

**NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT OF  
1969—AMEND**

87603090

**HEARING AND MARKUP**

**BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS  
AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS**

**OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS**

**FIRST SESSION**

**ON**

**H.R. 1463**

**TO AMEND THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1969  
RELATING TO THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN SYSTEM**

**MAY 4, AND JULY 19, 1989**

**Serial No. 101-5**

Printed for the use of the  
Committee on the District of Columbia

U.S. GOV'T DEPOSITORY

OCT 16 1989

RUTGERS LAW LIBRARY  
CAMDEN



61343  
44-7263/1  
2/0/89

95-841317

**U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1989**

## COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RONALD V. DELLUMS, California, *Chairman*  
WALTER E. FAUNTROY, District of Columbia  
FORTNEY PETE STARK, California  
WILLIAM H. GRAY III, Pennsylvania  
MERVYN M. DYMALLY, California  
ALAN WHEAT, Missouri  
BRUCE A. MORRISON, Connecticut

STAN PARRIS, Virginia  
THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR., Virginia  
LARRY COMBEST, Texas  
DANA ROHRABACHER, California

---

EDWARD C. SYLVESTER, Jr., *Staff Director*  
MARK J. ROBERTSON, *Minority Staff Director*

---

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS

ALAN WHEAT, Missouri, *Chairman*  
WALTER E. FAUNTROY, District of Columbia  
FORTNEY PETE STARK, California  
WILLIAM H. GRAY III, Pennsylvania

LARRY COMBEST, Texas  
STAN PARRIS, Virginia  
DANA ROHRABACHER, California

# CONTENTS

	Page
Staff summary of findings and conclusions.....	VIII
H.R. 1463 (by Mr. Dellums) to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 relating to the Washington Metrorail System.....	2
Completing the 103-Mile Adopted Regional Metrorail System—Fact Sheet.....	5

## HEARING AND MARKUP

Subcommittee hearing (H.R. 1463), May 4, 1989.....	1-241
Subcommittee markup, July 19, 1989 .....	243-284

## STATEMENTS

Barry, Hon. Marion S., Jr., Mayor of the District of Columbia.....	92
Bozman, Ellen M., chairwoman, board of supervisors, Arlington County, VA....	127
Castaldi, Richard J., chairman, board of directors, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.....	175
Clarke, David A., chairman, D.C. Council.....	101
Coleman, William T., Jr., former Secretary of Transportation, prepared statement.....	188
Davey, John P., chief administrative officer, Prince Georges County, MD, represented by Fern Piret, senior advisor on transportation matters.....	219
Dellibovi, Albert A., Administrator, Urban Mass Transportation Administration, accompanied by Robert McMannis.....	148
Fautroy, Hon. Walter E.....	13
Prepared statement .....	247
Hoyer, Hon. Steny H., a U.S. Representative from the State of Maryland.....	22
Kramer, Sidney, county executive, Montgomery County.....	111
McMillen, Hon. Thomas C., a U.S. Representative from the State of Maryland	36
Mikulski, Hon. Barbara A., a U.S. Senator from the State of Maryland .....	57
Moore, Audrey, chairwoman, board of supervisors, Fairfax County, VA.....	120
Moran, James P., Jr., mayor, city of Alexandria, VA .....	131
Morella, Hon. Constance A., a U.S. Representative from the State of Maryland.....	29
Northern Virginia Transportation Commission, Lilla Richards, chairman, prepared statement with attachment .....	235
Parris, Hon. Stan .....	10
Prepared statement .....	252
Pownall, Thomas G., chairman, transportation coordinating committee, Greater Washington Board of Trade, accompanied by Theodore C. Lutz.....	227
Robb, Hon. Charles S., a U.S. Senator from the State of Virginia.....	69
Rohrabacher, Hon. Dana .....	20, 254
Sarbanes, Hon. Paul S., a U.S. Senator from the State of Maryland.....	48
Schaefer, Hon. William Donald, Governor of the State of Maryland, represented by Richard Trainor, secretary of transportation.....	85
Turner, Carmen E., general manager, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, accompanied by Mr. McAlhiny, Mary Margaret Whipple, Hilda Mason, Gladys Mack, Bob Oestrum, Kate Handley, and Matt Watson .....	186
Warner, Hon. John W., a U.S. Senator from the State of Virginia.....	63
Watts, Hon. Vivian E., secretary of transportation and public safety, Commonwealth of Virginia .....	75
Wheat, Hon. Alan D., opening statement .....	7
Prepared statement .....	244
Wolf, Hon. Frank R., a U.S. Representative from the State of Virginia .....	42

IV

COMMUNICATIONS

	Page
American Public Transit Association, Jack R. Gilstrap, executive vice president; letter to Hon. Alan D. Wheat, dated May 30, 1989.....	271
City of:	
Fairfax, George T. Snyder, Jr., mayor; letter to Hon. Alan D. Wheat, dated May 9, 1989.....	264
Falls Church, Elizabeth A. Blystone, mayor; letter to Hon. Alan D. Wheat, dated May 15, 1989.....	266
Committee of 100 on the Federal City, Gary G. Nelson, chairman, Transport Subcommittee, board of trustees; letter to Hon. Alan D. Wheat, dated May 16, 1989.....	270
George Washington University, Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, president; letter to Hon. Ronald V. Dellums, dated September 1, 1989.....	284
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Ellen M. Bozman, chairman, Arlington County Board of Directors and Rose Crenca, chairman, Montgomery County Council Transportation Planning Board; letter to Hon. Alan D. Wheat, dated April 28, 1989, with attachments.....	259
Ward 1:	
Democrats, Stanley Allen, chairperson; letters to Alan D. Wheat, dated May 10 and 22, 1989, with attachment.....	267, 268
Metro Action Committee, Richard Landis, chairman; letter to Hon. Ronald V. Dellums, dated June 1, 1989.....	273
U.S. Department of Transportation, Galen J. Reser, Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs; letter to Hon. Ronald V. Dellums, dated July 26, 1989, with attachments.....	280
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, Carmen E. Turner, general manager; letter to Hon. Alan D. Wheat, dated July 5, 1989, with attachments.....	275

[The following witnesses were group into panels as shown below:]

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS**

**COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Hearing on H.R. 1463, a bill to amend the National Capital Transportation Act  
of 1969 relating to the Washington Metroraill System.

Thursday, May 4, 1989

9:30 a.m.

1310A LHOB

**WITNESS LIST**

1. **PANEL**

The Honorable Steny H. Hoyer

The Honorable Thomas McMillen

The Honorable Constance A. Morella

The Honorable Frank R. Wolf

2. **PANEL**

The Honorable Paul S. Sarbanes

The Honorable Barbara A. Mikulski

The Honorable John W. Warner

The Honorable Charles Robb

3. The Honorable William Donald Schaefer  
Governor of the State of Maryland, represented by Richard Trainor  
Secretary of Transportation

4. The Honorable Vivian E. Watts  
Secretary of Transportation and Public Safety  
State of Virginia

**BREAK: 12:00 P.M. - 1:00 P.M.**

**Page 2**  
**Witness List**

5. PANEL

The Honorable Marion S. Barry, Jr.  
Mayor of the District of Columbia

The Honorable David A. Clarke  
Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia

6. PANEL

The Honorable Audrey Moore  
Chairwoman, Fairfax Board of Supervisors

The Honorable Ellen Bozman  
Chairwoman, Arlington County Board of Supervisors

The Honorable James P. Moran, Jr.  
Mayor of City of Alexandria

The Honorable Sidney Kramer  
County Executive of Montgomery County

7. Mr. Alfred A. Dellibovi  
Administrator  
Urban Mass Transportation Administration

8. PANEL

Mr. Richard J. Castaldi  
Chairman, Board of Directors  
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Mrs. Carmen E. Turner  
General Manager  
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

9. Mr. John P. Davey  
Chief Executive Officer of Prince George's County

**Page 3**  
**Witness List**

10. PANEL

Mr. Thomas G. Pownall  
Chairman, Transportation Coordinating Committee  
Greater Washington Board of Trade

Mr. Theodore C. Lutz  
Member, Transportation Coordinating Committee  
Greater Washington Board of Trade

## STAFF SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

On May 4, 1989, the Subcommittee on Government Operations and Metropolitan Affairs held hearings on H.R. 1463, a bill to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 relating to the Washington Metrorail system. The legislation authorizes \$2.16 billion in Federal funds to complete construction of the total 103-mile Metrorail adopted regional system. It is anticipated that these funds will be appropriated over 11 years in increments of \$200 million per year.

The subcommittee held a full day of hearings receiving testimony from more than 22 witnesses. The bill received overwhelming support for completion of the total 103-mile adopted regional system. The bipartisan testimony by Members of Congress and area elected officials, made repeated reference to the fact that since its inception, construction of the Metrorail system has proceeded with the understanding that the entire system would be built with the assistance of the Federal Government. The one witness to oppose the legislation was the representative of the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation. It was reported that the administration opposes a special authorization for the Washington Metrorail system and suggests that Metro compete for Federal mass transit funds along with other transit authorities.

H.R. 1463 authorizes additional Federal contribution beyond the current Federal authorization in Public Law 96-184, referred to as Stark-Harris, which provides funding sufficient to complete only 89.5 miles of the 103-mile adopted regional system. The Stark-Harris authorization expires at the end of fiscal year 1991. This new authorization is predicated on the same reasoning and justification for the early bipartisan support of four Presidents—Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon—and the support of Congress as stated in language contained in the 1968 National Capital Transportation Act. A regional public transit system was essential, the act concluded: (1) To the continued and effective functioning of the Government of the United States; (2) for the welfare of the District of Columbia; (3) for the orderly growth, planning, and development of the National Capital region; and (4) for the preservation of the beauty and dignity of the Nation's Capital.

Testimony reaffirmed the numerous ways in which the Metrorail system serves the operation of the Federal Government in the following ways: (a) It is an integral part of the Nation's Capital coordinated transportation system which daily carries a large part of the 400,000 Federal employees in the region. (b) It transports thousands of persons conducting business with the Federal Government. (c) It serves many of the 17 million tourists from across the country and around the world who visit the Nation's Capital each year. (d) It carried over 600,000 passengers on Inauguration Day. (e) It has over half of the existing stations located in such a way as to directly serve Federal facilities such as the Pentagon, the Federal Triangle office buildings, Capitol South Station, and the Smithsonian Station.



These were given as examples of how Metrorail is an essential element which allows the Federal Government to function efficiently in the city and the region. The subcommittee was told that without Metro, an additional 100,000 automobiles would enter the central business district of the Nation's Capital during peak hours each day " \* \* \* enough cars to convert the Capital Beltway into an eight-lane bumper-to-bumper parking lot."

In considering the question of why an additional authorization is needed for the Metrorail system, the subcommittee received testimony that indicated that the Stark-Harris pay-out schedule was ignored, such that original construction schedule could not be met within appropriated amounts. There were delays imposed by the U.S. Department of Transportation Urban Mass Transit Authority in administering the Federal grants and Federal requirements which further slowed construction. Their requirement for "full funding" or the policy of approving construction for "operable segments only" forced Metro into an inefficient construction schedule.

Other delays included litigation regarding routes and normal construction delays which all result in the need now to reauthorize funds for the Federal share of the total construction cost to complete the Metrorail system.

Should additional Federal funding be authorized for the Metrorail system, these funds will not be out of line with Federal contributions to the Nation's largest or third largest rapid transit system. Washington Metro is the Nation's second largest rapid rail system and in 1988 was awarded the American Public Transit Association highest honor by naming it the outstanding public transit system in North America.



**H.R. 1463—TO AMEND THE NATIONAL CAPITAL  
TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1969 RELATING TO  
THE WASHINGTON METRORAIL SYSTEM**

---

**THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1989**

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS  
AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS,  
COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
*Washington, DC.***

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:30 a.m., in room 1310A, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Alan D. Wheat (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Wheat, Fauntroy, Parris, and Rohrabacher.

Also present: Edward C. Sylvester, Jr., staff director; Dietra L. Ford and Ronald C. Willis, senior staff associates; Marvin R. Eason and George Ohl Withers, staff assistants; Howard Lee, minority assistant staff director; and Jacqueline Maki, Congressman Fauntroy's office.

[The text of H.R. 1463 along with a fact sheet follow:]

101ST CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 1463

To amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 relating to the  
Washington Metrorail System.

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 16, 1989

Mr. DELLUMS (for himself, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. STARK, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MORRELA, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, and Mr. WOLF) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

---

## A BILL

To amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969  
relating to the Washington Metrorail System.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

4 This Act may be cited as the "National Capital Trans-  
5 portation Amendments of 1989".

6 **SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTA-**  
7 **TION ACT OF 1969.**

8 Effective October 1, 1989, the National Capital Trans-  
9 portation Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-143; 83 Stat. 320)

1 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new  
2 section:

3           “AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL FEDERAL  
4                           CONTRIBUTIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION

5           “SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary of Transportation is au-  
6 thorized to make grants to the Transit Authority, in addition  
7 to the contributions authorized by sections 3 and 14, for the  
8 purpose of financing in part the cost of construction of the  
9 Adopted Regional System.

10          “(b) Federal grants under subsection (a) for the Adopted  
11 Regional System shall be subject to the following limitations  
12 and conditions:

13           “(1) The work for which such grants are author-  
14 ized shall be subject to the provisions of the Compact  
15 and shall be for projects included in the Adopted Re-  
16 gional System.

17           “(2) The aggregate amount of such Federal  
18 grants made during any fiscal year shall be matched by  
19 the local participating governments by payment of cap-  
20 ital contributions for such year in a total amount that  
21 is not less than 25 percent of the amount of such Fed-  
22 eral grants and shall be provided in cash from sources  
23 other than Federal funds or revenues from the oper-  
24 ation of public mass transportation systems. Any public  
25 or private transit system funds so provided shall be  
26 solely from undistributed cash surpluses, replacement

1 or depreciation funds or revenues available in cash, or  
2 new capital.

3 “(3) Such grants shall be subject to terms and  
4 conditions that the Secretary may deem appropriate for  
5 constructing the Adopted Regional System in a cost-  
6 effective manner.

7 “(c) In addition to funds authorized under section 14,  
8 there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of  
9 Transportation for the purpose of making grants to complete  
10 the Adopted Regional System as provided in subsection (a)  
11 an aggregate amount not to exceed \$2,160,000,000.

12 “(d) Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authoriza-  
13 tion under subsection (c)—

14 “(1) shall remain available until expended; and

15 “(2) shall be in addition to, and not in lieu of,  
16 amounts available to the Transit Authority under the  
17 Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 and section  
18 103(e)(4) of title 23, United States Code.”.

○

**FACT SHEET**  
**COMPLETING THE 103-MILE**  
**ADOPTED REGIONAL METRORAIL SYSTEM**

**Genesis of the 103-Mile Adopted Regional System**

In the twenty years since the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority was created by Congress, it has been building a rail system for the nation's capital in a partnership with the Federal government, the States of Maryland and Virginia, the District of Columbia, and eight local jurisdictions. The Adopted Regional Metrorail System has been planned as a unified and coordinated 103 mile-rail system, of which 70 miles and 64 stations are now operational.

The participating jurisdictions, with the understanding and support of the Federal government, have presumed completion of the full 103-mile system and have contributed to the construction program in expectation that their lines would be built. This understanding has not only formed the basis for an unprecedented political coalition, but flows from an extensive transportation planning process begun in the 1950's aimed at the development of an integrated transportation network. The 103-mile Adopted Regional System is the result of an intensive public participation process, as well as a Federally-mandated alternatives analysis in which land use, highway, and transit issues were all considered. The locations of rail yards and terminus points were determined strategically to maximize operational effectiveness and to minimize the operating costs of Metrorail.

**Financing History**

Construction funding through FY '89 totals \$7.1 billion, and has been financed through a combination of direct congressional appropriations, federally guaranteed bonds, federal grants, interstate transfers, contributions from local jurisdictions, and investments. Through FY '89, the federal contribution has been \$4.9 billion. It has been a unique federal-local partnership that has advanced this construction program, aimed at serving the vital transportation needs of the nation's capital, with its massive federal workforce, millions of visitors annually from across the nation and around world, and the residents of the region, seeking fast and reliable transportation.

The current federal authorization, P.L. 96-184 enacted January 3, 1980 and referred to as Stark-Harris, provides funding sufficient only to complete 89.5 miles of the 103-mile Adopted Regional System. A Full Funding Agreement entered into between Washington Metro and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration in 1986 provides for orderly construction of 89.5 miles of the system. The Authority's FY '90 appropriations request would exhaust the \$193 million which remains available in the Stark-Harris authorization.

**Scope and Cost of the Remaining 13.5-Mile Construction Program**

Included in the remaining 13.5 miles is construction of the final portion of the long-delayed Inner Green Line, which will serve the most transit dependent population of the region. This would connect the H-Street and Fort Totten Stations, with intermediate stops at Shaw-Howard University and Mt. Vernon-UDC Stations. The southern leg of the Green Line would extend from the Anacostia Station in Southeast Washington to Branch Avenue near the Beltway, providing a vital intercept for traffic in rapidly developing southern Prince George's County. This line would also have stations at Congress Heights, Southern Avenue, Naylor Road and the major Federal Government Center at Suitland. The Red Line would be extended from Wheaton to Glenmont providing access to a service and inspection yard, and the Yellow Line would be extended to Franconia/Springfield reducing traffic in that overburdened corridor.

The legislation would authorize Federal funding of \$2.16 billion, with the local jurisdictions providing an additional 25 percent of that amount as the local share. Annual review by the Budget and Appropriations Committees in each House will ensure careful oversight of the construction program. As with any capital construction project, the cost of completing the full Adopted Regional System depends on the rate at which funds are made available and the constraints placed upon their use. These estimates assume Federal appropriations commencing in FY '91 of least \$200 million annually for eleven years. Should appropriations fall short of that level or grants be unduly delayed, the cost of system completion would unavoidably rise.



## OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. ALAN D. WHEAT

Mr. WHEAT. Ladies and gentlemen, the Subcommittee on Government Operations and Metropolitan Affairs will come to order.

We have before us today legislation to amend the National Capital Transportation Act. It was originally in 1952 that Congress passed the first National Capital Planning Act. This act led to a serious analysis of the area's transportation problems and needs. With the planning groundwork established, the National Capital Transportation Agency was created in 1960 to develop a rapid rail system.

Late in 1965, that legislation was signed, authorizing a basic 25-mile, \$431 million rapid transit system capable of future expansion.

Shortly thereafter, legislation was signed creating the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, which by 1968 had approved the adopted regional system. The approved system of 97.2 miles included 38.4 miles in the District of Columbia, 29 miles in Virginia, and 29 miles in Maryland.

In 1979 Congress approved the National Capital Transportation Act, which authorized over \$1 billion for 10 years, providing for a two-thirds/one-third Federal/local match for a total project cost of \$1.7 billion.

Almost 10 years ago this subcommittee, then chaired by my colleague Mr. Stark, heard testimony seeking an extension of the Federal commitment to authorize funds for the completion of the Washington Metrorail system and the retirement of bonds issued by W.M.A.T.A.

This legislation, which came to be known as Stark-Harris, reduced the local share to 20 percent and authorized an additional \$1.7 billion to complete the system, which was expanded from 97 miles to 101 miles.

Once again, members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, with the bipartisan support of the area delegation, come before this subcommittee on behalf of the Metrorail system.

The legislation under consideration today, H.R. 1463, will amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 to complete the Metrorail system now expanded to 103 miles.

The bill before us seeks to authorize additional Federal funds of \$2.16 billion, which is the current projected cost for construction of the remaining 13.5 miles. The bill continues the local jurisdiction match at 25 percent of the Federal share.

Budget constraints and the implementation of Gramm-Rudman require a serious assessment of current priorities. A careful examination is therefore required to determine whether it is appropriate to expend additional Federal funds for this project.

If it is appropriate, we must decide what Federal funds will be authorized for future rail construction and the rate at which those funds will be made available.

In the planning of this hearing, I have been very fortunate to have a more than cooperative ranking member. In fact, I have had a ranking member who has been diligent in the carrying out of his responsibilities, and has been a strong advocate for the funding of the Metrorail system. At this time, I would like to call upon Mr. Parris for any opening statement that he might wish to make.

[The prepared opening statement of Mr. Wheat follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF  
THE HONORABLE ALAN WHEAT, CHAIRMAN  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS  
HEARING ON H.R. 1463  
THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1989

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS WILL COME TO ORDER.

WE HAVE BEFORE US TODAY LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT. IT WAS IN 1952 THAT CONGRESS PASSED THE FIRST NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING ACT; THIS ACT LEAD TO A SERIOUS ANALYSIS OF THE AREA'S TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS AND NEEDS. WITH THE PLANNING GROUNDWORK ESTABLISHED, THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY WAS CREATED IN 1960 TO DEVELOP A RAPID RAIL SYSTEM.

LATE IN 1965, LEGISLATION WAS SIGNED AUTHORIZING A BASIC 25 MILE, \$431 MILLION RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM CAPABLE OF FUTURE EXPANSION. SHORTLY THEREAFTER, LEGISLATION WAS SIGNED CREATING THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY (WMATA) WHICH BY 1968 HAD APPROVED THE ADOPTED REGIONAL SYSTEM. THE APPROVED SYSTEM OF 97.2 MILES INCLUDED 38.4 MILES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 29.1 MILES IN VIRGINIA, AND 29.7 MILES IN MARYLAND.

IN 1969 CONGRESS APPROVED THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT WHICH AUTHORIZED \$1.1 BILLION FOR TEN YEARS, PROVIDING FOR A TWO-THIRDS/ONE-THIRD FEDERAL/LOCAL MATCH FOR A TOTAL PROJECT COST OF \$1.7 BILLION.

PAGE 2 - STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN WHEAT

ALMOST 10 YEARS AGO THIS SUBCOMMITTEE, CHAIRED BY MY COLLEAGUE MR. STARK, HEARD TESTIMONY SEEKING AN EXTENSION OF THE FEDERAL COMMITMENT TO AUTHORIZE FUNDS FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE WASHINGTON METRORAIL SYSTEM AND THE RETIREMENT OF BONDS ISSUED BY WMATA. THIS LEGISLATION, WHICH CAME TO BE KNOWN AS THE STARK-HARRIS ACT, REDUCED THE LOCAL SHARE TO TWENTY PERCENT AND AUTHORIZED AN ADDITIONAL \$1.7 BILLION TO COMPLETE THE SYSTEM WHICH WAS EXPANDED FROM 97.2 MILES TO 101 MILES.

ONCE AGAIN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, WITH THE BIPARTISAN SUPPORT OF THE AREA DELEGATION, COME BEFORE THIS SUBCOMMITTEE ON BEHALF OF THE METRORAIL SYSTEM. THE LEGISLATION UNDER CONSIDERATION TODAY, H.R. 1463, WILL AMEND THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1969 TO COMPLETE THE METRORAIL SYSTEM NOW EXPANDED TO 103 MILES. THE BILL BEFORE US SEEKS TO AUTHORIZE ADDITIONAL FEDERAL FUNDS OF \$2.16 BILLION WHICH IS THE CURRENT PROJECTED COST FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE REMAINING 13.5 MILES. THE BILL CONTINUES THE LOCAL JURISDICTION MATCH AT TWENTY PERCENT OF THE COST.

BUDGET CONSTRAINTS AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF GRAMM-RUDMAN REQUIRE A SERIOUS ASSESSMENT OF PRIORITIES. A CAREFUL EXAMINATION IS THEREFORE REQUIRED TO DETERMINE WHETHER IT IS APPROPRIATE TO EXPEND ADDITIONAL FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THIS PROJECT. AND IF IT IS APPROPRIATED, WE MUST DECIDE WHAT FEDERAL FUNDS WILL BE AUTHORIZED FOR FUTURE RAIL CONSTRUCTION AND THE RATE AT WHICH THOSE FUNDS WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE.

## STATEMENT OF HON. STAN PARRIS

Mr. PARRIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief. Let me first congratulate and thank you for scheduling this hearing so quickly. I sincerely appreciate the leadership which you have demonstrated.

I want to publicly say that the cooperation that you have been very forthcoming with, in affording those of us on the minority, as well as, of course, working with the staff, has been exemplary and in the best traditions of the Congress of the United States. I appreciate very much that cooperation.

The passage of the legislation being considered by the subcommittee today is of critical importance, not only to the residents of and to the visitors of the Washington metropolitan area, but to the operation of the Federal Government itself.

H.R. 1463, the Dellums-Parris Metro Reauthorization Act, would amend Public Law 96-184 to provide for completion of the full system, consistent with my understanding of Congress' original intent.

I might add categorically, I see my friend Joe Alexander sitting in the audience out there. Joe and I were members of the board of supervisors when Metro was authorized 20-some odd years ago.

Joe is still a member of that board of supervisors. He has become rich and famous, and I am in the Congress of the United States. That is called life, I suppose.

The existing authorization under the public law, as the chairman has indicated, has only enough funds, balance of funds, to complete the 89.5 miles. The fiscal year 1990 request of \$193 million would exhaust the funds available under that authorization.

The point of all this, in my view, Mr. Chairman, is that Washington, DC is our Nation's Capital. No matter how simple and no matter how obvious that statement is, no matter how often we repeat it, it is of critical importance to this debate.

In addition, it must be noted that the largest single employer in the Washington metropolitan area is the Federal Government. More than 17 million people from the United States and the world at large come to visit the capital city of the most powerful nation in the world each year. Washington is America's city, and Metro-rail is America's subway.

I believe it is safe to say the majority of the nearly 1 million Metro passengers each day either work for the Government, they work for a company which does business with the Government, or they are visiting their seat of Government. That constitutes a significant impact on the transportation infrastructure capacity of this city.

The Federal Government's contribution to the construction of the Metrorail should not be considered a "special interest hand-out." On the contrary, it is and should be considered a mitigation of impact or the creation of an important public facility.

Let's face it. As bad as traffic is today in the Washington metropolitan area, imagine what it would be like with another 500,000 cars on the roads. It would look like the Capital Centre after a Bulls game or the R.F.K. after the Redskins game. It would be im-

possible. Can you imagine what life would be like, what it is today? Imagine the inauguration, where 600,000 people rode the subway.

Metro rail and Metro bus feeder service has far surpassed original expectations in the role it plays today as perhaps the most important component of the Washington area's transportation infrastructure.

I am most pleased with the level and intensity of the support for this legislation, which has been expressed by so many of my colleagues in both the House and the Senate.

I am looking forward to working with the chairman of the subcommittee, and I want to again emphasize that the gentleman from Missouri has been extremely cooperative and helpful in this entire endeavor, as well as the chairman of the full committee, Mr. Delums, in aggressively pursuing passage of this important legislation in this session of the Congress. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Parris, for your more than kind and generous remarks, and thank you for succinctly summing up the arguments for the Metro system. I especially note the traffic arguments that you cited.

I have been a part-time resident of Washington, DC for almost 7 years now, but I only purchased a car about 6 weeks ago. Prior to that time, I did all my traveling on the Metro. But it is only in the last 6 weeks, with the ownership of the car, that I really appreciate what the Metro does for us.

Mr. PARRIS. Wonderful.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Parris follows:]

**The Honorable Stan Parris**  
**Opening Statement Before the Subcommittee on**  
**Government Operations and Metropolitan Affairs**  
**Dellums-Parris Metro Reauthorization**  
**May 4, 1989**

Mr. Chairman, I would at first like to congratulate and thank you for scheduling this hearing so quickly. I sincerely appreciate the leadership which you have demonstrated and the cooperation you have afforded Republican members of this committee in planning the hearing for today.

Passage of the legislation being considered by our subcommittee today is of critical importance not only to the residents of and visitors to the Washington Metropolitan area, but to the operation of the Federal government itself. H.R.1463, the Dellums-Parris Metro Reauthorization Act, would amend P.L. 96-184 to provide for completion of the full 103-mile Metrorail system consistent with Congress' original intent. The existing authorization under P.L. 96-184 provides only enough funds to complete the first 89.5 miles. WMATA's FY1990 request of \$193 million would exhaust funds available under that authorization.

Washington D.C. is our nation's capital. No matter how simple and no matter how obvious that statement is, it is of critical importance to this debate. In addition, it must be noted that the single largest employer in the Washington metropolitan area is the Federal government, and that more than 17 million people from the United States and the world come to visit the capital city of the most powerful nation in the world. Washington is America's city, and Metrorail is America's subway.

I believe it is safe to say that the majority of the nearly one million metro passengers each day either work for the government, work for a company which does business with the government, or are visiting their seat of government. That constitutes a significant impact on transportation infrastructure capacity. The federal governments' contribution to construction of the Metrorail system should not be considered a "special interest handout" -- on the contrary, it is and should be considered a mitigation of impact. Let's face it, as bad as traffic is now, imagine what it would be like with another five-hundred-thousand cars on the roads -- it would look like the Capital Centre parking lot after a Rolling Stones concert.

Metrorail and Metrobus feeder service has far surpassed original expectations in the role it plays today as perhaps the most important component of the Washington area's transportation infrastructure.

I am most pleased with the level and intensity of support for this legislation which has been expressed by so many of my colleagues in both the House and Senate. I am also looking forward to working with the chairman of this subcommittee and Mr. Dellums in aggressively pursuing passage of this important legislation in this session of Congress.

Mr. WHEAT. There is very little that happens in the District of Columbia without the hard work and the diligence, the leadership, and the foresight of the Delegate of the District of Columbia.

The Delegate was part of the original leadership team that sponsored the Stark-Harris legislation. He is still earnestly working for the funding to complete the Metrorail system today.

I now call upon my esteemed colleague from the District of Columbia, Delegate Walter Fauntroy.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

Mr. FAUNTROY. Thank you so very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to amplify and agree with the fine statements made by our colleague, Mr. Parris, and attributed to you in your leadership in bringing this matter quickly before our committee and with your leadership beyond this committee, moving it to the floor, and hopefully receiving a favorable action.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to make a few comments at the beginning of this most important hearing regarding the reauthorization of the Federal funds for the completion of the remaining 13.5 miles of the Washington Metrorail system as originally planned. In light of our extensive and illustrious witness list, I will make my remarks as brief as I can.

I am honored to join with my House and Senate colleagues from Maryland and Virginia to confirm formally here today our cooperative commitment to the passage of H.R. 1463 and its companion bill in the Senate, S. 612. This, of course, is the legislation which we introduced together in mid-March to provide for the reauthorization of funds to complete the Metrorail system of the Nation's Capital.

As you indicated, I was privileged to be among the community leadership nearly 30 years ago now which helped to forge the initial partnership among the various metropolitan area governmental jurisdictions that ultimately resulted in the creation by Congress in 1967 of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. Indeed, for a period, it was my privilege to chair the W.M.A.T.A. Board.

For more than 20 years now, the W.M.A.T.A. partnership has demonstrated remarkable success in the construction and management of an exemplary mass transit system, including the regional Metrorail system, of which 70 miles are already operational, with 19.5 additional miles currently under construction.

The completion of the remaining 13.5 miles of this model Metrorail system will thus be the culmination of an unprecedented working partnership among the Federal Government, the District of Columbia, the State of Maryland, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the eight local jurisdictions served, a partnership founded on mutual responsibility and accountability.

In the next 11 years, with the funding authorized under H.R. 1463, we can anticipate a completion of the remaining 13.5 miles of Metro as originally planned, an achievement which will maximize the system's efficiency and enhance mass transit service for millions of area residents and visitors to our Nation's Capital each year.

As a Member of Congress representing the people of Washington, DC, it gives me particular satisfaction to note that the final 13.5 miles of the Metro system include the long-delayed innercity green line.

Once completed, the green line, as originally planned, will connect the U Street and Fort Totten Stations with intermediate stops at Columbia Heights and Georgia Avenue, linking some of the most economically disadvantaged and Metro-prone residents of the District to employment opportunities existing throughout the metropolitan area.

In addition, the extended green line in southeast Washington will connect the Anacostia Station with Branch Avenue near the Beltway in southern Prince Georges County, permitting convenient access to Andrews Air Force Base, two area hospitals, and a major U.S. Government employment complex.

Indeed, to many people in Washington, DC, the completed Metro-rail system will constitute a lifeline to economic opportunity. For tens of thousands of District of Columbia residents who will be directly served by the green line, this improved access to our modern Metrorail system will make the critical difference between today's often frustrating dependence on cumbersome and time-consuming bus/rail/bus transfer arrangements and tomorrow's swift, comfortable, convenient, safe, and affordable transportation to employment opportunities throughout the area.

Completion of the green line will also encourage development of commercial, residential, and recreational opportunities, as well as social services, within the neighborhoods contiguous to the Metro stations, enhancing both the economy and the community pride in some of our more economically depressed areas of the region.

Mr. Chairman, from the outset, we have promised the people of Washington, DC that the Metro system will also serve them. We promised the residents of Anacostia, of Congress Heights, of Naylor Road, and Alabama Avenue out in southeast Washington. We promised the people who live in Columbia Heights and along Georgia Avenue and in Shaw, my own neighborhood, up in the north central part of the city. We promised that Metrorail would serve them.

We promised them that their young people will be able to take the subway to the University of the District of Columbia and to Howard and to George Washington Universities, that their families would be able to take advantage of low-cost, fast, safe subway transportation to jobs and schools and shopping centers throughout the Metropolitan Washington region.

But after so many years, Mr. Chairman, these promises remain largely unfulfilled. After more than 20 years of waiting, most of these residents continue to wait for the completion of vital lines that will link them to the rest of the Metro system and to the opportunities that the system brings within their reach.

In the meantime, we have opened the doors of our magnificent subway system first to the lawyers up on Connecticut Avenue and to the investors and lobbyists in their downtown offices.

We have opened the doors to the commuters from the suburbs and to millions of visitors arriving at Union Station and National



Airport. In fact, the people of Washington, DC have themselves warmly invited and welcomed these Metro users to our city.

Indeed, we have opened the doors of Metro to ourselves here on Capitol Hill, as you know, and we have been the ones who benefited first from the Metro, while the people who need it most, quite frankly, have had to wait.

Mr. Chairman, we have waited patiently, but 20 years is long enough. I submit to you that all of the people of our Nation's Capital should have access to the benefits of our Nation's finest Metro-rail system. But until the green line is completed, this will not be the case.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of seriousness and resolve that I join today with my colleagues in the Congress; with government officials from the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, and related local jurisdictions; with W.M.A.T.A. officials; and with representatives from our business community as we unite in a spirit of commitment and progress to call for the Federal Government's full cooperation in reauthorizing the funds necessary to complete the W.M.A.T.A. Metrorail system: a model of mass transit for the Nation and a model of regional cooperation with our Federal Government.

I thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Fauntroy follows:]

REMARKS OF  
 THE HONORABLE WALTER E. FAUNTROY (D-DC)  
 AT THE HEARING ON H. R. 1463  
 BEFORE THE SUBC. ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS & METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS  
 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
 REGARDING THE REAUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR  
 THE COMPLETION OF THE WMATA METRORAIL SYSTEM  
 THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1989, 9:30 AM  
 1310 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

MR. CHAIRMAN, THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE A FEW COMMENTS AT THE BEGINNING OF THIS MOST IMPORTANT HEARING REGARDING THE REAUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE REMAINING 13.5 MILES OF THE WASHINGTON METRORAIL SYSTEM AS ORIGINALLY PLANNED. IN LIGHT OF OUR EXTENSIVE AND ILLUSTRIOUS WITNESS LIST, I WILL MAKE MY REMARKS BRIEF AND TO THE POINT.

