GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Public Hearing, In Re:

DESIGN - INTERSTATE ROUTE 266 :

OFFICE COPY

RETURN TO

PLANAMIG RESEARCH SECTION

OFFICE OF PLANAMIG AND PROGRAMMING

DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC

FILE NO: 31.39 C

Wednesday, December 16, 1970
Washington, D. C.

WARD & PAUL

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

(202) 544-6000

692

693

698

701

722

727

734

742

744

755

758

763

768

777

24

25

Matthew Andrea

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

3 ---------

Public Hearing, In Re:

DESIGN - INTERSTATE ROUTE 266 :

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

Wednesday, December 16, 1970

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

BEFORE:

JULIAN R. DUGAS

Paris.

PROCEEDINGS

e e

MR. DUGAS: This hearing is called to order.

Our first witness for the morning session is

Eleanor C. Robbins.

7902 BROOKLYN BRIDGE ROAD, LAUREL, MARYLAND
MISS ROBBINS: What bridge design am I for? I am
for Nature's design forested river bluffs overlooking three
tiny islands.

STATEMENT OF ELEANOR C. ROBBINS, CITIZEN,

I have lived in the Washington area most of my life, but I have been in other States and other countries. How thrilled I was to return to the view of the Potomac. How civilized are we? Are we intelligent enough to appreciate scenery cherished by people all over the world? If so, we must save it.

The more land you pave for cars, the more cars will crowd the land. In cities it is not efficient to use only automobiles tomove traffic. Some people realize that to make city air healthy less space must be devoted to cars, more to plants. The bridge portends not only taking people's businesses and houses, but growing plants, even in public parks enjoyed not by just one family but by millions — including overseas visitors.

Every big city must have an efficient public transit system. Why not build it before our best view is destroyed

Gest

for more cars.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you very much, Miss Robbins.

Our next witness will be Mr. Simon L. Cain,

President of the D. C. Federation of Civic Associations.

STATEMENT OF SIMON L. CAIN, PRESIDENT,

D. C. FEDERATION OF CIVIC ASSOCIATIONS

MR. CAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hearing Officer, my name is Simon L. Cain,

President of the District of Columbia Federation of Civic

Associations, Inc., representing over 100,000 persons. I

reside at 517 Oglethorpe Street, Northeast, in the District

of Columbia.

At the outset I question the wisdom of this purported hearing since some of the matters upon which it touches are on appeal before the Courts. I might add that, terefore, we not waive any rights that we have as a result of my being here this morning.

I wish to reiterate our continued and total opposition to the construction of the proposed bridge. We view it as a complete waste of the taxpayers' money. The proposed bridge and all of its allied freeway projects are totally unnecessary and will leave indelible scars on our land for years to come. The desecration, the air pollution, the noise, and the dumping of thousands of motor vehicles in the Georgetown area are completely inimicable to continued

den den

wholesome human habitation. It seems that not only are many of our public officials unresponsive to the needs and desires of the community but are completely impervious to reason.

But we are supposed to be talking bout the design of the so-called Three Sisters Bridge. I think that a bridge approximately 2,750,000 feet high with no post in the middle and about two centimeters wide touching neither the Virginia shore of the Potomac nor the District of Columbia shore of the Potomac would undoubtedly be the best kind of bridge under the circumstances.

It has been advocated by many of the members of our business community that we must have the proposed bridget together with all of its connecting freeways in order to save the downtown. All of the studies with which I am familiar indicate that the contrary is true. Freeways cause a fleeing of business and most of it would be customers to the suburbs. Traffic would move right through the City.

How long must citizens hard-earned money be forcefully exacted from their pockets in order to support bridge
and freeway projects which will visit total destruction upon
them and their community? We demand in the name of God and
common decency that this outrageous practice be halted at
once.

Thank you, Mr. Hearing Officer.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Cain.

g.

MR. CAIN: Before I leave, there is one thing I forgot to make reference to. Let the record reflect I am referring to a picture that appeared in the Sunday Star on December 13, 1970. This is entitled, "A Jumbo Job to Unmix the Mixing Bowl."

Now, of course, perhaps to an engineer this may be

Now, of course, perhaps to an engineer this may be a tremendously beautiful and picturesque sight, but to me and the average citizen and many other attorneys, this is ridiculous.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

MR. CAIN: Thank you.

MR. DUGAS: Mr. Strickland.

STATEMENT OF RONALD G. STRICKLAND, D. C.

WILDERNESS COMMITTEE

MR. STRICKLAND: Good morning, gentlemen. My name is Ronald Strickland. I am representing the D. C. Wilderness Committee, which is a group of D. C. residents who are very concerned about our deteriorating environment.

I notice that I am the 100th witness, and you must be getting tired of hearing long testimony. The only thing I have to say is that we are unalterably and strongly opposed to this bridge. And I hope that after 100 witnesses, you have gotten the point that the best design for this bridge is no design at all.

Thank you.

	693
e e	MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Strickland.
2	Mr. Robert Ewell.
3	(No response.)
4	MR. DUGAS: Mr. Ferrier.
5	STATEMENT OF JOSEPH G. FERRIER
6	MR. FERRIER: I have an exhibit, Mr. Chairman, which
7	I will put up here, if I may, and I will leave this for infor-
8	mation.
9	MR. ABBOTT: Will you please furnish the specifica-
10	tions?
4 9	MR. FERRIER: In answer to the gentleman, yes.
12	Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like, as other
13	speakers have done, to officially protest the legality of the
14	hearing, with all due respect to the Chairman, on three
15	grounds.
16	First, there has never been a formal hearing on the
17	need for such a bridge.
18	Second, the Mayor and Council, whosshould be here,
19	if this is going to be a hearing in truth, are not present.
20	And, third, the bridge at the location designed is
21	illegal because it would enter Federal Parkland on the
22	Virginia side and Federal law forbids this.
23	However, I have given this a good deal of thought.
24	I have gone into considerable consultation on it, including
25	with Mrs. Joan Knight, one of your witnesses here on Monday

night, and she suggested that the Three Sisters Bridge
properly could extend probably only as far as the Three
Sisters. In this respect, it would save the ecology of the
Virginia side and also would not encroach on Federal Parkland.

My design, which I have gone through some pains to work out, would enhance Mrs. Joan Knight's idea, by carrying it a little further without touching the Parkland, by a large arch. This would be a tremendous tourist attraction, just as Rainbow Bridge in the Far West, 250 feet high, attracts tourists, although no traffic passes over. The Gateway to the West in St. Louis, 670 feet high, attracts tourists, although no traffic passes over that, and this arch here would be 1200 feet high.

It would be a tremendous tourist attraction. I would recommend that it be painted a soft harmonious gray to blend with the natural limestone of the region and the smog which is generated so frequently in this area.

At the top, I would have a helicopter pad, which would permit the radio helicopter to broadcast traffic information from a stationary point where various traffic crosses over bridges on the Potomac River, and also for the use of the helicopter passage to and from Washington and Dulles Airport for passengers who may want to go back and forth in safety and without traffic hazards.

The idea of the small windows at the top of the

bridge would be to have a restaurant and souvenir shop for the benefit of tourists from all over the country to this national monument. And there they would be able to get metals struck with the likeness of Congressman Natcher and Congressman Broyhill.

Also, at 25 cents a look, they could look through telescopes and see the various different historic battlegrounds in the area -- Antietam, Manassas, Bull Run, Fort
Stevens, Upper 14th Street, the U. S. Capitol Building, and the Emmbattled Civic Associations of Arlington County.

Now, on one end of this bridge, I would propose that we name it for Congressman Natcher, since he has been a very strong proponent of the bridge, and I would call it "Natcheral Bridge." At the other end, an artificial mound would support that end of the arch, and that I would call, with simple dignity, "Broy Hill."

In order to enhance the ecology, I would match the lower parts of this arch with vervain. On Broy Hill, I would plant sprigs of ivy from William and Mary College at Williamsburg, to give it an academic tradition. And this would go up the flanks of that particular portion of it and would be in good taste and it would also make it more beautiful.

At the other end, Natcheral Bridge, in honor of Mr. Natcher of Kentucky, and in thinking of Jack and the

4 5

Beanstalk, I would plant Kentucky wonder beans to go up there, so that it would be matched with green during our summer months.

I have heard one argument against this design, and that is that it doesn't permit freeways, but I am sure it could be engineered in such a way that sufficient money could be spent upon it to offset any savings on freeways, so that the funds would be available which many people are fighting so hard to spend and which many citizens are so anxious that they not spend on freeways.

I have also been aware of the fact that the Calvert
Street Bridge, now an attractive nuisance for unhappy people
who leap off it, might lose its luster and they might stampede
to this new design. But I believe, Mr. Chairman, that a
\$300,000 engineering study could work out a system whereby
there are no openings above the ground level, so that picnickers
in the park below would be safeguarded against any strangers
dropping in on them unexpectedly.

(At this point, the exhibit fell off the easel.)

MR. FERRIER: Just as you have seen the collapse of the bridge itself there. And that all of the way around, this is the one thing that should satisfy everybody — home owners, residents, citizens and taxpayers, would not have freeways going through their homes. You would not have smog emitted by this structure, you would not have to increase your parking

Q.

A.

problems in Downtown Washington. Tourists would come to it in droves. It would be one of the things which would enhance our third largest industry, which is tourism, and it would please everybody.

I commend it, Mr. Chairman, to the thought of this Committee and to the recommendations for our Mayor and Council. And I thank you.

The exhibit, Mr. Chairman, I do hope will be a part of the record. That is my intent.

MR. DUGAS: It will be admitted.

(The exhibit above-referred to, follows:)

(GOVERNMENT INSERT)

1 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Robert Ewell? 2 (No response.)

MR. DUGAS: Mr. Frederick Thomas.

(No response.)

MR. DUGAS: Mr. Jim Davis.

STATEMENT OF JIM DAVIS, PRESIDENT,

LIFE, INC.

MR. DAVIS: I am Jim Davis, President of Life, Inc., an organization of private citizens who are deeply concerned about our environmental condition in general and our transportation problems in particular. Life means "Live in a Favorable Environment." It was formed during this current year and is incorporated under the laws of the State of Virginia.

The impetus for forming LIFE centered on a Federally funded highway project in Northeast Alexandria, Virginia, which on close inspection seemed to have all of the hallmarks of every major road-bjilding project that is prompting citizen outcry across the Nation.

We founded LIFE in the hopes of bringing public attention on the lack of coordinated transportation planning in this reaion. Our definition of the problem is quite thoroughly outlined in a white paper published by LIFE entitled "The Transportation Crisis in the Northern Virginia Ecological System."

2.0

Across the Potomac we face gigantic problems. They are a product of urban growth. But our problems are also the result of a lack of coordinate planning between the three jurisdictions that live shoulder to shoulder, Alexandria, Fairfax and Arlington.

Several citizen groups are hoping that a coordinated effort toward intelligent transportation planning can be launched by these three jurisdictions. But, in the meantime, we must use hearings such as this to impress upon our authorities the need to begin to plan, not just for a road or bridge -- but for an eco-system.

We believe that the proposed "Three Sisters Bridge" does not lend itself to the type of planning that we must have. Our opinion is based upon the simple fact that this bridge would not be an isolated piece of a transportation system, but would link the District of Columbia with Virginia via an interstate highway. That highway came under fire through recent public hearings and the need for it has been questioned, challenged and attacked.

The design information which has been published in connection with this hearing states that it is anticipated that I-266 and I-66 will be built concurrently. Those who are concerned about environment hope that I-66 may not be needed, that I-266 may not be necessary. We hope that the environmental impact of a constant flow of concrete can be lessened, and

q.

M

9 50

that alternatives to massive highways can be found and that the quality of living in a metropolitan region such as that of Washington can be restored, or at least kept from slipping.

Our basic thesis in reference to the Three Sisters
Bridge is that:

- 1. This construction is not an isolated piece of metal and concrete that will span the Potomac, but that it is a link to a sprawling transportation complex on both sides of the river.
- 2. On our side of the river that transportation complex is not being designed to serve the people, because it is not being presented as a master plan to the people, and it can never meet these two needs until the people who are involved meet to talk transportation. So far there has never been a session between the officials of Alexandria, Arlington, and Fairfax to discuss common transportation problems.

behind their homes who refuse to sit down and talk about the possibility of having a sewer hook-up in 1970. We believe that no part of a transportation system affecting Northern Virginia should be approved until these three jurisdictions meet, talk, and launch efforts to coordinate transportation from their point of view. We are urging our City Council to launch these efforts on a bi-partisan basis and informally with Arlington and Fairfax, and through the more formal channels of the

Northern Virginia Planning District Commission.

3. Finally, we must reiterate what has no doubt been said here many times, that the Metro System now launched should be viewed as a possible substitute or supplement to major highway construction and that such construction should be deferred until that system is operative.

As an environmental organization trying to find a ray of light in the transportation mess that we are all facing, we hope that the design of the Three Sisters Bridge will be judged inadequate, if not from an aesthetic or engineering standpoint, then surely from the way that design cuts into the lives of people.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

Has Mr. Ewell come in yet?

(No response.)

MR. DUGAS: Mr. Frederick Thomas?

STATEMENT OF FREDERICK THOMAS, CITY PLANNING

COMMITTEE, D. C. FEDERATION OF CIVIC

ASSOCIATIONS .

MR. THOMAS: My name is Frederick Thomas. I am the Chairman of the City Planning Committee of the D. C. Federation of Civil Associations.

The first request I have, I would like to request

9.8

Time the

B

6

7

8 9

10

FF

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a little more time than was originally allotted to me, if that is possible.

Mr. Chairman, I appear before you today as a citizen of the District, Chairman of the City Planning Committee for the D. C. Federation of Civil Associations. The Federation was the vehicle used by citizen groups to bring this hearing about. And I would like to thank each group and person who came to our aid and helped when it was greatly needed.

It will be very difficult to present a case of any interest today when I am only one of many concerned citizens in our city. It would be difficult not to repeat what has been stated before me.

I further cannot summarize the total attitude of the citizens of Washington, or the citizens of the Metropolitan area. So I come before you with a few facts and thoughts for your consideration.

I am concerned citizens branded "anti-freeway." Why? Is the defense of one's community irrational? Is the desire to express our grief over the effect of air pollution and the effects it will have on our children wrong? Is the genuine belief that well-planned freeways are costly, destructive, and a poor solution to moving the masses?

Concerned citizens are here today and the many who have preceded me are tired of freeways, they are tired of being branded "anti-freeway" and "radical." These are

unsupportable charges.

In spite of the anti-freeway label, concerned citizens come again and again in an attempt to educate those who have but one ear.

I would further like to echo the feelings expressed by many. First, it is questionable if these hearings are legal.

Second, if there is any evidence or can any evidence be presented that the major Congressional members who are directly concerned with this bridge were asked to testify and if they were not, the maximum input in these hearings has totally been avoided.

Third, the Highway Department Report of booklet presented to the general public was grossly inadequate and should not have been accepted as a document for these hearings. It is inadequate because, as previously stated by many people, many of the diagrams shown have little or no relationship to what the bridge will do.

are located. And as the Chair knows, I do attend these hearings not only the day I testify, but on other days, to really get the feeling. The fire protection indicates locations of stations. I would like to find out how any of those stations can be of assistance to a person in distress from a bridge, when it is very difficult to get to the bridge when there are

A

tong

A SE

automobiles in the way.

It is like a highway when an automobile has a flat tire. We can't get to it walking and we don't think those vehicles can get to it, either. So their location, it is questionable what they will do as far as safety for fire protection.

As far as religious institutions, I am sure there isn't a church known that depends on the freeway for its parishioners. They don't use the freeway to save souls.

Most of the people who have testified at these hearings have good intentions. The so-called opponents of the bridge strive to save our city from a plight worse than destruction. They fight to sae the city from death and fight for the people. Those who advocate the bridge do so mostly for financial gain. Some who favor the bridge are not well educated in art or parks and fail to see the whole problem that the bridge will create.

Our many civic groups and citizens groups are caught in the middle of many city issues. Many citizens think we move too slow and talk too soft. Others feel if we work with the powers to be, we can be more meaningful in developing progress.

Therefore, to build civic pride and leadership, our Citizen Association must review the facts available in an attempt to lead its more than 40 civic groups in a responsive

way to reflect the feelings of its people.

That is why we oppose the freeways.

These hearings on I-266 have little design here.

I would like to review that for just one minute.

It should be noted by all present that in the I-266 design information booklet, page three, figure two, the bridge is shown with both sides of the river in a general manner. However, on page four, figure three, there is a blow-up of the Virginia approach. Note, there is no blow-up of the Washington approach.

