report in writing?

22 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: You are next to speak, if  
23 you would like to, Mr. Curtin.

24 MR. CURTIN: No, sir, I think I have heard enough.  
25 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I will submit my speech.



1 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Curtin.

2 Mr. Miller?

3 MR. CURTIN: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman, may I have  
4 one last word?

5 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Yes, Mr. Curtin?

6 WHEREUPON,

7 MR. JOHN J. CURTIN, JR.,

8 CURTIN AND JOHNSON, INC., APPROACHED THE PODIUM AND TESTIFIED,  
9 IN SUBSTANCE, AS FOLLOWS:

10 MR. CURTIN: As I was leaving the hall, sir, some  
11 gentleman in the back of the room made the remark that I sold  
12 asphalt. I appreciate the Chair's reconsidering and would  
13 ask that the Chair would allow me to make a very short state-  
14 ment.

15 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I wish you would speak.

16 MR. CURTIN: Thank you, sir, I shall. Mr. Chairman,  
17 my name is John J. Curtin, Jr. I live at 4800 W Street,  
18 Northwest. I would first like to express my appreciation  
19 to the Chair for the opportunity of appearing here tonight  
20 as a citizen, and I strictly am appearing as a citizen, and I  
21 would so request that the record show that. Mr. Chairman?

22 A SPECTATOR: (loud remark)

23 MR. CURTIN: Mr. Chair, may I ask the Chair to call  
24 this meeting to order? I cannot speak and concentrate with  
25 remarks from my rear, sir.

1 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I would hope that the Chair  
2 would not find it necessary to ask that order be kept. Let's  
3 maintain a sense of decorum and allow Mr. Curtin the opportunity  
4 to speak just as others have been allowed the opportunity.

5 MR. CURTIN: Thank you kindly, sir. Mr. Chairman,  
6 I am a fourth generation Washingtonian, and as such I am sure  
7 that you, sir, can appreciate that I have a desire to see the  
8 beautiful city of Washington kept and maintained as well as any-  
9 one who has appeared before you at this hearing either today,  
10 this evening or yesterday, or any time in the future.

11 I think in speaking as a citizen, sir, I have the  
12 right to be heard as I have sat here for over an hour, as a  
13 gentleman, and have heard others speak and listened to their  
14 opinions expressed, and I feel I have the right to express  
15 mine, sir.

16 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I agree with you.

17 MR. CURTIN: Thank you, sir.

18 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

19 MR. CURTIN: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding  
20 that this hearing is being conducted strictly for design on  
21 this bridge. I respectfully request or state to the Chair I  
22 should say that I, in my own personal opinion as a citizen  
23 and not as an asphalt peddler as this gentleman has indicated  
24 and said I was afraid to talk - I am speaking again as a citizen  
25 sir, and I would like to remind this gentleman and the others in



1 the room, sir, that as a fourth generation Washingtonian I  
2 venture to say that my people were here long before his ever  
3 came here, and will be here after his leave.

4 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

5 MR. CURTIN: Sir?

6 MR. ABBOTT: (loud comments)

7 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Abbott, I am not going  
8 to have any more disturbances in this hall. Now, Mr. Curtin  
9 is going to speak and he is going to speak without any  
10 disturbance.

11 (MR. DUGAS GOT UP FROM HIS SEAT AND APPROACHED  
12 AN OFFICER AND ADDRESSED MR. ABBOTT.)

13 Now, Officer, would you come here, please.

14 If I have any more disturbances from anyone in the room would  
15 you please remove them. Thank you.

16 MR. CURTIN: I am here, Mr. Chairman, to tell you  
17 this evening that in my personal opinion the design of this  
18 building should be left to the engineers and to the Fine Arts  
19 Commission. Again, I reiterate, sir, that I express this as a  
20 citizen.

21 I stated earlier, Mr. Chairman, that I understood  
22 this hearing was being held strictly for the design. I, there-  
23 fore, request permission of the Chair to deviate with my state-  
24 ment to one extent, if I may, sir, and I will try my best to  
25 confine my remarks strictly to one other very important issue

1 that has been brought out by several of the folks who spoke  
2 previously to me this evening.

3 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Curtin, Judge Sirica and  
4 the Department of Transportation have indicated that there are  
5 23 factors that may go into a design hearing. We have allowed  
6 wide latitude, and I can't imagine that anything you will say  
7 that will go any wider than some of the conversations I have  
8 heard. You have the floor, and you may speak on whatever sub-  
9 ject you desire.

10 MR. CURTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to  
11 speak simply on the question of pollution, sir. I have given  
12 you my home address, sir, and I live not too far from the  
13 Potomac River.

14 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Might I suggest, sir, that  
15 that is Item #15 of the 23 factors, as suggested by DOT and  
16 by Judge Sirica, and we would appreciate your comments on  
17 pollution.

18 MR. CURTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Where we live,  
19 sir, we are continuously bothered day and night by jet air-  
20 craft either taking off or landing at National Airport, and in  
21 doing so, in particularly when they are approaching the field  
22 for a landing. Not being an expert on jet aircraft, Mr.  
23 Chairman, I am not in the position to state whether they in-  
24 ject a certain proportion of water into the jet fuel before  
25 they empty the fuel over our homes or what process takes place,



1 sir, but nevertheless I can tell you emphatically without fear  
2 of contradiction that this emission is most obnoxious from a  
3 pollution standpoint and also from a safety aspect. Plus the  
4 fact, Mr. Chairman, this aircraft coming across the Northwest  
5 area in which I live--and this is the only area that I can  
6 really speak of, sir--fly on occasions which seems to be so  
7 low that the windows in our home vibrate.

8           The Palisades Citizens Association a couple of years  
9 ago asked all the citizens to please notify the airport,  
10 the National Airport, Civil Aeronautics Authority, if this  
11 occurred. I, personally, sir, made numerous calls. My calls  
12 were received in a very courteous manner and I was informed  
13 that they would be passed on to a higher echelon. That is where  
14 they stopped. Now it is my understanding, sir, that by the  
15 building of this bridge and the adjacent roads tying into the  
16 existing Dulles Airport Roadways, the travel time to Dulles  
17 Airport will be cut by 20 minutes, or somewhat similar time.

18           I have gone into detail, Mr. Chairman, to state  
19 these facts simply because I live in fear of an aircraft  
20 dropping over my house and I am very much fed up with the  
21 emission of jet propulsion over my home and my windows vibrat-  
22 ing, and when friends are visiting me in the summer time we  
23 can't even sit out in our yards. We cannot sit in our yards  
24 and hear each other talking, and I think that something should  
25 be done to help us in this matter. This, Mr. Chairman, should

1 be taken into consideration. When our Mayor and Council are  
2 continuously talking about the Federal government, the District  
3 government, and everything else, trying to eliminate pollution,  
4 and the people who have preceded me here this evening have  
5 continuously referred to pollution from automobiles. I re-  
6 spectfully suggest to the Chair that pollution emanates from  
7 the aircraft flying over our homes, and is far, far worse, sir,  
8 than the pollution that could possibly come from any automobiles.  
9 They wouldn't be any where comparable, sir.

10 Mr. Chairman, this concludes my remarks. Again, I  
11 thank you for your indulgence and appreciate the courtesy  
12 you extended to me this evening (sobbing). Thank you, sir.

13 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you so much for your  
14 testimony, Mr. Curtin. Thank you.

15 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

16 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Miller?

17 WHEREUPON,

18 MR. HAROLD O. MILLER,

19 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF FAIRFAX, APPROACHED THE PODIUM AND  
20 TESTIFIED, IN SUBSTANCE, AS FOLLOWS:

21 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Sorry I had to interrupt you,  
22 Mr. Miller.

23 MR. MILLER: No problem at all. I appreciate an  
24 opportunity to be here. I know several of you from working  
25 with the Transportation Planning Board, and I will be very



1 brief. You have so many long hearings. I might say that I am  
2 from the suburbs of Virginia. I don't own a great deal of  
3 real estate, about a third of an acre. I don't represent any  
4 real estate interests. I am a local official out there, and  
5 Vice Chairman of the Fairfax County Board.

6 I might say also that the real estate I own isn't  
7 on the Palisades or Spout Run. I am a Fairfax County official;  
8 but I am here to say that I am very much concerned as I think  
9 everyone is with the need for a good transportation system.

10 I am also here, however, to request that you do a  
11 very difficult thing, and that you really evaluate the need  
12 for this bridge. The impact of the I-66 hearings in Virginia  
13 I think were so great that the Arlington County Board will ask  
14 hearings on the reopening and need for the road itself.

15 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

16 MR. MILLER: Thank you. And also, if the road is ul-  
17 timately determined to be needed in some fashion that perhaps  
18 it wouldn't be needed in as great a size as has been designed,  
19 but could perhaps be a more forward looking transportation  
20 corridor. I feel that at this moment to proceed with a design  
21 and all the expense and work entailed in designing the Three  
22 Sisters Bridge -- would be to preclude, foreclose at this time,  
23 any gain from any future public hearings on the need for the  
24 road itself or for a redesign of the corridor, or perhaps a  
25 more forward look at the transportation use. I feel most

1 strongly that we have not been looking to the best uses for  
2 this transportation corridor. As Chairman of the Transportation  
3 Planning Board - and Past Chairman - I was a Commissioner of  
4 the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission - it is my  
5 observation that we are not solving our metropolitan transpor-  
6 tation crisis by building more and more highways and bridges.  
7 I admit that we do need highways and bridges, and we have got  
8 to have a balanced system. But I think in many cases we are  
9 using band aids when a tourniquet is needed to choke off the  
10 flow of more and more vehicles into a city whose streets are  
11 already over capacity, and is desperately short of parking  
12 facilities.