I AM HONORED TO JOIN WITH MY HOUSE AND SENATE COLLEAGUES FROM MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA TO CONFIRM FORMALLY HERE TODAY OUR COOPERATIVE COMMITMENT TO THE PASSAGE OF H. R. 1463, AND ITS COMPANION BILL IN THE SENATE, S. 612, THE LEGISLATION WHICH WE INTRODUCED IN MID-MARCH TO PROVIDE FOR THE REAUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS TO COMPLETE THE METRORAIL SYSTEM OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL.

I WAS PRIVILEGED TO BE AMONG THE COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP NEARLY THIRTY YEARS AGO WHICH HELPED FORGE THE INITIAL PARTNERSHIP AMONG THE VARIOUS METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AREA GOVERNMENTAL JURISDICTIONS THAT ULTIMATELY RESULTED IN THE CREATION BY CONGRESS IN 1967 OF THE WASHINGTON

METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY (WMATA). FOR MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS NOW, THE WMATA PARTNERSHIP HAS DEMONSTRATED REMARKABLE SUCCESS IN THE CONSTRUCTION AND MANAGEMENT OF AN EXEMPLARY MASS TRANSIT SYSTEM, INCLUDING THE REGIONAL METRORAIL SYSTEM, OF WHICH 70 MILES ARE ALREADY OPERATIONAL, WITH 19.5 ADDITIONAL MILES CURRENTLY UNDER CONSTRUCTION.

THE COMPLETION OF THE REMAINING 13.5 MILES OF THIS MODEL METRORAIL SYSTEM WILL THUS BE THE CULMINATION OF AN UNPRECEDENTED WORKING PARTNERSHIP AMONG WMATA, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, THE STATE OF MARYLAND, THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, AND THE EIGHT LOCAL JURISDICTIONS SERVED -- A PARTNERSHIP FOUNDED ON MUTUAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY. IN THE NEXT 11 YEARS, WITH THE FUNDING AUTHORIZED UNDER H. R. 1463, WE CAN ANTICIPATE A COMPLETION OF THE REMAINING 13.5 MILES OF METRORAIL AS ORIGINALLY PLANNED, AN ACHIEVEMENT WHICH WILL MAXIMIZE THE SYSTEM'S EFFICIENCY AND ENHANCE MASS TRANSIT SERVICE FOR MILLIONS OF AREA RESIDENTS AND VISITORS TO OUR NATION'S CAPITAL EACH YEAR.

AS THE MEMBER OF CONGRESS REPRESENTING THE PEOPLE OF WASHINGTON, D. C., IT GIVES ME PARTICULAR SATISFACTION TO NOTE THAT THESE FINAL 13.5 MILES OF THE METRO SYSTEM INCLUDE THE LONG-DELAYED INNER GREEN LINE. ONCE COMPLETED, THE GREEN LINE AS ORIGINALLY PLANNED WILL CONNECT THE U-STREET AND FT. TOTTEN STATIONS, WITH INTERMEDIATE STOPS AT COLUMBIA HEIGHTS AND GEORGIA AVENUE, LINKING SOME OF THE MOST ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED RESIDENTS OF THE DISTRICT TO EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES EXISTING THROUGHOUT THE METROPOLITAN AREA. IN ADDITION, THE EXTENDED GREEN LINE IN SOUTHEAST WASHINGTON WILL CONNECT THE ANACOSTIA STATION WITH BRANCH AVENUE NEAR THE BELTWAY IN SOUTHERN PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, PERMITTING CONVENIENT ACCESS TO ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, TWO AREA HOSPITALS, AND A MAJOR U. S. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT COMPLEX.

INDEED, TO MANY PEOPLE IN WASHINGTON, D. C., THE COMPLETED METRORAIL SYSTEM WILL CONSTITUTE A LIFELINE TO ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY. FOR THE TENS OF THOUSANDS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RESIDENTS WHO WILL BE DIRECTLY SERVED BY THE GREEN LINE, THIS IMPROVED ACCESS TO OUR MODERN METRORAIL SYSTEM WILL MAKE THE CRITICAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TODAY'S OFTEN FRUSTRATING DEPENDENCE ON CUMBERSOME AND TIME-CONSUMING BUS-RAIL-BUS TRANSFER ARRANGEMENTS AND TOMORROW'S SWIFT, COMFORTABLE, CONVENIENT, SAFE, AND AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION TO EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE AREA. COMPLETION OF THE GREEN LINE WILL ALSO ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMERCIAL, RESIDENTIAL, AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES, AS WELL AS SOCIAL SERVICES, WITHIN THE NEIGHBORHOODS CONTIGUOUS TO THE METRORAIL STATIONS, ENHANCING BOTH THE ECONOMY AND THE COMMUNITY PRIDE IN SOME OF OUR MORE DEPRESSED AREAS.

MR. CHAIRMAN, FROM THE OUTSET WE HAVE PROMISED THE PEOPLE OF WASHINGTON, D. C., THAT THE METRO SYSTEM WAS ALSO FOR THEM. WE PROMISED THE RESIDENTS OF ANACOSTIA, OF CONGRESS HEIGHTS, OF NAYLOR ROAD AND ALABAMA AVENUE OUT IN SOUTHEAST WASHINGTON. . . . WE PROMISED THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN COLUMBIA HEIGHTS AND ALONG GEORGIA AVENUE AND IN SHAW (MY OLD NEIGHBORHOOD) UP IN THE NORTH CENTRAL PART OF THE CITY -- WE PROMISED THEM THAT METRORAIL WOULD SERVE THEM. WE PROMISED THEM THAT THEIR YOUNG PEOPLE WOULD BE ABLE TO TAKE THE SUBWAY TO U-DC AND TO HOWARD AND GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITIES, THAT THEIR FAMILIES WOULD BE ABLE TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF LOW-COST, FAST, SAFE SUBWAY TRANSPORTATION TO JOBS AND SCHOOLS AND SHOPPING CENTERS THROUGHOUT METROPOLITAN D. C.

BUT AFTER SO MANY YEARS, MR. CHAIRMAN, THESE PROMISES REMAIN LARGELY UNFULFILLED. AFTER MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS OF WAITING, MOST OF

THESE RESIDENTS CONTINUE TO WAIT FOR THE COMPLETION OF VITAL LINES THAT WILL LINK THEM TO THE REST OF THE METRORAIL SYSTEM AND TO THE OPPORTUNITIES THAT SYSTEM BRINGS WITHIN THEIR REACH.

IN THE MEANTIME, WE HAVE OPENED THE DOORS OF OUR MAGNIFICENT SUBWAY SYSTEM FIRST TO THE LAWYERS UP ON CONNECTICUT AVENUE AND TO THE INVESTORS AND LOBBYISTS IN THEIR DOWNTOWN OFFICES; AND WE HAVE OPENED THESE DOORS TO THE COMMUTERS FROM THE SUBURBS AND TO THE MILLIONS OF VISITORS ARRIVING AT UNION STATION AND NATIONAL AIRPORT -- IN FACT, THE PEOPLE OF WASHINGTON, D. C., HAVE THEMSELVES WARMLY INVITED AND WELCOMED THESE METRO-USERS TO OUR CITY. INDEED, WE HAVE OPENED THE DOORS OF METRO TO OURSELVES HERE ON THE HILL -- WE HAVE BEEN THE ONES TO BENEFIT FIRST FROM METRO WHILE THE PEOPLE WHO NEED IT MOST HAVE HAD TO WAIT.

AND, MR. CHAIRMAN, THEY HAVE WAITED PATIENTLY -- BUT TWENTY YEARS IS LONG ENOUGH. I SUBMIT TO YOU THAT ALL THE PEOPLE OF OUR NATION'S CAPITAL SHOULD HAVE ACCESS TO THE BENEFITS OF OUR NATION'S FINEST METRORAIL SYSTEM. BUT UNTIL THE GREEN LINE IS COMPLETED, THIS WILL NOT BE THE CASE.

THUS, MR. CHAIRMAN, IT IS WITH GREAT SERIOUSNESS AND RESOLVE THAT I JOIN TODAY WITH MY COLLEAGUES IN THE CONGRESS; WITH GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, MARYLAND, VIRGINIA, AND RELATED LOCAL JURISDICTIONS; WITH WMATA OFFICIALS; AND WITH REPRESENTATIVES FROM OUR BUSINESS COMMUNITY AS WE UNITE IN A SPIRIT OF COMMITMENT AND PROGRESS TO CALL FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S FULL COOPERATION IN REAUTHORIZING THE FUNDS NECESSARY TO COMPLETE THE WMATA METRORAIL SYSTEM: A MODEL OF MASS TRANSIT FOR THE NATION.

THANK YOU.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Fauntroy, for your fine statement. I know indeed that many of your constituents have been waiting for the completion of the system for a very long time.

I think it was partially with that in mind that the cosponsors of the legislation who are here with us today introduced H.R. 1463 at an early time in the Congress and sought this early hearing. They have been very persuasive and convincing in the arguments that they have made.

I would now like to call our first panel of witnesses this morning. I am sorry. Mr. Rohrabacher, who is a distinguished member of our committee, has also been very cooperative. I didn't mean to overlook you.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. All right.

Mr. WHEAT. We would appreciate and receive any opening statement you wish to make.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. DANA ROHRABACHER

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I am pretty easy to overlook because I am brand new to this committee and brand new to the Congress. But thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the remarks of my distinguished colleagues.

I hate to be the one to throw cold water on all of these great words, but when I was elected to Congress, I was just elected to Congress. I just had to put myself before the voters for the first time. I pledged to them that I was going to oppose any type of Federal spending that was not absolutely necessary.

The words that I've heard today are eloquent and they talk about serving people's needs, but they don't talk about the tough choices that we're going to have to make in this time of high-deficit spending.

I happen to believe that to be responsible, we are going to have to make tough choices. We're going to have to talk about transportation needs versus people's medical needs.

I think that I'm going to be faced with choices. I think all of us in Congress are going to be faced with choices as to whether we're going to support prenatal care for children versus something else. This might be the something else that we're comparing it to.

I see this transportation system as a subsidized transportation system for Government workers. I see the people in southern California, whom I represent, as well as other areas of the world, other areas of the country subsidizing the transportation needs for the people of Washington, DC and the greater metropolitan area.

As you may know, the people of southern California have some transportation needs of their own. I happen to oppose any Federal subsidy to meet their transportation needs.

When we come back—you know, when we're talking about a situation where it's going to facilitate Government workers getting to their jobs, well, I think that's certainly a benefit, but the Government workers who are benefiting from that should be the ones who are paying the price.

I see no reason why the Federal Government should be spending over \$2 billion in order to subsidize the transportation needs of Government workers.

We have a situation where there's a transportation need in this city, in this great metropolitan area. The people who are using the transportation facility are the ones who should be paying for it.

If the Government workers can't afford to pay for their own transportation needs, then we can talk about a pay raise for Government workers in order to provide a situation where they can afford to pay for their transportation needs. I happen to believe that they can probably afford their transportation needs right now.

In terms of taking this money out of the Federal budget, \$2 billion out of the Federal budget, in order to further subsidize transportation of Government workers to and from their jobs, I think that it might be better if we paid for this out of a bond system. If there really is a need, why don't we issue some bonds and then pay this back through operating profits of the system itself?

I happen—I just can't go back and face the taxpayers in my State and tell them that they're subsidizing a transportation need when we have so many other crying needs in this country.

I'll have to admit it will be real nice. It would be very, very nice. I know that when you're riding in your car to work, it's very nice that other people are riding that Metro system. It makes it easier for you to get here in your car.

But the people of Iowa have needs. The people of southern California have needs. We're not going to—I just don't see that we should be siphoning money out from the heartland of America and different places into the Nation's Capital.

I'm looking forward to discussing this with the witnesses and trying to talk to the other members of this committee to see if this is, indeed, the type of tough choices that we're going to need to make in order to balance the Federal budget.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Rohrabacher, for your statement. I think you certainly raised some questions that need to be answered and that you will give the witnesses, both the Members of Congress who are presenting the legislation and the technical witnesses who are going to appear before us, the opportunity to answer these questions in some detail and make a case.

There is no doubt that our Federal Government resources are finite and are limited, but there are many of us who have the belief that this is an important system.

I think that many of them are going to testify today, as well as there will be witnesses who share your view and will be presenting information that perhaps suggests, with the limited choices we face, the funding of the system should be changed from the last Stark-Harris authorization.

With that, I think the actual debate is engaged, and I would at this time like to call the sponsors of the legislation who have pushed for this early hearing and who have worked very hard to try to make sure this legislation would come before the Congress at an early date so that we could consider the important questions that face us.

Congressman Hoyer, Congressman McMillen, and Congresswoman Morella, if you would come to the table, we would appreciate and receive your testimony at this time.

Congressman Wolf is also a cosponsor of the legislation and is delayed this morning. He will be arriving at approximately 10:15 o'clock. We will hear his testimony when he arrives.

At this point, we'd like to hear one of the most ardent and effusive supporters of the Metro system, a gentleman who has worked very hard in support of the entire 103-mile adopted system, Congressman Steny Hoyer.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. STENY H. HOYER, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE  
FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND**

Mr. HOYER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We very much appreciate, those of us who live in the Washington metropolitan area, your chairmanship of this subcommittee, your concern with this region, and your concern with the operations of the Federal city. It is a labor of love to serve in the seat in which you serve, and we very much appreciate that.

I want to also congratulate Mr. Parris and Mr. Dellums, the chairman and ranking member of this committee, who have themselves worked very, very hard over many years to see this realization of this system. Of course, we're pleased to join Mr. Fauntroy, the Representative in Congress from the District of Columbia. That ought to be the State of Columbia. He ought to have a vote in this Congress. It's a shame that he doesn't.

The Representatives, of course, from southern California do have a vote in this Congress. The District of Columbia does not. But perhaps we will turn that around some day.

Mr. Chairman, members of this distinguished subcommittee, I am pleased to be here this morning to testify in strong support of H.R. 1463, the Washington Metro Reauthorization Act. Mr. Chairman, as so many have said, Washington Metro is one of the country's true success stories. This system, named, and I quote, the "best in North America" by the American Public Transit Association, is second only to New York in passenger rail trips per year.

Washington Metro is also far more than a local mass transit system, and I think that point needs to be made. I can understand a new Member of Congress perhaps looking at it as a local system.

I want to assure him that many of his constituents, however, are going to be visiting from southern California, one of the largest nations in the world, the 28.5 million people who use this system regularly, not all of them perhaps, but many of them. It is truly a "national" system.

Imagine, if you will, Mr. Chairman, the impact on our Capital City if the 300,000 Federal workers had no alternative to the Beltway and the bridges over the Potomac. Imagine the area traffic infrastructure accommodating an additional 147 million passenger trips a year. Imagine for a moment what would happen if the 17 million tourists, many of whom are from California, to our Nation's Capital each year did not have access to the world's cleanest and safest subway system.

What would happen, Mr. Chairman, is that our Federal Government would not operate effectively and efficiently on behalf of all 240-plus million Americans, and we would have a less efficient, more costly operation of their Federal Government.



Clearly, the images this brings to mind make the worst snow blizzards impact pale in comparison.

This Capital City needs this system. The Washington metropolitan area needs this system. Its Federal workers and tourists, Californians, New Yorkers, Floridians, need this system. The Congress should act to meet this need.

Mr. Chairman, in 1979 this committee and the Congress, fully appreciating these arguments, acted to complete the Washington Metro system. \$1.7 billion was authorized to complete a 101-mile system.

Today, under your leadership, Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee is considering a request for an additional \$2.16 billion to complete a 103-mile system. A fair question is: Why the cost escalation?

Experts far more knowledgeable than myself will be testifying later this morning on the details of this escalation. However, let me attempt to address the question early on.

First, inflation has taken a serious toll on construction. Original estimates assumed that inflation would total 20 percent of the cost of construction. Today, that estimate is 300 percent and more greater; that is to say, 66.6 percent of the cost of construction. The Stark-Harris payout schedule was ignored from the beginning by the Congress, such that the original construction schedule could not be met within appropriation limits.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, in most years, it was over \$100 million less than was originally projected, so that Metro could not meet its construction schedule and was, therefore, vulnerable to the escalating construction costs because of the slowdown in construction.

So not only was inflation much larger than anybody expected, but, as well, the construction schedule, because of the Congress' inability to fund as it had said it was going to do, was much slower. Today, this subcommittee will hear debates on this issue.

Further, Urban Mass Transportation Administration has imposed numerous Federal requirements and delays in funding for Metro, further slowing construction. Their requirement for, and I quote, "full funding" forced on Metro an inefficient construction schedule.

Now, as one who was deeply involved, along with Congressman Parris, Congressman Fauntroy, and others, in this whole debate about full funding, we understood UMTA's concerns, but it, nevertheless, did impose a less efficient construction schedule than we otherwise would have been able to pursue.

Today, for example, UMTA refuses to release \$200 million that has been appropriated by the Congress, money appropriated by the Congress, which has further slowed construction awards. Of course, all of the blame cannot be placed, nor do we intend to place the blame, on UMTA litigation, redesign, realignment also impacted on system costs, not unlike the costs of other systems around the country and around the world. Labor disputes, the oil embargo, and improved environmental standards also compounded the costs of inflation.

The Federal Government, Mr. Chairman, has also imposed its own constraints. A station, a station entrance, and several other facilities were added at direct Federal request.

New elderly and handicapped access requirements also resulted in additional facilities and design modification, all Federal requirements that made sense, but, obviously, added to cost.

Finally, Metro is also a victim of its own success. Ridership has exceeded all original estimates. This is a system that has been more successful than was originally perceived, resulting in the need for more rail cars, expanded maintenance capacity, and more support equipment in order to maintain acceptable timetables and efficient service for riders.

The bottom line, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, is if we are to complete the system, more money is needed. It is important to note, however, that Metro's Federal funds are not out of line with other national systems of comparable size and ridership, not out of line.

Washington Metro is the Nation's second largest rail transit system. Washington Metro has received a total of \$3.4 billion from UMTA. Metrorail has also received \$1.2 billion in direct appropriations from the Congress.

These amounts are just over half of the \$8 billion received by the largest rail network in the country for modernization and extensions. It's also comparable with the \$3.4 billion received by Chicago, even though Chicago is not as large a system.

Other systems have received less, but it is important to note that many of these systems are just beginning construction and are planned to carry far less riders and serve fewer miles. When these systems are completed, their costs will be comparable with those of the Washington Metro system.

The critical comparison that this subcommittee should make is to miles and passengers carried. Under any comparison, Washington Metro is a good buy for the taxpayer of this region and the taxpayer of the United States.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, over the years the Congress and the Federal Government have met their commitment to construct a regional rail system for our Capital region.

Let me reiterate that the Congress long ago adopted the premise that this was, indeed, America's subway, for which all taxpayers had a responsibility and to which they had a commitment.

We have not finished that commitment. This is a continuation. It is not a new commitment. It is simply a continuation of the existing commitment.

The local jurisdictions and the neighboring States have all met their financial commitment to the system in full. They have done so not only with dollars, but by also forgoing interstate highway construction and adopting policies and bus service which encourage transit ridership.

It is clear that Washington Metro is a critical link in the Capital region's transportation network. Without continued Federal assistance, local governments will be unable to fund completion of this system. We need this legislation.

As President Johnson made clear in 1965, this commitment is essential, and I quote him, "for the welfare of the District of Columbia, for the orderly growth and development of the Capital region, and for the preservation of the beauty and dignity of the Nation's

Capital," a capital of which we are all supremely proud, whether we live, as I said before, in Florida, New York, Maine or California.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say that we will look back on this expenditure 20 years from today and say that it was an absolutely essential expense.

The people of the west coast are properly concerned about their environment. We see one of the greatest oil spills in history on the west coast.

That oil needs to move because we move so many millions of cars in this country. We are getting to a point where neither the environment nor the supply of oil will allow us to do that.

We will look back on this expenditure, we will look back on the construction of America's subway, 20 years from now and say it was one of the best buys that southern Californians or Marylanders or Floridians ever made because it will allow the Capital of the greatest Nation on the face of this Earth to remain an integrated region, to remain a viable region, to remain an efficient and effective Federal seat of Government.

So I would urge my friends from whatever part of the country they come to support their subway.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Representative Hoyer follows:]

METRO TESTIMONY BY STENY H. HOYER  
MAY 3, 1989

MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THIS DISTINGUISHED SUBCOMMITTEE, I AM PLEASED TO BE HERE THIS MORNING TO TESTIFY IN STRONG SUPPORT OF HR 1463, THE WASHINGTON METRO REAUTHORIZATION ACT.

MR. CHAIRMAN, WASHINGTON METRO IS ONE OF THIS COUNTRY'S TRUE SUCCESS STORIES. THIS SYSTEM, NAMED THE "BEST IN NORTH AMERICA" BY THE AMERICAN PUBLIC TRANSIT ASSOCIATION, IS SECOND ONLY TO NEW YORK CITY IN PASSENGER RAIL TRIPS PER YEAR.

WASHINGTON METRO IS ALSO FAR MORE THAN A LOCAL MASS TRANSIT SYSTEM. IT TRULY IS A "NATIONAL" SYSTEM. IMAGINE THE IMPACT ON OUR CAPITAL CITY IF THE 300,000 FEDERAL WORKERS HAD NO ALTERNATIVE TO THE BELTWAY AND THE BRIDGES OVER THE POTOMAC. IMAGINE THE AREA TRAFFIC INFRASTRUCTURE ACCOMMODATING AN ADDITIONAL 147 MILLION PASSENGER TRIPS A YEAR.

IMAGINE FOR A MOMENT WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF THE 17 MILLION TOURISTS TO OUR NATION'S CAPITAL EACH YEAR DID NOT HAVE ACCESS TO THE WORLD'S CLEANEST AND SAFEST SUBWAY SYSTEM.

CLEARLY THE IMAGES THIS BRINGS TO MIND MAKES THE WORST SNOW BLIZZARD'S IMPACT PALE IN COMPARISON.

THIS CAPITAL CITY NEEDS THIS SYSTEM. THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA NEEDS THIS SYSTEM. ITS FEDERAL WORKERS AND TOURISTS NEED THIS SYSTEM. AND THE CONGRESS SHOULD ACT TO MEET THAT NEED.

MR. CHAIRMAN, IN 1979, THIS COMMITTEE AND THE CONGRESS, FULLY APPRECIATING THESE ARGUMENTS, ACTED TO COMPLETE THE WASHINGTON METRO SYSTEM. \$1.7 BILLION WAS AUTHORIZED TO COMPLETE A 101 MILE SYSTEM.

TODAY, THIS SUBCOMMITTEE IS CONSIDERING A REQUEST FOR AN ADDITIONAL \$2.16 BILLION TO COMPLETE A 103 MILE SYSTEM. A FAIR QUESTION IS WHY THE COST ESCALATION?

EXPERTS FAR MORE KNOWLEDGEABLE THAN MYSELF WILL BE TESTIFYING LATER THIS MORNING ON THE DETAILS OF THIS ESCALATION. HOWEVER, LET ME ATTEMPT TO ADDRESS THIS QUESTION EARLY ON.

FIRST, INFLATION HAS TAKEN A SERIOUS TOLL ON CONSTRUCTION. ORIGINAL ESTIMATES ASSUMED THAT INFLATION WOULD TOTAL 20% OF THE COST OF CONSTRUCTION. TODAY, THAT ESTIMATE STANDS AT 66.6% OF THE COST OF CONSTRUCTION.

THE STARK-HARRIS PAY OUT SCHEDULE WAS IGNORED FROM THE BEGINNING BY THE CONGRESS, SUCH THAT THE ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE COULD NOT BE MET WITHIN APPROPRIATED AMOUNTS.

FURTHER, UMTA HAS IMPOSED NUMEROUS FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS AND DELAYS IN FUNDING FOR METRO, FURTHER SLOWING CONSTRUCTION. THEIR REQUIREMENT FOR "FULL FUNDING" FORCED ON METRO AN INEFFICIENT CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE WHICH THIS SUBCOMMITTEE SHOULD DISCUSS WITH METRO AND UMTA IN FULL.

TODAY, FOR EXAMPLE, UMTA REFUSES TO RELEASE \$200 MILLION THAT HAS BEEN APPROPRIATED BY THE CONGRESS, FURTHER SLOWING CONSTRUCTION AWARDS.

OF COURSE, ALL OF THE BLAME CANNOT BE PLACED ON UMTA. LITIGATION, REDESIGN AND REALIGNMENT ALSO IMPACTED ON SYSTEM COSTS. LABOR DISPUTES, THE OIL EMBARGO, AND IMPROVED ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS ALSO COMPOUNDED THE COSTS OF INFLATION.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS ALSO IMPOSED ITS OWN CONSTRAINTS. A STATION, A STATION ENTRANCE, AND SEVERAL OTHER FACILITIES WERE ADDED AT DIRECT FEDERAL REQUEST. NEW ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED ACCESS REQUIREMENTS ALSO RESULTED IN ADDITIONAL FACILITIES AND DESIGN MODIFICATION.

FINALLY, METRO IS ALSO A VICTIM OF ITS OWN SUCCESS. RIDERSHIP HAS EXCEEDED ALL ORIGINAL ESTIMATES, RESULTING IN THE NEED FOR MORE RAIL CARS, EXPANDED MAINTENANCE CAPACITY AND MORE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN ACCEPTABLE TIMETABLES AND EFFICIENT SERVICE FOR RIDERS.

THE BOTTOM LINE IS THAT IF WE ARE TO COMPLETE THE SYSTEM, MORE MONEY IS NEEDED.

IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE HOWEVER, THAT METRO'S FEDERAL FUNDS ARE NOT OUT OF LINE WITH OTHER NATIONAL SYSTEMS OF COMPARABLE SIZE AND RIDERSHIP.

WASHINGTON METRO IS THE NATION'S SECOND LARGEST RAIL TRANSIT SYSTEM. WASHINGTON METRO HAS RECEIVED A TOTAL OF \$3.4 BILLION FROM UMTA. METRORAIL HAS ALSO RECEIVED \$1.2 BILLION IN DIRECT APPROPRIATIONS FROM THE CONGRESS. THESE AMOUNTS ARE JUST OVER HALF OF THE \$8 BILLION RECEIVED BY THE LARGEST RAIL NETWORK IN THE COUNTRY FOR MODERNIZATION AND EXTENSIONS. IT IS ALSO COMPARABLE WITH THE \$3.4 BILLION RECEIVED BY CHICAGO, IF THE ORIGINAL DIRECT APPROPRIATION IS DISCOUNTED.

OTHER SYSTEMS HAVE RECEIVED LESS, BUT IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT MANY OF THESE SYSTEMS ARE JUST BEGINNING CONSTRUCTION, AND ARE PLANNED TO CARRY FAR LESS RIDERS AND SERVE FEWER MILES. WHEN THESE SYSTEMS ARE COMPLETED, THEIR COSTS WILL BE COMPARABLE WITH THOSE OF WASHINGTON METRO.

THE CRITICAL COMPARISON THAT THIS SUBCOMMITTEE SHOULD MAKE IS TO MILES AND PASSENGERS CARRIED, AND UNDER ANY COMPARISON, WASHINGTON METRO IS A GOOD BUY FOR THE TAXPAYER.

TO CLOSE, MR. CHAIRMAN, OVER THE YEARS, THE CONGRESS AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS MET ITS COMMITMENT TO CONSTRUCT A REGIONAL RAIL SYSTEM FOR OUR CAPITAL REGION. THE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS AND THE NEIGHBORING STATES HAVE ALL MET THEIR FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS TO THE SYSTEM IN FULL. THEY HAVE DONE SO NOT ONLY WITH DOLLARS, BUT BY ALSO FORGOING INTERSTATE HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION AND ADOPTING POLICIES AND BUS SERVICE WHICH ENCOURAGE TRANSIT RIDERSHIP.

IT IS CLEAR THAT WASHINGTON METRO IS A CRITICAL LINK IN THE CAPITAL REGION'S TRANSPORTATION NETWORK. WITHOUT CONTINUED FEDERAL ASSISTANCE, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WILL BE UNABLE TO FUND COMPLETION OF THIS SYSTEM. WE NEED THIS LEGISLATION. AS PRESIDENT JOHNSON MADE CLEAR IN 1965 THIS COMMITMENT IS ESSENTIAL "FOR THE WELFARE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, FOR THE ORDERLY GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CAPITAL REGION, AND FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE BEAUTY AND DIGNITY OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL..." LET US KEEP OUR COMMITMENT. THANK YOU.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Hoyer, for your statement. I suspect that there may be questions from the committee, but I would ask to hold them until the entire panel has had the opportunity to testify.

We look forward to working with you as we consider this legislation. One of the most impressive things about this legislation is the strong bipartisan support it enjoys.

At this time we would like to call upon Congresswoman Connie Morella.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, A  
REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND**

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, members of the subcommittee, Mr. Fauntroy, Mr. Parris, and Mr. Rohrbacher.

I really appreciate the opportunity to testify in favor of the Metrorail system, which means so much to the residents of and visitors to the Washington metropolitan area. I speak in strong support of the National Capital Transportation Amendments of 1989, a bill to authorize funds to complete "America's subway."

There is a longstanding Federal commitment to a regional transportation system. Statesmen from President Kennedy onward have sought funds for the Metrorail Construction Program.

President Johnson stated, "The problem of mass transportation in the Washington area is critical. It is also a problem in which the Federal Government has a unique interest and responsibility."

President Nixon supported it eloquently. Former Senator Charles McC. Mathias added, "It would be a tragic breach of promise were the Federal Government to renege on its share of the Metrorail dream for those not yet served by the system."

Metrorail is more than a subway for the Washington area. It is the transportation keystone of the Nation's Capital. Federal workers, the American taxpayers, employees get to work faster, safer, and in better spirits because Metrorail exists.

In Montgomery County, Maryland alone, there are over 47,000 workers employed at the National Institutes of Standard and Technology, the National Institutes of Health, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Naval Research Centers. I could go on. These are the people who make America run.

Indeed, many of the 400,000 Federal workers in the Washington area depend on the Metrorail system to get to work. Trips to and from Montgomery County on Metrorail total 100,000 every workday, certainly well over the projected 70,000.

Washington hosts 17 million tourists a year from across the country and from around the world. American taxpayers, who may come to town with a cynical view of Washington, will leave impressed by the clean, safe, efficient system that they will use to get to your offices and to the historical monuments and museums that this country holds so dear.

Local jurisdictions have always met their funding obligations. Metrorail has met its commitment. Now it is time for the Federal Government to meet its commitment to the Metrorail system. I

hope that you will do so and support the Federal share of the estimated cost of completing the 103-mile Metrorail system.

Included in the remaining 13.5 miles of construction is the final portion of the red line from Wheaton, Maryland to Glenmont, Maryland. I just want to point out, as an example, without this portion of the red line, the authority will be forced to operate the Wheaton Station as a terminal station, which was never intended, thus causing enormous traffic problems in one of the fastest growing corridors in the region.

The Glenmont terminus will also provide needed maintenance service, car storage, and minor repairs. That's just one small example of the need for completing this system.

Both the House and the Senate reports that accompany the Stark-Harris authorization of 1980 stated that the subway is "essential for the continued and effective performance of the functions of the Government of the United States, for the welfare of the District of Columbia, for the orderly growth and development of the national capital region, and for the preservation of the beauty and dignity of the Nation's Capital."

The completed 103-mile Metrorail system was agreed to in 1966 by Federal, State, and local governments. I ask this subcommittee to look at the vital job the public transit system is doing and support the authorization to complete the remaining 13.5 miles.

For the Washington area as a whole, Metrorail has been good for the business, has effectively reduced traffic congestion, has significantly cut air pollution.

Without Metro, an estimated 100,000 private automobiles would enter the central business district during peak hours every workday. It has "set an example for the Nation," as President Johnson recommended.

I certainly do appreciate the opportunity to testify before this subcommittee in support of the National Capital Transportation Amendments of 1989, which will benefit not only our region, but the efficient operation of the Federal Government.

Thank you for your past support of the Metrorail system, and I certainly ask for your continued support for this excellent system.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Representative Morella follows:]



CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

8TH DISTRICT, MARYLAND

COMMITTEES

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING



**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
1024 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515  
(202) 225-5341

DISTRICT OFFICE  
11141 GEORGIA AVENUE  
SUITE 302  
WHEATON, MD 20902  
(301) 948-8901

STATEMENT BY

THE HONORABLE CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

before the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS  
AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 4, 1989

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to testify in favor of the Metrorail system, which means so much to the residents of, and visitors to, the Washington metropolitan area. I speak in strong support of the National Capital Transportation Amendments of 1989, a bill to authorize funds to complete "America's Subway."

There is a long-standing federal commitment to a regional transportation system. Statesmen from President Kennedy onward have sought funds for the Metrorail construction program. President Johnson stated: "...The problem of mass transportation in the Washington area is critical. It is also a problem in which the federal government has a unique interest and responsibility."

Former Senator Charles Mathias added: "It would...be a tragic breach of promise were the Federal Government to renege...on its share of the Metrorail dream for those not yet served by the system."

Metrorail is more than a subway for the Washington area. It is the transportation keystone of the Nation's Capital. Federal workers, the American taxpayer's employees, get to work faster, safer, and in better spirits because Metrorail exists. In Montgomery County, Maryland alone there are over 47,000 workers employed at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Institutes of Health, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Regulatory Commission, and the Naval Research Centers. Indeed, many of the 400,000 federal workers in the Washington area depend on the Metrorail system to get to work. Trips to and from Montgomery County on Metrorail total 100,000 every workday, well over the projected 70,000.

Washington hosts 17 million tourists a year from across the country and from around the world. American taxpayers, who may come to town with a cynical view of Washington, will leave impressed by the safe, clean, and efficient system they will use to get to your office and to the historical monuments and museums that this country holds dear.

Local jurisdictions have always met their funding commitments; Metrorail has met its commitment; now, it is time for the federal government to meet its commitment to the Metrorail system. I hope that you will do so, and support the Federal share of the estimated cost of completing the 103-mile Metrorail system.

Included in the remaining 13.5 miles of construction is the final portion of the Red Line from Wheaton, Maryland to Glenmont, Maryland. Without this portion of the Red Line, the Authority will be forced to operate the Wheaton Station as a terminal station, which was never intended, thus causing enormous traffic problems in one of the fastest growing corridors in the region. The Glenmont terminus will also provide needed maintenance services, car storage, and minor repairs.

Both the House and Senate reports accompanying the Stark-Harris authorization of 1980 stated that the subway is "essential for the continued and effective performance of the functions of the Government of the United States, for the welfare of the District of Columbia, for the orderly growth and development of the National Capital region, and for the preservation of the beauty and dignity of the nation's Capital."

The completed 103-mile Metrorail system was agreed to in 1966 by federal, state and local governments. I ask this Subcommittee to look at the vital job the public transit system is doing and support the authorization to complete the remaining 13.5 miles.

For the Washington area as a whole, Metrorail has been good for business, has effectively reduced traffic congestion, and has significantly cut air pollution. Without Metro, an estimated 100,000 private automobiles would enter the central business district during peak hours every workday. It has "set an example for the nation..." as President Johnson recommended.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this Subcommittee in support of the National Capital Transportation Amendments of 1989, which will benefit not only our region, but the efficient operation of the Federal government. I thank you for your past support of the Metrorail system, and I ask for your continued support for this fine system.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you for your testimony and thank you for your leadership in the fight for the funding for the Metrorail system.

Now, I'd like to call upon another good friend of this committee, a gentleman we're delighted to have testify this morning, Congressman McMillen.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. THOMAS McMILLEN, A U.S.  
REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND**

Mr. McMILLEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to commend the members of the subcommittee who have supported Metro in the past.

I am pleased to testify today in support of H.R. 1463, the reauthorizing of the funding for the completion of the Washington Metro system. I'm pleased to be here today with other cosponsors of this measure.

