

STENOGRAPHIC TRANSCRIPT

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

HEARING ON ROUTE U. S. 280

LIBRARY COPY

RETURN TO

OFFICE OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING
DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC
GOVT. OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILE NO: 31.156

Washington, D. C.
7 January 1958

ACE REPORTING COMPANY

261 CONSTITUTION AVE., N. W.
WASHINGTON 1, D. C.

Official Reporters

MEtropolitan 8-4780

ENGINEER COMMISSIONER

t48

Government of the District of Columbia, Executive Office,
Hearing on Route 240, Washington, D. C., 7 January 1958.

C O N T E N T S

<u>STATEMENT OF:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Clifton G. Stoneburner, Highway Engineer, Arlington County	346
T. N. Sandifer, On behalf of R. L. Robinson, President, Foxhall Community Citizens Association	350
Armistead Peter, III Progressive Citizens Association of Georgetown	353
Mrs. Harold Hinton, President, Progressive Citizens Association of Georgetown	358
Charles A. Burmeister, Recording Secretary, Northwest Council of Citizens Associations	365
Leo J. Richards, Civil League of Brookmont & Vicinity	376
Miss Virginia Russell, National Wildlife Federation	384
Francis D. Lethbridge, Chairman, Government Relations Committee, American Institute of Architects, Washing- ton-Metropolitan Chapter	390
Grosvenor Chapman	398
J. A. Barr, On behalf of the Reverend F. L. Farris, Bethesda-Chevy Chase, Little Falls, River Road Property Owners Association	403
Isabel C. Moore	408

District Department of Transportation Library
 55 M ST SE, Suite 400
 Washington D.C. 20003

t49
1/7/58

C O N T E N T S (continued)

<u>STATEMENT OF:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Fred S. Peabody, Orchardale Citizens Association	418
Arthur P. Davis	419
George L. Hart, Jr. On behalf of Robert V. Fleming, Federal City Council	425
Laura F. Warfield	428
Constant Southworth	432
Ellis Haworth, American University Park Citizens Association	437
Charles T. Tittmann,	439
Alden A. Potter	446
Theodore J. Prahinski, The Young Democratic Club of D.C.	442
Scott Seegers	479
John R. Immer, Chairman, Zoning Committee Sheridan-Kalorama Neighborhood Council Dupont Circle Citizens Assoc.	487
Clarence E. Kefauver, President Columbia Federal Savings & Loan Assoc.	493
W. Edward Gallagher, Washington Gas Light Company	496
Eugene L. Stewart, Baltimore and Ohio Railroad	499
Sigurd F. Olson, National Parks Association	509
Arthur Clarendon Smith, Jr., D.C. Trucking Assoc.	516

Barther-1

C O N T E N T S (Continued)

STATEMENT OF:	<u>Page</u>
Milo G. Coerper, Friendship Heights Citizens Assoc.	518
Mrs. Benjamin Powell, National Capital Garden Club League	525
William K. Norwood, Chevy Chase Citizens Assoc.	527
Arthur K. Stelhorn Maryland-D.C. Park and Planning Comm.	528
Richard Daniels Chevy Chase Village	534
- - - -	
Memorandum re letters received	543
<u>Communications Received</u> (filed at end of original transcript)	
George Bisset, Potomac Electric Power Company	
Frank C. Broadbent	
Mrs. Edward B. Morris, Federation of Citizens Assoc. of D.C.	
William E. Shepherd, Georgetown Citizens Assoc.	
George de Sibrik	
Milton Hopfenmaier Company, by Alvin L. Newmyer	
William E. Shepherd, Planning Advisory Council	
Resolution, Spring Valley-Wesley Heights Citizens Assoc.	
Robert J. Bird	
Randall C. Wyant, Master Builders' Assoc. Inc.	
Edward D. Hollander	
Fred J. Kelley, Western Bethesda Community Planning Assoc.	

Jarl T. Mack, North Cleveland Park Citizens Assoc.

Clarence B. Hewes,

Milton Eisenberg, Merrinack Park Citizens Assoc.

Stanley R. Green, Bethesda Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce

Orme Wilson

John A. Logan,

Walter F. Rothe, Universal Calendar Society, Inc.

TM/1

PUBLIC HEARING ON ROUTE 240

-- --

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

-- --

Board Room (Room 500)

District Building

Washington, D. C.

Tuesday, 7 January 1958

Met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:05 a.m.

BEFORE:

Board of Commissioners:

Robert E. McLaughlin, President

David B. Karrick

Alvin C. Welling, Colonel, U. S. Army

G. M. Thornett, Secretary

-- --

P R O C E E D I N G S

TM
1/7/58
rel

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: We have a quorum of the Board. Maybe we better get started.

I want to start off this morning with Mr. Clifton G. Stoneburner, Highway Engineer and Chief of the Highway Division of Arlington County, and he also has an important position as Chairman of the Coordinating Agency over there.

Mr. Stoneburner, will you sit right down there, and will you give for the record, your position and also your position as Chairman of the Coordinating Committee.

STATEMENT OF MR. CLIFTON G. STONEBURNER, HIGHWAY ENGINEER, ARLINGTON COUNTY.

MR. STONEBURNER: Mr. Chairman, I am Clifton G. Stoneburner, Highway Engineer and Chief of the Highway Division of Arlington Division, also the Chairman of the Regional Highway Coordinating Committee of the Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission.

We have a desire to not get involved in the local problem of the location of an interstate highway in the District of Columbia. However, we are concerned with some of the items involved.

First, I would like to discuss the Arizona Avenue Bridge. A statement was indicated by one of the speakers yesterday that Virginia Highway officials were not in accord

re2

with the Arizona Avenue Bridge. I would like to say that in the early study stage, the consultant for the District of Columbia discussed this item with me, and a suggested location was made and accepted by the consultant in his recommendations on this, and shortly thereafter, a representative from the consultant's office went to Richmond with me to review this matter with the State Highway Department, and at a subsequent date, I think on April 18, a meeting was held in the office of the National Capitol Planning Commission, in which General Anderson, Mr. Harwood of the State Highway Department, and Mr. Dieter, our Planning Engineer in Arlington and myself were present.

Statements were made at that time favoring the location of the Arizona Avenue Bridge, and by all of the Virginia participants, and after a review of the discussion, pointing out the advantages of the location of the Arizona Avenue Bridge, General Anderson stated that he was in complete agreement with those statements.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: I wonder if you could point out on any of these maps here, how that would tie in, presumably, with your Virginia Highway. Could you give us some idea of that?

MR. STONEBURNER: Well this map here will probably be the best one. This is in such small detail though, it is rather difficult to show. However, I think most everyone

re3

involved in this Committee, the Arizona Avenue Bridge with connection on the Virginia side would intersect with Glebe Road and Route 123 immediately west of the present intersection of Military Road and Glebe Road on the Virginia side. A high level location at that point would permit interchange of traffic and a very good approach road system.

One of the main problems that we have on the Virginia side is because of the low grade of the present Chain Bridge. It is very difficult to get the roads, the important roads which are Glebe Road, Route 120, and Route 123 into this low location because of the steep grades.

The proposal for the Arizona Avenue Bridge was to construct it at a higher level, very good grades, roughly in the neighborhood of 3 percent grades could be accomplished, and would provide direct flow of traffic into the Bridge.

Now, insofar as Chain Bridge itself is concerned, it has a serious capacity problem in rush hours at present, it recently has been converted into a reversible lane arrangement, and even with this, it still involves delays in getting on the Bridge.

It has the greatest percentage increase in traffic volume and with the proposed developments on both sides of the River which should no doubt increase the demand for traffic capacity on that Bridge, would indicate that a new bridge in that vicinity is extremely desirable and should be

provided for.

re4

The Arizona Avenue Bridge in our opinion, meets this requirement.

Now, there is one other item that we think is of great importance in this particular subject that is under discussion.

The Canal Road and Chain Bridge have been for many generations before the use of the motor vehicle, an important commercial market road and has been used for commercial vehicles for many many years. We certainly would not want to see any development which would cut off the truck route and commercial vehicle route that is involved along the present Canal Road and the Chain Bridge, and I mean by that, that if a Parkway is developed there as was suggested by some of the speakers, that it would cut off that means of truck ingress, commercial vehicle ingress, and would result in the very detrimental effect upon the local roads on both the Virginia side and District side in our opinion.

The George Washington Parkway on the Virginia side is not to permit vehicles, commercial vehicles, and therefore, if the entire River road is cut off from both sides by any adequately designed truck route, it would only force many of those trucks over the local streets on both sides. We think that would have a very undesirable effect upon both communities.

Thank you.

re5
COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Could I ask you, what is the attitude of Arlington County and the State of Virginia toward a Three Sister Bridge?

MR. STONEBURNER: We have looked rather favorably upon a bridge at that location and we think that in the long range planning of the community over a long period of time, a bridge at both Three Sisters and Arizona Avenue would be desirable. There has been discussion of the proposed bridge at Nebraska Avenue, we feel that of the three locations, that is the least desirable one.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: We certainly appreciate your coming, Mr. Stoneburner.

We will continue this morning with the calling of witnesses where we broke off last night, and then return to any that may have come in.

Let's see, I think I had a special arrangement with one person, I said I would call him this morning, that is the President of the Foxhall Community Citizens, and I think also, with Armistead Peter, III. Is he here now?

COMMISSIONER KARRICK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Oh, yes.

STATEMENT OF T. N. SANDIFER, APPEARING FOR ROBERT L. ROBINSON, PRESIDENT, FOXHALL COMMUNITY CITIZENS ASSOCIATION.

MR. SANDIFER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board.

re6

My name is T. N. Sandifer, 1524-44th Street, Northwest, Foxhall Road.

I have been delegated by Robert L. Robinson, President of Foxhall Community Citizens Association, to present a brief statement which he has prepared, setting forth that Association's views.

It might be pertinent to mention briefly that this community is just south of Reservoir Road, and immediately adjoins the proposed extension on Route C through Glover-Archbold. The statement follows.

The members of the Foxhall Community Citizens Association appreciate this opportunity to be heard with regard to the proposed location of U. S. Route 240 within the northwest section of the District. This Association represents some 550 families living in the residential area immediately west of the lower end of Glover-Archbold Park.

This Association is unalterably opposed to the construction of an 8- or 6-lane expressway through Glover-Archbold Park. The primary reasons for our opposition are: The thorough destruction of valuable park land; the extreme danger created for youngsters attempting to play in the Park; the complete disuse of the Park as a recreational area during the 2-year period of construction, including high fills, deep cuts, underpasses, etc.; the constant roar, vibration,

re7

and fumes created in this narrow low-lying Park by heavy commercial trucks and buses as they climb the continual grade; the immediate and continued deterioration of desirable residential property along the Park and in contiguous areas as a result of the above; the advantages of routing express trucks and buses away from, not through, residential areas; the estimated additional construction costs in excess of 33% or \$15.0 million over another available route, plus millions of additional costs to effect condemnation of private property; and the availability of the Park for a desirable parkway.

It is only natural that the foremost desire of the Maryland Capitol Planning Commission should be to effect the most expedient system for transporting the thousands of commuters it represents from their homes in Maryland to their jobs in the District and back to their stores and markets in Maryland. It has little concern for the effect on District residents except possibly to increase the trend on the movement of District residents to the suburbs.

With downtown District parking space at such a premium the membership of this Association critically questions the advisability of pouring additional thousands of commuter automobiles daily into the downtown area from nearby Maryland. We earnestly solicit the Commissioners and the National Capitol Planning Commission to provide a more

effective rapid transit system for the metropolitan area in lieu of expressways.

In conclusion, of the four expressway routes defined by the Clarkeson Engineering report, this Association recommends the River route. This route is recommended because it eliminates most of the disadvantages listed above in connection with an expressway through Glover-Archbold Park.

That concludes our statement, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Sir, you are surrounded by these routes, aren't you?

MR. SANDIFER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Mr. Armistead Peter, III.

And is Mrs. Hinton with you, Mr. Peter?

MR. PETER: Yes.

STATEMENT OF MR. ARMISTEAD PETER, III, PROGRESSIVE CITIZENS ASSOCIATION OF GEORGETOWN.

MR. PETER: My name is Armistead Peter, and I am Second Vice-President of the Georgetown Progressive Citizens Association, and Chairman of the special committee on Route 240.

I would like to read a resolution that was unanimously passed by the Residents Association of Georgetown at their meeting on December 9, 1957.

re9

WHEREAS, all of the plans for Route 240 which have been presented thus far have imposed a heavy increase in the traffic load on the Georgetown waterfront or in the close vicinity of Georgetown, and,

WHEREAS, a new plan has been suggested by the National Capitol Planning Commission which would utilize tunnels, roughly paralleling Massachusetts Avenue, to effect a connection between the northern end of Glover-Archbold Park and the Inner Loop, and,

WHEREAS, This plan, if satisfactorily developed would eliminate a major truck expressway from the valley of the Potomac and the borders of the Canal and would relieve any further pressure to allow trucks in Glover-Archbold Parkway. It would save the banks of the river above the canal from destructive excavation, would preserve the recreational properties of the area and would eliminate a large volume of traffic from the Georgetown waterfront.

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the Progressive Citizens Association of Georgetown shall take no action in support of any plan for Route 240 until a detailed development of the Massachusetts Avenue Tunnel plan is presented, and that the Association recommends to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that, to this end, they give full support to the National Capitol Planning Commission.

I should like to add to that, that we feel strongly

re10

that the river route is not a satisfactory route, certainly from the standpoint of Georgetown, and I would say from the standpoint of Washington as a whole.

In the first place, it seems indefensible to carry a truck route of that volume directly into the Inner Loop at such a short distance from the Lincoln Memorial, the new auditorium that will be built in that location, when we consider that if 240 was brought through the circumferential highway with outlets in both directions, from there through the Fort Drive, with outlets in both directions, all the really heavy truck traffic, long-distance traffic with objectives in Washington should be carried in the direction that they want to go before they come to the center of the City.

I cannot believe that modern planning justifies bringing heavy truck traffic directly into the center and most monumental part of Washington.

I know that the Fort Drive has not been considered very seriously lately, but it is one of the circumferential routes around the center of the City that has been planned for many years. It comes into Battery Kemble Park where at one time I believe the Park Department had suggested a bridge, which would relieve traffic even in interstate commerce from coming into the center of the City, and that I believe is going to be the objective of all cities in the future, to keep

rell

truck traffic out rather than bringing it in.

If, for instance, as has been suggested, trucks are in the process of conducting business in the City, they will not necessarily follow Route 240. Their normal objective will be their dumping area, which might be in the Northeast section of the City, as it is in many cases, when they would take one of the circumferential routes to go to that area and from that area have to come through the City streets in order to get to whatever objective they were going to.

Also, I believe that it is hardly to be defended to put a route of that importance, completely to one side of the area that it is supposed to serve. It is one-sided and it has no ingress from the District line to Georgetown except at one point, a road carriage through the Wisconsin Avenue corridor would draw traffic from both directions and while we do not necessarily support the position of the Tunnel in all cases, particularly where it comes out in Normanstone Drive, we believe that the basic plan of the Tunnel, and particularly its location, is sufficiently important to justify further examination.

But, we would like to leave with the Commissioners, the feeling or the suggestion that it would be well to examine more closely the question as to whether it was necessary to bring that truck route into Washington at all, granted that it has the two outlets at the circumferential parkway and at

the Fort Drive.

rel2

In addition to that, I should like to speak of the appearance of the waterfront in Georgetown and above Georgetown that will be caused by the building of either Route A or A2.

A road that is an 8-lane road with a separation carried up the river or 6-lane road, as it would be further up, would hardly leave the bank of the river in a recognizable condition from what we know it today. I really believe that our prestige as a country is going to depend in some extent on the solutions that we give to these problems and in the national capitol that prestige is going to mean more and more. It really means something concrete and important to us that we make solutions that do not fly in the face of the appearance of things after we finish with them.

I don't believe it could be again said that there is a time that arises in any City when surface traffic cannot solve its problems. If New York had depended on surface traffic and developed freeways and overpasses and that sort of thing in the beginning, without building subways and without building a system of mass transportation, Manhattan Island wouldn't have been large enough today to carry the traffic that goes in and out every morning. I do feel that before very long, we should consider seriously a system of mass transportation that would save Washington from having

el3
its face so changed by these large throughways and freeways,
that most of us who have lived here will hardly be able to
recognize it.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Peter.
Have you a word for us, this morning?

MRS. HINTON: Yes.

STATEMENT OF MRS. HAROLD HINTON, PRESIDENT,
PROGRESSIVE CITIZENS ASSOCIATION OF GEORGETOWN.

MRS. HINTON: I might say there is a mild study on
mass transportation in progress now.

I am Mrs. Harold B. Hinton, President of Progressive
Citizens Association of Georgetown. Mr. Peter already told
you what our association stand has been on it, so what I am
telling you now is for myself and from my long experience,
ten years that I have done a great deal of civic work in
Georgetown and in Washington.

I want to refer to what General Prentiss said
yesterday. He said that the Interstate Highway Act was not
devised to aid traffic inside of cities, but to route it
around industrial cities and from city to city and from state
to state.

I agree perfectly with that, and I do not think
that any leg of Route 240 coming from a by-pass route to
bring truck traffic into the city could possibly be called a

rel4

proper interstate route. Maybe this isn't a very nice thing to say, but I feel strongly that if we didn't have that 90 percent federal aid dangling in front of our noses, there wouldn't be so much impetus to bring this truck traffic into the city.

Now, if you have read, and I am sure you have, the opinions and cries which have gone up since the Baltimore Tunnel, they say that has taken -- I have seen this expressed in the paper -- all of the traffic off the streets in Baltimore. Of course that means all the traffic which doesn't directly have business in that particular street. I feel very much that Route 240, when opened around Cabin John and when the Jones Point Bridge is open, that same thing will happen. The truck traffic which then comes into Washington will be coming here to do business. As Mr. Peter said, go to the particular spot it wants to go to, not necessarily to have a large interstate piece of a highway to go on.

Most of the traffic in Northwest Washington, the truck traffic, except for the small neighborhood stores, goes to the Georgetown waterfront. It is mostly concrete trucks, that is about what it amounts to, those Mahoney concrete trucks, and they go from their base down in Georgetown waterfront to whatever particular building is being built at the time, and that is not in a stable position, as you can understand. Therefore, there is no point in building a truck

rel5

route, a huge truck route for huge trucks to go to a waterfront which is not exactly one, but which is certainly not getting more industrial, but tending more toward lighter type commerce, bit by bit.

Now, I want to make another comment on what Mr. Robertson said yesterday. He said that to bring in the highway truck route, along the river, would give a very dignified and esthetic interest to the nation's capitol.

Now, if you are going to make a leg of an interstate highway by-pass coming right into the center of the capital city, you are not going to do anything esthetic the least bit. I think the Highway Department's interest in esthetics is very commendable, they need a great deal more practice in that field before it takes much effect. If any of you did, as I did, follow the hearings in the capitol, on trying to get some small modicum of control on billboards on the new interstate highway system, where it is going into virgin country where we probably never again find any more virgin country to put a highway through, they would not accept any control at all on billboards.

Now, the worse thing about the Georgetown waterfront is not the commerce that goes on, it is the billboards being put up to attract attention, and neon signs to attract attention of the people on the freeway, and nothing, no truckers coming into the national capitol is going to have the

rel6

least bit of dignity attached to it, because I assure you they are permitted to put up billboards, and that is going to be just the absolute end of anything that could even be human looking along the river.

And I feel very strongly against either of those river routes. In fact, our Association felt, as Mr. Peter said, all four of the routes suggested, two of the Planning Commission Highway Department routes and Clarkeson report route were so bad, we simply could not take any stand. We couldn't even take a stand criticizing them.

Now, in conclusion, I wanted to ask you a question, and that is, here is a piece that I took from the Star, December 13, 1957, where it speaks of the Advisory Committee on Planning and Colonel Welling spoke to them, and Mr. Robertson, and I thought it was planning to see where things should be put, but it seems to be planning to see how they will get to pay for them. And the last paragraph, I would like to ask you what this means, perhaps Colonel Welling can tell me. It says, "Colonel Welling told the council he also would like their advice on whether or not the city should seek to build a link with Maryland Route 240 within the next six years."

I should say they should not seek to. "This project is --" I'm finishing the quote -- "is not in the existing six-year program."

rel/

"Mr. Robertson said that the Department is considering substituting Route 240 for the central leg of the proposed Inner Loop expressway around the central part of the city."

Now, does that mean that the part coming down from the river will be part of the Inner Loop? What does that mean?

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: I was thinking something else. You realize 240 comes in now, don't you?

MRS. HINTON: I know it comes down Wisconsin Avenue right now.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Plenty of people speak about this problem as though we were just going to add a lot of traffic here, which is not coming into the city already at present.

MRS. HINTON: We realize it comes right down Wisconsin, we have it every day.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: What was that question, Mrs. Hinton?

MRS. HINTON: Where they said should they substitute --

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: What is that question?

MRS. HINTON: I wondered what it meant by - "Mr. Robertson said that the Department is considering substituting Route 240 for the central leg of the projected Inner Loop

expressway around the central part of the city."

rel8

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Is Mr. Robertson here? Would you explain that, or would you want the "Star" to explain it.

(Laughter.)

MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. President --

MRS. HINTON: If it is out of order, I will just pose the question and let you find an answer, if that is what you would rather do. I don't suppose I have any right to question anybody.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Were you properly quoted in that statement?

MR. ROBERTSON: We were considering a study to take some of the interstate money which would apply to the central leg of the whole inner belt for use of 240, if it had to be built by the Maryland connection. If we had to build it, we would have to find money to build it, that is one possibility. It is all interstate connections.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: The point is under the program we have so much -- 90 percent money, is that right?

MR. ROBERTSON: That is right.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: And the question is where that 90 percent money is going to be applied.

MRS. HINTON: Do you have to spend it? Couldn't you just let Route 240 take the traffic. Every by-pass of any

rel9

city takes the traffic around it and they do not build big throughways to bring traffic into the city. The point is to take it around. Couldn't there be some part of the money not spent?

I saw in the paper the other day, that Congress is very much worried as the cost of the interstate highway system is getting so much bigger than they expected, and it would be rather nice, if there was part of it that didn't have to be spent.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: You are suggesting that the District of Columbia should --

MRS. HINTON: Not have any leg of Route 240 coming in.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Should construct this Highway Department, paying 50 percent, instead of taking advantage of the same statutes that the other 48 states are taking advantage of?

MRS. HINTON: No, Mr. McLaughlin, when a through route, interstate route, yes, but I don't see any need to try to bring a by-pass into the middle of the city into the best residential areas of the District and through the few remaining parks of the District, just so we could get 90 percent federal aid.

As you pointed out, 240 does come into the District,

re20

comes down Wisconsin Avenue, when the by-pass around is completed, through trucks will go around there, and I think you will be able, the ones which come down Wisconsin Avenue come for business to where they are going to some local area and they would rather come there any how, and there isn't any need to build a throughway through the best residential district.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: It is coming down Wisconsin Avenue.

MRS. HINTON: We will be greatly relieved when it goes around, be much better then it is now.

Fls
 TM/re
 mcl
 1/7/58

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much. I think perhaps we better go back to the representatives of the groups here. There aren't many that were not present last night.

Friendship Heights was not present last night. The American Federation of Labor, CIO, was not present last night. I mean, are they present now?

(There was no response.)

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Northwest Council of Citizens' Associations?

MR. BURMEISTER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Will you come forward, please. Will you proceed and give the name of your organization that you represent. Is there anyone else here representing Northwest Council?

MR. BURMEISTER: No.

xxx

STATEMENT OF CHARLES A. BURMEISTER,
 RECORDING SECRETARY, NORTHWEST COUNCIL OF CITIZENS'
 ASSOCIATION

MR. BURMEISTER: My name is Charles A. Burmeister. I am recording secretary of the Northwest Council of Citizens' Association, and I appear here for that organization.

In view of the fact that you have had a long two days of it, I can condense this a little bit, if you want to.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Why don't you put the

mc2

whole statement in the record?

MR. BURMEISTER: There are some parts I would like to emphasize.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Proceed in your own way.

MR. BURMEISTER: The first paragraph refers to the fact that we presented a resolution on this, on November 25. I would like to read the last paragraph of that resolution which is attached.

Now, Therefore be it resolved, that the Northwest Council of Citizens' Associations convened in a regular meeting on November 25, 1957, hereby opposes any use of land in or adjacent to (1) Rock Creek Park, (2) Glover-Archbold Park, (3) Whitehaven Park, (4) Wisconsin Avenue, (5) George Washington Memorial Parkway, or (6) Palisades-Potomac Parkway as a right-of-way to link Route 240 at the Maryland-District of Columbia boundry with downtown Washington; and

It is further resolved, that the Northwest Council of Citizens' Associations favors and endorses a circumferential highway by-passing the District of Columbia to the West.

Now the Council is made up of nine citizens' associations located in Northwest Washington, and they adopted this resolution unanimously.

Later on, two of them, the American University Park and Cathedral Heights modified their position, and since they

mc3

are appearing here, I will not attempt to present what their views are, although we have summarized them in this statement.

The Forest Hills Association has felt that if it was inevitable that there be a super highway coming into the District, that consideration should be given to the railroad right-of-way of the B&O Railroad and use land adjacent to that right-of-way and make connections with the inner-circumferential highway.

