

74
In 8/4

1019

91-39
In 8/4
7114

91-39

SUBSIDIZED TRANSPORTATION FOR NEW EMPLOYEES

GOVERNMENT
Storage

500
/C

HEARING BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 14385 and H.R. 14393

BILLS TO PROVIDE AUTHORITY FOR SUBSIDIZED
TRANSPORTATION FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
EMPLOYEES AFFECTED BY THE TRANSFER TO THE
PARKLAWN BUILDING IN ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

JANUARY 27, 1970

Serial No. 91-39

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1970

40-895

KSU LIBRARIES

ALL900 807997 ✓

AY
4/8 nI.
92-19

SUBSIDIZED TRANSPORTATION FOR
NEW EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

HARLEY O. STAGGERS, West Virginia, *Chairman*

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Maryland	WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, Illinois
TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Massachusetts	SAMUEL L. DEVINE, Ohio
JOHN JARMAN, Oklahoma	ANCHER NELSEN, Minnesota
JOHN E. MOSS, California	HASTINGS KEITH, Massachusetts
JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan	GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska
PAUL G. ROGERS, Florida	JAMES T. BROYHILL, North Carolina
LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, California	JAMES HARVEY, Michigan
J. J. PICKLE, Texas	ALBERT W. WATSON, South Carolina
FRED B. ROONEY, Pennsylvania	TIM LEE CARTER, Kentucky
JOHN M. MURPHY, New York	G. ROBERT WATKINS, Pennsylvania
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III, Virginia	DONALD G. BROTZMAN, Colorado
BROCK ADAMS, Washington	CLARENCE J. BROWN, Ohio
RICHARD L. OTTINGER, New York	DAN KUYKENDALL, Tennessee
RAY BLANTON, Tennessee	JOE SKUBITZ, Kansas
W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY, Jr., Georgia	FLETCHER THOMPSON, Georgia
PETER N. KYROS, Maine	JAMES F. HASTINGS, New York
BOB ECKHARDT, Texas	
ROBERT O. TIERNAN, Rhode Island	
RICHARDSON PREYER, North Carolina	

W. E. WILLIAMSON, *Clerk*

KENNETH J. PAINTER, *Assistant Clerk*

Professional Staff

JAMES M. MENDER, Jr.	ROBERT F. GUTHRIE
WILLIAM J. DIXON	KURT BORCHARDT

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE

JOHN JARMAN, Oklahoma, *Chairman*

PAUL G. ROGERS, Florida	ANCHER NELSEN, Minnesota
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III, Virginia	TIM LEE CARTER, Kentucky
PETER N. KYROS, Maine	JOE SKUBITZ, Kansas
RICHARDSON PREYER, North Carolina	JAMES F. HASTINGS, New York

(II)

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1970

CONTENTS

	Page
Text of H.R. 14385 and H.R. 14393.....	1
Report of—	
Bureau of the Budget on H.R. 14385.....	2
Civil Service Commission on H.R. 14385.....	2
Health, Education, and Welfare Department on H.R. 14385.....	2
Housing and Urban Development Department on H.R. 14385.....	3
Statement of—	
Health, Education, and Welfare Department:	
Elson, Sol, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	4
Rosoff, Saul R., Deputy Assistant Administrator for Management of Health Services and Mental Health Administration.....	4
Gude, Hon. Gilbert, a Representative in Congress from the State of Maryland.....	16
Additional material received for the record by—	
Eighteenth & Columbia Road Business Association, George Frain, secretary, letter to Chairman Jarman.....	29
Health, Education, and Welfare Department, letter dated February 12, 1970, to Mr. W. E. Williamson, clerk, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, re general counsel's opinion of advisability of proceeding with the move of employees to the Parklawn Building.....	11
Kalorama Citizens Association, George Frain, elected delegate, letter to Chairman Jarman.....	18
National Capitol Association for Railroad Travel, Inc., Loren G. Hill, letter to Chairman Jarman.....	26

SUBSIDIZED TRANSPORTATION FOR HEW EMPLOYEES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1970

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 2218, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Jarman (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. JARMAN. The hearing will please be in order.

The hearing this morning is on H.R. 14385, introduced by Chairman Staggers at the request of the administration to authorize subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer to Rockville, Md., and an identical bill, H.R. 14393, introduced by Congressman Gilbert Gude, on October 16, 1969.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has established a new office facility in Rockville, Md., and is in the process of transferring a number of agencies within the Department to that new facility. The move started January 8 and is expected to be completed by late February, by which time approximately 5,000 employees will have been relocated. Over 2,000 of these employees live in the District of Columbia and in Virginia, and have been working in those locations. Transportation for these employees to the new facility is expensive and time consuming. This bill would provide a bus subsidy to help meet increased commuting costs of these employees, and would permit the use of charter buses which would reduce travel time substantially.

At this point there will be included in the record the text of the bills, H.R. 14385 and H.R. 14393, and the agency reports thereon.

(The bills and agency reports referred to follow:)

[H.R. 14385 and H.R. 14393, 91st Cong., 1st sess., introduced by Mr. Staggers on October 16, 1969, and Mr. Gude on October 16, 1969, respectively, are identical as follows:]

A BILL, To provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Maryland

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of facilitating retention of Public Health Service employees affected by the move to certain offices to Rockville, Maryland, and otherwise helping to ensure an adequate work force, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may provide or arrange for transportation for employees who commute to the site of the new offices. Such transportation may be provided or arranged for only for a period of up to two years following the official date of such move of offices and only to the extent that the Secretary determines that the purpose of this Act cannot reasonably be achieved by available transportation, and shall be provided or arranged at such charge to the user as will not unreasonably interfere with achieving this purpose.

Sec. 2. Any charges collected pursuant to the first section of this Act shall be credited to the current appropriation available for carrying out this Act.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., October 29, 1969.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request of October 22, 1969, for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on H.R. 14385, a bill "To provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Maryland."

The bill is identical to draft legislation submitted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. We recommend enactment of H.R. 14385.

Sincerely yours,

WILFRED H. ROMMEL,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., November 18, 1969.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
Rayburn House Office Building.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for the Commission's views on H.R. 14385, a bill "To provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Maryland."

The bill would enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide or arrange for transportation at reduced cost for employees who commute to the new offices. The subsidy would be to the extent necessary to ensure an adequate work force and would continue for a period of up to two years following the official date of the move.

The Commission strongly endorses the enactment of the bill.

The Civil Service Commission is very concerned about the impact of relocation upon employees. The proposed bill is designed to alleviate the extra commuter costs imposed upon employees least able to afford it. Similar legislation obtained by the Atomic Energy Commission in 1957 provides precedent for this approach to a sensitive personnel problem.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the Administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. HAMPTON, *Chairman.*

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., November 14, 1969.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request of October 22, 1969, for a report on H.R. 14385, a bill "To provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Maryland."

H.R. 14385 is identical with the draft bill submitted by this Department to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on October 13, 1969. A copy of that letter is enclosed for your information. For the reasons set forth in the letter, we urge enactment of the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. FINCH, *Secretary.*

Enclosure.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1969.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We are enclosing herewith for the consideration of the Congress a draft bill "To provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Maryland."¹

The bill would provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in order to facilitate relocation and retention of Public Health Service employees affected by the move of certain offices to Rockville, Maryland, could, for a period of up to two years following the official date of such move of offices, provide or arrange for transportation for employees who commute to the site of the new offices, to the extent necessary to ensure an adequate work force, where the Secretary has determined that this purpose cannot reasonably be achieved by available transportation. This would be done at such charge to the user of the transportation as would not unreasonably interfere with achieving this purpose. Any charges collected would be credited to the current appropriation available for carrying out this bill.

We believe that approval of this bill will substantially reduce adverse impact of the relocation on employees, as well as help to assure an adequate work force.

We estimate that approximately 500 employees affected by the move depend exclusively on public transportation. Total Department cost is estimated at \$93,750 for the last half of fiscal year '70, and \$187,500 annually thereafter.

An estimated \$50,000 for the last half of fiscal year '70 and \$100,000 annually thereafter is expected to be collected from the sale of tickets to employees. These amounts would be applied to the reduction of the total HEW cost. The Department is not asking for additional appropriations for this purpose for fiscal year '70.

We would appreciate it if you would refer this draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the submission of the draft legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. FINCH, *Secretary.*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., January 29, 1970.

Subject: H.R. 14385, 91st Congress (Staggers).

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 14385, a bill "To provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Maryland."

This Department defers to the views of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare on this bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

GEORGE ROMNEY, *Secretary.*

Mr. JARMAN. Our first witness this morning will be Mr. Sol Elson, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and he is accompanied by Mr. Saul R. Rosoff, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Management of Health Services and Mental Health Administration.

We appreciate, gentlemen, your being with us.

¹ See text of H.R. 14385, p. 1, this hearing.

STATEMENT OF SOL ELSON, ACTING DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE; ACCOMPANIED BY SAUL R. ROSSOFF, DEPUTY ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION, HEW

Mr. ELSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am pleased to appear before you today in support of H.R. 14385, a bill to provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Md. We believe that enactment of this bill will assist in substantially reducing the adverse impact of the relocation of the employees as well as help to assure an adequate work force. This bill is the same as the draft bill which we sent to the Speaker and to the President of the Senate on October 13, 1969.

Temporary subsidization of costs of transportation for employees in the case of a move such as this is not without precedent. Thus, similar authority was provided in connection with the move of the AEC to Germantown.