The Washington area Metrorail is a system in which we can all take pride. Currently spanning almost 90 miles, it stands as a model for the development of metro systems nationwide.

Further, the organization of this Metro system typifies the kind of Federal, State, and local cooperation and partnership that we should seek to emulate in other public policy initiatives.

In many ways, as it has been said, the Washington Metro is, indeed, America's subway, as it is the primary conveyance for the 17 million tourists who come to our Nation's Capital each year, not to mention the main transportation source for many of the 400,000 Federal civil servants who are based in this area and who do the good work of Government.

However, the time has come to renew our commitment to completing the planned 103-mile system. Still remaining are 13.5 miles of railway, 6 miles of which are in my State of Maryland.

I am convinced that we need to follow through on the reauthorization of the Stark-Harris Act, the legislation that initiated the Washington Metro funding. Its passage is essential if we are to realize our hope that all the Metro area counties are fully integrated into the subway system.

Omitting any portion of the Metrorail plan at this juncture would be unfair to both the individuals who relied on an efficient public transportation in this area, but also to the surrounding States, such as Maryland, who have honored their commitment to the funding of a complete Metro system.

To date Maryland has made a capital investment totaling \$337 million, and this figure does not include the \$315 million that Maryland has spent in operating costs to maintain a top flight bus and rail system.

In response to the gentleman from California's concern about Federal employees and local residents paying a fair share, let me just say that 74 percent of the operating costs for the subway come from total collections.

The importance of the remaining 13-mile leg to the efficient functioning of the whole system becomes readily apparent when one considers that this remaining portion, especially the green line extending into Prince Georges County, Maryland, will be serving

the most transit-dependent segment of the Washington area population.

The proposed southern leg of the green line will expedite the daily commute of thousands of area residents. Additionally, D.C. and Prince Georges County residents who work at Federal installations in Prince Georges County, including the Bureau of Census and Andrews Air Force Base, will have a shorter commute.

While it's difficult to quantify at this stage, suffice it to say that this increase in the efficiency in the system will translate into dramatic area wide economic benefits, especially as access to employment opportunities for citizens increases commensurately with the growth of the Metro system.

Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in our enduring commitment to building and maintaining the Nation's finest subway rail system, as I have asserted. The reauthorization of the Stark-Harris legislation is a key component of the Federal commitment to this infrastructure project.

I look forward to working with you and other members of this subcommittee to bring the final stages of this project to fruition.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Representative McMillen follows:]

4 MAY 1989

STATEMENT OF REP. TOM McMILLEN (4-MD)  
BEFORE THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOV'T OPERATIONS AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS  
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
ON H.R. 1463  
A BILL TO REAUTHORIZE FUNDING TO COMPLETE THE WASHINGTON  
METRO SYSTEM

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE, I AM PLEASED TO APPEAR BEFORE YOU TO TESTIFY IN SUPPORT OF HR 1463, A BILL TO REAUTHORIZE THE FUNDING FOR COMPLETION OF THE WASHINGTON METRO SYSTEM.

I AM INDEED PROUD TO JOIN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE IN COSPONSORING THIS IMPORTANT TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATION. THE WASHINGTON AREA METRORAIL IS A SYSTEM IN WHICH WE CAN ALL TAKE PRIDE. CURRENTLY SPANNING ALMOST 90 MILES, IT STANDS AS A MODEL FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF METRO SYSTEMS NATIONWIDE. FURTHER, THE ORGANIZATION OF THIS METRO SYSTEM TYPIFIES THE KIND OF FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL COOPERATION AND PARTNERSHIP THAT WE SHOULD SEEK TO EMULATE IN OTHER PUBLIC POLICY INITIATIVES. IN MANY WAYS, THE WASHINGTON METRO IS "AMERICA'S SUBWAY," AS IT IS THE PRIMARY CONVEYANCE FOR THE SEVENTEEN MILLION TOURISTS WHO COME TO OUR NATION'S CAPITAL EACH YEAR, NOT TO MENTION THE MAIN TRANSPORTATION SOURCE FOR MANY OF THE FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND FEDERAL CIVIL SERVANTS WHO ARE BASED IN THE METROPOLITAN AREA.



HOWEVER, THE TIME HAS COME TO RENEW OUR COMMITMENT TO COMPLETING THE PLANNED 103-MILE SYSTEM. STILL REMAINING ARE 13 MILES OF RAILWAY, 6 OF WHICH ARE IN MARYLAND. I AM CONVINCED THAT WE NEED TO FOLLOW THROUGH ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE STARK-HARRIS ACT, THE LEGISLATION THAT INITIATED THE WASHINGTON METRO FUNDING. ITS PASSAGE IS ESSENTIAL IF WE ARE TO REALIZE OUR HOPE THAT ALL METRO AREA COUNTIES ARE FULLY INTEGRATED INTO THE SUBWAY SYSTEM.

OMITTING ANY PORTION OF THE METRO RAIL PLAN AT THIS JUNCTURE WOULD BE UNFAIR TO BOTH THE INDIVIDUALS WHO RELY ON AN EFFICIENT PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, BUT ALSO TO THE SURROUNDING STATES, SUCH AS MARYLAND, THAT HAVE HONORED THEIR COMMITMENT TO FUNDING A COMPLETE METRORAIL SYSTEM. TO DATE, MARYLAND HAS MADE A CAPITAL INVESTMENT TOTALLING \$337 MILLION. THIS FIGURE DOES NOT INCLUDE THE \$315 MILLION THAT MARYLAND HAS SPENT IN OPERATING COSTS TO MAINTAIN A TOP-FLIGHT BUS AND RAIL SYSTEM.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE REMAINING 13-MILE SEGMENT TO THE EFFICIENT FUNCTIONING OF THE WHOLE SYSTEM BECOMES READILY APPARENT WHEN ONE CONSIDERS THAT THIS LAST LEG, INCLUDING THE GREEN LINE EXTENDING INTO PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND, WILL BE SERVING THE MOST TRANSIT-DEPENDENT PORTION OF THE WASHINGTON AREA POPULATION. THE PROPOSED SOUTHERN LEG OF THE GREEN LINE WILL EXPEDITE THE DAILY COMMUTE OF THOUSANDS OF AREA RESIDENTS. ADDITIONALLY, D.C. AND PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY RESIDENTS WHO WORK AT FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS IN P.G. COUNTY, INCLUDING THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS AND ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, WILL HAVE A SHORTER COMMUTE. WHILE IT IS DIFFICULT TO QUANTIFY AT THIS STAGE, SUFFICE IT TO SAY THAT THIS INCREASE IN THE EFFICIENCY OF THE SYSTEM WILL TRANSLATE INTO DRAMATIC AREA-WIDE ECONOMIC BENEFITS, ESPECIALLY AS ACCESS TO EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR CITIZENS INCREASES COMMENSURATELY WITH THE GROWTH OF METRO

SYSTEM.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I JOIN MY COLLEAGUES IN OUR ENDURING COMMITMENT TO BUILDING AND MAINTAINING THE NATION'S FINEST SUBWAY RAIL SYSTEM. AS I HAVE ASSERTED, THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE STARK-HARRIS LEGISLATION IS THE KEY COMPONENT OF THE FEDERAL COMMITMENT TO THIS INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT. I LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH YOU AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THIS SUBCOMMITTEE TO BRING THE FINAL STAGES OF THIS PROJECT TO FRUITION. THANK YOU.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, if I might, before you recognize people for questions, I would be remiss, I think, if I did not recognize—and I'm sorry that he's been delayed—the contribution that Congressman Frank Wolf of Virginia has made to the realization of the project's progress to date.

He has been a tireless worker on behalf of this project. As a member of the Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee, he has been, in my opinion, the key person in terms of moving funding forward on this.

I know that we have behind us Senator John Warner of Virginia, who has really been one of the principal leaders, obviously, as one of the ranking Republicans in the United States Senate, very close to the administration.

Without John Warner, we could not have moved this project forward. My colleagues, Senator Sarbanes and Senator Mikulski, will be testifying, but—

Mr. WHEAT. I would encourage you to look behind you.

Mr. HOYER. Is Frank Wolf here? They're here. They're here.

Well, they've always been there, Mr. Chairman, so I'm not surprised.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Hoyer. We not only commend Mr. Wolf, but we commend all of you for your knowledge and your leadership on the question of whether the Metrorail ought to be funded.

In recognition of the fact that we do have our colleagues from the other body with us, I will leave my commendations on that and hold any further questions until such time as we actually mark up the bill.

I would call upon my distinguished colleague, Mr. Parris, for any questions or comments that he might have.

Mr. PARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to thank our colleagues for their statements. As a principal sponsor of this measure, along with my friend, the chairman of the full committee, Mr. Dellums, I have no questions.

I just want to extend my support for the statements and thank my colleagues for their strong support in this matter and urge them to continue. We'd be gratified to see the active participation by all of the area delegations in the marshaling of the support in the parliamentary and the legislative process that takes place on this Hill every day.

You, ladies and gentlemen, will be an important part of that, and we look forward to working with you. We will be grateful for your support. I am sure and confident that all of us working together can get the job done.

Thank you for being here, this morning.

Ms. MORELLA. We thank you, Mr. Parris, for the leadership that you've shown through the years on this project.

Mr. PARRIS. Thank you.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Fauntroy.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I obviously am so pleased with the presentations of this panel, particularly the reference to the need to see this as an investment in not only our region, but our Nation.

Certainly anyone from southern California who knows the consequences of automobile traffic on pollution and the contamination of the lungs and the atmosphere within which citizens live, anyone who understands that certainly appreciates the effectiveness of this subway in dealing with that problem here and for constituents around the country.

I have no questions. I want to yield what I would have said to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Wolf, and with that, hopefully terminate any other questions we have of this distinguished panel.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Wolf, we would appreciate hearing any statement that you would wish to make at this time. We have already heard glowing words of your work on this particular project, and we hope and expect that your words will match it.

#### TESTIMONY OF HON. FRANK R. WOLF, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Mr. WOLF. Well, I don't know about that, but I appreciate the comments that we do——

Mr. WHEAT. We have no doubt.

Mr. WOLF [continuing]. All agree with this. Maybe I can ask for the opportunity to submit the statement for the record——

Mr. WHEAT. Without objection, your statement is accepted for the record.

Mr. WOLF [continuing]. And cover one major point. I think when you're investing in something, it is important that you're investing in something that is a good product that is well run, and I'm sure the others have mentioned it.

Metro is a well run and a well designed and efficient system. It was named the number one metro system in the Nation by the American Public Transit Association.

Number one, it beat out every other transit system in the country, from the east coast to the west coast to the South to the North. I think that, in itself, is an indication that the money has been well spent, well used. Second, Carmen Turner has done an outstanding job.

It is not only a subway for the people here in the Washington, DC area, but visitors who come to Washington from abroad and from around the country or from California and Wyoming and from the South and North, all feel that this is an excellent system and compliment the system.

In fact, there are many letters that you receive and letters in the newspapers about how well people felt when they came to Washington to ride the system.

One other thing, particularly in this day of concern with regard to crime, the Metro system is relatively almost free of crime. It is free of graffiti. It is free of the problems that some of the other systems have.

So it is an outstanding, well-run system by Carmen Turner, and I think the system has spent the money very, very well.

I strongly want to identify with all of the things that my colleagues said in support of this legislation and thank Mr. Parris for

taking the leadership here. Hopefully, we can move this thing very quickly.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Representative Wolf follows:]

## STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE FRANK R. WOLF

May 4, 1989

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning. In the interests of time, I will be brief.

I join my colleagues today from the Washington metropolitan area in supporting H.R. 1463 which would authorize funding to complete the Washington Metro system.

I support this bill, in part, because of the important role Metro plays in the capital area transportation structure. Metro takes thousands of cars off the region's highways every day and it is vital to the mobility of all residents in our region. Without Metro, traffic in our area would be gridlocked. Completion of the entire system is critically important if we are to avoid increased congestion and gridlock in the future.

But that is just one reason I support Metro and the reauthorization request.

I also support Metro because it truly is "America's Subway." Visitors from around the nation use the Metro system when visiting Washington to see the sights and attractions of our nation's capital. Without Metro, visiting Washington could be a difficult proposition.

The importance of Metro to visitors to Washington was clearly in evidence last January when tens of thousands came to Washington for the Presidential Inauguration. Without Metro, it would have been difficult, if not impossible in some cases, for these visitors to get to the Capitol to participate in the events.

2-2-2-2

Congress and administrations of both parties have long supported Metro. In light of the unique role of Metro in our region, and to visitors from throughout the nation, I believe that this federal commitment should continue and I support the reauthorization legislation.

One additional point I think is worth mentioning. Metro is a well-run, well-designed, efficient system. It was named the number one metro system in the nation last year by the American Public Transit Association. Carmen Turner, general manager of Metro, does an outstanding job in running the system. It is a system that we, as a nation, can be proud of. Visitors who come to Washington from abroad and visitors who come to Washington from across the country are proud of and impressed with the Washington Metro. I believe we have a responsibility to continue the federal commitment and complete the full system.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to testify this morning.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Wolf, for your testimony. I am sure that Mrs. Turner and the administrators at W.M.A.T.A. appreciate your kind words. I think it is also a tribute to the strong congressional support that has been provided over the years by yourself and the other members of the panel who are here.

Mr. Rohrabacher.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes, sir; I am very pleased to add a little flavor to today's hearing.

Mr. HOYER. You got our attention. You got our attention.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. First of all, for Congressman Hoyer, you labeled this the "best in America." Can't the best in America make a profit or at least operate on its own rather than having to have a subsidy from the rest of America?

Mr. HOYER. The fact of the matter is no transit system in the world makes a profit. It is a service of government that obviously needs to operate as efficiently and effectively as possible, and we believe this system does.

But the fact of the matter is it is a government service as well as a revenue-raiser to offset costs.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. You know, there are many people in America who don't rely on government service in terms of providing their transportation needs.

You think those people should subsidize the others, especially if the others are perhaps not lower income people? Perhaps they're government workers, as we have in the case of our city.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Rohrabacher, this Government some decades ago made a Fauntroy has pointed out and others have pointed out, mass transit is going to be absolutely essential if the future is going to be a viable one in terms of increasing numbers of people from point A to point B, which is good for the economic health of the Nation and the security of the Nation.

So I think the answer to your question, Mr. Rohrabacher, from my premise, is the reason the Federal Government has made that commitment historically is because they believe it is in the national best interest. The Congress has made that commitment.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Isn't the interstate highway system self-financing with the user fee gas tax?

Mr. HOYER. Yes, it is.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Do not the people who are using—

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Rohrabacher, if you want me to answer your question—

Mr. ROHRABACHER [continuing]. That system pay for it themselves?

Mr. HOYER [continuing]. I'll be glad to do it. The administration dedicated a penny of the raise on the Surface Transportation Act and then tried to undermine that expenditure to setoff the budget deficit because it didn't want to raise revenues to pay for the things that America apparently thinks it needs.



You said we need to make choices. I think that's correct. Mr. Rohrabacher, I agree with you. I'm pleased to hear that you're going to be joining us on tough votes for programs for education, for health care, women, infants, and children.

I'm looking forward to those votes. I think they're important votes, and I will be with you in supporting those programs and the tough decisions to fund those objectives.

I also happen to believe, however, that this is a critically important judgment as well. As I said at the outset, and I think all my colleagues agree, that this is really the Nation's subway.

One of the reasons it has to be as good as it is because we serve the Nation, your constituents as well as mine.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. You know, we do have tourists in southern California as well. I don't understand necessarily why tourists who come to the Nation's Capital should be subsidizing their transportation needs as compared to tourists in southern California.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Wolf would like to help me.

Mr. WOLF. Just one question to followup on what Mr. Hoyer said, in support of it. At the fare box for the Metro system, the mass transit system, it reclaims 76 percent at the fare box, which I believe—and the committee might want to check—is the highest in the country, higher than New York and Boston.

Mr. HOYER. Yes. That's right.

Mr. WOLF. It is?

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

Mr. WOLF. It is the highest reclaiming, paying for itself at the fare box. For mass transit, that is an excellent return. Many of them will be in the ranges of 45 and 50 and 55, but with 76 percent, it does pretty much pay for itself at the fare box.

I think the same thing with regard to the other systems around the country. We have, actually, the best return rate for the Metro-rail of any in the country.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, there are some of us who believe that decades ago, when we put out our goal of subsidizing transportation, perhaps that wasn't a—perhaps that is what led us to a \$150 billion deficit that we're facing today.

When we talk about this issue, we're not talking about whether this area can deal with or without Metro. We're talking about what the financing mechanism is going to be.

If this program is absolutely necessary, which everyone seems to indicate it is, what we have to talk about is the financing mechanism, whether it should come straight right out of the budget, the general budget, and thus be subsidized by people from my district and from districts across the United States or whether or not it should be done at a level which people themselves can pay for it who are using it and benefiting from it directly.

Is it totally impossible to think that this system could be done with a bonding system and then paid for out of restructuring so that the system itself would make money?

Mr. HOYER. I think the answer to that question is, of course, the answer is no. I mean, to say that it's impossible would be to say no. To say is it consistent with the commitment that the Congress and, because we are the representatives of the American people, the American people have made to the construction of the system, the

answer would be it would be inconsistent with that commitment and that promise.

The commitment was made. Now, if your question is can the commitment be reneged upon, the answer is yes, it can be. Our belief is it should not be.

Mr. WHEAT. Let me mention now for the benefit of all of the subcommittee members and for all of our witnesses who are here that in the interest of time and allowing all of our distinguished colleagues to testify and in the interest of getting all of the best and available information, the subcommittee will submit written questions to the witnesses.

We would appreciate it if the witnesses would respond to further questions in writing if they are submitted to you.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I'll take that hint. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to ask the questions.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Rohrabacher.

Let me once again thank all of our distinguished colleagues for coming this morning. We appreciate your testimony, and we look forward to working with you.

We'll call the second panel at this time, Hon. Paul Sarbanes, Hon. Barbara Mikulski, and Hon. John Warner. Of course, it requires the leadership of the Members of Congress and both bodies to pass legislation of this significant and important in nature.

We appreciate the fact that our colleagues from the other body have taken the time to come over and testify on this legislation today. Their leadership is recorded, and we appreciate their willingness to spend some time in the House.

At this time I would like to call on the most senior Member of the other body who is with us, the distinguished Senator Paul S. Sarbanes.

#### TESTIMONY OF HON. PAUL S. SARBANES, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Senator SARBANES. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. We very much appreciate this opportunity, and I'm delighted to be here in the company of my Maryland colleague, Barbara Mikulski, and my very good friend from Virginia, John Warner.

Mr. Chairman, I'll submit the statement for the record. I know the subcommittee is under some time constraint here and you have a number of other witnesses to hear from, including Carmen Turner.

I simply want to say that we regard her as the best administrator of mass transit in the Nation and perhaps in the world. She's really just done an outstanding job here with this Metro system in the National Capital area.

I just want to touch on a few points. First of all, we are here today asking for an authorization to complete the 103-mile system which represented, in effect, the joint commitment of the Federal, State, and local governments working in concert with the private sector in the National Capital area.

That decision was made some 20 years ago. It was reexamined 10 years ago and reaffirmed. What was a very careful arrangement

was put together. It's really an incredible achievement in terms of intergovernmental cooperation. There's really just a classic example of the positive good that can be accomplished if we all work together. It wasn't easily done.

Congressman Parris, who has been a leader in this effort for a long time, was in the beginning at the local level, as I recall, and had the benefit of the perspectives from that point of view. He knows what it took to put this all together.

Now, commitments were made. Undertakings were made. Money was spent on the premise that we'd complete the 103-mile system. As you can see if you follow that map, there are very important segments of it yet to be done.

The full efficiencies of the system rest upon its total completion. There are places now where they're turning yards in instead of out at the end terminus, which was the plan. You've got places overloaded because they haven't completed it out in terms of developing a rational transportation network.

So we're here today really to plead—there are two questions here. We're not here asking to go beyond that original system. We want to complete the original system, on which the commitments were made. The money was spent. People have gone out at the local and State level and put their dollars on the line.

Second, at the time the judgment was made, the decision was reached that there was a clear Federal interest in this particular transit system. It's very important to understand that.

I think that was a good decision. I think it rested on solid premises. I don't think it should be gone back on at this point in the process. That depended on—first, this is the Nation's Capital, and we need to recognize that.

All of us, from wherever we come in this country, should be concerned about our Nation's Capital and take pride in it. This is Washington, DC, the Capital of the United States.

That means we have an incredible number of people who come from all over the country. I'm incredibly impressed to use the Washington Metro and go down there and see huge groups of teenagers, 4-H, visiting high schools, who come to Washington and can enjoy the Nation's Capital because this mass transit system is there for them to use, and use it they do, indeed.

Second, you have a huge Federal workforce, so you have the interest of the Federal Government as an employer, a direct interest that transcends its presence anywhere else in the country. Of course, this system is a very important part of enabling those people to go to work every day.

So you've got—if we didn't have this system, we'd have gridlock in here that would absolutely paralyze the Nation's Capital.

Finally, let me say the system has been extremely well run. The localities have carried through their commitments, provided stable local funding sources.

It's been testified that, you know, three-quarters of the revenue is recovered at the fare box. That's tops in the country.

I want to be very clear on one point because of some of the questions that were put by the Congressman from California. If you drive fares up too high, the consequence of that is to make the

system less able to pay for itself, not more able. There is a fine line.

But if you drive them up too high, you drive users away from the system. Therefore, you don't get more revenues. You end up getting less revenues. Now, where that line is, is a tough one.

I think the Metro Board here has been pushing up against it consistently. The fact that they get more than from anywhere else in the country in terms of the contribution at the fare box, I think demonstrates that.

The Congress has supported this system consistently from the beginning. We are here today to ask that we renew that support and enable us to carry it through and complete the 103-mile system that was originally envisioned, that is being reaffirmed, and on which all of the commitments have been made.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Senator Sarbanes follows:]

TESTIMONY

OF

SENATOR PAUL SARBANES  
NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT AMENDMENTSSUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS  
AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS  
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIAMAY 4, 1989

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for inviting us to appear before you today in support of legislation we introduced on March 16, 1989 to reauthorize the National Capital Transportation Act. Joining me in introducing that bill, S.612, were my colleagues from Virginia and Maryland, Senators John Warner and Charles Robb, and Senator Barbara Mikulski, and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Federalism, and the District of Columbia, Senator Jim Sasser. S. 612 is identical to H.R. 1463, introduced in the House by Chairman Dellums.

The current Federal authorization for Metrorail construction, P.L. 96-184, referred to as Stark-Harris, provides funding sufficient only to complete 89.5 miles of the 103 mile Adopted Regional System. WMATA's FY1990 request for an appropriation of \$193 million would exhaust the funds available under the Stark-Harris authorization. H.R. 1463 and S. 612 will enable Congress' vision of completing the full 103 miles system to become reality. The National Capital Transportation Amendments of 1989 reaffirm the Federal commitment to serving the vital transportation needs of the nation's capital with its large Federal workforce, 17 million visitors annually from across the nation and around the world, and residents of the region.

The legislation we are discussing in this hearing today authorizes the \$2.16 billion Federal share of the estimated costs of completing the Adopted Regional System. In introducing this authorizing legislation we were aware that its implementation is subject to annual appropriations and budget review. These funds are envisioned to be appropriated in \$200 million increments over an eleven-year period. Estimates of the cost to complete the system are mindful of Federal fiscal constraints, yet assure an orderly and cost-effective construction program. If annual appropriation levels contemplated in the cost estimates are not achieved, as with any capital construction project, cost increases will inevitably result from a stretched-out construction schedule.

The participating local jurisdictions will provide a matching share of 20 percent of the total cost. The Federal/local cost-sharing set forth in this bill is identical to that established in the Stark-Harris legislation. At that time it was recognized that the participating local jurisdictions would meet the remainder of the capital costs and establish a "stable and reliable" funding source to meet operating expenses. The jurisdictions in this region have always met their commitment to provide subsidies to meet Metro's operating costs, as well as the local share of construction costs, and will continue to do so.

Since its inception, construction of the Metrorail system has proceeded with the understanding among the participating jurisdictions and the Federal Government that the entire system would be built. Many jurisdictions in the region have contributed to the construction of the system which is operating today in the expectation that lines in their area would be completed. This understanding has formed the basis for a unique Federal/local partnership, enabling Metrorail to be constructed crossing through many local subdivisions, states, the District, and on parcels of Federal land. This region, including local government, business, and community representatives, has put aside parochial concerns and come together in an unprecedented fashion to support this system. Congress has demonstrated its support time and again, not only through the efforts of the regional delegation, but with the active bipartisan support of Members from geographic regions across the country.

This legislation will enable the final portion of the long-delayed Inner Green Line, which will serve the most transit dependent population of the region, to be completed. Also on the Green Line U Street and Fort Totten Stations will be connected with intermediate stops at Columbia Heights and Georgia Avenue. The southern leg of the Green Line will extend from the Anacostia Station in Southeast Washington to Branch Avenue near the Beltway, providing a vital intercept for traffic in rapidly-developing southern Prince George's County. The Branch Avenue Station will permit convenient access to Andrews Air Force Base and add a valuable maintenance yard to the system. This line will also have stations at Congress Heights, Southern Avenue, Naylor Road, and Suitland, serving two hospitals and the major U.S. government complex in this area.

In addition, the Red Line will be extended from Wheaton to Glenmont, providing access to a vital service and inspection yard, thus enhancing operational efficiency. It will also relieve substantial traffic congestion at Wheaton, the temporary terminus, which was not originally designed to be a terminal point.



Finally, the Yellow Line will be extended to Franconia/Springfield where parking facilities and highway intercepts will draw traffic from I-95, I-395, and I-495, increasing capacity, reducing traffic, and enhancing safety in that overburdened corridor. As in the case of the Red Line at Wheaton, the temporary terminus at Van Dorn is not suitable for operating for an extended period of time, due to local traffic conditions. The \$2.16 billion Federal share includes basic construction costs, as well as additional rail cars; power, computerized train control, communications, and fare collection systems; start-up management; and all other expenses associated with bringing the final 13.5 miles into revenue operation.

Over twenty years ago, Congress embarked on a vital mission to address the problems posed by the enormous growth forecasts for the National Capital region. Ensuring orderly commercial and residential development, enhancing critical mobility for the millions of visitors and the massive Federal workforce scattered about the region, and providing residents of many transit-dependent neighborhoods a means to travel to their jobs or to visit with family and friends were all important considerations when Congress first addressed the transportation needs of the region.

These goals remain important national priorities today, and Metrorail is a shining example of what a Federal/local partnership can achieve. But while ridership is exceeding all projections, and by every conceivable indicator Metrorail is an outstanding success, much remains to be done. Gridlock still threatens our roadways today as the planners' growth forecasts become a reality, and many of the most transit-dependent neighborhoods continue to wait patiently for Metrorail's long-promised arrival.

Congress has long maintained its commitment to completion of the entire Metrorail system. Today we merely seek reaffirmation of that commitment. This critical legislation will provide optimal operational efficiency of our transit network and ease the region's traffic congestion. These have been and should remain important national priorities.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you very much, Senator Sarbanes, for your statement.

It is my pleasure to welcome back to the House of Representatives one of our distinguished colleagues who has gone to the other body. We appreciate your service there, but we'd love to have you back with us.

Senator Barbara Mikulski, we would very much appreciate hearing from you at this time.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, A U.S. SENATOR  
FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND**

Senator MIKULSKI. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would ask unanimous consent that my statement be included in the record.

Mr. WHEAT. Without objection, your statement and all statements will be made a part of the record.

Senator MIKULSKI. I always hear it being referred to as the "other body." It sounds like I've gone by astral projection.

But, Mr. Chairman and colleagues in government, I think the importance of this issue is demonstrated by the fact that you've got four Senators here from both sides of the aisle, both sides of the Potomac, both Houses of Congress to support the completion of Washington Metro.

We're here to urge this authorization not because we think it's a new start, but because we think it's an unfinished one. Metro has a little over 13 miles left to be authorized, 13 hard miles.

The engineers have their task, but we know that Congress has a difficult challenge to go through the budgetary bedrock. But we believe, however, that because this is an unfinished one, that it has merit.

My colleagues have talked about how this is Washington's—that it is America's Metro, that it takes America to work, the thousands of Federal employees that Senator Sarbanes and Congresswoman Morella has talked about, but also the fact that so many come from all over the country to visit is what really democracy is all about.

Tourism uses the Metro to go to Arlington Cemetery, to see the graves of loved ones and those who fought for our country, to the Smithsonian to see our history, and to see our Capitol because our best tourist attraction is our democracy. So it is America's Metro.

When we talk about finishing the red line, green line, yellow line, what we really want to end are those long lines, whether it's the Wilson Bridge, Route 270 or on the Beltway or Suitland Parkway.

This metropolitan area has only grown in the last 25 years. We in Maryland are painfully aware that we've gone from bucolic Maryland to bumper-to-bumper Maryland. No highway can meet these needs, and that's why we need Metro.

There's a great deal of conversation about the cost, and we know that. But there's a unique partnership between Federal, State, and local government.

States of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia, as well as eight local governments, including our own in Montgomery

and Prince Georges, have paid their share of operating costs for Metro. We've put up over \$1.8 billion for construction.

The local share of operating costs was well over a quarter of a billion, representing 46 percent of the operating costs, compared to 4 percent of the Federal share. The balance of that was covered by the fare box.

You'll hear more about the Metro success from Carmen Turner, our Metro manager, but I want to make one point about these last 13 miles. The long delay in the green line in Maryland has two vital sections that have not been authorized, the inner line from U Street to Fort Totten and Branch Avenue to Anacostia. What is important to recognize is that these people are transit dependent.

They are the least affluent people. They are not parking their Mercedes-Benz, picking up their Gucci handbag, or wearing their London shoes to go to work at minimum wage jobs, which we won't raise.

These are the people who need to ride Metro because that is the only way that they can get to work. They don't drive fancy cars. They don't have fancy jobs. But they're part of that great American public that gets up and puts on their socks every day and goes to work and wants to be able to go to work and get there on time.

So we hope that, in the wisdom of the House and also in the Senate, we will complete this unfinished program.

Thank you very much for your kind attention.

[The prepared statement of Senator Mikulski follows:]

BARBARA A. MIKULSKI  
MARYLAND

## United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-2003

Statement by Senator Barbara A. Mikulski  
Before the U.S. House of Representatives  
Committee on the District of Columbia  
Subcommittee on Government Operations  
and Metropolitan Affairs  
May 4, 1989

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, on both sides of the Potomac, and in both houses of Congress to support the completion of the Washington Metro.

But this isn't just the Washington Metro, it's America's Metro. That's why we're here today. Metro takes America to work. That is, it takes tens of thousand of federal workers to their jobs every day--from the Pentagon on the Blue Line to HUD on the Yellow Line to NRC on the Red Line.

Metro is America's Subway also because it carries millions of Americans, and people from all over the world, to and around our nation's capital--from the National Zoo to Arlington Cemetery, from the Smithsonian to the Capitol.

Yet, when we talk about finishing the Red Line, the Green Line and the Yellow Line what we really want to end are the long lines on the Wilson Bridge, on Rt. 270, on the Beltway, and on the Suitland Parkway. I don't need to tell you how the D.C. area has grown in the past twenty-five years.

Page 2

Places that were once bucolic Maryland are now bumper-to-bumper Maryland. There is no amount of highways that can meet this need. Anyone who has been caught in a rush hour traffic jam knows what I'm talking about. That's why we need Metro.

As you know, Metro is a unique partnership between federal, state and local governments. Maryland, Virginia, the District of Columbia and eight local governments including Montgomery and Prince George's Counties have paid their share of the cost of Metro--operating costs and construction costs. They have put up over \$1.8 billion for construction. In FY1988, the local share of operating costs was over \$230 million. That represented 46% of operating costs compared to a 3.2% federal share. The balance of operating costs was covered by the fare box.

You will hear more about this part of the Metro success story from WMATA's General Manager Carmen Turner. Her leadership has been an important reason behind Metro's success. But the point I want to make at this time is that the local and state governments have paid their share but many of their residents are still waiting for the train.

Page 3

The long-delayed Green Line has two vital sections that have not yet been authorized by Congress--the Inner Line from U St. to Ft. Totten, and the Branch Avenue Line to Anacostia. You will hear that the people who live in these areas are "the most transit dependent", you will hear that some of these areas are "the most socioeconomically disadvantaged". The Census tells us this is so. But what do these labels really mean?

I'm a former social worker, but you don't have to have a masters degree to know that we are talking about people who don't have a lot of money, and we are talking about minorities. They have to get to work, but they don't drive--they ride. These folks are waiting for the Green Line, but there is no line of green in the budget. There can't be until Congress acts to authorize the completion of Metro.

Metro will not be finished until the low and moderate income communities are served.

Metro has a little over 13 miles left to be authorized. But these are 13 hard miles. The engineers have their task. But Congress has an equally difficult challenge. We have to tunnel through some budgetary bedrock. We don't have the luxury to look toward many new horizons. But Metro is a

Page 4

twenty-five year-old commitment. This is not a new start, but an unfinished one. Congress has been a committed partner in Metro. We have seen what a vital asset it is to our nation's capital. Let's finish the job we started and take Metro to the end of the line.



Mr. WHEAT. Thank you very much, Senator.

It is, indeed, impressive to have four distinguished Members from the other body here with us today, and we'd like to call upon a distinguished Member from the other side of the aisle.

Senator Warner, we would be pleased to receive your testimony before the committee at this time.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. JOHN W. WARNER, A U.S. SENATOR FROM  
THE STATE OF VIRGINIA**

Senator WARNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Parris, members of the committee. The reputation of the Chair and ranking other members of this committee is well known in the other body.

To show that respect, I'm going to accord you brevity that I seldom do, submit my statement for the record, endorse entirely what was said by my two distinguished colleagues in Maryland, and save the only paragraph that I'll read momentarily. That will be the sum and substance of my testimony in strong support of this issue.

As I listened to the panel that preceded this panel and knowing full well that distinguished Carmen Turner and board will then speak, I'm sure the case will have been well made.

But I would like to say first that one of the great pleasures to service in the Senate is working with my distinguished colleagues in Maryland, indeed my colleague in Virginia. We join together, putting aside any vested bipartisanship, as we have done for many, many years.

Prior thereto, every President since President Kennedy has endorsed this, as well as strong bipartisan support in each of the successive Congresses.

It would seem to me, without being presumptuous, that the guidepost for this committee and its counterpart in the Senate should be the historical precedents which have been referred to by my colleague, Mr. Sarbanes.

To add to that testimony, I'd like to read one paragraph, reflecting correspondence in 1963 from then President Kennedy, in which he said, "Improved transportation system must include a major rapid transit system.

"The alternatives would be steadily worsening congestion, with what all that congestion means in losses in time and money, or an enlarged highway and freeway system program entailing additional expense, major disruptions of persons and businesses, and substantial impairment of the appearance and attractiveness of the city," the "city," of course, being the Capital of the United States.

Therein lies the vestige which should guide us in making the decision. It was true in 1963. It's true in 1989.

I thank the Chair.

[The prepared statement of Senator Warner follows:]

JOHN WARNER  
VIRGINIA

COMMITTEES  
ARMED SERVICES  
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE  
ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

## United States Senate

226 PUBLIC SENATE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20510  
(202) 522-2773

CONSTITUENT SERVICE OFFICES

810 FEDERAL BLDG NO  
2100 CHERRY WALK  
NORFOLK, VA 23510  
(754) 443-0279

PARCE WOOD BLDG NO  
101 EAST MAIN STREET  
RICHMOND, VA 23219  
(804) 775-2875

226 FEDERAL BLDG NO  
182 WEST MAIN STREET  
ARLINGTON, VA 22202  
(703) 628-4766

COMMUNION BANK BLDG NO  
215 S. JEFFERSON ST. S.W. 1003  
RENO, NV 89501  
(703) 982-4776

MAY 4, 1989

STATEMENT OF  
HONORABLE JOHN W. WARNER  
UNITED STATES SENATE  
VIRGINIA

BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS  
COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REGARDING:

AUTHORIZATION FOR WASHINGTON METRORAIL

MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, I APPRECIATE YOU HAVING THIS HEARING TO DISCUSS LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE FULL 103-MILE ADOPTED REGIONAL SYSTEM FOR THE WASHINGTON METRORAIL SYSTEM.