That part is mentioned in here, and I will not dwell on that any more.

On page 2, we present a statement or paragraph outlining what the problem is. Since that has been discussed very fully, I will not go into that. But down at the end of the page, I bring out that the question seems to be, it is not whether a route is actually needed at the present or in the future for the orderly development of Washington, it seems to be a question only of where shall the link be located.

Now, it is the position of this Council that none of the four proposed locations will contribute to the orderly and comprehensive development of our city, since all of the proposed routes involve, to a greater or lesser extent, the sacrifice of park areas. It is believed that parks, which presumably are areas set aside for the rest and recreation, protected from the inroads of mechanical gadgets, are fully

mc 4

as important as are means of transportation, and that the former should not be sacrificed to the latter.

The presently proposed locations seem, moreover, advanced in a manner carefully calculated to minimize opposition from property owners directly affected. The great fault of the proposed routes is that they proceed from the assumption that our public parks, which contain irreplaceable recreational and historical values, are expendable. In parks there are no private owners to be dispossessed, no cost of litigation or compensation. Thus, those who would destroy our parks use as their battle cry "which shall it be, birds or people?" As we see it, this approach completely misnames the issue, which is of course, "which shall it be - automobiles or people?"

Thus, in their hurry to secure free Federal money under the 1956 Act, the road construction enthusiasts have placed in jeopardy the historic C and O Canal, adjacent Potomac River Parkland, Whitehaven Park, and Glover-Archbold Park, a substantial fraction of which was dedicated in perpetuity to the people of the District of Columbia as a natural sanctuary for the relief of human tensions generated by our increasingly complex urban life.

Even if it were to be conceded that transportation takes precedence over parks, we are then faced with the annoying fact that automobile transportation cannot do the

mc5

major job for which these highways are intended; namely, the speedy and safe transport of urban and suburban workers to and from downtown Washington to work and shop. If there is one single solitary characteristic which all the urban superhighways in every American city have in common it is this: They are inadequate during the rush hours, no matter how many lanes they have. Most of the day they are used far less than capacity, while during the rush hours they are quite inadequate to meet the demands upon them. This continues to be true, irrespective of the increase in the number of routes and lanes available.

Under these circumstances, why should the parks be sacrificed to super highways. If they could do the job that would be one thing, but to sacrifice the parks with the sure knowledge that this will be a vain effort to keep up with rush hour traffic peaks, is quite another. After all the parks are gone in this vain effort, what then shall we do? Sacrifice of these priceless and irreplaceable areas is a bald surrender to the dictates of a short-sighted expediency.

It is our further position that to proceed with the design and construction of this highway over any of the proposed routes, in opposition to the expressed wishes of the inhabitants of the area to be served, and this is at the very time when the District's highway financing resources show signs of strain, is clearly contrary to the public

mc6

interest.

Opposition to the proposed highway locations springs from several convictions. Firstly, it is believed that the major objective of the Federal Highway Act of 1956, under which the proposed construction will proceed, is to alleviate, not compound traffic congestion. It cannot be doubted that construction of an eight-lane limited access highway between the District Line and downtown Washington through the heart of the Northwest Quadrant will compound the automotive congestion which presently clogs Washington.

Another reason we oppose the present plans is their complete lack of integration with the mass transportation survey presently being conducted at a cost exceeding \$1/2 million by the National Capital Regional Planning Council and the National Capital Planning Commission. We are today asked to express a preference as to highway routes without knowledge of important data as to land use, population growth, traffic patterns, and alternatives to park-devouring automobiles which will be forthcoming in the Mass Transportation Survey. To us it seems the sheerest waste of limited resources to separate highway from public transportation planning, when both clearly have the same purpose, namely, to provide for the facile movement of people and goods in the Washington area. Is it not time we sought some more fundamental solutions, such as giving people an

mc7

alternative to the use of automobiles, in the manner which is now being studied by the Mass Transportation Survey?

Furthermore, the justification of these plans rests upon some very questionable premises, of which the following will serve as examples:

First, That with automobile registrations increasing faster than population, automobiles will continue to be the major method of intraurban transportation; and

Second, That present day commuting patterns will characterize the future Washington community; and

Third, That population growth will actually occur at projected rates; and

Fourth, That forecast population growth is an inexorable phenomenon to which everything else must be adjusted.

The proposed highway plans represent an impetuous effort to build for a suburban population projected by those who have lost sight of the need for a well-balanced community containing parks as well as highways; homes as well as businesses; in short, a region where the population can be comfortably accommodated.

We have outlined our reasons for opposing the proposed plans. We also have certain affirmative views to offer.

Firstly it is our belief that the present timetable for construction of the outer circumferential highway and its supporting bridges should be accelerated. Connection

mc8

of Interstate U. S. Highway 240 with this outer circumferential highway outside of the District will serve to divert from the District that traffic which has no desire to penetrate there, but which will nevertheless be attracted under the present construction timetable. We therefore strongly recommend that action be taken as soon as possible to effect this change in timing of the construction program.

Second, we urge the Commissioners to defer their final determination on Route 240 link until the results of the Mass Transportation Survey become known. These may indicate that modern rapid transit will accommodate anticipated traffic requirements in a manner more economical of both land and money than is possible with total reliance upon private automobile travel, upon which the present plans are predicated.

Third, that highway construction which is so vital a part of transportation planning not be treated out of context with or separate from the myriad other problems of planning for a greater, better, and more beautiful Federal city.

To sum up, we recognize the value of super highways as facilities for fast intercity travel; we question, however, whether sole dependence on them for intra-city travel is wise public policy. And we are quite certain that the imposition of eight lanes of concrete in our public parks will be

mc9

adverse to the best interests of the citizens of the District of Columbia.

The following four excerpts from volume eleven, number three, dated December 1957, of a study of the Potomac River Basin, which treats the Route 240 link, as part of studies in Business and Economics of the University of Maryland, adequately, it seems to us, states the case for the people:

"Human physical ailments usually are studied by a general diagnostician who refers to specialists areas of particular concern. The objective is health for the whole man. Similar procedures are normal for a region, which should be analyzed, planned, and developed as an integral concept. Otherwise, development to the disadvantage of the whole ...

"Little can be accomplished in the way of planning for regional development without comprehensive study of the area in question. This investigation must consider not only the physical and topographical characteristics but must include economic, social, and aesthetic factors as well. In many instances these factors are not suited for simple mechanical or quantitative comparison and analysis. It is difficult to place a monetary value on something of great social or historical importance; consequently these aspects are frequently

mc10

eliminated or ignored.

"In any region as diversified as the Potomac River Basin, many alternative uses compete for land and must be considered in programming land development. These include agriculture, industry, commerce, transportation, recreation and private residences as well as land for public installations. Each must be examined thoroughly in ourder to provide an intelligent basis for effective enlightened land-use planning.

"The foregoing appraisal of the D. C.-Potomac River Valley development problems indicates conclusively that there are many aspects of this problem which need careful study and that all of the various problems are inseparably interrelated. No program for the fulfillment of the region can possibly be successful unless it frankly accepts the need for acquiring much more information than is now available with a recognition of the vital interdependence of the many aspects."

In closing, I would like to make a few personal comments pointing out to you that in view of the rapidity of technological changes, we need to give a very careful appraisal to the future possibilities in the way of transportation development. In the last 150 years, we have seen the development of the stage coach, the canal, the steam railroad, the electric interurban, followed by the diesel and gasoline

mc11

motor, and then the airplane. Of the first four of these modes of transportation, two of them have practically been eliminated, three of them, rather, that is the stage coach, the canal, and the electric interurban; the steam railroad is finding disastrous competition, and even the diesel railroad is since 1910, we have had the development of the motor transportation. Since 1930, airplane transportation. In the last ten years, helicopters.

In view of the rapidity of all these developments, it may be within 20 years that the automobile transportation may meet the same type of disastrous competition as these earlier methods of transportation, and you may be confronted with a problem of finding landing fields rather than through highways into the city.

There was a rather disastrous mistake, I think, made in developing a tunnel on Connecticut Avenue. It damaged a great many business interests, and now with the streetcar tracks about to be eliminated, we have a tunnel there that will not be of very much use.

I thank you.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you, sir. You wouldn't suggest we just let 240 dangle until we get helicopters, then we might have to take a whole park for a landing field?

mc12

MR. BURMEISTER: There was one point in here that I failed to mention, didn't read, and that will answer your question there. It was on page 2, and I left it out. That we now have as feeder roads off of Route 240, we have Connecticut and Wisconsin Avenues, Sixteenth Street, Beech Drive, Oregon Avenue, Utah Avenue, Broad Branch Road, Nevada Avenue, Military Road, River Road, Massachusetts Avenue, Dalecarlea Parkway, McArthur Boulevard. We have 14 or 16 roads now leading traffic off of 240 into the city.

I don't see where adding four more lanes of concrete will help distribute that traffic very much better than those

Some of my friends have said, "Oh, yes, if we build 240 into the city, we can ride 50 miles an hour into Washington." Well, I have never been able to find out how you could pour 50 gallons of water through a one-inch bunghole without having some congestion, and no one has ever told me yet how you are going to get that traffic off of 240 after you get it downtown without having some traffic congestion. When you solve that problem, you can solve this thing.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: It is all a big problem. Brookmont, we haven't heard from the Civic League of Brookmont. Mr. Engelstad or Richards. Give us your name, sir, and your position.

xxx

STATEMENT OF LEO J. RICHARDS,
CIVIC LEAGUE OF BROOKMONT AND VICINITY

mc13

MR. RICHARDS: My name, sir, is Leo J. Richards, and I live at 6410 Ridge Drive, Brookmont, Maryland.

I am a member of the Civic League of Brookmont and Vicinity, and currently the editor of "Brookmont News."

As a preface, Gentlemen, I would like to endorse quite heartily the statements of the previous speaker. He has presented the broader point of view that we should like in our statement to emphasize.

Brookmont is a small community lying along MacArthur Boulevard and between MacArthur Boulevard and the Potomac River, immediately across the District line in Montgomery County, Maryland. Brookmont is very proud of its rural advantages, and is happy with the public transportation it enjoys from the Cabin John Line of the Capital Transit Company. Some of the Brookmont householders find this public transportation adequate for their complete needs and thus do not bother with an automobile.

I have personally commuted many years by streetcar to and from Washington, and I find the streetcar service entirely adequate to take me anywhere I want to go in Metropolitan Washington. The members of my family find it more convenient to go by streetcar than to go to Washington or Georgetown by automobile, so great has traffic congestion become for the automobile.

We in Brookmont thus lend an unsympathetic ear to

mc14

the Road Building propaganda for new roads, for wider roads, for faster roads. We like our public transportation. It is sure. It is fast. It is safe.

It is thus with some surprise that we became acquainted with other areas where there seems to be a desire to make more complicated the present traffic of private automobiles on Washington streets by opening up a wider road for Route 240 and thus bringing more private automobiles into the business and Government areas of the Federal City.

Why not extend the streetcar tracks so as to allow more people the pleasure of traveling in a nice warm streetcar on these winter mornings when an automobile is sometimes cold and uncomfortable go ride in. If there is snow on the ground it is also hard to control.

Public transportation it seems to us, is the answer to the commutation problems of Northwest Washington rather than more and faster, and by that some token, more dangerous public streets.

We thus think that it is a mistake to go on and on building more high speed roadways within the city limits of the Federal City.

Thus, I desire to point out important areas of logic, fact, and need that should be taken into consideration in connection with the entrance of vehicular traffic into the District via Route 240.

mc15

Any decision about traffic lanes for surface transportation should consider the District of Columbia as the Federal Capital City. The land areas within the confines of Washington proper and in the surrounding suburbs comprise the World Capital of the Free Western World. The City of Washington should be a place of beauty and a joy for anyone to visit. It should be a place from which to draw the inspiration and hope that all free people everywhere cherish.

Traffic within this area should be diminished, not increased, to the end that visitors can be uplifted by the grandeur that is Washington. This grandeur must not be degraded, as now, by congestion in the public streets. In a very real sense Washington today is what Rome was to the ancient world. The modern wording of the ancient phrase, "See Rome, then die" must be "See Washington; be inspired, live nobly and in freedom."

Senator Murray, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has the touch of this inspiration. He says:

"It seems to me that Washington has an unusual opportunity to be the world's finest city ... I hope the city can be allowed to avail itself of that opportunity."

Instead, therefore, of putting much more surface

transportation onto the broad streets and the grand avenues of this world's city, this Honorable Board should address itself toward a relief of traffic congestion on the existing streets.

I think that the project of extending Route 240 into the Federal City should be denied at this time regardless of the particular terrain involved. It appears to me that there is no logic or sense in the proposal at this time.

One streetcar will do the work of 50 to 100 private automobiles, and at a fraction of the total cost. Moreover, a streetcar uses no gasoline, a commodity which, in the event of World War III, may be hard to keep in supply for private use. Our Air Force and other Armed Forces may need to take all supplies, particularly if the Near East oil fields fall into Russian hands, and oil and gas supplies of this country need to be shared with Europe.

In the event of war, the essential operations of the Federal City may be severely handicapped by the breakdown of local transportation too much dependent upon the frailties of the private automobile.

I say, therefore, let us enlarge our reliable public transportation system now apparently under competent private management.

The logic of the present and the war-possible future for local traffic within the Federal City seems to say,

do not complicate the administrative problem of the Federal Government by forcing more reliance upon the frail private automobile.

Now, each time there is a snow flurry the public offices have to release their staffs one or two hours early so that these automobiles can break through the jams of homeward bound traffic.

Gentlemen, I ask you to consider the traffic chaos if a few bombs should be dropped on this Federal City. This city stands like a sitting duck, a target for missiles fired over the North Pole or from sneak submarines.

In a previous war the City of Washington was abandoned by the Government and burned by the British Army. In more recent wars the Federal City has been more fortunate since it had the American Navy standing between it and the enemy soldiers. This protection will be now unavailable since destruction can rain in from the air.

At this point, perhaps, it might be well to remember what happened to Ancient Carthage. Washington can be utterly destroyed too. Its present traffic confusion, engendered by too much use of the private automobile, would aid in this destruction.

If the entrance of Route 240 as a so-called modern high speed multiple lane traffic arterial is deemed in the city's interest, then the Civil League of Brookmont and

Vicinity desires to go on record as endorsing the views of the Palisades Citizens' Association. The Civic League of Brookmont and Vicinity has participated in the Roads Committee of the Potomac Valley Communities through its Roads Chairman, Mr. Francis N. Engelstad. And other members of the Civic League have over a long period shown an active interest in roadways. Mr. Powell, the President and Mrs. Burgess are well known in this connection. The League wishes to endorse the presentation made by Mr. Phillip Thorson, Chairman of the Roads Committee.

Although Brookmont lies at the doorstep of Washington, it does not like to be walked over by the powerful forces operating in Washington. It chooses to preserve the civic values of this community even from roadbuilders and/or bomb throwers from across the seas.

We feel that instead of the Highway Department of the District of Columbia complicating traffic within the Federal City and the Defense posture of the National Government by intensifying the use of the private automobile for public transportation, it should consider the building of a modern subway for the commuters to and from the business and Government office centers. This Department should really go modern and build the subways, which is Washington's real need.

To this Honorable Board we would say, deny entrance

of Route 240 into the City unless it can be placed underground for its entire length. Only in this way can the surface property values be maintained.

Washington is unique in beauty as a city. Washington is also unique in the ineptitude in which it manages its public highway traffic. Its complicated traffic signals its reversible uni-directional traffic rules and its fancy pedestrian arrangements are an irritation to the free citizenry which uses its streets.

We feel that the Department of Highways should dust off the subway plans which have lain dormant for so many years and really do a job for the traffic of this city by building a subway for local and high speed transportation.

London can afford a subway, so can Washington. Paris can afford a subway, so can Washington. And Berlin. And Moscow. What these other cities can do for their traffic problem, Washington can do for its traffic problem.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN MC LAUGHLIN: We have a problem of density here, you know the laws that keep us down to a few stores, and I think that is the reason we can't go under ground on this problem.

I would like to point out when you speak of scenic Washington, that 240 is the connection with the National Old

Trails Highway, which was the first approach to a transcontinental highway, and I imagine that a lot of Congressmen's constituents who use that highway to get to Washington to see the City, wouldn't want to have to get a guide to get over from Rockville to Washington, when they get that far off.

MR. RICHARDS: My answer there is, sir, you need a guide now to get around these circles in the City.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much.

MR. RICHARDS: Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: National Wildlife Federation. Will you give your name, please, and your position.

xxx

STATEMENT OF MISS VIRGINIA RUSSELL

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

MISS RUSSELL: I am Virginia Russell. I am in charge of the Servicing Division of the National Wildlife Federation, which is a part of the conservation department. The National Wildlife Federation is a membership organization of state affiliated bodies which are made up of local conservation and sportsmen groups. We have over two million members within our affiliated organizations.

Conservation is not only for the protection of furred and feathered animals, plantlife and our soil and water, its primary reason for being is the welfare of the

people. Growing urban populations will experience greater need for the sort of outdoor recreation that parks provide. The outdoor furnishes release from the tensions and turmoil of everyday living as no concoction by a chemist ever can. Stress is found to be the basis of many illnesses and the serenity found in natural areas does much to restore mental and physical well-being. Since biblical days, man has realized that wilderness is both his refuge and his strength, and we must not push this awareness aside.

Our organization, along with other national and local conservation groups, has watched with growing concern the invasion of precious park lands by roadways. We question the philosophy of this destruction of unique and diminishing natural values at the cost of hundreds of millions of dollars simply to accommodate automobile traffic. The National Parks, including some superb areas in Washington, D. C., were set aside as inviolate areas not only for the preservation of scenic treasures and historical monuments, but for recreation. These lands belong to the American people and right to this property is as sacred as the right to private property. The beauties of park areas cannot be viewed briefly from a speeding automobile to receive the full benefits of their esthetic and spiritual qualities, and the presence of heavy traffic depreciates these values for the people who enjoy them fully.

The route for Interstate U. S. Highway 240 should be carefully considered in the light of knowledge that the District of Columbia already has more area in streets than in houses, and that vast amounts of the surrounding lands are already lined and looped with highways and super-highways or are tentatively marked for future traffic arteries. Some of the District's finest city park lands have already been sacrificed to roads.

Rock Creek Park is a ready example of what can happen to a park when more and more of its lands are turned over to roadways. For months the section of road under construction near Blagden Mills has been an eyesore, standing as mute evidence of a sick landscape and poor construction practices.

Here are some pictures taken in recent weeks which I will pass around to those of the Commission, they might like to see them, showing this road that is under construction there, the resulting erosion. Silt fills Rock Creek as it is carried by the stream to the already dangerously polluted Potomac River. Trees, their roots exposed, tilt at angles along its banks. It takes nature centuries to develop a magnificent woodland such as this. Once destroyed, it cannot be restored.

No route for 240 -- or for any other road -- should be planned through Glover-Archbold Park, a part of

the National Park System. City parks are as important to urban population as wilderness lands are in the national conservation scheme. Glover-Archbold serves a growing population in one of our city's largest residential areas. Given by the donors as a woodland park and children's playground, it serves its purpose well. Because its length is unmarred by through roads, it satisfies a heavy demand for outdoor recreation in a natural area that can be enjoyed in safety. Inquiry to the Chief of the Park Police indicates that other parks where roads provide easy access, do not always have such a good record.

The surviving contributor of this parkland is opposed to intrusion of a road through the park. Such desecration would create a serious legal and moral problem which would give rise to grave doubts that the terms of any gifts of property to the government will be honored.

Before I go on to the practical reasons why route 240 should go other locations, I might call the attention of some of you to a recent copy of Sports Illustrated, possibly five or six weeks ago, in it they devoted an article to the study of sports and recreations within the Soviet Union. They carried many pictures, a full three pages were devoted not to the sports that are done by teams and the people simply sit and watch. They showed people enjoying outdoor areas, alone or in groups. If you took away the caption from

mc24

under one of the pictures, it could have well been a scene along the C&O Canal National Park, a coupe rowing, or people just enjoying the park solitude of wooded natural area where they can rest, and as I have mentioned before, getting a little bit of relief from tension and the turmoil and the traffic that surrounds us all the time.

Because of the unusual topography of Glover-Archbold Park, a highway cutting the length of this natural area creates traffic and other hazards for those making use of it. It would also obliterate the natural beauty that we find here. The heart of the park, the woodlands where the majority of local animals and plant forms are to be found would be gone forever. The lovely stream-valley would become a stinking trench where exhaust fumes would concentrate to offend those using the Park. Is not the preservation of fresh, clean woodland for the benefit of all, more important and more to be treasured than just another road?

There are practical reasons as well as the esthetic ones that argue against the use of Glover-Archbold Park as a route for 240. Gradient problems in the Park would be necessitated and heavy right of way costs in the vicinity of Mt. Alto Hospital and the Georgetown area would increase the cost of the highway tremendously.

Before the Commissioners consider a final route for 240, we would respectfully urge them to explore all the ways

possible in which interstate traffic can be brought around this area, or if it has to enter it, to enter it gradually, and we also respectfully urge them to oppose any proposal of highway or roads of any nature which would jeopardize the remaining park lands in the Nation's Capital.

I thank you for the opportunity to appear here today.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much.

TM/1
DC - Rt. 240
1/7/57
fls TM/mc

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Is Mr. Lethbridge here, Chairman, Government Relations Committee, American Institute of Architects, Washington-Metropolitan Chapter. Proceed in your own way.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS D. LETHBRIDGE, CHAIRMAN,
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE, AMERICAN INSTITUTE
OF ARCHITECTS, WASHINGTON-METROPOLITAN CHAPTER

XXX

MR. LETHBRIDGE: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, gentlemen:

This is a statement for the Washington-Metropolitan Chapter of the American Institute of Architects on the subject of the location of Route 240 in the District of Columbia. This statement has been endorsed by the executive directors of the Washington-Metropolitan Chapter in a meeting yesterday.

The choices presented for the route of Interstate Highway 240 within the District of Columbia cannot and should not be considered without concurrent study of the connection from the District line through Maryland to the main section of the highway west of the City. The shortest, most logical, least expensive and least destructive route, which lies along the northern bank of the Potomac River from Cabin John to the Whitehurst Freeway in Georgetown, has been blocked from present consideration by the action of the National Park Services and the Army Engineers.

I'm going to digress from my statement for a moment.

t2

I'm referring specifically to the upper section of the northern Potomac River route that lies above Dalecarlia Reservoir. It has been stated repeatedly in the past today that the river route has been abandoned by the Maryland Planning Commission, Maryland Road Commission, and is not in favor by those bodies. It is my belief that the river route was abandoned by those Commissions only after it was deemed impossible for them to share the right-of-way along the river with the Interior Department's National Capital Park Services.

These two agencies have refused to consider the sharing or joint use of their rights-of-way along the present street car line and land adjacent to the River, or along McArthur Boulevard. Since the construction of another highway paralleling the proposed parkway and McArthur Boulevard, another six or eight lanes of road hacked into the palisades above the conduit right-of-way would be exceedingly wasteful, the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission has been correct in opposing that alternative.

It is not clear, however, why the parkway route from Georgetown to Cabin John cannot be planned and constructed to meet a modified form of the interstate highway specifications, or why the McArthur Boulevard right-of-way cannot be used for a lane of this route if necessary. Vaulting over the water conduits with reinforced concrete would be considerably less difficult than tunnelling under the Washington Cathedral.

t3

Keeping the river parkway completely free of local truck traffic (since with the construction of the Cabin John Bridge it would be local, not interstate truck traffic) is a commendable objective, but not at the cost of these grossly destructive alternatives. The Park Service seems willing to give away Glover-Archbold Park, Little Falls Park, Normanstone Park or even Dumbarton Oaks Park before they will consider any alteration of their plans for the Maryland branch of the Potomac River parkway. The trouble, the deep and tragic trouble is that there is no single authority in the entire Washington-Metropolitan area, with the exception of Congress itself, that can knock heads together to bring about a sensible plan that will serve the best interests of the community as a whole. Each Department, each Service and each Municipality independently pursues its own plans -- to the extent of actively opposing proposals in the public's interest that threaten to disturb its own pet ideas.

In general, we feel that a route along the River is the best alternative for the District of Columbia. We feel that it is unnecessary to smash a new truck route through the Wisconsin Avenue area into Glover-Archbold Park or some even more idiotic path. This highway, sometimes elevated, sometimes tunnelling, as it weaves back and forth across the northwest section of the city will blight all of the land under it and next to it more surely than if it were constructed directly

t4

along the present path of Wisconsin Avenue from beginning to end. We feel that it is equally unnecessary to hack an interstate route along River Road and Little Falls Park. Although it would be preferable to the Wisconsin Avenue route it is obviously a poor substitute for the road directly along the River.