13 I think we must remove the blinders of a 15 year  
14 old decision and look with more and new vision to the best  
15 use of this corridor rather than lane after lane clogs of  
16 automobiles. Perhaps we can design a model corridor. Perhaps  
17 it could be limited in rush hour to METRO and other mass  
18 transit vehicles along which we could build attractive, multi-  
19 level parking facilities. Such a corridor wouldn't require  
20 nearly as many lanes. It would greatly minimize the impact  
21 of noise, congestion and air pollution on our community.

22 I know that you gentlemen have labored long to  
23 complete this highway and that you have been through many  
24 fights in the process. I think when you are so close to a  
25 project it is often very difficult to consider radically alter-



1 ing your course, but this is exactly what I request you do.  
2 I think a bold an innovative approach to this corridor, an  
3 approach which seeks to move people rather than cars could be  
4 a model for the nation.

5 It could, with the help and cooperation of us all,  
6 hold such promise for the relief of the Metropolitan transpor-  
7 tation crisis, and I believe we could persuade the urban mass  
8 transit administration, and other federal agencies, to in fact  
9 give us special funding.

10 I myself as a local official am deeply involved in  
11 the transportation problems of the area, and I certainly offer  
12 my assistance. I hope all those here this evening and others  
13 in the community would. I really think that there has been  
14 such focus on this road, that now we have such a rare oppor-  
15 tunity we don't usually have, that is an opportunity to take a  
16 second look.

17 I think we certainly have time and I encourage us to  
18 do that. Thank you.

19 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

20 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Miller.

21 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might be  
22 permitted just one or two very quick questions. The hour is  
23 late.

24 MR. MILLER: You have been here longer than I have.  
25 Take your time.

1 MR. AIRIS: We have been sitting here trying to take  
2 it all in. Would the Board have any preference for a treatment  
3 such as shown there, one or the other (indicating), or anything  
4 else across the river?

5 MR. MILLER: Which Board are you referring to, sir,  
6 Fairfax County Board?

7 MR. AIRIS: The Fairfax Board of Supervisors.

8 MR. MILLER: The Board itself has taken no position,  
9 sir.

10 MR. AIRIS: No position. Oh, I see, you are appearing  
11 as an individual.

12 MR. MILLER: As an individual; yes, sir.

13 MR. AIRIS: Oh, I see. Thank you. Well, would you  
14 have any position on either treatment? Or any other alterna-  
15 tive.

16 MR. MILLER: Well, as I say, my feeling would be  
17 that we shouldn't proceed with the design at this time until  
18 we really see if there is going to be a road attached to the  
19 bridge there.

20 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

21 MR. MILLER: If I had to make a choice I think I  
22 would take the three span.

23 MR. AIRIS: The long-arch bridge. I see.

24 MR. MILLER: This is not a well thought out position,  
25 it's just my reaction to it from observing.



1           MR. AIRIS: I understand. Now, the second question  
2 is: If, as I understand the Virginia folks are thinking, you  
3 could pull out for your county there, put a rapid transit  
4 facility in the medium, or something like that, is that what  
5 you are thinking of?

6           MR. MILLER: Yes, I believe we could. I might say  
7 also that Mr. Curtis alluded to the need and I think it is  
8 very real to make it easier to get to Dulles and also to mini-  
9 mize the impact of the heavy traffic at National on our  
10 community, from a safety and noise and pollution viewpoint; I  
11 think there are two things I would encourage in this regard.  
12 I would encourage the entire community and the Congress to  
13 get behind Senator Spong's proposal, running a spur from the  
14 METRO to Dulles.

15           THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

16           MR. MILLER: I think once again there is definitely  
17 a need for highways, but I think we should be more forward  
18 looking, not always looking to highways to serve these purposes.  
19 I think the METRO would give these people service much more  
20 comfortably and efficiently. I think secondly, as far as the  
21 use of National itself goes, many of you know that there was  
22 a suit filed today by citizens of Virginia and the District to  
23 prohibit certain types of jets from using National. I think  
24 we were taking the right route in this area a few years ago,  
25 before everyone buckled under congressional pressure when we

1 limited the types of flights that could originate at National.  
2 I think we are going to have to look into that. There are  
3 other ways simply by just building highways to look to this  
4 problem.

5 MR. AIRIS: Well, my colleague from Virginia reminds  
6 me that part of the plan for I-66 is space in the median for  
7 rapid transit.

8 MR. MILLER: Yes, sir, it certainly is.

9 MR. AIRIS: I didn't know whether you were aware of  
10 that or not.

11 MR. MILLER: Very much aware of it. My point is,  
12 if we decide, number one, that we don't need the highway it-  
13 self, I don't know if that will be the determination. It may  
14 only be decided that you need some transportation corridor  
15 there; it doesn't preclude using a right of way there for the  
16 METRO and using the balance for other community purposes.

17 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

18 MR. AIRIS: If the facility is built you would very  
19 much endorse putting that in it?

20 MR. MILLER: Oh, yes, sir, and I have, as a member  
21 of the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission, most  
22 certainly.

23 MR. AIRIS: I thought that was your thinking. Thank  
24 you.

25 MR. MILLER: Yes, sir.



1 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you again, Mr. Miller.  
2 Mr. Frank Buck, Jr.?

3 A SPECTATOR: Mr. Chairman, could I have a point of  
4 order?

5 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Yes, sir? Let me hear  
6 the point of order.

7 A SPECTATOR: I mean no disrespect of the request  
8 that you made that no one make any remarks to the gentleman  
9 that spoke before, but it is an ancient tradition in the  
10 English tradition to heckle those you disagree with. And I  
11 think as long as the heckling is not openly disruptive, that  
12 no harm is done, and that anybody that can't come in here and  
13 take a little heckling, especially educationally heckling, which  
14 is the kind of heckling I think we had here, is well-advised  
15 not to speak on an unpopular view. Unpopular views are always  
16 heckled. This is human nature, and I think our heckling is  
17 basically educationally. We don't object just to be nasty.  
18 Thank you.

19 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I appreciate your opinion.  
20 Mr. Buck?

21 WHEREUPON,

22 MR. FRANK BUCK, JR.,

23 CITIZEN, 1844 MINTWOOD PLACE, N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.,

24 APPROACHED THE PODIUM AND TESTIFIED, IN SUBSTANCE, AS FOLLOWS:

25 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I know you are very busy

1 and you are tired.

2 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Not at all, sir, I am pre-  
3 pared to stay here until Christmas.

4 MR. BUCK: I know you are. And you are liable to be.  
5 Anyway, my name is Frank Buck, Jr., and I am running on the  
6 independent ticket of the D. C. non-voting delegate to Congress.  
7 I came with a speech fully for this committee, which is com-  
8 pletely non-representative of the people of Washington. Not  
9 to be flipping, but to be honest, as I know you gentlemen have  
10 put in a lot of time. But the people of Washington are not  
11 represented as far as Mayor Washington and the City Council,  
12 which is not here. And according to D. C. Code Title 7,  
13 Chapter 1 through VI, Section 1 through 106, I in my heart  
14 cannot deliver the proposed design hearing speech that I would  
15 love to, because I really feel it would be useless and of no  
16 point to the people of this city, the District.

17 May I reiterate again, totally useless, and I would  
18 like to waive the remainder of my time and just say that I am  
19 totally one hundred percent against any 30 square mile  
20 construction, super-highway, etcetera, going through the  
21 District. I mean we are going to create another superb  
22 problem, according to Mr. Nadex; we have approximately 5,000  
23 cars per square mile during the rush hour. I am sure this has  
24 been mentioned before many times. But we are running into an  
25 environmental crisis here, a severe one. Respectfully, I would



1 like to say, in my opinion, this hearing is very illegal.

2 Thank you very much, gentlemen.

3 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

4 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you, sir.

5 Mrs. Johnson?

6 WHEREUPON,

7 MRS. ELIZABETH S. JOHNSON,

8 LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON, APPROACHED

9 THE PODIUM AND TESTIFIED, IN SUBSTANCE, AS FOLLOWS:

10 MRS. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Highway  
11 Department: I am Elizabeth S. Johnson, the Chairman of the  
12 League of Women Voters of Metropolitan Washington. That is  
13 an organization made up of the members of the eight leagues  
14 in our area, five in Virginia and two in Maryland and the  
15 District of Columbia.

16 The Metropolitan Washington League of Women Voters is  
17 opposed to the proposed design and construction of I-66 and  
18 I-266.

19 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

20 MRS. JOHNSON: These designs are not clearly related  
21 to the needs of the region for transportation nor coordinated  
22 with other facilities under development. The economic facts  
23 of the projects under consideration are clear. We are sub-  
24 sidizing auto use especially for commuting by building these  
25 facilities, and the parking facilities that go with them. These

1 facilities are neither constructed nor maintained by user  
2 taxes alone. The fact is that we are underwriting a costly  
3 rail transit system, approved since these projects were con-  
4 ceived. Rail systems in other cities throughout the world  
5 do not meet costs of construction and operation through user  
6 revenue charges in cities which subsidize competing auto  
7 travel. If we build both system, we are asking the general  
8 public to give massive subsidies to two massive transportation  
9 systems, neither of which will be self-supporting. Our  
10 community resources are limited. The support which goes to  
11 this construction is unavailable to other needed programs. The  
12 League believes more efficiency and economy will result from  
13 investing in improved bus and other mass transit systems. Motor  
14 vehicle facilities of this kind would add to the environmental  
15 blight already created by the excessive dependence on private  
16 motor vehicle travel in this region. Insufficient land for  
17 recreation use, dangerous neighborhoods for children, rising  
18 accident tolls, health damaging air pollution, extreme demands  
19 on the time of all individuals in the community for transpor-  
20 tation, either as passengers or as chauffeurs, and immobility  
21 for a large segment of the community, the young, the old, the  
22 infirmed, the poor, and those who could not drive for lack  
23 of a license, lack of a car, or lack of courage. These  
24 are the high prices of our existing system, the system that  
25 would only be extended by the proposed highway project.