AS YOU WELL KNOW, THE FOUR SENATORS WHO REPRESENT THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA AND THE STATE OF MARYLAND HAVE JOINED TOGETHER TO INTRODUCE THE COUNTERPART LEGISLATION TO THIS BILL IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

THERE CAN BE BUT ONE PERSON'S NAME AS THE PRIME SPONSOR OF A PIECE OF LEGISLATION; HOWEVER, AS IN THE PAST, OUR EFFORTS TO WORK TOGETHER TO GET THIS LEGISLATION DRAFTED, INTRODUCED AND ENACTED INTO LAW ARE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT EFFORTS ON EACH OF OUR PARTS.

I AM PLEASED TO JOIN MY COLLEAGUES FROM ACROSS THE POTOMAC, THE SENATORS FROM MARYLAND, SENATORS SARBANES AND MIKULSKI, AND MY OWN VIRGINIA PARTNER, SENATOR ROBB, IN SUPPORTING YOUR LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE COMPLETION OF THE FULL METRORAIL SYSTEM.

THE FEDERAL COMMITMENT TO THE METRORAIL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM HAS SPANNED SOME TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AND SIX ADMINISTRATIONS. EVER SINCE PRESIDENT KENNEDY FIRST CALLED THE PLAN FOR METRO "BOTH SOUND AND NECESSARY," PRESIDENTS OF BOTH PARTIES HAVE SOUGHT FEDERAL FUNDS TO SUPPORT THE METRORAIL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.

-2-

SIMILARLY, MEMBERS OF BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS OF BOTH PARTIES, AND REPRESENTING CONSTITUENCIES ACROSS THIS GREAT NATION, HAVE UNDERSCORED TIME AND AGAIN THE NEED FOR SUSTAINING THE FEDERAL COMMITMENT TO COMPLETION OF METRORAIL -- AMERICA'S SUBWAY.

THE RAIL SYSTEM IS THE PRODUCT OF MORE THAN 30 YEARS OF DISCUSSION, PLANNING, AND CONSTRUCTION. EXTRAORDINARY EFFORTS FROM CITIZENS AND LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS ALIKE HELPED SHAPE THE ADOPTED REGIONAL PLAN FOR A 103-MILE RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM TO RELIEVE TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND ITS ATTENDANT POLLUTION, AND TO IMPROVE THE PHYSICAL CHARACTER, ECONOMIC GROWTH AND WELL-BEING OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION.

AS EARLY AS 1960, CONGRESS RECOGNIZED IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT "...THAT AN IMPROVED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION IS ESSENTIAL TO THE CONTINUED GROWTH AND EFFECTIVE PERFORMANCE OF THE FUNCTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES, FOR THE WELFARE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, FOR THE ORDERLY GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, AND FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE BEAUTY AND DIGNITY OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL ..."

IN CORRESPONDENCE TO CONGRESS IN 1963, THEN-PRESIDENT KENNEDY SAID THAT ANY SUCH "...IMPROVED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MUST INCLUDE A MAJOR RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM. THE ALTERNATIVES WOULD BE STEADILY-WORSENING CONGESTION WITH WHAT ALL THAT CONGESTION MEANS IN LOSSES IN TIME AND MONEY, OR AN ENLARGED HIGHWAY AND FREEWAY SYSTEM PROGRAM ENTAILING ADDITIONAL EXPENSE, MAJOR DISRUPTIONS OF PERSONS AND BUSINESSES, AND SUBSTANTIAL IMPAIRMENT OF THE APPEARANCE AND ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE CITY."

-3-

THE POLITICAL CONSENSUS FORGED AMONG THE EIGHT LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN MARYLAND, VIRGINIA AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO SUPPORT A COHERENT AND ORDERLY PLAN FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SUCH A RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM HAS REMAINED INTACT. THIS LOCAL JURISDICTIONAL COMPACT FORMED A PARTNERSHIP WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ADVANCE A COST-SHARED CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM -- A PARTNERSHIP THAT HAS NOW BUILT SEVENTY MILES OF METRORAIL. RECOGNIZED BY THE AMERICAN PUBLIC TRANSIT ASSOCIATION THIS YEAR AS "THE OUTSTANDING TRANSIT SYSTEM IN NORTH AMERICA," METRORAIL HAS PROVEN ITSELF A SAFE, RELIABLE AND CLEAN SYSTEM. WITH RIDERSHIP EXCEEDING HALF A MILLION DAILY IT NOW IS SECOND ONLY TO NEW YORK MTA IN RIDERSHIP.

THE FEDERAL-LOCAL PARTNERSHIP THAT HAS YIELDED THIS FINE SYSTEM MUST BE SUSTAINED TO FULLY REALIZE THE DREAMS OF THOSE PIONEERING AND VISIONARY PLANNERS SOME THIRTY YEARS AGO. WITH THIS YEAR'S APPROPRIATIONS REQUEST BY WMATA OF \$193 MILLION, FUNDS AVAILABLE UNDER THE CURRENT, SO-CALLED "STARK-HARRIS" AUTHORIZATION WILL BE DEPLETED. WITH THE AGREEMENT AND SUPPORT OF CONGRESS AND THE URBAN MASS TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION, THESE REMAINING FUNDS WILL PERMIT THE AUTHORITY TO BRING 89.5 MILES INTO FULL-REVENUE SERVICE.

THE ADOPTED REGIONAL SYSTEM, HOWEVER, PROVIDES FOR A 103-MILE SYSTEM. THIS WILL REQUIRE ADOPTION OF NEW AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION. ONE OF THE GREAT CHAMPIONS OF METRO HAS BEEN FORMER

-4-

SENATOR CHARLES MATHIAS OF MARYLAND. DURING THE 1979 FLOOR DEBATE ON THE STARK-HARRIS LEGISLATION, SENATOR MATHIAS SAID "IT WOULD...BE A TRAGIC BREACH OF PROMISE WERE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO RENEGE...ON ITS SHARE OF THE METRORAIL DREAM FOR THOSE NOT YET SERVED BY THE SYSTEM." AND INDEED, THAT IS THE SENTIMENT TODAY OF HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF RESIDENTS THROUGHOUT THE REGION, MANY OF WHOM RESIDE IN THE MOST TRANSIT-DEPENDENT NEIGHBORHOODS WHICH HAVE LONG BEEN THE TARGETS FOR IMPROVED ACCESS TO MASS TRANSIT.

FOR RESIDENTS OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND ALONG THE OUTER GREEN LINE, THOSE LIVING IN THE DISTRICT'S URBAN CORE ALONG THE INNER GREEN LINE, AND YET OTHERS WHO MUST COMPETE WITH TRAFFIC GRIDLOCK IN GLENMONT ALONG THE RED LINE OR SPRINGFIELD-FRANCONIA ON THE YELLOW LINE -- FOR ALL THESE RESIDENTS WHO HAVE WAITED PATIENTLY FOR SO LONG TO RECEIVE METRORAIL SERVICE, WE MUST KEEP OUR PROMISE. EACH OF THE EIGHT JURISDICTIONS IN THE REGIONAL COMPACT HAVE DUTIFULLY EXTENDED THEIR SHARE OF CONSTRUCTION FUNDS OVER THE LAST TWENTY YEARS TO ENSURE THAT THOSE SEGMENTS PLANNED FOR THEIR AREAS WOULD INDEED BE BUILT.

I URGE THE COMMITTEE TO UNANIMOUSLY SUPPORT THIS AUTHORIZATION BILL SO THAT WE MAY UNDERScore OUR COMMITMENT TO THE FEDERAL-LOCAL PARTNERSHIP NECESSARY TO COMPLETE THE ENTIRE METRORAIL SYSTEM. IT IS OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO FULFILL THE HOPES AND PROMISES OF THOSE VISIONARIES WHO CONCEIVED AND NOW HAVE NEARLY COMPLETED THIS LANDMARK RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM. WE OWE THIS TO THE MILLIONS OF FUTURE RIDERS THAT WILL ENJOY ENHANCED ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT OFFICES, BUSINESSES, FAMILY, FRIENDS, AND THE MANY FINE ATTRACTIONS OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Senator. I'm sure with statements of that clarity and brevity, you're not only respected in the Senate, but you are appreciated by your colleagues also.

Senator WARNER. I would like to say to the Chair that my mother came from Missouri, and she taught me certain lessons.

Mr. WHEAT. We appreciate the sense of values that one gets from the heartland of America.

We would now like to call upon the fourth distinguished Member of the Senate who has joined us this morning, Senator Charles Robb of Virginia.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. CHARLES S. ROBB, A U.S. SENATOR FROM  
THE STATE OF VIRGINIA**

Senator ROBB. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I am very pleased to join with my distinguished colleagues here in support of this particular legislation.

One of the things that I learned early on is to increase both respect and the opportunity to continue to participate, that brevity does have, indeed, a virtue. I will subscribe to it.

You have already indicated that the formal testimony will be included in the record. I will not give my formal testimony at this particular time.

I also learned a long time ago that any time that you're dealing in a regional issue, that if we start off with Senator Sarbanes' succinct summary of the facts and with my distinguished colleague from Virginia giving a good overview, the most colorful quotations, all of the headlines will come from none other than the junior Senator from Maryland, Barbara Mikulski, for whom we all have tremendous respect and affection.

I couldn't begin to compete with the way she has stated her case so persuasively. I don't want to detract from it in any way, shape or form. I join with the words of all three of my colleagues here, those that have preceded and the distinguished members of the group supporting this legislation that you will hear from, including Carmen Turner, very shortly.

I would say only that I have lived with the entire evolution of Metro. I had an office downtown about 20 years ago or just a little less. When they were starting the initial construction phases, I was directly under a Metro station, precisely under a Metro station. So you can understand my appreciation for what has gone into this project from the very beginning.

I appreciate the fact that the Federal Government and all of the jurisdictions have made a commitment, worked together. During my period of service at the State level, I worked very hard with our delegation to provide that kind of support.

I appreciate the fact that both Congressman Parris and Congressman Fauntroy have worked on this project for a long period of time with many others on a bipartisan basis across the board.

We've got about 110,000 Federal employees, approximately, in the jurisdiction that Senator Warner and I represent. About 20 percent of them are estimated to ride Metro.

If we can complete the full 103 miles of this system, we will be able to provide access to additional members of that group and

hope to reduce some of the congestion coming from both sides of the river.

So, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity. I am very pleased to join with my colleagues on this issue in a bipartisan, bi-regional cooperation. I hope it will be the pleasure of this committee to report favorably on the full 103 miles for the authorization.

I thank you.

[The prepared statement of Senator Robb follows:]



STATEMENT OF SENATOR CHARLES S. ROBB  
METRORAIL REAUTHORIZATION  
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
MAY 4, 1989

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, today I am pleased to join my colleagues in supporting legislation to continue the Federal government's commitment to complete the 103 mile Metrorail system.

Congress' goal of building and operating an exemplary rapid transit system for the national capital region is close to realization. Today, of the 103 miles in the planned Adopted Regional Metrorail System, 70 miles and 64 stations are operating and construction continues on another 19.5 miles. There remain to be built 13.5 miles that are an integral part of a system that was conceived and designed as a whole.

Construction of the Metrorail system is based on the understanding among the participating jurisdictions and the Federal government that the entire system will be built. Many jurisdictions in the region have contributed to the construction of the system based on the expectation that lines in their area will be completed. This unique Federal, state, and local partnership has enabled Metro to proceed with construction through many localities, states, the District, and on parcels of Federal land. Local government, business, and community representatives throughout the region have set aside parochial interests and pulled together in an unprecedented fashion to support this system. Congress has demonstrated its support time and again for completion of the entire system.

The current Federal authorization for Metrorail construction, referred to as Stark-Harris, provides only enough funding to complete 89.5 miles of the 103 mile adopted regional system. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's fiscal year 1990 request for an appropriation of 193 million dollars exhausts the funds available under the Stark-Harris authorization.

This bill authorizes the 2.16 billion dollar Federal share of the estimated cost of completing the system. Funds are to be appropriated in 200 million dollar increments over an eleven year period. This appropriations plan takes into consideration real Federal fiscal constraints, while attempting to ensure an orderly and cost-effective construction program. As with any capital construction project, if annual appropriation schedules are not met and construction is delayed, total cost increases are inevitable. The system has in fact realized some cost overruns as a result of implementation delays.

I ask the committee to join me in supporting this critical legislation to fulfill a commitment made to this region over a quarter of a century ago. Metrorail is the most efficient means

Page 2

we have of moving our Federal workforce to the many governmental facilities throughout our region. In Virginia alone, for example, we have an estimated 110,000 Federal workers. Perhaps 20 percent are currently using Metro to commute to work. To realize our goal of alleviating the traffic problems we face, even more of the region's workforce must gain ready access to Metrorail. We must stand with our local partners to make the "miracle of Metro" become a reality for all the residents of the National Capital region.

I am confident that we can be successful, even in these times of budgetary concerns, because investments in transportation now will represent significant savings in the future. I urge the members of the committee to support this critical legislation.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you very much, Senator, for your testimony. Let me thank all of you for coming over this morning.

Let me call upon my distinguished colleague, Mr. Parris, for any questions or comments he might have at this time.

Mr. PARRIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Let me just say the statements by our four friends from the other side of the aisle, or the other side of this building, have been excellent.

Individually and cumulatively, I think much, if not all, of the merits of this case has been made. I most certainly wish them well in the adoption of this measure on the other side of Capitol Hill.

I would say to them I would love to complete this job before the end of this year, before I go off to a different capital. I won't get into that.

I just want to add one other thought to the discussion. That is, as both my friends Senator Robb and Senator Warner will understand the implications about what I'm about to say, I have no desire to be too obtuse about all of this, but there are some enormously important national defense implications to this measure, as well as all of the other things that we've discussed earlier this morning.

For instance, the Secretary of the Army has indicated to us and others that there is a need for something like 3 million square feet of office space in the military establishment in the Washington area, a duplication, if you will, of the size of the Pentagon.

Now, many have suggested that a great deal of that could be accommodated in the engineer proving ground, right down Shirley Highway from the Pentagon now, or perhaps at Fort Belvoir, places like that.

If, in fact, the extension of Metro was completed to Springfield and just another little segment was added on to tie that together, you could have the two Pentagons, if you will, tied together with a subway.

Now, I think that's an enormous, extraordinary, unique consideration of this measure. I don't think we can be, Mr. Chairman, myopic or shortsighted in what we are attempting to create here.

For 200 years since George Washington, this has been the Capital. Hopefully 2 million more, it will continue to be. I don't think we can be timid in approaching this problem in the national interest.

I thank my four friends from the other side of the building for being here this morning, assisting us with this important measure. Thank you.

Senator SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, could I just add there that the completion of the 103 miles—I think I should add this addendum—opens up tremendous opportunities throughout the National Capital area.

Mr. PARRIS. I want to say to my friend Paul: I do not mean to be lobbying for the 3 million totally in Virginia. The point is if that need is truly there, and I believe it probably is, then it has to be accommodated.

This system is an important ingredient in that accommodation.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Fauntroy.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I simply want to reiterate the importance of the testimony here, not only of our other

colleagues in the other body, but our colleagues in the House, on the value of this system to the Nation.

I do plan to submit later on in the process documentation of the fact that, indeed, this is the heartbeat of America in that all of our national leaders and supporters and support staff and our administration, cabinet, and staff have to work in this region.

Quite frankly, were it not for this Metro system today and its needed completion, our hearts as individuals would be taxed with a tremendous amount of pollution by virtue of the geographic location of the National Capital region in this valley.

So it is an investment that is already paying off in better health for those of us who must help to make the decisions that affect this entire Nation and, indeed, the world.

So I want to thank our colleagues for so eloquently stating in so many ways the strongest argument that can be made for the completion of America's subway system.

Mr. WHEAT. This is, indeed, America's system. I believe it to be a cost effective one also. All of our Nation's leaders are here.

When I go home to Missouri, I'd like to be able to tell Senator Warner that I went home and told my constituents that I supported cost effectiveness for Government leaders, out of the limos and onto the Metro.

Senators, thank you all very much for appearing here today, and we look forward to sending this legislation to the other body so that you can handle it there.

Senator SARBANES. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHEAT. This morning's third and final panel will include Hon. Vivian Watts, the secretary of transportation and public safety for the State of Virginia; and Hon. Richard Trainor, the Maryland secretary of transportation.

Would they both come forward at this time?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, if I might just say a word?

Mr. WHEAT. Certainly. Congressman Hoyer.

Mr. HOYER. On behalf of the entire Washington metropolitan region—I haven't talked to all of them, but I know from talking to all of them—we are blessed in our two States with two heads of transportation who are incredibly knowledgeable, very sensitive to their communities, politically savvy, and who both work very, very closely with the congressional delegation.

I think that is one of the reasons that we have been as successful. Very frankly, we think that they not only cooperate with us and communicate well with us, but they communicate well with the Representatives in Congress that impact on our two States.

I am very pleased to, on behalf of all of our regional Representatives, welcome them to this hearing and thank them for their leadership and commitment and effectiveness.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you very much, Congressman Hoyer. We appreciate hearing your kind words about the respective secretaries of transportation, and we appreciate the chance to hear from them.

At this time, we will call on Hon. Vivian Watts, the secretary of transportation from the State of Virginia.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. VIVIAN E. WATTS, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC SAFETY, COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA**

Ms. WATTS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, distinguished members of the committee. It's a pleasure to appear before you this morning to urge the continued congressional support for construction of Metrorail adopted regional system.

You are going to be hearing from many today—and I appreciate your patience on this very important concern—who will cite the unique Federal interest in the Metrorail system, special financing that has existed for 20 years, and the enormous contribution Metrorail makes to land use and transportation in this region.

I agree with all of those sentiments. I urge you to listen carefully for these political and civic leaders which have contributed many years, indeed, decades, to the planning, the construction, and the growth of the system to its current 70 miles and 64 stations.

On behalf of Governor Baliles, however, I would like to talk about Metrorail from an international and a national perspective. Governor Baliles declared 1988 as the "Year of Trade" in Virginia.

As the current chairman of the National Governors Association, he has carried this challenge nationwide. Under the theme "America in Transition: The International Frontier," he has emphasized repeatedly the lessons he has learned taking the initiative to open up this corner of our country to greater international trade.

During his travels, the Governor has been impressed by the care and pride which other nations pay to their capital cities. The capital of a country is more than a place where the national legislature makes laws and the bureaucracy implements national policy.

It is a place that embodies the aspirations and the values of a nation. It is the face that a nation shows to the international community.

From the broad vistas of Pennsylvania Avenue and the Mall; the magnificent monuments to freedom: George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln; and the quiet eloquence of the Vietnam Memorial; and the Smithsonian and its national treasures; as well as its displays of the exciting history of our technological achievements, which have brought forth unparalleled improvements in mankind's standards of living and of man's ability to conquer air and space, people come from all over the world to see these symbols of the United States of America.

How do they get there? They get there by Metrorail, which is a monument to national pride in and of itself. It is a symbol of the technological excellence which Americans want to show to the international community.

It is among the finest examples of public architecture in this country and the world. It carries over 140 million passenger trips annually, of which 17 million are international or national visitors.

Transportation planners, designers, and architects from all over the world study the Metrorail system in the hope that they can duplicate its success in their countries.

Thousands of your constituents visit the National Capital each year. They ride the Metrorail to visit you and to see their national

heritage. I am told that the pocket brochure "All About Metro" is the most widely distributed piece of information handed out by congressional offices during spring and summer months.

But if Metrorail presents only an impressive snapshot picture for a postcard, we risk having a mockery of other values this Nation represents. To quote Governor Baliles before the National Governors Association, "How do we expect to move our products around the world when we can't move our people across town?"

Before the Governor launched his efforts in expanding trade, he first spearheaded an unprecedented threefold increase in Virginia's transportation spending, with \$55 million of those State funds annually committed to this region's mass transit.

Metrorail is, first and foremost, an example of the critical role public transportation plays in an integrated transportation network, especially in the rapidly growing urban areas.

In northern Virginia, over 200,000 passenger trips per day are taken on Metro, most of them during peak commuting hours. It provides a mode of transportation that is critical to the total transportation network of northern Virginia and the region.

Governor Baliles established a blue-ribbon task force of elected officials, business and civic leaders to develop a comprehensive transportation plan for northern Virginia, looking to the year 2010.

That effort was completed in December 1989. I would like to summarize the results for you. I had the pleasure of chairing that effort on behalf of the Governor.

Between now and the year 2010, northern Virginia will require \$7.3 billion, or \$331 million per year, in new transportation infrastructure expenditures just to prevent traffic conditions from deteriorating further.

This is in addition to the \$2 billion committed in State funds and the optimistic assumption that current Federal levels would continue at at least \$700 million.

Of the \$7.3 billion in new expenditures, \$4 billion are for transit and high-occupant vehicle facilities. Public transit in its various forms is 55 percent of the critical transportation improvements required in northern Virginia over the next 20 years. In other words, as we all know, highways alone will not add enough transportation capacity to meet future needs.

The results of the northern Virginia 2010 Transportation Plan are being replicated in similar studies in high-growth urban areas all over the country.

Cities and their burgeoning suburban areas are discovering that an intelligent mix of transportation modes is the only way to sustain economic growth and the quality of life.

As the Congress takes up reauthorization of the Federal interstate and transit programs next year, I believe the necessity for a strong, integrated highway and transit program at the Federal level will be evident to all of you.

In this regard, the Washington Metrorail is the preeminent heavy rail system in this country. It is worthy of the Nation's Capital in architecture, design, speed, comfort, cleanliness, safety, operating efficiency, and in system concept.

All of these elements combine to create a rail system of unparalleled distinction, except the absence of the last element, and that is

the system concept. The adopted regional system is designed as a system.

Cutting off construction of the remaining portions of the red, yellow, and green lines will substantially reduce operational efficiency. Cutting off the system will skew the equal economic opportunity which should be accessible to all residents of this region.

Cutting off the system will ignore the highest growth area of the region and stand as an example of urban planning gone awry.

The effort by the Federal, State, and local governments to plan, construct, and operate this system can stand as a monument to intergovernmental cooperation. It must not be unilaterally terminated before the planned 103 miles are completed.

I would be negligent if I did not mention the particular importance of the Franconia-Springfield Metrorail Station to northern Virginia's transportation network.

This terminal station of the yellow line, located at the intersection of I-95 and the Beltway, will generate enough ridership to equal the capacity of more than one interstate highway lane during the peak hours, capacity which is currently at "G" level of service.

Now, many of you know highway engineers don't recognize any worse level of service than "F," failing, gridlock. But in our northern Virginia planning process, we had to develop "G" to describe how many hours gridlock lasts. I would emphasize hours it lasts.

Completion of the yellow line will serve the office complex proposed by GSA immediately adjacent to the station and the proposed "Crystal City South" being discussed by the U.S. Army at Fort Belvoir.

The Franconia-Springfield Metrorail Station is not only essential to the transportation plan for the southern part of our region; it is the most cost effective way of meeting the need in a corridor that is already 10 lanes plus.

Mr. Chairman, Governor Baliles and the Commonwealth of Virginia stand firmly with our partners in the District of Columbia and Maryland and many local governments in the region to request that this subcommittee report H.R. 1462.

Metrorail must represent our determination not only to plan, but to build a unified, functioning community and to commit the public's scarce resources to their highest and best use.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Secretary Watts follows:]



**COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA**

*Office of the Governor*

*Richmond 23219*

**TESTIMONY OF**

**VIVIAN E. WATTS**

**SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC SAFETY**

**FOR THE**

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA**

**BEFORE THE**

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS**

**OF THE**

**COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**ON**

**WASHINGTON METRORAIL REAUTHORIZATION**

**MAY 4, 1989**



Good morning. I appear before you today to urge continued Congressional support for construction of the Metrorail Adopted Regional System. You will hear from many others today who will cite the unique federal interest in the Metrorail system; the special financing that has existed for 20 years; and the enormous contribution Metrorail makes to land use and transportation in this region. I agree with all those sentiments, and I urge you to listen carefully, for these political and civic leaders have contributed many years -- indeed, decades -- to the planning, the construction and the growth of the system to its current 70 miles and 64 stations.

I would like to talk about Metrorail from an international and a national perspective. Virginia Governor Gerald Baliles declared 1988 the "Year of Trade" in Virginia. As the current Chairman of the National Governor's Association he has carried this challenge nationwide. Under the theme "America in Transition: The International Frontier," he has emphasized repeatedly the lessons he has learned taking the initiative to open this corner of the nation to greater international trade.

During his travels, the Governor has been impressed by the care and pride which other nations pay to their capital cities. The capital of a country is more than a place where the national

legislature makes laws and the bureaucracy implements national policy. It is a place that embodies the aspirations and the values of a nation -- it is the face that a nation shows to the international community. The broad vistas of Pennsylvania Avenue and the Mall; the magnificent monuments to George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln and the quiet eloquence of the Vietnam Memorial; the Smithsonian and its national treasures, as well as its displays of the exciting history of our technological achievements which have brought forth unparalleled improvements in mankind's standard of living and of man's ability to conquer air and space -- people come from all over the world to see these symbols of the United States of America.

And how do they get there? They get there by Metrorail, which is a monument to national pride in and of itself. It is a symbol of the technological excellence which Americans want to show the international community. It is among the finest examples of public architecture in this country and the world. It carries over 140 million passenger trips annually, of which 17 million are international or national visitors. Transportation planners, designers and architects from all over the world study the Metrorail system in the hope that they can duplicate its success in their countries.

Thousands of your constituents visit the nation's capital each year -- they ride the Metrorail to visit you and to see

their national heritage. I am told the pocket brochure "All About Metro" is the most widely distributed piece of information handed out by Congressional offices during the spring and summer months.

But if Metrorail presents only an impressive snapshot picture for a postcard, we risk making a mockery of other values this Nation represents. To quote Governor Baliles before the National Governor's Association, "How do we expect to move our products around the world - when we can't move our people across town?" Before the Governor launched his efforts at expanding trade, he first spearheaded an unprecedented three-fold increase in Virginia's transportation spending, with \$55 million of those state funds annually committed to this region's mass transit.

Metrorail is, first and foremost, an example of the critical role public transportation plays in an integrated transportation network, especially in a rapidly-growing urban area. In Northern Virginia, over 200,000 passenger trips per day are taken on Metro, most of them during peak commuting hours. It provides a mode of transportation that is critical to the total transportation network in Northern Virginia and the region.

Governor Baliles established a blue-ribbon task force of elected officials, business and civic leaders to develop a comprehensive transportation plan for Northern Virginia looking

to the year 2010. That effort was completed in December, 1989. I would like to summarize the results for you.

- Between now and 2010, Northern Virginia will require \$7.3 billion or \$331 million per year in new transportation infrastructure expenditures just to prevent traffic conditions from deteriorating further.
  
- Of the \$7.3 billion in new expenditures, \$4.0 billion are for transit and high occupant vehicle facilities. Public transit in its various forms is 55 percent of the critical transportation improvements required in Northern Virginia over the next 20 years. In other words, highways alone will not add enough transportation capacity to meet future demand.

The results of the Northern Virginia 2010 Transportation Plan are being replicated in similar studies in high-growth urban areas all over the country. Cities and their burgeoning suburban areas are discovering that an intelligent mix of transportation modes is the only way to sustain economic growth and the quality of life. As the Congress takes up the reauthorization of the federal interstate and transit programs next year, I believe the necessity for a strong, integrated highway and transit program at the federal level will be evident to all of you.

In this regard, the Washington Metrorail is the preeminent heavy rail system in this country. It is worthy of the Nation's Capitol in architecture, design, speed, comfort, cleanliness, safety, operating efficiency, and in system concept. All of these elements combine to create a rail system of unparalleled distinction, except the absence of the last element. The Adopted Regional System is designed as a system. Cutting off construction of the remaining portions of the red, yellow and green lines will substantially reduce operational efficiency. Cutting off the system will skew the equal economic opportunity which should be equally accessible to all residents of this region. Cutting off the system will ignore the highest growth area of the region and stand as an example of urban planning gone awry. The effort by the federal, state and local governments to plan, construct and operate this system can stand as a monument to intergovernmental cooperation. It must not be unilaterally terminated before the planned 103 miles are completed.

I would be negligent if I did not mention the particular importance of the Franconia-Springfield Metrorail Station to Northern Virginia's transportation network. This terminal station of the Yellow Line, located at the intersection of I-95 and the Beltway, will generate enough ridership to equal the capacity of more than one interstate highway lane during the peak hours...capacity which is currently at "G" level of service. Highway engineers don't recognize any worse level of service than

"F": failing, gridlock. In the Northern Virginia planning process we had to develop "G" to describe how many hours gridlock lasts.

Completion of the yellow line will serve the office complex proposed by the GSA immediately adjacent to the station and the proposed "Crystal City South" being discussed by the U.S. Army at Fort Belvoir. The Franconia-Springfield Metrorail Station is not only essential to the transportation plan for the southern part of our region, it is the most cost-effective way of meeting the need in a corridor that is already 10-lanes plus.

Mr. Chairman, Governor Baliles and the Commonwealth of Virginia stand firmly with our partners in the District of Columbia and Maryland and the many local governments in the region to request that this subcommittee report HR 1462. Metrorail must represent our determination not only to plan, but to build a unified, functioning community and to commit the public's scarce resources to their highest and best use.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Secretary Watts.  
Secretary Trainor, we would be pleased to receive your testimony at this time.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. RICHARD TRAINOR, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, STATE OF MARYLAND FOR GOV. WILLIAM DONALD SCHAEFER**

Mr. TRAINOR. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, Governor Schaefer planned to be here this morning. Unfortunately, he got up and wasn't feeling well, and he asked me to take his place.

Fortunately for me, he prepared a written statement to submit, and I will submit that to you. I would like to just touch on a few points that would have been in the Governor's statement.

One of the great things about testifying on behalf of Metro is that I don't have to go into a lot of details about its success. I don't have to tell you about its reliability, its aesthetics, its safety, its popularity, the management. Most of that has been reinforced this morning by previous testimony.

The system is the envy of those of us who run other systems, and we have a small one in Baltimore City. The W.M.A.T.A. system is the envy of other systems across the country because of its management, because of the thoughtfulness that went into the design of it, and its general operation day to day, and its success, its fare box recovery. It's the relief of the local highway system.

This legislation was initiated in the 1960's and it was the forecast of the enormous growth of the Washington metropolitan area. I think from the Virginia side of the river and our side, if you travel any of it, you see that growth. If anything, Congress probably underestimated the growth that would occur and is continuing to occur.

I think, by any measure, it's a success. Congress has recognized the success over the years by reaffirming its commitment to the system. Time and time again, it has approved legislation to provide the necessary moneys to continue the system and to complete the system.

I can say, without hesitation, that passage of this legislation is Maryland's top transportation priority. There is no question the delegation from Maryland supports it completely, all of them. We support it. The Governor supports it. Certainly the people in the entire State of Maryland support the Metro system.

I am here today to echo those pleas for additional Federal funds to complete it. We have a lot at stake. Maryland is a little behind Virginia and the District in their share of the system that was originally intended to be built.

The legislation before you today authorizes funding to complete the last 13 miles; 4½ of those miles are on the green line in Prince Georges County. That line will serve mostly low- and moderate-income communities, as Senator Mikulski mentioned, that are dependent on public transit.

The other line is about a mile and a half up in Montgomery County from Wheaton to Glenmont. Both of these segments will also serve some of the regions largest Federal facilities.

Maryland has paid its fair share of the system's costs. We're 100 percent behind the project, and we have been since its inception. Our total capital investment thus far is \$337 million in State funds, and I emphasize that's our capital investment.

We've also invested \$315 million in operating the subway and the excellent bus system. We'll continue that support.

In my department, we've set aside about \$120 million over the next several years to continue our support of the Capital program and, at the same time, we've put almost \$300 million aside and earmarked for continued operating costs.

All together, over the next several years, we will have invested a little over a billion dollars in W.M.A.T.A., and we think it's a good investment. It's a lot of money for a small State, but we think we've gotten our money's worth.

I think we look to the future, that it's something that we really don't have a choice about. We can't afford not to do it.

We ask you to support this legislation and allow us and W.M.A.T.A. to continue the job and make the complete 103-mile system a reality. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Governor Schaefer follows:]



Testimony of Governor William Donald Schaefer  
Before the U.S. House of Representatives  
Committee on the District of Columbia  
Subcommittee on Government Operations and Metropolitan Affairs  
on H.R. 1463  
A Bill to Reauthorize Funding to Complete the  
Washington Metrorail System

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I am delighted to have the opportunity to testify on behalf of legislation to reauthorize funds to complete the last 13 miles of the 103-mile Washington Metropolitan Area transit system.

One of the great things about testifying on behalf of Metro is that I don't have to go into a lot of details about its success. I don't have to tell you about its reliability, its aesthetics, its safety or its popularity. You already know that.

You know that because most of you have had the opportunity to witness first hand the success of the Metro system. Many of the people sitting in this room used Metro to get to this hearing. No doubt many of you use Metro to go to and from work. In fact, I suspect one of the reasons that the Metro system has been able to capture the support of the executive and legislative branches over the years is the very fact that they could actually see the tangible results of Metro legislation. It is this success that

the Administration and the Congress envisioned when they approved the legislation to get the system underway.

Congress initiated legislation to build the WMATA System back in the early 1960s. The impetus for the legislation was the forecast of enormous growth for the Washington metropolitan area. Congress knew they had to create this system to relieve traffic congestion, to minimize pollution, to ensure continued economic growth and the well being of the area, and to ensure the efficient operations of the federal government. Metro was designed not only to serve the region but also to benefit visitors to the nation's capital. By any measure, Metro is a success. Congress has recognized this success by reaffirming its commitment to the system. Time and again it has approved legislation to provide the necessary monies to continue the system.

As successful as this effort has been, we have not yet realized the dreams that Congress envisioned in its original plan. While we can take pride in what we have done, we should not forget what we have yet to do. The areas of the planned system that have not yet been completed will serve some of the most transit-dependent communities in the area. It would be unfair and unjust if these moderate income communities were not included in the successful completion of the Metro system.

I had more than a passing interest in the Metro system when I was mayor of Baltimore. And I have given it undivided attention since I became governor. I can say unequivocally that passage of this legislation is my top transportation priority. But I feel like the new kid on the block. What can I tell you about the success and needs of Metro in Maryland that you haven't already heard from members of the Maryland Congressional Delegation? Sometimes it seems as if many of the members of the Maryland Delegation have been pushing this project since the dawn of time -- for some it has been more than a decade. I know that Paul Sarbanes, Barbara Mikulski, Steny Hoyer, Tom McMillen and Connie Morella have been working diligently to make the case for more money to complete the system. And I can see today they have characteristically come fully armed with facts that would make a convincing case for even the worst skeptic about the need to complete Metro.

I am here today to echo their plea for additional federal funds to complete the system. It is my state that has the most at stake in this legislation.

The reality of the situation is that Maryland has one half of its system yet to be built. This is in marked contrast to the other two jurisdictions involved -- Virginia and the District of Columbia. Both can boast of having three-quarters of their Metro system built.