The Health Services and Mental Health Administration, together with the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service are presently located in 18 different locations in the District of Columbia, Virginia, and Maryland. To enable these agencies to operate in a more effective and cohesive fashion, major elements are being relocated into a single office building at 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Md. The building is approximately 18 miles from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare buildings located in the District of Columbia. It is approximately 18 to 20 miles from the several buildings occupied in Arlington, Va. Approximately 5,000 employees will be relocated in this phase of the move which is now underway. Over 2,500 of these employees live in Washington, Virginia, and Prince Georges County, Md. At present, access by public transportation from these areas to the new building is expensive and time consuming. Commuting from the southeast area to the Parklawn Building, for example, could in some instances take over 3 hours per day, round trip, at a cost of approximately \$1.80. A similar experience would face the employee using public transportation from Virginia and Prince Georges County, Md. Such costs and such times are double what most of our employees have had to bear in the past.

These factors will make it difficult for many trained employees to move with their agencies and will place severe hardships upon others. To ease these hardships, the bill would provide for a bus subsidy to assist employees for a limited time in meeting the increased commuting costs. It would provide a joint benefit to both the agencies and the individuals involved in the move. The agencies would benefit by retaining skilled and valuable employees who might otherwise leave. The individuals would benefit by receiving assistance provided by the subsidy, thus enabling them to remain with the agencies.

Over the past months we have endeavored to assist our employees in making this move. We have had face-to-face discussions with several thousand of the employees involved in the move. A matter of deep concern expressed repeatedly has centered upon the problem of transportation, both as to time and cost. Many employees are now engaged in determining whether they will remain with the

agencies involved. Many who wish to remain will find it extremely difficult because of the factors cited. We believe the availability of the subsidy will be a major factor in their decision.

The subsidy would be available for a 2-year period. Thus, employees would have time to develop individual solutions to their specific problems while still being able to continue to work for their agencies.

The Department will not request additional funds to implement this bill. Costs will be funded within existing appropriated funds. At the present time, we would expect individuals to pay approximately \$1 per day to meet transportation costs. Charges collected would be credited to a current appropriation available for carrying out this act.

I shall be pleased to answer any questions the subcommittee may have.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Elson, have you a rough estimate as to the cost that would be involved in a 2-year period?

Mr. ELSON. Over the 2-year period?

I think it was around \$150,000 over the 2-year period.

Mr. JARMAN. I notice that the bill refers specifically to Public Health Service employees.

Are there other employees affected by the move that would not be covered under the bill?

Mr. ELSON. There are a few employees that are not specifically Public Health Service employees. I would say something in the neighborhood of 60 or 70 of them. For instance, some of the general counsel staff who will be moving out closer to their own clients, in effect, but not very many.

Mr. JARMAN. But there are a number of agencies affected within the Department of HEW by the move to the new facility, are there not?

Mr. ELSON. Well, that is correct. The agencies that comprise the Health Service and Mental Health Administration, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Consumer Environmental Protection Services.

Mr. JARMAN. But you think, if this bill is to be passed, that it is adequate in its coverage of employees affected, or do you think that there are others who should be provided for?

Mr. ELSON. No; we think it would be adequate, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Rogers?

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you.

Now, you say it will cost \$150,000 for the 2-year period.

Mr. ELSON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, does that account for the \$1 per day per individual—

Mr. ELSON. No, sir; that is the Government cost.

Mr. ROGERS. What does this amount to, to the employee?

Mr. ELSON. Well, we estimate that the cost to the employee would be somewhat similar to what they are now paying for transportation to come to work, which is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1 a day.

Mr. ROGERS. How much does this amount to, overall, for the 2-year period?

You have 5,500; is that it?

Mr. ELSON. No, approximately 5,000.

Mr. ROGERS. So, what does that amount to?

Mr. ROSOFF. Well, we feel that the total cost of transportation will run approximately \$250,000 to \$300,000. The subsidized share would

run in the range of about \$150,000-plus, or the employee would pay about 50 percent or so of the cost—roughly.

Mr. ROGERS. That is the way it would average out?

Mr. ROSOFF. Roughly.

Mr. ELSON. Roughly.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, from what appropriation will the \$150,000 come?

Mr. ROSOFF. We would probably attempt to prorate the costs among the various appropriations available for administration of the programs moving into the building. Basically, the funds will contribute in achieving better total employment. So, we believe that it would be appropriate to use the management funds available in each appropriation.

Mr. ROGERS. For instance, how much would you take out of Food and Drug?

Mr. ROSOFF. It would depend on the number of Food and Drug employees using it.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, how many?

I assume that not all 5,000 would use this line?

Mr. ROSOFF. No, sir. We assume that about 500 to 600 employees would use the bus system and that of this number perhaps a third might be Food and Drug. Food and Drug, I believe, is moving about 1,300 to 1,400 employees.

Mr. ROGERS. All right. And who else?

Mr. ROSOFF. Health Services and Mental Health Administration is moving a total of about 3,000 employees.

Mr. ROGERS. That would be two-thirds?

Mr. ROSOFF. That would be two-thirds. And Consumer Protection—the remainder would be Consumer Protection moving about 700 or 800.

Mr. ROGERS. Is this after the reorganization?

Mr. ELSON. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, how long do you plan to use this building?

Mr. ROSOFF. There is a 20-year lease on the building.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, you do not plan—Food and Drug does not plan—to use it the whole 20 years; do you?

Mr. ELSON. Well, so far as we know, unless there are some other changes, for the foreseeable future, this building will be used in this fashion.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, now, what are your plans on moving back in, when the FBI building is completed?

Those quarters are made available to you here?

Mr. ELSON. Well, we have other segments of the Department that may be moved into that area.

Mr. ROGERS. So, you do not plan, then, to move back any of the elements that you are now moving out into this area?

Mr. ELSON. Not at the moment, there are no plans whatsoever for that.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, at the moment, I understand; but what about the long-range plans?

Mr. ELSON. So far as I am aware, there have been no plans whatsoever for moving any of these elements back into the District.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, I would like a statement after you check with whoever is responsible for making these decisions, and letting the committee have that.

Mr. ELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. It was my understanding that these people would be moved out and probably all would be moved back.

I had heard that it would be in 3, 4, or 5 years.

Mr. ELSON. One of the basic reasons for moving them out there was to have all of our medical scientific community more or less concentrated in an area which would be contiguous. We will certainly get that statement for you, but I would certainly have some serious doubts if there are any plans with that type of move in mind. (See p. 9.)

Mr. ROGERS. Now, what are you doing with the space that is now being given up by the units?

Mr. ELSON. Well, much of that space, for instance, in the Virginia area will be backfilled, by the Navy Department's plan to move in there because of the demolition of the Munitions Building along Constitution Avenue.

So, they will move there.

Mr. ROGERS. That is the Crystal City area?

Mr. ELSON. Into the Crystal City area and the Tower Building, I assume.

Mr. ROSOFF. Yes, the Tower Building.

Mr. ROGERS. How much will they take? All of your space?

Mr. ELSON. They will take all of it, and then some.

Mr. ROGERS. What about other areas that are vacated?

Mr. ROSOFF. In Maryland, we are vacating several commercial buildings. One is the Lee Building, another the Willste Building. And I believe, in both cases, they will not be filled with Federal staff.

Mr. ELSON. Those leases are expiring.

Mr. ROGERS. Are there any other areas that you will have jurisdiction over which you will move present personnel in?

Mr. ELSON. I am not aware of any, Mr. Rogers.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, I would like to know for the record, if you will let us know.

Mr. ELSON. Yes, we will.

(The following information was received for the record:)

QUESTION

In what buildings will space vacated as a result of the move be filled by government personnel?

ANSWER

	<i>Agency</i>
Virginia:	
Webb.....	Department of Defense.
Ballston Center Tower I.....	Department of Defense.
Ballston Center Tower II.....	Department of Defense.
Crystal Plaza 5.....	Department of Defense.
Crystal Plaza 6.....	Department of Defense.
Maryland:	
Woodmont.....	Department of Defense, Post Office Department.
North Bethesda office center.....	Commerce Department (partial).
Wiscon.....	DHEW (NIH).
NIH Building 31.....	DHEW (NIH).
District of Columbia:	
North Building.....	DHEW.
South Building.....	DHEW (Social and Rehabilitation Service).
Federal Building 8.....	DHEW (Food and Drug).

Mr. ROGERS. Now, what are the rents presently paid for the space?
 Mr. ROSOFF. I believe that the rents from the areas that we are vacating probably will total in the neighborhood of about \$2 million a year. I would like to check that figure, to provide the accurate amount.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. But about \$2 million?

Mr. ROSOFF. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. What are the rents in the new building?

Mr. ROSOFF. About \$4 million.

Mr. ROGERS. For the total?

Mr. ROSOFF. Yes. Some of the space we are vacating is Federal space.

Mr. ELSON. Government owned.

Mr. ROSOFF. Such as the North and South Building, DHEW.

(The following information was received for the record:)

QUESTION

How much rent is paid for the leased space being vacated?

ANSWER

On an annual basis, \$3,807,900 is being paid for leased space to be vacated because of the move to the new building.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, who is using the Government space that you are vacating?

Mr. ELSON. These are the expansions of the Department right now, and they are going into much of the Government space.

Mr. ROGERS. Do you mean you are putting—How many personnel will go into the Government space?

Mr. ELSON. I am not too sure, but I would say in the neighborhood of several hundred people will be moving in the Government space.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, where is that expansion coming from?

Mr. ELSON. Not only expansion; we have been crowded. We have been using rented space for many of the people that we are bringing into the Federal Office Building No. 8, as well as into the DHEW North and South Building. These are buildings from which certain people are moving out.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, I would like more specifics. This is too general. I want to know who they are, where they come from, where the expansion is. At a time when we are trying to hold down expenditures, we are doubling our rent. But this may be advisable; I do not know.