1           The environmental considerations behind this plan have  
2 to include not only the immediate threat to the Potomac shore-  
3 line. It also includes a concern for the use of irreplaceable  
4 ores, metal, minerals and fuels in an extravagant plan for in-  
5 creased auto use.

6           The final environmental blight is already creating  
7 health damage - the high levels of air pollution due to burning  
8 gasoline. The need for action to reduce auto use for this  
9 reason is urgent. As one of our Fairfax Leagues put it: "I  
10 have decided that I have the choice of seeing the sun or seeing  
11 the cars, and I want to see the sun." Thank you very much.

12           THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

13           HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Charles S. Butt, Jr.

14           (no response)

15           HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Herman M. Ward.

16           MR. AIRIS: Here comes Mr. Butt.

17           HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Is that Mr. Butt? Sorry.

18           WHEREUPON,

19                           MR. CHARLES S. BUTT, JR.,

20           WASHINGTON LEE HIGH SCHOOL, APPROACHED THE PODIUM AND TESTIFIED,  
21           IN SUBSTANCE, AS FOLLOWS:

22           MR. BUTT: My names is Charles S. Butt. I live in  
23           Fairfax County, about 150 feet from the Beltway, which arrived  
24           after my house so I know a little bit about what some of these  
25           people are talking about. However, my purpose in being here is

1 to comment on the design of the bridge. The reason I am here  
2 is because I coach a crew, Washington Lee High School, and I  
3 have had it now for about 21 or 22 years and I know a little  
4 bit about the river and the problems that arise in our attempts  
5 to row there. We now have a total of seven crews on the  
6 river, from high schools: Three of them are in Alexandria but  
7 they do row up at our end of the river. We also have three  
8 universities: George Washington, Howard, and Georgetown, which  
9 row in the same area. We have many crews in this region,  
10 rowing in this part of the river. The map that I have put  
11 up here shows the courses that we now use. These courses have  
12 evolved over a long, long time, long period of use, some of it  
13 very bitter use. We have rowed in Alexandria a lots of times  
14 and that's a great place about 6 o'clock in the morning, before  
15 the motor boats and the wind begin to blow. We have also rowed  
16 down off Haines Point, and that is another place where the wind  
17 is a little interesting.

18           People have rowed races in the Washington Channel,  
19 and apparently the waves there can build up and break a boat  
20 in half. It boils down to the fact that these courses shown  
21 up here -- and I am sorry I didn't chose colors to contrast a  
22 little more -- but the courses shown here have evolved over a  
23 long period of time and they are really outstanding race  
24 courses. The major problems at the moment are that they are  
25 not straight and there is not a whole lot that we can do about



1 that, but they are on water that has proven to be usable, and  
2 most every day of the spring, summer and fall, but when there  
3 is ice on the river that sort of complicates life, of course.  
4 The course in "green" which you will see, and which finishes  
5 on the right hand side, that course finishes down at about the  
6 foot of Wisconsin Avenue and that is the one that Mr. Morton  
7 was talking about a little bit ago for the Cherry Blossom  
8 Regatta. The colleges use this perhaps more than the high  
9 schools. It's a six-lane course. We internationally, all over  
10 the world - people row races on six-lane courses. This let's  
11 you take care of the--if you have more than six people to  
12 race--if you have you can get up to 24 or 30 or so, if you  
13 have to, and run heats, which you do need a basic six-lane  
14 course in order to run a decent regatta when you have a fair  
15 number of crews.

16 We have had as the years have gone on more participa-  
17 tion in rowing in the area, outside crews coming in to parti-  
18 cipate. As I say, the green course which is on the right  
19 finishing at Wisconsin Avenue is the one that the colleges  
20 use. The "blue" one, which starts on the left side of the  
21 picture is the one that is used perhaps more by the high  
22 schools and also by the boat club.

23 You will notice about a third of the way from the  
24 left, you will notice a bridge. That's the site of the Three  
25 Sisters Bridge. It has a little red dot in there. And that

1 little red dot is representative of the center pier of the  
2 six arch bridge, which, from my point of view, is a disaster,  
3 to things from our point of view. If you take a six lane  
4 course and knock out two lanes, you destroy the utility of the  
5 race course unless you have no more than four crews, and you  
6 hardly ever get in that situation.

7 In fact, we now have seven high schools in the area,  
8 and this sort of raises the devil with how do you row seven  
9 crews on a six lane course? The answer is you can't do it.  
10 There has to be some other solution.

11 My point in being here really is to say that that  
12 little "red" dot up there (indicating on a diagram) on that  
13 center bridge from the six arch bridge design would effectively  
14 ruin our race course, and we feel we have got a good recreation-  
15 al operation going here and we think it would be a horrible  
16 shame to destroy it. I think it is only fair to say that the  
17 bridge, the single arch, the one in the right hand picture  
18 (indicating) is designed to work around our race course re-  
19 quirements. We have communicated our problems to the people  
20 that design bridges, and that bridge, as far as I know, will  
21 not affect the rowing course in any detrimental manner.

22 There isn't a whole lot more to say, really. We  
23 would be horrified, and I guess would be a lot more unhappy  
24 than a lot of people have been at this hearing, if that bridge  
25 in the left hand picture were to be built because we feel that



1 it would ruin our race course. As one that gets up at 5:30  
2 in the morning, I think I will stop talking and thank you for  
3 the privilege of being here.

4 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I believe the Director,  
5 Highways District of Columbia, has a question for you.

6 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, I know it's very late and  
7 I will be very, very brief. But I have known Mr. Butt  
8 slightly. I know he has been acquainted with the office. It  
9 was his testimony, Mr. Chairman, at the 1964 hearing that led  
10 us into changing the configuration of the bridge that the  
11 Howard-Needles firm had presented at that hearing into the  
12 long-arch span.

13 Now, may the Department have your plan to reproduce  
14 it - to sell this bridge, it costs more, it's going to take  
15 some selling, and I would like to have for the Department a  
16 copy of your plan with how your courses are laid out.

17 MR. BUTT: That's your piece of paper, I got it from  
18 somebody a long time ago.

19 MR. AIRIS: All right. May we borrow it and reproduce  
20 it, and we will get it back to you somehow.

21 MR. BUTT: We intend to submit data for the record.

22 MR. AIRIS: All right. Thank you. Now, thirdly, I  
23 would just like to point out again that in order to try and  
24 be responsive to the people here we work with these crews. I  
25 have counted nine crews out there. Maybe that doesn't conform

1 with the official figures, Mr. Butt, but I have counted nine  
2 crews out rowing at one time out there in that river, and the  
3 Department did sponsor and by use of troop training labor, we  
4 took out the piers of the old Aqueduct Bridge that used to exist  
5 just upstream of Key Bridge in order that this course could be  
6 laid out to the satisfaction of these people, and we have  
7 cooperated with them in a few other ways.

8 MR. BUTT: The removal of that bridge was one of the  
9 outstanding achievements from our point of view in making this  
10 a good place to row in.

11 MR. AIRIS: As I said, I have seen nine crews out  
12 there and this is one of the things, Mr. Chairman, we have tried  
13 to do here.

14 MR. BUTT: Thank you.

15 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you so much, Mr. Butt.

16 MR. BUTT: Thank you so much.

17 MR. ABBOTT: May I ask you a question, Mr. Butt: Do  
18 you have any concern whatsoever for the people and the property  
19 and the pollutants to be caused by the freeway which would be  
20 projected from that bridge regardless of the design of the  
21 bridge? There has to be a North Leg of the Inner Loop. There  
22 has to be a North Central Freeway. I rowed in a crew. I  
23 wrestled and I played football in high school and college.  
24 But sports to me had some bearing to the community, or they  
25 have no definite goal. What is your opinion, or is your concern



1 limited to rowing on the Potomac without any concern for the  
2 rest of the problems of the bridge regardless of its design?

3 MR. BUTT: I think this is an extremely complicated  
4 matter. There are many diverse effects on all of us. I live  
5 in Virginia. Well, I used to have to cross bridges in the  
6 District to get to work but the Navy moved us over into Route  
7 1, and there is a beautiful traffic jam down there. I know a  
8 lot about traffic jams. I still have to get to work. There  
9 is now no way to get there other than in an automobile. I am  
10 one of these people many of you don't like very much because  
11 we live in Fairfax County and we have to come very well  
12 by vehicle to work. We are sorry about that but it's enjoyable  
13 to work. It is also from my point of view, I do have to go  
14 into the District now in order to get to the boathouse to coach  
15 the crew. If I didn't do that, I wouldn't become involved in  
16 crossing bridges from the District into Virginia. There are  
17 many problems here. I know a lot about pollution. I know a  
18 heck of a lot about airplanes scheduled. You ever tried talk-  
19 ing to a crew with airplanes over your head, every minute or  
20 so? We appreciate your problems, sir. There are many problems.  
21 We all have problems. I am not going to get involved in the  
22 whole ball of wax at this point. My concern in being here is  
23 to say please, if you build a bridge, don't build it with that  
24 pier in the middle of the river. I am sure that all the words  
25 that have been said have been very well said but I am just

1 going to concern myself at the moment to the design of the  
2 bridge. That's all I can do right now.

3 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you very much, Mr.  
4 Butt.

5 MR. BUTT: Thank you

6 A SPECTATOR: May I just one question in connection  
7 with what was just said.

8 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I think, sir, I had better  
9 proceed with the agenda and you may address yourself to that  
10 question at the end of the hearing.

