

these results. It is part of the whole picture. It is one of the things that just has to be done.

Mr. MOORHEAD. In the Sky-Bus system, our demonstration project is not one of the problems that they attack this waiting period for the vehicle to arrive; maybe you can tell the committee a little bit about that system?

Dr. ROMUALDI. The guideline is that there must be no greater than 2-minute leadway between vehicles. You have either missed one by 1 minute or perhaps just another minute to wait. Or if you have just missed one, there is no more than 2 minutes to wait for the next one.

It has another advantage which can be improved upon. If the structure is so attractive and light that it can be weaving through the community, then the person does not have to walk very far to this transit system.

Incidentally, in terms of the optimization concept again, our cities change. The centers of population change. If we imagine an urban transit system that is not such a tremendous piece of equipment that it actually is economical to tear it down and put it in another place—we can do it with a light structure. We can do it by cutting it off at the ground line and putting it someplace else. This kind of planning optimizes the whole thing. The concept is to get it frequently enough, attractively enough, and close enough to the people to let them leave the car in the garage when they leave in the morning and get to the rapid transit.

Mr. MOORHEAD. This is the area where research is needed, is that correct?

Dr. ROMUALDI. Definitely.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Reuss?

Mr. REUSS. I would first like to ask unanimous consent that a letter from the president of the Minneapolis City Council, Glenn Olson, concerning precisely this mass transit research and development proposal be placed in the record.

Mr. BARRETT. Without objection, so ordered.

(The letter referred to follows:)

MARCH 7, 1966.

Representative HENRY S. REUSS,
Chairman of the Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE REUSS: The city of Minneapolis, like most of the major cities in the country, finds that its present public transit system carries only a very small percentage of the total daily commuting traffic. The fact that these systems cannot effectively compete, from a functional point of view, with the automobile has created problems for our community:

1. Need for more roads to handle the ever-increasing automobile traffic.
2. Need for more off-street parking facilities.
3. Traffic congestion that gives promise of becoming more severe, even if present road and parking construction proceeds according to plan.
4. Continued loss of taxable property to accommodate roads.
5. A central or core city whose growth is stagnated because of traffic and parking problems.

In our search for alternate solutions (other than simply building more roads and more off-street parking) we have turned to public transit. We find that the bus systems cannot provide effective competition to the private car. We have been told that our community cannot support a high-speed rail system patterned after the BART system of the San Francisco area.