The legislation before you today authorizes funding to complete the last 13 miles of the system. Four and one half of those miles are on the Green line in Prince George's County. And as I mentioned earlier, that line will serve mostly low and moderate income communities. Another one and one half of those 13 unbuilt miles are in Montgomery County, from Wheaton to Glenmont. These segments will also serve some of the region's largest federal facilities, such as Andrews Air Force Base and the Suitland Federal Center.

Maryland has paid its fair share of the system's costs. Maryland is 100 percent behind the project and has been for the last 20 years. We helped foot the bill for the Virginia and D.C. lines when they were being built. Our total capital investment thus far is \$337 million in state funds. And I emphasize that that's just our capital investment. We have also spent \$315 million to operate the subway and its excellent bus system.

Our commitment by no means stops there. The fact that we have established a stable and reliable source of funding virtually guarantees that all future funding needs will be met.

Maryland's Department of Transportation has set aside an additional \$119 million over the next five years to continue the construction program. And on top of that it anticipates that it

will put in another \$294 million over that period in additional operating support.

The facts speak for themselves. I don't think anyone can quibble with the fact that Maryland has been a good partner in this effort. Its effort should be fostered -- not frustrated. I urge the Congress to make good on its promise by passing this important piece of legislation today to make the complete 103-mile system a reality.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Secretary Trainor. We are sorry that the Governor couldn't be here, but we do appreciate your being here with us to provide this testimony and to answer questions that might arise.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Parris.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I note that we have a vote going on on the floor in the House. I just want to suggest that, from my part, I appreciate very much the continuing support of the various States involved here and the statements of the ladies and gentlemen who have just testified to us.

I have no particular questions. Rather than have them wait and us go vote, I just wanted to make that statement with the suggestion that, in the absence of other questions, perhaps we could go vote and it would not be necessary for them to stay.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Parris.

Inasmuch as we are taking a rollcall vote, I would submit any questions that I have in writing, and invite the other subcommittee members to do the same, if you would agree to respond to any questions that we might have in writing.

We appreciate very much your coming out to testify today. With no further questions from the subcommittee at this time, this hearing will stand in recess until 1 o'clock this afternoon.

Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 11:15 a.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 1 p.m., the same day.]

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. WHEAT. The subcommittee will come to order. This afternoon we have a very distinguished, as well as extensive, group of witnesses. So we'll try to get started here as close to on time as possible and move expeditiously through the testimony.

Of the jurisdictions that are involved, a higher proportion of the mileage in the Metro system is located within the District of Columbia than any other jurisdiction. As a result, the District of Columbia has proportionally paid more for the creation and the existence of this system than any of the other jurisdictions.

It has as much impact on the District of Columbia, as a city in its own right and also as the Nation's Capital. So this afternoon, we are very pleased to have testify before us two representatives of the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia, Mayor Marion Barry; and the chairman of the city council, David Clarke.

Mayor, we appreciate your longstanding support of the Metro system and the hard work that you have done over the years to help create and extend the system. We appreciate the progress that has been made under your leadership, and we are very pleased to hear your testimony at this time.

#### TESTIMONY OF HON. MARION S. BARRY, JR., MAYOR OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mayor BARRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask that my testimony in its entirety be submitted to the record.

Mr. WHEAT. Without objection, all testimonies submitted will be made a part of the record.

Mayor BARRY. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all thank you for agreeing to serve on the House District Committee. It's a committee which does not necessarily benefit your constituents but, because of your commitment to public service and commitment to democracy, you've done that. We certainly appreciate that, and also we appreciate your chairmanship of the subcommittee.

Also we are delighted to see our good friend, ranking minority leader Congressman, Governor Parris from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, this hearing comes at a very important time in our Metro history. I want to, on behalf of the executive branch of government—I'm sure David Clarke, our distinguished Chair of the city council, will share our views that we unequivocally support H.R. 1463, a bill to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969.

This amendment would authorize the expenditure of \$2.16 billion to complete the full 103-mile adopted regional Metro system.

Mr. Chairman, the District of Columbia has long been the strong supporter of our Metro system. We have supported it from the very beginning, even before W.M.A.T.A. was formed. That was nearly 20 years ago.

We had the first groundbreaking in 1969. No one would have guessed at that time that we would have one of the finest systems anywhere in the country.

Mr. Chairman, the District of Columbia believes in putting its money where its mouth is. The D.C. government has transferred \$2.3 billion of our interstate highway money.

Ironically, before I was elected to the school board and the city council, I was on the other side fighting against massive freeways in Washington. Then when I came to this side, as the Mayor, we were able to take that \$2.3 billion and transfer it to our Metro system.

Moreover, we have added another \$380 million for local matching funds. These have come from local tax revenues to our capital budget. So I wanted to indicate that we have not only talked about supporting Metro, but we have.

This year's subsidy for Metrorail and Metrobus is over \$100 million, which is larger than the budgets of some cities. In fact, 1988, Atlantic City's entire budget was \$91 million. So, again, we have put our money where our hearts and our mouths are.

I am sure you have heard, Mr. Chairman, the reason why we need this funding, why we need the additional 13.5 miles completed. But from the District's point of view, it's even more critical because a significant amount of the unfinished rail system is in Washington, DC.

The green line is finally going to Anacostia, which is heavily transit dependent. This additional money will enable us to take the green line from the Anacostia station on through to Maryland.

Also our 14th and U station is coming on line in, I think, 1991. But we need to go from Columbia Heights to Fort Totten and then from Fort Totten on in to Greenbelt. Also there's a gap in the green line in Maryland.

So we feel very strongly that the Federal Government's interest is well served by this authorization.

A significant number of people work in Washington for the Federal Government. Out of the 600,000-odd jobs in Washington, over 300,000 of those jobs are from Maryland and Virginia, with a significant number being Federal Government employees, which means the Federal Government is served, like no other region, by the ability of its employees to get to work in a timely and efficient manner.

Also, Mr. Chairman, let me just indicate that this region has been together, all jurisdictions have been together, in support of Metro, not only just Metro, but the Metropolitan Council of Governments with its 19 jurisdictions, have agreed almost unanimously on everything.

The only area that we have a disagreement with—it is not unanimous, and Mr. Parris is a minority dissenter in this—is about Lorton, but in terms of air quality, in terms of waste water treatment plant, in terms of all of the things that affect this region, we're together.

So, on behalf of the executive branch of the D.C. government, we would like very much to go on record as supporting this bill, recognizing the longstanding partnership arrangement that the Federal and local government has.

You heard by my representative on the Metro Board, Gladys Mack, who has been a champion of Metro. She's also Chair of our parole board, so she has several jobs.

But it is vital that the current construction minimum be maintained, we complete the entire 103-mile system at a pace that avoids inevitable costs.

Mr. Chairman, finally what happens is a Catch-22 situation. We're going to build this 103-mile system. It's a question of when and how. The longer we wait, the more it costs. So we need to get on with it so we can keep it on schedule.

Also, as you know, in 1988 the American Public Transit Association determined that the D.C. metropolitan area Metro system was the best transit system in America.

No offense to any other jurisdiction, but we're just proud of the fact that W.M.A.T.A. is America's subway. We're proud of Metro-rail, our recognition by the American Public Transit Association.

We're very hopeful that this committee will vote unanimously to support this and take it to the full committee and into the House of Representatives.

I think it's significant that this morning you heard from all four Senators, two from Maryland, two from Virginia, and the area's Congress people. So this is a nonpartisan effort on the part of all of us who live in this region because Washington is our Nation's Capital.

We want it to remain the number one city in America. No offense to your hometown, Mr. Chairman, but obviously I'm a little biased about your second hometown.

Again, thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mayor Barry follows:]



STATEMENT OF  
MAYOR MARION BARRY, JR.  
BEFORE THE  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
SUB-COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT  
OPERATIONS & METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS  
THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1989  
9:30 a.m.  
LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
ROOM 1310A

MR. CHAIRMAN:

THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT TESTIMONY ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 1463 (H.R. 1463) A BILL TO AMEND THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1969. THIS AMENDMENT WILL AUTHORIZE THE EXPENDITURE OF \$2.16 BILLION TO COMPLETE THE FULL 103 MILE ADOPTED REGIONAL METRORAIL SYSTEM.

THE CREATION OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY IN 1960, THE FORERUNNER OF WMATA, WAS THE BEGINNING OF A PARTNERSHIP ENTERED INTO BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, THE STATE OF MARYLAND AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA. WMATA HAD ITS FIRST GROUNDBREAKING CEREMONY IN 1969 AT THE JUDICIARY SQUARE STATION IN THE DISTRICT.

PRIOR AUTHORIZATIONS FOR METRORAIL HAVE FUNDED EIGHTY-NINE AND ONE-HALF MILES OF THE 103 MILE SYSTEM. H.R. 1463 WOULD AUTHORIZE THE ADDITIONAL THIRTEEN AND ONE-HALF MILES.

EFFICIENT AND AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION IS ESSENTIAL FOR THE RESIDENTS OF THE CITY AND THE REGION. THE INTEGRATED METROBUS AND METRORAIL SYSTEMS HAVE CONSISTENTLY PROVIDED THE RELIABILITY, THE DEPENDABILITY AND THE SAFETY THAT OUR CITIZENS DEMAND.

METRO IS ALSO VITAL FOR ITS SERVICE TO THE CONGRESS AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. IN FACT, A MAJOR CRITERIA USED BY THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (GSA) IN EVALUATING POTENTIAL LOCATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT FACILITIES IS THE WALKING DISTANCE TO METRORAIL AND METROBUS.

WASHINGTON, D.C., THE NATION'S CAPITAL IS THE HUB OF THE NINTH LARGEST METROPOLITAN AREA IN THE COUNTRY. ITS TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT RESIDENTS COME FROM ALL OVER THE COUNTRY AND THE WORLD TO PARTICIPATE IN THE AFFAIRS OF THE CITY AND THE REGION. METRORAIL SERVED THE TRANSPORTATION NEEDS FOR MANY OF THE ESTIMATED 19 MILLION VISITS TO WASHINGTON, D.C. IN 1987.

THOSE VISITS INCLUDED ABOUT 17 MILLION TOURISTS, AND ANOTHER TWO MILLION VISITS TO DO BUSINESS WITH CONGRESS, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, THE DIPLOMATIC COMMUNITY, THE WORLD BANKING COMMUNITY, TRADE ASSOCIATIONS, NON-PROFIT AND FOR PROFIT HEADQUARTERS ORGANIZATIONS, AND BUSINESSES OF ALL TYPES MANY OF WHICH ARE LOCATED NEAR RAIL AND/OR BUS SERVICES.

IT HAS BEEN NEARLY 20 YEARS SINCE THE FIRST GROUNDBREAKING IN 1969. NO ONE WHO WAS PRESENT AT THAT TIME COULD HAVE GUESSED THAT WE WOULD BE HERE TODAY WITH PORTIONS OF THE SYSTEM STILL NOT STARTED. THE PASSAGE OF THE TIME HAS BROUGHT ABOUT A GREAT DEAL OF GROWTH IN THE REGION, AND THE NEED FOR MASS TRANSPORTATION HAS GROWN RIGHT ALONG WITH IT.

ONE OF THE LONGEST AND MOST FRUSTRATING WAITS OVER THESE TWO DECADES HAS BEEN FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE GREEN LINE WHICH RUNS FROM GREENBELT, MARYLAND ON THE NORTH THROUGH SOME OF THE NEEDIEST COMMUNITIES IN THE DISTRICT, TO BRANCH AVENUE IN SOUTHERN MARYLAND. OF THE 13.5 MILES WHICH H.R. 1463 WILL FUND, OVER TEN OF THEM ARE GREEN LINE CONSTRUCTION, FIVE OF WHICH ARE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

COMPLETION OF THOSE FIVE MILES WILL ALLOW US TO CONNECT THE MID-CITY GREEN LINE SEGMENT IN NORTHWEST WASHINGTON AT U STREET, WITH GREEN LINE SEGMENTS CURRENTLY UNDER CONSTRUCTION IN NORTHEAST WASHINGTON AND IN PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY. WE CALL THIS MISSING LINK, THE 3 MILE GAP IN THE SYSTEM.

THE MID-CITY SERVICE AND THE OTHER 2 MILES OF DISTRICT SERVICE IN SOUTHEAST WASHINGTON WILL BRING THE MANY BENEFITS OF METRORAIL TO SOME OF THE MOST TRANSIT DEPENDENT COMMUNITIES IN THE ENTIRE REGION.

INITIALLY, PLANNERS THOUGHT THAT METRORAIL WOULD PRIMARILY SERVE THOSE WHO WERE COMMUTING INTO THE CITY; HOWEVER, WITH THE PHENOMENAL GROWTH OF THE SUBURBS, THE SO-CALLED "REVERSE COMMUTE" IS INCREASINGLY BECOMING A TRANSPORTATION NEED. SEVERAL YEARS AGO, I ORGANIZED A SUBURBAN EMPLOYMENT INITIATIVE, WORKING WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND BUSINESSMEN IN THE REGION, TO HELP FACILITATE TRANSPORTATION FOR INNER CITY RESIDENTS TO JOBS IN THE OUTLYING AREAS. THE PROGRAM WAS VERY SUCCESSFUL.

THE COST OF TRANSPORTATION, LIKE OTHER PUBLIC SERVICES, HAS INCREASED SUBSTANTIALLY OVER THE YEARS. HOWEVER, NO MATTER WHAT THE REQUIREMENT, METRO HAS ENJOYED THE UNWAVERING FINANCIAL COMMITMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, THE STATE OF MARYLAND, THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA AND THE INDIVIDUAL JURISDICTIONS WHO PARTICIPATE IN METRO'S CAPITAL AND OPERATING FUNDS REQUIREMENTS. WE HAVE REMAINED UNITED IN OUR SUPPORT FOR METRO AND DILIGENT IN CARRYING OUT OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO PURSUE COST CONTAINMENT MEASURES AND TO ASSURE THAT COSTS ARE REASONABLY DISTRIBUTED BETWEEN THE GENERAL TAXPAYER AND THE METRO RIDER.

WE ARE PLEASED TO SEE THAT THE CONTRIBUTION LEVEL PROPOSED IN H.R. 1463 CONTEMPLATES A COMMITMENT FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT THAT CLOSELY APPROXIMATES THAT OF STARK-HARRIS. THIS COMMITMENT, I BELIEVE, RECOGNIZES THE LONG-STANDING PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENT; THE FEDERAL AND LOCAL SERVICE BASE FOR METRO; AND THE REALISTIC CAPABILITIES OF THE PARTICIPATING GOVERNMENTS.

FINALLY MR. CHAIRMAN, LET ME CONGRATULATE THE AUTHORS OF H.R. 1463 AND THE COMMITTEE, FOR YOUR TIMELINESS IN PROPOSING THIS LEGISLATION. IT IS VITAL THAT THE CURRENT CONSTRUCTION MOMENTUM BE MAINTAINED, AND THAT WE COMPLETE THE ENTIRE 103-MILE SYSTEM AT A PACE THAT AVOIDS THE INEVITABLE COST ESCALATION THAT COMES FROM LONG DELAYS SUCH AS THAT WE HAVE EXPERIENCED OVER THE YEARS.

METRORAIL IS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THIS REGION OF 3.4 MILLION PEOPLE AND THE MANY ADDITIONAL MILLIONS WHO COME HERE EACH YEAR. IT IS APPROPRIATELY CALLED "AMERICA'S SUBWAY."

IN ADDITION, WE ARE PROUD OF METRORAIL'S RECOGNITION BY THE AMERICAN PUBLIC TRANSIT ASSOCIATION IN 1988 AS THE BEST TRANSIT SYSTEM IN NORTH AMERICA--AN AWARD IT RICHLY DESERVES.

THANK YOU FOR ALLOWING ME TO APPEAR TODAY. I WILL BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I will admit to being biased for my hometown also, but no offense is taken as we all do consider—whether we are originally from Washington, DC or not, we all recognize it as our Capital City.

We're proud of the record that the W.M.A.T.A. administration has maintained here. I think all of us are supportive of that kind of quality administration that you have promoted during your tenure as Mayor.

I now call upon the chairman of the city council, David Clarke.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. DAVID A. CLARKE, CHAIRMAN, COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Mr. CLARKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to appreciate your leadership in this issue as well as the correspondence your office has had with mine, recognizing the sensitivity of my schedule this afternoon. I appreciate that very much. Given that, I will submit my statement for the record and just highlight a couple portions of it.

The Metro system's benefit, I think, have been clearly outlined in the hearings before you: employees' benefit, visitors' benefit, employers' benefit, business' benefit, local governments' benefit. The culture and recreational joie de vivre of the community is increased.

Our ridership has increased steadily on both Metrobus and Metrorail, even during periods when neither miles of the system nor the hours of its operation were increased. The word has gotten around that Metro is a success.

As glamorous as it is, it is still a work in progress, however. Although a 103-mile rail system was officially adopted, construction has only been authorized for 89.5 miles. Metro is in the final stages of completing the authorized work.

I want to speak, for the remainder of my testimony, about what has not been done, what has not been planned into the system, at least what has been taken out of the plans.

It affects a portion of the city running from 14th and U Streets, Northwest, north through the Columbia Heights neighborhood, 14th and Irving Streets, Northwest and then turns east and goes through the remainder of ward 1 into ward 4 out to ward 5 to join up with the authorized portion of the green line at Fort Totten Station.

It was my benefit and my great honor to represent that particular ward, ward 1, which includes the 14th and U Station and the Columbia Heights area, for the first 8 years of home rule in the first 8 years of my public service career.

While I represent the entire city now, I do continue to feel the sensitivities of that neighborhood. But you, having been excluded from everything good and admitted to everything bad that happens in this city, as you may know, that was the neighborhood which experienced the brunt of the 1968 difficulties in our city.

It is a community which has held together, however. Its people have stuck together to be sure that when the community comes back, they will be there to enjoy its coming back.

They worked early through the 14th Street Project Committee, which does not exist anymore, through the Columbia Heights Metro Action Committee, which doesn't exist anymore, to assure that the line would come through that area and that it would make the turns that were necessary to save the homes in the area.

Unfortunately, all the way along the green line, there have been fights. There was a fight in our area, I guess, 16 years ago, when the line was to turn east, a little bit north of where it was ultimately designed to turn east.

Then we had some more fights to the east of us. Then we had fights out in Prince Georges County as to what route it was to take there.

The fights are all now resolved in the local community. Everybody is sure of what line it ought to take. The problem is that the Federal Government dropped out of a portion of it.

The portion that it dropped out of was the portion in our city and, unfortunately, the sister portion of a lot of other cities that always get dropped out of the good programs.

This community is very much in need of the Metro line. It, together with ward 8, which will be served by the green line, are the most employment needy areas of the city, where we have the highest levels of unemployment, the highest level of service dependent population, the lowest levels of car ownership in the city. This area just really needs to be served.

I would urge your committee to do everything possible to see to it that that forgotten area, in terms of Metro, will not be forgotten any longer.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Councilman Clarke follows:]



STATEMENT OF  
DAVID CLARKE  
CHAIRMAN  
COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
BEFORE THE  
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND METROPOLITAN  
AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE  
OF THE  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
MAY 4, 1989

As Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, I am pleased to appear before you today to represent the support of my constituents for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and to urge you to report favorably on HR 1463, the National Capital Transportation Amendments of 1989.

Congress was farsighted and wise when it created METRO in 1966. Through the compact that serves as METRO's constitution, the federal government, the District of Columbia, the states of Maryland and Virginia and some of their local jurisdictions, have forged a partnership that has created a transit system whose success is second to none in North America.

The fruits of METRO's success are almost too numerous to mention. But, to name a few:

1. Employees of the federal government and private sectors benefit from fast, safe, and reliable transportation;
2. Visitors from around the nation and around the world spend less time negotiating unfamiliar traffic patterns and more time enjoying the sights and participating in democracy by visiting with their elected officials;
3. Employers with offices near METRO have access to employees from throughout the region;

4. Businesses benefit from the large number of potential customers who walk in front of their stores on their way to and from the METRO;
5. Commuters and visitors who drive benefit from reduced highway congestion as a result of the million METRO trips taken on the bus and rail every day;
6. Local governments, to the extent that they cluster residential and business development around their METRO stations, require fewer expenditures for roads and other infrastructure;
7. Cultural and recreational opportunities are expanded because METRO takes out the hassle of driving and parking; and
8. All of us who breathe benefit from reductions in car exhaust that result when people ride METRO.

And do they ride? Ridership has increased steadily on both Metrobus and Metrorail even during periods when neither the miles of the system nor its hours of operation were increased. When something works, word gets around. As you know, the word got around to the American Public Transit Association which awarded METRO for being the outstanding large transit system in North America.

As glorious as METRO is, it remains a "work in progress." Although a 103-mile rail system was officially adopted, construction has only been authorized up to 89.5 miles. METRO is in the final stages of completing the authorized work. Ironically, it is the attainment of 89.5 miles of track that makes authorization of funds for system completion so compelling.

In late 1993, the Green Line from Greenbelt will be carrying passengers toward the station at Fort Totten. However, because construction of the Green Line between Fort Totten and U Street has not been authorized, all passengers will have to disembark at Fort Totten and attempt to board trains already crowded with passengers from Wheaton and Silver Spring. It is imperative for the safe and efficient operation of the system that funding be provided to complete this vital link in the Metrorail system.

This segment of the Green Line will serve the Shaw, Cardozo, Columbia Heights, and Petworth neighborhoods. These neighborhoods have high concentrations of transit dependent households. These households, at the low end of the economic ladder, have waited patiently for the expanded employment opportunities that rapid transit will bring. It would truly be penny wise and pound foolish to abandon Metrorail completion and dash the hopes of those for whom hope is in such short supply.

From the earliest days of this nation, government has subsidized transportation infrastructure to support economic and social needs. In the beginning, port facilities and canals were the subject of this effort. Later, railroads, interstate highways, and airports became the recipients of assistance.

Over the past 20 years, the District of Columbia has supported regional transportation needs and been a major advocate for the Metrorail system. The District was one of the first urban areas in the nation to forego major interstate highway construction, and instead devote those funds to transit. Over \$2 billion in Metrorail construction, much of it in the suburban jurisdictions, has been funded by highway entitlements transferred by the District.

The Adopted Regional System, all 103 miles, represents a commitment by the federal government to work in partnership with the state and local governments of the region to produce a transportation system that will meet national and regional needs. We appreciate the introduction of legislation designed to fulfill this commitment, to sustain this unique and successful partnership, and to keep hope alive.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Clarke. Let me ask you, Mr. Clarke and Mayor Barry, very briefly, if I may: I do recognize the unusual financial commitment that you have made to the Metro over the years with the taking of the interstate highway funding that you would have received and applying it to the Metro system, but it's my understanding that those funds—since those funds will no longer be available to you, what is your plan for financing your local share of the funding that would be required?

Mayor BARRY. Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out earlier, in addition to the \$2.3 billion highway transfer, we have matched our local share with \$380 million of local capital money. We intend to continue that.

But we are now able to issue bonds, as other cities are, and we will just have a bond issue and say it will be part of our overall capital program that will take care of our share, our local share.

We've always met our commitment in that regard.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Mayor, I know this may be a little bit premature, but the administration is going to be testifying this afternoon, and I think one of the things they're suggesting is that the matched ratio ought to be different than it is now, that it shouldn't be the 80/20 match.

If the match were to be significantly different, would that put any onerous burden on the District of Columbia or would it affect your ability to participate in finishing the full adopted system?

Mayor BARRY. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman, it would. Our charter limits us to capital borrowings of 14 percent of our revenues. We have been good financial managers, and we have been prudent with balancing our budget for the last several years.

Last year we missed it by \$15 million. We have about 9 percent now of our revenues in capital borrowings, which means the more we have to borrow to make our share.

Either other projects that are important to the citizens of Washington would suffer or we would not be able to contribute our full fair share.

I'm of the notion that when you look at the Metro, you can't compare it with any other city as far as the Federal Government participation. I've heard the argument once before: If we do it for the Washington area, why not the Los Angeles area? Why not the Chicago area? But there's no other city and region in America that does this.

But the bottom line is that we would have to struggle to match more than 20 percent. Obviously, if the Congress, in their wisdom, decides to change it, which I hope it wouldn't, we would have to look awfully hard at some other projects we would have to cancel, such as the school building or recreation center or a road or some other capital needs that we have or a jail.

See, here you are, Mr. Parris, in Lorton. You don't mind sacrificing that, do you?

Mr. PARRIS. I heard you the first time.

Mayor BARRY. Also, Mr. Chairman, let me say that the District has made some tough decisions about realignment. No one likes to make decisions about where homes will be taken. We have done it with a minimum amount of taking of homes.

But, again, it cost me some political difficulties to decide to go out the New Hampshire route where we're going. But, again, it demonstrates leadership, but it also demonstrates our commitment to the system.

Mr. Chairman, let me also mention, since I'm talking, we have a program with Fairfax County and Montgomery County, where we have gotten about 7,000 jobs for D.C. residents in those counties.

The Metro system has helped us to do that because people who don't have cars, who don't know how to get around in Virginia have been able to use that system to go out there to work.

Therefore, that has also been a good part of the Metro program.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Questions or comments, Mr. Parris?

Mr. PARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have any precise questions to address these two gentlemen. I would just say to both of them, over time there have been occasions when we didn't see exactly alike on some of these important matters of public policy or position.

I will say publicly that I think in many instances, that has been grossly exaggerated. You will recall, Mr. Mayor, the efforts of many of us in what I thought was a proper and effective approach to the problems of the sludge disposal area, the snow removal program, the recent action in terms of the bill for additional police officers and court expansions, and the progress on the new jail in the District of Columbia, things of that kind. It has been my pleasure to be a part of that and, as well, of this.

It has been said many times here this morning, and I think it is worth repeating, that the Metro system is critical to the future not just of the core city of the District of Columbia, but to the suburbs as well and to those of us who call that part of this area home.

So I am delighted to welcome you gentlemen's support to this legislation. We have high hopes for it. We're optimistic about it. We look forward to working with you on it in the future.

Thank you.

Mayor BARRY. Mr. Parris, let me express my appreciation for your leadership. Obviously, you have a different constituency than mine. From time to time you have to make different kinds of decisions.

But outside of maybe one or two issues, we've been basically together on issues. The longer we stay together, the better we work together. So I appreciate your support of this and support of other important projects affecting the region and the District.

Mr. PARRIS. Well, I appreciate your saying that, Marion. The problem is you'd better hurry, because I'm only going to be here about another 6 months.

Mayor BARRY. Well, I have enjoyed working with Governor Bales. As I've indicated, you'll probably win the Republican nomination. We Democrats will have a good time with you.

Mr. PARRIS. Thank you.

Mr. WHEAT. We appreciate the statements from all three of you gentlemen.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Chairman, may I just add to that point?

Mr. WHEAT. Certainly.

Mr. CLARKE. Relative to the question that you raised, that cost would have been much lower for both the Federal Government and the District of Columbia had the Federal Government kept its original commitment.

So for the Federal Government to change the stakes together, if, in fact, they do in terms of their testimony as to the match, is really grossly unfair.

Second, the Mayor indicated, and I think I did, too, that we have already paid the political and the heart rending intercommunity conflict price within the community of settling the differences, sometimes by fiat, that the route will go this way.

That is a price that we had to pay. The city has already paid beyond just the dollars that it has put into the system.

It should proceed ahead at least according to the original formula, even if it cannot proceed ahead according to the original cost.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Clarke and Mr. Mayor. We appreciate, and we know from talking to your staffs, that you both had extremely busy schedules today. We appreciate your making time to appear with us.

Your statements will be made a part of the record. We look forward to working with you in completion of the full 103-mile Metro-rail system.

Mr. CLARKE. Thank you.

Mayor BARRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I see our distinguished Congressman Fauntroy coming in. It is always a pleasure to see our outstanding Congressman.

Mr. WHEAT. Before you go, let me recognize the distinguished Delegate from the District of Columbia who has just returned from making a statement on the Congressional Black Caucus budget on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Fauntroy, do you wish to make a statement and give any questions for the Mayor or the chairman?

Mr. FAUNTROY. Thank you. I simply want to thank our distinguished Mayor and distinguished chairman of the council for what I know has been excellent testimony.

As the chairman indicated, our constructive alternative budget is now being debated on the floor of the House, a process which you may recall I began when I was Chair of the caucus in 1981.

I did want to be there to make the point that the budget which we propose does call for adequate spending on America's infrastructure and certainly would accommodate the funding that this bill, with the unanimous support of a bipartisan coalition of Members of the House and Senate from this region, would go a long way toward realizing a part of that goal while completing a commitment the Federal Government made with Stark-Harris and which we intend to see to it that it meets, thanks to the wisdom that you've imparted in your testimony.

Mr. CLARKE. Thank you, Congressman.

Mayor BARRY. Thank you.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you very much.

The next witness will be the county executive of Montgomery County, Hon. Sidney Kramer. There are many jurisdictions that are involved; one that certainly has as much of an interest as any, is Montgomery county.



Mr. Kramer, we'd be very happy to hear your testimony at this time.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. SIDNEY KRAMER, COUNTY EXECUTIVE OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY**

Mr. KRAMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, it is indeed a pleasure to submit this statement for the record in support of H.R. 1463, the bill to provide funding authorization to complete the 103-mile Metrorail adopted regional system.

I might say that I've personally been exposed to this process now since 1970, when I was first elected to the Montgomery County Council. Those years have run by, and I've seen what was at that time simply a dream come into fruition.

Now we're on the brink of completion, and I would hope that, through your collective good judgment, we will, indeed, very soon see the completion of this dream.

One of the basic roles of government, aside from common defense, equal protection, and equal opportunity, is the provision of transportation infrastructure.

Among the first acts of the First Congress was the establishment of the post roads for the delivery of mail and to facilitate travel between our States.

Today our Nation is an urban one and our citizens require the ability to travel within our urban regions without gridlock threatening our safety, our environment, and our commerce.

In the National Capital area, the responsibility for mobility has historically been shared between the Federal Government, the State government, and local governments acting in partnership.

The subcommittee may recall that the Metro concept began in 1962 as a federally endorsed project, and I emphasize that it was then, as it is today, a federally endorsed project, by the National Capital Transportation Agency.

That plan proposed rail transit service to Rockville, Vienna, Springfield, Greenbelt, Rosecroft, and up through the Adams/Morgan area in the District of Columbia. The plan recognized that the travel requirements of the Federal region would not be met effectively unless the rail system extended out to the suburban centers.

In 1966 the States of Virginia and Maryland, in concert with the Congress, enacted legislation to create an interstate compact agency for the express purpose of a long-term relationship to construct, operate, and maintain a rapid transit system for the region. This compact, unique in public transportation, has served the Federal Government and this region well over 23 years, since its very inception.

It is vital to recognize the transportation systems in the National Capital region must function in a coordinated and well-planned fashion if the public and private sectors are to function efficiently.

It is appropriate, therefore, for this subcommittee to approach this legislation not just in the context of rail construction costs, but as a matter of how effectively and efficiently this region functions as the Nation's Capital.

In addition to serving the Federal agencies, their staff, and related private entities, Metro is used extensively by visitors from throughout the Nation who come to visit the Nation's Capital.

These visitors come to see how their Government functions, to meet their congressional representatives, and to view the memorials and museums.

At the Shady Grove Metro stop, there is a 3,000-car parking lot. We have noted license tags from 30 different States on a single day.

The Government could not function effectively on a day-to-day basis in this region if this influx of visitors all brought their cars into downtown Washington. Nor does the Government want to discourage these visitors from visiting their Nation's Capital.

We should consider the cost of not completing the final 13.5 miles of the Metro system, including the real costs associated with street congestion and lack of access to jobs. This access was referenced by Mayor Barry just a moment ago.

Economic revitalization in the core of this region could not have occurred without the presence of Metro. This point is no better demonstrated than in those of the District of Columbia and suburban corridors where planned Metro lines are not yet under construction and where there is a very dire, immediate need.

A very real cost to both regional and national economies is the social costs incurred when a significant segment of our society has restricted earning power because it does not have good access to the jobs available.

The chronic imbalance between underemployment in the District of Columbia and the difficulty in filling jobs in the suburbs will not be corrected until the region is unified by building the remainder of the 103-mile Metrorail system.

In the case of my own jurisdiction, Montgomery County, this legislation would fund completion of the final 1.3 miles of Metro's red line from Wheaton to Glenmont. This last segment would maximize use of the red line, which is scheduled for September 1990 extension to Wheaton as a temporary terminal.

The final segment to Glenmont would include construction of a train inspection and storage yard, which is vital to safe operation of the red line, Metro's most heavily used line.

This yard is so essential that the Federal Department of Transportation 12 years ago authorized Metro to purchase the land for the yard, even though construction financing was not then in hand.

We do not expect the Federal Government to finance the entire transportation system in this region, nor all of our mass transit needs. Throughout this region, there are substantial local and State expenditures for transportation separate and apart from federally assisted projects. Again, that point was emphasized by Mayor Barry.

In my community, in my county, we have spent over \$200 million in 100-percent locally funded road and transit improvements over the last 5 years just to support the Metro project. We will spend another \$400 million in county funds in the next 6 years for construction and improvement of roads throughout our community.

From my own jurisdiction's standpoint, I can say without reservation that Metro continues to be a roaring success. Specifically,

the red line to Shady Grove, completed in 1984, now carries 100,000 riders a day, 20 percent above our original projections for this stage.

Three key factors have contributed to this success: Number one, Federal funding, with local matching grants, for rail construction; number two, locally funded roads, parking, and feeder buses for better access to the stations; and, third, private sector, private sector involvement in transit fare subsidies for employees.

In Montgomery County, 150 private companies provide discounted transit passes or other incentives to encourage their employees to use our rail system.

The lesson we have learned is it takes a combination of Federal, State, and local funding and the private sector involvement to expand transit's appeal and success. This has been a complete partnership.

Further, the Shady Grove red line has proven that the outer ends of the subway system, as proposed for the Glenmont, Branch Avenue, and Springfield lines, are essential elements of the regional system and do attract significant ridership.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the subcommittee to consider the following points as it reviews this legislative proposal. First, this is the National Capital region.

Second, there is a direct Federal interest in how transportation infrastructure is constructed and operates in this region. Such a system cannot be effective if long-planned segments of this system remain unfunded and unbuilt.

Third, to maximize the transportation investment already made by the Federal, State, and local governments, there must continue to be a combination of Federal, State, and local resources applied to finish the Metro job that we mutually contracted to in 1966.

While I speak for Montgomery County in support of this legislation, I also want to associate myself with the testimony that you received from Governor Schaefer's office this morning, from Prince Georges county executive, with statements made on the floor of the Congress by Senators Sarbanes and Mikulski, Representatives Morella, Hoyer, and McMillen, and from other elected officials from the District of Columbia and Virginia, with whom we have always joined in support of the full 103-mile system.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I appreciate your patience in spending a day of your very valuable time on this subject. I would hope that you will concur with our testimony and support this proposal before the full Congress.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of County Executive Kramer follows:]

*Montgomery County Government*

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

Sidney Kramer  
County Executive  
(301) 217-2500  
TTY 279-1085

STATEMENT OF SIDNEY KRAMER  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY EXECUTIVE

BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS

May 4, 1989

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, it is a pleasure to submit this statement for the record in support of H.R. 1463, the bill to provide funding authorization to complete the 103-mile Metrorail Adopted Regional System.

Historical Context

One of the basic roles of government, aside from common defense, equal protection, and equal opportunity, is the provision of transportation infrastructure. Among the first acts of the first Congress, was the establishment of the Post Roads, for the delivery of mail and to facilitate travel between the States. Today, our nation is an urban one, and our citizens require the ability to travel within our urban regions without gridlock threatening our safety, our environment, and our commerce. In the National Capital Area, the responsibility for mobility has historically been shared between the Federal, State, and local governments, acting in concert.