11 Mr. Ward?

12 A SPECTATOR: Oh, I am sorry. I thought that was  
13 the last speaker.

14 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: No, we have quite a few  
15 speakers. Mr. Ward? Mr. Herman Ward?

16 (no response)

17 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. James Clark?

18 WHEREUPON,

19 MR. JAMES CLARK,

20 CITIZEN - D. C. Delegate, Candidate, approached the podium and  
21 testified, in substance, as follows:

22 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Clark, I apologize for  
23 being 25 minutes late.

24 MR. CLARK: That's all right. My name is James  
25 Clark, and I am an independent candidate also for the D. C. non-



1 voting delegate, and I have formed my own party, and it will  
2 be made more acquainted with the community later.

3 First, I would like to emphasize that it's impossible really  
4 to discern between these two designs of the bridge because the  
5 problem itself is gone beyond the stage where the problem can  
6 be solved. It has become a puzzle that has to be put to-  
7 gether, so I don't have no respect for the advocates of the  
8 bridge and those trying to get it built.

9 I think the people in Washington, D. C., mainly the  
10 poor people who are concerned with traffic commuting - the  
11 District itself is really not interested in the problem of  
12 this design which is before the public; it has no solution to  
13 their ears, so far as travelling is concerned. Because all you  
14 are doing is opening a bridge probably for Roy Chalk to have a  
15 wider gap to speed up the bus rates for the people to be charged.  
16 Insofar as politics are concerned, which I didn't come here to  
17 do tonight, this case--like the people who were mentioned pre-  
18 viously--the Mayor and some of the City Council should be here.  
19 It is just a case, and I would like to quote this for the  
20 record: "It is just a case of the Sergeant Carter staying  
21 home and sending out the --- ." Now I am not going to stay here  
22 too long because I have something else to do but I would like to  
23 say that the people of Washington, D. C., so far as the lower  
24 class, who are predominantly the citizens of Washington, D.C.,  
25 they don't want the bridge and they don't see why Congress or

1 the D. C. Government or anyone should try to cram it down their  
2 throats. Thank you very much.

3 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you.

4 THE AUDIENCE: (applause)

5 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Cain?

6 WHEREUPON,

7 MR. BERNARD L. CAIN,

8 BROOKLAND CITIZENS ASSOCIATION, APPROACHED THE PODIUM AND  
9 TESTIFIED, IN SUBSTANCE, AS FOLLOWS:

10 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: You have a copy of your  
11 statement?

12 MR. CAIN: No, sir, I don't and in my remarks I  
13 will cover the reason why. For the record, which is not  
14 written on the witness list, I reside at 1328 Newton Street,  
15 Northeast. For the record, which is also incorrect, the pre-  
16 vious speaker, Mr. Johnson, should have the "incorporated"  
17 and so forth removed from his name. He is listed as a speaker  
18 for Curtin and Johnson, Incorporated, which is a paving con-  
19 tractor. #89.

20 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: What were you suggesting?

21 MR. CAIN: Than you correct the record and take the  
22 fact that he is representing Curtin and Johnson, Incorporated  
23 out of the record.

24 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: He indicated that, and it was  
25 so done.



1 MR. CAIN: Well, I hope it's corrected.

2 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: He indicated that he was  
3 appearing as a citizen, living at 4800 W Street, Northwest.

4 MR. CAIN: Therefore, this is incorrect - this list?

5 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: That is right.

6 MR. CAIN: That's what I wanted to clear up.

7 Now in applying for an application to these hearings we were  
8 requested to send in a written statement. I ask that I please  
9 be notified in writing as to the time, place and date not  
10 later than 5 p.m. by Monday, December the 14th, 1970. Would  
11 you have the record show that this request was never complied  
12 with. I was never notified by telephone or written word that  
13 the location hearing had been changed from the Department of  
14 Commerce over here to the Labor Building.

15 Mr. Dugas - Hearing Officer, men of the Highway  
16 departments, good evening, ladies and gentlemen: The presenta-  
17 tion I make here tonight is on behalf of the Brooklands  
18 Citizen Association, a body as old as Brookland itself, dating  
19 back to the early 1890s. I hold the office of president. Today  
20 we were in the beautiful countryside of Arlington to bury our  
21 Vice President, Mr. Reichmach. I, therefore, have not typed a  
22 prepared statement. We do not believe this to be a, "public  
23 hearing." Our appointed representatives should be here. They  
24 carry out the local transportation plans. The needs of the  
25 Federal City should not be, and I repeat, not be controlled by

1 studies produced by the D. C. Highway Department and its  
2 directed consultants whose own economic life depends on the  
3 results. We do not want Georgetown and Brockland roads de-  
4 termined by "K" and "M" street monies. This is, as Mr. Airis  
5 previously stated. We fear that as in the past the officials  
6 not present will not even read the transcript of the testi-  
7 mony much less feel any of the emotion involved. The decision  
8 has been made and these notions are only required by law.

9           The 1962 Federal Highway Act stated, and I quote,  
10 "It is declared to be in the National interest to encourage  
11 and promote the development of transportation systems embracing  
12 various modes of transport in a manner that will serve the  
13 states and local communities efficiently and effectively."  
14 The D. C. is now considered for the record a state.

15           Back in 1967 former President Eisenhower answered  
16 the problem, quote:

17           "We have gone about it in the wrong way," he said,  
18 "we should have insisted on city plans made by the people on  
19 the spot," that's us. It's silly and wasteful to design some  
20 national plan in Washington and impose it on the cities. He  
21 was correct, as the people have already shown their thoughts  
22 on those former Congressmen: Kramer and Fallon, who tried to  
23 callously ignore the people themselves by writing the 1968  
24 Highway Act. The people in Baltimore have spoken. They know  
25 what is right. The men are now leaving control in the govern-



1 ment. We believe the Federal Highway law provides that the  
2 commissioner may not let contracts for any bridge or freeway  
3 except in accordance with the comprehensive major thoroughfare  
4 plans approved by the Planning Commission and the City Council.

5 We wonder whether Mr. Airis will abide by his words  
6 of Friday, November the 8th, 1968 on the Three Sisters Bridge  
7 hearing when he said, quote:

8 "We will stop planning if the courts tell us  
9 to."

10 The courts gave a remark on the North Central Freeway, and yet  
11 he has not stopped planning the North Central Freeway. The  
12 local fragmented government is independently bureaucratic. It  
13 fails to show up in important hearings. The power of executive  
14 action now rests on a single head both of policy and opera-  
15 tion. But if a single commissioner is to function, he will  
16 need adequate citizen support. Differences between the  
17 officials and policy have frequently erupted into open con-  
18 flict. Public name-calling has been seen. The former  
19 commissioner severely and publicly criticized the NCPC for  
20 failing to give adequate consideration to human needs in the  
21 1985 comprehensive plan. The present commissioner has over-  
22 looked the same element. The structure itself virtually  
23 guarantees conflict with no provision for constructive improve-  
24 ment. You, Mr. Dugas, try "economic development." And Mr.  
25 Airis sits over here and tries "traffic development."

1 Observation: Business has been encouraged to build big build-  
2 ings with plenty of parking, paying low taxes. The D. C.  
3 Government has a policy stated here tonight - said that it  
4 builds roads to provide these private needs, entrances into  
5 these parking lots on "K" and "M" Streets. We hope that this  
6 encounter will encourage some improvement. "Our neighborhood  
7 is now a potential powder-keg composed of discouraged, frustrated  
8 and angered citizens, worrying over the loss of their homes  
9 which they had purchased and planned to be their life residen-  
10 ces." "This is true today." As it was April 4th, 1948, when  
11 the statement was presented. We regret any actions as trailer  
12 burning. We did not approve of such actions. We urge all  
13 persons to avoid any such actions. However, and you had better  
14 get this clear to the Mayor because he isn't here, and you had  
15 better take this page of the transcript and deliver it to him  
16 personally because if you don't he won't get the message, and  
17 the message is: This action has been a powerful force on those  
18 who have lost faith in the law. Our national history shows  
19 the Boston Tea Party, the Molly Mcguires of labor, they had  
20 lost faith in their own actions. Recently the beforementioned  
21 Mr. Fallon and Kramer were removed by people with faith in  
22 their own actions. We have not lost hope in the law, and the  
23 lawsuit ordering this meeting over the proposed project proves  
24 this: We have not lost faith with the citizens who have  
25 voted in the referendum. We are slowly seeing the youth rightly



1 become concerned with the future that will before long be  
2 controlled by themselves. We question whether the present  
3 inadequate bridges that we have in the city much less any new  
4 bridges that we build, are going to offer us any safety.

5 Now, I am going to deviate from the prepared state-  
6 ment, and I will have it written up and sent in for the  
7 record. I am going to leave it here right now. Now last night  
8 we heard, Mr. Dugas, that you answer to the Mayor. I think  
9 somebody asked you about who was going to deliver the copy of  
10 this transcript, and so on, and so forth. So, I would like to  
11 ask the same question to Mr. Airis.

12 Mr. Airis, who do you answer to?

13 MR. AIRIS: The Mayor is my boss, sir.

14 MR. CAIN: Does he direct the policy that you stated  
15 tonight about the streets and highways being developed to  
16 bring all those cars into the parking lots on "K" and "M"  
17 Streets?

18 MR. AIRIS: Well, there are many forces that shape  
19 the policy in the District. The Highway Department is re-  
20 sponsible for meeting their transportation needs.

21 MR. CAIN: And who else do you answer to then?

22 MR. AIRS: Well?

23 MR. CAIN: The Deputy Mayor?

24 MR. AIRIS: The Federal Government shapes their  
25 policies on transportation; the courts; the White House; the

1 Capitol; the many commercial establishments. All of these  
2 entities develop their traffic requirements. And my primary  
3 mission from the Mayor and from the Deputy Mayor is to keep  
4 the city knitted together from a transportation standpoint.