(The following information was received for the record:)

QUESTION

What use will be made of the DHEW space being vacated?

ANSWER

Federal Building 8—Food and Drug Administration

In action related to a recent reorganization, 190 staff members will be relocated into that building.

South Building

Approximately 40 members of the Social and Rehabilitation Service now located in the Webb Building will be relocated here. This will bring the entire Social and Rehabilitation Service together into one location, an action planned since its establishment in 1967. In addition, 80 new SRS positions will be located here.

North Building

As a result of the moves underway space will be available for the proposed new Central Construction Agency. In addition, serious overcrowding in the Office of the Secretary, where in some cases, there is less than 100 square feet per person, will be alleviated.

A third result will be to make space available for 100 new positions in the Office of the Secretary.

Wiscon Building

The space vacated by the Health Services and Mental Health Administration in this building will be used to house approximately 120 employees of NIH's Bureau of Health Professions Education and Manpower Training relocated from the Woodmont Building.

Building 31 (NIH)

Space vacated in this building will be used to house 78 employees of the newly created National Eye Institute and the increase of 106 employees in the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development for population studies.

Mr. ROGERS. Also, I want to know if, as I understand it, FDA would have the first turndown on FOB 1, which is the FBI annex, when FBI moves into the new building.

Now, that is what the General Services Administration tells me, but you do not seem to know anything about that.

Mr. ELSON. I am not aware of that.

Mr. ROGERS. It is not strange that GSA knows about it but HEW does not.

Mr. ELSON. We will certainly find out about it.

Mr. ROGERS. I would be concerned if we were moving personnel out there and were going to move them right back in. It seems to me rather an exercise in cost expenditures more than anything else, and particularly when we are dislocating people from the District, and I would like to know the details on that if you will furnish it for the committee? I think it would be helpful.

(The following information was received for the record:)

QUESTION

Are there plans to move the Food and Drug Administration back from the new building to the FBI Annex, FOB #1?

ANSWER

Several years ago, the move by the Food and Drug Administration into FOB #1 was under consideration. However, there are now no intentions to move the Food and Drug Administration staff being relocated to the new building back to FOB #1.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, who owns this building that we are moving into? Do you know?

Mr. ELSON. It is a corporation.

Mr. ROSOFF. It is called Parklawn Ventures.

Mr. ROGERS. Who makes up the corporation? Do you know? Who owns it? Who are the stockholders?

Mr. ROSOFF. I believe a principal person is Dr. Tauber. I do not know of the others.

Mr. ROGERS. Does he work for the Government?

Mr. ROSOFF. No, sir. He does not work for the Government.

Mr. ROGERS. Do you know if any of the stockholders work for the Government, the NIH, Food and Drug?

Mr. ELSON. I would not know at the moment as to whether any of the stockholders work for the Government or not on this.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, I would like to know this. I think this committee would be interested in knowing. If you could, check that out for us. And if they are working for the Government, in what capacity, and the names of those who do. (The following information was received for the record:)

QUESTION

Do you know if any of the stockholders work for the Government, the NIH, Food and Drug?

ANSWER

The following individuals are associated with the Government in the manner indicated:

1. Dr. Emanuel P. Papper, employed as a consultant. Serves as Chairman, General Medical Research Program, Project Committee, National Institute of General Medical Sciences, NIH.

2. Dr. Charles Hufnagel on a fee-basis contract with the Clinical Center, NIH.

3. Dr. John Fischer works for the Library of Congress.

In addition, Dr. John Bonica was, until June 1969, a member of the Anesthesiology Training Committee, NIH.

Mr. ROGERS. What about a lawsuit—was there not a lawsuit filed on behalf of the employees?

Mr. ELSON. There was.

Mr. ROGERS. What happened to that?

Mr. ELSON. The lawsuit was tried in the District of Columbia, and the decision was in favor of the Government there. The employees have now appealed that matter and it is before the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, in effect, what are they asking for in that lawsuit?

Mr. ELSON. Basically, they are asking to enjoin the move.

Mr. ROGERS. So, it is possible that you could still be enjoined if they prevail in the court of appeals?

Mr. ELSON. Possibly, yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, when will that be decided? Any estimate?

Mr. ELSON. I do not know.

Mr. ROGERS. I know you could not tell me.

Mr. ELSON. I do not know, because I do not believe the arguments in the court of appeals have been set.

Mr. ROGERS. Are you proceeding with the move before that has been decided?

Mr. ELSON. Yes, sir; we are proceeding with the move.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, suppose the court said you should be enjoined, what would you do?

Mr. ELSON. We would, at that time—I suppose we would have to—stop.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, would it not be better to get this settled?

I would think, to go through this without knowing the outcome—

Mr. ELSON. Well, based upon the judgment of our legal counsel, we felt that we could safely proceed with the move.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, who is the counsel that gave you that advice?

Mr. ELSON. Our general counsel.

Mr. ROGERS. What is his name?

Mr. ELSON. Mardian.

Mr. ROGERS. Martee?

Mr. ELSON. Mardian, M-a-r-d-i-a-n.

Mr. ROGERS. And he has said it is all right to proceed?

Mr. ELSON. In effect, yes.

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to see his opinion, if you would furnish that for the record.

(The following letter was received for the record:)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1970.

Mr. W. E. WILLIAMSON,
Clerk, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMSON: This is in response to your further request for a statement on the advisability of proceeding with the move of our employees to the Parklawn Building while the litigation seeking to prevent the move was still pending in the Courts.

As we told you earlier, we did not seek or obtain a formal written opinion from our General Counsel. In informal discussions, however, with members of his staff, we were advised that there was no legal basis which would require that we halt our plans until the litigation was finally concluded.

Our General Counsel's Office was of the opinion that the suit was frivolous, had no merit, and was unlikely to succeed. The District Court dismissed the suit holding that the Court had no jurisdiction over the subject matter and plaintiff lacked standing to sue. The dismissal merely confirmed our own opinion of the suit and we saw no basis for reversal by the Court of Appeals. No stay of any kind pending appeal was asked for nor was one granted. If one had been, we, of course, would have complied with the Court's order.

No action had been taken on the appeal, nor was any hearing set, at the time that the move was begun. There was no way to estimate how long the case would continue to be pending in the Court. All things considered, it was more advisable to execute our plans than to disrupt and delay the Government's business for an indeterminate period of time. Since there was no substantial reason to delay, we carried out the move as scheduled.

I hope that this will clarify this issue for the Committee.

Sincerely yours,

SOL ELSON,
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration.

Mr. ROGERS. Do you know the cost of this building that you are moving into?

Mr. ELSON. No. I am not aware of the specific cost of it. I think it was brought out at the time of the lawsuit, but I do not know what the cost of the building is.

Mr. ROSOFF. I believe—and I will have to check this out, but I believe it is approximately \$22 million.

Mr. ROGERS. About \$22 million?

Mr. ROSOFF. Yes. But I will have to check this out. (The following information was received for the record:)

QUESTION

What is the cost of the building?

ANSWER

The estimated total project cost is \$31,250,000.00.

Mr. ROGERS. And we are paying a little over \$4 million on the lease, about \$4,271,000?

Mr. ROSOFF. Yes, approximately.

Mr. ROGERS. So, that would allow a return of—well, you could pay for the building, I guess, in 5 years—6 years?

Mr. ROSOFF. The lease arrangement also includes for the upkeep, the heat, and the cleaning, and so on.

Mr. ROGERS. That is about \$400,000, is it not, for all of your upkeep?

As I understand it, it is about \$400,000, out of the \$4,271,000, which would leave about \$3.8 million as the actual rental.

I do not know. Maybe this is typical, but it seems to me this is not all of the building either; is it?

Mr. ROSOFF. We are renting 850,000 square feet at this time and another 150,000 to be occupied a year from this coming June.

Mr. ROGERS. Do they not have a drugstore and a bank in it, too?

Mr. ROSOFF. Yes, sir. There are commercial facilities in the building.

Mr. ROGERS. So, they are getting additional rents out of that?

Mr. ROSOFF. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. When was the decision to move made; do you know?

Mr. ELSON. No; I do not know the specific date, but it is approximately a year or better—several years.

Mr. ROGERS. And who made the decision to move, basically?

Mr. ELSON. The basic decision, of course, is made by the Secretary.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, I understand that. But who advised him on that?

Mr. ELSON. I could not say that anyone advised him, any one individual. It was the advice of a number of people.

Mr. ROGERS. Who handles the housing problems in the Department?

Is that a certain committee, or is there a certain staff?

Mr. ELSON. Well, each of the individual constituent agencies of the Department have their required needs. They examine their requirements for housing. Then we would transmit our requirements to GSA to seek that type of housing.

Mr. ROGERS. So, you do not know whether Food and Drug plans to move back or not?

Mr. ELSON. I do not know. I could not say. I would say at the moment that I doubt seriously that they have any plans to move back.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, I certainly will be doubly concerned if they did.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you very much.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Hastings?

Mr. HASTINGS. I would like to reserve my time, Mr. Chairman, having missed part of the testimony.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Satterfield?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. How many, total, employees did you say would be using this bus subsidy?

Mr. ROSOFF. We expect about 500 would be the approximate number.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. And would all 500 have to pay \$1.80 a day without it?

Mr. ROSOFF. Some would be paying \$1.80; some would be paying more. I believe people coming in from Prince Georges County might well be paying over \$2; as would people coming in from Virginia. The \$1.80 is the cost for people coming in from the District. People living close to the line might pay less, but a number might be paying more.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. As I figure it, just doing it quickly in my head, 500 people at 80 cents a day is \$400 a day. You are going to get this subsidy of \$150,000 for the 2 years, and that works out to two and eighty-nine dollars a day, which would be about an average of about \$.45 per person, would it not?