The proposed Cabin John Bridge and the connecting link to Shirley Highway are the most crucial items in the development of this part of Route 240. Until these are completed, the interstate traffic from the northwest to south will continue to claw its way through the streets of Washington. With the construction of the Cabin John Bridge, it may ultimately not even be necessary to open the Northern River parkway to truck traffic at all, although it should be constructed to accommodate it if the need exists. And if it is open to truck traffic, it does not necessarily follow that it will be very heavily used for that purpose. Truckers are far less interested in the scenery than in getting where they need to go to deliver their cargoes. Interstate trucks will take the bridge upstream and the route south. Trucks carrying supplies to Washington will not use this route at all, but will cross over on the outer circumferential highway to their destinations. This dual purpose parkway along the northern bank of the River can still be an attractive route, and would not seriously jeopardize the development of the

t5

proposed riverside recreational areas. An additional bridge across the Potomac River at Arizona Avenue will undoubtedly be required eventually as the traffic bottleneck at Chain Bridge grows increasingly worse. This route will provide adequate roads to serve that bridge when it is built.

When this north-south connection is completed, the existing street system will be relieved of a large part of the present traffic congestion. These existing streets can also be vastly improved for a fraction of the cost of some of these more drastic proposals. The removal of the street car tracks from Wisconsin Avenue and the widening of River Road with a connection to Massachusetts Avenue will aid the commuting traffic, particularly if the limited use parkways in Rock Creek Park, Glover-Archbold Park, Whitehaven Park and Little Falls Park are constructed or are further improved.

It has been proposed that the Wisconsin Avenue corridor route would be most desirable because it could function as an express bus route for commuters as well as a limited access highway connection to Route 240. We feel that it would be a foolish and short-sighted compromise to use the funds from the Government Interstate highway program to build an interstate highway connection along an unsuitable and very destructive route in order to gain a right-of-way for intra-city rapid transit. A transit route which would be in the wrong place altogether and conflicting with the efficient

t6

operation of the highway to and from the City. Getting a connection from Route 240 into Washington is one problem, and a rapid transit system for Washington commuters is another problem. Solving this first problem in the best way now will make a solution to the other problem easier to reach when an effective Planning Authority has been created to act upon it. This eager scramble to spend as much money as possible just so long as the Federal Government is footing most of the bill ought to be checked by Congress itself. It will take an act of Congress, or an Executive Directive, to force the Interior Department to reconsider its present inflexible position. We urge that this be done before it is too late.

Now, I want to make quite clear that we have no anti-Park Service feelings at all. In fact, we might thank heaven that the Park Service, through its long range planning program, has painfully collected this land along the River. We do feel that it is the height of folly to adopt an inflexible attitude on one hand, that we must either have a parkway that has no local truck traffic on it or we must have a super highway which has no bearing or relation to the parkway.

It seems to me that with a certain amount of intelligent compromise, the Highway Department and the Park Department could get together to devise a road that would not be a blight along the palisades.

Now, it stands to reason, if Route 240 as it comes

t7

down from Frederick at present is a four-lane road, two lanes on each side of the island and any road, larger than the main highway itself is scarcely going to be required until it reaches a point where local traffic is the deciding factor.

Now, preservation of the river front in its natural state is a fine idea but if local traffic requirements eventually force the construction of the Arizona Avenue bridge or other connections to Virginia, these local arteries will have to be constructed, must be constructed, to serve the local traffic. I think that ultimately discussion as to how large the road will have to be, how many lanes there have to be up to the point where local traffic is not a great factor is almost completely academic. Much of the argument that has gone on here the last day or so, whether the Arizona Avenue bridge ought to be included in the Clarkeson estimate or ought not to be are questions which have absolutely no bearing upon this Route 240 controversy.

I think a second observation is this: If the local traffic from the outlying suburban areas is considered, such as the traffic from Bethesda, Rockville and those areas at Gaithersburg becoming increasingly popular, the River route is just as practical, just as fast, just as simple for those commuters as a route taken down through Wisconsin Avenue. More so perhaps because as has been pointed out by the Highway people, this is a route that can be constructed as a limited

access route, which is more important.

t8

Now, if the residents of the area along the Wisconsin Avenue corridor, the residents whom this road is supposed to serve as an aid to commuting, if they oppose it, if the business interests oppose it through the inner city section of the road, then what conceivable reason would we have to construct that particular part of the route? It stands to reason that if the long range commuters from Rockville and the Bethesda area can use either route, the one will serve as well as the other.

I think that while one route can be selected over another, in order to take care of truck traffic, it should be pointed out that it is also possible to encourage truck traffic along one particular route and to in a sense discourage it by the selection of another route. The selection of the River route has a tendency to disperse truck traffic through the Northwest section of the city, local truck traffic I'm speaking of. However, if the Wisconsin Avenue corridor route were brought down, it would have a tendency to collect and concentrate local truck traffic rather than to disperse it.

I think in conclusion, our main plea is for a compromise, getting together of the Highway Department and the Park Service to work out a satisfactory route that would not impair the scenic values of the Potomac River valley.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

t9

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Grosvenor Chapman.

STATEMENT OF GROSVENOR CHAPMAN, 1640 WISCONSIN
AVENUE, NORTHWEST, WASHINGTON, D. C.

XXXX

MR. CHAPMAN: My name is Grosvenor Chapman. I live in Georgetown. I'm speaking as a property owner along the River route. I own the property at 4809 Potomac Avenue and two adjoining lots, 75 and 76, Square 1387.

Mr. President and members of the Board of Commissioners: I have a short statement to read and then I want to make a few supporting remarks after that. This statement has been signed by all the property owners but one in the 4800 block of Potomac Avenue, which overlooks the proposed Routes A and A-2, except for one, and there is a supporting letter from their agent.

The undersigned feel that the Potomac Valley is the wrong place for Route 240. We agree with the editors of the "Washington Post," that from the point of view of public interest, the right place is the Wisconsin Avenue corridor because that is where the traffic is. One of our reasons for objecting to the use of the Potomac Valley is that it is the City's greatest natural asset, greater by far than Glover-Archbold Park or Rock Creek Park.

Reference is made to Exhibit 14 of the Clarkeson Engineering Company Report which shows a typical roadway

t10

section near Georgetown Reservoir. This section is typical for a distance of 4100 feet of the 9000 feet of natural wide water area upstream from Georgetown to Fletcher's Boathouse. It indicates what will be left of the North bank of the Potomac Valley if Route A is adopted. The entire natural hillside from the Canal at the valley floor to the valley shoulder will be stripped of all trees and natural soil and replaced with roadways and concrete retaining walls rising in solid steps over 80 feet above the Canal.

Route A-2 is considerably better since its total height is less and it preserves the upper third of the hillside whose trees together with the trees on the valley floor will help to blend road structures into the valley.

The undersigned owners of property facing proposed Routes A and A-2 believe it is a great mistake to put a truck route in the Potomac River Valley, and they are unalterably opposed to Route A as the worst of two evils.

Now, last Saturday, I went on the Virginia side, facing this section I'm particularly concerned about, which is this 4100 foot stretch of the roadway. It starts on the North side, about half way between Battery Kimble Park and the intersection of Reservoir Road and goes down to the lower Southeast corner of a reservoir -- that is the stretch that has three steps of 25 foot retaining walls. While I was there, I took some photographs. Incidentally, that view of the National

t11 Capitol, the Lincoln Memorial, from that point right opposite the reservoir looking down the valley is one of the nicest things you will find anywhere around. I think it certainly rivals the view from Mount Vernon and, of course, the National Capitol, as you all know, was chosen because it was at the fall line of the Potomac River and outside of the practical reasons which would occur to George Washington and others, who had to do with it at that time, because it was a point at which navigation stopped. It also has its aesthetic qualities, which are primarily because of the fact that the valley suddenly gets deeper and somewhat gorge-like and you get that little stretch in there from Georgetown up to Fletcher's Boathouse, where there is wide water and high valley side, which, in my opinion, is the best that we have in the whole valley.

I will show you very crude snapshots looking -- unfortunately, my photography is not good enough to show the spiral or the Washington Monument -- at the V of the valley at the far end, which is what people will see approaching Washington from the Northwest as they drive down this beautiful roadway being built by the Park Service on the Virginia side and it is a beautiful job.

Now, I have another photograph, that same view, in which I have overlaid mastic tape indicating the height of the accumulated 75 feet of concrete retaining wall on that

t12

view from the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: These are taken from the Virginia side?

MR. CHAPMAN: These are taken from the Virginia side; yes, sir. Incidentally, as far as the property owners that I'm representing here today, the effect on that property by Route A or Route A-2 will be substantially the removal of a screen of trees on the palisade there which will open up their view so they will have a lovely view of the Potomac which they now don't have except in the wintertime, so the only hurt they will suffer is the fact that there will be a lot more noise than there was before.

These (indicating) are other views. That (indicating) is North of the reservoir and this (indicating), as you can see, is the reservoir where I have carried the retaining wall half way across the photograph so you can get a rough idea of its relative height and what it would do to that valley. Personally, I would much prefer to see the plan of the Park Service executed along there because of the fine job they are doing on the South side of the valley.

The main difference between what they propose and what is being proposed by the Highway Department is the mass of the thing. They are proposing two lanes in each direction for private cars, whereas the Highway plan would necessary allow for trucks and for some reason, is twice as wide at its

t13

lower portion. In fact, right opposite the reservoir, it is built for four lanes in either direction, although only three lanes will be paved initially. So that the reason for these enormous retaining walls, and so forth, is because of the enormous width of this highway. It is a colossal thing and it is really a brutal destruction of the naturalness of the valley.

Although I didn't hear General Grant's testimony yesterday, I understand that he suggested an alternate valley route. I know that there are problems no matter where we bring it in and the question, of course, arises in my mind, whether it is absolutely necessary or why, for example, the Park Service road would not be sufficient? But, if the truck route must be located in the Potomac Valley, I wonder whether consideration has been given, I know Clarkeson didn't so state in his report, whether consideration has been given to putting it along the B&O Railroad tracks, alongside the B&O railroad tracks in the lower portion of the valley where it could be much better concealed and would not require these enormous retaining walls that cover the entire side of the valley.

Finally, I would like to mention a personal anguish of my own and that is the fact that I have built these houses that are now lived in by the people who endorse this statement and I have one left, which was completed almost a year ago. Many people have seen it and like it, as

t14

they have the others which were bought, and unfortunately, almost every week, since last January, right after some real estate office would have the house open, there would be an enormous article, headlines, "Route 240 River Route," or someplace else and we never hear from these people again. So, as far as I'm concerned, I would be very, very appreciative if the decision would be made as soon as it is humanely possible to do so.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Mr. Chamberlin, representative of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase, Little Falls, River Road Property Owners Association.

STATEMENT OF J. A. BARR, APPEARING FOR THE
REVEREND F. L. FARRIS, BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE,
LITTLE FALLS, RIVER ROAD PROPERTY OWNERS
ASSOCIATION

XXXX

MR. BARR: I'm Mr. James A. Barr, appearing for Reverend Farris, who originally asked for this time and Mr. Chamberlin.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: You are representing the same group?

MR. BARR: I represent that same group.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: And they are an association?

MR. BARR: Yes.

TL%

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Give the reporter your name and proceed.

MR. BARR: My name is James A. Barr and I represent a group in Bethesda-Chevy Chase area composed of business and civic organizations, which is joined and calls itself "Joint Committee to Oppose the Wisconsin Avenue Corridor and River Road Routes for U. S. Highway 240." This organization now consists of approximately 22 civic and business groups, representing approximately 35,000 people from the Bethesda-Chevy Chase area, residents and business people.

I have a statement which I would like to leave for the record. I will not read it completely.

This organization was formed rather quickly. It met last Thursday night and passed a very strong resolution, recommending that the River Route be adopted. In the interests of saving time, I would like to subscribe wholeheartedly to the excellent statement made just a few minutes ago by Mr. Lethbridge who represented the American Institute of Architects -- that is the title, I believe.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Yes.

MR. BARR: In a way, he stole a lot of my thunder and I'm glad he did because it is much better when someone else presents your argument for you. So, in the interests of time, I will just file this with the Committee.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much.

t16

MR. BARR: In closing, I would like to say, as we are foreigners in a sense and not in the District, we do appreciate particularly your permitting us to come here today. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Very glad to have you.

(The prepared statement and resolution of Reverend Forrest L. Farris is as follows:)

"Gentlemen:

"The Reverend Forrest L. Farris of the St. Andrew's Methodist Church, acting in his capacity as temporary Chairman of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase, Little Falls, River Road Property Owners Association, wrote you requesting to be granted time to appear at this hearing today. Since this request was granted the Association has become greatly enlarged and by our best estimates represents nearly 12,000 homes and businesses in lower Montgomery County and approximately 35,000 residents, and the number is increasing daily. The present name of the group whose resolution I would like to read is 'Joint Committee to Oppose the Wisconsin Avenue Corridor and River Road Routes for U. S. Highway 240.' The resolution passed at a meeting held January 2, 1958 in the Perpetual Building in Bethesda, Maryland, is as follows:

"WHEREAS the proposed locations in lower Montgomery County for U. S. Route 240 as a limited access, interstate highway, either along Wisconsin Avenue or River Road and

t17

through areas adjacent thereto would create community dislocation and extreme economic loss to homes, churches, businesses and long established recreational institutions, and

"WHEREAS damages resulting from such invasion and disruption of established communities including both residential and business areas cannot be adequately and fairly compensated for in condemnation proceedings, and

"WHEREAS, the selection by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of the route for U. S. Highway 240 within the Northwest section of the District of Columbia will necessarily affect the selection of the route for U. S. Highway 240 in lower Montgomery County, Maryland,

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Joint Committee to oppose the Wisconsin Avenue Corridor and River Road Routes for U. S. Highway 240, representing 11,953 homes and businesses in the affected areas oppose the planned invasion of the Wisconsin Avenue and River Road areas, and recommend the Potomac River Route for U. S. Highway 240 both within the District of Columbia and through Montgomery County to the planned Circumferential Highway.'

"Both the Wisconsin Avenue Corridor and River Road routes are relatively new ideas conceived by certain planners. We say new because the routes which have been publicized required extensive and intensive study, planning and consultation by the Federal, District of Columbia and

Maryland authorities months and years in advance of actual contemplated construction. The State Roads Commission of Maryland planned for the improvement of River Road and publicized plans on July 6, 1955. The property owners at that time were informed of a right-of-way of 150 feet and recognizing the need for improvement in River Road, the highest degree of cooperation was received from the property owners. Since that time churches have been built, another is under construction, and others are planned along the proposed River Road route, in addition to many homes and businesses.

"It is apparent to all that the Wisconsin Avenue corridor route is fresh from the drawing board and has no public acceptance in Maryland.

"What sinister forces are behind this radical change in previously well-considered plans?

"It would be better to abandon all plans for a limited access inter-state highway connecting the District of Columbia and the State of Maryland in lower Montgomery County if the only agreement between us can be that the highway must stab through the heart of one of two densely populated areas in Montgomery County, leaving blight in its path.

"A highway such as is proposed through Bethesda-Chevy Chase or cleaving the River Road communities, destroying homes and churches, would cause such disruption to residential and business areas during its construction and afterwards that

t19

the ill effects would scar permanently this prosperous section in the No. 1 county of the world. The proposition that because the Federal Government contributes 90 percent of the cost of a road building program requires us to build something regardless of its consequence is unsound in every sense.

"If the joining of this highway to the District Line cannot be made near the Potomac River permitting its extension through Montgomery County along the River to the Circumferential Highway, then the project should be abandoned."

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Colonel Higging?

(There was no response.)

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Charles L. Norris, Jr.?

(There was no response.)

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Isabel C. Moore?

STATEMENT OF ISABEL C. MOORE, 3106 CHAIN BRIDGE ROAD, NORTHWEST, WASHINGTON, D. C.

XXXXX

MRS. MOORE: I'm Isabel C. Moore, 3106 Chain Bridge Road, Northwest. I live just a short distance from the Arizona Avenue and Loughboro Road Freeway, one of the present express routes of the District. So I have had a ring-side seat on this problem for quite a few years.

For the good of everyone involved, it is important for people to exercise common sense and take a realistic approach to problems, instead of demanding perfect solutions, which are obviously impossible to accomplish, or insisting on

t20

a plan which will suit their particular needs the most. They should not protest every progressive, badly needed project, without evaluating it correctly, and facing the fact that some compromises and sacrifices usually have to be made, in order that the most people will be benefited.

In the matter of express roads, in the District of Columbia, people are going to have to make up their minds which they prefer, being killed and maimed on city streets, especially children, many of whom have no place else to play, or having safeguarded express roads through park areas, which are the only places left where they can be placed, without spending millions of dollars to tear down buildings, and for expensive land. The park land is already owned by the Government, so would cost nothing. It is ridiculous to protest that this will destroy the parks -- actually, it will make them more enjoyable, through being more accessible and better equipped, and the small percentage of land needed for roads, will still leave thousands of acres for parkland.

It is most essential to have spots in cities where birds may find sanctuary, and the human spirit may find surcease from life's strains and conflicts, but if there has to be a choice between these and the using of a small part of parkland for safe traffic arteries to prevent human suffering and death, the latter should unquestionably take precedence. However, in this case, both can easily be had.

t21

It is unrealistic to protest that express roads will bring traffic into sections. The traffic is there now. The roads through many nice residential sections of D. C. are actually interstate highways, with all the hazards of fast flowing, heavy interstate and local traffic, including enormous trucks, with none of the safeguards. People object strenuously to having express roads go through their sections, and at the same time complain about dangerous traffic on all their streets. Concentrating traffic on modern express roads would get much of it off city streets, where it is now dispersed so dangerously. Also, it should be recognized that the convenience of nearby express roads is a great asset.

It is just as important to provide express roads for trucks as passenger traffic. Trucks are important to the welfare of everyone, in getting necessary supplies to us, so the efficient expediting of their movement increases our personal efficiency and comfort.

Modern roads cost enormous amounts of money, which is a heavy burden on taxpayers, so should be built to give maximum service, with the greatest economy in cost. It is ridiculous to consider building along the Potomac River a park road and a separate truck route, parallel to each other, a short distance apart, simply because it is against the law for trucks to travel on park roads. There should be one road for both truck and passenger traffic, and our Government's

t22 procedures should be flexible enough to pay for this, when practicable; or land should be turned over to local jurisdiction, so it will be eligible for Government funds; instead of there being a rigid setup where the Federal Government can only pay for certain types of road, with a resultant waste of millions of dollars.

All three proposed express routes for Route 240 through D.C.: Potomac River/Wisconsin Avenue-Glover-Archbold/ and Rock Creek Park/ are equally essential. There is no choice.

Potomac River Route: This should be built first. The most practical location for the western leg of Route 240, from the D. C. line to the center of D. D., is along the river. With all the thousands of acres of unused land there, it should not be necessary to take down anyone's home to make room. It should be high enough to be out of the flood area, and not in the way of future dams.

This is an excellent location for several reasons: It can connect nicely with the new Cabin John Bridge, diverting interstate traffic completely around Washington. It is picturesque, making a lovely pleasure drive and an appropriate continuation of the George Washington Memorial Boulevard. It would provide access to beautiful open country for athletics and recreation, which is so desperately needed to build health and relieve the strain of modern high-pressure living, which is filling our country with mental and physical wrecks, and

t23

adult and juvenile delinquents, but most of all, it would provide rapid, uninterrupted traffic flow, because of few intersections.

Anyone who would protest this is exceedingly lacking in practical thinking, and inconsiderate of the welfare of the most people who could be benefited. This land has been a useless, inaccessible jungle since the beginning of time, and without a road probably will remain that way until the end of time. Only a few hardy hikers can now enjoy it. A road only takes up a small area, and there would still be left many square miles of virgin country with excellent potentialities for recreation, which thousands could enjoy. One hiking path should be placed adjacent to the road, which would be a safer place for people to walk, especially women and children, than the woods.

New York City and vicinity has made excellent use of land along its waterways for express roads, which has expedited traffic in one of the most congested places in the world.

An express route is especially needed to get the present dangerous and excessive interstate and local traffic off the streets of this lovely residential section, where people have contributed millions of dollars, through their homes, toward the beautification of our capital city. This area should be protected from blight, which has made much of

t24

Washington unsightly, and which causes so much loss in taxes, rehabilitation, and personal ownership. At present many street crossings are death traps, and poisonous gas fumes have displaced fresh air.

It is incorrect to think a park road for passenger car traffic only, through here, would save taxpayers' money, simply because park roads are paid for 100 percent by the National Government. National Government funds are acquired through taxes paid by the people of this section, as well as everywhere else, so it is their money which is paying for it and it would cost much more of their money to build the widened Wisconsin Avenue route, instead of or in addition to the Potomac River Route.

It is a physical impossibility to have an express road down the Wisconsin Avenue corridor, as it is through an urban section where the maximum speed could only be 35 miles an hour; whereas, an express road to be any good should have a maximum speed of at least 60 miles an hour.

Another bridge over the Potomac River between Key and Chain Bridges has to be built, anyhow, as Key and Chain Bridges are not adequate for traffic volume, so that cost should not be added to the Potomac River Route. The new bridge should logically be placed at the end of the express road through Glover-Archbold Park, as that is where the largest traffic flow would occur; not at the end of Arizona or Nebraska

Avenues, as that would perpetuate dangerous interstate traffic through one of the nicest residential sections of Washington, where it is now so bad and they do not have good connections with main routes.

It would be most practical to have the George Washington Memorial Boulevard on the Virginia side of the river for the park road; and the road on the D.C.-Maryland side for the interstate express route for passenger and truck traffic. It is impractical to have both roads for park service only.

Wisconsin Avenue-Glover-Archbold Park Route: The Potomac River and Rock Creek Routes should be built first, which would relieve much traffic congestion on Wisconsin Avenue. Then it could be better estimated how much provision for traffic would be needed there. The tunnel diverting traffic around Baltimore has already reduced traffic 30 percent on city streets there, although it has only been operating a few weeks.

To try to make a major route for interstate traffic down Wisconsin Avenue or paralleling it, would be highly impractical. It would be a great waste of money to tear down many buildings and pay for expensive land. This area is already too congested and needs to have traffic diverted. It would be impossible to make this an express road unless it were elevated, which is unsightly, or depressed, as there are too many busy intersections. It leads traffic right through the heart of

the city instead of around it and it would cost \$13,000,000 more than the Potomac River Route.

However, better provision needs to be made for local traffic and some interstate traffic, which has to go through here, and diverting it through the Glover-Archbold Park would channel it around the more centrally located city streets. The Glover-Archbold express road needs to be built without delay. It is ideally located, going through a thickly built up area, and lying in a valley which makes overhead crossroads easy to build. It is unused land, which would eliminate the tearing down of buildings. The land is already owned by the Government. Like the land along the Potomac River, it is practically useless now. It is filled with tangled vegetation; much of the terrain is too steep for recreational use and the land the road would take up would still leave space for some recreational equipment and instead of eliminating its use for recreation, a road would make it possible.

Inasmuch as the land was donated to the city for recreation, the consent of the donors to use part of it for a road should be obtained, but if this is impossible, the only honorable course for the city to follow is the usual procedure of condemning sufficient land for the road and paying the donors for it.

The Government should agree to develop adjacent land

t27

for recreation and provide compensatory recreational facilities in other parks, especially along the Potomac River nearby, which has much better potentialities for this. This would make up for the small loss of land here.

This route is especially well located to make excellent connection with Virginia by a bridge over Three Sisters' Islands at its Potomac River terminus. This bridge should be called the John Carroll Bridge, in honor of one of the ancestors of the Glover family who was a signer of the Declaration of Independence. A bridge here would be much more practical than Key Bridge, with its hopeless bottlenecks at both ends, and inadequate access to the George Washington Memorial Boulevard on the Virginia side or the further developing of Chain Bridge, which would present engineering difficulties, or the proposed bridge at the end of Nebraska Avenue, which would perpetuate traffic through this nice residential section, and does not connect with any main routes.

Rock Creek Valley Route: It is exceedingly shortsighted for people to protest this location. It is a speedway now with none of the safeguards. The land occupied by the road is useless for recreation. The road is so narrow and winding, it is even hazardous for hiking. The steeply sloping sides cannot be used for recreation. Instead of a road being undesirable, it would give better access to the park and make a safer and nicer drive for pleasure. It is ideal for an

t28

expressway, as it runs the whole length, and right through the heart of the city, and is in a valley, which allows for overhead crossroads very well. Express roads going across the park are also badly needed.

To prevent the serious waste of our natural resources, which scientists are warning us about, effective measures should be taken without delay to reduce the volume of individual cars, by building express roads on which public conveyances can move quickly, reducing local fare to 10 cents, and not taxing transportation companies for income to make up for loss of revenue. This tax comes out of the pockets of the people, not the companies, so they are really paying it to themselves, and providing fast electric trains for long-distance commuting, which make it possible for families to live in the healthful country at lower cost.

This is especially needed for real slum rehabilitation. At present old housing is being displaced by new, but the old bad congested conditions remain, and children have no place but the streets to play. Land would be cheaper in the country, so each family could have more space to live in. It is impractical to use expensive property in the heart of the city for this; also undesirable to have it so near our beautiful Government buildings.

Low fares encourage people to use public transportation; every time fares have been raised, passenger volume

t29

dropped, reducing income. And the large saving of natural resources and individual travel costs would make this a most economical measure. Also, a great saving would be effected through reduced automobile insurance premiums, which are now so high, because of many accidents and high damage suits.

Thank you.

MR. PEABODY: Mr. Chairman. I have about a two-minute statement.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Are you on the list?

MR. PEABODY: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Which organization is it?

