



# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

# NEWS

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

DOT -- 3870  
Phone: (202) 963-5154

President Nixon today nominated Dr. Robert H. Cannon, Jr., of Stanford, California, to be Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Advanced Systems Development and Technology.

Dr. Cannon, 46, is Professor and Vice Chairman of the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics at Stanford University and Director of the University's Guidance and Control Laboratory.

He replaces Secor D. Browne, who resigned last year to become Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

"We are extremely fortunate that President Nixon has chosen a man of Dr. Cannon's capability to head this very important office in the Department of Transportation," Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe said. "He will use his talents and those within the office to further our goal of a balanced transportation system in our nation.

"By working with the Department's operating administrations in their research and technology efforts, he can make a significant contribution toward this goal."

As Assistant Secretary for Advanced Systems Development and Technology, Dr. Cannon will provide support to the Department's six operating administrations in planning and developing future transportation systems and establish the essential supporting technology programs. He will be working closely with other government agencies, particularly the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, on matters of common research and development, such as technological advances in aviation, air pollution and noise abatement.

- more -

At Stanford, Dr. Cannon teaches dynamics and control. He is the author of a 925-page undergraduate textbook, "Dynamics of Physical Systems," and of numerous technical papers and articles, alone and with his students.

Professor Cannon has served often on government advisory committees, chairing NASA's Subcommittee on Guidance, Control and Navigation and the advisory group of the NASA Electronics Research Center. He also served as Vice Chairman of the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board and as Chief Scientist of the U.S. Air Force from 1966 to 1968.

He is a Director of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics. He has recently been active in long-range studies of air traffic control.

Before going to Stanford in 1959, Professor Cannon was a member of the mechanical engineering faculty at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Prior to 1957, he supervised research and development of automatic flight control and inertial navigation systems at the Autonetics Division of North American Aviation and of hydrofoil boats at the Baker Manufacturing Company, where a 35 mph sailboat was developed.

Dr. Cannon was born in Cleveland and attended DeVilbiss High School in Toledo, Ohio. He received the BS Degree from the University of Rochester in 1944 and the Doctorate from MIT in 1950. He served two years as a radar and CIC Officer with the U.S. Navy.

He is married to the former Dorothea Collins and they have six sons and a daughter.

####





# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TAD-49  
**NEWS**

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

FAA Library

FEB 11 1970

Acquisitions  
Section Hq 810A

FOR RELEASE FRIDAY  
February 6, 1970

DOT -- 4070  
Phone (202) 963-5154

The Department of Transportation announced today that it is issuing a rule changing the boundary line between the Central and Mountain time zones in Kearny County, Kansas, so as to include in the Central zone the eastern one fourth of Kearny County.

The change made by the rule was in response to a petition from over 200 "qualified voters" who live in and around Deerfield, the principal community in eastern Kearny County. A notice of the proposed rule was published on November 27, 1969, and interested persons were given a 45-day period within which to comment on the proposal. The new time zone boundary will coincide with what is now the boundary line between the county's two unified school districts.

The change will become effective at 2:00 a.m. on Sunday, March 8, 1970.

This action by the Department of Transportation does not concern the observance of advanced (daylight saving) time. That is controlled by the Uniform Time Act of 1966 which requires that advanced time be observed within each established time zone from the last Sunday in April to the last Sunday in October, but permits any State to exempt itself, by law, from observing advanced time within that State. The Department of Transportation has no administrative authority with respect to this requirement.

#####





# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

# NEWS

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

FAA Library

FEB 26 1970

FOR RELEASE MONDAY  
February 9, 1970

Acq: 102  
Sect: 102

DOT -- 4170  
Phone: (202) 963-5154

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe today directed all units of the Department of Transportation to provide in advance for fair replacement housing for families displaced by federal and federally-assisted construction.

"Projects of the Department of Transportation will not be approved if they involve the dislocation of people -- black or white -- unless and until adequate replacement has already been provided for and built," Secretary Volpe said.

"It is my policy and the policy of the Administration that we shall do everything we can, in each individual case, to guarantee that the building of highways, airports, transit systems and so forth will cause the least disruption of human and natural resources. It is my sincere hope that this action by the Department will help make fair housing a reality in this nation and also contribute to our efforts in reducing the economic hardship on private citizens as a result of construction activity," the Secretary said.

"Each year, Department projects, including those federally-assisted, displace 70,000 persons -- some 50,000 by federal highway construction alone.

"I consider the new policy so important that I am approving procedures at this time so that you can make the necessary changes and place them into effect without delay."

Secretary Volpe outlined in a memorandum to the Administrators of the operating administrations the three principal points called for in the new Replacement Housing Policy of the Department of Transportation.

1. Specific written assurance that adequate replacement housing will be available (built, if necessary) before the initial approval or endorsement of any project.
2. Construction will be authorized only upon verification that replacement housing is in place and has been made available to all affected persons.

- more -

3. All replacement housing must be fair housing -- open to all persons regardless of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. This is in addition to the requirement that replacement housing must be offered all affected persons regardless of their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

The new policy directive went to the Administrators of the Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Highway Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, Urban Mass Transportation Administration and the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard.

#####





# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

2134  
**NEWS**

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

DOT -- 4270  
Phone: (202) 963-5154

A two-pronged effort which has been underway to provide maximum safety in the manufacture and performance of school buses was outlined today by Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe in a letter to Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts.

Acting under the authority of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, Volpe said the National Highway Safety Bureau of the Department of Transportation has issued ten standards applicable to school buses and has in process about thirty additional safety standards.

Among the proposed standards are:

- \* School bus handling and performance characteristics, with special emphasis on steering and braking systems.
- \* Driver vision aids with special emphasis on front end view where children may cross below the driver's view.
- \* Uniform and adequate warning light devices.
- \* Provision for collision-resistant devices at bumper heights compatible with other vehicles.
- \* Provision for steering wheel and steering column protective devices for drivers.
- \* Protective restraint systems for driver and front seat occupants.
- \* Provisions for safety glass windshields and quick escape devices for side windows.

Secretary Volpe said the Department has drafted a proposed standard of Pupil Transportation Safety which will be circulated in March to each State and other affected jurisdictions. Publication of the operating standards are expected by next winter, he said.

The areas of school bus safety for which operating standards have been drafted include: safety performance of school bus seats; safety belts for drivers and passengers; a prohibition against standing bus passengers; standards for school bus maintenance; qualification and training of school bus drivers; improvement of school bus routings.

Also described by Secretary Volpe was the consideration being given to the construction of an experimental school bus similar to the experimental safety passenger car program.

The text of the letter is attached.