Are you really going to save these people 80 cents a day or not?

Mr. ROSOFF. Yes; I believe some we will be saving 80 cents a day and some we will be saving more.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. And some saving less?

Mr. ROSOFF. And some saving less. This is approximate.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. You do not think the subsidy will go higher than the \$150,000 that you mention?

Mr. ROSOFF. If fares go up, or if there is a change in projected use, it might; or it might go down if people are able to make accommodations more quickly.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. I have no other questions.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Preyer?

Mr. PREYER. At the end of the 2-year period, you indicated that the employees would develop individual solutions to their specific problems. You anticipate that would be in the nature of car pools, or are you anticipating public transportation will become available out there?

Mr. ELSON. I believe you will have both. As a matter of fact, that is, more or less, the experience the Atomic Energy Commission found in Germantown. Their experience was that at the end of almost 6 months that the transportation to their area had gotten to such a point that they were able to reduce the level of subsidized service.

Mr. PREYER. How long did that subsidy run for?

Mr. ELSON. That was approximately 2 years.

Mr. PREYER. And they were able to operate without the subsidy?

Mr. ELSON. As a matter of fact, as I said, although their subsidy was for a 2-year period, they actually did not use it for the 2-year period. They did not use the authority for the full period because they found the employees were able to accommodate themselves.

Mr. PREYER. So, conceivably, this could run for less than 2 years?

Mr. ELSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROSOFF. Actually, it was the Atomic Energy Commission experience that showed that within the first 6 months there was a 25-percent decrease in the use of their subsidized system. By the time they terminated their subsidized system there were only 30 people using it. As people moved closer, or made other arrangements, there was a decrease in use.

Mr. PREYER. Well, the President, in his state of the Union speech, talked about the need to diversify our population and spread it out, so I think anything along that line is a proper step, and it would seem that something that would soften the blow to the employees is desirable, because we want to do it in the best way possible, which means answering some of the questions Mr. Rogers has raised.

Thank you.

I have no further questions.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Hastings?

Mr. HASTINGS. No. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JARMAN. Are there further questions?

Mr. ROGERS?

Mr. ROGERS. Now, you said that some employees, if they had their own transportation, would take 3 hours to commute, 3 hours one way, I believe you stated?

Mr. ELSON. At the moment, it might take as much as 3 hours for certain employees in certain areas. This is the total transportation, on a round trip basis.

Mr. ROGERS. There and back, in 3 hours?

Mr. ELSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS. Where would they come from?

Mr. ROSOFF. Well, the employees coming from the southeastern part of Washington would probably take an hour and a half each way. It would take them about a half hour to get downtown and then transfer. It would take about an hour from the downtown area out to the building.

People coming in from Virginia, also would have to go into the District and then transfer. It might well take them more than an hour and a half, depending on how far away from the District line they are.

For people living in Prince Georges County, it would depend on whether they were in the northern or southern part. Those in the southern part would have to go into the District, transfer, and then perhaps transfer again. This might take substantially more than an hour and a half. It would depend on the specific area involved.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Now, your plan would be that they would come into the District to get a bus and then be moved out by bus?

Mr. ROSOFF. Sir, we would plan to arrange a system of charter buses. These buses would make stops for individuals in certain neighborhood areas and then go by an express route to the building. Thus, in Prince Georges County, a bus might make three stops, load up, and then go to the building.

Mr. ROGERS. And what is the estimated time?

Mr. ROSOFF. The estimated time would be about an hour. This might vary, but it would be about an hour, using the charter buses.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, when you use the charter buses, are the employees then working as soon as they board the bus?

Mr. ROSOFF. They travel on their own time, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. They do?

Mr. ROSOFF. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. What is the present situation, as to the time for these people to come to work?

Mr. ROSOFF. Well, we have done a survey which shows, on an average—and I guess it is difficult to say, but on the average—about a half hour to 35 minutes one way is about what it takes.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JARMAN. Dr. Carter?

Mr. CARTER. Yes, sir.

This will last for 2 years. Is that correct?

Mr. ELSON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. CARTER. At the end of that time, you expect these people to be moved?

Mr. ELSON. Well, we expect that by that time they would have been able to make their own personal arrangement.

Mr. CARTER. Do you think it will take that long?

Mr. ELSON. Probably not, but we want to at least take every precaution that we have covered in the requirements.

Mr. CARTER. Well, as time goes along and as these people move, will there be adjustments made?

Mr. ELSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. CARTER. So, they will be checked off and the amount of money used reduced?

Mr. ELSON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. CARTER. As the number decreases.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. JARMAN. Are there further questions?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. I have just one other question.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Satterfield.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Am I correct in my understanding, from your statement, that, in addition to this subsidy, you would collect \$1 apiece from these 500 individuals?

Mr. ELSON. That is, approximately. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. So, what this really works out to then, based on a 260-day year, is \$148.20 per person subsidy per year for each of these 500 people. Is that correct?

Mr. ELSON. I have not figured it out, but I am perfectly willing to accept your mathematics on it, Mr. Satterfield.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. It will be a subsidy for approximately 10 percent of the people?

Mr. ELSON. Approximately, that is correct.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. How do you decide which ones get the subsidy and which ones do not?

Is it if they desire it, or not?

Mr. ELSON. We have not worked out all of the details of that yet insofar as the mechanism by which we will do it.

There are a number of mechanisms which we are studying, the one that the Atomic Energy Commission used, for instance in this connection.

But there will be a determination made as to those who will be entitled to the subsidy, and then, as they go along and no longer would meet the criteria, they would no longer be on that subsidy.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, suppose everybody in the southeast and the far areas wants the subsidy? I presume they would, would they not?

Mr. ELSON. As has been indicated, that is no necessarily true, because many of them would prefer their vehicle, either using their own vehicle or car-pooling, rather than the bus transportation.

Mr. ROGERS. So, there would be no subsidies to those who use their own cars?

Mr. ELSON. No, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Or carpool?

Mr. ELSON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. No further questions.

Mr. JARMAN. Thank you very much, gentlemen, for your testimony this morning.

Mr. ELSON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. ROSOFF. Thank you.

Mr. JARMAN. We have with us also this morning, our colleague from Maryland, Congressman Gilbert Gude. We are very pleased to have you with us this morning.

STATEMENT OF HON. GILBERT GUDE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. GUDE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to have this opportunity to testify in behalf of H.R. 14393, a bill to provide for subsidized transportation for employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare who are affected by the move of some of the Department's offices to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Md.

The Department estimates that about 500 employees affected by the move rely upon public transportation, which does not adequately serve the needs of commuters to Rockville. The bill would facilitate the retention of these employees by providing or arranging for their transportation to the extent necessary to maintain an adequate work force for a period of 2 years following the official date of the move. I have introduced a bill identical to the Chairman's, because I am concerned about the hardship imposed upon these employees by this move to a site in my district.

The Department has already outlined the problem and the details of the solution proposed by the bill. I wish only to underline the fact that there is ample precedent for action to facilitate the relocation of important centers of employment, and that such action contributes importantly to the efficiency of Government.

Agencies in both the private and the public sector have seen that it is good business to ease the transition for their employees when they move their offices. When the National Geographic Society moved production facilities to Gaithersburg from downtown Washington, the Society instituted subsidized bus service to transport its employees from numerous points in the metropolitan area. Government agencies, including the Department of Defense, the Veterans' Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission have obtained legislation authorizing similar action. In the case of the Atomic Energy Commission's move to Germantown, Md., the AEC contracted for 13 bus routes in Virginia and Washington to transport 405 employees. The program was phased out after 18 months of operation, because gradual resignations and employee moves to the area eliminated the need for it. The same factors will permit the phasing out of the Parklawn transportation service, too. This sensible utilization of mass transportation facilities will aid in normalizing traffic and parking problems in the area.

The consolidation of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration and the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Administration at the Parklawn site will not improve the efficiency of the Department if it is accomplished at the price of numerous resignations and a decline in employee morale. That is why I urge the committee to give its approval to this modest proposal

to minimize the loss of loyal and experienced employees at HEW and to lessen the financial hardship of those now faced with a long commute if they stay.

Thank you.

Mr. JARMAN. Thank you.

Are there questions?

Mr. ROGERS?

Mr. ROGERS. I am glad to see our colleague here.

I have just expressed concern about a possibility of a move back into the District and the possibility of losing employees. They are not certain what the Food and Drug plans are. Have you any knowledge on that?

Have you heard that Food and Drug was thinking of moving back into the District when the FBI building is completed?

Mr. GUDE. Well, I have heard rumors to that effect. I certainly hope they do not come about. We have had somewhat the same experience with the Atomic Energy Commission which has become established in upper Montgomery County. Now, they want to move back to the District, and this is tremendously disconcerting to the employee morale and to the entire operation of the agency.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. Well, I agree with you. And this is my concern, and I want to check this out, because I think it just does not make sense to just move out for maybe 2 or 3 years and then move right back in, and I think this possibility exists from talking with the General Services Administration.

Mr. GUDE. Well, I certainly feel that notice should be served on these agencies of the tremendous cost involved, in even thinking about moving back into the city. The disruption is pretty deep.

Mr. ROGERS. And it has been testified that our rent will be double of what we are paying for space now.

Mr. GUDE. I heard the testimony, and, of course, I do not know what all the factors are that go into consideration of that. It may be that the facilities will gain something in efficiency and a better operation all the way around.

At the Atomic Energy Commission, after consolidating at Germantown, even though they have room there to enlarge their facilities, they have started diversifying again and opening up in Bethesda, and we have seen that the annual cost of their decentralizing after they were centralized in Germantown amounts to about \$300,000 a year, and this was one of the reasons they used for moving to Germantown, that they were going to save this money for the Government.