STATEMENT OF FRED S. PEABODY, ORCHARDALE CITIZENS
ASSOCIATION

XXX

MR. PEABODY: I'm Fred S. Peabody of the Orchardale Citizens Association in Bethesda-Chevy Chase Area of Maryland.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the September 23, 1957 quarterly meeting of the Orchardale Citizens Association:

"Be it resolved that the Orchardale Citizens Association unanimously endorses the recommendations of the Clarkeson Engineering Company, Incorporated, to the District of Columbia's Director of the Department of Highways, favoring the utilization of the Palisades route for the southwest extension of Highway 240 into Washington."

The Clarkeson Survey is the only scientific

t30

evaluation of the engineering problems encountered in this construction project. When an undertaking of this magnitude is contemplated, our Association feels that local pressures, individual preferences, and local prejudices should be submerged in the face of engineering facts. Consequently, without reiterating all of the very cogent and realistic reasons presented by the Clarkeson Engineering Company, we wish to re-emphasize that our Association is 100 percent in accord with the recommendations of this firm.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you, sir.

I haven't heard anyone testify here in two days now calling for this facility in his own neighborhood. Some of us just want to go underground like an ostrich and the others say, "Put it around the other way."

Mr. Davis, Arthur P. Davis, and then I believe Colonel Hart has a letter to read here. Is this Mr. Davis?

MR. DAVIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Will you step up and then Colonel Hart. He has waited a day and a half to read a letter. He will follow you.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR P. DAVIS, 1726 M STREET,
NORTHWEST, WASHINGTON, D. C.

XXXXXX

MR. DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, my name is Arthur P. Davis. I'm an architect. I'm not connected

t31

with any organization or any property or anything and have no ax to grind.

I'm presenting herewith for your consideration an alternate to Route A which I have called Route A-3. This proposed Route A-3 would be the same as Route A from the Inner Lopp connection near Washington Circle westward to the Glover-Archbold Park entrance. From that point on I am proposing that the roadway be constructed along the Potomac River bed near the East Bank. It would be bridge construction over water and land, elevated high enough to meet flood conditions. The following remarks are in regard to that portion of the project.

One, westward from the Glover-Archbold Park entrance the roadway bridge construction over water would be extended for approximately $3/4$ of a mile. The roadway for the remaining distance of approximately $2-1/2$ miles to the Maryland line would be elevated bridge construction over the dry river bed and erected close to the river bank. This portion of the river bed is waste rocky land and densely wooded, enough to screen the proposed roadway. The scenic aspects along this portion of the Potomac River would not be impaired by the roadway.

Two, the same number of traffic lanes and interchanges as shown for Route A-2 would be provided.

A full interchange can be made at Chain Bridge, not possible under Route A and Route A-2.

Three -- I will eliminate the first sentence because

t32

I was in error and put in the following:

The District of Columbia already owns the water rights for that portion of the roadway over water. The portion of $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles westward over the normally dry river bed is owned by the National Park Service. There should be no difficulty in transferring land for a right-of-way for the expressway since the Park Service has no use for the land, which is liable to flood conditions. It would, therefore, be unnecessary in this case to buy properties for a right-of-way. There would be no preemption or disturbing of the property rights and homes of many citizens as proposed in the other schemes. It would not be necessary to get into a struggle with the National Park Service and the National Congress over the land required for Routes A or A-2.

Following the above, it should be emphatically noted that no District properties will be taken off the tax rolls. Thus, there will be no loss of property taxes for the District where an excess of untaxed land is a major problem.

The estimated cost for the right-of-way of this portion of the project for Route A would be \$3,596,000.00; for Route A-2, \$2,500,500.00. For my suggested scheme, Route A-3, it would be nothing.

There will be no interference with traffic during construction. The other plans have plenty.

There will be no disruption or replacing of public

utilities, such as sewers, water lines, gas and electric services with their attendant costs.

There will be no road gradient or slope problems as the roadway will follow the level of the river.

The other routes will require expensive drainage systems. Route A-3 will require none as the water can be let directly into the river.

The recreational activities in the vicinity of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal will not be affected by my plan. That is one of the criticisms of the Route A-2 scheme.

The proposed Route A-3 will eliminate any need for the use of several hundred acres of adjacent river land owned by the National Park Service, which it is loath to give up. It has obtained this land for use as the George Washington Memorial Parkway. The Parkway could serve as an overflow for peak hour traffic and as a hedge against possible future expanded traffic needs in this area. Thus, this extra facility for passenger cars only will not be a duplication of roadways but will provide a relieving adjunct to the Route 240 Expressway. Incidentally, contracts for the connecting Parkway in Maryland are presently being negotiated.

Finally, in considering my proposed Route A-3 in its entirety from the Maryland line to the Inner Loop Connection, estimated costs based on reliable sources have been prepared. As might be expected, it is not the cheapest, due

t34

to the elevated type bridge construction. The total estimated cost for the Route is \$56,170,000. This compares with \$44,777,000.00 for Route A and \$46,990,000.00 for Route A-2. Thus, the proposed Route A-3 is \$11,393,000.00 more than Route A and \$9,180,000.000 more than Route A-2, not too large a percentage. Route A-3 is \$3,440,000.00 less than Route C and \$7,488.000.00 less than Route D. In comparison with Routes A and A-2 it therefore has to be decided whether the many favorable aspects of the proposed Route A-3 counter-balance the extra costs. In my opinion, Route A-3 is the answer for the many diverse interests in this knotty public problem.

Attached is an addenda giving the cost breakdowns of the proposed Route A-3 and comparisons with the other routes.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: What would be the danger of flood?

MR. DAVIS: The last flood was in '33, came up the Avenue. I don't know whether it has ever been up the bank of the Canal or over the bank of the Canal. You have lived here longer than I have. My idea is just to have a roadbed level or below the toll road, the toll road along the bank. It wouldn't be any higher than that and would be well protected.

MR. PETER: I have seen it over.

MR. DAVIS: You are going to have dams built all the time which will give you flood control.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much.

t35

Mr. Hart.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE L. HART, JR, ON BEHALF
OF ROBERT V. FLEMING, FEDERAL CITY COUNCIL

XXXXX

MR. HART: Mr. Chairman and members of the Board:

My name is George L. Hart, Jr. Mr. Robert V. Fleming, a member of the Federal City Council had hoped to be here to give you his ideas, but he had to be out of town and he has asked me if I would read this letter addressed to the "Board of Commissioners" into the record.

"I have your notice of a public hearing on January 6, 1958, to consider the proposed routes for Highway 240 in the District of Columbia. Due to absence from the city, I will be unable to testify in person, but I desire to have this letter incorporating my personal opinions made a part of the record of this hearing.

"After considering the facts presented in your notice of hearing and, as a member of the Executive Committee of the Federal City Council, having heard a thorough presentation of the matter, I have given careful thought to each of the proposed routes and I am convinced that Route A-2 is best suited to accomplish the basic purpose of this interstate and national defense highway and in so doing will cause the least damage to Washington's finest residential area.

"Specifically, I believe:

"a. That this highway should be built along the

t36

river for at that location it offers minimum dislocation to existing surface traffic patterns, to family dwellings, to business houses and to recreational areas.

"b. That the utilization of the Route A-2 by truck traffic would not destroy the public's enjoyment of the beauty of this scenic route.

"c. That serious consideration must be given to the \$13 million differential between the cost of A-2 and any Wisconsin Avenue - Glover Archbold-Parkway route.

"d. That future population growth of Montgomery County which will greatly increase the population density of the Rockville-Gaithersburg-Potomac Area, makes it mandatory that the traffic induced by this growth be encouraged to enter Washington by a route other than the already overburdened Wisconsin Avenue corridor.

"e. That the present peak load commuter traffic originating in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase areas should be encouraged to continue to utilize Wisconsin Avenue, Massachusetts Avenue and the East-West streets north of M Street and thereby distribute points where the traffic will enter the inner loop rather than concentrate it with interstate traffic all at one point.

"f. That the terms of the gift of parkland by the donors of the Glover-Archbold tract should be honored by the District Government and that the land be utilized as

t37

contemplated at the time of the acceptance of the gifts.

"g. That the added expense of \$30-\$40 million for a truck route tunnel as proposed by the staff of the National Capital Planning Commission is entirely unjustified. That the utilization of Normanstone Drive for a four-lane truck route would destroy one of the most valuable residential areas of our city.

"h. That immediate appreciation must be had of the financial condition of the District Highway Fund which already is inadequate even with 90-10 Federal aid to finance the construction of the interstate system in Washington, completion of which is absolutely essential to prevent traffic strangulation in the next decade.

"i. That the seriousness of routing this highway through the 28 acre development of the offices of the Government Employees Insurance Company as proposed in the Wisconsin Avenue route must be recognized, since I understand the company has already suspended construction on a multi-million dollar investment representing the type of industry badly needed in the Washington metropolitan area. The loss of 10 of 28 acres might force this company to abandon this site and seek a new site outside of Washington.

"For the above reasons I desire to go on record as favoring Route A-2."

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you.

t38

Mrs. Laura F. Warfield.

STATEMENT OF MRS. LAURA F. WARFIELD, 7 MC KAY
CIRCLE, BETHESDA 14, MARYLAND

XXXXX

MRS. WARFIELD: Mr. Chairman and members of the Board: I have asked to come here and be allowed to give you my two cents worth because I am concerned that you be mindful of values that are far greater than the dollar and cents cost of the highway.

Your morning newspaper yesterday carried at least four pictures of District area citizens enjoying the C&O Canal Park. If you had taken walks there, as I did this weekend, you would have seen many others not only ice-skating, but walking for pleasure, both with children and without, and canoeing a professional handicap course with outstanding performance which was accurately timed. These many persons were all having fun and they represented all age groups.

It is of maximum importance that the Potomac River, especially the land involving the C&O Canal, be retained for these purposes alone and that roads be kept out of the section.

It is a mistake on the part of all planners of this highway to attempt to connect an interstate highways system with the heart of a metropolitan area. Admittedly the planning is more than a decade too late, but even so, a plan could and should be worked out which would not traverse the most historical section of the city. Certainly, mechanized

t39

mass transportation must not be permitted to kill the wilderness-like advantages of the C&O Canal Parkway, which is so accessible to individuals without any but daily transportation offered to the public at large.

I have lived as a mature adult for thirty years. I perhaps am unique among people who have talked with you, especially those I have heard since ten o'clock this morning, in never having owned a car. But, I have walked more than half the total length of the C&O Canal Towpath and I walk it frequently and have done so for more than 23 years.

I have resided in the District of Columbia for more than that length of time, particularly a period of 18 years in a room and a half apartment while I was rearing two children. I have been able to do this because I could take my children to the C&O Canal Towpath. There I have instructed them in things that concerned botany; that concerned birds; that concerned weather; that concerned outdoor living at large and we have all returned to that room and a half apartment refreshed and strengthened for our lives.

We have been able to do this because of that towpath. I could live on a highway if I still had the C&O Canal Towpath that I could get away from that highway and come to be the person that I like to be and live the kind of individual life that I like to live.

Myself and daughter are both certified members of

t40

the Level Walkers. She earned her card before she was six. Children need more than sidewalks and highways to train them in outdoor life. Adults need more than highways for the strength and recreation in their lives. Please don't destroy the park with a highways system. I am quite willing to give you my home, to give you my church, to give you everything that there is; I would even be willing to give you my life if you would leave that C&O Canal Parkway.

I also desire to plead for the small home-owner residing in the vicinity where it is proposed to construct this interstate highway system. The property where I now reside adjoins the C&O Canal Park also, but I located myself there because I loved it. To be sure, I hope that the values of the wonderful natural resources of this watershed are not allowed to be harmed by the engineering of a highway just because it is more expedient and cuts down on your cost, does less harm to fewer people by putting it there because then you will take away these values that are available to all of the citizenry, both those now living and future generations. Leave the Park for the people to enjoy firsthand without paved roads.

It would be especially appreciated if I could speak with the tongues of angels, for I would do everything possible to have you understand the first and most important use for the land in question is maintaining a park for

t41

educational and recreational purposes. Please do not consider for a single moment placing a highway along the river. Devote the land along the river only to the Park.

I would like to add that one of the children that has been brought up walking this Canal has placed third in the whole 14 Coast Guard District in the Pacific as champion sailor. The boy was not brought up around boats and I think the reason he was able to do that is because he had that C&O Canal. He learned weather and he learned outdoor life and he learned it from that area and I think that this is an important value that we give to people and I would ask you to consider and be mindful of these values when you are putting in highways.

I thank you for the chance to tell you these things that are very deep inside of me and I know that there are thousands of people who feel and believe these things and who can live on highways, super highways, expressways, et cetera, but who cannot live without this type of resource for restoring their lives.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much, Mrs. Warfield.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Constant Southworth.

t42

STATEMENT OF CONSTANT SOUTHWORTH, 4000 CATHEDRAL
AVENUE, NORTHWEST, WASHINGTON, D.C.

XXXXX

MR. SOUTHWORTH: Mr. Chairman, my name is Constant Southworth, 4000 Cathedral Avenue. Like the last speaker, I appear as an individual, though in somewhat perhaps different slant. I have just as intense a devotion to the C&O Canal, I think, probably as she though my approach is -- I will elaborate slightly here -- different.

I am a member of and am in accord with the presentations of certain organizations and associations that came here yesterday, C&O Canal Association, the Audubon Society and the Westchester Corporation.

In a word, my position is that no new highway should be built at this time, but that if humanely a new highway cannot be avoided, Route A or Route A-2 should be chosen.

On the first point, the traffic angle, that there should be no new traffic artery at this time, I suggest with great hesitation that the planners, among whom I have many valued friends and highway men, as General Grant presumably in a joking way referred to highway experts yesterday, may be vulnerable at times like all professional men and with the best will and greatest sincerity in the world to occupational disease. Unless they have bold, challenging new road projects to work on, they may face a tendency to desiccation.

Basically, I consider it a fallacy to bring a dense

t43

concentration of essentially commuter traffic into almost any big city to debouch at one or two spots. The traffic jam last Friday in Norwalk, Connecticut, the day after the Connecticut Turnpike opened, sounded a warning.

Most of the proposed routes under consideration here today, despite certain expensive suggestions for partial siphoning off traffic from the Wisconsin Avenue corridor North of Canal Road or particularly the tunnel that has been worked out by the Planning Commission staff involve -- however, my point is now that most of the routes that come in that are proposed involve a tremendous increase in traffic on the Whitehurst Freeway where traffic congestion at rush hours is already formidable.

It is sounder, as has just been advocated by Mr. Burmeister, to keep the traffic dispersed along existing arteries and to make reasonable bottleneck widenings and improvements. For instance, some sort of a ramp to eliminate 4:00 to 6:30 p.m. traffic, like stoppage at Massachusetts Avenue and Waterside Drive might clean up most of the congestion on that Avenue.

It has also been suggested possibly it would help to get the embassies to have their parties at noon instead of evening rush hours. Or perhaps we should try to muster the money for a subway before even encouraging more traffic arteries and the further building of suburban homes to

send their autos on the Whitehurst Freeway.

However, it has been shown that suggestion of rapid transit comes into a realm of twilight and particularly, I not being an engineer, have no specific suggestions, I will confess, on that. But in any event, I think we should await completion of the Mass Transportation Survey now being conducted by responsible agencies.

Furthermore, as Mr. Cover, speaking for the C&O Canal Association said last night, we should avoid in our planning for Washington, limiting our consideration to one factor, the transportation factor. So, up to this point, I'm fully in accord with Palisades and Brookmont citizens, but now I will part company and come to my second point, the conservation angle, which is that if a new artery must be built, let it do minimum damage to parkland.

Parks, secluded wooden open spaces are just as important to men as to squirrels and once gone, of course, they can't be restored. The immediate question here as regards conservation is whether the route, the expressway through Glover-Archbold would injure parkland more or less than one along the river in the District and in the valley of Little Falls Branch in Maryland, through which Maryland, apparently, is quite willing and would like to continue that route.

On that, I offer the following thoughts: Glover-

t45 Archbold Park is one of Washington's very special ir-reproducible assets. I know from 25 years of roaming in it. Its charm is in its seclusion, in its freedom from roads. The proposed expressway through it, which is divided into two far separated roads, absorbing practically the park's whole width, would mark its end as a woodland retreat and as repeatedly emphasized yesterday, break faith with its donors.

On the latter point, I particularly call your attention to what General Grant said last night -- I have talked with him occasionally over many years on that subject and I know how deeply he feels about that. Incidentally, conservationists have by no means given up hope that the park values of Glover-Archbold will be preserved even from a parkway. That is a point I won't bring up now as it is not involved in this hearing.

The River route, it is true, involves a somewhat wider road along the river in the District than Interior's proposed parkway there and it would be used for trucks, but Canal Road with its heavy traffic already closely borders the Canal in the District for most of this distance. And the parkway which Interior is ruggedly determined shall link up with its recently started George Washington Memorial Parkway in Maryland would damage the park values of the Canal perhaps only slightly less than would an expressway and the valley of Little Falls Branch in Maryland paralleling the B&O freight

t46

line, which would presumably pick up the River route in the District, does not possess, except in one or two short narrow stretches, anything faintly approaching the attributes of Glover-Archbold as a natural recreational park.

To sum up from traffic and from the conservation point of view, I believe that no new artery should be built. But, if there must be one, let it worsen in a mild way with the proposal for Route A or Route A-2 the present park situation of the C&O Canal in the District and the situation planned there by Interior rather than ruin the recreational values of a hitherto uncontaminated natural park.

Since writing that, I have heard both General Grant and Mr. Davis, who spoke a moment ago, who suggested an interesting Route A-3. I knew nothing about it but it might be worth studying as an alternative to A or A-2.

Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you, sir.

We will suspend for lunch and reassemble at two o'clock and we will keep driving until we finish this job.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 o'clock p.m., the hearing was adjourned to reconvene at 2:00 o'clock p.m. of the same day.)

DR Fls.

1-7-58
fls TM
Barther-1

AFTERNOON SESSION

(2:00 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN MC LAUGHLIN: We will now hear Doctor Haworth representing the American University Park Citizens Association.

STATEMENT OF ELLIS HAWORTH ON BEHALF OF AMERICAN
UNIVERSITY PARK CITIZENS ASSOCIATION

XXXXXXXXXX

DR. HAWORTH: The American University Park Citizens Association at a meeting which it held last evening authorized me to present the following statement relative to our position regarding the Route 240.

(1) We recommend the plan for a connecting four-lane highway to join Route 240, known as Route A-2, because:

(a) It is one of the least costly of all the proposed routes;

(b) It will involve taking the smallest amount of privately owned property off the tax rolls;

(c) It will tend to promote a growth in population to the west of the District where there is ample room for growth;

(d) It can be constructed with the least harm to the scenic qualities of the route.

(2) We are opposed to having any major part of Route 240 go through the District of Columbia. This highway should by-pass Washington to the west and enable through

traffic to go north and south without having to go through the city.

(3) We are opposed to the use of any part of Rock Creek Park or the Glover-Archbold Park for a connecting highway to Route 240 and we are opposed to the use of any highways within these parks by trucks except for crossing the parks in a generally east-west direction.

(4) We are opposed to a tunnel running roughly parallel to Massachusetts Avenue from Wisconsin Avenue to Rock Creek Park on the ground that this project will be too expensive for the objectives in mind.

Our association was not aware of the proposal made this morning by Mr. Arthur Davis of a route which he designated A-3 of an elevated highway over the river bed. I think many of the factors that led us to recommend Route A-2 would also cause us to approve his suggestion if the cost was possible and if it was possible from an engineering viewpoint.

We thank you for allowing us this opportunity to present our statement.

CHAIRMAN MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you, Doctor.

Is there a representative of the American Federation of Labor and CIO?

(No response.)

And still no representative of the Friendship Heights

DB-3

Citizens Association?

(No response.)

I believe we next come to Mr. William Mason Shehan.

(No response.)

Mr. Edward D. Hollander?

(No response.)

Mrs. Max M. Kampelman?

(No response.)

Mr. Charles T. Tittmann.

STATEMENT OF MR. CHARLES T. TITTMANN, 1718 CONNECTICUT
AVENUE, N.W.

MR. TITTMANN: Gentlemen, I have found these hearings very instructive and entertaining at times. I am Charles T. Tittmann. I live at 1718 Connecticut Avenue, and I am representing four property owners in that neighborhood on Connecticut and on R Street.

Now, to boil things down, I think that the best thing is for me to read an editorial here from the Washington Post of December 16, 1957. It expresses our views, the views of each of us, and with your permission I will read this. It will only take a minute. The heading is "Transit and the Future."

"The University of Maryland Business and Economic Research Bureau wisely warns Washington to look more to improved mass transit and less to superhighways for the cure

XXXXXXXXXX

DB-4

of its transportation problems. We hope the forthcoming transportation report of the National Capital Planning Commission will reflect a more balanced approach, as between mass transit and the private auto than has been implicit in the Commission's plans until now.

"There has been altogether too great a tendency to regard the widespread individual preference for automobile commuting as something that simply has to be accommodated, whatever the cost. Now that the cost is being reckoned in hundreds of millions of dollars, the invasion of precious park lands and the setting aside of vast areas of the inner city for parking facilities merely to serve traffic that is already present and foreseen for the immediate future, it is time to ask where such a philosophy will lead.

"Already the District devotes more space to streets than to homes. In the plans for redevelopment and renewal of the near Northwest area, a large part of the area is tentatively earmarked for roadways. But the more frightening aspect of the all-out superhighway approach to urban transportation is that these facilities have a way of merely inducing more and more traffic. A new freeway is seldom opened that is not used to capacity from the outset and soon overburdened.

"Buses, streetcars and commuter trains are of course

DB-5

vastly more efficient means for moving large numbers of people around in a city. No parking space is required at the 'work' end of the trip, and any fringe parking that is needed at the suburban end can be widely dispersed or largely eliminated by the effective use of connecting shuttle service. The right-of-way requirements are drastically less. The individual cost to the commuter is probably less in most cases. Convenience, as to frequency of trips and location of routes, and comfort are the main problems in overcoming the costly preference for private car travel. None of these problems need be insurmountable if there is a clear-cut community decision to tackle them by policies that favor mass transit development and discourage auto travel. "

I think that is all I need to read from this.

CHAIRMAN MC LAUGHLIN: That is a very good editorial. I might say the Engineer Commissioner is a member of the National Capital Planning Commission and Chairman of the Regional Planning Council and therefore involved in the half million dollar mass transportation study, and I am Chairman of the Steering Committee on that study and also Chairman of the Tri-State Commission set up for the purpose of studying mass transportation, so we are pretty water-logged in mass transportation, too.

I agree with that entirely, except that I think there

DB-6

are some other things that should be considered as well.

MR. TITTMANN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MC LAUGHLIN: Scott Seegers?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MC LAUGHLIN: Mrs. Warren T. Faircloth?

(No response.)

Is there a representative present of the Young Democratic Club?

STATEMENT OF THEODORE J. PRAHINSKI ON BEHALF OF THE
XXXXXXXXXX YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUB OF D.C.

MR. PRAHINSKI: Sirs, my name is Theodore Prahinski and I am vice-chairman of the District Affairs Committee of the Young Democratic Club. Our chairman is at this time handing out copies of the detailed statement. We would like to summarize briefly.

As between the Potomac route and the Wisconsin corridor route, we favor the Wisconsin route because it is located to serve so many more people and because it will have utility as a mass transportation right-of-way. I think it would help to end these snow tie-ups because a medium strip railroad would not be tied up when auto traffic is. I just wanted to add that because of what you said before.

I think it will save the District taxpayers money in the long run because it will save that four and a half million Glover Archbold Parkway. It will save the unknown

sum that any mass transportation right-of-way is going to cost.

We suspect that Rock Creek route might be even better than a Wisconsin corridor or Potomac route. I don't know what the factors were that led you to not study the cost of that route, but we think the cost study would still be justified. We don't think any intelligent decision is possible without such figures. It is obvious that a Rock Creek route would serve more people and reduce the interchange problems.

We don't think that the Clarkson Report objections to the Wisconsin corridor route are very important compared with the advantages of the Wisconsin route.

Finally, we don't think the decision on the route location should be based too much on the effect on residential property. However, every effort should be made to minimize the effect as for example by constructing two or three routes instead of one big route.

We think suitable provision should be made for screening; tall evergreens or firs would hide the roads and cut the sound to some degree.

We think there should be a provision of enough overpasses or underpasses so that residential neighborhood will not be split.

In conclusion, we would like to return to our basic

DB-8

point, that the most important thing is what road will serve the most people and what will be cheap for the taxpayers, and I think the Wisconsin route is it.

Thank you.

(The complete statement submitted by Mr. Prahinski is as follows:

I. The Wisconsin route saves the District taxpayer money in the long run because it serves more people and is better located for a mass transportation right of way.

(1) It will serve the most people. The road the Park Service intends to build will take care of the 146,000 autos daily the Clarkson Report estimates will use a Potomac route. Only a Wisconsin corridor route can serve the estimated 164,000 autos that will daily use that route.

(2) Only the Wisconsin Corridor Route is properly located for a mass transportation right-of-way. The 146,000 Potomac area auto drivers already have the fastest public transportation in the area in the Cabin John streetcar line. If public mass transportation is not provided the expressway will only clog downtown with more cars.