021170





THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

February 10, 1970

Honorable Edward M. Kennedy  
United States Senate  
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Kennedy:

Thank you for your letter of January 27. I am happy to know of your concurrence with our concern for the safety of the nation's school children. There is a clear and urgent need for a family of safety standards to ensure that these children ride in vehicles which are, by law, designed and manufactured to provide maximum safety, operated by certified and professionally competent drivers, and are subject to high standards of regular inspection and maintenance.

Our statutory authority in this regard can be grouped under two headings: (1) motor vehicle safety performance standards affecting the design and manufacture of school buses, and (2) standards affecting school bus operations in the States. The National Highway Safety Bureau is making progress in both regards:

- (1) Motor Vehicle Standards. Under the authority of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, the Bureau has issued 10 standards to date which apply to school buses (as well as to all buses). A time table has been established for issuing future standards, including those dealing with the specific areas mentioned in your letter and discussed in detail below. This schedule is incorporated in the Bureau's report to the National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Council of September 9, 1969, which you mentioned in your letter. The long-range goal stated in that report is to establish performance criteria for a school bus which will provide maximum safety for the children. To reach that goal, we will issue standards covering such items as seats and passenger restraints, stability, side window mounting, transmission shift effort, turning radius, ground clearance, vehicle acceleration, and side underride.



- (2) Standards for School Bus Operation. Under the authority of the Highway Safety Act of 1966 we have been drafting a proposed standard on Pupil Transportation Safety. This draft will be circulated to each State and the many various affected jurisdictions for comment in mid-March. Final publication is expected by next winter or sooner, depending on the substance of the comments. That review period is necessary to gather the views and suggestions of the States and communities who will be affected by the standard. The standard as now drafted addresses the items mentioned in your letter and are discussed in detail below.

in response to each of the eight specific suggestions you have outlined, may I give you some details on precisely what the Department of Transportation has been doing up until now, as well as some of the plans for the realistic implementation of a meaningful program in the immediate future.

1. Performance Standards for Seats

The Department, in Docket 2-11, has already initiated the first rule making action to upgrade substantially the safety performance of school bus seats. Prior to proceeding with this work a research contract was initiated with the Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering at the University of California at Los Angeles, as an extension of the 1967 report which you cite in your letter, to provide objective criteria for seat performance standards. While the information from this research has not been as definitive as we would like, we nevertheless believe that there is sufficient information for us to proceed with this rule making.

The question of whether existing school buses should be retrofitted with improved seat designs is primarily an economic one. Safety performance standards cannot be written in the context of the seat performance alone but must take into account the strength of seat anchorages and floor retention points. It is probable that retrofitting a school bus now in service with improved seat design would cost more than the purchase price of a new bus. For this reason, the Department has not taken steps to adopt such requirements.

## 2. Lap-type Seat Belts

On September 15, 1969, the Department issued proposed amendments to motor vehicle safety Standards 207, 208 and 210 to extend the applicability of safety belts to the driver seating position in buses (as well as other vehicles) and to incorporate specific strength requirements for seat anchorages. Comments from interested parties on these proposals are now being analyzed and it is expected that the amendments will become effective January 1, 1971.

With regard to seat belts for bus passengers, work is now proceeding to determine the feasibility of incorporating requirements for seat belts as a part of Docket 2-11, which would set specific safety performance requirements for bus passenger seats.

## 3. Prohibition of Standees

Twenty-eight States have a law or regulation prohibiting or limiting the number of standees on a school bus. However, there are approximately 1.44 million children who must stand while being transported to or from school each day. Standees on a moving school bus can be injured even in the normal start and stop operation. This potential hazard to a standee is multiplied many times in the event of an accident or sudden stop necessitated by traffic. Chances of injury to a standee are greater than for a seated child and the injury can be more serious. Standees limit the vision of drivers and could overload tires, clutch and brakes and may in some instances violate the manufacturers' gross vehicle weight. Carrying standees may also affect insurance coverage and most certainly increases operating cost.

Additional hazards arise when trying to evacuate an overcrowded bus quickly. The increased discipline problems that often occur pose one of the most serious hazards to the bus operator. Fights or "horseplay" can be distracting to the point where an operator has to take his eyes off the road and risks a run-off roadway accident or possible head-on collision should he inadvertently turn the steering wheel to the left.



Therefore, the National Highway Safety Bureau has included in its current draft of the Pupil Transportation Safety Standard a requirement that each school bus passenger be seated in a regular seat while the school bus is in motion.

#### 4. Maintenance of School Buses

Department investigation of several recent school bus crashes disclosed serious vehicle maintenance deficiencies. Our concern about the adequacy of school bus maintenance is heightened by the results of 10,462 school buses inspected in one mid-western State in 1968. These inspections resulted in the rejection of about 40 percent of the buses.

The report of the School Bus Safety Committee of the National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Council, mentioned in your letter, recommended a mandatory inspection and maintenance program. Forty-five States have an inspection program for school buses. Thirty-five of these States inspect buses at different or more frequent intervals than other motor vehicles.

Therefore, the Highway Safety Bureau has included in its current draft of the Pupil Transportation Safety Standard a requirement that there be at least two inspections every year. A requirement for a daily pre-trip inspection and report from each school bus driver is also being considered. The guidelines accompanying the standard will provide details concerning qualified mechanics, preventive maintenance programs and spot checks to review the effectiveness of the maintenance program. The development of such a program will require the allocation of greater resources to the maintenance of school vehicles but the consequences of not fully maintaining these vehicles are likely to be so serious that the risk may not be acceptable.

DOT is participating in the development of Inspection Requirements for School Buses being coordinated by the National Commission on Safety Education of the National Education Association.

## 5. Qualification of Drivers

The States are definitely interested in having a standard for qualifications and training of school bus drivers. The Department fully concurs. Accordingly, the draft standard includes the requirement for a State plan to assure the selection, training, and supervision of the highest attainable quality of personnel engaged in the transportation of school children. The draft standard also requires a license for school bus drivers, that calls for the same skills as other bus drivers.

The State of Maryland has recently proposed for Federal funding a project which will test and evaluate hundreds of school bus drivers in an attempt to quantify measurements of driver skills. The project will be helpful to the drafting of the Pupil Transportation Safety Standard.

## 6. School Bus Routes

School buses travel 2 billion miles annually over routes that change almost daily. Both our School Bus Safety Division and our Pedestrian Safety Division are concerned with the problems of getting children to school safely. Recommendations for safe loading areas and routes are given in the guidelines accompanying the Standards.