The Subcommittee may recall that the Metro concept began in 1962 as a federally endorsed project by the National Capital Transportation Agency, a

federal agency. That plan proposed rail transit service to Rockville, Vienna, Springfield, Greenbelt, Rosecroft, and up through Adams-Morgan. The plan recognized that the travel requirements of the federal region would not be met effectively unless the rail system extended out to suburban centers.

In 1966, the States of Virginia and Maryland in concert with the Congress, enacted legislation to create an Interstate Compact agency for the express purpose of a long term relationship to construct, operate and maintain a rapid transit system for the region. This Compact, unique in public transportation, has served the federal government and this region well over the 23 years since its inception.

#### The Federal Interest

It is vital to recognize that transportation systems in the National Capital region must function in a coordinated and well planned fashion if the public and private sectors are to function efficiently. It is appropriate therefore for this Subcommittee to approach this legislation not just in the context of rail construction costs, but as a matter of how effectively this region functions as the Nation's Capital.

In addition to serving the Federal agencies, their staff, and related private entities, Metro is used extensively by visitors from throughout the nation. These visitors come to see how their government functions, to meet their Congressional representatives, and to view the memorials and museums. At the Shady Grove Metro 3000-car parking lot, we have noted license tags from 30 different states on a single day! The government could not function effectively on a day-to-day basis in this region if this influx of visitors

all brought their cars into downtown Washington; nor does the government want to discourage these visitors.

Costs of Not Completing 103 Miles

We should consider the cost of not completing the final 13.5 miles of the Metro system, including the real costs associated with street congestion and lack of access to jobs. Economic revitalization in the core of this region could not have occurred without the presence of Metro. This point is no better demonstrated than in those D.C. and suburban corridors where planned Metro lines are not yet under construction.

A very real cost to both regional and national economies is the social costs incurred, when a significant segment of our society has restricted earning power because it does not have good access to jobs. The chronic imbalance between underemployment in the District of Columbia, and the difficulty in filling jobs in the suburbs will not be corrected until the region is unified by building the remainder of the 103-mile Metrorail system.

Impact in Montgomery County

In the case of my own jurisdiction, this legislation would fund completion of the final 1.3 miles of Metro's Red Line from Wheaton to Glenmont. This last segment would maximize use of the Red Line which is scheduled for September 1990 extension to Wheaton as a temporary terminal. The final segment to Glenmont would include construction of a train inspection and storage yard which is vital to safe operation on the Red Line, Metro's most heavily used line. This yard is so essential that the Federal Department of Transportation, 12 years ago, authorized Metro to purchase the land for the yard, even though construction financing was not in hand.

We do not expect the federal government to finance the entire transportation system in this region, nor all of our mass transit needs. Throughout this region, there are substantial local and State expenditures for transportation separate and apart from federally assisted projects. In my County, we have spent over \$200 million in 100% locally funded road and transit improvements over the last five years just to support the Metro project. We will spend another \$400 million in County funds in the next six years for construction and improvement of roads throughout the County.

From my own jurisdiction's standpoint, I can say without reservation that Metro continues to be a roaring success. Specifically, the Red Line to Shady Grove, completed in 1984, now carries 100,000 riders a day, 20 percent above earlier projections. Three key factors have contributed to this success: (1) federal funding, with local matching grants, for rail construction; (2) locally funded roads, parking, and feeder buses for better access to stations; and (3) private sector involvement in transit fare subsidies for employees. In Montgomery County 150 companies provide discounted transit passes or other incentives to encourage their employees to ride transit.

The lesson we have learned is that it takes a combination of federal, state, and local funding, and private sector involvement, to expand transit's appeal and success. Further, the Shady Grove Red Line has proven that the outer ends of the subway system, as proposed for the Glenmont, Branch Avenue, and Springfield lines are essential elements of the regional system and do attract significant ridership.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I would urge the Subcommittee to consider the following points as it reviews this legislation:

1. This is the national capital region.
2. There is a direct federal interest in how the transportation infrastructure is constructed and operates in this region. Such a system cannot be effective if long-planned segments of this system remain unfunded and unbuilt.
3. To maximize the transportation investment already made by federal, state and local governments, there must continue to be a combination of federal, state and local resources applied to finish the Metro job that we mutually agreed to in 1966.

While I speak for Montgomery County in support of this legislation, I also want to associate myself with testimony you may receive today from Governor Schaefer, from the Prince George's County Executive, with statements made on the floor of the Congress by Senators Sarbanes and Mikulski, and Representatives Morella, Hoyer, and McMillen, and from the other elected officials from D.C. and Virginia with whom we have always joined in support of the full 103-mile rail system.

####



Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Kramer. I don't have any questions. Let me just say that we recognize that you individually and Montgomery County have indicated to us a strong commitment to the future of the Metro system. We appreciate that commitment and your willingness to fund and see the project through to the end.

Mr. Parris.

Mr. PARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me just say, Mr. Kramer, I appreciate your testimony, and I was particularly struck by your statement that you're going to spend another \$400 million in county funds in the next 6 years for construction, improvement of roads, and so forth.

I congratulate you on that. I think that is frequently overlooked. The system itself, the Metro system, has to have assistance in permitting its ridership to and from.

Now, the old question about kiss and ride was gone a long time ago. What happens now is you kiss each other bye at the house and you both get in your cars and you go in different directions, each to a job.

I'm not an expert on it, but I understand that in the BART system, the Bay Area Rapid Transit in San Francisco, the local jurisdiction has basically looked to the subway system to "fix the problem," unquote.

They did not utilize the opportunity that they had to put particular effort into access to the system itself. And it ultimately got in real financial difficulty.

So I congratulate you on your continued dedication to the improvement of a balanced transportation system, including, obviously, Metro itself.

Thank you for being here.

Mr. KRAMER. That reference that I made to the local commitment did not include many of the satellite parking lots that we are building to encourage people to park their cars and then use other forms of transit down to the Metrorail system.

I am very pleased to have sitting at my side my Congress person, Congresswoman Connie Morella. Thank you.

Mrs. MORELLA. Thank you.

Mr. WHEAT. Let me mention, Mr. Kramer, that Mrs. Morella did testify this morning, and your now having associated yourself with her remarks, while your remarks were very, very good, I think you've improved them to the quality of excellent by having associated them with her.

Mr. KRAMER. I concur totally.

Mr. WHEAT. Mrs. Morella, we would be glad to have you appear again at this time.

Mrs. MORELLA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

This is a wonderful committee, as you know, Mr. County Executive. I came here, really, to introduce to the committee our county executive for Montgomery County and you see how promptly they act.

This man has deep roots in the region. He really does. I first met him when he was on the county council in Montgomery County. Then he went on to serve in the State legislature, where he was in the State senate for 8 years, while I was on the house side. Then he went on to become our third county executive.

I must say I think we are testimony, too, to the bipartisanship that goes on in Montgomery County, Maryland. Certainly Sid Kramer, to his credit, has pulled all sides together in terms of solving our community problems and our regional problems.

In so doing, transportation is one of the key issues that is of concern to all of our constituents in the region.

So I really came to give him moral support, to introduce him to the committee, but you have given him such a hospitable reception I appreciate it.

We did all testify this morning, the Members of the House delegation and the Members of the Senate delegation, on behalf of the funding. This committee also has Mr. Parris, who has been instrumental in this bill, and other members who are Mr. Fauntroy and Mr. Rohrabacher, who is one of the newer members, from California, who has had some very good questions that he has asked.

So thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mrs. Morella, for taking time to join us again this afternoon.

Thank you, Mr. Kramer.

Mr. KRAMER. Thank you.

Mr. WHEAT. The entire proceeding is beginning to remind me of the television commercials. I believe it's the—I hate to say it, but it's the Honda commercial, where they keep looking for someone to find something negative to say about the product.

We haven't managed to do that so far in our proceedings.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I don't want to miss the opportunity to remind the committee that, although we're delighted to have Mr. Rohrabacher here, he at times emulated the skunk at the proverbial picnic this morning in his questions, although I'm encouraged by the fact that I think he's still a little ambivalent about his final position in this matter.

Mrs. MORELLA. But he returned this afternoon.

Mr. WHEAT. We are encouraged by the fact that Mr. Rohrabacher is back to hear the testimony this afternoon.

If there are questions or comments that you have at this time, Mr. Rohrabacher, we would appreciate it. [No response.]

Thank you very much, Mr. Kramer.

Thank you, Mrs. Morella.

Mrs. MORELLA. Thank you.

Mr. KRAMER. Connie, thank you for everything.

Mr. WHEAT. Our next witnesses will be a panel composed of the chairwoman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Hon. Audrey Moore; the chairwoman of the Arlington County Board of Supervisors, Hon. Ellen Bozman; and the mayor of the city of Alexandria, Hon. James P. Moran.

Would you please come forward? Mrs. Moore, of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, would you begin the testimony for this panel?

#### TESTIMONY OF HON. AUDREY MOORE, CHAIRWOMAN, FAIRFAX BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mrs. MOORE. Well, I'm very honored to be here. You have a written statement from the county, which I'm not going to read to you

because I think you have all the statistics there and the information.

Mr. WHEAT. Without objection, all of your written statements will be made a part of the permanent record of the committee.

Mrs. MOORE. Very good. What I would tell you is that transportation is the single most important issue to us in northern Virginia. Mass transportation is of paramount importance to the future of this area.

While there are different traffic patterns now in northern Virginia than there were when the original Metro system was designed and we, therefore, also are trying to provide H.O.V. lanes and bus systems and bus service to the transit because of the job centers that are scattered around the suburbs, the push always is going to be from the central city out. The major traffic will always be carried in that direction.

We are so fortunate now to have the Huntington Station in the southern part of our county and to have Vienna in the northern part of the county. It has made a tremendous difference in people's driving habits and in their commuter habits.

The county is now subsidizing fares to take people on the bus to those stations. We have reduced the fares to 25 cents because we want to encourage it. The bus service is picking up dramatically.

Where we have the great need is in the 95 corridor at Springfield. That will not only serve to help Fairfax County; it will help Alexandria by taking some of the traffic off of Alexandria and out of Arlington; and it will also serve our neighbors to the south in Prince William County.

In fact, we have a regional endeavor going where we will provide commuter service as an extension of Metro down to Manassas and Fredericksburg on the existing railroads, the R.F. & P. and the Southern.

The county and the State and the Federal Government are working together on that project. With the help of Congressman Parris and the approval of Conrail, we will be ready to go and order equipment and get that service in.

So this station will not only serve the people in Fairfax County, but it will serve a much extended population in northern Virginia and almost down in central Virginia; right?; for commuting.

Fairfax County has spent a great deal of money on our transportation system, on the subsidies of buses, on getting buses ourselves, in terms of providing parking lots.

We are working with the Federal Government, with UMTA on a 50-percent partnership, to provide 2,000 additional spaces at Huntington and at Vienna and at this particular station location.

Temporarily, until we can get this station going, we will be carrying people from this area over to Van Dorn to get on the Metro system there.

But this particular station is badly needed. The corridor is probably the heaviest traveled corridor in the State of Virginia, Shirley Highway. It is backed up every day to way down in Prince William County.

Until you have seen that traffic, you can't imagine how bad traffic can be, because it simply does not move morning, noon, and night.

In addition to the parking lots, to the bus service, to the subsidies, and reducing the fares on bus service, Fairfax County has spent \$340 million directly on transportation in the last few years. I guess that's the last 6 years, to be exact.

We are planning to put as much money from this year's budget. We already have assigned \$27 million in our budget. We're hoping to find an additional \$20 million to \$30 million to \$40 million more to put into it. A developer in the area of the Springfield Station in connection with the shopping mall that's there intends to build a six-lane road that will connect the station to Franconia Road, the arterial corridor in that area, which is going to be a great help to that area.

This is of paramount importance to Fairfax County and to the region, the extension of the Metro system. If we want people to commute, we have to provide the facilities to make that convenient and accessible.

While all of us are doing as much as we can in terms of putting money into our transportation networks and into providing access to the rail stations, we can't do it by ourselves. We are going to depend on the original partnership agreement that we had with you to provide this service.

We very, very much appreciate your spending so much time with us today on this issue. We very much look to you for assistance.

[The prepared statement of County Chairwoman Moore follows:]

STATEMENT OF AUDREY MOORE, CHAIRMAN FAIRFAX COUNTY  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, ON H.R. 1463, TO AUTHORIZE  
FUNDING TO COMPLETE THE ADOPTED 103-MILE  
METRORAIL SYSTEM

GOOD AFTERNOON MR. CHAIRMAN AND DISTINGUISHED MEMBERS OF THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS & METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS.  
I AM AUDREY MOORE, CHAIRMAN OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY BOARD OF  
SUPERVISORS, AND I THANK YOU FOR THE INVITATION TO TESTIFY  
BEFORE YOU REGARDING THE FUNDING AUTHORIZATION TO COMPLETE THE  
FULL 103-MILE METRORAIL SYSTEM IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION.

AS THE REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE MOST POPULOUS JURISDICTION IN  
THE REGION, I URGE YOU TO CONTINUE THE ONGOING PARTNERSHIP  
AMONG THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, STATE GOVERNMENTS, AND THE LOCAL  
JURISDICTIONS TO FUND THE COMPLETION OF METRORAIL. THE LAST  
UNFUNDED SEGMENT IN VIRGINIA IS THE YELLOW LINE FROM VAN DORN  
STREET TO FRANCONIA-SPRINGFIELD WHICH IS THE CENTER OF ONE OF  
THE MOST CONGESTED AREAS IN NORTHERN VIRGINIA.

FAIRFAX COUNTY IS STRIVING TO MAXIMIZE MOBILITY FOR ITS  
CITIZENS AND BUSINESSES AND CAN ONLY ACHIEVE THIS OBJECTIVE BY  
UTILIZING VARIOUS FINANCING MECHANISMS TO ENHANCE THE FAMILY OF  
TRANSPORTATION SERVICES AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC. EACH OF THESE

TRANSPORTATION MODES (ROADS, HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLE LANES AND MASS TRANSIT FACILITIES) COMPLEMENT THE OTHERS TO PROVIDE NECESSARY MOBILITY TO THOSE WHO LIVE AND WORK IN OUR AREA. THE PLANNED FRANCONIA-SPRINGFIELD METRORAIL STATION IS PART OF A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO PROVIDING TRANSPORTATION SERVICES THROUGH THE UTILIZATION OF SEVERAL FINANCING MECHANISMS.

IN THIS CONTEXT, FAIRFAX COUNTY HAS RECEIVED VOTER APPROVAL IN A REFERENDUM TO UTILIZE \$30 MILLION OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT THE FRANCONIA-SPRINGFIELD PARKWAY WHICH WILL PROVIDE DIRECT HIGHWAY ACCESS TO THE METRORAIL STATION. THIS PROJECT IS NOW UNDER CONSTRUCTION. IN THE SPIRIT OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE COOPERATION, A PRIVATE DEVELOPER HAS AGREED TO EXPAND TO SIX LANES THE OTHER PRINCIPAL ACCESS ROAD TO THE STATION. THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, HAS BEGUN CONSTRUCTION OF THE EXTENSION OF THE I-95 HOV LANES WHICH WILL ENHANCE MOBILITY TO THE FUTURE FRANCONIA-SPRINGFIELD STATION. THERE ARE PLANNED PREFERRED PARKING AREAS FOR HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLES AT THIS METRORAIL STATION. PASSAGE OF H.R. 1463 WOULD ENABLE THE FRANCONIA-SPRINGFIELD METRORAIL STATION TO BE BUILT JOINTLY BY THE FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

IN 1969 AND AGAIN IN 1982 FAIRFAX COUNTY VOTERS OVERWHELMINGLY APPROVED REFERENDUM AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY TO USE GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS FOR METRORAIL CONSTRUCTION. AS OF TODAY FAIRFAX COUNTY HAS CONTRIBUTED \$117.7 MILLION TOWARD THE LOCAL MATCH FOR THE 89.5 MILE SYSTEM. WHILE FAIRFAX COUNTY HAS MAINTAINED ITS LONG-STANDING COMMITMENT FOR METRORAIL CONSTRUCTION, IT HAS ALSO MADE ANNUAL PAYMENTS TO SUPPORT THE OPERATION OF METRORAIL SINCE ITS INCEPTION IN 1976. DURING THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR FAIRFAX COUNTY WILL PAY \$7.6 MILLION TOWARD METRORAIL ANNUAL OPERATING SUBSIDY.

FAIRFAX COUNTY DESIRES TO MAXIMIZE THE BENEFITS OF OUR MUTUAL INVESTMENT IN THE METRORAIL SYSTEM. DUE TO THE TREMENDOUS DEMAND TO RIDE THE REGIONAL METRORAIL SYSTEM, THE COUNTY BOARD, IN COOPERATION WITH WMATA, HAS AGREED TO PROVIDE LOCAL FUNDING TO INCREASE PARKING CAPACITY BY 50% AT THE EXISTING VIENNA AND HUNTINGTON METRORAIL STATIONS BY CONSTRUCTING OVER 2,000 ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACES. THE COUNTY WILL ISSUE \$34 MILLION IN FAIRFAX COUNTY REVENUE BONDS TO MAKE THIS LOCAL INVESTMENT WHICH WILL ALLOW WMATA TO UTILIZE ALL AVAILABLE METRORAIL FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT THE ADOPTED REGIONAL METRORAIL SYSTEM.

IN SUMMARY, FAIRFAX COUNTY HAS BEEN AN INTEGRAL PARTNER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF METRORAIL IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION OVER THE LAST TWO DECADES. LET US EMBARK TOGETHER, AT THE START OF THE NEXT DECADE, TO COMPLETE OUR COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR TO PROVIDE MOBILITY IN OUR NATION'S CAPITAL. ON BEHALF OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS I URGE CONGRESS TO CONTINUE OUR PARTNERSHIP AND TO COMPLETE THE 103 MILE ADOPTED REGIONAL SYSTEM BY PASSING H.R. 1463.

I APPRECIATE AND THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON A MATTER OF CRITICAL IMPORTANCE TO THE REGION AND FAIRFAX COUNTY.



Mr. WHEAT. Thank you very much, Mrs. Moore.

Our next witness will be Hon. Ellen Bozman, chairwoman of the Arlington County Board of Supervisors.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. ELLEN M. BOZMAN, CHAIRWOMAN,  
ARLINGTON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Mrs. BOZMAN. Thank you very much. We do appreciate this opportunity to speak briefly to you on a most important subject.

Arlington County is the one and only jurisdiction within this metropolitan area which has its Metrorail system complete.

It is no coincidence that the Council of Governments and the Transportation Planning Board have found that Arlington County is, and is projected to remain, the least congested jurisdiction in the area. This comes despite a sizable high-rise office development and also the Pentagon, which is within our borders. Without the Metrorail system, this would not have been the case. In fact, Arlington has concentrated its dense office development at the Metrorail stations in order to minimize highway traffic problems and air pollution.

Metrorail has been a major factor in improving public transportation use and economy of transportation. Transit ridership in Arlington has more than doubled in the decade since we have had Metrorail, and this reverses the previous decline in public transportation use.

Our population has not increased in relationship to Metro ridership because we're a mature community, but our employment has increased tremendously. In Arlington, people make an average of 180 transit trips each per year. That means only New York City does better than Arlington County in the amount of transit usage per person.

In Arlington, it costs \$1.40 per passenger net to carry bus riders. It costs \$0.27 per passenger net to carry a Metrorail rider. The savings to the general public are very great, indeed.

Obviously, Arlington could not provide the facilities needed. This Metro region can't provide the Metro facilities needed by ourselves. We have greatly appreciated the Congress' interest and support in interstate public transportation, and we ask for your continued help.

The system is complete within Arlington, but Arlington needs the whole system just as much as the rest of our neighbors do. The 103-mile system will benefit all of us greatly.

I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak briefly to you. Your interest is very much appreciated. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of County Chairwoman Bozman follows:]

TESTIMONY BEFORE  
THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS & METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS

HEARING ON H.R. 1463

MAY 4, 1989

BY

ELLEN M. BOZMAN, CHAIRMAN  
THE COUNTY BOARD OF ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE, I AM ELLEN M. BOZMAN, CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNTY BOARD OF ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA.

WE APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO OFFER TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1463, A BILL WHICH WOULD AUTHORIZE COMPLETION OF THE APPROVED REGIONAL METRORAIL SYSTEM SERVING MARYLAND, VIRGINIA AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MOST SUCCESSFULLY.

ARLINGTON COUNTY IS THE FIRST AND ONLY COUNTY IN THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN REGION TO HAVE HAD ITS PORTION OF THE METRORAIL SYSTEM COMPLETED. IT IS NO COINCIDENCE THAT THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS AND THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD HAVE FOUND THAT ARLINGTON COUNTY IS, AND IS PROJECTED TO REMAIN, THE LEAST CONGESTED JURISDICTION IN THE METROPOLITAN AREA, DESPITE THE HIGH RISE OFFICE DEVELOPMENT AND THE PENTAGON WITHIN ITS BORDERS. WITHOUT THE METRORAIL SYSTEM, THIS WOULD NOT BE THE CASE. WE HAVE CONCENTRATED OUR MOST DENSE DEVELOPMENT IN METRORAIL SERVICE CORRIDORS TO MINIMIZE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC PROBLEMS AND AIR POLLUTION.

METRORAIL HAS BEEN THE MAJOR FACTOR IN IMPROVING PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION USE AND ECONOMY. TRANSIT RIDERSHIP IN ARLINGTON HAS MORE THAN DOUBLED SINCE METRORAIL SERVICE COMMENCED A DECADE AGO, REVERSING THE DECLINING TREND IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION USE. ARLINGTON'S POPULATION HAS NOT INCREASED IN PROPORTION TO METRORAIL RIDERSHIP, SINCE WE ARE A MATURE COUNTY, BUT OUR

EMPLOYMENT HAS INCREASED TREMENDOUSLY. IN ARLINGTON, PEOPLE MAKE AN AVERAGE OF 180 TRANSIT TRIPS PER YEAR EACH. ONLY NEW YORK CITY DOES BETTER IN THIS COUNTRY. IN ARLINGTON, IT COSTS \$1.14 PER PASSENGER NET TO CARRY BUS RIDERS, BUT ONLY \$0.27 PER PASSENGER NET TO CARRY METRORAIL RIDERS. THE SAVINGS TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC ARE GREAT.

ARLINGTON, ALONE, COULD NOT PROVIDE THE FACILITIES NEEDED. WE APPRECIATE CONGRESS' SUPPORT FOR INTERSTATE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION. OUR NEIGHBORS NEED IT JUST AS WE DO.

I WANT TO THANK YOU, CHAIRMAN WHEAT AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR YOUR ATTENTION THIS AFTERNOON AND THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT THE VIEWS OF ARLINGTON COUNTY. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS AT THIS TIME, I WILL BE HAPPY TO ANSWER THEM.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you very much, Mrs. Bozman.

The final witness on this panel will be the mayor of the city of Alexandria, Hon. James P. Moran.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. JAMES P. MORAN, JR., MAYOR OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA**

Mayor MORAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to convey the citizens of Alexandria's strong support, likewise, for the authorization of the \$2,160,000 for the completion of the 103-mile Metrorail system.

We in Alexandria, as my colleagues, have very strong compelling reasons to get this system completed. In Alexandria, as in Arlington, so many of the commuters that work for the Federal Government and within the Federal Employment Center have to drive through Alexandria to get there.

The costs that we pay in air pollution and noise pollution and the congestion of all of our streets, not just the State highways, but our residential streets, is enormous.

Really, the only way out is to have a complete Metrorail system that will entice people to get off the road and into public transit.

We've really done just about everything that we can think of. We also have started up our own local bus system, and that is helping. We have enforced high occupancy vehicle lanes.

In fact, thanks to the insight provided by Chairman Moore and by Supervisor Highland by taking me, handcuffed, into a helicopter one day to see the backup—we changed the H.O.V. 3 to H.O.V. 2. But, actually, that is working very well, and it is a sign of strong regional cooperation.

We have also established what we call a "transportation management plan" requirement upon all of our developments, where everyone that has any substantial development proposed has to come up with ways to reduce the traffic that would normally be generated by up to 30 percent, by requiring them to use public transit, Metrorail, the bus service, the ride sharing, van pooling, and the like.

We have had thousands of transit passes given out free by employers in order to comply with this requirement. It is a requirement that has to be met before they can develop in the city.

I mention that because we want you to know that we are taking extraordinary measures to get people in to public transit because we recognize that it is really the only alternative.

But local governments and the State have spent almost a quarter of a billion dollars for public transit in northern Virginia, and the Federal Government has provided about \$86 million, only about 38 percent of the cost.

We spent many months going over a northern Virginia subregional transportation plan, and it showed a funding shortfall of \$330 million annually, \$330 million every year through the year 2010, in order to put in place a system that would restore the levels of service that we experienced in 1985.

Now, that is pretty hard to believe. But when we looked out at the major intersections in Fairfax and Prince William and even out

to Loudoun, we found that the traditional levels of service from "A" to "F" were no longer applicable.

We had to go to level "G" and level "H" because the fact is that not only are we going to be at gridlock, we're going to have virtual parking lots in some of these intersections if we don't come up with a better transit system than we have now.

That's why it is critically important to extend this Metrorail system. Our commitment has been substantial. I want to stress Alexandria's unique situation in getting this system out to the 103-mile boundary.

Otherwise, the yellow line terminates at Van Dorn, and that would be an intolerable situation for us. Not only do we not have enough parking, but neither do we have enough road capacity. So that entire area is going to come to a standstill.

We have a major development, and Supervisor Alexander is behind this. It's in his district. That's just fine that he has been so helpful to his district.

But when those 50,000 cars start trying to get into their workplace and run into that congestion on Van Dorn Street, everyone in the Congress, at the State, and at the local level is going to hear from them.

We've got to get out to Springfield/Franconia because there we can afford to build about 4,000 parking spaces. That's why it is so critically important to get out there. That's where we have the room to put the parking and to access Shirley Highway and the Beltway.

One other thing before I close: I want to mention another aspect of public transit that's very important to us in northern Virginia, and that is the commuter rail system.

We have been working for years on this and not just through the northern Virginia Transportation Commission. But I mention it because last year I was chairperson of the northern Virginia Transportation Commission.

But we have gotten together with the Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission. Mrs. Bozman and Mrs. Moore are on this commission. We recognize that we have got to supplement the Metrorail system, and so we've come up with this commuter rail system.

We have put a substantial amount of local money into this system. We're going to issue \$86 million in bonds for rolling stock and an insurance reserve, and then we're going to assume responsibility for \$15 million in annual operating expenses and debt service.

But the Federal financial role has been almost nonexistent. We've had about \$750,000 come in, or less than 1 percent of our startup costs.

We hope it will go as far south as Fredericksburg and as far west as Manassas. Then it will come through Franconia/Springfield Station, through King Street, and into Union Station.

It's going to help a great many of the people that work up here on Capitol Hill as well as people who work throughout the District because they can then get on Metro.

But right now we're at a standstill. The reason we're at the standstill is what we find to be an unfair and inappropriate requirement that Conrail has imposed on us.

They control about 2 miles of track leading to Union Station across the Potomac River, and they won't allow us to use that rail line until Federal legislation is passed which provides them indemnity against any liability claims.

We've already created a pool of \$200 million in insurance reserve, and we think that's enough. It was enough for the other railroads that have cooperated with us, and it ought to be enough for Conrail.

But right now these potential 4,000 riders that we could get onto public transit can't access public transit because of this requirement by Conrail. That ought to be part of this discussion because it's very much relevant to our public transit needs in the Washington metropolitan area.

With that, let me emphasize again our strong support for H.R. 1463. We've got to have this authorization. It's absolutely critical to all of us and to the quality of life of everybody who lives in the Washington area.

We thank you for having the hearings and thank you for your attention.

[The prepared statement of Mayor Moran follows:]



James P. Moran, Jr.  
Mayor

*City of Alexandria, Virginia*



STATEMENT OF

JAMES P. MORAN, JR.  
MAYOR, CITY OF ALEXANDRIA

TO  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT  
OPERATIONS AND METROPOLITAN  
AFFAIRS OF THE U.S.  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVE'S  
COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF  
COLUMBIA

ON

HR 1463, A BILL TO AMEND THE  
NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION  
ACT OF 1969 RELATING TO THE  
WASHINGTON METRORAIL SYSTEM

— MAY 4, 1989 —

*"Home Town of George Washington and Robert E. Lee"*



CHAIRMAN WHEAT AND HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE:

MY NAME IS JAMES P. MORAN, JR. I SERVE AS MAYOR OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA. I APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR BEFORE YOU TODAY TO CONVEY THE STRONG SUPPORT OF THE CITIZENS OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA FOR HR 1463, WHICH WOULD AUTHORIZE \$2.16 BILLION TO COMPLETE THE 103-MILE METRORAIL SYSTEM OPERATED BY THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY. I ALSO AM A MEMBER OF THE NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, WHERE LAST YEAR I SERVED AS CHAIRMAN. MY COMMENTS TODAY ARE ALSO PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THAT REGIONAL ORGANIZATION, WHICH APPOINTS VIRGINIA'S FOUR MEMBERS OF THE WASHINGTON METRO BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

BECAUSE YOU WILL HEAR FROM OTHER REPRESENTATIVES OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA JURISDICTIONS, I WOULD LIKE TO FOCUS ON THE NEED FOR COMPLETION OF THE 103-MILE METRORAIL SYSTEM FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF ALEXANDRIA. AS YOU KNOW, OUR CITY IS LOCATED ADJACENT TO CORE EMPLOYMENT SITES OF THE PENTAGON, ROSSLYN, CRYSTAL CITY AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. THIS MEANS THAT TWICE EACH DAY OUR CITY SERVES AS A FUNNEL THROUGH WHICH PASS STREAMS OF DRIVERS INTENT ON REACHING THEIR JOBS AND HOMES. FURTHER, AS POPULATION GROWTH ACCELERATES TO THE SOUTH AND WEST OF OUR CITY, AND

- 2 -

ALEXANDRIA ITSELF EXPERIENCES SHARP INCREASES IN JOBS OVER THE NEXT TWO DECADES, OUR CURRENT PROBLEMS WITH TRAFFIC CONGESTION, NOISE, AND AIR POLLUTION WILL GROW STEADILY WORSE.

WE ARE TRYING A WIDE ARRAY OF LOCAL SOLUTIONS TO SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS. THESE INCLUDE:

- O A PRIZE-WINNING LOCAL BUS SYSTEM (DASH) TO COMPLEMENT METRO'S REGIONAL BUS AND RAIL SYSTEMS;
- O HIGH-OCCUPANCY-VEHICLE LANES ON SEVERAL MAJOR THOROUGHFARES, INCLUDING THE VERY SUCCESSFUL SHIRLEY HIGHWAY (I-395); AND
- O AN ALEXANDRIA ORDINANCE THAT REQUIRES LARGE DEVELOPMENTS TO BE ANALYZED FOR EFFECTS ON TRAFFIC. SPECIFIC PLANS MUST BE PRODUCED TO MITIGATE ADVERSE TRAFFIC EFFECTS. FOR EXAMPLE, DEVELOPERS HAVE AGREED TO PURCHASE NEW BUSES FOR OUR CITY'S TRANSIT SYSTEM AND TO PURCHASE THOUSANDS OF TRANSIT PASSES FOR EMPLOYEES UNDER THE TERMS OF THIS FAR-SIGHTED ORDINANCE.

IN NORTHERN VIRGINIA WE ALL UNDERSTAND THAT SEVERE BUDGET PRESSURES EXIST AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL, AND THAT EACH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN COOPERATION WITH THE PRIVATE SECTOR MUST DO MORE FINANCIALLY TO HELP EXPAND OUR CRITICAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS. BUT DESPITE SPENDING ALMOST \$225 MILLION IN NORTHERN VIRGINIA IN FY 1988 FOR PUBLIC TRANSIT ALONE, WE ARE FALLING FURTHER BEHIND IN OUR EFFORTS TO CONTROL TRAFFIC. OF THAT ALMOST ONE-QUARTER BILLION DOLLARS SPENT LAST YEAR IN NORTHERN VIRGINIA, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PROVIDED ONLY ABOUT \$86 MILLION, OR BARELY 38 PERCENT.

A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DEVELOPED BY NORTHERN VIRGINIA'S GOVERNMENTS AND CITIZENS FOR GOVERNOR BALILES SHOWED A FUNDING SHORTFALL OF \$330 MILLION ANNUALLY THROUGH THE YEAR 2010, IN ORDER TO PUT IN PLACE A SYSTEM OF IMPROVED TRANSIT AND HIGHWAYS THAT WOULD BARELY RESTORE LEVELS OF SERVICE ON THESE SYSTEMS TO THE QUALITY EXPERIENCED IN 1985. GIVEN THE GROWTH EXPECTED IN THE MEANTIME, JUST HOLDING OUR OWN AGAINST THE ONSLAUGHT OF DRIVERS AND AUTOMOBILES WOULD BE A MAJOR, AND ENORMOUSLY COSTLY, ACHIEVEMENT.

AN INTREGAL PART OF THE ESTIMATED \$7 BILLION IN PUBLIC TRANSIT AND RIDESHARING IMPROVEMENTS IDENTIFIED IN THE REGION'S NEW TRANSPORTATION PLAN IS AN ESTIMATED \$120-150 MILLION TO COMPLETE THE 103-MILE METRORAIL SYSTEM. FUNDS PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS WILL EXTEND METRORAIL'S YELLOW LINE TO THE VAN DORN STATION (ON THE BORDER OF ALEXANDRIA AND FAIRFAX COUNTY). UNFORTUNATELY, THE GREAT POPULARITY OF THE METRORAIL SYSTEM WILL POSE SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR ALEXANDRIA, SINCE THE VAN DORN STATION IS NOT DESIGNED TO SERVE AS A TERMINAL. THERE SIMPLY IS NOT NEARLY ENOUGH PARKING CAPACITY AT THE VAN DORN STATION: NOR CAN OUR EXISTING STREETS BEAR THE CRUSH LOADS OF COMMUTERS BOUND FOR THE METRORAIL LINE AT VAN DORN STATION. INSTEAD, THE FRANCONIA/SPRINGFIELD METRORAIL STATION, WITH 4,000 PARKING SPACES, IS DESIGNED TO ACCOMMODATE THE AUTO COMMUTERS THAT WILL FLOCK TO THE EXTENDED RAIL LINE. BUT THE COMPLETION OF METRORAIL IN VIRGINIA, JUST AS IN MARYLAND AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, REQUIRES PASSAGE OF HR 1463.

- 5 -

WHILE THE REGION IS SEEKING FEDERAL FUNDS FOR METRORAIL CONSTRUCTION, WE ARE PROCEEDING ON OUR OWN TO INITIATE OTHER NEW PUBLIC TRANSIT SYSTEMS THAT WORK EFFICIENTLY TO COMPLEMENT EACH OTHER. FOR EXAMPLE, THE NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION IS SPONSORING NEW COMMUTER RAIL SERVICE WHICH WOULD PROVIDE THE EQUIVALENT CAPACITY OF A NEW FREEWAY LANE. TOGETHER WITH ITS PARTNERS TO THE SOUTH AND WEST, NVTC JURISDICTIONS ARE PREPARING TO ISSUE \$86 MILLION IN BONDS FOR ROLLING STOCK AND AN INSURANCE RESERVE, AND TO ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR \$15 MILLION IN ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENSES AND DEBT SERVICE. THE FEDERAL FINANCIAL ROLE IN THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN ALMOST NON-EXISTENT (\$750,000, OR LESS THAN ONE PERCENT OF START-UP COSTS).