(3) The Wisconsin Corridor Route will be cheaper in the long run. The difference in cost of D.C.'s share between Route A and Route C is only \$1.26 million after the Federal 90% is paid. The Glover Archibold Parkway cost is estimated at \$4½ million. Any mass transportation

DB-9

right-of-way will no doubt also cost much more than \$1.26 million.

II. A Rock Creek Park route might be better than either a Potomac Route or a Wisconsin corridor route.

We feel a study of the costs of constructing a route through Rock Creek Park would be justified. This route would serve many more people both as an auto route or as a mass transportation right of way. Without detailed figures we do not feel an intelligent decision is possible.

III. The Clarkeson Report objections to the Wisconsin Corridor Route are easily answered.

(1) Since the Park Service favors a Wisconsin Corridor Route the 1948 agreement prohibiting trucks should not be an obstacle.

(2) The heavy right-of-way costs the Clarkeson Report speaks of, \$6.3 million, are less than the \$6.7 million Route A will require, the \$12 million for Route D, or the \$14 million for Route B.

(3) The extra climbing lane needed for trucks in the Glover-Archbold Park represents only a comparatively small extra cost which is included in the \$59.6 total for Route C. The savings in mass transportation construction and other road construction justify this total higher cost.

IV. The decision should not be based primarily on the effect on adjacent property.

DB-10

As many people seem to be affected by either route, we do not feel the effect will be as serious as many adjacent property owners believe. In any event, the needs of the whole city outweigh the interests of a few, but no effort should be spared to minimize the effect on even a few:

- (1) Several smaller routes, rather than one large route should be constructed to minimize the impact in any single area. This would better serve the city's traffic needs. The immediate cost of a Wisconsin Corridor Route could be reduced by planning on Rock Creek and Potomac Parkways.
- (2) Suitable screening, such as tall evergreen firs should be provided to hide the road, and cut the sound.
- (3) Enough overpasses and underpasses should be built to prevent splitting of neighborhoods.)

- - - -

CHAIRMAN MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you, sir. Is Mr. Potter here?

STATEMENT OF ALDEN A POTTER, ON BEHALF OF MATTHEWS
AND POTTER, CONTRACTORS & BUILDERS

XXXXXXXXX

MR. POTTER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to abbreviate what I say, what I would like to say, by reading a very brief statement of the general philosophy that controls my thinking. Highway and location engineering is limited by geometry and geography. To enlarge the space on this

DB-11

globe so as to make more room for more people without limit is literally impossible as pointed out so forcefully by Dr. Paul Sears of Yale in his recent Presidential address to the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Indiannapolis in which he specifically referred to Washington and its problems.

So it is that to build more roads for more surface vehicles can not serve any useful purpose when it invades the space needed for other elements of the community.

What these elements are today is virtually unrelated to what they may be in the technically remodeled communities of 1980. If we meet the one problem that must be met, to preserve peace on earth, that is, if we undertake to fit population to space instead of trying to adapt space to population, we have to prevent the growth of population and also of a number of vehicles they are using in transportation.

It follows that any attempt to survey present traffic and predict the future by extrapolating the past growth thereof is elementally unsound. The failure of so many toll roads to meet even the interest on investment is plain evidence of this fallacious so-called engineering.

Population and automobiles have to be restricted in number. The highways and other transportation utilities that serve the nation must be engineered on a geometrical principle of hexagonal intersections for radiating great

DB-12

circles such as an airline system begets on precisely the same design as the avenues of Washington have been correctly built to intersect. Airlines have to underpass and overpass each other at different levels. In highway networks they must proceed similarly at three different grades having intersections if unhindered passage is to be served. But unhindered passage can not be made available as a rule. There are various factors which severely restrict what can be done.

Land is but a small part of the earth's surface. The continental contours and drainage control what can be done. Moreover, a densely developed area of population can not be economically remodeled to fit a statistically projected growth pattern for vehicular traffic of the same models used today.

If a population has been immobilized in centers, fixed by waterways and served by the now primitive transport with horses and buggies and trolley cars and railroads, a change to individualism in transportation may, and of necessity does result in dispersment of those centers.

To predict their continued growth and try to engineer it is elementally facetious. That applies notably to Washington and its interloops for so-called urban rehabilitation.

The plan is fundamentally unsound in its quiddity, its geography, and demography. This interloop is in engineering

DE-13

in short an extravaganza.

I would like to do most of my talking from the map, Mr. Chairman, and in order to do so, I have to talk off the cuff.

I will say that I will file with the Commissioners, without reading it, a statement which is prepared, entitled "Remarks on the Location and Economics of Interstate Highway 240 in the Northwest Section of the District of Columbia before the Board of Commissioners, January 6, 1958." Instead of reading that and taking your time to read it, I will file it with the Board.

I will also file a letter to Colonel Welling under date of 11 November 1957 criticizing the report on the InnerLoop.

Now, going to the maps, this is the map which goes with the call for this hearing. My principle criticism will be directed to this map in order to disclose the facts.

I told Mr. McLaughlin this noon I was going to be the first witness to advocate a highway where I have property. I want to show him how much I fooled him with that because I have property in three different places at interest.

This is where I live, and this map is not correct because as I drove out of the place this morning there was a surveying party correcting the angles made last summer in the surveying of this highway. It really bends sharply here

DB-14

and comes right across my house, right there, and then across. It does not come down straight like this and is not on property that is already owned by the government, as it should be.

I would save the government the bother of buying my property if they would put the highway as this map shows it and there are some complications involved with the interchange here with the Parkway because this is a very difficult place to put an interchange.

Here is Rock Run; the hearing on the Cabin John situation did not cover this highway; this is not a Cabin John Creek; it is Carther Rock (?) Bridge where the Naval Testing Base is and here is Rock Run. It is a stream that runs riot in the case of bad weather. It is almost as big as Cabin John Creek. And the bridge that was originally -- route 240 originally came straight down here like this. (Indicating on map.) I think sitting in the audience is the senior highway engineer of the Maryland and National Park Planning Commission from Silver Spring, Mr. William Adams, and Bill has been on our sawmill on our place helping us at times, so I know these people very well indeed. And he points out that the original course for this was designed by the Maryland National Capital Planning Commission, the original map showed this highway crossing here at Cabin John. It came into Dead Run -- or is it Turkey Run -- right near

DB-15

here in Virginia and that wasn't where Virginia wanted
it so they had to move it up, as far as they could/^{get} it
up-river and here was the Naval testing base in the way, so
the natural thing was to bring it across here as far up
as they could get it.

Well, the present fact is that the contract for this
parkway, which is I believe already let, does not extend
beyond approximately where this arrow on this map is. It
does not carry the Parkway beyond this interchange. I
have myself designed an inter-change which I have submitted
for consideration of the authorities which does not involve
a clover leaf as has been tentatively designed by the Mary-
land State Roads Commission.

In visiting Frank Dryer of the Maryland State Roads
Commission last September, I learned something which I
will refer to in a moment, because this map does not show
what is on page 13 of the authorized mileage map for this
particular highway in dispute. This is the original design
for the mileage allocated to the different states; this is
the Maryland mileage of course, and this is partly Maryland
and partly District mileage. The funds/^{are} assigned by mileage,
not by dollars and since this map is correct regarding the
authorization -- this was printed in 1955, but it was
designed in 1944 -- in a session of all the State Roads
Commissions and I suppose the District Highway Department

DB-16

participated. They designed the whole system of interstate highways in 1944 and that has not been materially changed.

It has changed occasionally, instigated by various State Roads Commissions and approved by the Bureau of Public Roads. The Bureau of Public Roads has no initiative in making any such changes.

So, going to this map over here in which this is indicated as the problem area, if the Clarkeson branch as shown on this map, as it is here, you wouldn't have had any reflection on the Clarkeson Company or the District Highway Department. As one of the ladies who spoke here from the Cathedral Heights Association said, it is suggested that the Palisades Group had questioned -- well, at least there was a reflection against the District Highway Department and the Clarkeson Company. I don't think that reflection is warranted at all, because when you put this map in here, you can see that the Highway Department here and the Clarkeson Company were only carrying out instructions which the law had given respecting that mileage. So I am compelled to conclude that there is no criticism against the Clarkeson Company for simply designing the highway where it was originally laid out 'way back in 1944.

But if they do put it up there, then Matthews and Potter, who are not -- do not include myself; it is my younger son

DB-17

and a partner, is involved in this part of it, because they are building a new addition here called Potomac Overlook and it comprises houses up to \$40,000 and that is the style of building they have done all through this area.

Now this area would be directly invaded by this route. Starting here and going straight down on top of the Palisades above McArthur Boulevard and right straight through Mr. Thorson's home, and you remember Mr. Thorson told you of a discussion he had back -- was it May or June -- our associate, Mr. Bennett of the Bennett Construction Company was in on a conference in Annapolis with Mr. Pritchard and Mr. Frank Dryer, the location engineer for the Maryland State Roads Commission, and it was then decided on the statement that there were too many lanes already down the river, which you can see, is apparent, and Mr. Pritchard was very much for this way of getting at 240. But he was dissuaded and it was ever since then, has been a by-word with the Maryland State Roads Commission and other authorities that they will not build this branch.

However, in the conference with Mr. Dryer last September in his office in Baltimore, the offices of the State Roads Commission, in which he was reviewing for me the structure of this inter-change here which was a 30 or 40 acre clover leaf which I think should not be constructed-- I think it is an expensive needless proposition to build such

DB-18

a clover lead and very difficult because they have to clop it down on top of Rock Run and that is an engineering feat that will cost a lot of money. Mr. Dryer said to me, voluntarily -- I didn't ask him about it -- he pointed to this cut-off here, this Clarkeson spur that it is called, and he said that is not dead yet. In a discussion on that same point with Mr. Brewer the vice chairman of the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, I was trying to get a conference with him and Blair Lee and I didn't succeed, but I did get to talk to Mr. Lee and Mr. Adams and another friend of mine in the offices at Silver Spring, and Mr. Brewer said, nope, we will never build this spur at all. That is out. I talked with him about the circumstances and told him what Mr. Dryer had said, and he said, well, maybe it isn't dead.

Now I want to point out that subsequent to these experiences, this idea was hatched. (Indicating on map.) Why did they bring this up? Because they wanted to keep this one here. That is my way of sizing it up. So I am between the Devil and the deep blue sea because right over here on this place in Bethesda is something called a Farm Women's Market, and my wife was one of the original organizers of that and she still sells in that market -- not very much; she is crippled and can't get out, but she hates to give it up. That market would be very seriously

affected, just as Woodward and Lothrop's Budget Store would be affected. Unfortunately, perhaps, although of course Woodward and Lothrop's main store would be much more seriously affected, the Budget Store, which is right next to the market would be affected the same way, caught between the Devil and the deep blue sea.

Now how easy it is for me to decide on one of these propositions; which one do I choose, getting rid of this or this or this?

In either case I am choosing against myself and perhaps also for myself. I pointed out that if we are compelled to choose between this and this, I choose this. (Indicating on map.) And it is right straight through the subdivision in which Matthews and Potter are building, the Bennett Construction Company.

Now I will point out also that Mr. Adams, who is sitting here in the audience, has designed a very helpful aspect of this situation, namely, he has persuaded the Army Engineers -- this was in connection with the Cabin John hearings on this structure in here, planning for the Cabin John area -- there is a service road to be constructed so as to carry heavy axles to the naval testing base, and that service road is already mapped and it comes out here from Goldsboro Road (?) along side -- there is plenty of room on the McArthur Boulevard right-of-way without getting

DB-20

on the conduits and Cabin John Bridge is to be rebuilt by the Army Engineers at their expense to carry heavy axles.

Then this highway is to be continued up to Thomason Avenue to connect across Seven-locks Road and to connect with a re-constructed Persimmon Tree Road. This road is now necessary for the travel of the Naval Test Base to bring loads of sand and gravel and any other heavy stuff it has to carry; it has to be brought out Massachusetts Avenue, here, and over to River Road and out here and down Persimmon Tree Road and down here to this little road which is a very rough proposition, and down a very steep hill -- a truck got away from itself once there and ran down to the bottom of the hill and crashed -- this little road crosses Rock Run and then goes by a special service road over a very make-shift bridge on Rock Run -- no, I have it wrong. I have my pointer wrong. It goes down this little road and crosses Rock Run, on a very make-shift bridge, only 90 square feet in it, and when this stream runs wild, it tears out all the fences there. It did so last year. It did an immense amount of damage and they have to put it back where it was.

Now this proposal which Mr. William Adams, our senior highway engineer has devised in connection with the Army Engineers, carries out here like this and also out here. The map so far doesn't go any further than out to here, any

DB-21

further than Persimmon Tree Road. But it is indicated that this can be continued and carry these heavy axles to the Naval Testing Base and of course this 240 proposition is a matter of trucks, not commuters to the naval testing basin. That would help the commuter traffic from the Naval Basin immensely. It is awkward to get on this narrow road and I live on it so I know about how it is crowded -- it is not crowded except at rush hour.

Now what I want to do is point out that there are dilemmas of this kind/partly solved by this service road. And that affects the way this highway can serve to carry commuter traffic connected with the problem of interchanging here. The Commuter traffic would not bother to take this road if they wanted to go down to this part of Washington; they would come across here and go down and go back over these bridges back into Washington. This is a wonderful highway here, six-lane speedway.

Now the specific part of this design to which I wish to take exception is this section right here. It has Key Bridge in it and anybody who drives this section knows that all the bottlenecks are there.

General Prentiss, who is the former Engineering Commissioner, gave me the favor of almost an hour's conference on this question and in it he pointed out that nobody would think of building a bridge as Key Bridge is built today.

DB-22

When they built it, the General said that he had a satisfactory bridge head for Key Bridge which could not be build because you couldn't get the funds to build it. Both Key Bridge and as he said Chain Bridge are not built as anybody would build them today. They had to rebuild Chain Bridge because it was an old plank bridge and when the ice gorge formed in 1948, the spring I believe it was, it was all but torn out. If you put an A-3 system out in the river there ^{and} such an ice gorge forms, it would probably tear it all to pieces. Therefore this was put in merely at the same place the old plank bridge was put in and our house has planks taken out of that old bridge and put into the rafters. That, everybody knows, is not a satisfactory level. It should have been a high bridge and the reason for building the Arizona Avwnue Bridge is because this one is not properly placed and designed.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: I wonder if we could see the hands of all the people who want to testify this afternoon?

(Showing of hands.)

Thank you.

MR. POTTER: Now this map does not represent the circumstances which a truck faces when it comes down any way to get into this segement of the highway because it shows a closed inter-loop here. Now I will point out that this

DB-23

map over here shows that the inter-loop is not closed here not because it is not a truck highway and trucks are not permitted in here, therefore this map represents the fact that if a truck comes down here and wishes to go to the waterfront in Washington, it comes down here like this, then it can't turn this way, it has to go this way and down here. If it wants to, it can go to the rear yards over here, but it has to come down here and around this way to where he wants to go.

I think that the Commissioners can readily see that this is a dilemma, not only for me but for them. You have to choose between evils and I would like to make a constructive suggestion of a way in which there will be no such conflicts as have been presented here in these hearings and I have marked the point by this little red strip because it involves River Road. River Road is a straight line, if you continued it down to Meridian Hill Park, where the trucks want to go. They don't have to go around like this, involved in a chinese wall around the city -- this is a Chinese wall, you know, and so is this. They can go to Meridian Park and come straight out where they want to go. There is no roundaboutness to it. Moreover, Maryland is about to rebuild River Road. It is an awful mess now. It is a death trap. Everybody admits that. It has long needed rebuilding, and here it is ready to be rebuilt in Maryland.

DB-24

The only question is how shall it be used? If River Road underpasses Wisconsin Avenue right here, where all this tangle is, and then is kept underground to the grounds of the National Bureau of Standards, which is to be vacated not very soon, it can emerge very easily -- this is all high ground in here, no trouble about staying under any surface construction at all; you don't have to condemn any private property except perhaps in here where you have to enter the tunnel. Your tunnel is down here and you come out and on this ground we can arrange an interchange with Connecticut Avenue to help the traffic off Connecticut Avenue/give it convenience of use, and you come down here in Rock Creek and down the Kringle Road interchange, you come from the Bureau of Standards down the Kringle Road interchange, down the zoo fence to Harvard and out to 16th Street, and a tunnel under 16th and Meridian Hill.

I notice that this tunnel here is no longer -- is no shorter than this distance from here to here. This non-tunnel part is much -- quite a bit shorter than from here down to here and then this tunnel is about the same length as that. I figure with Mr. Keith that if these tunnels were built, if this cost 36 million dollars, this would cost/possible 50 million dollars. The Commissioners are prepared to spend 5 million dollars on these roads in the District, I imagine, because most of the proposals have

DB-25

approximated 50 million dollars. It would cost nothing at all to Maryland in a sense less than nothing because if they built the road without any connection with 240, they will get a 50-50 help, and if they build it as part of 240, they get a 90-10 help.

General Prentiss pointed out to me that the proper way to bring this in is not to come up the river here, but to go out on Little River Parkway to an inter-change with River Road and then out. But that involves all this down here, all the confusion, all the opposition that was engendered by these here. This doesn't even engender any opposition at all except the vaguely expressed opposition of some of the Bethesda groups that they do not approve of the use of River Road for any part of this system. They are going to get a new road, they are going to pay for it, it is badly needed and the only question remains is what traffic is going to use it.

Now I think I have explained well enough what my proposal is and have explained that if you take this tunnel system and move it up here, at a very slightly greater cost it would save all this monkey business down here. Thank you.

(Applause.)

(The official statement and letter referred to by Mr. Potter are as follows:

DB-26

Remarks on the Location and Economics of Interstate Highway 240 in the northwest section of the District of Columbia, before the Board of Commissioners, January 6, 1958 -- By Alden Potter, 8400 MacArthur Blvd., representing Matthews and Potter

The eyes of the nation are on us here today; for their attention was focused specifically on Washington and its space problems by the Yale University Ecologist, Dr. Paul Sears, in his recent presidential address to the American Association for the Advancement of Science (of which I have been a Fellow and Life Member for many years) on space limitations versus population growth.

In a day of travail this nation stands in grave need of the guidance of such a limiting principle, opposing the utopian materialism of the alleged "ideals" in a program of "atoms for peace." We can never beat our swords into plowshares capable of turning up a paradise unlimited. It is the plain, impersonal truth, not the hypocritical dreams of altruism that can alone make possible peace on earth and good will among men -- even among men possessed by the ill will of controversies over civil rights and civil defense and civil war and even the civil engineering of highways. It is economy, not extravagance that these hearings are charged by law to consider in the location of a highway, before asking Federal aid.

DB-27

I wish I could stand before you as a member of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce which has recently been so ably guided by Donal Chamberlin of the Kenwood Club, whom I have known for many years. This I wish because of their recent resolution applying this ecological principle, this stricture against trying to stretch space into infinity, to assuage the brainstorms that have been indulged in planning the destination, if any, of Maryland's wandering Route 240, which seems about to be christened the Washington National Pike.

In the face of a flood of propaganda to the contrary, by a resolution emanating from the Kenwood Club and passed by the Executive Committee of the Bethesda Chamber of Commerce on which my wife is represented through the Farm Women's Market, we have been given a guiding principle, to wit, that no high-speed, limited access thoroughway shall be driven anew through the length and breadth of any densely developed community, not even under the hypocritical pretense of benefiting that community. Surely any community needs a highway; but not at the expense of destroying the community.

I beg to note that the application of this Bethesda resolution to Washington itself would, as it certainly should, bar at once the construction of any Inner Loop speedway to direct traffic, not into the city, but through it at 50 MPH.

DB-28

What the Bethesda principle does not bar is the economy of space implicit in tunneling such as is projected under Capitol Hill at a cost duplicating that of the Inner Loop, of over a quarter billion dollars. One need not be a highway engineer to know that tunneling is not generally called for where there is no hill to tunnel. One need only be old enough to have traveled the railroads of the nation through their picturesque mountain tunnels. It has been these same railroad tunnels that have made feasible the outstanding success in multi-lane toll roads, the Pennsylvania Turnpike.

It should be pointed out that Capitol Hill is only the least of a number of hills that surround downtown Washington. Thus the National Capital Planning staff has come up with a design for such a tunnel for trucks into the Inner Loop, to pass under the grounds of the Washington Cathedral and serve the laudable purpose of relieving traffic congestion on Massachusetts Avenue instead of dumping more traffic on that overburdened highway as does the DeLeuw-Cather design for an Inner Loop. Thus the tunneling of these hills can serve the very necessary purpose of underpassing, or sometimes over-passing the city's North-South radial highways in order to set up East-West radials that do not intersect at grade and require stop lights. This is the problem that faces the entrance of this fearsome Route 240 as a truck route into the city from

DB-29

the West.

In the proposed construction of a N-S Wisconsin Avenue Corridor there are no hills to tunnel so as to remove it from surface difficulties. Neither is there any place for tunnelling in the design of highways adjacent to the Potomac River along its beautiful Palisades. The Virginia section of the George Washington Memorial Parkway now under construction has required 14 very expensive bridges to help it mar the palisades.

No one is more frank to admit the very expensive blundering involved in the two palisade bridges already in use, than former Engineer Commissioner, Major General Prentiss. Already the Georgetown Key Bridgehead has undergone one expensive reconstruction job, and it badly needs another to remove the stop lights serving to let Canal Road traffic through into M Street. Already, with a new Chain Bridge only briefly in use, it is proposed to reconstruct it on a higher, more expensive level. How many more, costly high-level, palisade bridges must be built in the attempt to steer traffic across into Virginia and off the riverside in Maryland and the District where it is to be deliberately dumped by a so-called freeway into the city for Route 240? I dare say such escape bridges will work both ways; the traffic will be welcome on neither side of the river.

DB-30

The canal, the trolley car tracks, the city water conduits, reservoirs and pumping station are complicated enough without adding an inaccessible speedway for trucks to this riverside melange. In such a riverside site, limited accessibility is reversed into unlimited inaccessibility for the community through which the highway passes; I know for we live there and our property is under threat of condemnation for the Carderock Bridgehead, mistakenly still called in the press the Cabin John Bridge.

The economy of downtown Washington is centered on its chief industry, government. While national welfare dictates that it should not grow any bigger, as it has in fact kept on growing its components have in fact been moved into the outlying counties just as industry has done in other cities. Boston, for example, has seen big business take over its circumferential route 128.

In plain fact there are today more and more people who do not live in or seek to enter the charmed inner circles of our big cities. It is like trying to sweep back the tide with a broom to try to stem this movement by shortening the trip time into the city from distant suburbs. This inevitable dispersal into suburban areas with new centers does not call for tearing up the near suburbs in order to give more distant ones the same trip time to the Inner Sanctum.

DB-31

I have reason to know all about such urban dispersal for I own a one-third lessor's interest in a 100-year lease on a small downtown property in a large western city. This lease has never made much money for the lessee because of the dispersal of the city into the suburbs. The original lessee figured on some 90 years of easy money; but he didn't reckon with those years correctly in figuring that horses and buggies and trolley cars and railroads would dominate transportation. Only inflation has served to preserve this lease at all.

The nation today will be indulging in as silly a prophecy or worse if it tries to plan now for a 1980 highway system based on our present sweptwing automobile traffic, or on our present busses, or by resort to monorail schemes for mass transportation. Russian science, if not our own, could easily make this whole American scene passe' with such a development as that recently outlined by Moscow for transmitting power without wiring. In that case each individual might have his own electric and electronic ornithopter; then Icarus would turn over in his grave as he sees human bird flight a fully accomplished fact. Russia has already developed ornithopters; where are ours? Waiting on bigger appropriations for so-called basic research in aeronautical laboratories to provide the equations for design?

DB-32

Highway problems are just for today, gentlemen. They require planning, not for ultimate mileage, but for priorities; for getting first things first in construction. In Washington they call for more under passes and overpasses now; on outer Massachusetts Avenue, for example. Where are those plans? Buried under the Inner Loop dreams of the DeLeuw-Cather Report? Such grandiose plans must be curbed and reduced to serving present needs rather than developing the engineering brainstorms produced by statistical extrapolations into a distant future that is entirely imaginary. We can serve national defense only through the prior needs of today that are obvious without any expensive so-called "surveys" of the problem.

In the case of River Road, tunnels can be built much sooner than any Inner Loop can be constructed and without any of the semi-permanent detours that will be required for Inner Loop construction. Such tunneling can easily underpass the high ground along Wisconsin Avenue and stay down deep below surface construction to emerge on the present grounds of the National Bureau of Standards, overpass Connecticut Avenue into Tilden Street, overpass Rock Creek down to the Harvard Street hill at the Zoo, thence by tunnel under 16th Street and Meridian Hill to let the traffic disperse at low speeds onto the city's streets at Florida Avenue right where the Inner Loop's north leg is

DB-33

planned and could, therefore, be dispensed with by a few surface street improvements. This plan delivers truck traffic, which is the nub of the 240 problem as presented by the requirements of the 1956 act, not into the riverside bottleneck at Key Bridge as all your current plans do, but right where most trucks want to go, to the vicinity of the railyards.

This traffic tunnel would soon put that section of the city northwest of Union Station to better use without any heavy subsidy for rehabilitation; for example, as a convention center with ample motel and hotel accommodations and shopping facilities for transients and tourists, none of the section to be preoccupied by speedways to accommodate through traffic in violation of the Bethesda principle. Such accommodation should not be provided even if it did not cost anything.