A number of States have implemented plans for projects in this area which are quite promising; several propose the use of data processing to improve bus routing. Implementation of these plans await Federal grant-in-aid funding, and must compete with other priority areas for the limited safety program funds that are available. As stated in the law, the executive direction of the States' safety programs is assigned to the Governor who has the responsibility to set priorities.

Every effort has been made, and will continue to be made to encourage the States to maintain close scrutiny over all issues that bear on school bus routing, for we consider this to be one of the key aspects of the problem. Moreover, the Pupil Transportation Safety Standard is being drafted to provide firm guidelines for the establishment of routes and for loading zones and procedures, including a requirement for zones which are off the main, traveled portion of the highways.



## 7. National Conference on School Transportation

The NHTSB has selected from the National Conference Standards those major, safety-related items which are objective and are adaptable to Federal Motor Vehicle Standards. Ten of the current motor vehicle standards are applicable to school buses. Approximately thirty additional rule making matters are in process.

Among these thirty are proposed standards in the following "areas:"

- School bus handling and performance characteristics, with special emphasis on steering and braking systems.
- Driver-vision aids, with special emphasis on front-end view where children may cross below driver's view.
- Uniform and adequate warning light devices.
- Provision for collision-resistant devices at bumper heights, compatible with other highway vehicles.
- Provision for steering wheel and steering column protective devices, for drivers.
- Protective restraint systems for driver and front seat occupants.
- Provision of safety-glass windshields and quick-escape devices for side windows.

The NHTSB will be participating in the 1970 National Conference on School Transportation during the period May 4-8, for the purpose of updating these "Minimum Standards." A meeting of the planning council took place on December 15-16, 1969, at which time working committees were formed to investigate both body and chassis of school buses; and subsequently to develop recommendations for inclusion in standards revision. A working session of these committees will be held during the final week of February 1970.

## 8. Prototype Safety School Bus

The NHTSB has already investigated the possibility of sponsoring the design and construction of an experimental school bus utilizing the systems engineering approach now

incorporated in the experimental safety passenger car program. Preliminary plans for such an experimental school bus have been under consideration for some time. However, there are no immediate plans to schedule it because the next priority for our limited resources, after the 4,000 pound passenger car, is the small (under 2,000 pounds) passenger car. Depending upon resources, of course, schedules can be advanced.

Once again, may I assure you that the Department of Transportation is both interested in and deeply committed to upgrading the safety of pupil transportation throughout the country. We are pushing the development and early issuance of relevant safety standards for school bus vehicles. We are also urging States to improve their school transportation systems; the key immediate need here is the full cooperation of States and local communities in providing favorable consideration of the draft standard which is to be released for comment shortly.

I enlist your continuing concern and enthusiastic support of our action programs to upgrade school bus safety as rapidly as our resources permit.

Thank you for writing.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "J. Edgar Hoover", with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the left.





## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

# NEWS

### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

DOT -- 4370  
Phone: (202) 963-5154

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe today said actions are under way to resolve grievances between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization.

The controllers group -- known as PATCO -- threatened Tuesday to cause an air traffic slowdown starting Sunday in a dispute with FAA management over working conditions. The FAA says such a slowdown would constitute an illegal strike.

Secretary Volpe noted that one of his first actions when he took office a little over a year ago was to order a new initiative in framing the Airports and Airways Development Act of 1969, now before Congress. This bill, the Secretary said, would provide the resources to modernize the air traffic control system and ease the burden on controllers -- specifically those on duty during peak hours at certain high density airports.

Last July, Secretary Volpe commissioned a group of air systems experts to study the problems of controllers. The report of this 7-man committee -- headed by Dr. John Corson -- was received by Secretary Volpe on January 29. The Secretary, after a review of the Corson Committee recommendations, instructed FAA Administrator John Shaffer to implement on a time-phase basis, as many of the recommendations as practical.

Two such actions -- aimed at increasing communication between FAA management and the controllers -- were explained Tuesday by Secretary Volpe in a letter to Michael J. Rock, Chairman of the Board of PATCO:

1. The establishment of controller committees at the facility level composed of controllers selected from their own ranks. They will be expected to participate in local operational matters affecting them in their work; e.g., route structure, arrival and departure procedures, equipment and environmental improvements.

- more -

2. Another meeting with representatives of all employee organizations at an early date. A major agenda item will be the Corson Committee report; copies of this report have already been sent to all air traffic control facilities. FAA's plans include soliciting and incorporating controller views in its programs to improve the air traffic controller career and work environment."

Secretary Volpe said when he received the Corson Committee report that "I have felt, and the report appears to support, that much can be done in a relatively short time to bring about significant improvements.

"I'm thinking particularly of recruiting, training (at all stages of controller development), promotion selection, and automation of operations.

"What comes through clearly in the Committee's report is the need for improvement in communications between controllers and management.

"The Federal Aviation Administration has not been sitting idly by, waiting for this report. Jack Shaffer is every bit as concerned about the controllers as I am. The FAA has already taken a number of actions to improve the situation.

"For example, at FAA's request, the Civil Service Commission waived its time in grade requirements so we could promote 7,699 controllers into a new higher-level Air Traffic Control Specialist classification without their having to sit out prescribed waiting periods."

Secretary Volpe, in his statement issued today, concluded that, "I believe, given sufficient time and goodwill, we can resolve any problems which exist between the FAA and the air traffic controllers."

####





# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

*Mr. Kruse*  
**NEWS**

**OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

**WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590**

FOR RELEASE MONDAY  
February 16, 1970

DOT -- 4570  
Phone: (202) 963-5154

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe today directed all units of the Department of Transportation to provide in advance for fair replacement housing for families displaced by federal and federally-assisted construction.

"Projects of the Department of Transportation will not be approved if they involve the dislocation of people -- black or white -- unless and until adequate replacement has already been provided for and built," Secretary Volpe said.

"It is my policy and the policy of the Administration that we shall do everything we can, in each individual case, to guarantee that the building of highways, airports, transit systems and so forth will cause the least disruption of human and natural resources. It is my sincere hope that this action by the Department will help make fair housing a reality in this nation and also contribute to our efforts in reducing the economic hardship on private citizens as a result of construction activity," the Secretary said.

"Each year, Department projects, including those federally-assisted, displace 70,000 persons -- some 50,000 by federal highway construction alone.

"I consider the new policy so important that I am approving procedures at this time so that you can make the necessary changes and place them into effect without delay."

Secretary Volpe outlined in a memorandum to the Administrators of the operating administrations the three principal points called for in the new Replacement Housing Policy of the Department of Transportation.