5 MR. CAIN: What other transportation, besides autos  
6 and trucks are you working on?

7 MR. AIRIS: Well, we coordinate very closely on the  
8 construction with WMATA, and we are in constant touch with  
9 WMATC on the bus problems. We have sponsored a number of  
10 bus facilities here and are presently working on the Shirley  
11 Highway Rapid Express Bus movement.

12 MR. CAIN: You mean you work in Virginia?

13 MR. AIRIS: Was there a question asked? I am sorry?

14 MR. CAIN: Do you mean that you work in Virginia?  
15 You say you work on Shirley Highway.

16 MR. AIRIS: The Department does not work in Virginia,  
17 but through them.

18 MR. CAIN: Would you like to correct that statement  
19 then?

20 MR. AIRIS: No, it is correct. We have to work with  
21 the Virginia authorities and with the transportation planning  
22 board people on the Shirley Highway bus movements which involve  
23 both Virginia and the District.

24 MR. CAIN: Do you very much ever have to work with  
25 the people in Brookland?



1 MR. AIRIS: Well, you know quite often we are in  
2 touch with you, Mr. Cain.

3 MR. CAIN: Do you ever accomplish any of our  
4 requests?

5 MR. AIRIS: I hope so. I hope we are responsive.

6 MR. CAIN: Well, sometimes, and many times not,  
7 and specifically you are not on the design of this bridge.  
8 I would like to ask a few other questions:

9 Do you have design sheets available on this bridge,  
10 or are these the only photos that you have?

11 MR. AIRIS: Well, these are artists' renderings.  
12 There are more technical drawings than these available; yes.

13 MR. CAIN: Would they have anything to do with this  
14 hearing of design?

15 MR. AIRIS: I don't think so. I think the essential  
16 data shows that. . .

17 MR. CAIN: All we need is a picture, in other words?

18 MR. AIRIS: . . . is in the brochure and in the artists'  
19 rendering.

20 MR. CAIN: All we need is a picture then?

21 MR. AIRIS: Sir?

22 MR. CAIN: All we need is a picture?

23 MR. AIRIS: Well, here are your artists' renderings  
24 (indicating).

25 MR. CAIN: Is that what you used to determine the

1 construction of a bridge - just that?

2 MR. AIRIS: Well, you know I am sure that before you  
3 build any kind of structure, bridges included, you have many  
4 voluminous detailed sheets detailing the reenforcing of the  
5 curvatures.

6 MR. CAIN: And you don't present these at public  
7 hearings?

8 MR. AIRIS: Not normally; no, sir.

9 MR. CAIN: And they are not here tonight, are they?

10 MR. AIRIS: No. No, the design is not - when those  
11 are prepared, Mr. Cain, the design is fixed, and this is a  
12 design hearing before the design is fixed. In other words,  
13 there are some drawings?

14 MR. AIRIS: Oh, yes, Mr. DeGast reminds me that  
15 they are available if anyone would like to inspect them.

16 MR. CAIN: Did Mr. G... in his testimony yesterday  
17 indicate that he had copies of these drawings?

18 MR. AIRIS: I don't recall that he asked for them or  
19 that it was even discussed.

20 MR. CAIN: Do you have a list of any public witnesses  
21 that have been supplied with these drawings?

22 MR. AIRIS: I don't think so.

23 MR. DeGAST: We have supplied copies of these drawings  
24 to those requesting them, and to those who were not satisfied  
25 with the simple inspection of them in the hearing information.



1 MR. CAIN: Do you have a list of these?

2 MR. DeGAST: I am sure our people have a list of  
3 those who were supplied these drawings.

4 MR. CAIN: Would you supply it for the record?  
5 Please?

6 MR. DeGAST: If that will be acceptable to you; yes.

7 MR. AIRIS: Well, this is up to the Hearing Examiner  
8 here. If he wishes them in the record he will put them in  
9 the record.

10 MR. CAIN: Will you have them put in the record,  
11 please, Mr. Hearing Examiner?

12 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: What is it that you want in  
13 the record, Mr. Cain?

14 MR. CAIN: I would like the names of the witnesses  
15 who have requested the specific drawings that relate to the  
16 preliminary design of these particular sketches.

17 MR. AIRIS: I am not so sure we should really do that.  
18 That's up to the individual, if he wants to look at drawings  
19 why he should be permitted to look at them and not have his  
20 name brought out and put in the record. However, I will be  
21 guided by the Hearing Officer.

22 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I would rule that we will  
23 make as a part of the record these drawings that you have now  
24 referred to. I will also suggest that you be furnished a set  
25 of the drawings for your personal use.

1           MR. CAIN: I have a set, Mr. Chairman, and it is  
2 rather important at this point that this point be brought out  
3 because as I just stated a minute ago, somebody was testifying  
4 yesterday as an expert witness, as a professional, and if he  
5 has not had access to these drawings the credibility of the  
6 testimony is surely in doubt. So I would again request that  
7 you as a hearing officer--

8           HEARING OFFICER DUGAS (interposing): I am going to  
9 deny your request and will suggest that you contact that per-  
10 son to see whether or not he does have a copy. And if he does  
11 not have it we will make it available to him.

12          MR. CAIN: Mr. Airis, was the estimated cost given  
13 last night of approximately \$37,000 per year for upkeep on  
14 this particular span? Was it high, low or was it anywhere in  
15 the ball park?

16          MR. AIRIS: Well, that's our estimate. It is an  
17 estimate and I think it has about the accuracy of an estimate.

18          MR. CAIN: Would you say that this would have any  
19 effect on the economic situation of the District in the years  
20 to come.

21          MR. AIRIS: Well, of course all of these things  
22 have a bearing on the cost of running the District no question  
23 about that.

24          MR. CAIN: Mr. Airis, are you a member of the Society  
25 of Civil Engineers?



1 MR. AIRIS: I am.

2 MR. CAIN: Was a representative of the Society, who  
3 spoke yesterday, representing your views as an informed member  
4 of this Society?

5 MR. AIRIS: Possibly so; I am not an officer in the  
6 ASCE section and I rarely attend their meetings. I knew nothing  
7 about their position on the bridge until I heard his testimony.  
8

9 MR. CAIN: Well, then, it's possible that he doesn't  
10 fully represent your views?

11 MR. AIRIS: Well, it so happens after I listened to  
12 his testimony my view coincided with his views, to some extent.  
13 I'd go that far.

14 MR. CAIN: I wonder if the rest of the membership  
15 of this organization are in the same position?

16 MR. AIRIS: Well, they have a Board of Directors  
17 and they have regular monthly meetings, and I presume you would  
18 have to ask Mr. Granham this question. I can't really answer  
19 you. I presume that he represents the Society.

20 MR. CAIN: Do you feel that it would be pertinent  
21 for the record that the cost estimate for these two designs  
22 be in the record?

23 MR. AIRIS: I think they are, sir, since they are  
24 in this publication here.

25 MR. CAIN: Is that the total estimate, or a breakdown

1 schedule?

2 MR. AIRIS: They are lump sum figures. They are  
3 estimates - total estimates.

4 MR. CAIN: Would you think the break down schedule  
5 would be of any information to any official reading or document  
6 of this testimony?

7 MR. AIRIS: I wouldn't think so. I wouldn't think  
8 so.

9 MR. CAIN: The amount of concrete or the amount of  
10 steel would have no bearing on the load limit of this particular  
11 span?

12 MR. AIRIS: No, I wouldn't think so.

13 MR. CAIN: Is there going to be a sidewalk on this  
14 particular span that you are considering?

15 MR. AIRIS: The section, Mr. Cain, is shown in the  
16 drawings here, and there is ten foot shouldering by no side-  
17 walks.

18 MR. CAIN: There would be no sidewalk.

19 MR. AIRIS: No sidewalk.

20 MR. CAIN: In reading some of the documents I see  
21 a listing at \$10.00 a foot for handrail, which amounts to  
22 \$32, 400.00. Do we have handrails where we don't have side-  
23 walks?

24 MR. AIRIS: Well, most bridges have rail whether  
25 they have sidewalks or not. They have a rail; if it is a bridge



1 on which vehicles are running at medium high speed, it is not  
2 good practice to have sidewalks where people are walking  
3 adjacent to the vehicles. We'd rather have the sidewalks some-  
4 where else where they are a little more protected, such as on  
5 "Key" Bridge. In this particular bridge, we have shoulders  
6 and a rail that is designed as a guide-rail for vehicles, not  
7 for pedestrians.

8 MR. CAIN: But we do have hand-rail, don't we?

9 MR. AIRIS: Well, it's rail, I think, is the designa-  
10 tion we give to it.

11 MR. CAIN: Sheet C, Mr. Chairman, as I have it, has  
12 it listed as hand-rail.

13 MR. CAIN: All right.

14 MR. AIRIS: All right.

15 MR. CAIN: I wonder if this sheet is incorrect?

16 MR. AIRIS: If it's called hand-rail, I will agree  
17 with the terminology. It's almost interchangeable.

18 MR. CAIN: Well, you see, Mr. Airis, you are the ex-  
19 pert. We are supposed to be the public, and if you don't de-  
20 fine for us what you mean by hand-rail and interchangeable with  
21 guard-rail, I mean I am not an expert on it.

22 MR. AIRIS: I will do the best I can, Mr. Cain.

23 MR. CAIN: And I think there are many other citizens  
24 that if they were reading a sheet of this type they wouldn't  
25 even know what TS&L is, and so, therefore, they are asked to

1 conclude about "Do I like that one, or do I like that one?"  
2 It's like decorating a Christmas tree that has nothing under-  
3 neath, so to speak, all the needles are falling off. You can  
4 just put on so many decorations and people don't know what you  
5 are talking about. And I would request that you---

6 MR. AIRIS (interposing): If there are any questions,  
7 we have Room 16 open, and it was attended in the evening each  
8 night to work on this. Any one of these gentlemen that were  
9 in the room could explain any of these questions - if there is  
10 any need for an explanation. That was the intent of having the  
11 room open.