Now, how did that happen? Well, I submit this line of reasoning for consideration. The D. C. Highway Department has dealt long with citizen opposition and has leanred to hide as many facts as possible. Their Virginia counterparts either lack the experience or are more honest. Either one is a reason, we feel, we have no blow-up of the District side.

Since we have no blow-up of the District side, it is our contention that no competent plan has been made available to the public indicating how traffic will be dispersed in the District, and that is a question I would like to at a later time in this testimony direct to our Highway Department.

Now, let's get back to I-266 on our side of the river. I want to take everyone back a little further than that, to Public Works Project 28-7. I want to be sure that everyone gets that, so they will be sure what I am talking

about.

77 9

That project title is "Potomac River Freeway."

Its location, G Street, New Hampshire Avenue, to the Palisades

Parkway.

Does anyone here know where the Palisades Parkway is? The Palisades Parkway, I am pretty sure our Highway Department, if they feel moved to do it, is a Parkway that starts to come through Archbold Park behind Georgetown University and is the main north connection for the Three Sisters Bridge. This is how the bridge will have to disperse traffic.

These are the type facts that are being held from the citizens.

The justification in that Public Works Bulletin indicates this is another important route in the District Interstate 266 river crossing. Its construction will provide the necessary connection between the Palisades Parkway to be constructed by the National Park Service, and connection to the Inner Loop.

Now, there is no indication of what will happen here, but I think all of us who are knowledgeable and start to put the pieces together, see that the Palisades Parkway, the Intermediate Loop which has been hidden for some time, they now have our citizens in an uproar in the Tinley Circle Area, are all connected to this bridge.

Ame

5 6

Why do we look at these old facts? The Federation feels to maintain civic pride, one must be proud, rational and reasonable. He must not only live in the area, he must be a part of this community. There are many important people in Washington, and as the many problems surface, the concerned citizens look to the civic leaders to step forward and lead the community through its time of turmoil.

This city is now facing a time of crisis and turmoil. There is an obvious difference on how to approach the city's transporation problem. Our Highway Department, whose employees are paid with these citizens' tax dollar, seem not to hear the citizens' cries and pleas about the citizen transportation problem. The unpaid concerned citizens cry out to be heard before the air becomes thick with pollution and/or smog.

Our citizen groups are like an army without a Leader. We know that we are in a conflict that can produce no heroes.

One of the most important people in the world and one of the most important in the United States and the No. 1 citizen of our city, has not had the time to review with the concerned citizens the problem of his city. By now, I am sure you all know I am referring to President Richard Nixon. I deem it incumbent upon me, as a representative of concerned citizens of this city, to spek the aid of our President. And

Beech

I would seek it through these hearings, hoping that these testimonies will reach his desk.

Mr. President, as a responsible citizen of our city, we urge you to support the citizens of your city, for we will not stand idly by while special interest groups, highway officials, needlessly deface our city. Nor do we wish to be an army without a leader. We all know that an army without a leader is very unruly, is uncontrollable, and fringes upon being a mob.

say this is a conflict that he as President should not be directly concerned with. But as a citizen, whether he likes it or not, he is the No. 1 citizen of our city and he should address himself to this problem. And I am very sorry, I know he has many obligations, but he should join the civic group. It would mean a lot to the citizens in this group that he has interest in where he lives.

At the close of Monday night's hearings, I questioned the Chair on how these proceedings would be transmitted to the Mayor and the City Council. The Chairman responded that the Highway Department would have that responsibility.

This appears totally unacceptable. These hearings are similar to a pretrial hearing where issues are brought up and a person or persons who are totally neutral should present the facts. Realizing full well that we have said this

g g would be done in booklet form, I would like to direct this question to the Chair at this time.

3

4

Who or how will the City Council and the Mayor be briefed, other than by written statement?

5

MR. DUGAS: You will have to address that question to the Highway Departments concerned, sir.

6 7

MR. THOMAS: I will direct that question to Mr.

8

Airis.

9

MR.AIRIS: I am sorry, I didn't catch all of it.

10

Would you please repeat it, sir?

100

the Mayor's office be briefed on these hearings other than by

I am not sure. If they ask for a verbal briefing, I will be

MR. THOMAS: Who or how will the City Council and

MR. AIRIS: Other than by written testimony? Well,

13

12

written testimony?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

happy to present it to them. But the hearing is prescribed in a policy and procedural memorandum that is issued by the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, that is, the Federal Highway Administration. That is the hearing type that we are proceeding with today.

Now, all of the provisions in that procedural memo-

Now, all of the provisions in that procedural memorandum will be followed out. They are spelled out in detail.

One of the most significant ones that you are inquiring about is that the Departments, that is both the Virginia Highway

Department and the Department of Highways and Traffic in the

District, will render an engineering report on the design of the alternatives that are described in the pamphlet and are displayed up here today.

This will incorporated the requirements of 20-8, and will be furnished the Federal Highway Administration and as a part of just the local policy in the District Government, it will also be submitted to the District Government officials, also.

MR. THOMAS: The answer to the question, I feel, is one that we could not accept because I feel the citizens would object to the Highway participating in the briefing, being totally pro-highway, without any input from concerned groups who are in opposition to this.

(Applause.)

MR. THOMAS: We would object to that briefing.

We feel that if the Mayor does not have the time, his agenda will not allow him to attend these hearings and the City Council cannot attend these hearings, that these hearings should stand on their merits. And if it cannot be presented by both sides, we feel that the citizens of the City once again are being used and we would object very strenuously to any briefing by the Highway Department without oppositional forces who oppose this particular bridge.

That is something that possibly could be worked out, but I do feel that the opposing forces should be represented

at any briefing

MR. AIRIS: I might just add, Mr. Thomas, that the hearing record, of course, will be made available. Whether we will be called for any briefing or not, I don't know. We certainly do not intend to have any briefing. But the hearing record will be presented just as given, and will be part of the submittal.

MR. THOMAS: Without being repetitious, I think my point was understood.

Mr. Dugas, I trust as an individual you have not been offended by the people who oppose the bridge. Our attack on the hearings reflect our belief these hearings are being held only as a response to a Court Order for design. We feel that it is gross misuse of the citizens' participation. We constantly indicate that there should be citizen input into the many things we attempt to do in an urban area, and we misuse the citizens.

We are now going through a total staged production.

This indication of design hearings and the implication that everything has been approved, and only the design is in question, leaves very little for citizens input.

We know you, as Director of License Bureau, and we respect your job and we respect your patience.

In completing my testimony, as representative of the D. C. Federation of Civic Associations, I respectfully request

two copies of the testimony from these hearings as soon as they are made available to the Mayor and the City Council.

but I think you will have to make your arrangements to purchase them from the reporting service.

MR. THOMAS: I am making that request without purchase. I am requesting those for the citizens of the city at the same time they are presented to the Mayor and the Council.

(Applause.)

MR. DUGAS: Copies of the transcript will be made available to you, any public place, but we will not be able to furnish them to you. If your own Association desires them, they will be made available to you by the reporting company that is transcribing the hearings.

MR. THOMAS: Do you think you could make them available at the same time they are available to the Mayor and Council?

MR. DUGAS: They will be available for your purchase at the same time. I suppose when the company does it, they will do several copies of it. You might indicate your desire to the reporter, who will let the company know how many copies you want.

IMR. THOMAS: I am hoping this testimony will be that request. Are you saying we have to make another request

80 0

before these would be made available?

MR. DUGAS: I would hope you would make your private arrangements about the number of copies you want. I am in no position to contract on behalf of your Association, sir.

MR. THOMAS: I think the request is simple, but it has become very complicated.

Hopefully, testimonies from these hearings will also be sent to the Executive Branch and someone in the Executive Branch becomes a part of what we are trying to do here.

In ending my testimony, I would like to move from that to a series of questions, if there are no questions from the Chair or from the Highway Department.

Then I have questions for the Highway Department.

I would like to know from the Highway Department, what month and date and year the Department of Transportation approved

Three Sisters Bridge.

MR. AIRIS: This matter was discussed in some detail yesterday. My memory serves that it was initially approved in 1960. And then again in -- I will ask Mr. DeGast to clarify this. Mr. DeGast is the Chief of Highway Department's Office of Planning and Programming.

Go almead, Mr. DeGast.

MR. DE GAST: The Bureau of Public Roads initially approved I-266 as part of the interstate system in the District

of Columbia, as cited in the information booklet, in 1960, June of that year. They authorized the procedure into the design phase, September of 1966. They subsequently authorized construction in August of 1969.

MR. THOMAS: Do you have an approval, sir, from the Department of Transportation after the date or just before the date in between December 5 and 6 and December 31, 1967? I have in my hand a Congressional Report, Mr. Kluczynski's final statement, with respect to the Three Sisters Bridge and I-266 as presented and planned.

However, the Chair acknowledges that the Committee will stand . . . its recommendations before the Congress adjourns before the end of this session, with the exception that if the Department of Transportation does not assent to these recommendations on or before December 31, 1967, the Committee will take whatever legal action is prepared.

I would like to find out, do you have an approval from the Department of Transportation before that date and between these hearings?

MR. DE GAST: You specified between certain dates and December?

MR. THONAS: Yes, sir. That is when these hearings tood place.

MR. DE GAST: Between the date of the hearing and December ---

4 5

MR. THOMAS: And the 31st.

MR. DE GAST: -- the 31st of December of that year?

MR. THOMAS: Yes.

MR. DE GAST: I do not have a record here to indi-

the report that I am reading from happens to be the one issued

Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee of Public Works, House

cate such an approval.

MR. THOMAS: Perhaps that could be looked into and

of Representatives.

н

But I will ask Mr. DeGast to discuss for a minute

MR. AIRIS: We will be glad to check that out.

MR. THOMAS: I am sure you will.

by the 89th Congress, dated December 5 and 6, 1967,

In relation to the bridge itself, according to that same report there is an indication here on that map that indicates the volume capacity by 1990 peak hour. I would like to find out what your projections are in the way of vehicles during the rush hour, or during the normal working day.

MR. AIRIS: Mr. Thomas, I will ask Mr. DeGast to respond to that. The rush hour at the present time is extended into a rush period of something like two hours. Now, it varies a little bit as to which hour is the highest, but generally speaking, the rush period now is about two hours in length.

3

1 5

8

7

8

9

10

72 12

13

24

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

with you the capacity of the bridge. It, of course, is six lanes, as explained in the document. I will let him mention the normal capacity for each lane.

MR. DE GAST: Would you state your question again? MR. THOMAS: I will rephrase it. You have 95,000 crossings of that bridge. That is for how many hours? MR. DE GAST: This is a 24-hour design or projected need.

MR. THOMAS: What do you have for peak period? MR. DE GAST: The peak hour ranges somewhere in the vicinity of 10 percent of that as a desired volume.

MR. THOMAS: Ten percent. According to the map indicated in this same report, page 138, it indicates the capacity of 5,000 automobiles and this, we would be talking about in an hour. That is the reason I asked what your peak period is.

MR. DE GAST: The 5,000 is indicated as capacity, one directional capacity, not to be confused with the two directional capacity that results from the ten percent factoring of the 24-hour volume. Your projection is for two ways in the booklet you issued, this document?

MR. DE GAST: Yes, the booklet that was issued projecting high and low and citing the, I think we cited something 70 to 90 thousand in the book for public information.

MR. THOMAS: As further indicated in this book, and

Î,

the reason for the question, since the bridge construction
has now been halted and we are aware that it had proceeded
to a point, I would like to find out from the Highway
Department, the foundations that are now being placed are
being placed to meet which design indicated at these hearings?

(Applause.)

MR. DE GAST: I think you cite this yourself, Mr. Thomas, that the work has ceased by court injunction, pending the findings that will result months after these hearings and the hearing testimony and record has been fully considered.

MR. THOMAS: I don't think you heard my question.

MR. DE GAST: Not to continue with construction ---

MR. THOMAS: You didn't answer my question.

MR. DE GAST: I am trying to cite to you, we are not now under construction and by inference I got this feel from what you said, in phrasing your question. I want to clarify that we are not now under construction. The construction that had preceded prior to the court injunction was in conformance with the three-span alternative.

MR. THOMAS: So what you are saying here is this other photograph here has no meaning. That is what we are saying. That this whole thing to the right here is just a farce, it is just a picture here for us. The District has already spent money on the three-span item and we are being permitted citizen participation. You are showing us something

you had not intended to build, on the pretense that this is an alternative. And I suggest that you have not built that particular one because of this article indicating that F. C. Turner, the Federal Highway Administrator, doubts the safety and design of that bridge and he doubts if he would approve it.

So you are building that, but this is being presented to the citizens as an alternate, knowing full well it has been challenged by the Federal Highway Administrator as to its actual design, its constructual design. Why is this being as an alternate?

MR. AIRIS: I will admit it is somewhat complicated.

MR. THOMAS: Complicated? This is a farce.

MR. AIRIS: Let me try and straighten it out for you.

This is the bridge for which the pier construction was underway. Here are the two piers, here and here.

Now, we were committed to this bridge. This is the one that was under design at the time of the court injunction. We have had to take a step backward in order to proceed properly with this design hearing. Because as you will remember, in the requirements for design hearing, the designs they have gone forward in a preliminary way but the Highway Department is not committed to any particular design.

Now, that lets us proceed with other designs, so that

Cont

8 9

7.9

the design hearing may be held.

This is an alternative design here that utilizes on the end spans here, that is here and here (indicating), the same locations for the piers as in the concrete alternative.

But it adds a further pier in the center of the river.

Did I make myself clear?

MR. THOMAS: Yes. And I would like the record to show that the Highway Department officials are in total conflict. The first answer was, they were proceeding with the foundation for the three span. Mr. Airis has indicated that they were proceeding with the foundation for two spans. If that tape can be rerun, I am sure you will find these two things in conflict.

MR. AIRIS: Let me try again.

MR. THOMAS: I am not interested in your trying again. I am only stating as a matter of record, hoping someone listening to the tapes, that the Highway Department's two officials have said something in conflict, directly behind each other. This is why the citizens don't trust the Highway Department and we have no faith in what they do.

I don't want to belabor that question, but the question of the foundation is one I did want for a matter of record and I think I did receive the type of information I desired.

MR. AIRIS: Let me just add, Mr. Thomas, there is no

conflict between Mr. DeGast's statement to you and mine. The 170 facts are the same. And if there is in your mind a conflict, it is because we didn't speak clear enough to you. 3 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Thomas, I wonder if we could A conclude in about five minutes? 5 MR. THOMAS: Yes, sir, we can. 6 I would also like to ask the Highway Department if 7 they can give us a brief analysis on how the traffic will be 8 dispersed into the District from the Three Sisters Bridge as 9 now planned. 10 Those 95,000 cars, I just want to know how half of 11 them are going. 12 MR. DE GAST: The design of the bridge itself that 13 is being discussed at this hearing will automatically ---14 MR. THOMAS: That isn't the question I asked. 15 MR. DE GAST: -- is proposed to turn to the Potomac 16 Freeway, as ---17 MR. THOMAS: Where is the Potomac River Freeway, 18 please? 19 MR. DE GAST: -- as indicated by the gray lines, the 20 connecting link to be the subject of future design hearings. 21 MR. THOMAS: Where is the Potomac River Freeway? 22 Could it be illustrated? 23 MR. DE GAST: This map shows the Potomac River 24 Freeway outlined in gray.

MR. THOMAS: This comes down in front of all of 9 the building and along the waterfront; is that right? 2 MR. DE GAST: Along the waterfront. 3 MR. THOMAS: What other means are we using to dis-A perse the rest of the cars? 13 MR. DE GAST: The total bridge traffic is designed 6 to be taken into the Potomac River Freeway. MR. THOMAS: So all of the traffic, you are saying, 8 is going downtown? MR. DE GAST: Distributed via the Potomac River 10 Freeway or connections from east of the Freeway. 7 7 MR. THOMAS: What are the connections east of the 12 freeway? 13 MR. DE GAST: Those that exist in itself and tie to 14 E Street, K Street Expressway, as indicated by Mr. Airis 15 yesterday, and local connections in the area, some of which 16 already exist. 17 MR. THOMAS: Mr. Dugas, I would like to thank you 18 for your patience and thank the panel, and I would like to 19 only say the Highway Department has done this intimate thing 20 again, has presented nothing. 21 (Applause.) 22 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Bozzi. Mr. Rene Bozzi? 23 (No response.) 24 MR. DUGAS: Mrs. Sarah Montgomery? 25

(No response.)

2

MR. DUGAS: Mr. Robert Ewell?

(No response.)

MR. DUGAS: Mr. Pankowski?