THIS COMMUTER RAIL LINE, KNOWN AS THE VIRGINIA RAILWAY EXPRESS, WILL SERVE TO COMPLEMENT METRORAIL SERVICE BY FEEDING PASSENGERS FROM AS FAR SOUTH AS FREDERICKSBURG AND WEST AS MANASSAS, INTO THE SUBWAY AT FRANCONIA/SPRINGFIELD AND KING STREET IN ALEXANDRIA, AS WELL AS SEVERAL OTHER TRANSFER STATIONS. TWO OF THE RAILROADS THAT ARE PROVIDING ACCESS TO THEIR TRACKS (THE RICHMOND FREDERICKSBURG AND POTOMAC RAILROAD AND

SOUTHERN RAILWAY) HAVE PROPOSED ENORMOUS NEW DEVELOPMENTS FOR ALEXANDRIA. THE DEVELOPERS ARE BEING REQUIRED TO SHARE THE FINANCIAL BURDEN OF MITIGATING CONGESTION. FORTUNATELY, ACCESS OF THESE SITES TO THE NEW COMMUTER RAIL LINE (AND THE METRORAIL SYSTEM) WILL HELP TO CONTROL THE RESULTING GROWTH OF TRAFFIC.

UNFORTUNATELY, CONRAIL (WHICH CONTROLS ABOUT TWO MILES OF TRACK LEADING TO UNION STATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA) WILL NOT ALLOW THE VIRGINIA RAILWAY EXPRESS TO LEASE ITS FACILITIES UNLESS FEDERAL LEGISLATION IS PASSED WHICH PROVIDES ADDED PROTECTION AGAINST LIABILITY CLAIMS. WE HAVE AGREED TO PROVIDE \$200 MILLION IN PROTECTION, FAR GREATER THAN ANY OTHER COMMUTER RAIL SYSTEM IN NORTH AMERICA, BUT WITHOUT THE LEGISLATION REQUIRED BY CONRAIL, OUR TRAINS CANNOT LEAVE THE STATION, AND THE FOUR THOUSAND POTENTIAL DAILY RIDERS ARE LEFT STANDING ON THE PLATFORM.

IN THE CASE OF HR 1463 REGARDING COMPLETION OF THE 103-MILE METRORAIL SYSTEM, THE TRACK IS CLEAR. IN NORTHERN VIRGINIA, WE ARE ADVANCING ABOUT ONE-HALF MILLION DOLLARS OF OUR OWN FUNDS TO ACCELERATE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS OF THE FRANCONIA/SPRINGFIELD SITE. WE ARE ANXIOUS TO PROCEED,

SINCE WE VALUE THE PASSENGER-CARRYING CAPACITY OF THE METRORAIL SYSTEM AND ITS SOLID OPERATING EFFICIENCY (WITH A FAREBOX COST-RECOVERY RATIO OF WELL OVER 70 PERCENT).

WE ARE DOING ALL WE CAN HERE IN NORTHERN VIRGINIA TO COPE WITH THE MIXED BLESSINGS OF GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND IN PARTNERSHIP WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WE WILL CONTINUE TO HOLD OUR OWN. WHILE \$2.1 BILLION FOR COMPLETION OF THE METRORAIL SYSTEM IS A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF MONEY, THE COSTS OF NOT COMPLETING THE SYSTEM ARE TOO PAINFUL TO CONTEMPLATE.

I RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT YOU ACT FAVORABLY ON HR 1463, TO HELP ADVANCE THE PARTNERSHIP OF LOCAL, STATE, FEDERAL AND PRIVATE FUNDING BY WHICH WE ARE WORKING TO STRENGTHEN THE NATION'S CAPITAL THROUGH IMPROVED MOBILITY FOR ITS CITIZENS.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Moran, and I thank all of you for your testimony.

Well, let me ask you to respond to an argument that might be presented. I heard all of you talk about the traffic problems that exist in your respective jurisdictions. Yet, all major metropolitan areas have traffic problems.

How would you say that the presence of the Federal Government here or the fact that the metropolitan region that serves as the Nation's Capital has exacerbated your problems? To what degree does it contribute to your problems, in any order?

Mrs. BOZMAN. The location of the Federal Government here is the impetus for the major growth which is taking place in this whole metropolitan region.

Now, when we look at the projections for the year 2010, we see projected a 66-percent increase in jobs, a 33-percent increase in population, and a 47-percent increase in households, which when we think of the housing, raises some hairs on your head, too.

But it is the Federal Government's being here, the seat of government, which is bringing in the growth in this area. It's basically service industries serving the Federal Government, which is not to say that we want the Federal Government to leave or to reduce or change, but it is a fact of life that a lot of the growth that is coming, and it is causing our heightened need for an efficient, effective rail system, comes from the presence of the Federal Government.

I am most interested because I think one thing that interests everybody in the Congress is the ease with which your constituents can now get around the town when they come and see their Nation's Capital and all the wonderful things that they see and learn here, but I must say that I think that would have to be secondary in my answer.

Mrs. MOORE. I think Ellen said it better than I can say it. What makes us different from other cities across the country is that the Federal Government presence is here.

Whether you're hiring directly or whether you're contracting out, you are the stimulus for the employment in the region. In fact, right now, with the full-employment economy in much of this region, it is the reason that so many people are moving here for these jobs.

They're not forecasting any diminishment of it. It's forecasted to increase dramatically over the next 20 years.

If we're going to move people and move them efficiently, we've got to have this extension of rail. It's true throughout the region. We are all working actively to try to get people on transit in the region and to try to get more efficient ways for people to get to work.

Mayor MORAN. I think you can well justify the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority as being really a national, probably it ought to be an international, model of public transportation.

What it is really doing is serving this part of the Federal Establishment. Just as we do in these suburban jurisdictions and the District of Columbia, we are providing the housing the education, the transportation, the things that are necessary for the Federal workers who makeup the Federal Establishment.



If we want this country to run well, we have to make sure that people can get to work, that their children get educated, we have adequate housing, and we have adequate support services.

A public transportation system is critically necessary to ensuring that. So if any regional area is going to have a model system, it ought to be here.

I think everyone who lives in the United States has a stake in it being the best system that can be provided.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you.

Questions or comments from the committee? Mr. Parris.

Mr. PARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me welcome the contributions of these local elected officials.

I should tell you that the mayor of the largest city and the chairman of the board of supervisors of the largest county in the best represented congressional district in the Nation are here with us today.

Mr. WHEAT. I hadn't noticed my constituents in the room.

Mayor MORAN. We didn't mention that because we figured you probably would, Stan.

Mr. PARRIS. Thank you, Jim. It's uncharacteristic of me not to.

Let me share with you that we had the Secretary of Transportation here earlier, and she talked, as you have, about the new categories of unsatisfactory conditions of highways and the new category F, which has failed.

You now tell me you've got a "G" and an "H." Is that for God awful and pure hell or what does that mean?

Mrs. MOORE. What it means is that the "F" condition of traffic is where you don't move. Instead of just having that for 1 hour in the morning and 1 hour at night, it could be as high as 3 to 4 hours.

Mr. PARRIS. That's "G"?

Mrs. MOORE. That's "G."

Mr. PARRIS. Boy, what can—"H" has got to be pure hell.

Mrs. MOORE. Well, "H" is just all day long.

Mr. PARRIS. Oh, OK.

Mrs. MOORE. All day long. All right.

Mr. PARRIS. In any event, Mr. Chairman, I have no specific questions.

I thank you all for your support.

I think it's interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that the cost of the bricks and the tracks in Virginia in this proposal will be something of around 10 percent.

Yet, these ladies and gentlemen are here supporting the entire proposal, which is consistent with the effort over time, is consistent with the compact and bilateral obligations of all of the parties here. I think it is indicative of the kinds of support that this measure enjoys.

We're delighted to have their contribution and their presence here today. Thank you.

Mrs. MOORE. Thank you.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Fauntroy.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I simply want to thank these kind executives, from a region of the Capital area that will experience the most difficulty if we do not complete this system, primarily because they

have responsibility in the areas where the rubber hits the road, in terms of our transportation problems.

I promised earlier on that I would provide the committee with just some data on the polluting nature of excessive auto traffic in the District of Columbia region.

The fact is that, because of our physiological and topographical location this side of the mountain, with the wind speeds low and the cloud cover and the heat, we have a potential for a serious pollution problem, not as bad as that in southern California yet, but certainly it would catch up if we do not complete this system.

One of the things that all of those who study the issue agree is that our Metro system substantially contributes to our ability to reduce pollution in this area, not only the nitrogen oxide, but also the hydrocarbon pollution.

I'm sure that among the considerations in treating this as the Nation's system was the fact that with so many persons living and working in this region important to national public policy, it's important that they be in good health.

These executives are protecting not only the economic development of the region, but the health of our people. For that, I want to thank you again.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Rohrabacher.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I've just got a little bit of time here. I'm sorry. There's a major event that's about to happen.

I would just like to ask you: In terms of the people that you actually represent and the people who are actually using the Metro, would you categorize them as being basically middle class and above in terms of their income?

Mrs. MOORE. There are all kinds of people. There are low income, there are moderate income people, and there are affluent people.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. There have been no studies as to what the level of income is of the people using the Metro coming from your areas into the District of Columbia?

Mayor MORAN. I'll comment just briefly on one aspect of it. When we have tried to reduce bus service, people who were the most affected were immigrants, largely Hispanic refugees in one area of town who didn't have any automobiles.

They were providing labor supply for our hotels, our restaurants, and a lot of the maintenance, and so on, and construction in the district and throughout the area.

They were—it was their only means of transportation. You know, they couldn't afford an automobile, and so they were absolutely reliant.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That's the bus transportation.

Mayor MORAN. Well, bus into Metro. Bus is a part of it.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Let me put this another way. Is the average income in the areas that you represent above or below the national average?

Mrs. MOORE. In Fairfax County, the average income is above the national average, but we have a dramatic increase in the last few years in the working poor, who are people who are really having a tough time getting along. It's a result of the employment that's come into the area, largely the contractors that are contracting with the Federal Government, the people who are working in the

hotels, serving that industry, the people who are working in the restaurants, the people who are working in the buildings.

So while we have a very affluent population by and large, we also have an increasingly large population of poor people.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. So the arguments in terms of traffic congestion are made, in terms of those arguments being made to bolster the arguments for this Federal expenditure, are based on alleviating the traffic conditions for an area that has a higher income level than the average in the United States of America and will be paid for by the citizens in those areas that perhaps have lower income areas, perhaps in the Kansas area or a similar area.

Mrs. MOORE. Could I respond?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Sure.

Mrs. MOORE. Is that proper? While we may be an area in Fairfax of above average income, we are also an area of above average traffic. I doubt if you could find another area in the United States that has the traffic problems that we do in Fairfax County.

We're not bragging about it. Maybe we could have done a little better planning. All right?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Coming from the Los Angeles area—

Mrs. MOORE. We are at a point now in Fairfax County where, while we're not really limited in our borrowing, we're limited in our new borrowing for capital outlay.

This is of great concern to us right now because we are turning to raising taxes for transportation. That's what we're doing at this hearing.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I think the arguments that have been made of how important—

Mrs. BOZMAN. Perhaps I might be able to say a sentence while you're waiting for that. I think that the extension of hours that the Metrorail system is open has been very, very helpful in serving the low-income population in the whole metropolitan area because it has enabled the shift workers, the early workers, whether it is at the hotel, the hospital, or wherever it is, the early workers to use Metrorail.

I think Metro could probably provide some figures that show of that ridership, what types of jobs people are going to.

Mrs. MOORE. It helps work to bring people and make for better travel across the region among all kinds of people. For instance, if you want to go from the District of Columbia out to parts of Virginia, you can get to Vienna now. You can get to the Huntington area. But you can't get to the Springfield area. You know, it's an entirely different area.

I think this is going to work toward a better balance in the region.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. We've heard a lot of discussion today about the importance of Metrorail and how great it is and how terrific it is and it's the best in America, et cetera, et cetera.

But I personally don't see that this is an argument of whether there should be a Metrorail or a public transportation or not, but whether or not how the financing of that should be structured and whether or not we can afford to do this at a time when we have a high level of deficit spending which is going to force us to make fundamental decisions as to how we allocate money in America.

If it is such a great system and if it is used by the public and if it is necessary and if there is such a great traffic problem, is there some reason why this can't be structured in a way to pay for itself, so the fact that if there is a need, people will generally go toward that system if it makes it easier for them to get to work?

Is there some reason why the system, if it is so good, can't be structured to make a profit and be paid for—instead of out of increasing the Federal deficit paid for by bonds, which would then be paid for by the users themselves?

Mrs. MOORE. Well, I repeat. We are trying ourselves to provide money for the right of way for this station out of our own money. We cannot borrow for it right now because we are limited in the amount of debt that we can take on.

We are trying to provide for the new schools for the new people, the children who are moving into our area, trying to provide other amenities for them, and transportation. We have borrowed \$340 million in the last 6 years just for transportation.

We are turning toward taxation for capital outlay for these needs because we do have certain restrictions. That doesn't mean that we don't have a good credit rating, but we want to maintain it.

Mr. FAUNTROY. If the gentleman would yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Sure, sir.

Mr. FAUNTROY. As to his point he brought up earlier, you know, there's no system, public system, that pays for itself.

Second, however, if you are concerned about that, what we have before you would, in fact, reduce the cost of running the system for the region, that the very people about whom you expressed some concern are the ones who will most use it if it gets done in our neighborhoods.

You ought to know, in response to your earlier question, that 80 percent of the persons on public welfare in this region are in the District of Columbia.

It is those people who have been waiting longest for the green line, which you would cutoff now if we were not able to finish it. They will use it in larger numbers and, in terms of the cost effectiveness of their use, reduce the cost of running it.

So I'm sure that, again, this would be an investment, not only in the people about whom you said you're concerned when you ask are these affluent people living out here who are demanding this system. No.

The reason all of us are willing to pay locally and regionally more money for the building of this Metro system is that we recognize that we all may have come over here on different ships, but we're in the same boat now. We need that kind of system.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. With all due respect, this system, obviously, the last leg is going to help the less fortunate, and the first legs of this seem to have been built in order to help subsidize the transportation costs of upper, middle income government workers.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Boy, I wish you could have been here 20 years ago.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, actually, I believe perhaps one of the reasons we have this huge budget deficit at this time is that was one of the things we decided years ago was that we were going to—

the Federal Government would be developing transportation systems that were not economical.

Thus, we developed a system in which we had a long-term government subsidy of transportation that should have been put on the costs of the user.

Instead, we've now subsidized basically government workers and upper- and middle-income people with government funds here. Possibly now we no longer can afford that.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I can understand why your city would want 50-percent assistance in the building of its rapid transit. I understand that.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I oppose that, too.

Mr. FAUNTROY. That's why I was wondering how you can oppose what the people who sent you to represent them want.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I would like to thank you very much for this opportunity.

By the way, I appreciate the effort you're making to make sure that your people have adequate transportation. As I say, this isn't an argument over that at all.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Sure.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. It's over the mechanism of how we finance that.

I would like to ask the chairman, I am going to have to leave right now. We do have a vote, and there are also some other things. If I'm not here for the next witness, could he be asked whether or not President Bush intends to veto this appropriation if it is passed?

Mr. WHEAT. That is a question we will be certain to put to Mr. Dellibovi.

I would mention for the committee's benefit that we are going to take about a 15- to 20-minute recess to give us time to go over to the floor. After that time, we will continue with the questions of the next panel.

I would like to thank this panel very much for your participation and your willingness to appear before the committee and provide this testimony to us.

Mrs. MOORE. Thank you.

Mayor MORAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Recess.]

Mr. FAUNTROY [presiding]. The hearing will come to order, and we resume now our hearing of the Subcommittee on Government Operations and Metropolitan Affairs.

We are now pleased to welcome to the witness table Mr. Albert Dellibovi, the Administrator of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

Mr. Dellibovi, we are very pleased to have you join the long list of witnesses who are presenting their positions to us here today. We have your prepared statement, and you may proceed in whatever manner you choose to share with us your views.

**TESTIMONY OF ALBERT A. DELLIBOVI, ADMINISTRATOR, URBAN  
MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION, ACCOMPANIED BY  
ROBERT McMANNUS**

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee. I am pleased to appear before you today to discuss the proposed amendments to the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969, which would authorize \$2.16 billion to complete the construction of the Washington, DC Metrorail system.

I am joined by Mr. Robert McMannus, the Associate Administrator for Grants Management at UMTA.

At the outset, I would like to point out that I have addressed the issue reflected in this legislation over the past two budget cycles in answering questions before House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

Thus, it should come as no surprise to the committee that the Secretary of Transportation and the administration strongly oppose H.R. 1463 and its underlying policy. I would like to take this opportunity to tell you why.

In this time of budgetary constraints and given the enormous Federal contribution to construction of the Metrorail system to date, we believe that the era of special legislation for its further support should be over.

Rather, we believe that future funding of the Metrorail system should be considered in the context of future funding of the entire Federal mass transit program. That itself must be considered in the context of the overall budget and of the Nation's national transit needs.

To be more explicit, our position is that on expiration of the existing special Stark-Harris authorization, further financing of Washington Metrorail should be considered in the context of the basic Federal Urban Mass Transportation Program.

Reauthorization of the Federal transit program will certainly be an issue before the Congress soon because the current authorization expires at the end of fiscal year 1991.

To put this in a national perspective, I would like to review for you the level and the extent of Federal funding for the construction of the Metrorail system up to this date and compare that with the funding of major capital transit projects in other cities across this country.

Including the Federal share of the principal and the interest costs of the construction bonds, which became a Federal liability on enactment of the Stark-Harris Act in 1979, the Federal investment to complete the 89.5-mile portion of the 103-mile system will total \$7.72 billion, or 73.3 percent of the total cost of \$10.6 billion for these 89.5 miles.

Now, this enormous amount of Federal funding, \$7.72 billion quite obviously is more than any other city has received or can expect to receive. In short, Federal participation in the Washington Metrorail system has far exceeded the national norm.

In Atlanta, for example, construction of the planned 53-mile system has been underway since 1971, about the same time that construction of the Washington system began.

Through revenues derived from a local sales tax in Atlanta and a longstanding local commitment to complete that system, \$1.4 billion of local funds and \$1.5 billion of Federal funds, roughly a 50-50 Federal and local share, have been invested in that highly successful system, which has also been cited as a model system in America.

More recently, in 1986, Los Angeles began construction of a 17.3-mile heavy rail transit line. That is estimated to cost \$3.5 billion, with no more than a 50-50 Federal-local share cost.

In the San Francisco area, officials are planning some \$2 billion in various rail transit investments over the next several years. There they are intending a local share of 75 percent and a Federal share of 25 percent. Referenda were passed in participating counties in the bay area during the past year which authorize taxes to make all of that possible.

Other examples include Seattle, which will in 1990 complete an innovative bus tunnel project at a 50-50 Federal-local cost share; and the Santa Clara-Guadalupe corridor light rail line, also at a 50-50 local cost share.

There are a number of other examples in cities which, unlike the Washington Metro project, must compete with each other for the limited Federal assistance that is available.

In response to these real-world conditions in which we find ourselves, these cities have accepted the principle of significant local funding of new rail systems.

By contrast, here in the Washington metropolitan area, there is an attempt to preserve its advantageous position over all other transit systems by proposing an extension of this special local authorization at an 80-percent Federal share, 20-percent local share, which would raise the Federal tab for "America's subway" to \$9.9 billion, making it just about the most expensive public works project in the history of this Nation.

Let me note that even if the remainder of the system, which is some 13.5 miles, was completed entirely with local funds, if not another penny of Federal money were authorized, Federal participation in the total cost of the 103-mile system would still total almost 60 percent, based on W.M.A.T.A.'s estimated remaining cost to complete of approximately \$2.7 billion.

W.M.A.T.A., of course, continues to assert a special Federal interest in construction of the Metrorail system. That may have been a valid claim when the National Capital Transportation Act was passed in 1969. At that time, there was not a mature Federal mass transit program. Nor was there a transit trust fund account when the Stark-Harris Act was passed in 1979.

In the interim, however, much has changed. Today, with only 13.5 miles of the total system to be funded, the case for special treatment no longer exists.

Completing 13.5 miles is no more than the equivalent of the new lines being advanced in segments in the other cities that I've mentioned, which are being done with a significantly higher local share.

I do not believe that any claimed special Federal interest in the Metrorail system should exempt W.M.A.T.A. from participating in

whatever mass transit programs are available in the next reauthorization.

Nor do I believe that any alleged Federal interest warrants the continuation of 80-percent Federal funding when today other cities throughout the country are financially able and willing to provide 50 percent of the required funds to construct and complete their new rail systems.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would call the committee's attention to a February 1989 report of the Congressional Budget Office to the House and Senate Budget Committees regarding options for reducing the Federal deficit.

The section on the transit program states, in part, and I quote, "Outlay savings of \$610 million in 1990 and \$5.7 billion over the 1990 to 1994 period could be obtained by reducing the Federal match on capital grants to 50 percent," close quote.

The report goes on to note, and I quote again, that, "In the waste water treatment program, reducing the Federal share of investment to around 50 percent has improved investment choices," and notes that, "a reduced share," 50 percent, "in mass transit might have similar benefits." So the Congressional Budget Office seems to be on the track of increased local contributions.

A higher level of local funding for the construction of major rail systems is now the policy of the Department of Transportation. It was one of the first policy initiatives that was announced by Secretary Skinner before the American Public Transit Association in March of this year.

It is a policy that has been endorsed by the Congress itself, as reflected in the funding of the Los Angeles Rail System, which is the only system in America, by the way, that has something approaching a special authorization, and that approach is a mention in the authorization legislation that expires at the end of fiscal year 1991.

It is a policy that manifestly should apply to W.M.A.T.A. Metro-rail system as a future participant of the Federal mass transit programs.

I am well aware, Mr. Chairman, that some 10 years ago this committee played a significant role in enacting the Stark-Harris legislation that provided funding for the construction of the Metrorail system through the 1980's.

From a review of that bill's legislative history, it is clear that Members of Congress and of this committee thought that the Stark-Harris legislation would authorize the funding necessary to complete the remaining 40 miles of the Metrorail system and, thus, fulfill the Federal Government's role in funding Metrorail.

In fact, in 1979 President Carter predicated his public endorsement of the legislation on the assurance of the W.M.A.T.A. Board that funds made available under Stark-Harris were all that would be needed to complete the system. At that time, President Carter stated, and I quote, "The Federal Government has now placed its total monetary commitment to Metro on the table," close quote.

In brief, congressional support for Metrorail, as well as that of past administrations, was based on the presumption that there would be a monetary limit to W.M.A.T.A.'s demand for Federal assistance.



To abandon the preferential treatment to which Metrorail has long been accustomed would not constitute a breach of the Federal Government's commitment to the system. It would simply acknowledge that the assumptions on which that commitment was initially made and, thus, the nature of that obligation itself, have changed.

We believe it is time, Mr. Chairman, for a fundamental change in our policy of funding the Metrorail system. The era of special treatment in the form of a special local authorization should be over.

Furthermore, there is sufficient time for Congress to carefully consider this issue. As we meet this afternoon, W.M.A.T.A. has yet to put to bid some \$476 million in construction contracts for which Stark-Harris funds have been appropriated and which will provide a full-construction schedule for several years.

In other words, additional funds are not immediately required to maintain the construction progress or to keep construction going further on the lines of the system.

Indeed, substantial final engineering of, and refined cost estimates for, the remainder of the system will not be completed for several years.

Based on updated cost estimates and the progress of the construction that is now underway, we and W.M.A.T.A. are both confident that the 89.5-mile system can be completed within the funds available under the Stark-Harris authorization and quite probably with a balance remaining of at least \$100 million.

This will be known with greater certainty when the remaining construction contracts are in place within the next year. But it is clearly a comfortable position for W.M.A.T.A. to be in regarding construction management, and they are to be congratulated for that management.

We have abided by the terms of our full-funding agreement with W.M.A.T.A. and have committed, and remain committed, to annual appropriation levels sufficient to complete the federally authorized 89.5-mile system within the funds available under the Stark-Harris authorization.

As I recently noted in testimony before our Appropriations Committees, our 1990 budget request of \$42 million is more than adequate to continue providing project management and ancillary activities needed to bring the 20 additional miles, which will complete 89.5 miles of the Metro system, into revenue operation. This is in addition to the \$51 million annual payment for interest on the W.M.A.T.A. bonds.

Let me emphasize that the position we are taking, Mr. Chairman, is not hostile to W.M.A.T.A. We are not committing to completion of the 103-mile system, but neither, however, are we opposed to it.

Our view is that regarding construction of the final 13.5 miles, W.M.A.T.A. must be prepared to participate in the overall Federal mass transit program that is in place after fiscal year 1991 on the same terms as other transit systems in other cities.

Equally important, the focus really needs to be turned to local resources. This is an economically strong and growing area, which includes four of the wealthiest counties in this Nation.

Other areas have expanded their local support for their mass transit needs. In this area, however, the Congress and the executive branch have demonstrated both good will and financial support for Metro, while the W.M.A.T.A. Board has ignored the hand-writing on the wall with respect to the need for more local funding.

Why cannot the W.M.A.T.A. Board show the same regional unity and commitment to securing greater local funds that it has demonstrated in obtaining Federal funds?

As an April 20, 1986, Washington Post editorial noted, and I quote, "The participating governments should resume in earnest their on again, off again, complex search for dedicated sources of revenues. It's called facing up to reality. And in these hard financial times, it demands new political courage and understanding," close quote.

Well, if that was true in 1986, when we didn't have the huge deficit that we have today, it is more true now.

Mr. Chairman, I complete my statement on that note. Thank you very much. I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of Administrator Dellibovi follows:]

STATEMENT OF ALFRED A. DELLIBOVI  
ADMINISTRATOR, URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION  
BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS  
AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS  
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
MAY 4, 1989

MR. CHAIRMAN, DISTINGUISHED MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, I AM PLEASED TO APPEAR BEFORE YOU TODAY TO DISCUSS THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1969 WHICH WOULD AUTHORIZE \$2.16 BILLION TO COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION OF THE WASHINGTON, D.C. METRORAIL SYSTEM.

AT THE OUTSET, I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT I HAVE ADDRESSED THE ISSUE REFLECTED IN THIS LEGISLATION OVER THE PAST TWO BUDGET CYCLES IN ANSWERING QUESTIONS BEFORE HOUSE AND SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEES. THUS, IT SHOULD COME AS NO SURPRISE TO THE COMMITTEE THAT THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION AND THE ADMINISTRATION STRONGLY OPPOSE H.R. 1463 AND ITS UNDERLYING POLICY.

IN THIS TIME OF BUDGETARY CONSTRAINTS, AND GIVEN THE ENORMOUS FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO CONSTRUCTION OF THE METRORAIL SYSTEM TO DATE, WE BELIEVE THAT THE ERA OF SPECIAL LEGISLATION FOR ITS FURTHER SUPPORT SHOULD BE OVER. RATHER, FUTURE FUNDING OF THE

METRORAIL SYSTEM SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN THE CONTEXT OF FUTURE FUNDING OF THE ENTIRE FEDERAL MASS TRANSIT PROGRAM -- WHICH ITSELF MUST BE CONSIDERED IN THE CONTEXT OF THE OVERALL BUDGET AND OF THE NATION'S TRANSIT NEEDS.

TO BE MORE EXPLICIT, OUR POSITION IS THAT ON EXPIRATION OF THE EXISTING SPECIAL STARK-HARRIS AUTHORIZATION, FURTHER FINANCING OF WASHINGTON METRORAIL SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN THE CONTEXT OF THE BASIC FEDERAL URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE FEDERAL TRANSIT PROGRAM WILL CERTAINLY BE AN ISSUE BEFORE THE CONGRESS SOON SINCE THE CURRENT AUTHORIZATION EXPIRES AT THE END OF FISCAL YEAR 1991.

TO PUT THIS ISSUE IN A NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE, LET ME REVIEW FOR YOU THE LEVEL AND EXTENT OF FEDERAL FUNDING FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE METRORAIL SYSTEM TO DATE, AND COMPARE THAT WITH THE FUNDING OF MAJOR TRANSIT CAPITAL PROJECTS IN OTHER CITIES.

INCLUDING THE FEDERAL SHARE OF PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST COSTS OF THE CONSTRUCTION BONDS, WHICH BECAME A FEDERAL LIABILITY UPON ENACTMENT OF THE STARK-HARRIS ACT IN 1979, THE FEDERAL INVESTMENT TO COMPLETE 89.5 MILES OF THE 103-MILE SYSTEM WILL TOTAL \$7.72 BILLION, OR 73.3 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL COST OF \$10.6 BILLION FOR

THE 89.5 MILES. THIS ENORMOUS AMOUNT OF FEDERAL FUNDING, \$7.72 BILLION, QUITE OBVIOUSLY IS MORE THAN ANY OTHER CITY HAS RECEIVED OR CAN EXPECT TO RECEIVE. IN SHORT, FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN THE WASHINGTON METRORAIL SYSTEM HAS FAR EXCEEDED THE NORM.

- O IN ATLANTA, FOR EXAMPLE, CONSTRUCTION OF THE PLANNED 53-MILE SYSTEM HAS BEEN UNDERWAY SINCE 1971, ABOUT THE SAME TIME THAT CONSTRUCTION OF THE WASHINGTON METRORAIL SYSTEM BEGAN. THROUGH REVENUES DERIVED FROM A SALES TAX, AND A LONG-STANDING LOCAL COMMITMENT TO COMPLETE THE SYSTEM, \$1.4 BILLION OF LOCAL FUNDS AND \$1.5 BILLION OF FEDERAL FUNDS, OR ROUGHLY A 50-50 FEDERAL AND LOCAL SHARE, HAVE BEEN INVESTED IN THE SYSTEM.
  
- O MORE RECENTLY, IN 1986 LOS ANGELES BEGAN CONSTRUCTION OF A 17.3 MILE HEAVY-RAIL TRANSIT LINE ESTIMATED TO COST \$3.5 BILLION WITH NO MORE THAN A 50-50 FEDERAL/LOCAL COST SHARE.
  
- O THE SAN FRANCISCO AREA IS PLANNING SOME \$2 BILLION IN VARIOUS RAIL TRANSIT INVESTMENTS OVER THE NEXT SEVERAL YEARS, INTENDING A LOCAL SHARE OF 75 PERCENT AND FEDERAL SHARE OF 25 PERCENT. REFERENDUMS WERE PASSED IN PARTICIPATING COUNTIES DURING THE PAST YEAR TO AUTHORIZE TAXES TO MAKE THIS POSSIBLE.

0 OTHER EXAMPLES INCLUDE SEATTLE, WHICH WILL COMPLETE IN 1990 AN INNOVATIVE BUS TUNNEL PROJECT AT A 50-50 FEDERAL/LOCAL COST SHARE, AND THE SANTA CLARA-GUADALUPE CORRIDOR LIGHT RAIL LINE ALSO AT A 50-50 COST SHARE.

THERE ARE A NUMBER OF OTHER EXAMPLES IN CITIES WHICH UNLIKE WMATA MUST COMPETE WITH EACH OTHER FOR LIMITED FEDERAL ASSISTANCE. IN RESPONSE TO THE REAL WORLD CONDITIONS IN WHICH WE FIND OURSELVES, THESE CITIES HAVE ACCEPTED THE PRINCIPLE OF SIGNIFICANT LOCAL FUNDING OF NEW RAIL SYSTEMS. BY CONTRAST, THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY (WMATA) IS ATTEMPTING TO PRESERVE ITS ADVANTAGEOUS POSITION OVER ALL OTHER TRANSIT SYSTEMS BY PROPOSING AN EXTENSION OF ITS SPECIAL AUTHORIZATION AT AN 80 PERCENT FEDERAL SHARE/20 PERCENT LOCAL SHARE, RAISING THE FEDERAL TAB FOR "AMERICA'S SUBWAY" TO \$9.9 BILLION. LET ME NOTE THAT EVEN IF THE REMAINDER OF THE SYSTEM, SOME 13.5 MILES, WERE COMPLETED ENTIRELY WITH LOCAL FUNDS, FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN THE TOTAL COST OF THE 103-MILE SYSTEM WOULD STILL TOTAL ALMOST 60 PERCENT, BASED ON WMATA'S ESTIMATED REMAINING COST TO COMPLETE OF APPROXIMATELY \$2.7 BILLION.

WMATA OF COURSE CONTINUES TO ASSERT A SPECIAL FEDERAL INTEREST IN CONSTRUCTION OF THE METRORAIL SYSTEM. THAT MAY HAVE BEEN A VALID CLAIM WHEN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT WAS PASSED IN 1969. THERE WAS NOT AT THAT TIME A MATURE FEDERAL MASS TRANSIT PROGRAM. NOR WAS THERE A TRANSIT TRUST FUND ACCOUNT WHEN THE STARK-HARRIS ACT WAS PASSED IN 1979. IN THE INTERIM,

HOWEVER, MUCH HAS CHANGED. AND TODAY, WITH ONLY 13.5 MILES OF THE TOTAL SYSTEM TO BE FUNDED, THE CASE FOR SPECIAL TREATMENT NO LONGER EXISTS. COMPLETING 13.5 MILES IS NO MORE THAN THE EQUIVALENT OF THE NEW LINES BEING ADVANCED IN SEGMENTS IN THE OTHER CITIES I'VE MENTIONED AT A SIGNIFICANTLY HIGHER LOCAL SHARE. I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT ANY CLAIMED SPECIAL FEDERAL INTEREST IN THE METRORAIL SYSTEM SHOULD EXEMPT WMATA FROM PARTICIPATING IN WHATEVER MASS TRANSIT PROGRAMS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE NEXT REAUTHORIZATION. NOR DO I BELIEVE THAT ANY ALLEGED FEDERAL INTEREST WARRANTS THE CONTINUATION OF 80 PERCENT FEDERAL FUNDING WHEN TODAY OTHER CITIES THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY ARE FINANCIALLY ABLE AND WILLING TO PROVIDE 50 PERCENT OF THE REQUIRED FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT AND COMPLETE THEIR NEW RAIL SYSTEMS.

IN THIS CONNECTION, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD CALL THE COMMITTEE'S ATTENTION TO A FEBRUARY 1989 REPORT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE TO THE HOUSE AND SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEES REGARDING OPTIONS FOR REDUCING THE FEDERAL DEFICIT. THE SECTION ON THE TRANSIT PROGRAM STATES IN PART: "OUTLAY SAVINGS OF \$610 MILLION IN 1990, AND \$5.7 BILLION OVER THE 1990 TO 1994 PERIOD, COULD BE OBTAINED BY REDUCING THE FEDERAL MATCH ON CAPITAL GRANTS TO 50 PERCENT ...". THE REPORT GOES ON TO NOTE THAT "IN THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PROGRAM, REDUCING THE FEDERAL SHARE OF INVESTMENT TO AROUND 50 PERCENT HAS IMPROVED INVESTMENT CHOICES ..." AND NOTES THAT ... "A REDUCED (50 PERCENT) SHARE IN MASS TRANSIT MIGHT HAVE SIMILAR BENEFITS."

A HIGHER LEVEL OF LOCAL FUNDING FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MAJOR RAIL SYSTEMS IS NOW THE POLICY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION. IT WAS ONE OF THE FIRST POLICY INITIATIVES ANNOUNCED BY SECRETARY SKINNER IN A SPEECH BEFORE THE AMERICAN PUBLIC TRANSIT ASSOCIATION. IT IS A POLICY THAT HAS BEEN ENDORSED BY THE CONGRESS ITSELF AS REFLECTED IN THE FUNDING OF THE LOS ANGELES RAIL SYSTEM, AND IT IS A POLICY THAT MANIFESTLY SHOULD APPLY TO THE WMATA METRORAIL SYSTEM, AS A FUTURE PARTICIPANT OF FEDERAL MASS TRANSIT PROGRAMS.