12 MR. CAIN: I had several to arise and I couldn't get  
13 any answers, and I stayed as late as I could until about 6:30  
14 in the evening. Will you supply copies of cost estimate (a)  
15 and (c) and enter them in the record?

16 MR. AIRIS: Well, I think our cost here for a project  
17 at this stage is pretty well shown in the brochure. I don't  
18 think there is any need for a breakdown estimate of the type  
19 you are speaking of. We have a breakdown estimate but at this  
20 stage before the design becomes fixed why I can't see that it  
21 is of much value to anybody.

22 MR. CAIN: Well, in testifying in the Congress in  
23 the past, you often come without the proper information, and  
24 when questions of this nature arise you don't have it available.  
25 I remember back several years ago when we were discussing the



1 Taylor Street Bridge over across the street in the other  
2 auditorium, and I made such a request from you and I asked  
3 that I meet you right after the hearing. You said you could not  
4 supply the information, but if I came to your office right  
5 after the hearing you would supply it. Well, I am still wait-  
6 ing for it, so I do again request that you supply cost estimates  
7 (a) and (c) for the record. Could you do that, Mr. Airis?

8 MR. AIRIS: I will certainly try my best to give it  
9 to you. I remember that instance, and I think we got cross-  
10 up because I went to the wrong place. I thought I was to meet  
11 you in front of the building and you went over to District  
12 Building, or it was vice versa, I can't remember which.

13 MR. CAIN: Will you supply these two sheets for the  
14 record, Mr. Airis?

15 MR. AIRIS: Cost estimates (a)?

16 MR. CAIN: (a) and (c). One is labeled "Continuous  
17 steel box skirter, and the other pre-stress concrete box  
18 girder bridge.

19 MR. AIRIS: That's the two current bridges we are  
20 looking at here that have been designated by the artist render-  
21 ing?

22 MR. CAIN: That's correct.

23 MR. AIRIS: Will do.

24 MR. CAIN: Can you also supply the two renderings?

25 MR. AIRIS: Now, if I don't get them to you within a

1 reasonable time, would you please give me a ring?

2 MR. CAIN: Well, I would like to see them in the  
3 record first, Mr. Chairman, and then you can get me my copies  
4 later.

5 MR. AIRIS: I see no reason to clutter up the record  
6 with this information. If you want this, I will be glad to  
7 give it to you.

8 MR. CAIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, again, I would make  
9 this request: That if he is going to supply me the copy -  
10 copies -- that you hold the record open so that I can then  
11 submit those copies. In other words, if it takes him over 10  
12 days would you grant me the privilege to have the record held  
13 open until I receive the copies?

14 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Well?

15 MR. AIRIS: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, if it's of any  
16 moment, I can furnish copies. It's of no great trouble.

17 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Well, what I want to do is to  
18 be sure that Mr. Cain has had ample opportunity, and I would  
19 want to make the same type of ruling for him that we made  
20 earlier to David Peter Craig; you have suggested that you are  
21 going to furnish something. He has not had an ample opportunity  
22 -- if he has not had an ample opportunity on the 28th to re-  
23 spond to it then we will keep the record open until then -  
24 for the purpose of his response. We just want to make sure  
25 that everybody has the same shake in this ball game.



1 MR. CAIN: Well, that would be perfectly all right  
2 with me because I didn't hear that this morning and I am glad  
3 that you brought it up.

4 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Uh, huh.

5 MR. AIRIS: Well, we will send you these two  
6 estimates, Mr. Cain.

7 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: And we will get them to you  
8 as quickly as we can. In the event you don't have sufficient  
9 time, you will have 10 days from the receipt of them to get  
10 them.

11 MR. CAIN: That would be fine, Mr. Chairman.

12 I would like to offer just one little newspaper  
13 clipping for the record, and ask that it be submitted. It is  
14 in regard to a death and this occurred, I think, yesterday. So  
15 unless Mr. Airis had a long break at summer time and had his  
16 newspaper, he probably hasn't read it, but this refers to  
17 a car hurdling a 3 - foot guard rail and causing the 114th  
18 traffic death in the District of Columbia. According to  
19 the just day and a half that I had to look at these because  
20 of the circumstances I previously mentioned, I wonder if they  
21 could give us some statistics or give us some studies as to  
22 the effect of a better design for a 3-foot guard rail? And  
23 I might be specific. Not knowing exactly where this happened,  
24 it says on U S 295. I was wondering if we have the same type  
25 guard rail there, this concrete guard rail which is proposed on

1 this bridge? And if that be the case, then neither myself  
2 nor Mr. Airis has had the chance to look at it, but I would  
3 sincerely appreciate it that if he did find that both of these  
4 coincide that he would, in the interest of safety of all of us  
5 in the District, to have to use these facilities that are de-  
6 signed by his department, if we couldn't come up with something  
7 better? Evidently for some reason or other this 3-foot guard  
8 rail did not protect this individual; and if this is the same  
9 type, and this is merely an observation that is proposed on  
10 this particular structure I would be against such a guard rail  
11 and I think even the gentleman from Virginia would probably  
12 like to consider this and see if something better couldn't be  
13 produced. Because we don't want to be leading the Nation  
14 with the small square mileage we have here in traffic deaths  
15 just due to some of these malfunctioning of designs, and I do  
16 appreciate that this is a design hearing and we do have the  
17 Virginia and District officials that are experts here. And I  
18 am sure if they so directed or had such an interest--again, in  
19 the interest of the people that live in the District, not just  
20 in the people that go in and out, that perhaps he could furnish  
21 some studies that will show that maybe they could have even a  
22 better design.

23 MR. AIRIS: Will do.

24 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Although I can conceive, Mr.  
25 Cain, a 3-foot guard rail on a bridge of this kind.



1 MR. CAIN: Well, this is what again I would like you  
2 to have these in the record because we do not, on this parti-  
3 cular sketch I have, have a profiled designation. But going  
4 to the scale, it comes up to me to be about 3 foot guard rail.  
5 I don't have the brochure in front of me. I think that's  
6 what it states. I think that's what Mr. Airis said it was.  
7 So that's why I think that as a non-technical expert, that if  
8 the information and possibly again - it could even be put on  
9 these detailed drawings. They don't show it. It says low  
10 level railing, and that's the profile of the bridge.

11 MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, we will check this out  
12 and insert it in the record. The guard rail - the 3- foot  
13 concrete medium. It is the one that is recommended at the  
14 current time.

15 MR. CAIN: While I am thinking of this guard rail,  
16 I am wondering if it wouldn't be of benefit also to the  
17 commuter. In other words, we have got a panoramic view and  
18 we are really considering safety. Couldn't we possibly go to  
19 a 4 or 5 - foot guard rail so that these people riding in  
20 these vehicles aren't distracted and looking over the side of  
21 the bridge to see who is rowing which way, so on and so forth,  
22 and I think possibly this could improve safety. Now I would  
23 like the D. C. Highway Director and possibly the Virginia  
24 Highway Director to take a look at this particular map. They  
25 have it dated as Sheet #S-31. I just want to show it to them,

1 and then I will ask them the question (reviewing).

2 MR. AIRIS: It looks all right to me.

3 MR. CAIN: In looking at this particular drawing  
4 closely, and this is why again I would like to have it in the  
5 record because - is that correct, Mr. Airis, that you saw  
6 nothing wrong with the drawing?

7 MR. AIRIS: I just glanced at it. I didn't see any-  
8 thing wrong with it.

9 MR. CAIN: Is that correct with the official of  
10 the Virginia Highway Department?

11 MR. SNEAD: I looked at it. I scanned over it, and  
12 I couldn't see anything wrong with it.

13 MR. CAIN: Well, I wish you would pull out Sheet  
14 #S-31. In my observation, and again I am asking for an answer  
15 as an expert, so I wish your experts would get it on the draw-  
16 ing board and take a good look at it, because if we are going  
17 to construct the bridge, we want to know what we are getting.  
18 Now, my calculations show that on the right hand side of the  
19 sheet we have the roadway at 80 feet; on the left hand side of  
20 the sketch we have the roadway at 74 feet. Does the roadway  
21 have a 6 foot slope to it? This would be, roughly, from north  
22 to south.

23 MR. AIRIS: Let me see what you are looking at,  
24 Mr. Cain, please (review).

25 MR. CAIN: Is this roadway supposed to have a slope in



1 it?

2 MR. AIRIS: All that is is super elevation. You can  
3 look at that and tell that. You know what I mean. It's super  
4 elevated. You know when you go around the curve, your curve  
5 is banked. You see, this is over on the edge of the bridge,  
6 and your curve is banked, you know? All limited access  
7 facilities are built with super elevation - that's the pur-  
8 pose of this (indicating) cocked off like that, see?