5

STATEMENT OF TED PANKOWSKI, IZAAK WALTON

6

LEAGUE OF AMERICA

7

MR. PANKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8

My name is Ted Pankowski. I represent the Izaak

9

Walter League of America.

10

Our testimony here today was to be given by Mr.

11

Larry Young, and with your permission, I would like to put

12

his entire statement into the record.

13

concern of our membership in the District of Columbia, in our

In summary, Mr. Young's statement reflects the

14

large and organized chapters in the Maryland and Virginia

15

suburbs, and in our other affiliates nationwide, who have come

16 17

to regard this bridge in the Nation's Capital as a test case

this hearing, we deeply regret that it is limited to "design"

considerations, and, further, that even so minor a concession

League was one of those organizations which petitioned the

Although we appreciate the opportunity to testify at

18

for the cause of environmental quality elsewhere.

to public concern had to be provided by Court order.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

U. S. District Court.

This action was authorized by our National

Coor

Z

Executive Board, based on the League's long-standing premise that citizens have a right to timely, up-to-date and full participation in the governmental decisions affecting their lives, their property and their neighborhoods.

Even though it is not the subject of this hearing,

I would be remiss if I failed to restate that ordinary citizens, including the members of the Izaak Walton League, have
come to know this bridge as a project whose contrivution to
the solution of Metropolitan Washington's transportation
problem is disproportionately minimal compared to the environmental havoc which it will create — on the Potomac River, on
Glover-Archbold Park, at which it is aimed, on the unspoiled
watershed of Spout Run in Virginia, on district neighborhoods,
on the District's already crowded and smoky streets.

The inevitable opportunities for mischief which would occur if the bridge is built as planned and designed have already been documented in our pleading to the U.S. District Court, and we incorporate them here by reference.

The League believes that in this day of environmental awareness and concern, it is inconceivable that construction of the bridge has proceeded as far as it has even under older standards of planning and governmental conduct, before the Environmental Policy Act. Questions raised by the citizens with respect to aesthetics, recreation, noise, traffic control, air pollution, historical values, the very design that gives

Paris,

this city and its adjacent areas its soul, should be answered, however late they may have been asked in the opinion of the builders.

The suggestion was made to me, and I don't wish to be facetious, that the only way these design hearings could be relevant to the real concerns of the people of this area, who are the alleged beneficiaries of this project, would be a conclusion by this hearing that the bridge and its approaches be built totally underground.

Mr. Chairman, speaking further for a younger generation which is going to have to grapple with the problems the bridge will cause, I would like to suggest that it is still not too late to reconsider the substantive issues involved.

This is the essence of Mr. Young's statement, Mr. Chairman, If it could be included in the record, we would appreciate it.

both of the District and of the Virginia suburbs for going on ll years, I think it is fair to state that this entire proceeding would not have occurred if this city were any other city in this country. The kind of practices and procedures which have involved citizens in this debacle would not be tolerated by representative government anywhere.

Thank you for your time.

Thank you very much.

2

MR. DUGAS: The statement of Mr. Larry Young will

3

be entered into the record.

above-referred to, follows:)

1

(The complete prepared statement of Mr. Young,

5

Mr. Chairman.

6

7 My name is Larry Young and I represent the Izaak

Walton League of America, a national organization of volunteer

9

citizens who are concerned about and have been working to

10

protect and enhance the quality of our environment. While the

11

League maintains a professional staff in the District of

12

Columbia -- with which I am affiliated -- our concerns over

1.3

Three Sisters Bridge reflect those of our membership -- in the

14

District of Columbia, in our large and organized chapters in

15

the Maryland and Virginia suburbs, and in our other affiliates

16

nationwide, who have come to regard this bridge in the Nation's

17

Capital as a test case for the cause of environmental quality

this hearing, we deeply regret that it is limited to "design"

considerations and, further, that even so minor a concession

to public concern had to be provided by Court order. The

League was one of those organizations which petitioned the

18

everywhere.

U. S. District Court.

19

20

En V

21

22

23

24

This action was authorized by our National Executive

Although we appreciate the opportunity to testify at

gen

Board based on the League's long-standing premise that citizens have a right to timely, up-to-date and full participation in the governmental decisions affecting their lives, their property and their neighborhoods.

Even though it is not the subject of this hearing,

I would be remiss if I failed to restate that ordinary citizens,
including the members of the Izaak Walton League, have come to
know this bridge as a project whose contribution to the solution of Metropolitan Washington's transportation problem is
disproportionately minimal compared to the environmental havoc
which it will create — on the Potomac River, on GloverArchbold Park, at which it is aimed, on the unspoiled watershed of Spout Run in Virginia, on District neighborhoods, on
the District's already crowded and smoky streets.

The inevitable opportunities for mischief which would occur if the bridge is built as planned and designed have already been documented in our pleading to the U.S. District Court, and we incorporate them here by reference.

The League believes that in this day of environmental awareness and concern, it is inconceivable that construction of the bridge has proceeded as far as it has even under older standards of planning and governmental conduct, before the Environmental Policy Act. Questions raised by the citizens with respect to aesthetics, recreation, noise, traffic control, air pollution, historical values, the very design that gives

4 5

this city and its adjacent areas its soul, should be answered, however late they may have been asked in the opinion of the builders.

The suggestion was made to me, and I don't wish to be facetious, that the only way these design hearings could be relevant to the real concerns of the people of this area, who are the alleged beneficiaries of this project, would be a conclusion by this hearing that the bridge and its approaches be built totally underground.

Mr. Chairman, speaking further for a younger generation which is going to have to grapple with the problems the bridge will cause, I would like to suggest that it is still not too late to reconsider the substantive issues involved.

Thank you.

MR. MR. DUGAS: Mr. Leslie Dirks.

STATEMENT OF LESLIE C. DIRKS, PRESIDENT,

FOXHALL COMMUNITY CITIZENS ASSOCIATION

MR. DIRKS: I have mailed a letter which contains the essence of my remarks to you, in care of Mr. Schaller, and I can also leave a copy here. What I will do is just read that letter.

"This letter summarizes the views of the Foxhall Community Citizens Association concerning the proposed Three

21-

Sisters Bridge. It is submitted to be entered into the record of the public hearings on the design of this bridge which are to be conducted under your jurisdiction commencing 14 December 1970.

"The views expressed in this letter have been discussed and debated at a number of Citizens Association meetings, most recently 3 December 1970, and are representative of the thinking of the vast majority of the Citizens in the Association area.

"It should be said at the outset that the Foxhall
Community Citizens Association is opposed to the construction
of the Three Sisters Bridge under any circumstances independent of any particular design considerations. The
Association is a party to a lawsuit now in courts sponsored
primarily by the Committee of 100 for the Federal City, with
the objective of stopping the construction of the bridge. The
Association has supported this lawsuit not only by its resolution but also financially.

on three simple conclusions. Number 1: We have been unable to find any convincing evidence that the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge will lead to an improved transportation system for the District of Columbia. Indeed, we suspect that building of additional expressways into the District of Columbia will contribute to chaos and confusion in the center

tons

of the city."

I might add here, parenthetically, it is also the view of some of us who looked at this problem over a period of years in some depth, that perhaps even many of the supporters of the bridge will find their support based on ill-founded conclusions and they lead themselves to be very disappointed in the overall results, particularly with regard to the traffic patterns in the interior of the city.

"Number 2: We are extremely concerned that the building of the Three Sisters Bridge as an interstate route will lead to increases in vehicular traffic through the fringes of the Foxhall area, much of this traffic passing through the city only as a matter of convenience and not headed for metropolitan destinations at all, which will in turn lead to a serious, even catastrophic, degradation in our living environment. This degradation will be contributed to both by air pollution and by noise.

"Number 3: We are deeply concerned that the Three Sisters Bridge, if built, will serve as the hinge point for an ever-expanding network of interstate freeways through the District of Columbia. This foot-in-the-door tactic has been characteristic of highway builders and planners not only in the Washington metropolitan area but also in many other parts of the country.

"If, however, the Three Sisters Bridge is to be

A

7 3

built, it is quite clear that this bridge and the associated access roads will lead to major changes in the traffic patterns on the D. C. side of the river. These changes will undoubtedly have a substantial impact on the Foxhall community. Unfortunately, the subject of the hearings is confined to the bridge itself and the section of the proposed I-266 connecting the bridge to the downtown area is only schematically defined, and in any case is not the subject of this hearing.

"It appears on the surface that the construction of the bridge and its proposed connecting links will not only cut off the Foxhall community from easy access to the downtown areas but also lead to substantial increases in the Georgetown, M Street congestion. Furthermore, the overall traffic patterns could be dramatically influenced by access and highway pattern decisions made on the Virginia side of the river. These, too, are not the subject of this hearing. We understand, for example, that consideration is being given to a major relocation of I-66 through Arlington.

"Any or all of the above issues could have an impact on the Three Sisters Bridge project. Furthermore, the citizens of this community find it very difficult to review and comment on the design of the bridge itself without at the sme time reviewing and understanding the major links to that bridge, particularly those links on the D. C. side of the

river. Inshort, under these lamentable circumstances, we find it impossible to offer constructive comment to this hearing.

"In summary, it is the view of the Foxhall

Community Citizens Association that this hearing should properly conclude that further expanded hearings are required if full compliance with the relevant codes and procedures regarding public hearings on highway projects are to be fulfilled.

These expanded hearings should address at a minimum the entirety of I-266 and include a careful consideration of the impact of the design of I-266 on local D. C. traffic patterns.

"Please be assured that this entire matter is of the utmost importance to the citizens of this area and we urge your careful consideration of the issues raised in this testimony."

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, sir.

MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, might I just amplify one position of the last speaker?

MR. DUGAS: You may proceed.

MR. AIRIS: Sir, since the Foxhall Citizens
Association is so close to this area — this area is so close
to the bridge, I would just like to check two small points, if
you don't mind.

MR. DIRKS: Please.

MR. AIRIS: One is, as you know, the bridge as presently planned does not have a connection into the Foxhall-

La

5 6

MacArthur intersection, and you mentioned it in your testimony. Would this be the preference of the Citizens Association? Or would you rather have a connection at that point?

MR. DIRKS: I think in discussing this issue at the last Association meeting, following a presentation which your people kindly gave to us, the general view was that it is very difficult to address an issue of that degree of detail without a clearer idea of what we are likely to end up with.

MR. AIRIS: You have no position on this point?
That is what I would read into it.

MR. DIRKS: I would hesitate to represent the Association in a formal way on that particular issue. That is not to say that the Association wouldn't be delighted to formulate an opinion on that issue if we could really get a handle on what was going on downstream, what was the probable impact of the traffic pattern.

What we would like to hear is some discussion of the projected traffic pattern. What are people in Virginia going to use Key Bridge for; what is M Street going to look like; how are we going to get to M Street. And out of that context, which is really a quite neat problem, I would find it very difficult to think the Association would form an intelligent view.

That has been the difficulty, frankly, Mr. Airis,

hosp

A

which we have had with the whole proposition now. It has been very difficult to get a tangible feeling to what, indeed, the total impact, measured in terms of our local area, is going to be.

I am just putting aside the larger questions now.

MR. AIRIS: Thank you. I am very glad to have your frank appraisal.

I had a second point and that is, since this is a design hearing and we should probably consider alternatives, does the Association have any preference as to either of these two treatments?

MR. DIRKS: I must be very frank with you, --(Interruption from the audience.)

MR. AIRIS: Would it be all right if I get the opinion of your speaker? I don't doubt he is the representative.

Either one of these two treatments or any other treatment, would you have any preference?

MR. DIRKS: We just couldn't focus on that question, frankly. It just didn't seem to be relevant to the total issue.

MR. AIRIS: Thank you.

MR. DUGAS: Mr. Rene Bozzi.

STATEMENT OF RENE BOZZI, LAMOND-RIGGS CITIZENS
ASSOCIATION

MR. BOZZI: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen.

I wish to say I am Rene Bozzi, the Transportation
Chairman of the Lamond-Riggs Citizens Association, and former
Vice President.

Lamond-Riggs is a Citizens Association of 3,000 paid memberships, families that live north of Gallatin Street, south of Eastern Avenue, and bounded on the west by the B and O Railroad tracks.

It is a "middle-class" but highly desirable residential neighborhood, and we have been opposed to any further interstate highways in Washington, D. C., either from the north, the east, or in the case of the Three Sisters Bridge, from the west.

We were first presented with the problem of the

North Central Freeway about five years ago. And by petition

and by active neighborhood meetings, and many other forms of

public expression, at the Department of Commerce Auditorium

and many others, we have 100 percent been opposed to the

North Central Freeway, the Route 95, and the connecting inter
loops, the Three Sisters Bridge.

We consider these things unnecessary in a city of our size, of limited geographica area, and we have been one of the foremost proponents of the subway while it was still

A

being fought by some very selfish people, such as Chalk and others.

But now that the subway is getting close to being a reality, I think myself -- and I represent the membership of the Lamond-Riggs -- I think that we should first build the subway, have it in place, and then consider the problem of whether we need anymo re commuter roads, interstate roads, into the city.

I know the temptation of the gentlemen in the business, I mean with all due respect, the professional people who have the job of building and caring for the roads. The temptation is there because 90 percent of the money will be paid for by the Federal funds. And Congressmen areaalways prodding them and saying, "Why don't you spend this here money, it is here."

But they don't count the cost in destroyed neighborhoods, destroyed housing, destroyed recreation 1 areas. You can't put a price tag on that.

So we must not be too easy, so quick to spend this money. Let it not burn a whole in our pockets. Personally, I think this money could well be spent for mass transportation and Congress could ---

(Applause.)

MR. BOZZI: -- and Congress could somehow, I know they could very well arrange to have this money spent in a

Total Total

broader sense than just pouring concrete and interloops and all of the rest of the stuff.

I have always considered that particular section of the Potomac River as one of the most beautiful places in this part of the United States. I have been motorboating and a canoeist in Long Island Sound in New York City, which was my home until 1941, but having lived in Washington, we have gone for years, my wife and I and my son, canoeing, boating, and fishing in that particular section around the Three Sisters Island. It has something lifting about the broad view of that area and something that does good to man's soul.

And I think from the point of view of recreation alone, think again before we put a bridge across that part of the river.

But primarily the problem is transportation. We are a growing population, and I think considering that the subway will cover the northern part of Virginia, in which I have lived for seven years before I moved to Washington in 1948, when the subway is built there will not be any pressing need for the commuter traffic by automobile from that part of Virginia. And if that subway is not sufficient, let us plan now for more subways.

A city of this area would have to be serviced by a much larger system of subways than we are building now.

For example, New York City, I believe, has four

lines and they are right now building another one and planning still a sixth. They are building a S cond Avenue Subway, and they are going to consider the Ninth Avenue Subway.

This is our solution to the problem of transportation. Rapid rail transit, one rail line will handle twenty times the passengers as one road and it is not affected by bad weather, snow, ice, or other conditions which sometimes choke traffic.

The highway officials, I know, are pressured again and again by characterless Congressmen who sometimes are not the agents of the people of a great republic which they should be, but rather agents of selfish interests — highway lobby, the Triple A, parking lot interests, bus interests, tire interests, gasoline, concrete merchants — a long list of self-seeking narrow-minded people.

And this particular meeting doesn't even cover, I mean is not represented by the Mayor and the people who should be listening to what the people are saying, and I have to say that I consider that a great fault about this particular meeting. And other speakers have spoken and mentioned that.

But the three sisters bridge as an opening to the whole system of freeways is just another toe hold and it must be stopped. Gentlemen, reconsider this and let us build a subway first. Let us hold in abeyance the building of this

A

5

6

8

9

10

79

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

bridge. It is unwanted and unnecessary. Because when we think of the Three Sisters Bridge, we think of the North Leg of the Inner Loop, which is right only a mile or so away from the general area of T and U Street, or as we have been told, they are not going to build the Inner Loop at T and U Street, because it is a Negro/black residential neighborhood of apartment houses and so on.

They are going to build it on K Street. We know the businessmen don't want it on K Street. It is going to be kicked around back and forth and finally someone is going to say we just don't have enough money to build it on K Street, I guess we will have to build it on U Street. Isn't it too bad.

But there are thousands of people that live in that area. There are some serviceable apartment houses and there are some three- and four-story residential houses. I have walked the lanes of that street and I can tell you what kind of a neighborhood it is, as far as residential area. And there is a crying need in this city for residential areas and recreational areas. We know very well that black people can't go out in Silver Spring or in the better areas of the suburbs. They just can't afford it, and they are not made welcome, not withstanding all of the fine words of some Committees.