1. Specific written assurance that adequate replacement housing will be available (built, if necessary) before the initial approval or endorsement of any project.
2. Construction will be authorized only upon verification that replacement housing is in place and has been made available to all affected persons.

- more -

3. All replacement housing must be fair housing -- open to all persons regardless of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. This is in addition to the requirement that replacement housing must be offered all affected persons regardless of their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

The new policy directive went to the Administrators of the Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Highway Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, Urban Mass Transportation Administration and the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard.

#####





# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

# NEWS

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

FEB 25 1970

DOT -- 4670

Phone: (202) 963-5154

Acquisition  
Section

The Department of Transportation has assumed the compliance responsibility to assure equal employment opportunity on Metro system construction projects, Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe today announced.

"Metro contractors and subcontractors will be required to take affirmative action which will result in employment of minority group persons throughout their work force," Volpe said.

"This means that contractors and subcontractors will have to provide for employment of minorities in high-paying, skilled jobs as well as unskilled and semi-skilled jobs," Volpe added.

"If minority persons are not available for the skilled jobs, programs will have to be developed to train them."

The Department of Transportation is the Federal agency through which Metro funds flow to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The Department will make its requirements known to WMATA, which will spell out the equal opportunity obligations of contractors in bid specifications. Contractors will be responsible for the compliance of their subcontractors.

The Transportation Department's Urban Mass Transportation Administration will handle these contract compliance responsibilities for the Department.

Secretary Volpe explained that UMTA would work closely with WMATA to assure full compliance. "We expect to have 100 percent cooperation in this effort from all parties interested and involved, including WMATA, the contractor organizations, labor unions, and community organizations concerned with equal employment opportunity. This is a truly metropolitan undertaking and we want cooperation from all quarters," he said.

Transportation representatives plan to meet with WMATA representatives to discuss the compliance program within the next few days. Volpe said that the contractors and subcontractors on the three contracts already awarded would be asked to comply with the program voluntarily even though the specific provisions are not in their contracts.

The compliance responsibility has been assigned to Transportation by the Labor Department's Office of Federal Contract Compliance.

#####

021770



FOR RELEASE THURSDAY  
February 19, 1970

DOT -- 4870  
Phone: (202) 963-5154

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe today announced the appointment of Dr. Robert A. Hemmes as Assistant Administrator for Research in the Department of Transportation's Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

Dr. Hemmes, 45, is Associate Professor of Industrial Engineering at Stanford University. In his new post, he will be responsible for organizing and directing UMTA's research, development and demonstration programs.

"The Department of Transportation is fortunate in getting a man of Dr. Hemmes' qualifications to serve on our team," Secretary Volpe said. "He plans to turn what has become a static office into one dedicated to dynamism. He will organize an office of program management that will be responsible for seeing projects through to completion, thereby assuring coordination of our programs."

A 1948 graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, Dr. Hemmes served six years in the Navy, including destroyer-mine sweeper duty in the Korean War. In 1956, he was awarded a Master of Science degree in aeronautical and electrical engineering from Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he worked on applied mechanics for weapons systems.

However, Dr. Hemmes' thesis at MIT was on a servo-mechanical stabilization system for high-speed railroad trains.

From 1956 to 1958, Dr. Hemmes was a civilian employee of the Navy Department's Bureau of Aeronautics, working on bomb delivery systems. Then for two years he was an Assistant Professor of Civil Engineering at George Washington University in Washington, D.C.

Dr. Hemmes went to Stanford in 1960, where he earned his doctorate in industrial engineering. At Stanford, he worked on engineering applications to economic industrial planning.

Dr. Hemmes and his wife, the former Alexandra Ossipoff of Honolulu, Hawaii, and their three children now reside in McLean, Virginia.

####

FOR RELEASE FRIDAY 3:00 P.M.  
February 20, 1970

DOT -- 4970  
Phone: (202) 963-5154

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe today announced a \$1,021,315 demonstration grant to the Dallas-Fort Worth Airport Board for a circulatory transportation system at the regional airport now being built near Arlington, Texas.

"The Dallas-Fort Worth Airport Board," Secretary Volpe said, "has taken the first critical step in developing the necessary hardware for circulatory systems at major activity centers and the Department of Transportation intends to capitalize on it.

"Although research studies have shown the need for these systems at center cities, new towns, airports, education and medical centers," Secretary Volpe continued, "the hardware to do the job has not been developed. The risks were too high and no one had been willing to take the first step and build an operating system.

"I am anxious to move beyond studies and do something about public transportation problems. The Board's willingness to build a prototype system will give the Department's Urban Mass Transportation Administration a full-scale laboratory to test many of the concepts developed by the studies."

The Dallas-Fort Worth Regional Airport is, in effect, two airports flanking a multi-lane expressway between the two cities. The problems of moving passengers, baggage and air cargo among the various terminal modules on either side of the expressway is stimulating the development of a new kind of circulatory system.

The Board has spent \$384,000 on first stage development work and will contribute \$450,000 to the demonstration phase.

It has selected two companies to provide mock-ups of proposed systems, one of which will be selected for a prototype demonstration.

-more-



The two companies are Dashaveyor Company of Los Angeles, California and Varo, Incorporated of Garrett, Texas.

The prototype, to be built at the airport site, will consist of about 1500 feet of test track with vehicles, switches and passenger stations. The demonstration will include testing of the riding and switching qualities of the vehicles and an evaluation of automatic control equipment.

Project No. TEX-MTD-5

For further information: Thomas M. Sullivan  
Executive Director  
Dallas-Fort Worth Regional Airport Board  
604 Avenue H, East  
Arlington, Texas 76010

###



# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

# NEWS

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

DOT -- 5070

Phone: (202) 963-5154

A curb on aircraft noise and sonic boom soon will be issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe said today.

Secretary Volpe, in a letter to Representative Henry S. Reuss, declared that "the Department of Transportation is taking positive action on the control of sonic boom" and plans to issue a Notice of Proposed Rule Making on the boom no later than April 1970.

"As you know," Secretary Volpe wrote the Congressman, "President Nixon and I, on numerous occasions, have stated that it is the unequivocal position of this Administration that no commercial supersonic aircraft will be allowed to fly over populated areas at boom producing speeds."

He said the FAA is now preparing such a Notice of Proposed Rule Making, a procedure that allows the public, industry and interested parties to make their view known to the FAA.

#####

022470





# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

# NEWS

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

EMBARGOED UNTIL NOON  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24

DOT -- 5170  
Phone: (202) 963-5154

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe today expressed general agreement with the recommendations of the District of Columbia Government on freeway construction in the Nation's Capital.