Moreover, the cost of this tunnel cannot all be charged to truck service by any means; for the 16th street underpass will be just what the doctor ordered for cars coming down Rock Creek Park roads so they can avoid the Zoo Park fords and the gauntlet of bridgehead interchanges on the speedway by the river before turning east into the city. Build this River Road tunnel as a toll service and it would displace at once all Maryland use of the Inner Loop as a freeway, except for riverside communities served by

DE-34

Massachusetts Avenue as a way to avoid getting into the Key Bridge bottleneck. Its greatest service to such Maryland traffic would be that it would draw all other traffic away from Massachusetts Avenue and make that excellent highway never unduly congested. Its great temples and embassies should be grateful for such a relief as against the certain prospect of increasing congestion under the Inner Loop plans.

Even if the whole cost of tunneling be charged against a River Road extension into and across the District, it could not exceed \$50 million. The Inner Loop-riverside plans will run into half a billion dollars and still not solve the traffic problems presented, and will violate the rule against construction of speedways for through traffic in urban areas which the River Road tunnels would altogether avoid. For Maryland a respectable development of River Road would cost less than nothing because of bringing within the 90-10 Federal aid funds a presently projected reconstruction at state and local cost with much less aid from the Bureau of Public Roads. It would also eliminate future construction of a high dam on the Potomac above Great Falls at a cost of many millions of dollars unwisely spent; for that dam is projected right where River Road must bridge the river to connect with the increasingly urgent construction of the so-called Crozet Superhighway

through northern West Virginia under the Harley Staggers Bill.

Personally, I do not admit any need for any extension of Route 240 beyond whereit is now; but of course this does not cover the Circumferential Highway as a so-called "leg" of Route 240. This freeway is badly needed for trucking which is prevented by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the county council prohibiting its use for commercial traffic across Rock Creek. Federal aid from the 90-10 funds should not be available, under the law, for any of this construction until that ban is lifted. Given this unrestricted use of the Circumferential Highway, all traffic from Route 240, including that commuting from our bedroom suburbs, could and should be scattered to any and all radial roads out of Washington, including and especially River Road. This country lane of country clubs has been a death trap long enough and at long last is about to be rebuilt.

The only question remaining seems to be, shall this new and modern highway serve only the country clubs and squires it has been serving heretofore? To permit such exclusion can only beget extravagant schemes leading into serious bottlenecks along the river and to continued, inexcusable congestion on Massachusetts Avenue. What the sponsors of such restriction are urging is simply the

DB-36

continued dumping of River Road traffic onto Wisconsin Avenue where it goes now and is carried down into the increasingly impassable congestion of Massachusetts Avenue. They want a new road but no new traffic on it. That special privilege for those already tax-privileged country clubs must be categorically denied them. Fortunately, they do not own our public highways and cannot put up no trespassing signs or impose passage by permit only.

"The 'consumer' of transportation and the nontechnical citizen can follow programs, plans and developments and participate in their evolution by careful observation of maps, visual projections, specifications, and official statements. A healthy skepticism is an important attribute in this observation," says the University of Maryland's December report on the Potomac River Basin and adds: "Perhaps the most difficult situation occurs when officials do not provide adequate information, or when reports, for instance, of public hearings, are 'slanted' in favor of the official attitude."

We have, continues this excellent analysis by Dr. Cover, focused attention upon "concepts and upon the dangers attending unquestioning acceptance of premises which may completely vitiate objective evaluation of factors and thereby prevent a logical and practical plan. As these concepts are expanded into propositions, a structure is

DB-37

established which channels thinking automatically along prescribed directions. These channels become accepted as 'logic' and a mathematical formula may be called upon as a machine to carry through the quantitative solution. The formula may be inappropriate; the assumptions may be false; the observations may be limited or special. Under any or all of these circumstances the result is erroneous and may be in conflict with public interest."

It is greatly to be desired that a Potomac Valley Authority urged by Dr. Cover shall be created by law to take over and coordinate the outrageously intricate set of bureaucracies now creating untold confusion and maintaining public ignorance of plans until they are set forth as a fait accompli, at so-called public hearings. We must hope and trust that such an authority will not attempt to promote socialistic invasions of utility fields that can and should be privately operated without any subsidy from any public funds or by tax exemptions or privileges. Taxes or tolls for highway use must not be so distributed as to either penalize or subsidize the business of any particular group such as truckers. The ICC should give particular attention to preventing the omission of dividends or interest from the rates allowed to common carriers when and if they are not controlled as they should be by competition, not between different corporations, but between the

DB-38

increasingly numerous forms of modern transport.

- - - -

Col.A.C. Welling,
Engineer Commissioner,
District of Columbia

My dear Colonel:

Since addressing you last (Oct.28) I have purchased and read the DeLeuw-Cather Report on an Inner Loop design for Washington. I beg to offer some criticisms which, let me reiterate, emanate from the basic fact of non-Euclidean geometry, to wit, that the shortest distance between two points that are not imaginary is not in a Euclidean plane. It lies in a circle; but not in such surface-centered circles as constitute the theoretical basis for highway planning along the metropolitan Atlantic Coast, traffic from which is focused on the District of Columbia because of the unbridgeable Chesapeake tidewater.

The shortest distance, equivalent to the least trip time between two points lies in a great circle. It follows that the DeLeuw-Cather design is basically fallacious; for their brochure states that the traffic advantage of Washington's original design lies not in the great-circle principle of our Avenues with their complex circles, but rather in the width of our streets. The brochure does not state the basic alternatives on which the alleged savings

DB-39

in trip time are computed to be capitalized as a justification for the estimated cost (in excess of 1/4 billion!) of the Inner Loop. The "savings" seem to have been figured chiefly on raising the speed limit from 30 to 50 MPH; certainly not from the alternative of the construction of routes on the shortest possible lines.

The basic fault in design is compounded in several ways. There is the stated attempt to preserve the city's economic values by encouraging, not dispersion, but centripetal convergence of population and traffic. This outmoded idea is responsible, as I have said, for the highly confused and confusing beltline theory of by-passing the urban centers northeast of the Chesapeake and Potomac tidewater system which at present interrupts the coastwise construction of highways and has concentrated through traffic onto Washington's bottleneck bridges thus keeping coastwise traffic from an optimum development commercially. Obviously, any use of the system in national defense must encounter the same obstructions.

Another correlary of the centered-city tradition is the undisguised attempt to survey the existing traffic as a basis for design and location of freeways to accommodate the traffic as projected from these surveys to the year 1980. Design should be used to relieve, not to accommodate excessive flows. No freeways should be built to facilitate

DB-40

any traffic through the city to and from points outside the District as is presently the case and so is extended by the survey method into the 1980 picture presented in the brochure's flow charts.

The city center in Washington should be very gradually and privately (not by huge government contracts in staged upheavals) transformed to accommodate its central activity -- government -- and its by-products of sightseeing and lobbying. There is too much of an element of schools and parks for local residents as against transient accommodations in the current rehabilitation plans. The River Road tunnel plan I've proposed, linked as a Potomac Pike with the Crozet Superhighway project in West Virginia, would be especially suited to serve both transient motels and hotels (the area should have a modern convention hall nearby the Union Station, with a helicopter port on its roof) and the commerce and industry surrounding the N.E. railyards.

The currently adopted Loop plan is, in contrast, very expensively bottlenecked on the west, open only to the east. It is actually designed to clog Massachusetts Avenue with a flow of nearly 20,000 vehicles each way daily, added to what flows up from the city directly. This western bottleneck is so obvious that, instead of planning underpasses and overpasses on outer Massachusetts Avenue and redesigning

DB-41

the Key bridgeheads, another Whitehurst Freeway is projected out in the river so as to link Washington with the rest of the nation on the west over a northbound highway, to wit, Route 240, by an all but impossible freeway system up the riverside.

All this is done on the premise that the Inner Loop, conceived along with the State (labeled "interstate") Highway System in the 1944 rush into boondoggling against postwar unemployment, is (to quote DeLeuw-Cather) "as sound today as when originally proposed but - - ." How surely and sadly true -- if one reads on after that "but"!

So let's forget the Inner Loop and cut costs at least in two by promptly building much needed under and overpasses into the District's streets and avenues as they now are, instead of providing a contractor's paradise in building white elephants like the Pentagon with its messy maze of interchanges and bottlenecks.

New bridges and the highways they serve should not be designed and built piecemeal. If this jurisdictionally localized "planning" is continued, Washington will e're long be surrounded by relatively unused by-passes while some bridges will still be bottlenecked as Key Bridge is now. What will happen to the big Maryland-Virginia toll bridge, for example, when it has been flanked by Virginia's planned causeway and tunnel from Cape Charles across the mouth of

DB-42

Chesapeake Bay on one side and a Jones Point Bridge on the other? It will be about as white elephant as the West Virginia Pike or Route 240.

The Federal Government, and only the Federal Government, should plan and construct the trunkline highways for the nation as a whole, just as the Army Engineers have always done for the waterways of the country. The 1956, 90-10 Highway Act is producing unmitigated confusion in locations and priorities because it leaves initial planning to the individual state authorities.

Very sincerely yours,

Alden Potter

Bethesda, Md.

11 November, 1957

- - - -

(The following map was also submitted by Mr. Potter for inclusion in the record, but appears in the original transcript only.)

DB-43

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Mr. Consley (?), how much time did you want to take?

MR. CONSLEY: I am guessing about eight or nine minutes.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: We have had people waiting here for a day and a half to testify. I think we will have to proceed with this list. I thought if you just had a minute -- do you want to put your statement in? Have you got it?

MR. CONSLEY: I have a statement, yes, sir. I have been running back and forth between these meetings and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: We have had people waiting here constantly since yesterday morning through the session last night. If you have something typewritten that you want to put in, we can give you a couple of minutes to talk about it, but otherwise we will have to go ahead with this list.

I don't know what time we are going to get through this afternoon. I think we have to go ahead with our list.

The record will be open until Friday if you want to submit a statement, that is, until the 10th.

The next on the list is Mr. Scott Seegers.

STATEMENT OF MR. SCOTT SEEGERS, R.F.D. 3, MC LEAN,
VIRGINIA

XXXXXXXXXX

MR. SEEGERS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board: My name is Scott Seegers. I live in Langley, Virginia. I

DB-44

I think the gentleman who described the 240 controversy a few weeks ago as a question of "squirrels versus people" missed the real point. I believe it is more nearly a question of automobiles versus people.

Not all of us like to restore our souls with the solitude of a walk in the woods, but many do find it of very real value. To all of us, of course, the possession of our homes is of first importance. The peaceful character of our neighborhoods is equally vital. So is the existence of safe and beautiful playgrounds for our children.

But it seems that wherever any of these values come into conflict with the convenience of that modern Juggernaut the automobile, it is the human values that must yield. The forests and playgrounds must be obliterated, the homes must be torn down, neighborhoods destroyed.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Have you some interest in this controversy other than just your interest in parks? We have heard the people from Maryland because of their interest, but I see you live in Virginia.

MR. SEEGERS: Yes. I have a number of interests. The principal one is --

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: I am just trying to push ahead.

MR. SEEGERS: My prime interest is in the preservation of parks; my secondary interest is in not having Chain Bridge

DB-45

so involved with interchanges, the one thing we can hardly use in Virginia. Is that legitimate?

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: I think so.

MR. SEEGER: Thank you. Of the routes under consideration here today I can only ask: who wants more trucks in downtown Washington? The city streets are already choked beyond capacity with bumper-to-bumper traffic. These streets are not elastic; they will not expand to take additional volume of automobiles that still another high-speed expressway will pour into them.

Anyone who has crept through Washington in an automobile during the rush hour knows that the city has reached the point where the automobile has become the least efficient of all means of passenger transportation. Every city of this size has sooner or later had to face the fact that some form of rapid transit, either surface or subway, connecting the heart of the city with outlying districts is the only practicable method of handling the tens of thousands of people who surge back and forth twice daily.

I do not know what the money cost of such a system would be. It certainly would not in the long run exceed the cost of digging up another 50 or 60 million dollars every ten years or so to build still another expressway as the growing population of the area buys still more cars. Also, there are other values just as valid as money value.

DB-46

Every new such plan involves still more shattered neighborhoods, homes, and lifelong individual plans destroyed, more forestland laid waste. On a somewhat smaller scale, how do you long-suffering gentlemen relish the prospect of sitting through such a session as yesterday's every few years, and then wading through the testimony afterward, and the final agony of making the decision?

Route A will parallel the George Washington Memorial Parkway in places less than 100 yards away. What useful purpose can be served by such duplication? And can you imagine the mechanized bedlam this will create in the neighborhood between the two highways? Every home in that strip will be destroyed as surely as if the bulldozers had scraped it out of existence.

Route A-2, a split-level arrangement, will simply do twice as much damage along the Potomac as one road will do.

The lower end of Route C will, for practical purposes, wipe out the beautiful Glover-Archbold Park. The same objection applies to much of Route D.

Whatever route may be chosen for these extra trucks and autos we need in the city streets, there is at stake here today a principle considerably more important than where any road might go. It is the question of how much our Government's word is worth.

DB-47

The Glover-Archbold Park came into existence many years ago through parcels of land given specifically for park purposes. It is true that a 100-foot right-of-way for a road already existed through the area. Presumably, however, that right-of-way was conceived before anyone thought seriously of the area as a park. In view of the terms of the gifts and the terms of their acceptance by the United States for park purposes, it seems reasonable that just this once, the automobile might be the one to yield.

Now increasing population and increasing traffic is the excuse always given for destroying parklands in favor of automobiles. As population increases, does not the need for undeveloped parks increase in precisely the same proportion?

There wasn't any question regarding the intent of the people who gave this land. Mr. Charles C. Glover wrote "I hereby donate to the District of Columbia for park and playground purposes all the land shown hereon" and so forth. The generous old man was so keen on making his intention clear that he repeated the phrase "for park and playground purposes" again in the same short paragraph. That does not sound like provision for a highway.

Mrs. Anne Archbold, as a memorial to her father, gave the other piece of land, as she put it "in consideration of \$1.00 and her interest in the development of the Park

DB-48

System of the National Capital." That hardly sounds like a highway either.

Congress did not authorize the District Commissioners to accept either piece of land as a potential highway. The 68th Congress passed a bill authorizing the Chief of Army Engineers ". . . to accept a certain tract of land from Mrs. Anne Archbold donated to the United States for park purposes. . . "

The same Congress used almost identical language in accepting Mr. Glover's gift.

The D.C. Board of Commissioners referred to Mr. Glover's donation in lyrical words. "It " -- the land -- " is covered in great part by some of the finest trees in the District of Columbia, and is situated in part of the District where no parks have been provided." I never heard a superhighway right-of-way described in just that fashion.

More than six months later, officials wrote on the plat of Mr. Glover's gift that they reserved the right to put as many roads through the property as they might care to. Mr. Glover did not sign this amendment.

The purpose of Mr. Glover and Mrs. Archbold in making these magnificent gifts could not have been made more clear. The language of Congress was equally specific in authorizing the District of Columbia to accept the land. "Park purposes" does not mean "highway purposes."

DB-49

Yet the National Parks Service, while continually bewailing the lack of park land, wants to cut the great trees, turn the bulldozers loose on the lovely little valley and entomb the result beneath the concrete of Route 240.

That entire equation of automobiles versus people was summed up very graphically a few months ago by no less an authority than Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service. Mr. Wirth said, "What were quiet suburban streets are now through highways overtaxed with noisy, smelly traffic day and night. The open fields and woodlands you remember have disappeared in the wake of bulldozers clearing the way for more streets and highways, houses, and shopping centers."

Mr. Wirth referred nostalgically to "the natural beauties of the country, its streams, and lakes and ocean shores, its woods and great open spaces."

He also had a remedy for our national bulldozer psychosis. "Our immediate urgent need is to set aside a lot more land and water area for parks and recreation purposes in and around metropolitan areas."

Mr. Wirth was speaking before the American Institute of Park Executives on September 23, 1957.

Now let us see how his report of accomplishment bears out his spoken sentiments. He has under his protection a magnificent land and water area along the Virginia palisades

DB-50

of the Potomac. That once-inspiring stretch of natural scenery is today a shambles of blasted cliffs, raw earth, destroyed vegetation and shattered trees. It is a real monument to what the bulldozer can do with unlimited public money and with the blessing of the National Park Service. It was done for the sake of a high-speed highway.

A few weeks ago Mr. Wirth's agency approved the contract which will shortly send more bulldozers crunching into the sylvan retreat beside the C&O Canal. This also is for the sake of a high-speed highway. And now, for the sake of Route 240, Mr. Wirth would like to eradicate the Glover-Archbold Park, given and accepted for park purposes.

Here are three current examples of the fate of park and recreation lands in and around a metropolitan area. What does the National Park Service want with a lot more of these? To destroy them in their turn so that more concrete may be poured atop the ruins?

And finally, what is the word of our Government worth? If a United States citizen cannot make an agreement with the United States Congress that will be respected by our administrative officials, I suggest that we could do with a bit of agonizing reappraisal right here at home.

Thank you, gentlemen.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you. Now we come to Mrs. Faircloth. She was not here.

Mr. Immer, Sheridan-Kalorama Neighborhood Council and Dupont Circle Citizens Association.

STATEMENT OF JOHN R. IMMER, CHAIRMAN, ZONING COMMITTEE,
SHERIDAN-KALORAMA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL -- DUPONT
CIRCLE CITIZENS ASSOCIATION

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
MR. IMMER: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board of Commissioners: My name is John R. Immer. I live at 1735 19th Street Northwest. I am chairman of the Inner Road or Inner Loop Committee of the Dupont Circle Citizens Association, and chairman of the Zoning Committee of the Sheridan-Kalorama Neighborhood Council.

The statement which I am about to read has been approved by the Executive Committee of the Sheridan-Kalorama Neighborhood Council and early last evening was approved unanimously by a meeting of the Dupont Circle Citizens Association.

The statement follows:

We appreciate this opportunity to present the views of our association on this vital topic.

We propose that the following criteria be followed in locating the connecting link to Route 240 for the following reasons:

(1) All through traffic, truck and passenger, should be routed around the city.

(a) Through traffic should be routed around the

DB-52

city on the Circumferential Highway over proposed Cabin John Bridge. This section will probably be completed before the District Connecting Link is completed.

(b) Surveys show that this would keep 97 percent of the traffic on Route 240 out of the city as only three percent of this traffic has to enter the District.

(2) Traffic into Washington, D.C. from Route 240 should be kept separated from locally generated traffic.

(a) Link to city should be as close to the river as possible.

(b) Keep Route 240 traffic away from Wisconsin and Massachusetts Avenue traffic.

(3) Traffic into Washington, D.C. from Route 240 should feed into the inner loop as far south as possible.

(a) Entry of all Route 240 traffic to inner loop should be south of incoming traffic from Massachusetts Avenue and kept completely separate from it.

(b) Most commercial traffic will follow southern arm of the inner loop rather than the northern arm.

In addition to the above we note the following specific objections to proposed routes C and D. We are strongly opposed to routes C, D and X for the following reasons:

(1) There is a legal question as to whether or not the government of the District of Columbia can apply the right of eminent domain to the property of a foreign government.

DB-53

(2) Route D will require the removal of 11 embassies and chanceries and will disrupt the entire area around Sheridan Circle where many of the diplomatic missions are now located. Would each of these governments affected be permitted to buy other property in near-by Class A residential areas and convert them to chanceries and office buildings?

(3) The cost of routes C (\$59,610,000) and D (\$63,658,000) is substantially greater than that of routes A (\$44,777,000) and A-2 (\$46,990,000).

(4) Heavy vehicular traffic so close to Washington Cathedral will cause vibrations which, in time, will affect the stability of this structure.

(5) Route D (Whitehaven) will destroy one of the few remaining close-in wooded areas, i.e., Montrose Park and Dunbarton Oaks Park in addition to cleaving Glover Park down the middle.

(6) Rock Creek Park from the Massachusetts Avenue bridge to the Q Street bridge would be a jumble of bridges and criss-crossing traffic.

(7) The proposed method of running route D along the south side of Massachusetts Avenue and its awkward junction with the inner loop while crossing or running underneath Massachusetts Avenue will not only produce an extremely awkward traffic maze but will effectively destroy what beauty and attractiveness this section of the avenue has left. It

DB-54

must be kept in mind that a junction of this type requires a complicated interchange under the very best of conditions.

(8) The interchange at Massachusetts Avenue and the inner loop would destroy Sheridan Circle and require the removal of the Cosmos Club.

I am not saying whether that is good or not; I am just pointing that out.

(Laughter.)

(9) It is difficult to believe that the truck tunnel, route X, was proposed seriously. This would destroy another parkway -- the last one that hasn't been touched on this yet -- Normanstone Park, and would damage the residential character of this entire area.

(a) Vibrations from truck traffic would lower property values and, in time, would constitute a greater threat to the stability of the cathedral.

For the above reasons we believe that it is to the best interests of the District of Columbia and its citizens that the connecting link to Route 240 be in the vicinity of the Potomac River and enter the inner loop as far south as possible.

Now, in addition to that I would like to make for the record a few comments which have come out of observations of the hearings, since they started yesterday morning.

One, the requirements of mass transportation should be

DB-55

considered in all these plans. Two, it is assumed that whatever plan is finally adopted by the District, it will have to be in time approved and accepted by the Federal Bureau of Roads, and we also presume that this plan will have to satisfy the conditions which they have set forth.

Last evening, Mr. Chatelain pointed out that these requirements included a maximum of a three percent grade.

I would like to read once sentence from page 3 of the Clarkeson Report on this grade relating to the route D. "To get under Sheridan Circle would require about a four percent continuous grade for a distance of about 6,000 feet from the point near Rock Creek to the intersection of Wisconsin and Massachusetts Avenue." This would not come within the three percent limitation set by the Bureau of Roads.

In addition he pointed out that a 300-foot right-of-way was required. Now you can imagine the impact of a 300-foot right-of-way on the route D leg there, through the back of Dunbarton Oaks, which would cover almost entirely that stretch of Rock Creek Park in there and would take out everything east of Sheridan Circle to 21st Street.

One other aspect of this is the fact that in any case on both leg C and D you have a drop on leg C of almost 400 feet within 10,000 feet and on D you have 340-foot drop on a 3,000 foot stretch. This means that you would have

DB-56

an uninterrupted three percent grade for 2 miles and a half.

Now I would like to suggest the impact upon the area of heavy trucks coming down or shifting gears going up a continuous three percent grade. That doesn't sound like much, but it is a considerable load for trucks going up, and there is plenty of backfire of trucks coming down.

This, in addition to the nuisance of the vibrations. Of course this is still incidental to the important question: Will these plans be approved by the Bureau of Public Roads?

Three: Mention has been made of the extra cost of the Arizona Avenue Bridge and while it is true that that bridge is of considerable concern to us in considering the total traffic pattern, that bridge has nothing whatsoever to do with the linter-link of an interstate highway such as we are considering here at the present time.

Then, four: I would like to recommend that there be serious study and an engineering evaluation of the route A-3 proposed this morning by Mr. Arthur Davis. I feel that if it is engineeringly feasible, that there is a potentiality of a considerable cost saving in the thing, and there is no doubt in my mind but that the route A-3 would provide for considerably less interference to the life of the community while this entire project is being constructed.

Thank you.

DB-57

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you, sir.

Next, a representative of Columbia Federal Savings and Loan Association.

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE E. KEFAUVER, PRESIDENT,
COLUMBIA FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION

XXXXXXXXXX

MR. KEFAUVER: Mr. President and Members of the Board of Commissioners: My name is Clarence E. Kefauver, and I am president of Columbia Federal Savings and Loan Association which in March of 1957 opened a branch office at the corner of Wisconsin Avenue and Jenifer Streets, Northwest, Washington, D.C.

The Association constructed an attractive four-story office building which is fully occupied by a select group of tenants on the upper floors, the first floor being used by the Columbia Federal Savings and Loan Association at its branch office. This location was selected because of its character and future plans of development in this area.

This association vigorously objects to the location of the proposed U.S. Highway Route 240 along the so-called Wisconsin Avenue corridor route which generally follows Route C or D in the Clarkeson Report. The objection of this Association is predicated upon the fact that the location of a limited access highway of the size and character of the proposed U.S. Highway Route 240 will destroy to a very substantial degree the present high quality of commercial

DB-58

development in this area and make plans for further important commercial development in this area impossible.

The area presently represents one of the most active and largest regional shopping areas in Northwest Washington. Just over the Maryland line there is located the Woodward & Lothrop Department Store, the large Chevy Chase Shopping Center which includes Raleigh Haberdasher's as well as other stores of fine reputation and national standing. A medical clinic has been erected on the District side of the line. For many years the Wisconsin Avenue frontage in this area has been zoned and developed for commercial use. In recent years the quality and character of the commercial use in this section of Wisconsin Avenue has steadily improved and all future indications point to further important growth at and near the intersection of Wisconsin Avenue and Western Avenue. The future plans in the area presently include the location of one of the largest local insurance companies upon a 28-acre tract immediately west of the Woodward & Lothrop Department Store. Construction of this project has been brought to a halt in recent months by reason of the threat of locating U.S. Highway Route 240 over a part of this property. Immediately south of the Government Employees Insurance Companies' tract and on the District side, there is located a large unimproved tract of land. This is one of the most desirable future commercial

DB-59

sites in the entire Metropolitan Washington area. If this property were made available and utilized for commercial purposes, substantial real estate and sales tax revenues would inure to the District of Columbia. The proposed highway would destroy the future development of this tract and would have serious consequences upon the utilization of the Government Employees Insurance Companies' site.