And after you leave the proposed Inner Loop or the

24

K Street Passage, you have the east leg of the Inner Loop, then you have the North Central Freeway, which is not necessary. There are plenty of adequate roads going north and south and the only rush is for a short period of time around the commuting time, which could be arranged by better use of traffic lights perhaps, and certainly by building as many subway systems as we need.

These freeways would be a disaster to our neighborhood, because Route 95, I am sure, would have at least eight lanes right alongside of the southern border of the Lamond-Riggs area. It would be right alongside the Bertie Backus Junior High School. The children could watch the trucks go by and smell the fumes when they could hear each other.

What sense is there of building a road of that kind into a city, an interstate highway? It should be stopped at the Beltway and bypass the city. If Route 95 has to be built, it does not have to come into the city.

(Applause.)

MR. BOZZI: I can understand a financial problem.

If you build an interstate highway into the city, therefore it stands that the interstate highway will be — that is, the INner Loop — will be part of the interstate highway. Therefore, it will be paid for by 90-percent money. If it is not connected, by God, they are going to have to pay more for the inner loops. This is the thing that is pressuring the people

in the Highway Planning

They want tomake all of the interstate highways connected with the Inner Loop, so that they can be paid for with 90/10 mony

But let's face it. We don't even have the 10 percent in this city. The city is so bankrupt we can't even build the proper schools, pay teachers' salaries, get adequate teachers to cut down the size of the classes. There are so many pressing financial problems, and yet Congress wants us to spend money to pay for the building of more freeways, and not only that, but these freeways would have to be taken care of and paid for, repaid for by the city. This is another expense.

I believe the narrow-minded people who project designs such as we are presented with, without considering other alternatives, are trying to make this city a pitiful imitation of a city like Los Angeles, smog-choked, with a pitiful remnant of a city. The heart of Los Angeles is just lost, destroyed. Even the business areæ in Los Angeles are destroyed.

The problem of air pollution, poorly planned roads, the destruction of recreational areas, the destruction and division of neighborhood residential areas, and especially the destruction of valuable and needed housing in our crowded city, this is a crime to even consider this.

- 4

There is, as I said, rapid rail transit, which is a solution, which to me there is no doubt about. And I would like to say there are other things being planned by highway engineers and by engineers such as the men working with Goodyear, who plan and work and are experimenting with movable sidewalks. This is not a Buck Rogers' idea, it has been used in some cities.

It has been used in world fairs as far back as 1900. These things have to be considered, not just pushing more cars downtown and sort of destroying shopping areas, because people come downtown and get so disgusted, they can't park anywhere.

MR. DUGAS: Mr. Bozzi, could we conclude in about three minutes?

MR. BOZZI: I am concluding right now. I have the conclusion.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are dealing with a sensitive matter of social consciousness, a consciousness in which its citizens build and strengthen and protect the civilization.

Let us remember the examples of Washington, John Quincy Adams,

L'Enfant, and Bannekar. Those last two gentlemen, who designed the city; Jefferson, who worked with them.

These gentlemen designed a city that would be a proper setting for our democratic Republic, and we should always keep this in mind. Because once we destroy the original

plan, it is done and it is irrevocable. And the lack of social consciousness would only cause our city to wallow in a cesspool of greed and indifference with a callous disregard for the most desperate needs of the citizens of our city.

We cannot build any new highways, especially interstate highways, in our city and slowly destroy it. And I recommend for the Lamond-Riggs Citizens Association that we withdraw the plans for building the Three Sisters Bridge.

(Applause.)

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, sir.

Mrs. Montgomery.

STATEMENT OF MRS. SARAH MONTGOMERY,

SOUTH EAST CIVIC ASSOCIATION

MRS. MONTGOMERY: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen.

I am President of the South East Civic Association, representing the Capitol Hill Area. I will only speak as a very small segment of the D. C. Federation of Civil Associations who has gone on record opposing the Three Sisters Bridge.

The South East Civic Association, for 42 years, has been serving the people of the District of Columbia within the southeast quadrant to the Anacostia River. This area is also known as Capitol Hill. We are a member of the Federation

of Civic Associations, and we stand firm in support of its major agreements and disagreements.

We have in the past declared strong opposition not only to the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge, but to "freeways" in general. Our opposition remains the same.

The South East Civic Association is greatly concerned with the health, the safety, and all other conditions which affect the living of those persons whom it serves.

I come here today to speak not for those who have "abandoned" this city, yet continue to benefit from its industry and development, but for those persons who want to live here and who have to live here.

You state that your purpose for this hearing is to assure the public an opportunity to participate in the selection of a specific design. My purpose here is to let you know that it is not "design" we are concerned with. We see enough of that when we go through the South West area of this city — the "used-to-be" town of our poor.

We see design in the homes and buildings that stand on this "redeveloped" land that left many of our people homeless or concentrated in federally owned housing projects. What we are concerned with is clean air to breathe, and "America the Beautiful" preserved. Is there not already enough pollution? Has there not already been enough land site and wildlife destroyed, and homes and businesses demolished, and families

d de

1 displaced? No design can make up for this loss.

Mr. Chairman, the South East Civic Association today reaffirms its opposition to the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge. It feels that it is absolutely unnecessary and would be more detrimental to the people than needful.

Respectfully, the South East Civic Association.

(Applause.)

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mrs. Montgomery.

Mr. Vaughn.

STATEMENT OF PHILIP VAUGHN, CITIZEN

MR. VAUGHN: My name is Philip Vaughn. I am from
Iowa, fighting highways in Iowa. I received the National
Distinguished Service Award at the Wildlife Federation, which
Gaylord Nelson received the year before and Senator Jackson
received this year, too.

I fought highways a great deal. I have been to the Public Bureau of Road. I have seen a lot of people there.

I made a film of a highway that went through a forest that I grew up in. I met a great many people in the Public Bureau of Roads.

I would like to ask the opposition here, who controls the government in a democracy?

MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, is this a question to me?

MR. VAUGHN: To any of you who can answer that.

MR. AIRIS: Well, in the ultimate, of course, -of course, in a democracy it is the people that control the
government, and I would just like to add that it not your
Highway Department that is causing the problem here. It is
the people themselves. We are merely trying to take care of
the situation. My primary mission is as the Highway
Director in the City ---

MR. VAUGHN: It is the people themselves that cause the problem?

MR. AIRIS: Please let me finish — in the City is to keep the movement of people and goods moving. We are doing it the very best way we can. And what you are experiencing today is the public participation in the process. With the actions that are taking place here, the new developments that the Planning Commission, the Council and the businessmen are creating, such as the McLean Gardens increase, the other large developments, the great number of buildings that are going up, traffic generators in the downtown area.

This is what we must contend with.

MR. VAUGHN: But you are doing this for the welfare and good of the people?

MR. AIRIS: Please let me finish.

The Department has, of course, endorsed the subway system. I personally testified to it in the Foxhall area, that we have just heard. There is no leg of the subway that

disco.

1,3

comes through there. These folks out in that area are going to continue to have to depend on buses and private vehicles and taxis.

Now, only 35 percent of the load carried in the City here on traffic is the commuter. The other 65 percent is concerned with the movement of goods of various types and the variety of services and the other types of travel other than commuter. Not one, not even one crate of oranges, is going to be carried by your bus system or by your subway system, and I think of all of the crates of oranges and all of the other goods that have to be moved here in the City.

Your Highway Department, as I tried to point out, is trying to take care of the problem in the best way it can.

We are far from perfect, I would like to assure you, but on the other hand we are constantly criticized -- asked for relief from traffic on the residential and semi-residential streets of the District. And this is, really, when you get down to the guts of the problem, this is the only real purpose you have in building these facilities so that traffic, the essential traffic, can be moved on some type of a facility that does not conflict with the kids in the neighborhood, the school children, the pedestrians, and that type of activity.

This is the problem. It is not easily solved.

There are innovative types of transportation that are under consideration in the Department of Transportation and elsewhere.

They are not proven out. Maybe the next century will bring some innovations but not at the present time.

At the present time, we will have to use the facilities that are commonly known and in the best proportion that we can get them.

Thank you.

MR. VAUGHN: Who controls the Public Bureau of
Roads in that democracy? Is it by the wishes of the people?

Is it by the wishes of the people?

MR. AIRIS: If this is a request, of course, I think
I answered it before. All of the Government is controlled in
a democracy by the people.

MR. VAUGHN: Then, is America a democracy? Can we safely say America is a democracy?

MR. AIRIS: In my opinion, it is.

MR. VAUGHN: Can we say the people who control or should control the government in a democracy, can we say the people when given the correct facts should control their own welfare?

MR. AIRIS: Certainly.

MR. VAUGHN: All right. Then, those who disregard and disrespect the wishes of the people in a democracy are therefore enemies of the people?

MR. AIRIS: Please believe me, the people speak in many ways. I hear the group here today, but they also have

many behavior characteristics that your officials must take care of. 3 MR. VAUGHN: I don't understand that. MR. AIRIS: Behavior characteristics -- any engineer 4 5 can devise a more economic system for the movement of people 6 and goods, were it not for the people. 7 MR. VAUGHN: I cannot understand that it is the people's fault the highways are being put through. 8 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Vaughn, the Secretary of the 9 Department of Transportation in Pamphlet 20.8, Policy and Procedure Memorandum, has indicated a pretty wide range of 11 things that could be discussed at a public hearing of this 12 type, but he didn't get into civics. 13 MR. VAUGHN: Civics? 14 MR. DUGAS: Yes, and Government. MR. VAUGHN: And Government? 16 MR. DUGAS: He didn't get into that. 17 MR. VAUGHN: Well, Mr. Volpe is a road builder. 18 really can't trust a road builder with civics. 19 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Volpe didn't put this together. This 20 was before Mr. Volpe. So you had better go back a little bit 21 before Mr. Volpe. 22 MR. VAUGHN: Mr. Boyd? 23 MR. DUGAS: It was probably devised under Mr. Boyd. 24 You don't trust him, either? 25

MR. VAUGHN: Probably not.

MR. DUGAS: I thought not. But what I am trying to say to you is that we have a limitation on time. And I am enjoying this tremendously. You remind me so much of my son. He does the same thing to me. But if we could just narrow it down to the 23 things that this memoranda talks about, and if you are not familiar with those ---

MR. VAUGHN: But this is bringing it into a wide aspect which is important and which is part of this whole process.

MR. DUGAS: We have some time limitations and we have some people who have signed up before you. I fitted you in, and I would hope that you could, you know, within the rather wide parameter that we are allowing, meet somewhere close to the 23 things that the memoranda addresses itself to.

MR. VAUGHN: May I continue?

MR. DUGAS: Surely, sir.

MR. VAUGHN: And if I diverse ---

MR. DUGAS: I don't want to do that, because I am enjoying it tremendously. I just wish I had more time for it.

And Mr. Airis apparently is enjoying it, too, because he is going on and on and on. I didn't want to stop him.

MR. VAUGHN: Let us continue. This established

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

authority, are the Communists the enemies of the people and are they seeking to destroy the nation? Let me just say, is this true? Are the Communists seeking to destroy this nation?

MR. DUGAS: I don't know that Mr. Airis is competent to answer that question.

MR. AIRIS: I am a Highway Director. Please don't get me into the philosophical approach, into the intricacies of some of the various types of governments. I am not qualified in that field. Maybe you are.

MR. VAUGHN: A young man seemed to have been brought into this world rather young and is still kind of alive, I hope to say. I am trying to get at the roots of the problem, not the expediencies of the problem. The route of the entire problem which is embodied here, and I would like to see if you would just answer some of these questions, which I think are part of the entire question.

MR. AIRIS: Anything that concerns the movement of people and goods and such, I will be very happy to respond to and I will. And if you would like to continue the philosophical discussion at a later time, I will be very happy to talk to you. I enjoy it, really.

MR. VAUGHN: I think the time is right, right now, with the people here.

MR. DUGAS: Mr. Vaughn, I am afraid I am going to have to rule that type of question out of order.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. VAUGHN: Okay. Let me ask this question. Can 9 we say that highways and all that follows highways are 2 quickly destroying the integral nature of man in this country? 3 I would like to recall Mobrey's (?) book, "A Road to Ruin." 1 MR. AIRIS: Is that a question to me? 13 MR. VAUGHN: "If you put all of the concrete and 6 all of the highways together in this country, you would cover 7 the State of West Virginia with asphalt and concrete." 8 This is incredible. And every day it is being 9 built more and more and more. Can we say that putting this 10 amount of land under concrete is destroying the land? 11 MR. DUGAS: Is this a question? 12 MR. AIRIS: What is the question? 13

MR. VAUGHN: Is putting it under concrete, making it a desert, making it devoid of life, destroying a fine fabric between nature and man?

MR. AIRIS: I can't respond as to your arithmetic, I have not gone through it. I don't know anything about it. But I do know in the District here, though, under the present trend, there will be less pavement, less highway pavement, even with the full 29 miles of freeway here, in the next decade the way we are closing streets and roads here, than there has been a decade ago. This works out by aritimetic.

MR. VAUGHN: Do the people in the Highway Department concern themselves about human beings and about their welfare? 0.0

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

30

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I think you said the Government officials are.

All right, if it is true, I have encountered in my travels an incredible amount of misery caused by highways. An incredible amount of misery. People have died from highways, I have met. People's trees have been taken away, they planted years and years ago. Not only that, 5,000 farms have been put under concrete already. Farms, private citizens' homes.

What would happen if someone were to come along and destroy your home immediately? The anguish that it causes is incredible. The misery that it causes, and it lasts so long.

Have you been in a residential area for 15 years of your entire life and then it immediately is being destroyed? You are given 30 days to get out. I mean, even though it is a slum, even though it is a slum, a child will say, "Well, this is my home anyway."

But the anguish that this causes? Is it worth it? I ask you, not anyone else, just of the Highway Administration? Could you answer that?

MR. AIRIS: I will be glad to answer any specific question pertaining to the problem at hand here.

MR. VAUGHN: The problem is people and a road. The problem is people and a road, and the road is destroying the people. The road is destroying this land. The roads are destroying the land.

25

1	MR. ABBOTT: Did Mrs. Airis want a Beltway running
2	through your home?
3	MR. VAUGHN: Mrs. Airis didn't want the outer
4	Beltway through her home
5	MR. DUGAS: Mr. Vaughn, we are going to have to be
6	a little more orderly now. What Mrs. Airis wanted around her
7	home has absolutely nothing to do with the matter before us.
8	MR. VAUGHN: Why doesn't it?
9	MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Chairman, it was in a letter
10	introduced in the last hearing.
11	MR. DUGAS: Mr. Abbott, I am not going to have any
12	disruptions in this hearing from you today or any other time.
13	Mr. Guard, unless Mr. Abbott is speaking, I would
14	hope you would maintain order in this room, either by having
15	him be seated or by removing him, sir.
16	Go ahead, Mr. Vaughn.
17	MR. VAUGHN: The people have said they do not want
18	the highway. Eighty-five of the people do not
19	MR. DUGAS: May I just interrupt you again.
20	For the benefit of you ladies and gentlemen in the
21	audience, at 12:00 o'clock we are going to recess until 2:00
22	o'clock. So, Mr. Vaughn, you have until 12:00 o'clock.
23	MR. VAUGHN: Well,
24	MR. DUGAS: Fifteen minutes.
25	MR. VAUGHN: Well, back to the Communist. The

Communists are destroying this land, they tell me. I think it is the people who espouse the highways. Now only the highways, the people who destroyed life for their own profit, for other people's profit. These are the people who should be condemned and punished. I should like to finish on this thought.

These are the true enemies of the people. Whether it is Vietnam or here. These are the enemies of the people These are enemies right here of the people because of their blindness, because of their callousness. But the truth comes to the top and we know exactly who is destroying this land. It is not the Communists, it is the rich, it is the lords and dollars. The dollars and other bureaucratic Latins and their Mafia. These are the enemies that destroy life and profit in this country and others.

And this is really wonderful. I stand here and I feel everyone, most all of the people here are against the road, and that is beautiful to me because it shows me that the people are gaining more respect for themselves and they are going to put these bastards out eventually. Through any means necessary.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Vaughn.

Mr. Wesley.

2

4

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

37

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

STATEMENT OF EDWIN F. WESLEY, JR.,

7101 RIDGEWOOD AVENUE, CHEVY CHASE, MARYLAND

MR. WESLEY: I appreciate that because I have to be in Rockville.

I live in Montgomery County and I have some formal remarks and some informal ones which I will get in first. I came here because I feel that my county ought to be represented. Now, I am not a member of the County Government, but I was on a slate of candidates that was running in the county elections last fall. We called ourselves the "Nonpartisans for Better Montgomery County."