In his report, Secretary Volpe said, "My responsibility as Secretary of Transportation in reporting to Congress on these matters, requires that I give consideration to the metropolitan area and national transportation needs as well as those of the District of Columbia. My judgment must be based on transportation by all modes and not be limited to highway consideration alone."

In his report to the Congress, Secretary Volpe supported the District of Columbia Government's recommendation for construction of the south leg along with further study of the north leg segment of the freeway system.

At the same time, the Secretary called for a 16-month study of the proposed North Central Freeway, which the District of Columbia Government recommended deleting from the Interstate System.

The Secretary agreed with the District Government's recommendation that the New York Avenue industrial freeway be built. But he added that "it is not, in fact, a substitute for a North Central Freeway, it is an east-west corridor and offers little relief to north-south traffic."

The North Central area is the most heavily traveled in the District of Columbia-Maryland portion of the Washington metropolitan area. "This traffic load, now carried on residential streets and projected in the 1968 Cost Estimate to go up to 90,000 vehicles per

-more-

day by 1990, is bound to have an ever-increasing harmful effect on the neighborhood environment, schools, playgrounds, parks and community life," the Secretary said.

While **unable** to agree with local authorities that the North Central Freeway should be deleted at this time, the Secretary said that the project cannot be approved, if at all, until certain basic and compelling considerations are incorporated into freeway planning. He specified greater community involvement and citizen participation, land use and environmental planning, replacement housing, design work in relation to joint development of the North Central corridor with Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and resolution of Maryland road connections with the District of Columbia system.

A most significant factor in the consideration of North Central Freeway is replacement housing. Last week, Secretary Volpe directed that no construction project within the Department's jurisdiction shall be commenced until replacement housing is in place and has been made available to all affected persons.

The Secretary commended the District of Columbia Government for "its determined effort to comply with the requirements of Congress, as well as to remain sensitive to the expressed concern of the citizen groups of the District of Columbia."

The Secretary noted that in spite of the complexities of the problem, the District of Columbia Government's recommendation includes 73 percent of the network set forth in the 1968 cost estimate; and with the addition of the proposed New York Avenue industrial freeway, the total mileage would be 87 percent of the 1968 cost estimate of the 1968 Highway Act.

####





THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

February 22, 1970

IDENTICAL LETTER TO:

Honorable Spiro T. Agnew  
President of the Senate  
Washington, D. C. 20510

Honorable John W. McCormack  
Speaker of the House  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Mr. President:

I submit herewith the report and recommendations required of the Secretary of Transportation by subsection 23(c) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 regarding completion of the Interstate Highway System in the District of Columbia. This submission is within the limit of time specified in the Act.

Under the law, this report is concerned with the three freeway projects -- South leg, North leg, and North Central -- which were included in the 1968 Interstate System Cost Estimate for the District of Columbia but which were not specified in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 for immediate construction.

The development of this report began with the preparation of professional studies by the Department of Highways and Traffic of the District of Columbia on each of these segments of the system. These studies and related recommendations were the subject of public hearings before the City Council of the District of Columbia at which all points of view were afforded opportunity to be heard, including those from adjoining jurisdictions in Maryland. Following the hearings, the City Council unanimously adopted formal recommendations and alternatives, and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia has endorsed them. These recommendations and alternatives are being submitted separately by the District Government.

In my opinion, the recommendations of the Government of the District of Columbia reflect a determined effort to comply with the requirements of the Congress as well as to remain sensitive to the expressed concerns of the citizen groups of the District of Columbia. It is necessary to remember in this connection that the time available for preparation of studies and for Government action was considerably reduced by the practical necessity last year to resolve the controversy concerning the relationship of rapid transit and highways in a balanced transportation program for the metropolitan area. Yet the completed freeway network reflected in the District Government's recommendations includes in mileage over 73 percent of the network set forth in the 1968 Cost Estimate. With the New York Avenue addition proposed by the District Government, the total mileage would be 87 percent of the mileage in the 1968 Cost Estimate.

My responsibility as Secretary of Transportation, in reporting to Congress on these matters, requires that I give consideration to the metropolitan area and national transportation needs as well as those of the District of Columbia. My judgment must be based on transportation by all modes and not be limited to highway considerations alone. Based on this concept, my recommendations on the three projects referred to are as follows:

(1) South Leg Freeway. I recommend that Plan C in the District Highway Department report be adopted for the South Leg Freeway plan. This plan would provide for a tunnel about 1,400 feet long beneath the Lincoln Memorial area returning to the existing elevation on Independence Avenue approximately 1,000 feet beyond the south tunnel portal. I recommend a modification of the tunnel section in Plan C to the extent that a vertical clearance of 12-1/2 feet be provided rather than the 14-1/2 feet tunnel clearance, since commercial traffic will not be permitted on this route.

Additional background information and details regarding this project recommendation are provided in Enclosure 1 with this letter. My recommendations on this segment are in substantial agreement with



the recommendations of the District of Columbia Government. This plan will do the least damage to the esthetics and monumental character of this area and permit its easy accessibility to visitors and city dwellers alike.

(2) North Leg Freeway. I recommend that the action proposed by the District Government be deferred for 18 months pending preparation, in cooperation with the Government of the District of Columbia, of a final plan of action on this segment of the Interstate System in the District and pending necessary public hearings. The further study leading to this plan of action should not be restricted to the alternatives specified by the District Government (4-lane tunnel along K Street, 2-lane tunnels along L and M Streets, or a tunnel connecting the E Street Expressway with Downtown). Further details regarding the background information and other considerations relating to this freeway segment are provided in Enclosure 2 with this letter.

(3) North-Central Freeway. The District Government proposes to remove the North-Central leg from the freeway system. In my opinion, any judgment requiring or precluding this segment is premature. Significant problems have not been resolved. Admittedly, the North-Central area is the most heavily traveled in the D. C. -Maryland portion of metropolitan Washington. This traffic load, now carried on residential streets and projected in the 1968 Cost Estimate to go up to 90,000 vehicles per day by 1990, is bound to have an ever-increasingly harmful effect on the neighborhood environment, schools, playgrounds, parks and community life. The New York Avenue freeway proposed by the District Government as a substitute is not in fact an alternative; it is primarily an east-west corridor and offers little relief to north-south traffic. Nor can possible improvements in managing traffic arterials as suggested by the District Government meet but a part of the problem. For the safety and enhancement of this community, we must seek a more effective and reasonable solution for channeling this heavy traffic away from homes, schools, and playgrounds. In the professional judgment of our staff, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad corridor appears to offer the most practicable and feasible alignment for a freeway development in the North-Central area with the least disruption to the community.