The location of the proposed highway along the Wisconsin Avenue corridor would completely disrupt the present character of the neighborhood and would create an impossible situation during the period of construction for the following reasons:

(1) Wisconsin Avenue serves as a principal local street. The utilization of Wisconsin Avenue would be substantially impaired because of the necessity of constructing tunnels under the highway just north of Western Avenue, south of Western Avenue and in the Tenley Circle area.

(2) The highway would completely cut off access from east to west except on a limited number of streets which will either bridge over or tunnel under the limited access highway.

(3) Businesses located in the area will be materially affected because customers will find it difficult to reach their destinations, particularly during the period of construction which we understand will take many months.

DB-60

(4) The Wisconsin Avenue area is one of the finest residential and business areas in the far northwest section. The location of the proposed limited access highway will seriously and permanently affect the neighborhood, and in my opinion it changes the neighborhood which includes our own property of Columbia Federal from a first class commercial area with a great future potential to a second class neighborhood, with a very limited prospect for the future.

(5) This Association is informed that the cost of construction and land acquisition of a highway along Wisconsin Avenue will cost substantially more than other proposed routes and that the additional cost is not justified.

We believe for the above reasons that the Commission should approve a route other than the Wisconsin Avenue corridor for the location of the proposed U.S. Highway Route 240.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you.

Mr. W. Edward Gallagher, Claims Attorney, Law Department, Washington Gas Light Company.

STATEMENT OF W. EDWARD GALLAGHER, ON BEHALF OF THE
WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT COMPANY

MR. GALLAGHER: Mr. President, Members of the Board: My statement here today will be rather brief. We thought it appropriate to appear so that the Commissioners might

DB-61

understand the impact and affect that the extension of U.S. Route 240 with respect to the cost of relocating the company's facilities would be.

These facilities, as you know from the study, a casual study of the map, will indicate a great concentration of them along the Wisconsin Avenue corridor. We have also in mind the method in which we feel the costs should be paid.

Routes C and D will cost the company roughly six or seven times that of routes A and A-2.

Now under the Section 111 of the U.S. Highway Aid Act of 1956, provision is made for the payment of these costs to states under certain conditions provided of course that the state can qualify for these payments, which in this case is the District Government.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Isn't that qualified on affirmative action of the state legislature?

MR. GALLAGHER: I think that is how it has been construed so far.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: So how does that apply to the District of Columbia?

MR. GALLAGHER: Being a state --

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: We haven't got a state legislature. It would have to be Congress, wouldn't it?

MR. GALLAGHER: No, I think the law, Section 111-A, states that unless it is in conflict with the law of the

DB-62

state, then such relief is available. It is a touchy legal question.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Our present situation would be that the utility -- I know you wouldn't want to commit yourself on this, but it is my recollection the utility would normally have to pay for relocation of its facility.

MR. GALLAGHER: Normally it would. We thought perhaps there would be some hope under this Act for relief in that respect.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: You would rather we run it up the river, wouldn't you?

MR. GALLAGHER: Well, I am not here to oppose or speak in favor of any location, of course. But economically speaking, the impact is much greater on us with the Wisconsin Avenue corridor.

Now we think that the cost of such a project should actually properly be included in the cost of construction of the highway and these costs should be borne by the users of the highway and not by the customers of the company, who in the final analysis must bear such costs unless relief is obtained under the Act. Hence we offer that for your consideration.

That is all we have to say. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KARRICK: You said the cost was six or seven times, but you didn't give an absolute.

DB-63

MR. GALLAGHER: I don't have an absolute yet. In the absence of detail on which we can base a dollar figure --

COMMISSIONER KARRICK: You mean if it is \$1,000 in one place and \$6,000 in another, it is negligible, but if it is 1 million or 6 million --

MR. GALLAGHER: It will be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$250,000, and \$500,000 on the Wisconsin Avenue.

COMMISSIONER KARRICK: I see.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you very much.

Is counsel here for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad?

MR. STEWART: We would be happy to file our statement, or present it. It is about 10 minutes long.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: I think it would be well if you summarize a little bit and give us your points and then file the whole statement.

STATEMENT OF EUGENE L. STEWART OF STEPTOE & JOHNSON
ON BEHALF OF THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY

MR. STEWART: Mr. President and Commissioners: I am Eugene L. Stewart, a member of the law firm of Steptoe & Johnson, counsel for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.

On behalf of the B&O we are presenting this statement. I should like to say at the outset that the Baltimore and Ohio has always enjoyed the most amicable and harmonious relations with the District Commissioners and the Highway Department, and equally we take pride in the work and the

XXXXXXXXXXXX

DB-64

planning of the National Capital Planning Commission to preserve the beauty of the Capital City which we share.

We are also very mindful of the very patient consideration that everyone has given in the selection of a proper route.

What we have to say is not to be interpreted therefore as taking sides with any particular recommendation, but as inviting your serious consideration to certain factors which we consider essential to the health of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.

We are here today principally to call attention to the fact that routes A, A-2 and C involving as they do a leg in just a position with the industrial area at the foot of Georgetown, might well involve harm to both the B&O and other industrial organizations there located if certain factors were not taken into account.

We feel certain, however, that these factors can and will be taken into consideration.

So that you may have them fully in mind, we respectfully call them to your attention.

First, the industrial area, which is situated at the foot of Georgetown, generates about 25 percent of the car-load traffic enjoyed by the B&O into the Washington Metropolitan area. The number of car loadings run at the rate of about 5,000 to 6,000 a year.

DB-65

If the major industries that are there located, those which utilize the tracks in that area, were to be impaired by the manner in which the interstate highway is brought down that particular way, if one of these three routes^{is}/selected, it could cause us injury by drying up their activities or causing them to relocate.

Equally, if the construction were carried out in a way which would impinge upon our right-of-way, unduly, or which would make it necessary for us to give up the usage of some of those tracks, that also could cause us severe harm.

One of the factors which many studies of the Metropolitan area has brought out is that Washington has relatively a small amount of industry to contribute tax-wise to the support of the District and to provide employment. The B&O is one of those few industries which are located here which contribute to the welfare of the District through tax revenues and by providing employment.

With regard to the manner in which the construction might be carried out, it is the well-considered view of the highway department of the B&O that if the route selected should cross the B&O or overlap it, all the presently maintained tracks and facilities of the railroad should be spanned in such a manner as to require no bridge supports on railroad property.

DB-66

Now the railroad does not wish to be interpreted as making a senseless recommendation in this respect. The physical circumstances could obviously require, from a sound engineering point of view, some support. But to the extent that planning makes it possible to avoid the necessity for bridge supports on the B&O right-of-way, we respectfully request that that be done to the extent that it is possible and we feel confident that the Highway Department of the District and the Commissioners would wish that the encroachments on our right-of-way be kept to a minimum.

Finally, with respect to the question of costs, if the routes selected should involve crossing the B&O or overlapping, of course a grade separation structure would necessarily be required because this would be an extension of a highway into an area where the B&O is presently operating and its tracks are in place.

Under the criteria of the Bureau of Public Roads that would confer no benefit upon the railroad and we would not expect to pay any portion of the costs, and under the existing circumstances which affect the railroad, and other railroads, we feel sure that if we were required to pay a portion of such expenses, it would be very harmful to the railroad.

I would like to say in conclusion that we of course are confident that to the furthest extent of their ability

the Commissioners and Highway Department will avoid decisions which would conflict with the factors we have mentioned.

We have only taken the opportunity to bring them to your attention because we feel that you perhaps would appreciate knowing our point of view on these matters.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you. Are you still going to take those trains off to New York?

MR. GALLAGHER: I should say that I think the railroad would welcome a resurgence in patronage which would make possible a favorable decision.

Mr. President, I also request that my statement be incorporated.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Yes, it will be.

(The statement referred to is as follows:

As its counsel in Washington, D.C. we are presenting this statement in behalf of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company.

The Baltimore and Ohio has long enjoyed harmonious relationships with the District of Columbia Government and its Highway Department. As a business organization with a rather considerable employment in the District of Columbia, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad also takes pride in the beauty of our Nation's capital and its orderly development and in

htl

in the careful planning of that development which has been carried forward by the National Capital Planning Commission as well as other agencies.

Fully mindful, therefore, of the very serious and patriotic consideration which has been given by all concerned to the selection of a proper route for the extension of U.S. 240 into the District of Columbia, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad respectfully asks that the fullest and most serious consideration be given to the following factors applicable to at least three of the proposed routes which are under consideration, Routes A, A2 and C.

1. The industrial area grouped beneath the Whitehurst Freeway at the foot of Georgetown is of major importance to the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, as well as other industrial and business organizations whose establishments are located there. Actually, the industrial tracts, switch yards, and team tracks located between Key Bridge on the west, and Thirtieth Street on the east, are the major justification for the entire branch of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad stretching from Georgetown junction in Silver Spring through Bethesda and Chevy Chase along the Potomac River and into the industrial area at the foot of Georgetown.

Industries located or served by the trackage located between Key Bridge and Thirtieth Street account

2ht

for at least 25 percent of the carload traffic handled by the B&O Railroad for industrial and commercial firms located in the District of Columbia. During the past three years the number of carloads and tonnage handled into Georgetown, D. C. by the B&O Railroad were as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Cars</u>	<u>Tons</u>
1955	6,444	280,653
1956	5,544	242,059
1957 (11 mos.)	3,449	150,185

The selection of a route and the construction of an interstate highway of the size under consideration could destroy or damage the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad in several ways:

(a) If the construction itself were carried out in a way which prevented full use by the B&O of the industrial trackage located at the foot of Georgetown.

(b) If the construction and location of the highway were determined in a manner which would prevent all or a substantial part of the industrial and business activity in that area from being carried on in the future.

(c) If the B&O were to be saddled with any portion of the cost of grade separation structures necessarily required in connection with a route which would cross or overlap the B&O tracks.

2. If a route is selected which crosses or

ht3

overlaps the trackage of the B&O, all presently maintained tracks and facilities of the railroad should be so spanned as to require no bridge supports on railroad property.

3. Because Route 240 is an interstate highway being extended into the District along new routes, should that extension cross the B&O tracks at any place, the grade separation projects required to avoid crossing at grade would under the criteria of the Bureau of Public Roads confer no benefit upon the B&O, and no portion of the cost of such projects should be placed upon or borne by the B&O.

So far as the B&O's interests in this matter are concerned, we respectfully suggest that there is more involved than the mere impairment or destruction of property values. The freight revenues received by the B&O Railroad from the industries and commercial firms located on its line, or served by it in the District of Columbia, account in large measure for the financial support of the B&O, and make possible in great part the maintenance of service in those areas and in adjacent parts of metropolitan Washington outside of the District of Columbia proper, as well. Without the support provided by these industrial areas, including notbably Georgetown, D. C., the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad would be unable to continue to supply its present daily and dependable service to various government installations, including the West Central Heating Plant at Georgetown, D.C.

4ht

In the many studies of employment and economic conditions in the metropolitan area of Washington, attention has repeatedly been given to the relatively small amount of industry which can be depended upon to provide employment for the citizens of the area and to generate tax revenues for the support of the District.

So precious are the existing industrial areas in this respect that every conceivable amount of deference should be given to upholding and sustaining their continued dedication to such activity. For example, in recent years, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad itself has paid real estate taxes in excess of \$125,000 a year on its facilities within the District of Columbia and has provided employment for more than 250 people.

The abandonment of the Georgetown branch, which would have to be considered by the B&O if the proposed extension of Route 240 were carried out in a manner which would destroy or impair the industrial center at Georgetown, D. C., would in itself constitute a major blow to the economic resources of the District of Columbia. The correlative effects upon the industrial and business organizations served by the Georgetown branch line of the B&O would also represent a serious loss to the economic resources of the District.

It is not inappropriate in a hearing devoted to

5ht

the location of highways for purposes which include the alleviation of traffic conditions within the District to remind those concerned with the decision that the abandonment by the B&O of its Georgetown branch line would place an additional and heavy burden of truck traffic upon the roads of the District to handle such freight traffic as would still be required in and out of those industries which remained, at least for a time, in operation in the area served by the branch.

We are confident that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia would not intentionally finalize plans for Route 240 in a manner which would damage an important industrial and business resource such as the B&O or the firms which it serves along its Georgetown branch and in Georgetown, D. C. The purpose of this memorandum is to remind the Commissioners well in advance of their decision of the very serious injury which could result if their decision were to be made without a full awareness of the vulnerability of the B&O and its industrial customers in Georgetown, D. C. in this regard.

DB-1

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Mr. Olson, of National Capital Parks Association.

STATEMENT OF SIGURD F. OLSON, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL
PARKS ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

XXXXXXXXXXXX

MR. OLSON: I want to read this statement, which is rather brief, and I may follow with a personal remark later on.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Board: The National Parks Association is primarily concerned with the protection of areas which have been reserved and dedicated for the recreation and spiritual welfare of our people. We are opposed to any plan of highway construction which might jeopardize in any way the priceless national heritage these parks represent.

Three of Washington's most valuable and beautiful park properties are involved in the highway proposals being considered, properties which give to this city a unique and enviable position in the metropolitan areas of this country. The issues are of far greater significance than the re-routing of traffic. They have to do with social and humanitarian values, beauty and graciousness, living room and space. Any solution which fails to take these into account will break faith not only with those who gave these areas to the nation, but also with future generations whose need may be much greater than ours.

DB-2

The threat of a superhighway running the length of Rock Creek Park has been considered so adverse to national and local interest that legislation was introduced into Congress to prohibit its construction.

The Cheasapeake and Ohio Canal possesses an extraordinary opportunity for the development of a recreational area because of its beauty and historical significance and its proximity to the great populations of the east. When it was in danger of being invaded by a highway, I was one of the group who with Justice William O. Douglas made the famous hike from Cumberland to Washington to demonstrate what was at stake. At that time the Justice summed up the entire issue in one brief statement. "We set aside sanctuaries for wildlife," he said, "isn't it about time we set aside a few sanctuaries for men?"

The people responded magnificently and the highway proposal was dropped and now Congress has been asked to designate a substantial part of the canal property as a National Historic Park. However, there is still danger that some of the plans being considered at this time might violate irreparably the bwer part of this area.

The third reservation endangered is Glover-Archbold Park which lies in the beautiful watershed of Foundry Creek. It is a wonderful experience to leave downtown Washington and within just a few minutes sense the quiet

DB-3

of this still natural wooded valley. Given to the nation by private donors as a place where people might recapture some of the old serenity a less populous city knew, it is now threatened by a highway which would run its entire length in direct violation of the purpose for which it was set aside.

We take our stand in the belief that any proposal to utilize these three parks or any others in or adjacent to the metropolitan area lacks full understanding of the real issues involved. The Comprehensive Plan for the Capital and its Environs, published in 1950 by the National Capital Parks and Planning Commission, states that the District of Columbia must not only alleviate its traffic congestion but must also provide more open spaces with equal urgency. The present proposals apparently ignore the latter suggestion entirely though it is impossible to separate one need from the other in a city that has increased its population almost half a million during the last ten years.

Many ideas have been advanced for bringing Route 240 into the District. Each plan has its own advocates and opponents. Some are based on engineering studies, others solely on the desirability of bypassing certain residential areas. The result is a sense of urgency and confusion in which there is danger of unwise and precipitate action that would ignore the major issues.

DB-4

We do not feel qualified to point to any of these plans and say "This is the only right one." Rather we question at this time the soundness behind them all and feel that before any final decision is reached, aesthetic and sociological values must be as seriously considered as the physical problems posed by compounded transportation. Any plan predicated on the premise that the major objective is to bring traffic into the heart of the District rather than keeping out as much of it as possible is unsound. If through traffic can be diverted around the city by circumferential highways and controlled access points with the improvement of existing channels, the problem would be eased materially. If the western extension of Highway 240 could then be coordinated with a plan which would take vehicles from the city rather than forcing them into it, we might be on the road to a solution.

The National Parks Association will, however, oppose any plan which does not include complete protection of all parks and natural areas involved. It will also oppose the choices now being considered in the firm belief that a new study is warranted based on a vision of the future rather than on the immediate needs of today and that such a study can produce a plan which will not only give Washington the relief from traffic congestion it so desperately needs, but an assurance as well that it will continue as one

DB-5

of the most beautiful and liveable cities in the world.

The historic statement of J. Horace McFarland at the Governor's Conference called by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908 seems particularly applicable now.

"The true glory of the United States," he said, "must rest and has rested upon a deeper foundation than that of her purely material resources. It is the love of country that lights and keeps glowing the holy fire of patriotism, a light excited primarily by the beauty of the country."

In this controversy therefore let us not be forced into hasty decisions which may be regretted in the years to come. Let us hold to the conviction that any resources of beauty we still possess are beyond price and that anything we can do to preserve them is an investment in our love of country and therefore our strength.

That is my official statement. I just want to add a word and I will be brief. I have listened to the testimony now for two days and I have learned a great deal. Being an ecologist, which is my profession, which is a study of the relationship of animals to their environments, I can't help but be impressed with the similarity between the problems confronting we human beings here in Washington today and the problems confronting animal communities.

Animals, when they are confronted by severe competition, over-production, and lack of living room, invariably become

DB-6

affected physiologically. We are familiar with the lemming, for example, who migrates to the sea in great hordes and swims out into the sea and dies. We are familiar with the rabbit and beaver and other animals that have undergone the same sort of thing.

As I listened to this testimony today I could not help, as a biologist, in drawing certain parallels. We human beings fortunately don't have to do what the lemming does; we don't have to head into the Potomac or the ocean. We flatter ourselves in thinking we have brains and can figure out these solutions and maybe we have. At least the challenge is here before us.

As I look at the situation of the city of today, the city that has grown according to the figures some half a million in the last decade, and is still growing and will continue to grow for decades to come, as I realize the competition that has developed in transportation, living room, and the use of open spaces, when I realize what is happening to us as a people here in a favored environment, I wonder if the same situation is not confronting us as is confronting the other creatures biologically because in the last analysis we can not escape the biological principles which govern mankind and all living things.

If we are to escape the results of pure pressure

DB-7

ecologically on us, it seems to me we should embark on a bolder more visionary plan than anything that has been mentioned here today, a plan that will not be just a temporary expedient, which will not pyramid the confusion of traffic in the city, but which may solve, as it solved in other cities some of the other problems confronting us today and what I am thinking of is possibly in lieu of all of these proposals a subway system which will bring into the capital the people who have to come in which will do away with the compounding of transportation on the surface, which in the same breath will give us protection in an atomic age.

Someone said not long ago -- just the other day -- that if a bomb was dropped on Memorial Bridge today we would destroy three-fourths of all the brains and ability we have in this area, and it is probably true.

Other cities in other parts of the world are going underground. Why shouldn't we build an underground transportation system; why shouldn't we build underground parking lots, underground protection devices for our people that look ahead to this age and look ahead to the time when surface transportation may be obsolete.

I believe we can meet that challenge; I believe a new study is necessary; a new study is underway now on mass transportation. I hope as a result of that study, all of

DE-8

these temporary solutions will be put aside and we will embark on a real effort to solve the problems confronting us.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you.

Mr. Arthur Claredon Smith, Jr., representing the D.C. Trucking Association.

You ought to be popular here today, Mr. Smith.

STATEMENT OF MR. ARTHUR CLARENDON SMITH, JR., PRESIDENT,
D.C. TRUCKING ASSOCIATION

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

MR. SMITH: Mr. President, Members of the Board of Commissioners: I have a very short statement to read.

And about the popularity situation, I might say that they all call it a truck highway; I would like to remind the witnesses and all that this is not a truck highway; this is an interstate highway, I believe. It is a north and south highway connecting points in the north with points in the south and they have to come through Washington, which we are all very happy about. That is, if it ever comes through.

This is very brief. At our November 1957 Board Meeting, our organization asked me to appear in their behalf and favor the Potomac River and Canal Route entrance of Route 240 to the District of Columbia.

DE-9

We favor this route as we understand this is the least costly and would have least disruptive impact on private property in the District of Columbia. We believe these considerations are natural and the most important and would preclude the selection of any route.

Our only hope is that your decision be reached in the near future and contracts be let for this route as soon as possible. The highway users have already paid for these highways from their increased fuel and excise taxes and previous taxes collected for highway improvements never spent for highway purposes but on other operating general expenses.

I would like to add now a few notes I made. Over 80 percent of the traffic, I am sure, will be/on all highways, over 80 percent passenger car traffic. Trucks will use the route system as best suits their needs. If the trucks come into the city -- they would prefer to stay out if possible -- they will use the route which is the most economical to them, which is usually the one that will save time, because over 50 percent of our cost is time, or labor.

If trucks are going through Washington, or down into the Virginia area, they would like to bypass it; they hope this will eventually happen, that 240 will bypass and connect with another highway over in Virginia. But if they

DB-10

are coming to make discharges of goods in the area, to pick-up or deliver, they will go to wherever their point of discharge is by the least costly method. It will be any highway that will get them there cheapest.

That is all I have.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Mack, President the North Cleveland Park Citizens' Association.

Is Mr. Mack present?

(No response.)

MR. THORNETT: I have a letter from them that we can file in the record.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Mr. Coerper, President of the Friendship Heights Citizens Association.

STATEMENT OF MILO G. COERPER, PRESIDENT, FRIENDSHIP
HEIGHTS CITIZENS ASSOCIATION

XXXXXXXXXX

MR. COERPER: Mr. President, Commissioners: I am here to represent the Friendship Heights Citizens Association. Friendship Heights is a special taxing area in Maryland containing about 104 homes. It is one of the oldest Maryland communities in the Washington area. It is run by an Executive Committee which is an elected body and has the unique status of being one of the few incorporated taxing areas in the Montgomery County.

I would like to continue my remarks with the use of

DB-11

the map if I might.

I might preface any further remarks by stating that your decision in the District is of very vital interest to our community in Maryland because if you decide on the Wisconsin Avenue corridor, our community will be destroyed.

Friendship Heights is this little community right in here (indicating on map) to the north and west of the Woodward and Lothrop store, and it borders on Sommerset, which is a newer community, just to the north of Friendship Heights.

As you see, the Wisconsin Avenue proposal in Maryland is to come down the eastern side of Wisconsin, and then cross over through our community. This is the one proposal for Maryland, if you choose the Wisconsin corridor, and the other proposal in Maryland, if you choose the Wisconsin corridor is down River Road and come in across our community east and west.

Both of these Maryland proposals will destroy us. If they use the River Road route, they will have to condemn some 30 or 40 homes out of 104 presently in the community. If they use the Wisconsin Avenue corridor and whip across Wisconsin through our community, they will destroy 15 to 20 homes. I am here merely to point out that we would like to keep our community.

We don't have any great planning proposals nor do we

DB-12

know much about the engineering of highways and we will have to leave that to the people who do know, but I am sure that one of the considerations will be the amount of improved real estate, particularly residences, which would be destroyed as a result of any particular plan.

I would like to submit for the record a letter which we have written to the State Roads Commission of Maryland, Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission of Montgomery County and also the Montgomery County Council, and I would like to read certain excerpts from that letter and then submit it for the record.

"At a joint meeting of the Friendship Heights Citizen Committee and the Executive Committee of the Friendship Heights Citizens Association this date, the various proposals for routing the highway which have come to our attention were discussed. During the meeting, consideration was also given to the fact that, at a meeting of the Friendship Heights Citizens Association held for the annual election of officers on December 5, 1957, a spontaneous request was made of the new President that a vote be taken to determine the sentiment of the members present on the proposed routing of the highway through the community of Friendship Heights. The vote was unanimous against the use of any part of the community as part of the right-of-way for the highway. This result was reported in the Washington-

DB-13

Post and Evening Star on Demcember 6, 1957.

"We beseech you to consider the gravity of a decision to destroy an entire community where such a decision does not result from compelling and overriding considerations."

I can do no more than emphasize that fact to you and hope it will be taken into consideration with all the other factors you must consider.

I know we are all concerned with the public interest in determining where this highway should go, but I think you have to consider some of the private interests that are involved, and the destruction of an entire community for the purpose of a road which doesn't absolutely have to go through that community would seem to me to be a rather reckless decision.

Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you. I think it is very proper of you to make these statements. We would be suspicious of a community that wanted us to come through and tear them up.

(The letter mentioned by Mr. Coerper is as follows:

Montgomery County Council

December 7, 1957

Rockville, Md.

Dear Sirs:

It is our understanding that there is to be a joint meeting of the Montgomery County Council, the Maryland-

DB-14

National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the State Roads Commission on Monday, December 9, 1957 to discuss the location of the proposed U.S. 240 Highway.

The community of Friendship Heights, a special taxing area containing 103 homes is understandably concerned with two possible proposals of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission which would route the highway through Friendship Heights.

At a joint meeting of the Friendship Heights Citizen Committee and the Executive Committee of the Friendship Heights Citizens' Association, this date, the various proposals for routing the highway which have come to our attention were discussed. During the meeting, consideration was also given to the fact that, at a meeting of the Friendship Heights Citizens Association held for the annual election of officers on December 5, 1957, a spontaneous request was made of the new President that a vote be taken to determine the sentiment of the members present on the proposed routing of the highway through the community of Friendship Heights. The vote was unanimous against the use of any part of the community as part of the right-of-way for the highway. This result was reported in the Washington Post and Evening Star on December 6, 1957.