Now, they are turning around and—well, it is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JARMAN. Any further questions?

Dr. Carter?

Mr. CARTER. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman for his statement and for his thoughtfulness of his constituency.

Certainly, we will give this legislation sincere consideration.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. GUDE. Thank you.

Mr. JARMAN. If there are no further questions, thank you very much for being with us.

This concludes the subcommittee's hearing this morning, and we will stand adjourned.

(The following letters were received for the record.)

KALORAMA CITIZENS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1970.

Re Support of H.R. 14385.

Hon. JOHN JARMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Health, and Welfare,
Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Our citizens association is concerned with the best interests of the entire city, and specifically with the problems of such central and inner city areas as ours—since our association has, since 1919, been dedicated to working in the northwest Washington sector covered by 16th Street on the east, Rock Creek Park on the West, Harvard Street on the north, and Florida Avenue and Que Street on the south.

Employment, and the lack of it, is a major concern of our area. We have been given inferior zoning, and we are thus unable to provide the growth and development of other sections of the City and the Metropolitan area which have been provided far greater height and density than our own. For instance, the Federal Government's Public Health Service is moving into the 17-story high rise office complex near Rockville, Md. known as Parklawn. However, the Federal Government and the Congress has not permitted similar buildings to be built in our area. and the result is not only few jobs, but much vacant land, and a growing blight and decay.

But an interim step must be provided so that people in our area and the other central city areas of Washington can get to work. Otherwise, they are consigned to go on welfare, and poverty programs, to subsist.

We strongly support H.R. 14385, which provides authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Services affected by the transfer of the Federal offices to or near Rockville. This bill, we were assured by staff members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, not only covers bus operations but also covers other modes of transportation such as commuter railroad travel. In other words, as reported by your Subcommittee, commuter railroad travel could also be provided under this bill.

In fact, we have just learned that the National Capitol Association for Railroad Travel, Inc., has urged a commuter railroad program by means of a letter to you over the signature of Loren G. Hill, a surface transportation expert. We have examined the proposal of this association for railroad travel, and believe it deserves serious study and should be adopted as a part of the program authorized by H.R. 14385.

We hope you will do what you can, aside from the passage of H.R. 14385, to implement the railroad commuter program called for in Senate Document No. 117, 90th Congress, 2d Session, titled "Metropolitan Area Pilot Transportation Study". Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr. recently called for implementing this study. See *Congressional Record*, December 16, 1969.

In short, the National Capitol Association for Railroad Travel, Inc., recommends the following steps—

1. Since the B & O Railroad runs within a short distance of the new building of the Public Health Service, that a sidewalk and platform be provided for commuters.

2. Three B & O trains come into Union Station, one at 6:50 A.M., one at 7:35 A.M., and one at 8:05 A.M. These could be turned around and run back out to Rockville to serve the Public Health Service employees. These are commuter trains.

3. These trains could also be utilized to bring commuters to the new Southeast Federal employment sector, where 100,000 employees will soon be working, including the HEW buildings in the area and nearby.

4. These commuter trains could also be used to get central and inner city workers out to jobs in suburban areas as far away as Rockville. There is a growing concern of all Federal agencies in trying to provide jobs, instead of welfare and poverty payments to inner city residents. These commuter trains could help in this vital matter as well.

I have obtained releases from the Federal Department of Transportation which show that among the Federal grants to provide commuter railroad service are the following: New Haven railroad—\$28.4 million; Long Island railroad—\$22,697,500; Illinois Central railroad—\$25.2 million.

In view of these huge grants, it would seem to be important to provide at least some funds to beef up the B & O railroad commuter service to serve the city workers who want to get out to Rockville, and to the HEW office complex there.

I have recently received a letter from the City of Rockville, under date of January 21, 1970, saying the City Council "has several times in the past, attempted to obtain the kind of improved commuter service you support. These efforts, however, have largely been to no avail." But it is clear that the City of Rockville would be deeply interested in the type of commuter railroad program proposed by Loren G. Hill for the National Capitol Association for Railroad Travel, Inc. to you in the letter cited above, under date of January 30, 1970. I am enclosing a copy of the letter from the City of Rockville, Md. for your sympathetic action, in this matter.

Congressman Gilbert Gude has repeatedly called for "an improved B & O Commuter Service", in fact, this was part of his platform in the 1968 Congressional campaign. Yesterday, I talked to his Administrative Assistant Gordon L. Hawk, who told me of many and repeated attempts by Congressman Gude to obtain an improved B & O commuter railroad service. Among these attempts was one having to do with the very program of serving the HEW employees of the Public Health Service at the new office complex at Rockville which was the subject of Loren G. Hill's letter, as well as our own.

In the attached letter from the Council of Governments, Albert A. Grant, P.E., Director of the Department of Transportation Planning says: "Please be assured of COG's continuing interest and support for all types of improvements in public transportation, particularly over the near term, that will help to relieve growing traffic congestion and improve transportation service for the residents of the District of Columbia and the entire metropolitan area." I had written to Mr. Grant urging a commuter railroad program for the area, and was pleased to have this fine response.

I have, myself, talked to many Maryland leaders about an improved and responsive express bus program with exclusive bus lanes, and found a great deal of interest in it. DOT Secretary John Volpe has already funded such a program on the Shirley Highway, which is advancing nicely. A similar program would be of great assistance to Maryland at this time. In fact, as you know, Francis Turner has said that express buses with exclusive lanes are vital, and has said that one bus carrying 60 people would occupy no more space than two cars carrying a total of 3 people between them.

At the same time, all the Maryland leaders I have talked to have strongly urged that a commuter railroad program be provided. Among the people and leaders and groups interested in a commuter railroad program serving Rockville and other suburban communities, and using not only the B & O, but the Penn Central railroad as well are the following:

Charles A. Docter of the Maryland State Legislature

Mrs. Ida Mae Garrott, Maryland county official

William H. Willcox, Maryland county official

Henry R. Burt and Neal Potter of the Montgomery County Citizens Planning Association

Citizens for Sensible Transportation, P.O. Box 311, Silver Spring, Md. 20907

Harley Unger, 9820 Dameron Drive, Silver Spring, Maryland 20902

John Carter, Alliance for Democratic Reform, 608 Gist Ave., Silver Spring, Md.

Ralph W. Sherman, Allied Civic Federation, 1713 Luzerne Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

Edward Borda, Save the Park Committee, 1612 Tilton Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia

Federation of Civic Associations of the District of Columbia

Woodruff Price, National Association of Railroad Passengers.

I am attaching several related items, including the following, for your information:

1. A letter from Daniel P. Moynihan, Assistant to President Nixon.
2. An article from the *Washington Post* of June 6, 1969, by William Raspberry titled "Agencies' Move From D.C. Hurts Low-Income Employee".
3. A letter from Senator Charles E. Goodell.
4. Articles from the *Washington Post* and *Evening Star* of May 29, and May 28, 1969.
5. An article from the *Washington Post* of June 20, 1969 titled "U.S. Blamed for Bias in Suburban Housing".

6. Copies of the letters from the City of Rockville and COG cited earlier.
 7. A letter to Rep. Gilbert Gude, and a news article showing the interest of Congressman Gude in an improved B & O commuter service.

All of these items shed light on the matter discussed in this letter, and help show why the passage of H.R. 14385 is essential and the inclusion of a railroad commuter program is vital at this time. Please include in the printed hearings.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE FRAIN,
Elected Delegate, Kalorama Citizens Association.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
 Washington, February 14, 1969.

MR. GEORGE FRAIN,
Administrative Secretary, The Eighteenth and Columbia Road, Business Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRAIN: Thank you for your very interesting letter of February 7th which the President has passed on to me. We will give most serious consideration to your recommendation that the Administration reverse the directive of President Johnson to which you refer in your letter. If you will call my office, I will be glad to direct a member of my staff to meet with you to discuss these subjects at greater length.

Sincerely,

DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN,
Assistant to the President.

CITY OF ROCKVILLE,
 Rockville, Md., January 21, 1970.

MR. GEORGE FRAIN,
Elected Delegate, Kalorama Citizens Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRAIN: The Mayor and Council, at its meeting of January 19, noted your letter concerning B & O Commuter Service.

The Council has, several times in the past, attempted to obtain the kind of improved commuter service you support. These efforts, however, have largely been to no avail. Presently, the city is in touch with the various metropolitan transit agencies with the respect to the possibility that B & O commute service can be achieved prior to the rapid transit system completion, and is doing all it can to encourage this.

The Council thanks you for your interest in this matter and wishes to assure you that it shares your concern.

Sincerely yours,

JEAN R. HORNECK,
City Clerk.

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS,
 Washington, D.C., January 20, 1970.

MR. GEORGE FRAIN,
Elected Delegate, Kalorama Citizens Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRAIN: I was pleased to learn of your interest in the proposal to use a portion of the old W. & O.D. right-of-way in Arlington County for a busway. The reason the current proposal covers only the portion of the old W. & O.D. right-of-way (now the Route I-66 right-of-way) from Glebe Road toward the City, is that the volume of buses that could be routed into the busway west of this point does not justify extending the construction of the busway at this time. However, after this portion of the busway is built, patronage may increase to the point where such extensions would be feasible.

Please be assured of COG's continuing interest and support for all types of improvements in public transportation, particularly over the near term, that will help to relieve growing traffic congestion and improve transportation service for the residents of the District of Columbia and the entire metropolitan area.

Sincerely,

ALBERT A. GRANT, P. E.,
Director, Department of Transportation Planning.