Notwithstanding these observations, additional studies and planning are unavoidable, if a well-considered and long-range solution is to be our objective. First, a concerted effort must be made to obtain involvement of the community and meaningful citizen participation. Second, the highway planning in this area needs to be coordinated more closely with comprehensive land use and environmental planning for the total community. Third, continuing discussions with the Department of Housing and Urban Development are necessary to establish in advance attractive replacement housing alternatives for persons potentially subject to relocation, consistent with the policy I have stated that no construction will be undertaken before adequate replacement housing is in fact available. Fourth, the possibility of removing the operating rail line from the corridor needs to be explored thoroughly so that the most advantageous program for joint development of the corridor with the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority can be developed in order to save construction money and time, improve design features, and enhance appearance and utility. Fifth, additional time would permit clarification of the uncertainty which appears to have developed in Maryland regarding the Maryland connecting links.

In summary, I recommend that final judgment be deferred until the studies and planning enumerated above are completed. I believe that this work can be accomplished and a definitive recommendation made within a period of 16 months. Additional background information and details regarding this segment are provided in Enclosure 3 with this letter.

The District Government's proposal to create a New York Avenue freeway has merit as an addition or alternate routing for that portion of I-95, which is to be carried jointly with I-70S south of Gallatin Street. This section is very heavily loaded because the design was administratively restricted to eight lanes despite the larger traffic load demand. It is further complicated by undesirable weaving movements at and between the inter-changes. I would, therefore, be willing to give favorable consideration to an adjustment as proposed for rerouting I-95, assuming that approvals could be obtained for the adjustments in routing of the East Leg which are made as a part of the



District Government recommendation in connection with the New York Avenue change, and a satisfactory solution can be found to handling the traffic load on the section of present I-95 removed between the Beltway and the present I-70S junction near Gallatin Street in the District of Columbia.

In Section 23(b) of the Act, reference was made to four specific projects: (1) Three Sisters Bridge, (2) Potomac River Freeway, (3) Center Leg of the Inner Loop, and (4) East Leg of the Inner Loop, on which work was to proceed. There follows a status report on these segments.

#### Three Sisters Bridge I-266 (Section B1 to B2)

In 1966 a compromise location was agreed to by the District, Virginia, and the National Park Service. The Fine Arts Commission approved a single span structure design in September 1967. The February 1968 Court of Appeals injunction against this route was lifted by the 1968 Highway Act. In August 1969 a consulting engineer was engaged to prepare detailed plans. The first construction contract, for two river piers, is now underway.

In late 1969 there was a move in the U.S. District Court to enjoin further action on the Three Sisters Bridge. This was denied in January 1970, and the court ruled that construction should proceed. An appeal is now pending.

#### Potomac River Freeway I-266 (Section B2 to B4)

The District of Columbia presently has a design contract underway for this project. A civil action was filed in the U.S. District Court in January 1970 to enjoin construction and right-of-way acquisition on this project. The plaintiffs, defendants, and the alleged violation of law, are similar to those filed in the Three Sisters Bridge court action.

Recommendations regarding the design concept for this segment of the Interstate System in the District of Columbia are presented in Enclosure 4 with this letter. This design concept would enhance the development of the Georgetown Waterfront.

Center Leg of the Inner Loop I-95 (Section A6 to C4)

Preliminary design is underway for joint development housing and freeway facilities on a 5-acre site between H and K Streets, N.W., on the Center Leg, I-95. The segment of the route between the Southwest Freeway and H Street is under construction and is well along. The Mall tunnel is about 50 percent complete. Grading walls and structure for the depressed section between D Street and H Street, N.W., are complete. Paving and stone facing operations are awaiting improved weather conditions.

East Leg of the Inner Loop I-295 (Section C1 to C4)

The first section from 11th Street to Barney Circle (Pennsylvania Avenue) is partly under construction. Detailed design work is underway for 1/2 mile east of Barney Circle. Bids were opened January 15, 1970, for a short grading project in this area.

The alignment along the Anacostia River in the vicinity of the D. C. Stadium has been affected somewhat by recreational development studies by the Interior Department. The East Leg highway project should be developed in keeping with the planning of the National Park Service for this recreational complex, with joint financing to be determined on the basis of later discussion between the responsible agencies. Additional views on this subject are presented in Enclosure 5 with this letter.

To complete this submission, as a matter of information, I am also enclosing copies of the recommendations as reported by the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic. Enclosures 6, 7, and 8 are that Department's reports on the South Leg Freeway, the North Leg Freeway, and the North-Central Freeway, respectively.

My report is also being submitted to the Speaker of the House.

Sincerely,

**John A. Volpe**

Enclosures



SOUTH LEG FREEWAY1. Background of Planning

The report by the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic correctly states the long history of planning for the South Leg corridor, spanning a 20-year period from 1950 to the present date.

In addition to the chronology in the Highway Department report, there was the Report on Development of Lincoln Memorial Park prepared for the National Park Service in 1960. This report recommended a tunnel project connecting the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge with Independence Avenue by means of a twin tunnel section under the Lincoln Memorial area. This proposal did not include the additional tunneling under the Tidal Basin area as shown in Figure 2 of the Highway Department report, and did not make other changes in the present traffic service facilities in this area. This report also was the basis for the contract design proposal which was advertised for bids in June 1965 with the approval of all affected Federal agencies. As noted in Section II of the Highway Department report, the invitation for bids on this project was withdrawn prior to contract award.

The proposed tunnel cross section in the design as advertised was for two 36-foot roadways, a tunnel length of 1,430 feet between portals, vertical clearance of 12-1/2 feet and narrow refuge on each side of each roadway. The profile returned to the existing elevation on Independence Avenue approximately 1,000 feet beyond the south tunnel portal.

This advertised proposal very closely approximates the layout plan shown as Plan C, Figure 6, in the Highway Department report now under review, identified as a plan suggested by the Federal Highway Administration.

The Highway Department report provides descriptive data regarding Plan A, Plan B, and Plan C giving comparative cost figures, encroachment on present Tidal Basin area, ventilation structure needs, landscaping effects, and assigns to each Plan a traffic carrying capacity.

The Highway Department report recommends that Plan A be adopted citing the difference in traffic capacity and the possible later conversion of Plan A to a full tunnel section similar to the Plan B solution. Plan B is shown to cost \$95 million, Plan A \$65 million, and Plan C \$22.5 million.

The District Government recommends that Plan C be built.

## 2. Traffic Considerations

The Highway Department report assigns a traffic capacity of 100,000 vehicles per day to Plan A and Plan B. Plan C is stated to have a capacity of only 60,000 vehicles per day. Under the operating conditions set out in the report, we agree with these values.