At the joint meeting of this date, it was unanimously voted that an expression of our sentiment against the

DB-15

routing of the highway through our community be forwarded to you. Our views encompass two basic considerations: (1) the immediate physical effect on our community and (2) the overall benefit to the county.

The two possible routings through our community proposed by the Park and Planning Commission would effectively destroy us as a community. The proposal running from West to East would require the condemnation of approximately 30 or 40 residences and would in effect demolish the entire western portion of the community. The proposal running from north to south would cut the community in half and also result in the condemnation of a substantial number of residences. Moreover, neither of these proposals could be economically tied in with either route C or D (two possible routes set forth in the District of Columbia Plan of June 1957 prepared by Clarkeson Engineering Co.) for the District of Columbia. Accordingly, we feel that it would be nothing short of reckless to destroy our community unless there are overriding considerations of which we have not as yet been apprised.

The proposals for routes C and D for the District of Columbia which are converged at Western Avenue, the D.C.-Maryland line, cross the line east of Wisconsin Avenue. The most economical and effective continuation of this line into Maryland would be up the eastern side of Wisconsin Avenue

DB-16

and parallel with it through land which is presently vacant or parking area and through a few pieces of improved property to the Chevy Chase Club area where one of the Park and Planning Commission proposals could connect with it. It seems completely uneconomical and even reckless to completely disregard such a natural route and to criss-cross Wisconsin Avenue devastating an entire community to accomplish the same result. The criss-cross routing coming north from the District of Columbia would require three separate grade separations at Wisconsin Avenue in D.C., at Willard Avenue in Maryland, and again at Wisconsin Avenue in Maryland, respectively.

Routes A and A-2 of the District of Columbia Plan referred to above would appear to result in the most economical tie-in for the county in that such routes could follow the B and O railway corridor along unimproved land and thus avoid the Wisconsin Avenue corridor which contains a great deal more improved land.

We beseech you to consider the gravity of a decision to destroy an entire community where such a decision does not result from compelling and overriding considerations.

Very sincerely,

Mark Shoemaker

Chairman, Friendship Heights Citizens
Committee

Milo G. Coerper

President, Friendship Heights Citizens Assoc.

DB-16

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Merrimack Park Citizens Association?

MR. THORNETT: I have a letter to file for them.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Mrs. Powell, National Capital Garden Club League.

STATEMENT OF MRS. BENJAMIN A. POWELL ON BEHALF OF
THE NATIONAL CAPITAL GARDEN CLUB LEAGUE

MRS. POWELL: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners of the District of Columbia: What I have to say has been said before and will be said again. I beg your indulgence because I speak for several thousand people who will be affected by your decision.

My name is Mrs. Benjamin A. Powell. I reside at 5805 Highland Drive, Chevy Chase, Maryland, an address which will no longer exist if the alternate C goes through in Maryland. However, that is a personal matter.

I am conservation chairman of the National Capital Garden Club League, which is a federation of garden organizations in Washington, D.C. and its surrounding suburban areas.

It is my privilege to speak for our membership of approximately 6,000 men and women who are unanimously on record as opposed to any invasion of our parks by so-called superhighways or six or eight-lane expressways.

DB-17

We respectfully urge that you, in evaluating the various proposals for a District of Columbia route for highway 240, will protect and preserve what natural areas we still have. We submit that this is in the public interest, and is consistent with sound planning.

Recreation must be recognized as an important factor in overall planning. Present recreational facilities are not adequate to our concentrated population. Protected natural places where there is some respite from tension and frenzy are woefully lacking in our traffic-conscious urban development.

Here in the Nation's capital we have Rock Creek Park, Glover-Archbold Park, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, and other unique parks which add greatly to the beauty and interest and distinction of our city. Americans take great pride in Washington.

The need for adequate highways is real and serious. But if we here permit encroachment on the parks which have been set aside in good faith, we bear the responsibility of setting a precedent which may have far-reaching and national implications. And once these nature regions are despoiled, or destroyed, they are irretrievable.

It is our earnest plea that in making your most difficult decision as to a proper route for 240, some route will be found which does not preempt our park lands.

DB-18

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: You haven't any recommendations, do you?

MRS. POWELL: No, sir, I wouldn't presume.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you.

Mr. Norwood?

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM K. NORWOOD ON BEHALF OF THE
CHEVY CHASE CITIZENS ASSOCIATION.

MR. NORWOOD: Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Board of Commissioners: My name is William K. Norwood, and I represent the Chevy Chase Citizens Association. I can't add any new facts or angles to the problem we are discussing other than those that have already been discussed.

None of the proposals for extension of Highway 240 come through our particular area. However, they do come close enough to it to give us some little concern and interest.

However, we try to look at this problem objectively to determine according to the best of our ability what proposal would seem to be the best for the community. I am authorized by our Executive Committee and by the Association to favor the river or canal route, which is indicated on the map as A-2.

Our reasons for this are that we feel that such a route will be less disruptive to the property values involved. It will be materially less extensive than any of the other

DB-19

proposed routes. The canal or river route would also eliminate the addition of a heavy traffic flow to a route which is already overcrowded. And it would not bring this additional traffic through the busier parts of the city.

Also, as has been pointed out in the past, this route would avoid some of the steeper grades which would be an engineering problem.

If the Wisconsin-Carver route were used, via the Glover-Archbold Parkway, you would then be preempting for through traffic a route which has been practically wholly for local use.

I realize there are objections to this proposal as there are to any other. However, our review of the situation, our study, leads our Association to the conclusion that balancing the human factors involved and the practical needs of our community, that the river or canal route would be best in the over-all interests.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you.

Mr. Stellhorn, representing the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

STATEMENT OF MR. ARTHUR K. STELLHORN ON BEHALF OF THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

MR. STELLHORN: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, and Members

DB-20

of the Board of Commissioners: My name is Arthur K. Stelhorn. I am Planning Engineer with the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission. I do not come to you at this late stage in pressing any particular route, but rather to make a few comments that I think are appropriate.

First of all, I would like to advise you, in the event you have not already been advised, that the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, in conjunction with the Maryland State Roads Commission and the Montgomery County Council, will hold a counterpart of this hearing January 29 at 8 p.m. at the Leland Junior High School in Bethesda, which is at 44th and Leland Streets.

If our hearings are as well attended as yours have been, and I rather think they will be, I dare say that the hearings will have to be continued for more than one evening.

I would like to just observe that we are a Park and Planning Commission and that we do not hold the park activity in any less esteem than we do our planning activity. Money-wise it represents of course a much greater portion of our budget and our activity.

And I might say we realize the importance of these parks. From time to time I think representations are made that would lead people to believe that the only type of

DB-21

park that is worth while having is the type of park which is a wilderness where you can get away from it all, and almost get away from any form of civilization.

We have learned a little bit about operating a park system ourselves, and we have learned that there are many ways of enjoying parks. To one person a park is only a park when he has athletic equipment and he is enabled to run up a score a little higher than somebody else's score or perhaps lower, in the case of golf.

Other people think of parks as ornamental features of landscape, perhaps little more than a triangle intersecting streets that is beautified in summer and spring with bulbs and other plants.

Others quite legitimately enjoy such activities as horseback riding and wilderness hikes and so on.

I would like to observe that on the map at the right of the center I call your attention to the Washington Circumferential Highway, that is the outer route. About a month or six weeks ago, the west half of that portion which is shown in green was actually opened to traffic. That would be the portion between Wisconsin Avenue and Connecticut Avenue.

The Commission has owned that land for many many years, only a very small portion of it has been accessible to any traffic except those who were the most hardy and who wished

DB-22

to hike through brambles and wilderness and so on. Without in any sense depreciating that form of activity, I think it would be no exaggeration to say in the more than six weeks the road has been open, there probably have been ten times as many people who have seen the park, been able to enjoy it, than in the preceding 10 or 15 years it was in existence.

Many people enjoy their recreational use of parks simply by driving cars through and looking at them. Many people find that no other use of parks is possible for them, elderly people, people who find it difficult to get out and walk and hike.

I would like to observe that our Commission doesn't feel that this problem can be wished away; we do not feel that the problem can be solved by building circumferential routes around the city. That is often advocated. We advocate a circumferential highway, and as a matter of fact I am proud to say that the first portion of that has been built in Montgomery County and as I said is open to traffic. If that were the logical way of handling traffic, it seems to me all the trucks would ever be able to do or even most passenger cars, would be to get somewhere near the edge of a city and be routed to some other place and when they got to that other place, they would be routed to still another place; except for the exchange of

DB-23

farm produce, it seems to me that would not be really getting traffic where it wants to go.

Most people do live in urban areas and it is necessary, I think I can say with complete backing of my Commission, that we believe that a road into the city is necessary and is important and do not feel the problem can be solved by simply skirting traffic around the edge.

Put another way, we do not feel that all of the gasoline tax money that is collected -- I dare say most of the gasoline is burned up on city streets -- should be used to build highways going from one state to another. We feel that a portion of that, a fair proportion, should be used to put good roads under the wheels of vehicles where they want to go.

I have just one other point that is perhaps peculiar to Maryland, as in distinction with the District. From my inspection of your maps and knowledge of the District's problem, I think you have two types of land you are dealing with; the open land is pretty much in public ownership at the present time. Your other land is probably already built up or nearly so. We, on the other hand, have quite a different problem. We have a great deal of privately owned land which has not yet been built up. These are our problem areas.

It is the hope and intention of our Commission that when

a route can be selected, using, enabling us to use legislation which was granted to our Commission by the State of Maryland, that we will place the route or routes, if more than one is selected, on our official master plan of highways, thereby giving the local authorities legal right to deny building permits for the erection of additional buildings in this area.

This is one of the problems with which we are grappling constantly and one we feel points towards your selection of a route.

May I again invite the District to send its representatives to our hearing; we would be very happy to have them attend.

Thank you.

VOICE: May I ask Mr. Stellhorn a question?

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: No, we can't have cross-questioning.

Mr. Richard D. Daniels of Chevy Chase, Maryland.

DB-25

STATEMENT OF RICHARD D. DANIELS ON BEHALF OF
RESIDENTS OF CHEVY CHASE VILLAGE

MR. DANIELS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission:

I have a very brief statement here which is filed on behalf of the 48 residents of Chevy Chase Village, who by reason of illness or inability to attend the hearings have asked me to submit this in their behalf. It is very brief.

(The statement referred to is as follows, in duplicate in order to include all signatures as requested by Mr. Daniels:

INSERT
PHOTO COPIES

*Return
photocopy*

BEFORE THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

In the Matter of the Extension of
Route 240

We, the undersigned residents of Chevy Chase Village,
Montgomery County, being unable to personally attend the meeting
of January 6, 1958, wish to go on record as opposing the extension
of route 240 by way of what is known as the "Wisconsin Avenue
Corridor".

We wish to adopt the argument made on behalf of the Village
by its counsel, Edwin S. Northrop, and endorse the alternate pro-
posal set forth in his statement. We also endorse, as though
fully set forth, herein the arguments of Gregory Prince, Esquire,
attorney for the Chevy Chase Club. We also invite the Commis-
sioner's attention to the resolution of the directors of the
Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce as adopted in their meet-
ing December 30, 1957. That resolution supports the Potomac River
route, - and condemns the building of the contemplated highway
through the present built up areas as selected in the recommenda-
tion of the Maryland National Capitol Park and Planning Commission
from Pooks' Hill south to the District Line.

The attention of the commissioners is further invited to the
hardship of the residents and businessmen in the Bethesda-Chevy
Chase area, a case in point being the suspension of construction
of a multi-million dollar office building near Wisconsin Avenue at
the District Line in the contemplated path of route 240.

Respectfully submitted,

<u>NAMES</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>
<i>Charles E. ...</i>	<i>...</i>
<i>William J. Kennedy</i>	<i>4100 Wisconsin St. Chevy Chase</i>
<i>Robert D. ...</i>	<i>4001 Wisconsin St.</i>
<i>John H. Knowles</i>	<i>4019 Oliver St.</i>
<i>Louise H. Knowles</i>	<i>4019 Oliver St.</i>
<i>Richard ...</i>	<i>4005 Oliver St.</i>

NAME

ADDRESS

Mrs. O. O. ...	4003 Oliver Street Ch. Ch.
Harbert L. Sherman	4100 Oliver St. Ch. Ch.
Mary C. Sherman	4100 Oliver St. Ch. Ch.
Lillian ...	5700 Kalsado Drive Ch. Ch.
James O. ...	4015 Oliver St. Ch. Ch. Md
...	4031 Oliver St., Ch. Ch. Md
Mrs. Marcus Cohen	4031 Oliver St., Ch. Ch., Md
John A. ...	4105 Oliver St. Ch. Ch. Md
Josephine C. Boyle	4107 Oliver St. Ch. Ch. Md
...	136 ... St. Ch. Ch. Md
...	140 ... St. Ch. Ch. Md
Alberta Louise	140 Grafton St. Ch. Ch. Md
Leon C. Chamberlain	144 ... St. Ch. Ch. Md
...	134 ... St. Ch. Ch. Md
L. B. ...	4023 Oliver Street Ch. Ch. Md
...	...

BEFORE THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

In the Matter of the Extension of
Route 240

We, the undersigned residents of Chevy Chase Village, Montgomery County, being unable to personally attend the meeting of January 6, 1958, wish to go on record as opposing the extension of route 240 by way of what is known as the "Wisconsin Avenue Corridor".

We wish to adopt the argument made on behalf of the Village by its counsel, Edwin S. Northrop, and endorse the alternate proposal set forth in his statement. We also endorse, as though fully set forth, herein the arguments of Gregory Prince, Esquire, attorney for the Chevy Chase Club. We also invite the Commissioner's attention to the resolution of the directors of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce as adopted in their meeting December 30, 1957. That resolution supports the Potomac River route, - and condemns the building of the contemplated highway through the present built up areas as selected in the recommendation of the Maryland National Capitol Park and Planning Commission from Pooks' Hill south to the District Line.

The attention of the commissioners is further invited to the hardship of the residents and businessmen in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase area, a case in point being the suspension of construction of a multi-million dollar office building near Wisconsin Avenue at the District Line in the contemplated path of route 240.

Respectfully submitted,

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>
<u>Chas. Caggiano</u>	<u>133 Grafton St.</u>
<u>Warrent L. Anschutz</u>	<u>139 Grafton St</u>
<u>Yella J. Beaton</u>	<u>128 Grafton St</u>
<u>Paul J. Knapik</u>	<u>126 Grafton St</u>
<u>Ray K. Lee</u>	<u>124 GRAFTON ST.</u>
<u>Esther M. W. Deak</u>	<u>124 Grafton St.</u>
<u>Herbert S. Burnley</u>	<u>118 Grafton St.</u>

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>
Edward L. Brown	120 Grafton St.
Catharine B. Brown	120 Grafton St.
Arthur B. Miller	115 Grafton St.
Ernest G. Miller	115 Grafton St.
Rebecca H. Brown	118 Grafton St.
J. B. Hill	114 Grafton St.
Mary P. Schulte	112 Grafton St.
Lucretia M. Mauls	141 Grafton St.
Corahy B. Townsend	110 Grafton St.
Patience C. Townsend	110 Grafton St.
Joseph B. Putney	110 Grafton St.
Lucretia C. Cooper	108 Grafton St.
Ann S. Cooper	108 Grafton
William B. Brown	106 Grafton
J. S. Rosenfeld Jr.	142 Grafton St.
Eleanor Rosenfeld	142 Grafton St.
Dr. Frank Jagger	146 Grafton St.
Emma Rosenfeld	138 Grafton St.
George W. Rosenfeld	138 Grafton St.

DB-26

MR. DANIELS: I also wish to add to that our endorsement and incorporation of the statement made by General Prentiss who spoke for the transportation section of the Washington Board of Trade.

There is a little amplification of that in this covering letter which I will simply file for the record, and I understand the record is open until the 10th. I have but the one copy of the signatures. If you would like that photostated, I will get it done, or if the District has facilities for photostating it, I will pay for it.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: If you want to trust the reporter with your copy, you can get it back from the reporter. Is that all right.

MR. DANIELS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you.

(The covering letter referred to by Mr. Daniels is as follows:

5802 Kirkside Drive
Chevy Chase 15, Maryland

January 6, 1958

The Honorable Board of Commissioners
of the District of Columbia

District Building

Washington, D.C.

In re: Route 240

DB-27

Sirs:

The undersigned resident and property owner in Chevy Chase Village attaches hereto a list of forth-eight residents of the Village unable to attend today's hearings and oppose the use of the Wisconsin Avenue Corridor for reasons set forth in their signed statement. We wish to incorporate as though set forth herein in its entirety the pertinent portions of the statements made at the hearing by Highway Director J. M. Robertson and Douglas Brinkley, Chief Planning Aide of the District Highway Division, as to the desirability of an expressway along the Potomac River Route. We also wish to incorporate as a part of our joint statements the statement made in opposition to the Wisconsin Avenue Corridor by General Louis W. Prentiss, who spoke for the Transportation Section of the Washington Board of Trade.

The writer resides at the Southwest corner of Kirkside Drive and Grafton Street -- one block east of the intersection of Grafton Street and Wisconsin Avenue --- where the proposed tunnel would bear west in crossing Wisconsin Avenue. This is an intersection patrolled by emergency Traffic Directors during school hours and furnishes protection for the children of Chevy Chase Village attending the public school at Somerset, Maryland. It is not clear whether Grafton Street would be closed off at this intersection

DB-28

by reason of the construction of the tunnel or what steps would be taken for the relief of traffic coming down Grafton Street to go into Wisconsin Avenue in the event of the widening of the Wisconsin Avenue Corridor. Grafton Street furnishes the route for traffic coming east from Connecticut Avenue and Chevy Chase Circle to enter Wisconsin Avenue.

For this and other reasons set forth in the testimony given before the Commissioners and the documents submitted by various witnesses at today's hearing, the writer takes the same position in opposing the Wisconsin Avenue Corridor as do my fellow-residents who have signed the attached statement.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Richard D. Daniels

Richard D. Daniels

- - - -

DB-29

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: Who else wishes to be heard?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER MC LAUGHLIN: If no one else wishes to be heard, the record will be kept open for any additional statements until the close of business on the 10th and the Secretary will turn over to the reporter for inclusion in the record any letters which have been received or communications affecting the hearing.

If there is nothing further to be brought before this hearing, it is concluded.

(Whereupon, at 4:00 p.m. the hearing in the above matter was concluded.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
EXECUTIVE OFFICES

WASHINGTON

January 6, 1958

MEMORANDUM:

The following letters have been received with respect to the Public Hearing to be held on Monday January 6, 1958 to consider location of Interstate U.S. Highway 240:

Letter dated December 31, 1957, attached, from Mr. George Bisset, Senior Vice President, Potomac Electric

DB-30

power Company, giving estimated cost for relocation of said company's facilities along each of the four routes recommended to the Board of Commissioners and containing the following statement: "On our assumption that the cost of relocation of our facilities, located on private property will be borne by the District of Columbia, the adoption of either Route A, Route A-2 or Route D would require less investment by us of new capital than would the adoption of Route C. Naturally, in the interest of ourselves and our rate payers we must frankly say that we favor the adoption of Route A, Route A-2 or Route D. This is especially so since as we understand it, this being a Federal Aid Project, the District of Columbia will be reimbursed to the extent of 90 percent of the right of way cost of the project."

Letter dated December 7, 1957, attached, from Mr. Frank C. Broadbent, suggesting that consideration be given to the possibility of acquiring the right of way of the Baltimore and Ohio Branch Line which crosses under Wisconsin Avenue (Rt. 240) in Bethesda between Elm and Railroad Street.

Letter dated December 7, 1957 from Mrs. Edward B. Morris, Secretary, Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, attached, requesting that the record of the hearing on proposed extension of Route 240 be kept open after the January 6 hearing date so that Federation action expected to be taken at its regular meeting

DB-31

on January 9 might be included.

Letter dated November 30, 1957 attached from William E. Shepherd, President, Georgetown Citizens Association, submitting a resolution adopted at its meeting on November 25, 1957 as follows: "RESOLVED That the Georgetown Citizens Association recommends to all agencies concerned that the District of Columbia component of the highway link between the new Route 240 expressway in Maryland and downtown Washington be located south of K Street in Georgetown and along the line of Canal Road extended to the D.C.-Maryland boundary, as specified for Route A-2 in the Clarkeson Engineering Co's report, referred to in the first paragraph of above preamble."

Letter dated December 12, 1957 from George de Sibrik, attached, opposing proposal of the Clarkeson Engineering Company.

Letter dated December 26, 1957, attached, from Alvin L. Newmyer, Attorney for the Milton Hopfenmaier Company, opposing location of this highway as proposed in Route A, A2 or Route C.

Letter from William Edgar Shepherd, dated November 26, 1957, attached, transmitting his views on several long-range planning topics which may come before the planning Advisory Council in the near future, and submitting a report on Route 240 containing the following recommendations:

DE-32

"In view of the foregoing considerations, it is recommended that all agencies concerned endorse: Reference a, Route (a) in the vicinity of River Road and Little Falls Branch Parkway in Maryland, and Reference b, Route A-2, in the District of Columbia, utilizing Canal Road extended, paralleling the Potomac River and passing south of K Street in Georgetown. It is further recommended that a study be undertaken to locate an accessible, municipally operated fringe-parking lot near the north ramp of Key Bridge in Georgetown."

Resolution of the Spring Valley-Wesley Heights Citizens Association adopted at a special meeting on January 2, 1958, reading as follows:

"NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Spring Valley-Wesley Heights Citizens Association goes on record as opposing the destruction of the Glover-Archbold Park by the construction of the interstate highway known as Route 240 through said park, and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Spring Valley-Wesley Heights Citizens Association goes on record as favoring the location of the proposed interstate highway known as Route 240 as recommended by the Clarkeson Engineering Company in their report, or a minor variation to this reported recommendation as proposed by the Highway Department, District of Columbia. "

Letter dated January 2, 1958, attached, from Robert J.

DB-33

Bird, opposed to the Wisconsin Avenue Corridor.

Letter from the Master Builders Association dated December 4, 1957, attached, enclosing a pamphlet entitled "Relocation Housing," which he believes may be of some use to the Commissioners.

Telegram from Mr. Orme Wilson dated January 5, 1958, attached, as follows: "I am informed that it is planned to Route U.S. 240 under Massachusetts Avenue and Sheridan Circle. I own the residence at 2406 Massachusetts Avenue which will be seriously and injuriously affected. Please accept this telegram as my protest against such construction."

Letter from John A. Logan, 2238 Que Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. dated January 3, 1958 attached, in which he says, "As a resident and property owner in the Kalorama Heights area, I strongly urge that construction of Highway 240 be on the so-called River Route indicated as routes A- and A-2. Such routing follows the pattern of other major highway developments, with which I am acquainted throughout the United States and Europe. Routes A and A-2 would, in my opinion, best serve the purposes of the residents of the suburban area and the business establishments in the downtown Washington area. May I ask also that an opportunity be given more residents of the Kalorama Heights area to express their opposition to any route through or near this

DB-34

section of the city, if construction of such routes is seriously considered by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

Letter dated January 6, 1958 from Edward D. Hollander, 2425 Chain Bridge Road, N.W., attached, opposing the proposed route for U.S. 240, and stating, "Under the circumstances it would be a scandalous misuse of Federal and District funds; and if the Commissioners insist on accepting the plans of the Highway Department, I would propose a congressional investigation of the waste of public monies on this ill-conceived and wasteful venture. By such means, citizens might save the city from this great folly."

Letter dated January 6, 1958 from Fred J. Kelly, President, Western Bethesda Community Planning Association, attached, containing the following resolution adopted by its Board of Governors on January 2, 1958:

"WHEREAS, the location of Route 240 in the District of Columbia will inevitably affect the location of route 240 in Montgomery County, Maryland, and

"WHEREAS the more than 1100 members of the Western Bethesda Community Planning Association are vitally interested in minimizing the impact of Route 240 upon their fully developed residential area in Bethesda and adjacent Montgomery County,

"IT IS RESOLVED that we strongly urge the adoption of

DB-35

a Potomac River route for Route 240, extending all the way to Cabin John, Maryland."

Letter dated January 3, 1958, attached, from Clarence B. Hewes, 2358 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. protesting against the routing of U.S. Highway 240 under the Sheridan Circle area.

Letter from the Merrimack Park Citizens Association dated January 4, 1958, attached, signed by Milton Eisenberg, President, urging endorsement of the Wisconsin Avenue Corridor routing for 240 within the District of Columbia.

Letter from the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce dated January 6, 1958 containing the following resolution: "Be it further resolved that the Board of Directors strongly urges the use of either or both the Potomac Palisades and Rock Creek Park locations as the lead-in legs for this route."

Letter from Alexander G. Henderson, dated January 4, 1958, attached, in which he states: "I hope that you will be able to adopt a plan which will preserve the parks for present and future generations."

Secretary to the Board.

- - - - -

(The letters and communications mentioned in the preceding memorandum, along with others, follow in the original transcript only.)