Four years ago we pulled about 70 or 80 thousand votes in the County. So many that the two major parties went to Annapolis and got us off the ballot this time.

But I think Mr. Airis and others are probably aware by now that our new County Government and our State Delegation are very unhappy with some of the freeway plans of the District, particularly the North Central Freeway. They haven't spoken on the others and I thought I would.

I will just say in brief that I think to wound and displace the people, the citizens, the ordinary humble people, the Federal City, and to scar the face of the city irreparably, to scar the old dream of Jefferson and L'Enfant, if we could have a beautiful place to live, to do those things for the convenience of interstate traffic, and getting suburbanites,

1.0

myself included, into the City, I really think it is a sin against God and man to do that. And I want to come here and say it.

Now, I will read my prepared remarks and I will try to be very brief.

Conference on Children, which is going forward — or backward — or somewhere — or nowhere — this week in Washington, a committee of lesser notables has been meeting together down by the North abutment of the old Aueduct Bridge — the same bridge, that in simpler and more chivalrous times carried cannons and wagons and infantry into Old Virginny, just above Chain Bridge. And back, sometimes pretty damned fast, in those unauthorized retrograde movements dear to the heart of soldiers, and which, in that age, was called "skedaddling."

The wagons full of wounded, then, and the groans of the dying.

It seems the old Aqueduct abutment, which carried those soldiers, and canal boats before and after them, has been threatened by your bridge -- or rather, by the Potomac Freeway, one of those imperishable monuments to the complexity, if not the cupidity, of our own less chivalrous time.

Well, the committee of lesser notables, which does not want to see the Federal City "netted together from a transportation standpoint," -- to use Mr. Airis' words -- has suggested that we take the whole damned concrete net, bridge

and all, and dump it on Potomac, Maryland — so that, given the parameters and diameters of Mr. Airis' concrete net, every mole and molehill and woodchuck den, and skunk burrow of the Montgomery County piedmont could have instant communication with every other den and burrow and hill. And the bridge, if we build the six spanner, could be laid on its side across Mt. Sugarloaf, where it would provide a link with a similar concrete net the Maryland State Roads Commission is building for the moles and chucks and skunks — and foxes, I might add — of Frederick County. By laying the bridge on its side, the piers wouldn't interfere with the crew races the eagles hold on the Mountain summit. I should explain that the Eagles versus the Hawks is an old Frederick County tradition.

Here follows the full report of the committee of lesser notables -- scrawled in verse at the base of an old Sycamore stump at -- near Three Sisters Island, and this is their report:

What can be said of the Three Sisters Bridge?

"It's a great boondoggle," an old muskrat said,

"for truckers and cabbies, and used car dealers, and their

real estate friends -- who couldn't care less about me and my

kin. And think still less of the city and its people."

"You're right," said skunk from the sycamore stump,

"and from where I sit the whole thing smells. They're mad at

dia di

the river, and that's what's behind it: 'build the bridge, a and to hell with the view.' They're crazy."

"And getting rich," said mole, "but they're not the richest. For I've heard tell of the Highway Lobby, puffed up men who live 'high on the hog', and wreck towns and cities pursuing their hobby, which simply is: to pave the whole damned countryside, and the sun and moon, and oceans — and the Milky Way, beside. You smile. Well, don't. They're at work on a super asphalt to do it with, and a big new truck to carry the sun where they divert and process its beams, and sell them to the poor, packaged sun to illuminate the smog.

I heard that idea from their 'Concept Team.'"

"It's sad," said the old chieftan, whose wraith still broods by the river: "they're crazy, and in the saddle.

Oh, how long will they smash people's dreams?"

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. DUGAS: Miss Agnew?

STATEMENT OF MISS MARIAN K. AGNEW, CITIZEN

MISS AGNEW: My name is Marian Agnew. I represent my own point of view. I am on the Steering Committee of the Dranesville Environmental Force in the Dranesville District of Virginia.

Gentlemen.

"No design of a Three Sisters Bridge can increase

Quie.

the capacity of Arlington or D. C. streets to efficiently carry more traffic." Walter Fauntroy said this to you on Monday and he should know. He lives here. He hasn't, unlike many others, left the City. The latest Census figures show that in the course of natural selection of dwelling places, people are leaving. More would go if they had a viable choice.

The core of this great metropolis is gradually becoming the hole in the donut. Why? There is one major
reason -- because the life support systems of the inner city
have become so overloaded that people flee from it. The main
cause of this overload is the internal combustion engine,
automobiles and trucks.

The airborne filth that is generated by cars, the unbearable noise that progressively deafens everyone within earshot and has been proved to cause neurosis, the high concentrations of nitrates and phosphates that contain more pollutants than treated sewage that wash off the city streets into the Potomac, all these factors indicate the true nature of the cancer that has invaded our Inner City. And the more automobiles that are accommodated, the faster the cancer grows and the deterioration spreads.

Washington streets, alleys, parking facilities are operating at capacity now and will continue to do so whether or not this bridge is built. And people in auto-related

monopoly of the transportation business. Bus service is grossly inefficient at best as was proved by the study of the Mt. Vernon Council during the recent rate hearings.

The citizens themselves devised an efficient system because the efficiency of their bus system was so completely out of date.

There is no possible way to alleviate inner city traffic problems now or in the future by buildings more roads, or bridges, or parking garages, no matter how pretty they are. Because, by doing so, you are successfully eliminating the reasons people use the city. It is no longer a pleasure to come here even to visit our historic monuments or museums. Tourists only make it because they come through the traffic mishmash by bus. Shopping here in the downtown area is impossible. At this time of year, the "No Space at the Inn" could be rephrased as "No Place in the Parking Garage."

This morning I drove around for an hour and a half before I found a place to park my car. And I almost got a ticket.

(Applause.)

my car into this City. I would never bring it in again to shop. And I am never going to shop in the middle of D. C. again. This place, as far as I am concerned, is a complete

wasteland.

As a child, I vividly remember the New York
World's Fair in New York, 1940 — the great prewar exhibition
of the wonders that science was going to perform for us. The
Perisphere was filled with a "futurama" — landscape of the
future. Sweeping roadways, cloverleaf intersections, graceful
bridges spanning plastic rivers in a miniature motoized preDisneyland environment.

We were above, giants, looking down upon this miraculous landscape; Now, 30 years later, we have become the toys, this monster we have created is controlling and destroying us. We are hopelessly locked into concepts that are at least 30 years old. And at these hearings you have heard from people whose business it is to make sure that we will never be free from this intolerable and outdated highway stem.

Gentlemen, please listen. It is up to you to decide whether or not the monstrously destructive forces that we have unleashed upon the community are going to, in fact, destroy that community. No bridge will alleviate traffic congestion. It will just transfer that congestion to the next constriction in the network.

More volume, more constrictions, and it is in the interests of those in auto-related industries to constantly increase that volume. They have told you so here in the past

5 6

few days. There is no end to this cycle -- no, I am wrong, there is an end. The last constriction is where the people are, homes, schools, shops -- when they go, nothing is left.

The only design for this bridge I would deem acceptable is a bridge limited to bicycle and hiking traffic, linking both sides of the Potomac Heritage Trail. Bikers and hikers cannot now cross the river on any bridge because of the heavy traffic. And we are hoping that with an increase in biking commuting by bicycle, getting more people on their feet and walking down trails again, we may once again start to make some sense in our traffic patterns.

So if you must build the Three Sisters Bridge, build a hiking-biking bridge.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

The hour is now 12:00 and we will adjourn the hearing until 2:00 o'clock.

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

2:00 p.m.

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DUGAS: Mrs. Cram, or Miss Cram. STATEMENT OF PRISCILLA CRAM, STUDENT

MISS CRAM: I am a sophomore at Montgomery County and currently I am majoring in geography and, more precisely, urban planning.

My urban courses this semester . . . in some detail of the freeways in Washington, most particularly the North Central Freeway. Although my study has been primarily concerned with this one portion of the freeways, I think the study is relevant to the entire system, also. Since I reside in Upper Montgomery County and have relatively little connection with the District of Columbia, I think I can judge the North Central Freeway as well as the other freeways and the Three Sisters Bridge in an unemotional and unbiased way.

I have gathered a great deal of the reports published about the freeways as well as magazine articles, newsletters and pamphlets on this subject. I have, on the basis of my findings, arrived at one major conclusion.

The inadequacy of the planning done with regard to this subject is disgusting. Not only are the plans incomplete in that one single plan that I have been able to find has dealt with the entire problem sufficiently, but also the inconsistency of the data in each report which has been

presented makes it difficult to judge the validity of any single recort.

In some reports, the social factors of the freeway, such as the displacement of great numbers of low-income families, are totally ignored. While in others, the economic need for the freeway is not presented. I have found no studies pertaining to the effects on health or environment which would be produced by the increase of traffic into the City, nor have I found any plan for accommodating the immense increase in the volume of parking spaces needed.

Not even to mention what will happen to low-income blacks who will be displaced.

I understand that as a student, and certainly a beginner in this field, I am not competent enough to thoroughly understand the entire scope of this project. Also, however, if I can detect so many inconsistencies and inadequacies of the plan upon twhich the freeway system may be built, I am hesitant to think of the number of uncertainties that lie within these reports that I have known of.

I also read in Subsection A of Section 128 of Title

23, U. S. Code, that "Any state highway department which

submits plans for a federal-ail highway project involving the

bypassing of or going through any city, town or village, either

incorporated or unincorporated, shall certify to the Secretary

that it has considered the economic and social effects of such

Arm

And du

a location, its impact on the environment and its consistency with the goals and objectives of such planning as has been promulgated by the community."

Act of 1969, Section 102, that Congress directs that all agencies of the Federal Government shall utilize a systematic interdisciplinary approach, include in Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on (1) the environmental impact of the proposed action; (2) any adverse environmental impact which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented; (3) alternatives to the proposed action; (4) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment, maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and (5) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

meets the criteria set by the law. Design means appropriate physical expression of the detailed program. If the program includes meeting the national policy, and I quote from the National Environment Policy Act, encourage productivity and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment, to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and the biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare

of man.

Then this design does not appear to meet the program.

Nor does it appear that the proposed I-266, in that the

balance of the system has been developed in full considera
of "The economic and the social effects of such a location

and its impact on the environment."

This was the conclusion of earlier studies and it does not appear that adequate consideration has occurred subsequently.

I am aware that an engineering firm took a look at the plan already submitted over a period of three months and came up with substantially the same conclusion they started with. It does not appear that three months' study by an engineering firm is adequate to carry out a real impact study of the location of such a major and complex system of urban highway and its bridge connections. That is, a real study which utilizes a systematic interdisciplinary approach, which develops a serious elaboration of the environment impact of the proposed action, which states the adverse environmental impacts.

Such a real study would have set forth the alternatives to the proposed action and set forth the relationship
between local short-term uses of man's environment and the
maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity and
irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which

See See

would be involved.

It seems to me that the Nation's Capital is too important to be planned in this way, ignoring, it seems, Federal law and national policy.

Some of the finest developments in the country are found right here in Georgetown and some of the finest development potential. So long as transportation criteria are used for planning, in the absence of social, economic and environmental criteria, major transportation public works will be detrimental to the very centers they are meant to serve.

The Nation's Capital is too important, too superlative, too complex and too significant to the nation as well as to the millions of people in this metropolitan area, to be subjected to an inferior, outdated design process. I submit that this design does not meet the current national criteria for a good or even adequate planning and because of the significant and extent of the proposed system, it should be planned and engineered properly according to the 1970 criteria

It is my opinion, therefore, that further action on the freeways and the Three Sisters Bridge should be halted until a completely thorough study which relates all of the complexities of this problem in a way that can justify the millions of dollars to be invested in this project can be completed.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

Mr. Ferranda.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM FERRANDA, 3615

VACATION LANE, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA

MR. FERRANDA: Thank you for letting me speak here this afternoon.

I am a resident of Arlington, at 3615 Vacation

Lane. I am a physicist. I received my degree a few months

ago from American University in physics.

First of all, I would like to dispel -- there has been an impression conveyed here by some of the members of the Highway Department that this is only local, this opposition is only by a few citizens who are coming up here for their own particular reasons, opposing the present design and proposed construction of all of these freeways.

I would just like to reread into the record a statement of principles. It is self explanatory.

"North Central Freeway, statement of principles."

The proposed North Central Freeway would have serious adverse effects upon Montgomery County. It would divide established neighborhoods and school district, uproot families, generate more traffic, increase pollution, and generally impair the quality of life.

Seed.

4 5

In a recent election, Montgomery County residents registered their overwhelming opposition to the freeway in convincing fashion. Opponents in the freeway prevailed almost without exception while freeway advocates were almost uniformly defeated. We, the undersigned elected officials of Montgomery County interpret these results as a mandate to oppose construction of the North Central Freeway.

Pursuant to this mandate, we subscribe to its principles.

We oppose the construction of the North Central
Freeway. We oppose any purported commitment by the State
Roads Commission to build the Montgomery segment of the proposed freeway. This decision is not the Roads Commission's
to make. It is the responsibility of Maryland's elected
officials who alone are accountable to the electorate.

We similarly oppose relegating decision and construction of the freeway to Federal officials, either elected or appointed. The matter involves directly the interests of Maryland and her citizens. More particularly, those residing in Montgomery County and the decision should be made at the State and local levels.

No. 4. We favor rapid completion of the Metro

System to provide the basis for an effective transportation

network. We oppose any attempt to make completion of the

Metro System dependent upon freeway construction. These

matters are not intricately related and Metro should not be held hostage, for North Central or any other freeway.

Furthermore, until the Metro System is operating, its real impact on traffic cannot be validly assessed.

These are the principles to which we are committed.

We strongly urge the elected principles to represent the

citizens in Maryland at local, State of Federal levels, to

join with us in seeking to promote and implement these

principles in every possible way.

This is signed by 13 out of 16 of the State

Delegates and three out of five State Senators of Montgomery

County. That sounds like a few citizens anyway.

Now, there are a couple of assumptions made. First of all, -- the reason I make this statement from the people of Maryland, I think these roads are all tied together. I think these freeways are one big package or one big group and they must be considered as such.

Now, the assumption was made by some of the gentlemen here that this road, this particular road, is necessary principally for the moving of goods into the District. Now, on the contrary, I intend to dispute this. I don't have the figures, but the population of the District has remained relatively stable over the past few years. In fact, I think they have lost some population.

As far as vital goods go, I have concern for the

2 3

people getting vital goods, also, but I might point out if
we ran a few trains into Union Station with a few vital goods
in them, I think that --
(Applause.)

MR. FERRANDA: -- I think it is possible to solve our needs that way.

And I think with proper paanning on the roads, the present roads we have, and other methods, I think we can solve the vital goods problem.

At any rate, I want to also point out something else I just heard on the news, just about an hour ago. I just heard on the news that land developers are objecting to the proposed location of the outer beltway near Gaithersburg.

Now, why are the land developers now objecting? They want to keep this out of the Master Plan for that area for at least 60 days. It seems that the land there in the process they are developing would be affected.

Well, isn't it interesting that when their toes are being stepped on, the land developers scream like a bunch of stuffed pigs. We will see what kind of reception they get from the Highway Department, this particular group of people. I am interested in following that.

All right. I suppose by now you are aware that I favor holding up this or at least considering this freeway only after the Metro impact can be assessed. All right,

supposing that in the years to come we find the need for this type of a rapid transit system down the corridor of the I-66 and 266 corridor. Well, Mr. Harold O. Miller last evening challenged you gentlemen in assessing the needs of transportation in the Washington area, to make imaginative use of this right of way. Possible imaginative use of it and several other officials, I think, have done the same.

Mr. J. Ricks in the Arlington County Board has done the same and Harold Miller and several other community leaders in Washington.

All right, now, I just want to propose -- this is just a possibility if in the future we find a need, an additional rapid transit system to supplement the subway. This was originally not proposed by me, this was originally, some of these things I have added to it, but it was originally proposed by Dr. Barry Hyman in Arlington.

WO&D right of way in Arlington, and I think it is pertinent here.

express busway, bus corridor. The way we presently envision it would be an elevated structure. It would be able to tie into existing Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. The buses -- the capacity of this bus corridors, they have done some studies on this, it could handle 14 lanes of commuter traffice. It

has the flexibility. We have been critized -- the Metro has often been criticized for the lack of flexibility. The people have to walk a few blocks.

I will give you some of the advantages of a busway of this sort. First of all, it could be built rather quickly. Barry Hyman made a quick estimate and it could be built at half the cost of T-66, which is about 20/25 million. Half of that cost. And it could be built twice as quickly.