In considering the Highway Department report, however, it should be noted that neither Plan A or B take into account the 27,000 vehicles daily using 17th Street that would have to seek another route through the Mall area. Only Plan C mentions a capacity restraint, 60,000 ADT, "in the section east of the Tidal Basin, which is also the maximum current volume." This 60,000 ADT is the sum of the four present one-way roadways serving the area immediately east of 17th Street.

If Plan C were to be operated with the limited movements permitted in Plan A and B, i. e. the elimination of 17th Street connections during rush hour and the resulting removal of heavy weaving movements, then Plan C could, with relatively minor modification, be made to approach a capacity equal to Plans A and B. In addition to closing off the 17th Street service, there would be needed separation structures at 15th Street in the vicinity of the Bureau of Printing and Engraving. Consideration should also be given to the ultimate elimination of the grade crossing at Independence Avenue and 14th Street.

## 3. Environment Effects

As shown in the Highway Department report, Plan C has the minimum adverse effect on the present landscape, requires no modification of the existing Tidal Basin area and thus no change in its



functional operation. There would be no major disruption of a large part of the total area under Plan C as would be required for either Plan A or Plan B. And finally, Plan C, too, could be an element of some more extensive tunnel plan if future needs of the District made such a change desirable.

Meanwhile, the traffic requirements of this area, and of the District as a whole, can be met with the minimum of construction -- freeing the Memorial area of unwanted traffic while preserving for the most part the existing amenities of West Potomac Park.

#### 4. Recommendation

It is recommended that Plan C be adopted for the South Leg Freeway plan but with modification from the section as described in the Highway Department report to provide only a 12-1/2-foot vehicle clearance. There is no established need for a 14-1/2-foot tunnel clearance since heavy commercial traffic will not be permitted. The 12-1/2-foot clearance will accommodate all foreseeable emergency needs and other routings are available for the movement of military vehicles requiring larger clearances.

NORTH LEG FREEWAY1. Background of Planning

Several alternate alignments for the North Leg Freeway have been considered. The alternate in the area of T and U Streets, N.W. of the District was the line on which the 1968 Cost Estimate was reported. There was also included in the 1968 Cost Estimate the cost information on the proposal for the "K" Street tunnel line as information for the Congress to consider. This "line" was recommended for study by the District Council and the National Capital Planning Commission.

The Highway Department report recites the problems in this area and recommends that in order to provide needed time for a thorough study of this area and its problems, and to provide needed time for community input and public hearing review, that the Congress be requested to permit added study of the problem and an additional 18 months' time extension be allowed for this purpose.

The District Government rejects this recommendation and recommends instead aligning the North Leg in a 4-lane tunnel along K Street or in 2-lane tunnels along L and M Streets or some combination of these, or as an alternative, a tunnel connecting the E Street Expressway to "Downtown." The District Government rejects all other alternatives and notes that public hearings are necessary before the final alignment chosen can be built.

2. Other Considerations

In the study of the North Central Freeway alignment, and our report on this matter, there are involved many elements of the total study of relocation assistance and the associated problems of providing public housing at reasonable rentals. In the North Central Freeway study, in cooperation with HUD and other government departments and agencies which have authority and responsibility in public housing, it is our hope we can come up with some procedural answers and some financing solutions which can contribute greatly to solving the basic problem which creates the public opposition to a highway answering the traffic need in the North Leg corridor.



### 3. Alternates

There is a strong possibility that the "E" Street line extension, across the area in the rear of the White House and extending beyond Pennsylvania Avenue, perhaps ultimately to the Center Leg Freeway, can be accomplished. This could well be the "release" from the pressure for a traffic service line along "K" Street -- and certainly would give relief to the present problem of "just too many cars and too much confusion in area between the White House and the Washington Monument."

### 4. Recommendation

In view of the potential stated under paragraph 3 above, and in anticipation of the results we hope to achieve with HUD and others in the search for relocation problem solutions, we recommend that there be prepared within 18 months, in cooperation with the District Government, a final action plan on this segment of the Interstate System in the District. The additional studies necessary for this final action plan must not be restricted to the alternatives proposed by the District Government.

## NORTH CENTRAL FREEWAY

### 1. Background of Planning

The Department of Highways and Traffic report on a freeway in the northern sector includes a historical review of the recognized need for such a facility evidenced by many proposals spanning the broad area between the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers. All other corridors were ruled out and the highway department's evaluation of traffic and design considerations was limited to the North Central and New York Avenue routes. While conceding that highway improvement will be needed in the New York Avenue corridor, the District Highway Department recommended immediate construction of a low-level freeway along the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.

Preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition had been authorized by Public Roads for the southern portion of this route prior to the 1968 Interstate Cost Estimate. North of Taylor Street the estimate was based on the so-called Route 11 alignment recommended by consultants in 1964. The newer line following the tracks at-or-below railroad grade all the way to the Beltway resulted from a post-hearing attempt to minimize displacements. Within the District the number of families displaced was first reduced from 720 to 372, but with an increased cost of about \$29 million, or over \$83,000 per unit saved. Further efforts by the highway department have lowered the displacement needs to 223 units, again at some additional cost and sacrifice of design standards. The estimated cost now exceeds \$25 million per mile for a freeway that will barely serve traffic demands, while design elements suffer from the squeeze of right-of-way constrictions.

### 2. Traffic Considerations

The anticipated traffic of the combined northwest, central and northeast corridors into one North-Central route requires an exceedingly high capacity, 4-2-4 lane freeway with reversible express center lanes. The wide swathe needed for such a cross-section with extreme traffic concentrations in the vicinity of the Capitol dictated an arbitrary cutback to a 4-4 lane proposal. Although generally recognized as inadequate for future needs, it could be accepted at this time with two expectations.



First, another outlet to the northwest will eventually be supplied upon completion of the George Washington Memorial Parkway on the District side of the Potomac River from the Three Sisters Bridge to the Beltway, Interstate 495. Although commuter travel over parkways is generally undesirable, it would seem the river valley is too important a resource to be devoted solely to "pleasure" driving.

Second, an outlet to the northeast is possible in two ways. The proposed New York Avenue Freeway via the Kenilworth Interchange and northward on the Baltimore-Washington Parkway to the Beltway may be built. The northeast branch from the North Central corridor to meet Maryland's Interstate 95 at the Beltway would provide similar service.

### 3. Housing Potential

Continuing discussions with the Department of Housing and Urban Development are necessary to establish new methods of providing for these relocatees and replacing their housing. One possibility is a new goal to provide replacement housing while reconstructing the 1968 riot-damaged areas.