[From the Washington Post, Friday, June 6, 1969]

AGENCIES' MOVE FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HURTS LOW-INCOME EMPLOYEES

(By William Raspberry)

No one has suggested that the Federal Government is making a deliberate effort to kick low-income Washingtonians out of their civil service jobs.

But suppose you were given such an assignment. How would you go about it? Anyone who has ever worked for the Government knows how difficult it is to fire an employee outright, unless he is guilty of gross negligence or other flagrant misconduct.

You wouldn't expect to talk large numbers of people into quitting even the worst-paid jobs. The worse their jobs, the more they are likely to need them.

So how would you accomplish your mission?

Well, you could transfer the agency to Virginia, as the Patent Office, and the Food and Drug Administration have done. Or you could relocate it in Gaithersburg, after the example of the Bureau of Standards.

Or you shift a few thousand jobs to Rockville, as the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has contracted to do. You wouldn't have much trouble unless you happened to run into somebody like Sen. Charles E. Goodell (R-N.Y.).

Neither Goodell nor this writer suggests that the reason for moving Federal agencies out of the Federal City is to put low-income Washingtonians out of work. But, intended or not, that unquestionably is the result.

The Senator said last week that he is "profoundly concerned that the proposed move" of two HEW agencies to Rockville "will force a substantial number of lower GS-level employees, especially black employees, to give up their jobs because of lack of available housing and transportation."

He's not just guessing. The American Federation of Government Employees surveyed 315 employees of the National Center for Health statistics.

Only 23 percent of the employees in the GS 1-6 level said they would make the move. And, while 78 percent of the black employees in these grades said they couldn't follow their jobs, 50 percent of their white counterparts said they would.

The reasons are fairly obvious. Transportation from Washington, where the great bulk of the black employees live, to the suburbs is inadequate, time-consuming, and costly. And housing for Negroes is still awfully hard to come by in the suburbs.

(Goodell quoted a spokesman for Suburban Maryland Fair Housing as saying that no single-family dwellings priced under \$15,000 are available in the Rockville area and only three in the under-\$20,000 bracket. There is no point in mentioning anything more expensive when you are talking about GS-3 clerks and typists.)

It might seem fair to conclude that white employees would face just the same problems as the black ones—fair but for two facts:

1. Most of the low-grade Federal employees here are black.
2. Large numbers of white employees already live in Maryland; very few of the black ones do.

Goodell makes clear that while the employment problem is one of his major concerns, it is not the only reason he opposes the proposed move to Rockville.

The General Services Administration, real estate agent for the Government, has signed a lease with Parklawn in Rockville for 20 years at a cost of \$41 million in rental fees for a building that cost \$26 million to build.

Goodell wants that lease investigated by the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

He also wants the Senate District Committee to investigate the effects of the HEW transfers and of proposed transfers of other Federal agencies.

Finally, he wants President Nixon to issue any executive order directing Federal agencies, in selecting sites or facilities, to give primary consideration to the availability of adequate transportation and convenient housing for employees, particularly those of low-income groups.

Thousands of Washingtonians have reason to hope that Goodell gets what he wants.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., June 10, 1969.

Mr. JOHN JARBOE,
President, The Eighteenth and Columbia Road Business Association,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JARBOE: I am grateful for your interest in the position which I have taken on the proposed H.E.W. moves to Rockville, Maryland.

No doubt you saw a recent Raspberry column in the *Washington Post*. It is high time that more elected public officials stand for the people. Far too many are standing by economic and other interests, and in so doing, hostilities fulminate our nation.

Best personal wishes always,
Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GOODELL.

[From the *Washington Post*, Thursday, May 29, 1969]

GOODELL OPPOSES HEW ON MOVE TO ROCKVILLE

Sen. Charles E. Goodell (R-N.Y.) said yesterday a government plan to move offices to Washington's suburbs would put low-echelon employees out of work.

Goodell urged at a news conference that the government suspend plans to move 6500 employees of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to a new office center at 5600 Fisher La. in Rockville. The proposed move would be made in November.

Goodell said officials of Local 41 of the American Federation of Government Employees reported that a sampling showed only 23 per cent of the workers in the six lower civil service grades said they would be able to move.

He said most of the workers would have to find new jobs because there is no low-cost transportation or homes near the new office building.

Suburban Maryland housing officials say there are no single family dwellings in the area under \$15,000 and only three priced under \$20,000, Goodell said.

He said 78 per cent of the employees who said they will not be able to move are black.

An audience of about 30 government employees cheered and applauded when Goodell said he is urging President Nixon to suspend the move.

The Senator said the government is paying rent totaling \$41 million over 20 years for a building that cost \$26 million to construct.

Goodell urged a Congressional investigation of the rental contract, signed during the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

"I don't want to raise any suspicion," said Goodell. "I just want to find out the facts."

Goodell said the move is being made to consolidate some activities in the Department, not because of any lack of room in Washington.

[From the *Evening Star*, (Washington, D.C.), Wednesday, May 28, 1969]

GOODELL RAPS HEW ON MOVE

Sen. Charles E. Goodell, R-N.Y., today called for a Senate investigation of a scheduled Health, Education and Welfare Department move from the District to Rockville, Md., where he said there is little housing for low income persons.

"I am profoundly concerned that the scheduled move will force a substantial number of lower GS-level employees, especially black employees, to give up their jobs because of a lack of available housing and transportation," he said.

The move, planned for Nov. 1, involves the transfer of the health services and mental health administration and the consumer protection and environmental health services of HEW to the privately owned Parklawn site at a rent that will amount to \$41 million over 20 years, said Goodell, member of the Senate District Committee.

[From the *Washington Post*, Friday, June 20, 1969]

U.S. BLAMED FOR BIAS IN SUBURBAN HOUSING

(By Kirk Scharfenberg)

An unpublished report prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights charges that the Federal Government has contributed greatly to a discriminatory housing pattern that locks Negroes into Washington while suburban counties like Montgomery grow more and more white.

The 1966 move of the National Bureau of Standards from Washington to Gaithersburg, without any effort being made first to insure that Negro employees of the Bureau would be able to find housing close to Gaithersburg, verges on "white racism," the report states.

"The sum of Federal action related to Montgomery County not only inhibited the ability of Negro employees of NBS to find decent housing near their place of

work but supported the customary discriminatory patterns of development," according to the report.

To the extent that they have failed to act to alter these patterns, the report states, "Federal and local government authorities, and the officials of the National Bureau of Standards, are responsible for the segregated patterns that have been created and exacerbated as a result of the NBS move."

The report, prepared by three consultants, David and Linda Davidoff and Carla Cohen, was completed over a year ago and recently submitted to the Bureau of Standards. A spokesman for the Commission on Civil Rights said yesterday that plans are to publish it, "but not necessarily in its present form."

While the principal aim of the report is to measure the effect of the National Bureau of Standards move on its Negro employees, it contains wide-ranging criticism of Federal inaction in breaking the housing pattern in Montgomery County—criticism that probably would apply equally to other areas of metropolitan Washington.

According to the report there are a total of 4000 Negroes employed by Federal agencies in Maryland and only one-quarter of them live in the State. In addition, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has announced plans to move about 6500 employees to Rockville by 1971.

Further, in recent years, thousands of Federal employees have been moved to the Crystal Plaza and Rosslyn complexes in Virginia. In the next two years, 7000 Federal employees are expected to be shifted to the suburbs.

The Bureau of Standards employs about 2750 persons in Gaithersburg, and, at the time the study was conducted, about 13 per cent of them were Negroes.

The report notes that Rte. 70S, the only limited access radial road from Washington through Montgomery County, was constructed in the 1950's with Federal funds and "has been the crucially important element in bringing employment and housing development to the outer parts of the County (including Gaithersburg)."

"Because it has a major responsibility for increasing the accessibility of the County to population growth," the report adds, "the Federal Government also has a responsibility to determine whether or not this population growth takes place in an equitable manner."

"The Federal Government could require," the report states, "that State and local government units that benefit (through increases in their tax base from new development, or otherwise) from new highways act to reduce the barriers to movement of new population groups into their areas. Where such Federal regulation is absent, it permits new development that is discriminatory in its effects."

"Rather than changing existing patterns, the introduction of 70S has seen the growth of large new areas of industry and housing in the County that are closed to the same population segments—Negroes and low and moderate-income families—to which it has previously been closed."

The 112-page report also is highly critical of the Federal Government's failure to see that attention is paid to the housing needs of minority and low-income groups in general development plans that are financed, in part, with Federal funds.

"To the extent that the Federal Government has failed to produce requirements for planning work done (with Federal funds) to recognize differences between income and racial groups in the population and to plan for the elimination of segregation and discrimination in metropolitan areas, it has abetted existing patterns of segregation and discrimination."

The report notes that "A Policies Plan for the Year 2000: The Nation's Capital," a document outlining general development goals for the metropolitan area released by the National Capital Planning Commission in 1961, made specific reference to providing a wide range of housing in heavily developed corridors spreading out in a radial fashion from Washington.

However, the report notes, when the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission drew up its "Wedges and Corridors" plan for Montgomery and Prince George's Counties—a plan to implement the guidelines set out in the "Policies Plan"—it made no specific mention of the need to construct minority and low-income housing.

"The 'Wedges and Corridors' plan is practically devoid of references to the problems and solutions in this area," the report states.

The report also offers harsh criticism of the Federal Housing Administration. It contends that the FHA measures the demand for housing in Montgomery only on the basis of the housing that private developers are willing to supply.

Because land costs in the County are high, the report contends, the FHA considers that there is only an "effective demand" for relatively expensive housing.

"The FHA market analysis thus tends to disguise the fact that families with incomes under \$7000 to \$8000 are in need of new housing in Montgomery County. By making its analysis only in terms of what the private market, unaided, will provide, it is distorting the discussion of housing policy and ignoring the needs of an important segment of the population. It may even be helping to maintain a private market which fails to meet these needs, through its failure to indicate the ways in which the market is failing to serve them.