Here are some advantages. No. 1, local streets wouldn't have to be cut because the elevated nature of the structure would enable you to preserve neighborhoods. Buses — this is another thing people in Fairfax and further out want, access. Well, buses from Fairfax could have an unimpeded run through Arlington County on such a busway.

And No. 3, within a few years, buses would be very likely candidates for conversion to electric operation, using the new generation batteries which are just coming out now and are in the experimental stage, but are showing promise.

Thus, the potential pollutant emissions from the buses could be completely changed and -- well, that would have to await actually the conversion to a better form of electrical power.

However, I might point out with existing technology, the buses presently in use, a bus that is presently in use now is much less harmful despite its rather noise and odor

sometimes. The pollutants of a bus are less harmful and they can be controlled actually more simply than sontrolling it on 50 or 60 cars.

All right, that is an advantage there.

Much of the aggravation injury involved in commuter traffic accidents would be eliminated. While commuters are seldom traveling fast enough for serious injuries, as is quite obvious, much expense and minor injuries sustained each year while commuting is an aggravation and I have been a part of that now and then.

Well, in this I might say, buses are safer than autos. Per 100-mile passenger miles in the United States, there are 80 bus-related facilities and 730 auto facilities. So there is one more point.

No. 5. Buses could make stops not only along arteries but also sweep through principal neighborhood groups making it quite convenient for meny people at stops. Weather shelters could easily be provided and buses could gain access to this busway at the intersection with existing arteries without too much complication. This plan, I believe, would complement Metro rather than competing with it.

No. 6 here, transportation officials often mention the dollars and cents aspect of multiple use of the right of way. I might say to that, the relatively small size and elevated nature of such a busway would allow the remaining

å,

land already acquired in Virginia for the I-66 right of way, to be used by area residents as strip parks and neighborhood recreational areas. What better multiple use of the right of way could you have for Arlington residents than something like that? I think the \$18 million they spent on acquiring land so far would be very well spent in that way and I think many of the people who have lost their homes even along the right of way would agree.

I might add, such land in Arlington will never be available again, no matter what anyone says about it. And also this kind of a plan would effectively eliminate the need for — imagined need for — this bridge here, I-266. Because it could connect directly in with both the Metro and into Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, which would be more than adequate to handle bus traffic of this kind, and even take your expresslane up through the buses when they get into Washington for a short distance until they get to their destinations.

I would like to conclude now. I think I have beaten that to death, now.

I would like to conclude with a couple of quotes from Senator Muskie, recent quotes. This first one is from the August 25, 1970 proceedings of the Subcommittee on Roads, which should be familiar to everyone here. This is page 20 of those proceedings, by the way.

"It seems to me as we consider the highway program

. . .

Ą

for the next few years, we ought tomake sure it is flexible enough to permit us not only to build highways but also to build other forms of transportation which may serve our purposes more effectively and more wisely. Then perhaps we could avoid that point down the road where we again find an irreversible present situation that is a product of misguided policies of the past 1940 planning."

That was at 1940 World's Fair and this is 30 years later now.

halting of SST funding gby the Senate, a week and a half ago or so. Senator Muskie, after commenting on it as a possible turning point in national priorities, said, "If we had done the same thing in years past regarding the automobile, we would not have the problem in our cities that we do today."

I am glad to see this whole package, or can of worms, or whatever you call it, is finally coming out in the open.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

Mr. Ward.

(No response.)

MR. DUGAS: Mrs. Frances Hewitt

-16

STATEMENT OF MRS. FRANCES HEWITT, LEAGUE
OF WOMEN VOTERS OF ARLINGTON, ARLINGTON,
VIRGINIA

MRS. HEWITT: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen.

I represent the League of Women Voters of Arlington.

I am a member of the Board.

I am also a resident of Arlington, a concerned mother, a taxpayer of our Nation's Capital, and I want to be proud of that. I love it. I am also a citizen of the United States and I love this land.

The League of Women Voters of Arlington welcomes this opportunity to speak regarding Interstate 266 and the Three Sisters Bridge, especially with respect to the environmental effects this construction will have upon Arlington and its residents.

Since my testimony was written, I almost lost my life on Shirley Highway last Saturday. So forgive me today if my notes have been somewhat altered with greater emotion.

I have witnessed the hearings here and it seems that the issue is not the Three Sisters Bridge, but a contest between the Highway developers, people who have power to pressure, and the little people. There is an exciting legend concerning the eruption of the Three Sisters and this seems to have great prophetic significance. Perhaps this is merely

a prologue to the play that is being put on these three days.

The legend tells us that three Indian maidens with malicious intent started across the Potomac one night and were caught in a storm. The next day the three rocks appeared, but no sign of the Three Sisters. The Three Sisters Bridge is a timely topic for a budding playwright with the eloquence of Maxwell Anderson, to try his talents on a "High Tor."

Perhaps for the benefit of the young people in the audience who do not know who Maxwell Anderson was, or what kind of play "High Tor" was, you of my age know, but Mr. Anderson wrote a delightful story, a comedy, on an issue very similar to this, when they tried to destroy a high piece of land on the Hudson, along the Hudson. And the shades of aberrations of the Dutchman came out and stayed the bulldozers' hands.

Would that we could call for the sahdes of those
Three Sisters to stay the hands of the bulldozer operators.

I have nothing really new to offer. I am not an expert. Witnesses have already given ample evidence why the bridge should not be built. Citizens have indicated that they wish to have a balanced and well-coordinated system of transportation first. And a moratorium on the building of all bridges until a good transportation system has had the time to establish the new traffic patterns.

I am not expert on bridge design. I am not capable

A

of making any study of ecological effects, but the ecological effects, too, have been offered as evidence against the construction of this bridge or any bridge. One does not need the excertuse of pollution counter programs to study air pollution. We simply tried walking across 14th Street Bridge and Key Bridge and I know the hazards involved.

Also, an individual's right, so there must be a design approved. I suggest a lovely, rustic design for pedestrians only.

The appalling juncture of I-266 with Spout Run and Lorcom Lane will be another example of man's devastation of his environment. Witness the destruction of the once beautiful Shirley Highway. The residents living in South Arlington now are held captive by a wall of concrete high rises and carjammed roads. Freedom to move about? I no longer enjoy such freedom. My husband, who is a great hunter, calls it "arterial sclerosis."

It isn't the freeways and the beltways, but it is these little offshoots that go through the heart of the little towns and displace hundreds of people which we oppose.

The building of roads and bridges further encourages money-made investors to add to the density and congregation along their roots. Motel owners, high-rise builders and later, large shopping complexes, soon find profitable land use. Profitable for the big business investors. The recent high-

Que.

Q

density use of Arlington lands, the ravaging of Northern Virginia by wide ribbons of concrete, have already brought about maximum irritants in noise and air pollution.

Streets that once served the citizens of the community now separate playmates, neighbors and friends.

America was a beautiful land. It has been so richly endowed with natural scenic beauty. I wish to keep America green, not with dollars, but with the green landscape which all of us have a right to enjoy.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. DUGAS: Thank you.

Mr. Andrea.

STATEMENT OF MATTHEW ANDREA, CITIZEN

MR. ANDREA: My name is Matthew Andrea. For six years I have been a resident of the District of Columbia, a student at Georgetown University.

Since May I have been living at Stonehedge Farm, which is a commune in the Mountains of Virginia.

Just a few words about my background. I went to
Georgetown for four years. I majored in history. During
those four years, I rowed on the Crew Team at Georgetown, and
came to know the Potomac River, the stretches from Fletcher's
Boathouse down to Haines Point, quite by heart.

During those four years, I noticed a lot of changes

Stock

...

along the boat route. I saw what was once a very beautiful river, a natural habitant for wildlife, for birds, for fish, become increasingly destroyed by every kind of pollution imaginable -- air, water, noise.

It is a custom among crew teams when a team is victorious, to throw the coxswain of the winning boat into the river. Crews in the Washington area, now seriously consider abandoning the custom since the river has become so thoroughly polluted.

But I have seen what has been taking place on the banks of this river as well and this is equally frightening to what is happening to the river itself. For what was once probably a very quiet landscape has now become a source of constant noise. There is never quiet any more with highways on both sides. The constant flow of traffic over Key Bridge, and this fragile environment already so thoroughly hurt by the automobile, you gentlemen threaten to destroy even further with this abominable Three Sisters Bridge.

Perhaps you have noticed that there are not too many people my age at these hearings. Perhaps you wonder why. I think I can answer that question. I think a lot of people my age have begun to despair of the possibility of any sort of meaningful dialogue at a hearing such as this. And because of this despair, because they have seen hearings in the past, at which there has been an outpouring of citizen protest such

as there has been here, and then they see the type of response that has offered, more concrete, bureaucratic stubbornness, a determination to pave over the will of the people, they give up and they look for other means for redressing their grievances.

Last year I was one of quite a number of students who went out on Three Sisters Island and camped out there for several days and then proceeded to occupy the construction site when construction was scheduled to begin. For one week we held back the bulldozers and we were not alone, we weren't just young, radical students, we were accompanied by housewives by doctors, professors, school teachers, just citizens of the community.

Many people who owned cars. But all who felt something in common and that was that they did not want this precious environment to be des taged any further.

People want to be heard. You say that these roads are being built in response to the needs of the people and yet when the people speak their needs, cry their needs, shout it from jail cells, even, they feel that they are not being heard. That is just what is happening.

I think what has motivated people into going down to the Three Sisters Bridge site, to come into these hearings, to holding referendums, is a vision of what they think the community, the Washington Metropolitan area, ought to look like.

They see what we have built already, they see the suburban sprawl that radiates out from Washington in every direction. They see the decay of the inner city. They see the wall that the automobile in this, by encouraging private mobility, by encouraging the individual to build his own environment as far away from the web of the city as possible, to come in and out of it every day, but not to spend any more time there than is absolutely necessary.

They see that this whole process is something which can ultimately cause cause starvation and decay within the city itself. And so they want to talk about alternatives.

When they talk about mass transit, it is not just a matter of talking about moving people, but again like I said, it is a matter of vision, a matter of conceptualizing a way that people should live and relate to one another.

The idea of the transportation is a way of bringing people together in a community, not a way of propelling people out of the community as far away from one another as possible.

They see a vision of new communities that are not based on suburban sprawl, but perhaps little cluster signals that radiate out from the central city, like nuclei, and that can be tied together by transportation systems which carry the maximum number of people with the greatest speed and comfort, with the minimum amount of destruction to the environment.

jecting systems that are 30/40 years old in their conception.

A system the triumph of which was achieved by Adolph Hitler in his autobahns, prior to the Second World War. Do we want more of this, or do we want a system that can move people in such a way that, rather than going down the highway in individual compartments at an average of 1.3 individuals per steel compartment, which every once in a while rams into one another, rather than this, a system which will carry them in quietly, which will take them where they want to go, and which will not destroy the environment that it passes?

Mr. Airis, you said that Americans have a love affair with the automobile. But do you think this love affair is something that can be sustained indefinitely? Do you think there is a limit, a time when there will be just too many automobiles that we can no longer afford to carry on this love affair?

MR. AIRIS: Mr. Andrea, I don't ever remember saying that the Americans have a love affair with their automobile.

But what I have advanced is that the urban centers need balanced transportation and that is the only way that I see that balanced transportation will work is to provide the mass transit facilities of such a quality, subways, busways, as your predecessor spoke of, and possibly in the next century new innovative types of movement of people and goods of such

quality. All of these things that the citizens have need to move and the goods that have need to move, that can move by mass transit, will willingly use these facilities.

I don't believe from the benefit of experience that I have had, that it is possible to cram or force any type of transportation on the American citizen.

Mr. Andrea. Don't you think that is what is happening with the Three Sisters Bridge? I feel this is something that is being crammed down on American citizens in spite of the overwhelming sentiment of the very citizens that you are talking about.

I ask you, do you think that right now we have balanced transportation? Yes or no?

MR. AIRIS: Well, right now, we have probably one of the better bus systems, that is by nature an extensive bus system.

MR. ANDREA: You are saying we havebalanced transportation?

MR. AIRIS: That there is a part of, and a very essential part of any transit system in the entire United States. That is all mass transit systems have to have adequate bus elements.

Now, we do have that and actually, right now, if it was the desire of the people, this bus system that we have got could handle all of our commuter traffic.

MR. ANDREA: I am afraid that is not true, because the streets are so thoroughly clogged with automobiles that any bus that attempts to negotiate the streets has to ride behind lane after lane that is filled with automobiles. And consequently the transit we do have is seriously impeded. I would advance that the system of transportation we have at present is seriously imbalanced.

MR. AIRIS: May I point out, if the commuter people use the mass transit system movements that are available and will be forthcoming within the next year, actually, I should have mentioned the Shirley Highway project that is actually scheduled, is in use now actually, and is going to be in full use sometime about next May 1, if people will really patronize them, there would be no problem of traffic congestion.

MR. ANDREA: The fact is, it has been demonstrated by Jane Jacobs, Lewis Mumford, a number of other city planners, that when in fact a freeway is built and the two alternative means of transportation are offered to one group of the public that frequently people will choose the means of private transportation if it offered, simply because of the so-called convenience and freedom which this affords them, even though this convenience and freedom takes place at the expense of other people.

The points that I am trying to make is that when you baild a freeway element such as the Three Sisters Bridge,

B

that you obviate any possible mass transit alternatives by saying here is your open invitation to the city, take your car. Because here is the concrete to travel on.

The point is that what we are doing is like providing a service that we can't afford to provide. In other words, if we look at this from the cost-benefit point of view, which is a type of analysis which I am sure is quite dear to men such as yourself, you realize that the cost of the freeway is going to be greater than the benefits.

In other words, you give people an open access, this type of invitation to the city and certainly they will take it, rather than taking the inconvenience of perhaps driving to the subway station or walking to the bus station, something like that. But the cost, the cost of filling Downtown Washington with the density of automobiles which would just be unacceptable to human life. I mean right now you walk along F Street and try to breathe. I challenge you, I have a hard time myself, and I know that anything worse will make it really unacceptable down there.

You create a need for parking which will necessitate even the demolition of commercial areas, which seems very unlikely, or else the demolition of what now is strictly residential areas, which will aggravate the housing shortage we already have and aggravate the housing shortage that would be caused by those neighborhoods that would have to be

good .

destroyed to bring the freeway in, in the first place.

A.

Well, to continue with some questions that I wanted to ask and really would like answers to. I wonder seriously which of these two bridge designs is now being built. In other words, I have seen in the Potomac River some sort of pier structure emerging in rather ugly fashion out of the water.

MR. AIRIS: Well, I think the story is in the booklet here and I would suggest you read it. Just quickly, I don't want to take up time, the hour is getting late. Either set of piers, the set of piers will fit either bridge that is shown up there.

MR. ANDREA: Okay.

My next question is, what happens to the cars of incoming commuters after they get off I-266? Are there plans in your Department for the creation of more parking facilities within the Downtown area and if so, where would these parking facilities be erected and what would be the environmental impact of such facilities and do you have plans for widening the width of inner city streets to simply accommodate the traffic?

MR. AIRIS: Well, the answer to you question is, for a long time, Mr. Andrea, the city has advocated a control on parking in the Downtown area. You probably don't realize it,

but that is probably the best method of controlling the number of vehicles that come into the Downtown sector of the City.

Now, it would be our position on this bridge that it should not be permitted to encourage great numbers of additional commuters. That is not the object of the pier size. At the present time ---

MR. ANDREA: But hasn't this been found to be the

MR. AIRIS: Please.

by a price by the private entrepreneurs until legislation that would be needed to permit municipal parking and control all parking is obtained, why the control will probably be through the pricing arrangement of the private entrepreneurs in the Downtown area.

MR. ABBOTT: Imminent Domain?

MR. ANDREA: Where would these parking facilities be created? I mean, within Downtown?

MR. AIRIS: Well, they would be existing facilities.

I don't anticipate any great large number of additional parking spaces. That is your control on the number of vehicles.

MR. ANDREA: Okay. Now, do you think that the construction of freeways has solved traffic problems in Los

Angeles or Detroit? Los Angeles has one of the most sophisticated systems, engineeringly supurb, at least according to the standards of highway planners, and yet there we see an example where two-thirds of the Downtown space is devoted either to streets, highways or parking facilities, and yet in spite of this vast network, the travel time it takes commuters is as great as it always has been and the congestion exists on the freeways themselves.

And given the projected growth patterns for the Washington Metropolitan Area, I ask you ho youcan possibly see the use of the automobile and subsequent freeways as a possible solution.