9 MR. CAIN: I thank Mr. Airis for his expertise be-  
10 cause I don't get that everyday, and often when I go down to  
11 his office I get somebody else and they don't have that little  
12 expertise that he has. Again, as far as the design of the  
13 bridge is concerned we don't particularly like either design  
14 and we don't even like a bridge, and we don't even like the  
15 whole system that's connected with it. I do sincerely wish,  
16 Mr. Chairman, that the one page I referred to - that you  
17 would hand carry to the Mayor, because I live in this neigh-  
18 borhood, and I have lived in it for close to 40 years and I  
19 believe I am familiar with some of the problems of the neigh-  
20 borhood, some of the emotional feelings of the neighborhood, and  
21 I don't think you yourself would want to be put in a position  
22 of favoring any type of development that would cause real  
23 turmoil in this the Nation's Capitol. I sincerely am afraid  
24 that this is about the point we have reached in our particular  
25 community. I try to be as active as I can to try to prevent

1 some of these things, but you can only spread so far and do  
2 so much and we do have to look to you, the officials of the  
3 government to help us in every way. And this is really why  
4 we are appearing here tonight; that you do get this feeling  
5 and that you do understand our problem, and our problem is  
6 not just moving automobiles as Mr. Airis' problem is. In  
7 other words, we have the total picture. We get the air  
8 pollution; we get the low-income families; we get the major  
9 part of the public housing; we get the new incinerators out in  
10 our neighborhood; we get these beautiful new roads nobody else  
11 wants; we get the 69 homes all boarded up that nobody else  
12 wants. We get the rush-hour traffic that nobody else wants.  
13 But we don't get good public transportation that's reasonable.  
14 We don't get any express bus services to downtown, which are  
15 needed. We don't get low bus rates, which are also needed.  
16 We are slowly losing most of the trees that we have in our  
17 area due to this pollution thing. As an expert gardener on the  
18 side, I notice that the only way I can keep the tree in front  
19 of my house growing is to come out about every other day and  
20 spray it completely with water and this seems to remove these  
21 impurities in the air that form on the leaves and prevent the  
22 other trees from growing. And my tree, in comparison to some  
23 of the others is about twice as large as one compared to the  
24 same species grown roughly in the same terrain and approximately  
25 at the same location. So, if this thing keeps up and they build



1 all these things, I don't know where we are going to get the  
2 water to keep on spraying trees; and if they don't purify the  
3 air we are not going to keep on breathing. When that happens  
4 I guess we will just have to get a gas mask, and I guess we  
5 will have to come down to Mr. Airis every now and then and  
6 say, "Dear Tom: It's time for a refill on that cartridge be-  
7 cause you brought it all here and we can't drive to Potomac  
8 every night because we don't live out there." We have to  
9 stay here and suffer. So that it really does put a different  
10 light on it. I know the Mayor lives in the city and I know  
11 he suffers like we do and I think he feels some of the problems  
12 and this is why it is important that they be relayed back to  
13 him. Because we know as in the past the documents just build  
14 up and this reminds me of a remark that I think Mrs. Hubbard  
15 made and I made the same comment, and I will supply the date  
16 for the record: That we did have a public hearing on that  
17 freeway that went down toward the river over towards the  
18 arboretum and it was the only one, and I have attended nine,  
19 at which an acting D. C. Commissioner appeared. I think this  
20 was Colonel Mathey, and he did stay for an hour. I was the first  
21 witness. I made the same request that Mrs. Harriet made, back  
22 then, and this is a serious request: That you as a development  
23 officer should really carry back to the Mayor that we get a map  
24 that shows the total picture. Where is the bus lane that takes  
25 the travel downtown? Where is the auto lane? Where is the air

1 lane up above us? Where is the truck lane? Where are the  
2 rapid transit lanes. Put them all on one map because not  
3 everybody is as expert as you are and can read a map that  
4 you have 10 or 15 things superimposed on.

5 Mr. Airis again says he's got it down in his office,  
6 and again, as I said before, if I don't go down and see him  
7 personally I don't get to see it. I can read it. So if 10 of  
8 our members go down there I have to go down and interpret it  
9 for them.

10 If you really want economic development in this  
11 city and you really want the people to understand what's going  
12 on, you are going to have to give them the total picture and  
13 you are going to have to produce something like this.

14 I would like to make a personal request to the  
15 Hearing Officer, that he make this his number one priority  
16 because I believe that as you were saying before, you were try-  
17 ing to get all these related problems. It is by doing some-  
18 thing like this. The newspapers aren't going to do it. The  
19 highway department is not going to do it, Virginia is not  
20 going to do it because they are not really interested in the  
21 total picture in the District. I think that you, Mr. Duggs,  
22 as the Economic Officer, if you have such a map available for  
23 distribution could even entice some people to come to certain  
24 locations, because there again if they are locating they don't  
25 have the total picture. One of the major reasons that the city



1 is losing business, if you forget about crime for a minute,  
2 and I understand that's also a problem, but many of these  
3 business--and particularly up in our neighborhood - if additional  
4 facilities are built for these particular transportation systems,  
5 it's their third move in the District. And you see, they just  
6 get tired of it, like, "Well, who cares about us?" And if we  
7 lose another 25% of them as we have already lost out to the  
8 territory of the Beltway, there isn't going to be any economy  
9 here. People like myself that own a home, instead of paying  
10 \$450.00 a year in taxes just for that little piece of real  
11 estate, we are going to be paying \$1500.00. Then when you get  
12 into that category then there is no place to put the poor  
13 people because they can't afford those kind of taxes. So you  
14 see, it's really and truly the total picture that each one  
15 of these different categories has its direct effect, and we  
16 just can't continue as we have in the past, ignoring one  
17 another. I see you have looked at your watch, so I will  
18 take the indication.

19 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: We have a 12 o'clock deadline.

20 MR. CAIN: I do hope you have a happy Christmas and  
21 I hope you don't have to spend it here. Thank you, Mr. Dugas.

22 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Cain.

23 A SPECTATOR: (making comments)

24 MR. CAIN: He was asking about getting these docu-  
25 ments entered into the record.

1           A SPECTATOR: The one I am concerned about, I  
2 thought he said that someone testified here as a so-called  
3 expert about the highway and he was making reference to the  
4 fact that maybe he got the figures from Airis' office to  
5 determine himself as an expert, and I think you ruled against  
6 that. I was wondering - I think maybe what he was talking  
7 about was the record will show that this man is an expert  
8 giving his figures and he got them from Airis' office - so  
9 that's what I thought he was getting after. Of course you  
10 ruled against it, so I was just wondering if that was the  
11 ruling.

12           HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I don't know whether he was  
13 an expert or what he was. I simply said that if he knew he  
14 was he could ask him for it.

15           A SPECTATOR: But the point is, this is going into  
16 the record. And I think in reading the record I think they  
17 will assume that he was an expert and he got his information  
18 from Airis' office.

19           HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I don't think he was testify-  
20 ing as an expert because most of the people here didn't qualify  
21 as experts.

22           A SPECTATOR: I know he made reference to "expert,"  
23 and that's why I questioned it.

24           HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: As I say, he may have made a  
25 reference. There is only one man that I know of who qualifies



1 - qualified himself as an expert here - two: One doctor  
2 from California and Peter Craig this morning. The only two.

3 I am going to conclude this hearing by having one  
4 more witness.

5 A SPECTATOR: You just entered someone from the  
6 floor.

7 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: I know I did. I am not  
8 going to entertain another one, sir. I am going to hear from  
9 Mr. Milton V. Peterson.

10 We are going to get through here tonight.

11 Mr. Peterson?

12 (no response)

13 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Is Mr. Peterson here?

14 (no response)

15 Now, is Mr. Peterson here?

16 (no response)

17 Mr. Peterson is not here.

18 Now, I am ruling now that unless Mr. Peterson comes  
19 in the door within the next two minutes he will not testify  
20 tonight. You may ask your question.

21 A SPECTATOR: I just wanted a clarification. Mr.  
22 Airis, did I understand that--

23 THE REPORTER: What is your name?

24 MR. GOVERN: Mr. Govern - James Governor of

25 Arlington. If I understand the conversation earlier by Mr.

1 Bert who spoke about the rowing crews of of W&L High School  
2 -- Mr. Butt - I think you made a statement that it was his  
3 statement a few years ago that prompted the one design,  
4 the pre-stress concrete design, is that correct?

5 MR. AIRIS: Sir, he was - well, his testimony was  
6 one of the elements that led us to evolve the bridge we have  
7 today.

8 MR. GOVAN: Okay, thank you. I just wanted to  
9 bring one other thing out. In conjunction with that I wanted  
10 to relate one other point which I think should be of interest  
11 to Mr. Harris, and that is, if you are going to honor this kind  
12 of interest to the extent of considering a bridge which costs  
13 several million dollars more money I would like to ask how you  
14 make distinctions about what kind of educational or athletic  
15 interests you are going to accommodate, because in the case of  
16 I-66, in Arlington, related to the same high school - Washington  
17 and Lee, there is a biology curriculum which is focused on  
18 the open area behind the high school. And that teacher and  
19 those students are very interested in preserving that area as a  
20 laboratory for the study of life. I would like to ask why  
21 we can consider an alternate design, consider rowing, and  
22 perhaps not give any thought to the other part of the high  
23 school curriculum which probably is much more important in the  
24 long run?

25 MR. HARRIS: Mr. Govan, to answer your question, I



1 was in Mr. S....'s office this morning, and he has a suggestion,  
2 another proposal at the W&L relative to the stream on that,  
3 and there is a possibility that we could the stream to the  
4 north side of the interstate. We are working with Mr. S...  
5 diligently on this proposal now.

6 MR. GOVAN: Well, I think it is the fairest thing  
7 you can do if you are going to consider an alternate bridge  
8 design for rowing crews, that you can at least accommodate  
9 science curriculum in a high school.

10 MR. AIRIS: Sir, you are putting words in my mouth.  
11 I said it was one of the elements that led to the bridge -  
12 has been evolved. There are other elements also.

13 MR. GOVAN: All right, thank you very much. And I  
14 encouraged by what Mr. Harris just said, but I do hope that  
15 in talking to Virginia officials that you also talk to  
16 teachers in the high schools who would know much more about  
17 it than Mr. S.... in terms of how useful it is for their  
18 curriculum.

19 MR. HARRIS: Thank you.

20 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: The meeting is adjourned  
21 for the night.