"The FHA gives further support to maintaining existing distribution patterns in housing by failing to present data on race. By failing to report on the way the housing market serves Negroes as compared to whites, the FHA fails to highlight gross disparities based on race. In omitting reference to this distortion in the housing market, the FHA gives tacit approval to it."

The report also criticizes the Federal government for giving contracts to County firms that employ few Negroes.

"The Federal Government contracts with firms in the Gaithersburg area, thus insuring that few Negroes will be hired to do Government work. The resulting disparity between Negro employment and Negro residence is that although Negroes account for almost 25 percent of the population of the Washington metropolitan region, they account for only 10 percent of the employees in the firms doing government contract work in Montgomery County. Clearly, the Federal Government is acting as a sponsor of discriminatory employment patterns within the metropolitan region."

In general, the report states, "Federal support of the Interstate Highway System and Federal assistance to the private housing market—through FHA mortgages and Federal insurance of bank deposits—represent significant areas in which public assistance enables private development to occur at a far greater rate than would be possible without such backing.

"But the resulting development taking place in Montgomery County essentially excludes the Negro and low income sector of the population."

The study, based on statistics provided by the National Bureau of Standards, revealed that regardless of income, white employees were, on the whole, able to follow the move of the agency from the city to the suburbs. Negroes, on the other hand, were forced, regardless of income, to remain in or near Washington.

"The results of this study," the consultants state, "indicate strongly that Negroes have been denied the opportunity to live near their jobs. As a result of the NBS move to Gaithersburg, Negroes find themselves disproportionately distant from their place of work."

The study found that the percentage of white employees living in Washington dropped after the Bureau's move from 37 to 18 per cent while the percentage living in Maryland rose from 47 percent to 71 per cent. On the other hand, the percentage of Negroes living in Washington dropped only from 93 per cent to 81 per cent while the number living in Maryland increased from 6 per cent to 16 per cent.

The report found that Negroes generally had lower paying jobs than whites and concedes that this income might cause the lower rate of suburban migration by Negroes to the more expensive suburbs.

The report found, however, that while only 32.1 percent of low income Negro employees lived outside the city after the National Bureau of Standards move, 3.2 per cent of the whites, in the same wage levels, lived in the suburbs.

Public transportation to Gaithersburg from Washington, especially Southeast, was found to be very difficult and expensive. Respondents to a questionnaire circulated by the consultants indicated they spend up to \$20 a week and two hours a day getting to work.

The consultants said they found no instances of outright discrimination, but found instead a failure on the part of responsible agencies to act positively to bring equal opportunity to Montgomery County.

KALORAMA CITIZENS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., January 29, 1970.

OPEN LETTER—URGENT

Ref A B&O commuter railroad stop to serve HEW employees at Parklawn near Rockville and Garrett Park is a must.

Hon. GILBERT GUDE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUDE: Recently I received the attached letter from the Mayor and Council of Rockville expressing their interest in an improved B&O Commuter Service.

It is my understanding that you called for improved B&O Commuter Service in your re-election campaign in 1968.

I would like to suggest, indeed, urge you to call for B&O commuter service to serve the HEW employees at the Parklawn development near Rockville.

The Parklawn Building is within walking distance of the B&O. A station platform is all that would be required. This station platform should be located between Garrett Park and Rockville. This proposal would allow an extra out-bound trip for present B&O equipment which now terminates at Union Station.

A *Washington Post* article of January 28, 1970, a copy of which is attached, speaks of your interest in bus fares, and buses, to serve the Parklawn complex, with a subsidy to help pay bus fares for HEW employees. But there is no mention of any step by you to obtain a station for the B&O trains which could serve the commuters into Washington, as well as out to Parklawn. Your silence on this point is puzzling—especially in view of your campaign promises to improve the B&O commuter service.

I have talked to many Maryland leaders, and this includes Ida Mae Garrott, Charles A. Docter of the Maryland State Legislature in Annapolis, William H. Willcox of the Maryland-National Capital Planning Commission, Henry R. Burt and Neal Potter of the Montgomery County Citizens Planning Association, Harley Unger of the Save the Park Committee, Ralph Sherman of the Allied Civic Federation, as well as employee leaders in HEW and they are all interested in having a stop to serve the HEW employees at Parklawn.

It is also clear that the Mayor and Council of Rockville would also welcome a station to serve the Parklawn employees.

As you know, Governor Linwood Holton campaigned for a commuter railroad program, the Republican Party of Virginia supports such a commuter railroad program, the Senate Public Works Committee called for express buses, exclusive bus lanes, and a commuter railroad program. Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr. tells me he is going to insist on a commuter railroad program and I am sending you a copy of his recent speech.

Wouldn't it be a good time for you to redeem your campaign pledges of 1968 by calling for a station for the B&O so that the B&O could also serve the employees at Parklawn? I would appreciate having your comments on this realistic plan.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE FRAIN,
(Retired Congressional Aide).

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, Mar. 12, 1969]

GUDE TAKES A POLL—RIDERS FIGHT ENDING "OLD 40"

(By Anne Christmas)

"Old 40" is just a self-propelled four-car train that bustles each day from Brunswick, Md., (6:32 a.m.) to Union Station (8 a.m.) despite snow or heat or ice or darkness.

In the cozy comfort of good Old 40 the commuters alternately snooze, take the curlers from their hair, put on make-up or chat with their friends. Nearly everybody knows everybody else, and they regard these trips as a reprieve from the busy world of automobiles struggling to downtown Washington by more mundane routes.

Heavy snowstorms frequently have halted those drivers during the past few decades, but the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad's faithful 40 always has managed to get downtown, no matter what the absentee rate is among local residents.

B. & O. has asked the Interstate Commerce Commission to make a change in service of the long-established schedule for train 40, which would consolidate it with an earlier Cumberland-based train, thus reducing the line's rush-hour service from three to two runs.

An earlier train, known as 38, originating in Brunswick, will continue to operate. It arrives in Silver Spring at 6:30 a.m., so the early-birds call it the nightmare special, too early for most of their jobs.

Rep. Gilbert Gude, R-Md., boarded Old 40 himself at 7:25 a.m. in Rockville yesterday to equate what he had heard about the proposal to consolidate some commuter service with recent studies of mass transit for Montgomery County.

"On one hand, Montgomery County has just approved a multi-million-dollar rail transit system with service between the upper county and downtown Washington," Gude said. "On the other hand, the B. & O. has asked ICC for permission to reduce service on a route that includes stops in Silver Spring, Kensington, Rockville, Gaithersburg and Germantown, which are among our fastest growing areas.

Boarding the 4-car train during its brief stop at Rockville's antiquated station, Gude found the passengers in a mood to respond immediately to a questionnaire he had ready for distribution. A later survey showed that almost all of the 50 persons who turned in their questionnaires on the train trip said they were opposed to a change in service. Others took the questionnaires and envelopes to return by mail to Gude's office on Capitol Hill.

NATIONAL CAPITOL ASSOCIATION FOR RAILROAD TRAVEL, INC.,
Washington, D.C. Jan ary 30, 1970.

Hon. JOHN JARMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare,
Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are writing to support H.R. 14385, a bill to provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer of the Federal offices to or near Rockville, Maryland.

We understand, after checking with the Committee staff that H.R. 14385, as written, provides and covers all modes of transportation.

We believe there are sound reasons for including a program of commuter railroad service between Washington, D.C. and Rockville, Maryland. Briefly stated, these reasons are:

1. The B & O Railroad runs within a short walking distance of the new Public Health Service office complex. All that is needed is a sidewalk to step on.

2. The B & O has a commuter train arriving in Washington, D.C. at Union Station at 6:50 A.M.; one arriving at 7:35 A.M.; and one arriving at 8:05 A.M. These could be turned around and run out to Rockville to serve the Public Health Service employees who will be commuting from Washington, D.C.

3. Another advantage of this proposal is that these trains could be utilized to bring commuters into the SW Federal employment area where 100,000 employees will soon be working. The present transportation is most inadequate, and the subway won't be operating for several years.

4. HEW is properly concerned with the problem of getting its employees to the new office complex at Rockville, Md. However, there is a growing concern shown by all Federal departments and agencies of getting workers in Washington, including people from the inner city, out to jobs. This provides jobs, and cuts welfare, and poverty payment, costs. The B & O commuter trains which would take Public Health Service employees to Rockville could also be made available to all other citizens who wanted to work in suburban areas.

We would like to call your attention to the following: (1) Senate Document No. 117, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, published by the Senate Public Works Committee on October 11, 1968, titled "Metropolitan Area Pilot Transportation Study". This Senate study called for a commuter railroad program, but has been ignored and repressed; and (2) the attached speech by Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr. calling for implementation of this study, particularly in the northern Virginia area, in order to serve both Virginia and Washington, D.C. Certainly, your Subcommittee has a duty and responsibility to weigh these matters carefully. We request you to include this letter and its attachment in the printed hearings held on H.R. 14385.

Respectfully yours,

LOREN G. HILL.

[From the Congressional Record, Tuesday, Dec. 16, 1969]

WASHINGTON AREA TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am delighted that this year's appropriations bill for the Department of Transportation makes a start on the rapid transit system for the Washington area.

The Federal contribution provided for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority is not only welcome but overdue. It permits a start on what I believe to be one of the most important transit systems in the United States.

No one who has occasion to travel in the District of Columbia, northern Virginia, and suburban Maryland can doubt the need for this system. The present congestion is nearly intolerable, and until adequate public transportation is provided, it can only get worse.