MR. AIRIS: Well, that was a statement. You want to ask a question?

MR. ANDREA: The question is simply, do you see freeways as having solved traffic problems of other major American cities -- Los Angeles is a point of example.

MR. AIRIS: Well, let me answer you by saying that
I have never advocated a Los Angeles type system of freeways
for the District. Never have. The Council and the Mayor have
advocated a system that is a mere 24-1/2 miles in length, and
there is a dispute as to another four and a half miles.
That is nowhere near a Los Angeles type of freeway system.

If you look at the freeways that are built, particularly the ones in the Foggy Bottom area, you will see there

is very little relationship to a rural-type freeway such as has been built in sections of Los Angeles.

balanced transportation system. Your Highway Department, as
I am sure you know, has testified for rail rapid transit
system. We are closely coordinating the work that is going
on right now and, hopefully, in the next few years, we will
be able to achieve a full balanced transportation system that
will be of sufficient quality, willingly use it, where the
use of the individual vehicle is not needed.

MR. ANDREA: From my experience in chemistry and physics, I found when you want to create a balance, you have weights on one side of the scale and then you seek to bring the scale to a certain level by putting certain elements on the other side of the scale. Right now, I see a system which is in serious imbalance, much in favor of the automobile and the private commuter.

And it strikes me that the only way we are going to achieve a balance, that we can begin talking about, or even making new analyses, is to build a system of mass transit immediately, without another bit of network for private transit and then begin to see where to go from there.

MR. AIRIS: I am sure you are entitled to your opinion.

MR. ANDREA: Just a couple more questions.

No.

You say that citizens determine the needs for freeways, such as the Three Sisters Bridge. That their behavior dictates the need. If you think it it the democratic right of the citizens to make decisions in that process, what would you think of a referendum to be held in the areas affected?

(Applause.)

MR. ANDREA: Referendums in Arlington, in the District of Columbia, and in Montgomery County or any other areas which would be affected by proposed freeways?

MR. AIRIS: Well, referendum is one way of trying to get atpublic opinion.

MR. ANDREA: What do you think of this as a means of determining whether or not these roads should be built?

MR. AIRIS: Well, I would have no opinion on whether or not a referendum should or could be used. It is, as I say, one tool that is sometimes used to attempt to ascertain public opinion on points.

MR. ANDREA: Well, if you are not certain about a referendum, what means would you suggest?

MR. AIRIS: Well, we are pretty well committed to achieving a balanced transportation system here, and it is well on its way. It has pretty well been committed.

MR. ANDREA: But you said this was a democracy, and you said it was the right of the citizenry to determine what

type of transportation systems they should have to serve their needs. And it strikes me that if you really believe these things, that you would not take the noncommittal stance that you have, but would in fact actually call for a referendum and if, in fact, it is as you say, that the majority of the citizens, simply because they own automobiles and commute to work really deep down want the speedway, then in fact you should have no fear of a referendum which would substantiate your view if, in fact, it is true.

and these areas. We in the various citizen and student groups last fall requested that a referendum be held in the District of Columbia on the Three Sisters Bridge issue, at the time of the election last November. This request was denied. Therefore, the citizen groups, aided largely by the League of Women Voters, put together a piggyback referendum. People were stationed at almost all of the polling places throughout the city, ballots were printed and the question was asked, "Do you favor the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge and connecting freeway system?"

And of the people who voted in the School Board election, 84 percent voted against the bridge and the freeways.

Now, the question may be brought up that this was not an official election, and I was not going to advance that it was. But I am saying to you, gentlemen, if you really

believe in democracy, and if you really believe in building transportation systems that are responsive to the will of the people, expose this thing to a referendum and see what the people have to say.

(Applause.)

MR.AIRIS: Let me just say this. I do not want to prolong your soliloquy up there, but there is a tendency to over-simplify a question as to whether people, particular people, want a particular facility.

Now, to make it really responsive, it becomes quite a complicated project. You must show in your referendum quite a series of things of what will happen on certain alternatives do they want the price of oranges to double? That type of thing.

MR. ANDREA: When you elect a candidate, you don't have all of that matter.

Finally, I just want to close by saying this, that earlier witnesses you have asked which of the two bridge designs they prefer. All I can say is, that if you were to take these designs into the communities, or particularly if you were to go to young people in this town, I think you would find it very difficult to find a single person who would be able to respond to those designs in terms of their aesthetic or architectural value.

Both of these designs have come to symbolize a

9 9

tyranny, a willingness, a determination on the part of the Government to completely bypass, to override, much in the way that a freeway overrides, the will of the people. And if I had to choose one of those two designs, I would choose the one on the left because when it blew up, it would make a big splash.

(Applause.)

MR. DEGAS: Mr. Treamor.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM TREANOR, ADAMS MORGAN

COMMUNITY COUNCIL

MR. TREANOR: My name is Bill Treanor. I am the Chairman of the Adams Morgan Community Council and Director of Runaway House, and one of the leaders in the demonstrations last year down at the Three Sisters Bridge site.

I don't really think at this point there is too much more to be said. I frankly don't intend to waste a lot of time at what is, in effect, a wake. This hearing is an obvious farce. I am surprised Mr. Dugas allowed himself to be trapped into spending three days of his valuable time at something that everyone knows is an exercise in futility.

It is pretty obvious that even the design of the bridge has been already decided by the Highway Department, as well as the decision for the adjoining roads.

Mr. Airis, I want to tell you quite firmly and directly that you will never build, you will never build the

North Leg. Not through my community, and you are never going to get any other freeway up there. And it doesn't make any sense to build that bridge without connecting roads. And you don't have to be a highway engineer to know that.

Sir, you are not going to do it. As far as I am concerned, and as far as a lot of people in this city are concerned, there is a virtual state of war between the people in this city and the Highway Department. And you are the commanding general of the enemy, and you have to take the risks that go with that.

You are just a dumb tool of a highway lobby. I don't think that you really realize the calamity that these freeways will bring to this city. I think that you just have one of these typical technocratic minds turned out in this country 20 years ago and has no understanding, no grasp of the social ramifications of the things that you are proposing today.

I don't pretend to have any superior knowledge of transportation issues, but I think I do know something about the social effect of these roads. And I feel so strongly about it, that I am going to do all I can do by any means necessary to see to it that that bridge and that North Leg are not built.

I was arrested twice last year and I don't intend to make the mistake of getting caught in anything I do in the

- Con

A

future, but, sir, I assure you I am going to do something.

We are not playing. You refer to the bridge and these hearings as an exercise. It is an exercise to you but you are talking about my neighborhood. You are talking about my house, the people that I live with, and the community around me. And we are not going to be destroyed because the highway lobby wants to move their trucks in and out of the city faster, because a lot of people in the suburbs want to drive to work instead of taking the subways or the buses.

We think that is a really lousy reason.

parochial outlook, all you can see is the narrow issue of moving vehicles. That is allyou concern yourself with. And words seem to have very little effect in educating you. This is one of the few times you have even bothered to listen to what the people have to say. It has been pretty clear from your attitude, you don't like it and you are pretty reluctant to spend your time here.

But I want you to know that I am not standing up
here to complain about stuff in the past, or to run through
all of the obvious reasons why this freeway network and the
Three Sisters Bridge shouldn't be built. But I am standing
here to tell you face to face, sir, that there is going to
be some direct action against the Highway Department and the
construction companies that try to build these roads and this

bridge, and it is not going to be an easy struggle.

I am not saying you can't win, but I won't be using that bridge. If you get that bridge built and the North Leg built, I will be down in Lorton.

We are serious about this. I am not the only person who will be serious. The construction company lost a couple of trailers last year. That was just kid's play. Now we are for real, buddy.

You think you can wreck our town and drive back out to the suburbs every night and just forget about it? We have to live with that filthy air, all of these automobiles clogging our streets, destroying the city, destroying the very fiber of our lives. Many people live in the city, including myself, because we like it here. And every foot of freeway that is built makes the quality of life in this city go down, makes it a less desirable place to live.

It makes my life more unpleasant. If you can kill me faster, you can kill me in a slow manner. And that is what the technocrats seem to have in store for me and everyone else in the city. And I don't just intend to just passively lie around and wait a slow death at the hands of the technocrats.

So you are going to be hearing from me and from people who think the way I do again.

That is all I have to say.

Const

(Applause.)

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Treanor.

Mr. George P. Pipkin.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE P. PIPKIN

MR. PIPKIN: I guess I was supposed to come here and give another Jubilate to freeway presentation. I got that together.

I am kind of curious to ask Mr. Airis and the other people, what became of the proposal I gave at the last hearing for the Jubilate Freeway? It really isn't a great monument of citizen participation when you never hear a thing after proposing an alternative freeway system and nothing is ever heard from it again.

But I have an alternative bridge construction, which I will get into in a second.

I live in the District of Columbia. I live in the Embassy District over there and I was one of the kids that went down to the bridge site and was arrested. And I would like to tell some of the people what happened to some of those kids.

When I was involved in the freeway struggle a year ago last fall, my position was very moderate. As a matter of fact, I was opposed to having any kind of arrest or any kind of violence or anything of that nature, and I actually did make a trip down to the Highway Department to talke to one of

Mr. Airis' assistants. I believe I recognize him right there, but I am not sure that is the man. It looks like him.

I made a mistake. So I don't want to point anyone out in the room.

Anyway, when I asked this assistant and he showed me a model of the bridge, I was very impressed withthe bridge, the one on the right. It is aesthetic, has a nice arch. I got into a rap with him and asked him where he lived and he said he lived in the District all of his life but that he moved out a while ago.

And then I went, I said, "Why did you move out?"

And he said, "Well, I didn't want to raise my kids down among those Negroes." And I said, "Oh?" And he said, "No, they really can't run the city at all."

And at this time I was pretty moderate, liberal, and I was shocked, because this reflects an attitude which permeates the Highway Department, because they are technocrats and they say those Negroes can't run their city, and I guess that kind of applies to we whites, too.

As a matter of fact, I think from the gist of the testimony, it seems that people who are involved in designing h ighways don't feel that people for whom the highways are going to be built have the capability or the competence to make any kind of decisions at all. This is a rather antidemocratic attitude. But at the time of the demonstrations,

A

S de

I still had a good degree of faith in democracy and in the fact maybe this wasn't true, that in fact we could prevail upon the Highway Department, could prevail upon the Federal Covernmen through fairly nonviolent means, to change the course of events and stop the freeways.

And for that reason, up to the time of the bust,

I was pretty much against any kind of violence and I was

pretty much against blowing the trailers.

Now, since then, ---

MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, may I break in here?

This is an attempt to inject the racial situation into this problem. I don't believe that any of my people ever said such a thing. I think this is a fabrication and I have orders out that there is no such going on in the Department.

I just don't believe you. I think you are a liar.

MR. PIPKIN: Well, this is very typical of your type mind, because you say, "I have orders that people shall not think this, therefore they do not think this, because my people follow my orders."

Your people don't follow those orders. People are human beings. And there are racists, you know, floating around your Department. You may be one of them.

MR. AIRIS: I understand. I understand you.

MR. PIPKIN: Following that, it became so clear to me that the process of events was being shaped by the people

No.

1.01.10

A.

who were pushing the highway and the interests behind them,

that we had no chance whatsoever to shake these men through

nonviolence, the referendum, anything. We just didn't have

any kind of control over it at all.

I want to tell youwhat happened to the 141 kids that went to jail. About half of them got kind of turned off to the whole thing at all. They have gone out to rural communities.

Now, the technocrats may cheer this happening, that it is better they should be out smoking pot than be involved in opposing my plans, you know.

But I think this is a great loss and I think it is a great loss for America. I think what has happened to young people today, particularly the ones who turned off politics, in view of the futility of politics, in view of the futility of trying to shape the world, I think that is a far greater tragedy than what has happened to the other half, and the other half are the weathermen.

And my head is pretty close to that other half right now. Bill Treanor said you were not going to build the freeway system through his community. I think you may think that is an idol threat, but in view of the Standard Oil Refinery going up and what is going on in this country today, you had better wake up to the fact, unless you begin to take into account what people really want. And I don't think any

person wants this freeway, not even the people who live out in suburbia, at least their elected representatives don't seem to reflect it is their desire to have that freeway be built.

I am sure the people in the District don't want itUnless you begin to take into account what people want, you
are going to be facing a guerrilla war in the country in
which, you the technocrats, and you the politicians will be
one of the first casualties.

I guess what I said up to now was not very funny, and it isn't very funny, ---

MR. AIRIS: No, it isn't.

MR. PIPKIN: I had a tremendous design for a footbridge. But there have been a lot of footbridges submitted here. I think perhaps there should be a footbridge built across the river and I have a scenic design for a footbridge across the river.

There is a real need for this footbridge because there are pathways on both sides of the river that need connecting and I think the footbridge would be a very scenic addition to the landscape out there. I will submit them for the record.

It is a beautiful suspension footbridge and it would be very adequate for bikes and people.

That is the thrust of my thinking on this subject

Post.

and that is that we should start designing for people.

Now, the freeway systems as exist in the District of Columbia and exist in the suburbs, reinforces a technical reality which is against people. The other day I was reading an article in the Washington Post about a Northern Virginia legislator and it showed how he had made millions of dollars by buying real estate around the interchanges of highways and turned this real estate into shopping centers and places like that.

I think that this pattern of development and pattern of growth is clearly anti-human in what it does to people and what it does to the way they think has been pretty much demonstrated in the neurosis which is afflicting this country and neurosis uprooting the environment in which people have to live in.

I think we have to start designing for people. I think we have to start turning our technology in favor of people. I hate to see a lot of people wasting their time down at the Highway Department designing roads which are going to separate people. I would like to see them start designing transportation systems that would bring people together.

I am not saying that we have to end all roads altogether, sometimes roads are very nice toget out in the country sometimes and it would be very nice if we had some cars. But I think we can stop building roads now, or at least stop

expanding the freeway system, because if we expand the D. C.'s
freeway system and involve the Three Sisters Bridge, then we
will accumulate a certain level of traffic and the situation
will not be solved for 20 or 30 years.

And what about the next generation after that, and where are you going to draw the line and where are you going to stop?

In view of the talk which has been going around recently about environment, I think the time to stop building freeways, to stop this process of growth of the automobile as a primary transportation means, I think we should stop it right now and draw the line right now. I think we should build a footbridge across the Potomac River.

I think the footbridge should symbolize our commitment, our commitment to a technology for people, our
commitment to a pattern of grown which will be human rather
than anti-human.

And that is all I have to say. I will submit these for the record, if you want.

(Applause.)

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, sir.

That will be marked Exhibits 1, 2, and 3 of Mr.

Pipkin.

(The exhibits were so marked, and follow:)

(GOVERNMENT INSERT)

MR. DUGAS: Mr. Frank Wood.

STATEMENT OF FRANK WOOD, SALT INSTITUTE

MR. WOOD: My name is Frank Wood. I am Technical
Director of the Salt Institute. Our members compose or
supply about 95 percent of the salt used in the United States,
about 100 percent in Canada, 50 percent in Europe.

I have been asked if the salt that will be used on the Three Sisters Bridge would in any way pollute the river.

I made some calculations on this.

First, I obtained from the Department of Highways, the fact that we use 26,600 tons of salt. This is used on 1373 miles of highway. This is approximately six lanes or average of six lanes wide.

Calculations show that we use approximately 646 pounds of salt per mile of two-lane highway. This is, the correct order of magnitude is usually between 500 and 700.

The span that I have for the Three Sisters Bridge is 1630 feet, six lanes wide. So, therefore, at this rate, I use 597 pounds of salt. I understand the practice in D. C. is to salt approximately 20 times a year and there is in no case salting more than once a day. So this would be 597 pounds a day on the days when salting is practiced.

The flow rate of the Potomac at the Three Sisters

Bridge is approximately 74,000 gallons per second in December

on an average. It is 101, 700 gallons per second in January.

2,

It is 1/24th, 400 gallons per second in February, and
164,000 gallons per seconds in March. Calculating this out,
we find that the average chloride increase that you expose the
river to would be .10112 parts per million in December,
.008 parts per million in January, .006 parts per million in
February, .005 parts per million in March.

The present chloride level of the river is 15

percent per million. Therefore, this amount would not be

detectable by any analytical means and certainly could not be

construed as any hazard.

Are there any questions?

MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, I might have one.

MR. DUGAS: Mr. Airis.

MR. AIRIS: I don't want to discourage this gentleman from the Salt Institute. We do use in excess of 26,000 tons, at least we use that to start the season with.

Actually, it is a little more than that. But our present thinking is that on an important bridge, we probably would not use the chemicals at all. I am sure they could be used, but just as a precautionary measure, we probably would resort to abrasives.