### 4. Design Alternatives

The high cost per freeway mile on the Highway Department's recommended design, the low-level railroad concept, has been previously noted. Coupled with incompletely satisfied capacity needs, the price tag is inordinately high.

Undoubtedly the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad's presence adds considerably to the costs. The five underpasses are intrinsically expensive because of the angle of crossing and the need to maintain railroad operations by detour tracks and supports. The proximity of the railroad itself and the future rapid transit lines add to the costs by requiring additional retaining walls and other appurtenances.

Since the B&O has an alternate connection into Washington through Baltimore and Laurel, a proposal has been made to purchase the railroad right-of-way. The railroad might desire a new east-west connection from Gaithersburg to Laurel or thereabouts, however this would be their decision and action.

Removal of the operating rail line would allow joint development of the transportation corridor by the highway departments in conjunction with the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. There are many obvious advantages:

1. Joint Development would coordinate and accelerate construction plans, lessen traffic congestion and aid in solving many problems in parking facilities, relocation, etc.
2. Considerably better highway alignment both vertical and horizontal and improved interchange geometrics would be possible.
3. Large sections of expensive retaining walls would be eliminated.
4. Minor savings in right-of-way widths would either reduce displacement of people or result in lower wall costs and improved esthetics.
5. A major reduction in tunnel construction costs and in construction time would occur.
6. A corollary advantage would be the possibility of a later extension of I-70S along the railroad line north of the Beltway to an interchange in the vicinity of Gaithersburg. While adding to overall costs this would also reduce traffic overloading on critical sections of the Beltway and I-70S.

The Interstate alignment does not parallel the railroad until it approaches Monroe Street and the Taylor Street bridge reconstruction practically fixes the highway alignment to that point. The possibilities in highway design with the railroad removed begin therefore north of Taylor Street. The joint development with WMATA could well begin at Monroe Street.

#### 5. Recommendations

The following course of action is recommended:



1. Further exploration of the B&O corridor as a practical and feasible alinement for joint highway - metro development in the North-Central area.
2. Exploration of the possibility of removing the B&O Railroad from the corridor.
3. Continued study of housing replacement strategies involving HUD.
4. Study of joint development possibilities with WMATA.

POTOMAC RIVER FREEWAY

Section 23 of the 1968 Federal-Aid Highway Act lists the Potomac River Freeway as one of the segments on which work is to be started in accordance with the 1968 Interstate Cost Estimate without further study. In compliance with this mandate, the District of Columbia presently has a design contract underway.

It is the thought of the Federal Highway Administration that further consideration should be given to the design along the Georgetown Waterfront, particularly the area downstream from Key Bridge. The 1968 Estimate Report envisioned a tunnel for the eastbound lanes beginning near Three Sisters Bridge and extending almost to Wisconsin Avenue. The existing Whitehurst Freeway would remain at present for westbound traffic with a shorter tunnel beginning west of Key Bridge. It is felt that further consideration should be given to an earlier design concept which provided two elevated structures and reserved the area beneath and riverward for park and recreation purposes.

Full development of the Georgetown Waterfront requires the removal of all commercial and industrial activities between the Potomac River and the C&O Canal and the Whitehurst Freeway. Under existing concepts for highway development, the entire cost of acquisition for this land could be financed from the Federal-aid highway fund. The National Park Service would be the logical agency for developing the park and recreational use.

The proposal described permits full and unrestricted access from the entire Georgetown area to all of the Potomac River bank. The tunnel east of Key Bridge creates a severe barrier to access because of the approach grades towards the completed structure at 31st Street. The elevated facilities would obviate the necessity for the elaborate construction techniques, ventilation equipment and constricted operations that are the earmark of all highway tunnels.



In conclusion, it is felt that further study of alternative solutions in the Georgetown Waterfront area should be undertaken before final decision is made on the type of facility to be constructed. The treatment upstream from the Key Bridge to the connections with the Three Sisters Bridge and the George Washington Memorial Parkway will of necessity have to await final decision on the treatment of the waterfront downstream from Key Bridge.

EAST LEG FREEWAY1. Background

The 1968 Federal-Aid Highway Act directed the government of the District of Columbia to commence work on four specific segments of the Interstate System in the District. One of these was the East Leg Freeway described in the Act by the 1968 Estimate termini "(C1 to C4), terminating at Bladensburg Road." In terms of local street identification the East Leg so described extends from the connection with I-695 on the District side of the 11th Street Anacostia River Bridge, east along the Anacostia River to Barney Circle at Pennsylvania Avenue, then north past the East Capitol Street Bridge, to the south edge of the Arboretum, thence west to Bladensburg Road.

Inasmuch as this segment is specifically spelled out in the 1968 Act, the District Highway Department has made no recommendation regarding this route and is preparing for construction contract work on the south end of the line described. The Secretary has given 4(f) clearance to the entire segment.

2. National Park Service Planning

The National Park Service has been developing a recreation area plan along the Anacostia River in the stadium area. These plans, if they are implemented, will require full coordination of the construction activities for the Park Service objectives and for the highway facility. The highway can be designed to permit the development of the cover section envisioned in the Park Service plan as the center point for the recreational complex. Also the highway segment can be constructed south of the East Capitol Bridge so as to complement the Department of Interior Plans for a sewer system and treatment facilities. However, these elements of the joint planning effort are very costly and the highway contribution to the joint development should be limited to the value received for highway purposes, with others responsible for the funding of those elements which are non-highway oriented.



### 3. Recommendation

The joint development concept is endorsed for this highway segment, subject to the capability of the National Park Service to bring their plan into a firm schedule status within the Interstate timetable. It would be a mistake to proceed with a very costly highway design and then find there is no way in which the remainder of the undertaking can be accomplished.



77064  
**DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION**

2200  
**NEWS**

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

**WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590**

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

DOT -- 5270  
Phone: (202) 963-5154

The St. Lawrence Seaway will this year be open to navigation on April 1, David W. Oberlin, Seaway Administrator announced today. This date equals the early opening record set in 1966.

In the joint announcement of the 1970 opening and closing dates, all of which are conditional upon weather and ice, the Canadian St. Lawrence Seaway Authority and the U.S. St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation informed shipping interests that the Montreal-to-Lake Ontario section would remain open from April 1 through December 10 with the possibility that navigation may be continued beyond that date.

The Welland Canal which links Lake Ontario and Lake Erie will also open on April 1.

DOT LIBRARY

Mar 16 1970

FEB 10A Kardex  
TAD-494.3

#####

022670