Those of us who have urged this transit system for the past several years have high hopes that it will provide at least part of the solution for the tremendous traffic problems facing the National Capital area.

But while we have high hopes, I think we must admit that fulfillment is not going to come quickly. The Transit Authority's own estimates indicate that the first inner city lines are 3 to 5 years away, and extensions into the suburbs will not come for 7 to 10 years. Experience with construction schedules of major public works suggests that these estimates are optimistic.

The colossal traffic jams caused by the recent bus strike show that the area is alarmingly close to strangling in its own traffic. Even under normal conditions, the congestion on the bridges between northern Virginia and the District of Columbia is fearsome at peak traffic hours.

I believe that right now is the time to explore the possibility of improving the area's public transportation.

If a decade or more passed before any major improvement is made, we may come to the point where there will be a sign on the Virginia side of the Potomac bridges saying, "Washington: You Can Not Get There From Here."

I do not believe that day need come. I think effective action to improve public transportation—specifically, rail transit using existing lines—can be taken almost at once.

I would not for a moment suggest that the Metro system be held up to accomplish short-range improvements. On the contrary, I think every effort should be made to build the new system as rapidly as possible.

At the same time, I believe that shortrun action should be taken. This would not lead to curtailment of the subway system; it would not even serve exactly the same areas. And in the long run, it is quite possible that service using existing lines would be needed as a permanent supplement to the Metro Transit system.

A number of studies have been made of ways to exploit existing rail lines to provide commuter service. The problem has been investigated by the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission, the National Capital Transportation Agency, and the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority itself.

Last year, the Senate Public Works Committee issued a study incorporating many of the previous investigations and making specific recommendations for rail service. I believe the time has come to take action on the committee's report or on some alternate proposal to furnish augmented rail transit over existing lines.

A large-scale, cooperative effort will be required if the Public Works Committee study, or some feasible alternative, is to be implemented.

Leaders of the communities must be involved.

Officials of the railroads and the railroad brotherhoods must be involved.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and transportation agencies in the localities must be involved.

The U.S. Department of Transportation must be involved.

Clearly, this is not a simple undertaking. It is a major effort.

But the penalties of failure to act are severe, and the rewards of success could be enormous. I believe the effort must be made. I offer whatever assistance my own office can reasonably provide.

Working together, we can take the first steps. Let us hope that next year we can begin the actual work and funding that is necessary.

We are already late.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief excerpt from the Senate Public Works Committee report of July 19, 1968—Document No. 117, 90th

Congress, second session—together with a commentary, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"COMMUTER ZONE

"STEPS FOR ACTION

"(1) That a commuter rail service be instituted within 1 year having the following characteristics:

"Trains operating on a through-routed basis between Germantown, Md., and Manassas, Va., and between Baltimore, Md., and Quantico, Va.

"Trains serving some of the existing on-line stations as well as several new collection stations to be constructed, all stations to be provided with adequate parking and highway facilities.

"Trains providing downtown Washington accessibility with stops at Union Station plus one or two new stops that will be constructed along the existing right-of-way between the Bureau of Engraving and South Capitol Street. The new stops are key essentials to successful patronage of the system.

"A feeder-bus network utilizing a combination of new, specialized shuttle service and adjusted existing bus routes interfacing at one or more downtown rail station stops to provide distribution and collection of rail passengers throughout downtown Washington.

"Capital investment in rolling equipment, station facilities, and track alterations to be held to a reasonable minimum in the face of uncertainty as to the actual size of the ridership market and the possibility that the commuter rail service needs might be minimized upon completion of the Metro Rapid Transit System.

"Operating and administrative control to be placed in a new commuter rail division of the Washington Metro Area Transportation Authority.

"Financing to be provided through a combination of Federal and local government funds and farebox revenues on the basis of—

"(a) Federal moneys provided for all capital investment except station facilities which would be the responsibility of the appropriate local jurisdiction (or jurisdictions) serviced.

"(b) The net of operating expenses over passenger revenues to be subsidized in participation shares of one-third from the Federal Government, the balance to be shared by local governments in Maryland and Virginia proportionate to the seat-miles of service provided.

"(2) That a resolution of Congress be passed supporting the preservation of the W. & O.D. right-of-way until an in-depth feasibility study determines the usefulness of this right-of-way for possible future commuter and airport connector service, whether solely rail, joint rail-highway, or highway alone.

"(3) The preservation from encroachment of the right-of-way of the Washington & Old Dominion Railroad and be insured pending completion of an in-depth feasibility study for determining that line's usefulness as part of a through-routed northern Virginia-Washington, D.C.-northeast Maryland quadrant commuter and airport connector service.

"(4) That demonstrations be undertaken of reverse direction rush hour express bus service to the suburbs and of exclusive bus lane operation in the Shirley corridor.

"(5) The demonstration of road-rail bus operation on the Bethesda-Chevy Chase branch of the Baltimore & Ohio should *not* be undertaken because it would not be capable of offering any substantial advantage over existing bus service.

"(6) The demonstration of a hydrofoil or ground effect vehicle for commuter transport on the Potomac is *not* warranted at this time or in the near future since technology has not advanced far enough to solve vehicle limitations of carrying capacity and noise generation.

"FEASIBILITY CONCLUSION

"(1) The establishment is justified at an early date of a commuter rail service over the railroad lines described. At a minimum, this service would provide during the 7- to 12-year rapid transit construction period—

"(a) Interim relief from daily rush hour traffic congestion in the form of a viable mass transit alternative that does not use overcrowded highway facilities.

"(b) Service to four of the six suburban corridors thereby reinforcing and promoting the relatively higher density housing and employment location patterns

that are consistent with the wedge-corridor regional development goals and that are necessary as a population base to generate adequate ridership for the future rapid transit system.

"(c) Strength required to solidify the economic vitality of downtown Washington in its role as the major regional center for employment; government and professional services; retail enterprise; and attractions of a cultural, recreational, tourism nature.

"(d) Familiarization and orientation of area residents to rail transit as an alternative transport medium to the private automobile thereby building a patronage base that will be more favorably disposed to using the metropolitan rapid transit when it is opened.

"COMMENTARY"

"Sections (2) and (3) under 'Steps for Action' probably are no longer feasible. The chance of capturing the Washington & Old Dominion right of way for transit use, unfortunately, appears to have vanished.

"The key recommendations in the excerpt from the Public Works Committee study are those concerning establishment of rail commuter service in the short run.

"In Chapter IX of the study, detailed steps are outlined whereby a surface rail passenger service could be put into operation within a 12-month period. Difficulties involved in routing trains through Washington, instead of terminating them in Washington, are carefully set forth, and proposals are made to overcome these difficulties.

"The study includes analyses of equipment utilization, estimated ridership and revenues, coach and locomotive requirements, costs of providing service and deficit control. It is an excellent basic document to be used by those who will be involved in the planning process for surface rail passenger service."

EIGHTEENTH AND COLUMBIA ROAD BUSINESS ASSOCIATION,
February 2, 1970.

Hon. JOHN JARMAN,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare,
Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the president of the Eighteenth and Columbia Road Business Association, John Jarboe, I wish to call to your attention the enclosed letter from HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch in which he wrote Mr. Jarboe that —

"I know of the problems that many of our employees are now facing, and I have directed the Assistant Secretary for Administration to render every possible assistance to them—either in locating comparable jobs within HEW at downtown Washington facilities, or in resettling their families in the Rockville area."

Recently, the *Washington Sunday Star* of Washington, D.C. reported that Secretary Finch and his assistant for planning and evaluation, Lewis Butler, said the way HEW is growing, it will soon require a building about the size of the Pentagon, and they don't believe it should be set away from everyday activities of people the way it is now. Further, that government buildings in their opinion, would do well to include shops and restaurants on the ground floor so that employees dealing with people's problems are not working in sterile cocoons. And that "the best location for HEW's headquarters, said Butler, would be in the inner city instead of the manicured mall." No special transit programs would be needed in our area.

The Eighteenth and Columbia Road Business Association would, along with the great mass of the people welcome the location of such a building in the 18th and Columbia Road area where there is a large amount of vacant land, for instance on the tract at the east and of the Calvert Street Bridge, and the Henderson Castle site at 16th and Florida, and at 18th and Columbia Road itself. A total of 50-100 acres for Parklawn-type (17 floors) buildings in our area would give more space than the Pentagon. But, in the meantime, the kind of service provided by H.R. 14385 is essential, and it includes both bus transportation as well as covering railroad commuter programs. In view of the importance of H.R. 14385, Mr. Jarboe wants me to advise you that it has his full support. Please include these letters in the printed hearings.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE FRAIN, *Secretary.*

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., June 10, 1969.

Mr. JOHN JARBOE,
President, The Eighteenth and Columbia Road Business Association,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JARBOE: Thank you for your letter of May 19 regarding the proposed move of certain of our facilities to Rockville, Maryland. I am genuinely grateful for your candid observations and share your concern about the personal problems that, in some instances, this move may cause.

But, in every substantial way, my options are extremely limited. A 20-year lease was entered into by the previous Administration—back in December 1967—with the private builder of Parklawn and, by January of this year, the planned move had proceeded so far down the road as to be, realistically, irreversible.

Speaking very frankly, I wish this were not the case. I know of the problems that many of our employees are now facing, and I have directed the Assistant Secretary for Administration to render every possible assistance to them—either in locating comparable jobs within HEW at downtown Washington facilities, or in resettling their families in the Rockville area.

In the days ahead, let me assure you, this Administration will be fully sensitive to the human factor involved in such relocations of Federal facilities. I am in your debt for reminding us of our obligation.

Warm personal regards.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. FINCH, *Secretary.*

(Whereupon, at 10:55 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned.)

○