So this may be actually beside the point on whether or not this particular facility would have any deleterious effect on the Potomac.

MR. WOOD: I was asked to testify. I didn't

IT.

6

7

11

12

13

12

1 | volunteer to testify.

MR. AIRIS: Thank you, sir.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you very much.

A VOICE: I would like to know who asked this gentleman to testify?

MR. WOOD: The Washington Department of Highways.

MR. DUGAS: Mr. Bryant.

STATEMENT OF ANDREW BRYANT, CHAIRMAN,

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE, D. C. CHAMBER

OF COMMERCE; ACCOMPANIED BY GREGORY W.

HARRISON, PRESIDENT

MR. BRYANT: I am the Chairman of the Transportation
Committee of the D. C. Chamber of Commerce.

As representatives of uptown businesses, we support a balanced, total transportation system and as representatives of the middle city inhabitants, we will endorse a system that will halt the downward spiral of economic decay, shorten the distance between home and job and create a more wholesome, healthy city in which to live.

The Three Sisters Bridge has become the very symbol of controversy over construction of freeways. It is a very important link in Interstate Route 266, and as such would be the key in providing a gateway to Interstate 66 on East-West Freeway between the Capital and the Northern Shenandoah Valley of Virginia.

18

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

.

24

To not permit the erection of the bridge as provided for in the 1968 Highway Act creates a tremendous infliction of growth both in the city and without. At least 60 percent of total sales of Lansburg, for instance is generated in its suburban stores, indicating obviously the de-emphasizing of the in-town stores.

Increasingly, jobs and businesses are migrating to the suburbs, leaving the city with fewer resources and people, as indicated by the latest Census Tract, to cope with social and economic problems. If we are to reverse this trend and bring people back to the city, it must be with an effective, well-balanced transpor-ation system. Metro planners tell us that with a completed subway, 40 percent of the people traveling downtown at rush hours will have to use automobiles and that more than 80 percent of all trips in the Washington area during a 24-hour period will be made in automobiles. It has become increasingly necessary to balance the system.

A report prepared for the Federal City Council

proves conclusively, contrary to public opinion, as often

publicized, the majority of the citizens favor a balanced

system. The counties surrounding the District of Columbia have

voted overwhelmingly in favor of a bond referenda for

financing the subway and there has been complete accord be
tween the involved jurisdictions.

We have already submitted our views regarding the

freeway, and if the Three Sisters Bridge is a part of this
system, then let's have it. If the change from prestripped
concrete design as approved by the D. C. Highway

Department to the steel design as favored by the Federal
Highway Administration will save \$7.2 million dollars without
an appreciable sacrifice in design, then we feel that this
is money that surely could be used for much-needed housing
and schools.

Let us not object to freeways and bridges because of

Let us not object to freeways and bridges because of air pollution, but rather let the same concereted effort be directed toward pollution-free automobiles through legislation enacted by Congress.

Thank you.

MR. DUGAS: I notice the President of the D. C.

Chamber of Commerce is present and I wonder if you have any
comments on behalf of the Organization?

MR. HARRISON: Mr. Dugas, Ladies and Gentlemen, I
think Mr. Bryant expressed the views of the Chamber of Commerce.
MR. DUGAS: Would you give the reporter your full
name.

MR. HARRISON: Gregory W. Harrison, President, D. C. Chamber of Commerce.

We are definitely in favor of freeways, the bridges, and a well-balanced transportation system in the whole Metropolitan Area and especially the Hub, that Hub will die

2

3

Eigh

5 6

7

8

9

...

S div

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

unless we start doing something to keep the businesses and so forth from migrating to the suburbs. We will not have a healthy community if the Hub is dying.

We feel as if freeways and subways, or the Three Sisters Bridge, is definitely needed.

And to the opponents of the Three Sisters Bridge,

I think that they need to take a good hard look at what is
happening in the Center City and what is happening, especially
as far as businesses are concerned. You can notice after
7:00 o'clock in this town it is almost dead. I can remember
when this was a great wild city, and we have to make the city
that way again, and we are not going to be able to do it
unless we get a well-balanced transportation system.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Harrison.

MR. AIRIS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that it is a refreshing attitude, it is an affirmative one, and it is as I see the situation.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you very much for appearing, gentlemen.

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Dugas, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Where would you put the North Leg of the Inner Loop which comes off the bridge, K Street? I would like to know.

MR. FRAIN: Florida Avenue?

MR. HARRISON: We suggest it go back for further

0 study, but we are definitely in favor of the freeways. MR. ABBOTT: On U Street? 3 MR. HARRISON: Well now, Sam, if you go back and 4 check your record again, what did we say -- didn't we suggest 5 it might go down T Street instead of U Street? MR. ABBOTT: Tell us because I forgot. I wul 7 like to know for the record now and the audience here, the 8 recommendation of uptown business and the Chamber of Commerce for the location of the North Leg, the traffic that is coming off the bridge. 99 MR. HARRISON: Sam, we feel the way the situation has presently been proposed with the few alterations, it will do nothing but help uptown business. 13 14 MR. ABBOTT: Where is the traffic going to go? 15 That is a simple question I ask. Only from K Street up to U? 16 You have to come up with a recommendation. 17 back for further study, but we are in favor of it. 18 19 MR. FRAIN: Where, U, Florida, P Street?

MR. HARRISON: Sam, that is why we suggest it go

MR. ABBOTT: The Federal City Council doesn't want it on K Street. The Board of Trade doesn't want it on K Street. As representatives of a business community, primarily north of, say, Massachusetts Avenue, what are your recommendations, for the record?

MR. BRYANT: Let me say, as you know, we have been

25

20

21

23

Sec. devoted to the study of the Uptown Leg and obviously I think the Uptown Leg of the freeway would not in itself solve the 2 problem. It will mean a study of the working of the freeway 3 13 along with the subway proposed. MR. FRAIN: You want it on K, L, Downtown, or E 5 Street Expressway? Where do you want it? Do you ---6 MR. DUGAS: Now, Mr. Frain, you asked him a question. 7 8 Give him a chance to answer it. MR. FRAIN: He is not answering it. MR. DUGAS: He is not answering it the way you want 11 him to answer it. MR. AIRIS: He doesn't have to answer to you. 13 MR. FRAIN: He may want to answer it the way you 14 want to, Mr. Dugas, or Mr. Airis. But now I want to know how Mr. Fauntroy came down and said he didn't want it down there ---15 16 MR. DUGAS: Now, here is Mr. Bryant. 17 MR. FRAIN: These people apparently agreed to have it up there. 18 19 MR. DUGAS: Here is Mr. Bryant, who represents the businessmen who don't want it. 20 21 MR. FRAIN: The Federation of Civic Associations oppose it. Reverend Fauntroy says he doesn't want it. I 22 want to find out why they want it. 23 24 MR. DUGAS: Mr. Frain, these people represent an-

other segment of the black community. And you don't speak for

Nor does Mr. Abbott speak for any of the black community, 1 any of the black community. 2 MR. FRAIN: I don't know whether that is true or not. We have hundreds of black employees in the Downtown ---MR. DUGAS: You don't have a single black employee 5 anywhere, Mr. Frain. 6 MR. FRAIN: I am a retired Congressional aide. 7 MR. DUGAS: That is right. MR. FRAIN: And how many do you ---MR. DUGAS: But I have one thing you don't have, and you know what that is without me making it a part of this 11 record. 12 MR. FRAIN: You tell me. MR. DUGAS: I am a black living in this community. 14 MR. FRAIN: Are you for freeways on Florida Avenue? MR. DUGAS: I amnot for anything except for the opportunity for Mr. Bryant to answer your question, if you 37 want it answered. If not, you can say so. 18 MR. FRAIN: I would like to have an answer. I am 19 not trying to fight him. I want an answer. 20 MR. DUGAS: Let him answer. Mr. Bryant happens to 29 be a member of the AIA, a university graduate with several 22 degrees, and I think he is quite capable of answering. And I don't think he needs your help. 24 MR. FRAIN: Why does he need your defense?

No. 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

91

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DUGAS: He doesn't need my defense, but he needs me to shut you up.

MR. BRYANT: I didn't come prepared to offer a solution to the exact location because that is being studied. We are in the process, for instance, of trying to create a revival of business. As you know, some legislation is proposed which would be more or less centered between 13th and 12th Street with entrances on the northwest corner of 13th and the area adjacent to the Garnet-Patterson High School.

We feel that the subway stations and the catalyst they will create and the business they will generate along with the rebuilding that we hope would be completed, for instance, by the Centennial if this, along with many of the other things, when it is all set and put in its proper perspective with the freeway where it is most advantageous for the Uptown Leg to be, at that time we would be at another hearing as this making a statement.

But we at this time say the uptown businessmen want the leg. We have discussed it. There are some of these things, along with the proposals as established by the National Parks and Planning Commission, that perhaps attempt to revitalize Florida Avenue, which was the old boundary of the North Side. It might be a good idea. It is a part of the freedom of Florida Avenue. It might help us to redefine the City and, most importantly, and this is the thing we are

very much against, stop uprooting of the businesses and the people who have long been established in the area. For the few businesses or people who have to be removed or relocated, we want due process, we want just compensation for their properties and that they are allowed to put up an equal establishment in another location.

We feel the freeway will benefit most people and if it will generate the kind of life we would like to see in the City, then we are ready to sacrifice a few people and a few businesses. We will make another segment at another hearing at another time.

MR. ABBOTT: Do you know Mr. F. H. Thomas, an architect, also Planning Chairman of the D. C.Federation of Civic Associations?

MR. DUGAS: You are under no compulsion to answer that.

MR. BRYANT: I know Freddie Thomas.

MR. ABBOTT: Okay. Do you feel Mr. Thomas represents also as much a segment of the black community as you?

MR. DUGAS: If you can answer that, Mr. Bryant

MR. BRYANT: Well, we are not -- if you want it to bring it down to black and white issues, we are not saying we represent all black people and their views.

MR. ABBOTT: I got the impression from your beginning statement, that such was the case, the representation of the

129 1 black community. You represent Theodore Hagans and how many 2 groups, how many member groups of your organization are there in existence, for the record? 3 13 MR. BRYANT: How many? MR. ABBOTT: Yes, just roughly. How many businesses? MR. DUGAS: This is a statement on behalf of the 6 D. C. Chamber of Commerce. That is one organization made up of principally black businessmen in the Upper Northwest 8 Section of Washington, D. C. 9 10 11 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. ABBOTT: All I wanted to point out, that hitherto, the appearance of every spokesman from the black community and I don't want to go through the listing of them, they are all in the record, wide variety, unanimously opposed and there is no organization ---

MR. HARRISON: Now you heard one black who is for it. MR. ABBOTT: -- with the exception of this particua group that is for the freeway.

I go back. Let me finish the last thing. The day you come out, sir, the day you can come out and tell me where that North Leg is going to go, call a press conference at 14th and U, and I am there with you, see. Then you will have the right to speak for blacks.

MR. DUGAS: Now, Mr. Abbott, let him tell you something.

(Remarks by Mr. Harrison inaudible.)

MR. DUGAS: Mr. Trentman. STATEMENT OF STEVEN TRENTMAN, GEORGETOWN COMMUNITY 1 MR. TRENTMAN: I trust this will be short. My name is Steven Trentman. I speak as one of the Vice Presidents of the Citizens Association of Georgetown. 6 Originally, it was our understanding that this hearing was on bridge design. However, it currently has become somewhat broader. So, therefore, we plan to submit --(3) the Association plans to submit a statement by December 28, 10 pointing out that the Association is one of the plaintiffs in 11 a suit against the bridge. 12 The Association's stand has not changed. 13 Thank you. 14 (Applause.) 15 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, sir. 16 Mr. Davis Hawkins. 17 STATEMENT OF DAVID G. HAWKINS, STERN 18 COMMUNITY LAW FIRM 19 MR. HAWKINS: My name is David Hawkins and I am a 20 staff member of the Stern Community Law Firm. The Stern 21 Community Law Firm is a D. C.-based, privately-funded, 22 community-controlled law firm, which represents persons in 23 matters concerning the public interest. Transportation 24 planning in the National Capital Area is a crucial issue and

the Three Sisters Bridge proposal is symbolic of the directions such planning will take.

I would first like to comment that the present
hearings, being limited to design, are an exercise in
foolishness and unreality. I get the feeling that I have
fallen with Alice into a Wonderland where all proper procedures
are reversed. As you may recall when a trial was to be held
there, the Queen of Hearts demanded: "Pass the sentence first
Then we'll hear the evidence."

Congress has already passed sentence here, saying,
"Build the Bridge." Now, you, the jurors, are dutifully
assembled to gather the evidence. Design hearings are not
enough to satisfy Title 23 of the U. S. Code, Judge Sirica's
recent ruling to the contrary notwithstanding. Since the
question is now before the Court of Appeals common sense, not
to mention respect for the law, would suggest delaying any
hearings until the question is resolved.

However, you have decreed that these hearings shall focus on design and so I shall structure my testimony accordingly. The reasoning to be employed is simple. First, one must identify the damages and potential damages caused by the concept of the Three Sisters Bridge.

Then one must come up with a design which eliminates these damages. Identifying the bad aspects of the bridge is easy. Indeed, most of the witnesses who have appeared at

these hearings have already done so. Thus, a quick recapitulation is enough.

First, the bridge and its approaches will destroy acres of parkland on both sides of the river. The integrity of the Potomac Palisades will be ruined.

Second, it will be just one more barrier of concrete, automotive air pollution and traffic noise between the natural resources of the Potomac and those citizens who wish to enjoy it.

Third, its location puts the knife on the highwayman to the throat of Glover-Archbold Park. As traffic grows, due to the encouragement of more passenger-car use provided by the bridge, the temptation to slash through the park with nowther swath of concrete will become greater and greater.

Fourth, the bridge and its approaches will continue the paving over of the historic Georgetown Waterfront. Replacing concrete factories with concrete highways is not the way to preserve the area's landmark qualities.

Fifth, and most devastating, the bridge will escalate the trend of overrunning the city with commuter passenger cars. With its false promises of reduced congestion, the bridge will encourage greater and more irresponsible use of the automobile.

The prophesy of increased traffic flows will be fulfilled and demands for more and bigger inner-city highways

Com

will ensue. The pattern is predictable. Increased downtown congestion will build pressure for more parking facilities and businesses will be destroyed to make way for them. To accommodate the traffic, the poor and the disenfranchised will be steamrollered from their homes.

This is an impressive and depressing list of fault and finding a design that will eliminate all is a formidable task. However, after consulting with a team of architects and transportation planners, we finally came up with a design that comes closest to being tolerable.

(Presents display)

As you see, the design is for a one-lane wooden, covered bridge such as grace the country area of the Northeastern United States. I think you will agree that its features resolve most of the problems. Since its approaches are modest country lane affairs, very little taking of parkland is involved.

Traffic noise and air pollution will be minimal since only four cars will be permitted on the bridge at any one time and the speed limit will be 15 miles per hour. Finally, in order to prevent the onslaught of commuter traffic, the bridge will be one-way out of the District on weekday mornings and one-way into the District on weekday evenings.

Is your reaction to this proposal, "This can't be

2

3

1

5

6

7

8

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

serious?" If so, I can only suggest that you look to your own house. Or your own bridge, in this case. We have looked at your proposals for the Three Sisters Bridge and after considering the destructive and irresponsible nature of your planning, our only conclusion is, "You can't be serious."

For there is no design solution to what youwant to do -- namely, to make it easier and easier for more and more automobiles to rampage at will throughout the city.

No design will eliminate the governmental evil being perpetrated -- namely, the treatment of the District as a plantation to be overseen by a handful of Congressmen behaving like British Colonialist exploiters whose greed and arrogance tormented the original 13 colonies 200 years ago.

If this bridge is ever built, it will stand as a shining example of the low regard those in power have for the independence and freedom of the residents of the District of Columbia. It will make a mockery of the message of the 1976 Bicentennial Celebration.

We celebrate the bridges at Lexington and Concord for the battles which were fought there. Let us hope we can celebrate the Bicentennial of American Independence by placing a marker to commemorate the bridge which was never built at Three Sisters

Thank you.

(Applause.)

23

24

MR. DUGAS: Miss Lincoln. Sec. MR. DUGAS: This concludes our list. Is there anyone not on our list who has not spoken, who would like to make some testimony for the record? (No response.) MR. DUGAS: If not, these hearings will be adjourned at 3:40 p.m. (Whereupon, at 3:40 p.m., the public hearing in the above entitled matter was concluded.)