22 A SPECTATOR: I have just one more question. You  
23 mentioned liaison with the Mayor and with the Deputy Mayor.  
24 We have had a good deal of trouble with Deputy Mayors in the  
25 city, and it recently came to my attention from an unimpeachable

1 source that Mr. Graham Watt believes that the North Central --  
2 that is, we are holding out -- that the city government is  
3 holding out on the construction of the North Central Freeway  
4 because we plan to get development funds.

5 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: The meeting is adjourned.

6 A SPECTATOR: No, you said I could ask a question.

7 MR. AIRIS: Well, the record is closed - adjourned.

8 HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Mr. Harris, Mr. Airis and  
9 Mr. DeGast, I have one witness. He has a prepared statement.  
10 He had a letter to come in which apparently he did not re-  
11 ceive. I would like to hear him tonight.

12 MR. AIRIS: I'll be glad to stay.

13 WHEREUPON,

14 MR. FREDERICK HEUTTE,

15 APPROACHED THE PODIUM AND TESTIFIED, IN SUBSTANCE, AS FOLLOWS:

16 MR. HEUTTE: Mayor Washington, Members of the City  
17 Council of the District of Columbia, and the legal representa-  
18 tives of the citizens of the Commonwealth of Virginia, I am  
19 Frederic Heutte. I live at 1600 Newton Street, N.E., Wash-  
20 ington, D. C. and am a member of the Executive Board of the  
21 Catholic Interracial Council of Washington, D. C. and Chairman  
22 of its Transportation Committee. This statement is presented  
23 in behalf of the Catholic Interracial Council. I don't know  
24 whether it should be clarified for the record, we did apply  
25 to be on the hearing list by Special Delivery Letter, which we



1 mailed on Wednesday, and when I saw yesterday that our name  
2 was not on the list I checked with the Office and the letter  
3 was there and apparently there has been some foul up and I  
4 appreciate this opportunity to testify here. However, I might  
5 say at the outset, along with a number of other witnesses, our  
6 testifying here does not constitute a recognition that this is  
7 a legal hearing as required either by the District Code, Title  
8 7, or the Interstate Highway Act, or the Department of Trans-  
9 portation Guidelines.

10 As is usual we start off with a quote from the  
11 scripture. If these hearings go on much longer we will have  
12 the opportunity of having read the whole bible into the hear-  
13 ings, but this is a serious matter, and this is from HABAKKUK  
14 2:5, the Prohphet:

15 WEALTH IS INDEED A TREACHEROUS THING,  
16 HAUGHTY AND UNABLE TO REST IS HE WHO,  
17 IS AS GREEDY AS SHEOL,  
18 WHO IS LIKE DEATH, INSATIABLE,  
19 WHO ASSEMBLES ALL THE NATIONS FOR HIS OWN ENDS,  
20 COLLECTS ALL THE PEOPLES TO HIS OWN ADVANTAGE."

21 "Sheol," incidentally, is "hell."

22 This bridge and the freeway system, for which it has  
23 become the chief symbol, really have nothing to do with the  
24 solution of transportation problems...as has been proven time  
25 and time again they will exasserbate transportation problems,

1   poison our environment, and destroy our society, and our  
2   republic, this bridge and freeway system have to do with money.  
3   Money extorted from the people, at the sacrifice of their  
4   homes, families, community, and ecological and moral well-being,  
5   to feed the insatiable greed of the Money-Mafia, through the  
6   amoral and despicable activities of the Money-Mafia's chief  
7   prostitutes, the Highway Lobby, and their political clients in  
8   Congress, and their local shills: the highway departments.

9           We are here, once again, remind you, our city govern-  
10   ment, that you must not fall prey to their allurements. We  
11   insist that you, our city government, in your widely publicized  
12   program for "law and order" might well begin by obeying the  
13   law yourselves and adhere to the legal requirements for high-  
14   way planning set forth in Title 7 of the D.C. Code, and by  
15   making no move to build any bridges or roads under the pro-  
16   visions of the Interstate Highway Act until you have complied  
17   with the legal requirements of that Act and the guidelines of  
18   the Department of Transportation.

19           We reject government by blackmail, duress, intimidat-  
20   tion, extortion, and cabals; government which is deaf to the  
21   will of the people expressed in democratic referendum, in open  
22   and legally constituted hearings, and in the courts of law;  
23   government which listens only to the voice of the economically  
24   and politically powerful, and results of loaded polls concocted  
25   and paid for by special interest groups; government run by emas-



1 culated stooges who willing betry their sacred trust for  
2 money or agrandizement.

3 In two large popular referenda, May, 1968 and again  
4 in November, 1969, the citizens overwhelmingly rejected this  
5 bridge and these freeways.

6 On February 15th, 1968 the U. S. Court of Appeals  
7 ruled that this bridge and freeway system was illegal "from  
8 its inception." In April of this year, again the Court of  
9 Appeals ruled the Three-Sisters Bridge is illegal. At this  
10 moment the citizens are back in court, for the third time,  
11 because this hearing is illegal.

12 In December, 1968, after four full days of public  
13 hearings, the City Council voted, without dissent, to adopt  
14 the National Capitol Planning Commission's Comprehensive Trans-  
15 portation Plan, which calls for no more Interstate Freeways,  
16 and proclaimed as its key planning principle that "no new gate-  
17 ways to the city are needed"...this key principle was ratified  
18 by the present Council in February of this year.

19 Yet, on August 9th, 1969, under incredible duress,  
20 blackmail, political extortion, the City Council lost its  
21 courage and illegally reversed its vote..in flagrant disregard  
22 of Title 7 of the D.C. Code and the Interstate Highway Act...  
23 and proved themselves unworthy of their sacred trust to re-  
24 present the people of this city.

25 The illegal construction of the Three Sisters  
Bridge is being justified by a grossly amoral statute (Sec. 23

1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968), that was enacted over  
2 the outraged cries of the citizens and in arrogant defiance of  
3 a court ruling. It is a statute that will never survive the  
4 scrutiny of justice in the courts of law where the citizens are  
5 now testing it.

6 Since legal justification is impossible, the Money-  
7 Mafia is in a great rush to get this grossly illegal bridge  
8 built, for they hope to confront us with an accomplished fact,  
9 a physical structure that gives no hint of the true displace-  
10 ment and civic chaos it will cause. Break the citizens' will,  
11 and foreclose any possibility of the citizens of this city  
12 planning our community in any other way than the one that the  
13 Money-Mafia...the forces of insatiable greed...dictate.

14 At this juncture in the ongoing relationship between  
15 you, the government of this city, and us, the people of this  
16 city...we bring to your attention where we all stand in regard  
17 to this concocted "subway-freeway impasse." Incidentally,  
18 I might add that this statement is addressed to the Mayor and  
19 City Council, and that's the reason for this particular lan-  
20 guage. We share the view of former Chairman of the National  
21 Capitol Planning Commission, Mr. Hamner, that the NCPC had made  
22 a sound planning decision when it stated that no new gate-ways  
23 to the city are needed...and that this "subway-freeway impasse"  
24 was politically contrived.

25 The no new gateways decision is, in the democratic



1 process under which we all live, a contract between you and  
2 us which cannot be broken or disregarded by you, either in-  
3 dividually or collectively. If you, in your wisdom, should  
4 choose to break that contract you are legally and morally re-  
5 sponsible for breaking faith with the people of this city. To  
6 thus break a contract based on the clear mandate of the people  
7 is to abdicate...in a most profound way..your responsibilities.  
8 To the physical decay of this city..that would be brought by  
9 this bridge and freeway system..would be adding political  
10 anarchy and moral chaos.

11           Should you choose to reconsider to reconsider inter-  
12 state freeways and the opening of new gateways to the city in  
13 the future..you must go to the route laid down in the provi-  
14 sions of Title 7 of the D.C. Code...and in federal law of bas-  
15 ing your decisions on responsible fact-finding of the real  
16 transportation needs and the total welfare of the community.  
17 You must abide by the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals.

18           Moreover, we remind you that to initiate further studies  
19 at this time would be to throw good, and scarce, money after bad.  
20 We have no money we are told for decent housing, schools, crea-  
21 tion of job opportunities, therefore we have none for studies  
22 and designs for bridges and freeways.

23           We recommend to you the fact that the effects, in  
24 city and suburb, of this contrived "subway-freeway impasse"  
25 are being falsely inflated to the point where practical solu-  
tions to the real metropolitan transportation problems (which

1 must include, among other things, vastly accelerated and well  
2 planned bus service that all can afford and the imaginative  
3 use of existing rail-lines) something that no one every talks  
4 about: -- that is the using of existing rail - lines for mass  
5 transit -- are being deliberately obscured in the rhetoric of  
6 planned panic and greed.

7           This community cannot and will not stand by idle  
8 while its constitutional rights are being destroyed by the  
9 wilful and arrogant forces of greed who seek to destroy it and  
10 its freedoms. We will fight for our rights, in public forums,  
11 such as this, in the courts, and if need be, in the streets.  
12 That is, of course, as you realize, the American way.

13           I might add one more thing: I feel a certain  
14 sense of liberation tonight to see that we were able to  
15 question our officials. Maybe this is a good influence brought  
16 over the river from Virginia. I wish I had had such an  
17 opportunity to quiz our highway officials when you were con-  
18 sidering the North Central Freeway, the thing that is called  
19 the North Central Freeway, because I would still like to know  
20 how they were able to legally confiscate and extort from  
21 citizens 69 homes. But that was a missed opportunity I  
22 suppose. In any case, there isn't going to be any bridge. You  
23 will be wasting your time to build any more plans, because there  
24 simply is not going to be any bridge.

25           HEARING OFFICER DUGAS: Thank you very much. The  
hearing is adjourned. (ADJOURNED AT 12:20, 15 December 1970.)

END OF THIS DAY. (A.M. ADJOURNMENT)