I AM WELL AWARE, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT SOME TEN YEARS AGO THIS COMMITTEE PLAYED A SIGNIFICANT ROLE IN ENACTING THE STARK-HARRIS LEGISLATION THAT PROVIDED FUNDING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE METRORAIL SYSTEM THROUGH THE EIGHTIES. FROM A REVIEW OF THAT BILL'S LEGISLATIVE HISTORY, IT IS CLEAR THAT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, AND OF THIS COMMITTEE, THOUGHT THAT THE STARK-HARRIS LEGISLATION WOULD AUTHORIZE THE FUNDING NECESSARY TO COMPLETE THE REMAINING 40 MILES OF THE METRORAIL SYSTEM AND THUS FULFILL THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN FUNDING METRORAIL. IN FACT, IN 1979 PRESIDENT CARTER PREDICATED HIS PUBLIC ENDORSEMENT OF THE LEGISLATION ON THE ASSURANCE OF THE WMATA BOARD THAT FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE UNDER STARK-HARRIS WERE ALL THAT WOULD BE NEEDED TO COMPLETE THE SYSTEM WHEN HE STATED: "THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS NOW PLACED ITS TOTAL MONETARY COMMITMENT TO METRO ON THE TABLE."



IN BRIEF, CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR METRORAIL, AS WELL AS THAT OF PAST ADMINISTRATIONS, WAS BASED ON THE PRESUMPTION THAT THERE WOULD BE A MONETARY LIMIT TO WMATA'S DEMAND FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE. TO ABANDON THE PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT TO WHICH METRORAIL HAS LONG BEEN ACCUSTOMED WOULD NOT CONSTITUTE A BREACH OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S COMMITMENT TO THE SYSTEM. IT WOULD SIMPLY ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE ASSUMPTIONS ON WHICH THAT COMMITMENT WAS INITIALLY MADE AND, THUS, THE NATURE OF THE OBLIGATION ITSELF, HAVE CHANGED SINCE THEN.

WE BELIEVE IT IS TIME, MR. CHAIRMAN, FOR A FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE IN OUR POLICY OF FUNDING THE METRORAIL SYSTEM. THE ERA OF SPECIAL TREATMENT IN THE FORM OF SPECIAL AUTHORIZATION SHOULD BE OVER. FURTHERMORE, THERE IS SUFFICIENT TIME FOR CONGRESS TO CAREFULLY CONSIDER THIS ISSUE. AS WE MEET TODAY, WMATA HAS YET TO PUT TO BID SOME \$476 MILLION OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS FOR WHICH STARK-HARRIS FUNDS HAVE BEEN APPROPRIATED, AND WHICH WILL PROVIDE A FULL CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE FOR SEVERAL YEARS. IN OTHER WORDS, ADDITIONAL FUNDS ARE NOT IMMEDIATELY REQUIRED TO MAINTAIN CONSTRUCTION PROGRESS. INDEED, SUBSTANTIAL FINAL ENGINEERING OF, AND REFINED COST ESTIMATES FOR, THE REMAINDER OF THE SYSTEM WILL NOT BE COMPLETED FOR SEVERAL YEARS.

BASED ON UPDATED COST ESTIMATES AND THE PROGRESS OF CONSTRUCTION UNDERWAY, WE AND WMATA ARE CONFIDENT THAT 89.5 MILES OF THE SYSTEM CAN BE COMPLETED WITHIN THE FUNDS AVAILABLE UNDER THE STARK-HARRIS AUTHORIZATION AND QUITE PROBABLY WITH A BALANCE

REMAINING OF APPROXIMATELY \$100 MILLION. THIS WILL BE KNOWN WITH GREATER CERTAINTY WHEN THE REMAINING CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS ARE IN PLACE WITHIN THE NEXT YEAR. BUT IT IS CLEARLY A COMFORTABLE POSITION FOR WMATA TO BE IN REGARDING CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT.

WE HAVE ABIDED BY THE TERMS OF OUR FULL FUNDING AGREEMENT WITH WMATA AND HAVE COMMITTED, AND REMAIN COMMITTED, TO ANNUAL APPROPRIATION LEVELS SUFFICIENT TO COMPLETE THE FEDERALLY AUTHORIZED 89.5 MILES SYSTEM WITHIN THE FUNDS AVAILABLE UNDER THE STARK-HARRIS AUTHORIZATION. AS I RECENTLY NOTED IN TESTIMONY BEFORE OUR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES, OUR FY 1990 BUDGET REQUEST OF \$42 MILLION IS MORE THAN ADEQUATE TO CONTINUE PROVIDING PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND ANCILLARY ACTIVITIES NEEDED TO BRING THE 20 ADDITIONAL MILES, WHICH WILL COMPLETE 89.5 MILES OF THE METRO RAIL SYSTEM, INTO REVENUE OPERATION. THIS IS IN ADDITION TO THE \$51 MILLION ANNUAL PAYMENT FOR INTEREST ON THE WMATA BONDS.

LET ME EMPHASIZE THAT THE POSITION WE ARE TAKING, MR. CHAIRMAN, IS NOT HOSTILE TO WMATA. WE ARE NOT COMMITTING TO COMPLETION OF THE 103-MILES SYSTEM. NEITHER, HOWEVER, ARE WE OPPOSED TO IT. OUR VIEW IS THAT, REGARDING CONSTRUCTION OF THE FINAL 13.5 MILES, WMATA MUST BE PREPARED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE OVERALL FEDERAL MASS TRANSIT PROGRAM IN PLACE AFTER FISCAL YEAR 1991 ON THE SAME TERMS AS OTHER TRANSIT SYSTEMS.

BUT EQUALLY IMPORTANT, THE FOCUS REALLY NEEDS TO BE TURNED TO LOCAL RESOURCES. THIS IS AN ECONOMICALLY STRONG AND GROWING AREA WHICH INCLUDES FOUR OF THE WEALTHIEST COUNTIES IN THE COUNTRY. OTHER AREAS HAVE EXPANDED THEIR LOCAL SUPPORT FOR THEIR MASS TRANSIT NEEDS. IN THIS AREA, HOWEVER, THE CONGRESS AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH HAVE DEMONSTRATED BOTH GOOD WILL AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR METRO, WHILE THE WMATA BOARD HAS IGNORED THE HANDWRITING ON THE WALL WITH RESPECT TO THE NEED FOR MORE LOCAL FUNDING. WHY CANNOT THE WMATA BOARD SHOW THE SAME REGIONAL UNITY AND COMMITMENT TO SECURE GREATER LOCAL FUNDS THAT IT HAS DEMONSTRATED IN OBTAINING FEDERAL FUNDS? AS AN APRIL 20, 1986, WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL NOTED, "... THE PARTICIPATING GOVERNMENTS SHOULD RESUME IN EARNEST THEIR ON-AGAIN, OFF-AGAIN, COMPLEX SEARCH FOR DEDICATED SOURCES OF REVENUES .... IT'S CALLED FACING UP TO REALITY - AND IN THESE HARD FINANCIAL TIMES, IT DEMANDS NEW POLITICAL COURAGE AND UNDERSTANDING."

MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT COMPLETES MY STATEMENT. I WOULD BE PLEASED TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you, Mr. Dellibovi. We appreciate your statement and the detail that you've gone into to provide us with the administration's position. I want to ask you a couple of questions, and then I'm sure there will be other questions from members of the committee.

One of the things that you seemed to stress, is in other areas of the country, and you cited Atlanta, Los Angeles, Seattle, and San Francisco, the trend is to move toward a much higher percentage of local match.

But in your statement, you have suggested that at this point in time, the administration is not prepared to support any additional funding, at least any special dedicated funding, to the Washington area Metro system.

Are you suggesting that if, in fact, the match were a different match, a higher local match, that the administration would be willing to reconsider its position?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Secretary Skinner has indicated that he would give preferential treatment to those proposals which have as a basic element a significant local overmatch, more than the 25 percent that is now required by the regular UMTA program.

Next year the transit program will be up for reauthorization. The Secretary has repeatedly indicated his desire to develop a national transportation policy.

I am confident that, as part of that process, the administration will be moving toward a program which has as an essential ingredient a transit program with a substantial local contribution.

I am not prepared today to make a commitment on behalf of that because we believe that it should be done as part of the total transportation reauthorization process that the Congress will go through next year. We don't believe any one city should be separated out at this time to get a leap ahead of what the rest of America is going to confront next year.

Mobility is not a problem just in the Washington, DC area. Though I live here and would be presumably satisfied as a local resident if it were solved only in this area, I recognize, as a Federal transit official, that the mobility problem is in Overland Park, Kansas or in the San Francisco Bay area or in my hometown of New York City, or in New Jersey.

There are mobility problems all over America, and they should all be dealt with together fairly.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Dellibovi, we understand your argument. Let me just ask you to work through this with me for a moment.

As I understand what you're saying, what you would essentially be doing is having local communities bid for projects and, based not only on the quality of the project and the demonstrated need of the project they are going to give an area, a part of the consideration for whether or not there would be Federal funds awarded would be based on the willingness of a local community to come up with a higher than normal local share for a particular project.

Then, based on that commitment, since these projects all have to be phased and staged in over a period of years, the Federal Government would then make a long-term commitment to a given community.

That community would be able to rely on the word of the Federal Government for the amount of money committed for that period of time to finish a project.

Is that correct?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. We favor the funding of Federal projects on a cost-effective basis to leverage the funds that are available. That requires the kind of process that you have outlined.

Mr. WHEAT. Well, I think you see the point I'm getting to is that this is not a new project. This is not a project that is being begun today. This is a project that was started many years ago, based upon a commitment of the Federal Government to see the project through to completion.

In fact, you noted in your statement that the Congress had made a commitment to and had expected that the project was going to be completed with the funds that were appropriated.

That is not only an indication that the funds were hoped to be sufficient at that time, but that the Congress did plan for the entire project to be completed.

The entire project is not an 89.5-mile system. It's a 103-mile system.

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Well, let me answer your question in two parts. First, the project was never defined by the Congress. The Congress does not participate in the definition of how big the project is.

The project was defined by the local authorities and, as a matter of fact, the project has grown somewhat. It is a bigger project now in mileage than was originally envisioned. That is point number one.

The second point is that when the original commitment was made, there was not a Federal transit program for all American cities in the nature of the one that we now have at the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. In fact, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration was not at that time in existence.

There now is an Urban Mass Transportation Administration. There now is a Federal transportation program for cities. We believe that this city should compete, just as every other city is required to do.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Dellibovi, I would again think that you could see the potential problems we would run into if, in fact, we followed the process that you suggest and outlined for the rest of this administration after we make commitments to cities.

For instance, in Kansas City, if we would seek funds for expansion of our transit system, and the next or future administrations later decide to change the rules, it makes it very awkward to plan for the long-range completion of any kind of transportation system.

Now, it is my understanding—and feel free to correct me if I'm wrong—but I went back over and read all of the transcripts of the hearings and the floor debate on the passage of Stark-Harris.

My understanding is that the Congress did refer to and make a commitment to building the complete adopted regional system. While there isn't any mileage statement in the legislation itself, the adopted regional system, while it wasn't a 103-mile system originally, it was approximately a 101-mile system.

It's only as a result of some route changes that it's been expanded to about 103 miles.

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Well, the adopted regional system is that system which was adopted by the local authorities. In point of fact, there is nothing to stop those local authorities from adopting more amendments and extending the system further.

My point is, and I think President Carter recognized that when he said in 1979, "The Federal Government has now placed its total monetary commitment to Metro on the table."

I believe, and the administration believes, that the position taken by President Carter was the right position at that time, and that cities like Kansas City, cities such as Oakland, California, which are also looking for new systems, cities like Baltimore, Maryland, they had a right, and proceeded planning, figuring that there might be more money available and not that this one system would gobble up a new special authorization from the transportation funds.

Mr. WHEAT. Let me just ask one more brief question before we go on to the other panel members. One of the arguments that you point out is that you think that it's an economically viable and strong area and, in fact, some of the areas ought to be contributing a higher percentage of their local share based on their economic viability.

But one of the lines that remains to be finished is in the most transit-dependent areas of the entire Metro system, not just of the 13.5 miles that remains to be finished, but of the entire Metro system.

What would you suggest our attitude should be toward that area, recognizing the limited economic resources that would be available from those citizens to pay for their own Metro system?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. First of all, all but two of the stations on the green line will be completed—I believe it's two stations—with the existing authorization.

I would strongly urge the Congress that if it feels compelled to go with a special authorization for any of the system, that it target it to the neediest inner-city areas first because that clearly is the priority.

I would also tell you, Mr. Chairman, that our experience in this area has been that Metrorail is not meeting the needs of inner-city residents. The biggest need that inner-city residents have is to get to jobs that are growing in the suburbs, and Metro simply doesn't take people to those jobs.

We have done a number of studies and created some experimental services under our entrepreneurial services program to do what Metro doesn't do. We find that people living in the vicinity of the green line, where the green line will be, if they want to get out to any of the new jobs in Fairfax County, and we want them to get there or in suburban Maryland, they have to take a bus from their home to a train to the Pentagon or some kind of bus that wanders around these suburban counties and eventually gets them to a job.

It takes them about 2.5 hours to get there. It costs them about \$4.50 each way. They simply won't do that for entry-level jobs.

We believe that there are flexible local community-based services, usually operated with small vans or buses, that can be a much better vehicle for getting those folks onto the ladder of opportunity, for getting them to jobs.

It's not enough to get people jobs if they can't get to jobs. The experience, unfortunately, has been, because of the way Metro was laid out when these new towns weren't even on the maps, that people can't get to where the jobs are.

Mr. WHEAT. Well, Mr. Dellibovi, I understand the arguments. In fact, as I looked at the layout of the system, I did wonder if there would be some kind of problem with that.

Obviously, the system is designed to work very well for people coming into the city from suburban areas. I am not aware, and have to take your word, as to how well it works in reverse for people going seeking employment.

But inasmuch as the great majority of the system is in place, would it not be better at this time to try and do the kinds of things that you're suggesting to make the system work better for people seeking job opportunities in the suburban areas instead of abandoning the completion of the system at this point?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. We do not endorse abandoning completion of the system. We just suggest that an incremental approach ought to be taken. Maybe it will be built a little bit slower.

I certainly hope the whole 103-mile system is built. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that when the 103.5-mile system is built, there will be an appropriate time to expand that system.

The question that we have in this time of budgetary constraint is: How fast do you build those last 13 miles? How fast can we afford to add the additional miles?

There's no doubt in my mind that the additional 13 miles will be built and will be built in my lifetime, I might add.

Mr. WHEAT. Thank you.

We will now turn to the rest of the committee for questions and comments. Mr. Parris?

Mr. PARRIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Al, it's good to have you here. We've worked together on the commuter rail parking facilities, H.O.V. lanes, and that sort of thing for a number of years. It's good to see you.

But I gather from what you say that 13.5 miles will be built. It won't be built—it may be built in your lifetime, but not with your help. I don't mean "you" in the personal sense. Be my guest is basically what you're saying.

If this is not intended to be a hostile statement to W.M.A.T.A., then I'd sure as hell hate to see one of its friends come up here.

Let me just make a couple of points, and we are not going to solve this problem here today, I gather, in terms of our respective positions. But you did make mention of the fact that the system has grown somewhat. It's grown 2 miles, as the chairman has pointed out, from 101 to 103, which I wouldn't call an enormous change over 23 years.

Now, it is true that it has gone up in cost, but I would remind you that the original inflation increment of the cost of the system was something like 20 percent. Now it's expected to be 70, almost 70 percent. So there is an enormous difference in there, in that situation as well.

Very frankly, I think what you're telling us today—and I don't quarrel with your sincerity or your good faith in saying so. I would much rather have you, very frankly, come up here and take the

position you've taken in good faith and be forthcoming about it than to come up here and blow smoke at us and then in some way be uncooperative in a quiet way. I mean that sincerely.

Having said that, you can imagine that I'm somewhat less than enthusiastic about what you said. My point, very simply is, it seems to me that your statement simply represents the change of position by the Government.

It started in Ralph Stanley's, your predecessor's position, several years ago; 89.5 miles is all that's going to be authorized. That's it. You guys deal with the rest of it. It's your problem. Don't bother us with it.

Now, that's a little, I think, short sighted, Al, and I'll tell you why. You say in your statement that the funding of Metro has to be compared with the funding of major transit capital projects in other cities.

Do you really think it's a valid comparison, that there should be no recognition of the fact that this is the Nation's Capital? Is this the same city as Los Angeles or Miami or New York? Isn't there a distinction?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Well, Mr. Parris, there certainly is a distinction, and I think it is recognized by the \$7.7 billion down payment that distinguishes this system from all the rest.

I would say that, second, there is a distinct difference between what you have represented as an 89.5-mile, "that's it" position, and my position. My position is that 89.5 miles is all that should be built under a special authorization and that the remainder of the system should be built under the regular Federal mass transit program administered by UMTA.

Mr. PARRIS. Let me interrupt right there, Al, because that's where I'm coming from. The 89.5-mile system is a portion of the system that the Federal Government signed off on 23 years ago. That's the point.

Now, we have come to that place, or we will come to it soon, and the Government now says, "All right. We support, as we always have, the completion of it, but it's your problem, not our problem."

Let me tell you the difference between Los Angeles and New York and Washington. I've got 200,000 people that work in this town every day. If you wanted to work for the Justice Department or for UMTA, you come to UMTA's office.

If I want to work for an attorney in Philadelphia, I can live anywhere I want. If I don't like that, I can move to New York. But if I want to work for UMTA, I've got to come to Washington to your office downtown.

In order to get there, if I'm typical, I'm going to have to, at least in part, ride the subway system. Now, if that isn't a distinction between the Nation's Capital and the Justice Department, and there's only one of those and there always will be, at least the headquarters, then I don't know what it takes to make the argument.

Isn't that a distinction?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Well, if I wanted to work for the New York Times and I was a reporter, the only place I could work would be New York. If I wanted to work for the Los Angeles Times—I mean, I'm not sure that, with all of the national needs we have in this coun-



try, that moving people to their job whatever way they want to get there, I follow the argument.

But the point is I have testified that we would support completion of the system, but completion on a fair and equal basis, just as someone in New York or Los Angeles or any other city would compete for funds.

It could happen, by the way, just as fast under the basic authorization, especially if there was an increase in the local match—this is among the wealthiest areas in the country, and I think the areas could afford to put up a little bit more money to keep this project moving, particularly the suburban jurisdictions.

Mr. PARRIS. Let me ask you from a personal standpoint, then. You're the chairman, the administrator—I'm sorry; I've forgotten the correct word—of the Urban Mass Transportation.

If this legislation was amended to say a 75 percent or let me go even further, rhetorically; all right? Let's say it's 50-50. Would you support it? Would you take it to the Secretary and say, "I'm for this"?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. If the legislation were amended to be a 50-50 local share, I would certainly bring that to the attention of the Secretary and point that out to him.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Don't bother. Don't bother. We will do that.

Mr. DELLIBOVI. I would say it is a substantial factor.

Mr. PARRIS. Which way do you want it, Al? I mean, that is not exactly responsive to my question; OK? I mean, he is going to get his attention brought to it just like he does to the annual appropriation.

My question is: What are you going to say about it?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. I would have to read the amendment, the language of the amendment. I learned one thing when I was a State legislator four terms in Albany, and that is I never made commitments on bills until I saw the amendment in writing.

But if you have an amended version of the bill and can get it into the hopper while I'm still at the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, I will be happy to give you a commitment on making your views known.

Mr. PARRIS. Well, there is another thing, two old saws, that I will remind you of, Al. One is never say never.

Mr. DELLIBOVI. I've learned that.

Mr. PARRIS. I've had my friend from the District of Columbia, who, as you know, is a minister, a person of the cloth. I've had benedictions said over a lot of my words over 25 years. I even once had the guy say in the benediction, "Please bless these words about to be said because the guy who's about to say them may have to eat them." That's a true statement.

I submit to you that this is not an issue that's going to go away. I don't know how long you're going to be at UMTA. Maybe you'll be there longer than I'll be here, which is, as I've said two or three times already today, not going to be that long.

But there is going to be some earnest effort put on this legislation by all of us. I don't mean that in an antagonistic way. I hope you understand our differences here are most certainly not personal.

By the same token, I think there is a difference. I will just attempt to say it one more time. If I'm a young man and I apply for a civil service job and I get assigned as an attorney, theoretically, to work for the Justice Department, downtown Washington, then I have no choice. If that's what I want to do as a career choice then I have to take that job and go to that place and live in that city and ride its subway system.

I think there's a difference between that and some town in Iowa you mentioned. If I want to go to that town in Iowa and work for it as an attorney, I can do so, but not if I want to work for the Justice Department.

That is why this is the Nation's Capital, and that is why there are enormous personnel requirements that I think that the Federal Government overlooks at its peril.

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Well, I would just point out, Mr. Parris, though, that hypothetical attorney, if he were to locate in your district, where I live, he could get on the W.M.A.T.A. bus and have a swift ride down to the Pentagon and get on the Metrorail, as I did today and yesterday, and complete his trip to wherever downtown he wants to go, with the exception of a couple of stations along the green line.

So there is an opportunity for that young person. There is a bus system that works very well in conjunction with the rail system. That alternative is available in the interim, until the funding can be put in place.

I would submit to you I didn't mention a town in Iowa, but I could have. There are plenty of places in America where there is no alternative but the private automobile. There are, unfortunately, plenty of Americans who are not fortunate enough to have government jobs. As a matter of fact, they're not fortunate enough to have any jobs because they have no way to get to work.

I think that, as we look at the total issues confronting this country, a special authorization of this magnitude at this time is not going to be the kind of priority that we can afford.

It may sound self-serving in a sense, as I am leaving the Department of Transportation to go to another domestic agency, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, one where I frankly believe that those programs certainly are closer to human needs.

There are a lot of competing issues, and I don't envy any of you in the Congress who are going to have to sort this out. But this is a decision, this authorization question, that you face that goes to the heart of that matter.

To decide not to fund Metro at the level they're seeking does not mean, necessarily, that people are opposed to Metro, but that there may be other priorities.

I submit that, from the administration's point of view, we believe there are going to be higher priorities that need to be faced with the limited resources available.

Mr. PARRIS. Well, I will say three things very quickly, and my time has expired. The chairman has been most generous.

Number one, I wish you well at HUD. I had heard that there was a transfer imminent. I did not know how imminent or where it was going to be, and I wish you well. I mean that honestly.

Number two, I think you would have to concede to me that the completion of this system will be made extraordinarily easy if, in fact, the Federal Government continues to provide the 80 percent that was provided in the past as opposed to local funding, total local funding, which is obviously more difficult.

You will grant me that as a concession?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Well, it will be easy in the sense that it—

Mr. PARRIS. You don't have to answer now.

Mr. DELLIBOVI. If I may, I will answer it right now. It will be easier because it will let certain people, particularly local officials in Richmond, get off the hook. They are very good, apparently, at getting off the hook and letting northern Virginia and this part of the State strangle itself while they get roads that nobody rides on.

That's where the money apparently goes. I, as a taxpayer in the Commonwealth of Virginia, resent the fact that the people in Richmond that are now there have failed to face up to the local needs of northern Virginia and have abandoned that part of the Commonwealth when it comes to transportation.

Despite a lot of lip service, I am not sure that the locally elected officials have done a better job. But that is another issue.

So yes, the answer is that the Federal Government is the only game because in Richmond, they don't do what they do in Albany, in Trenton, in Springfield, Illinois, in Sacramento, California; in so many other State capitals. They don't care about transportation in the congested area.

Mr. PARRIS. Well, I am going to be one of those persons that lives in Richmond here one of these days, Al. You can count on it. It's going to get better. All right?

Finally, let me just say I hope that you will take back to Secretary Skinner the message, and that you will leave to your successor a quiet note somewhere in the desk that says, "I hope they would not slam the door on the consideration, at least," of the uniqueness and that the extraordinary requirements of the Nation's Capital, in terms of mass transit. Whether it turns out in the ultimate legislative process of all this to be this year or next year or 50 percent or 100 percent, I would hope that your successor and this administration would not slam the door on some kind of participation in furnishing what I think is a critical public need.

I mean this honestly. I mean this. It's good to see you. I wish you well. Thank you for being here today.

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Thank you.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Dellibovi, you have heard the buzzer ringing.

Mr. Parris and I are going to step away for a vote in just a few moments, and Mr. Fauntroy has generously agreed to continue the hearing in our absence. He will be taking the Chair in just a moment. I am sure he has some additional questions to ask of you.

I just have one question. You made a statement that under the funding mechanism you would propose, it would be possible for the 103-mile system to be completed in approximately the same amount of time as it would be under the special authorization.

Is that an indication that the \$2 billion plus being requested for this authorization would somehow be put into the national pot of funding and would be available for competition for cities across the Nation or are you saying that out of the currently expected

sources, there would be available \$2 billion less for other cities in the Nation?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Well, Mr. Wheat, I would like to provide for the committee an analysis of the existing authorization to show you exactly how the funds are programed and what the likely availability is.

If we provide that chart for the committee and for the record, we'll all be looking at the same numbers, rather than to try and discuss this here today.

Mr. WHEAT. We would appreciate that. We do appreciate your testimony here today. In fact, as a former HUD employee myself, I wish you well in your new assignment.

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Thank you.

Mr. WHEAT. As a former colleague of the new Administrator of HUD, I know you are going to have a challenging and exciting time while you are there. I have to leave for a recorded vote and Mr. Fauntroy will preside over the committee.

Mr. Fauntroy.

Mr. FAUNTROY [presiding]. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. Dellibovi, you will notice that as Mr. Parris and Mr. Wheat leave, I am able to remain. It's not because they represent more people than I. I represent more taxpaying citizens, as you know, than any single Member of the House. My constituents pay more per capita in Federal taxes than the residents of 49 of the 50 States.

Yet, I don't vote on the floor of the House. I have seniority, of course. For that reason, I'm pleased to be ranking member of this committee and second ranking member of the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee of the House, which will oversee your budget when it comes over in your new position.

But I am particularly pleased, as we have this hearing, to have the very eloquent arguments made by my colleague, Mr. Parris, on the inordinate burden placed upon the residents of this region by virtue of the Federal presence. I am sure you understand that.

It is just that Mr. Parris is not as angry as I am about the fact that while he can vote, I cannot on the floor. But inasmuch as I vote in committee and I am chairing this hearing at this point, as two junior members to me have gone to vote, I would just like to pick up at the point where Mr. Parris gave you the hypothetical of the young lawyer who would take the subway in.

Would you not agree that the cost of his subway ride to himself and certainly to those who made the system possible at the Federal and local levels would be less should we complete the entire 101-mile system inasmuch as those who are awaiting the privilege of use would be those contributing most per square mile in terms of their residences to reducing the costs of operating the system?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. I am not sure what contribution you're referring to, the tax on their residences or what.

Mr. FAUNTROY. No. The fact is that when we 20 years ago urged that the system serve not only those who come in, but those who have need to go out, we concluded that a green line, for example, would service an area of people who are far more likely—I don't know if to use it, but to need it and that these lines that remain to be completed are the most cost efficient lines in the system.

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Well, there is no doubt that if the system were to have been built on the basis of those areas that were most transit-dependent, we would not be looking at the map that we see now, and the green line would have been completed first.

Mr. FAUNTROY. True.

Mr. DELLIBOVI. I daresay that the fact that it was not completed first is testament to the fact that the system was built as a result not only of a large Federal financial contribution, but as a result of an incredible local political compact in which all of the parties, all of the jurisdictions came together and each of them received incremental stages of construction.

I don't think it's appropriate for me, but I could kibbitz here and say they should have built the whole green line first, they should have done this, they should have done that. I didn't have to go to all of the meetings where the system had to be ratified, and I am not going to second guess the way they built it.

My position is if they can be finished with existing transit programs, then that's what they should do.

Mr. FAUNTROY. But you would agree that were the full system to be completed, the relative cost to that young attorney would be less?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. I would say that's possible his fare would be less.

Mr. FAUNTROY. OK. Second, you are going over to HUD, and you will probably have to respond to measures being considered by the Banking Committee, on which Mr. Parris serves as well, that will create an opportunity for people now living in subsidized housing in the area in question in the city to acquire employment without their rent ceilings evicting them so that they can move up not only in terms of employment, but also in terms of housing opportunity.

Would you not agree that the completion of the system would certainly facilitate opportunity for jobs for persons who have been waiting a long time for the completion of the system?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. There is no doubt that inner-city residents along the green line will have an easier opportunity to get on the system when it is completed.

But, Mr. Fauntroy, I would like to remind you that every trip has both an origin and a destination, and most of the job growth in the Washington area, the new jobs, particularly the entry level jobs, are in the suburban areas.

Many of those suburban areas, and Tyson's Corner is probably the best example, are nowhere near where Metrorail goes. That is one of my concerns. It has been a concern as an Administrator of UMTA. We have created some alternative services for that.

So I would say to you that if the green line was completed tomorrow, it still might not be the answer to getting people to where the jobs are. It might help a bit, but we still need to focus on the new patterns of travel, the patterns that have developed and changed since that map was designed.

I am not faulting Metro, by the way, for not having a crystal ball. Nobody else in America had one either. But this is the pattern of growth.

So it is a complex issue. I would hope that some inner-city residents would be able to get to employment easier when the green line is completed. But I am not going to sit here today and tell you

that they all are going to be able to get to jobs because, unfortunately, the figures that I've looked at show that so many of these jobs are just nowhere near where the Metrorail goes.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Yes. It is for that reason that your suggestion was well taken that probably this system is going to expand in the future. I certainly look forward to that, and I hope I am here to see some of that.

But Mr. Parris also raised with you some differences between what you support and what, in the view of many of us, the Stark-Harris measure authorized and committed. You do support the full 101-mile system?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. I support the completion within the authorizations that have been provided for the locally adopted Metrorail system.

Mr. FAUNTROY. You know that the authorization provided was based on certain conditions. Let me just read from the bill. It says, "The Federal grants under subsection A for the adopted regional system shall be subject to" a number of conditions.

But the fact is that Stark-Harris applied to the adopted system, did it not?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. It applied a monetary authorization to the adopted system. There was a dollar figure in that authorization, as I recall, and I don't have it in front of me; \$1.7 billion, I am advised.

I would support the expenditure of every one of those dollars to complete as much of the system as those dollars would complete.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Yes. So that you would withdraw your statement that the Stark-Harris committed to 89.5 miles?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. The 89.5-mile figure was an estimate based on what people both at the Department of Transportation and W.M.A.T.A. in 1983 thought how much of the system it was expected the authorization would buy.

I have never been limited by miles. I have been limited by a pocketbook number in the authorization. I have said, when that authorization's dollar amount expires, then Washington Metro should look to the other transit funding programs that are in place.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I see. You are aware that the additional costs were really not the fault of the W.M.A.T.A. There were a number of factors, not the least of which some rather uncomfortable policies that I think may have added to the cost.

For example, is it true that we have \$600 million of the Stark-Harris authorization that we haven't drawn down right now?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Well, it may be that there are \$600 million that have not been drawn down, but that is due to the fact that the work has not been completed so the invoices haven't been processed. The real issue is that the Federal Government has obligated all of the funds for which we have received applications, and W.M.A.T.A. has draw down all of the funds they need to draw down for the work that is completed.

There is always an amount of money that is still in the Treasury because of the way the grant programs are managed; but that doesn't speak either to the management capability of the transit agency or the Federal Urban Mass Transit Administration.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I see you do mention the word "managed." Is it not true that you have required that W.M.A.T.A. have all of the

money in place before we can start a draw down, for example, on the building of operational segments?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. We have required that before a segment be funded, that there be funds available to complete it. This is based on our desire not to leave any unfinished projects underway.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Well, does that not require that really large sums of money, in the hundreds of millions of dollars, must be committed and in place before actual orders can be made of materials and equipment that may well escalate in cost over a period between the orders and the actual delivery?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Well, it requires that the funds be in place before bids are sought. That is a basic rule of the Federal grant program.

Mr. FAUNTROY. W.M.A.T.A. recently ordered some new rail cars. It is our understanding that they had to wait until all funds were in before they could order them and that, while the cars would not even be manufactured or shipped before 2 or 3 years hence, they cannot draw down on the money that has already been committed for that purpose.

Isn't that rather poor management? Doesn't that just add costs?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. No. I think it is very prudent management. They should not draw down money until they are ready to use it for the purpose for which it is appropriated. Under the Federal cash management requirements, no agency is permitted to draw down funds for a grant until they have entered into an agreement for whatever is the focus of that grant.

Indeed, what would they do with the money if they drew it down before they placed the order? What would they do with it? It would be idle somewhere.

There is an investigation going on now of one transit agency in Los Angeles, where allegations have been made that the mayor of Los Angeles withdrew funds prior to the delivery of the invoices.

Mr. FAUNTROY. But we're talking about—

Mr. DELLIBOVI. This is a criminal investigation that could be launched.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Yes. We are confident that you would not allow that, but you would know that if \$600 million were there, appropriated and authorized, for the use of W.M.A.T.A. in purchasing rail cars, that should they be ready to make the order and thus fix the price 2 to 3 years in advance of delivery, that is a cost efficient use of the money.

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Well, we have obligated all of the grants for which we have received applications that are approvable and have met all of the requirements.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Yes. It's just that requirement that I'm concerned about. We've got \$600 million there that could be more cost efficiently used if you didn't have that unfortunate management requirement imposed upon a system and an authority here that has been impeccable in its management of both regional and Federal resources for this purpose.

I am just sorry Mr. Rohrabacher isn't here because he ought to know that the Washington metropolitan area has transferred more money from highway and transit construction than any other in the country.

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Mr. Fauntroy, I think you are referring to the nearly \$700 million in construction contracts for which we have authorized and obligated the Federal funds but which the Washington Metro system has not gone to bid on.

I am not prepared, however, to criticize them for not taking those contracts to bid. Building a rail system is a very complicated endeavor, and they have done this over the past 20 years or so without any major scandals. They have done it cautiously. They have done it prudently. I do not quarrel with the bidding practice that they have not taken those funds out to bid.

I think they have managed it in a sensible way. It is just the nature of a very large public works project, and that's what this is, that you will have times when the money is available, either for the Federal Government to obligate or for them to go out to bid, and then it's drawn down slowly. There is always a rather large bubble.

With all due respect, I would say, Mr. Fauntroy, this is not something that is a concern either between W.M.A.T.A. or us. We both have watched that. I am sure when Mrs. Turner testifies, she will be able to amplify on that.

But I would not criticize them. I have criticized other transit agencies for not making use of the money that has been available. But W.M.A.T.A. proceeded in a way that I would regard as prudent on a schedule that they have set, based on the capability that they have to manage it, and it is a good capability, and on a timetable, to get the project underway.

So I think that the record there is quite good.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Yes. Well, I agree with you on the record. It is just that it could be better, in my view. Maybe this is not a bone of contention between you and our W.M.A.T.A. Board or our administration over there.

But it does seem to me much more cost efficient if we got the money authorized and appropriated and we're ready to make an order of something that is not to be delivered for 2 or 3 years, that we had better cash in on the inflation benefit that we will reap by placing the order without the requirement that we wait until the entire operation is secure in terms of the funding for a segment of the line.

I will discuss that more with the W.M.A.T.A. Board and the director.

But let me just finally raise a question. You mentioned you have had no problem with our locality. That is probably because Stark-Harris did require a stable and reliable source of funding for the rail operations.

That is true, isn't it?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. Stark-Harris did require a stable and reliable source of funding; yes.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Did not UMTA certify that the stable and reliable funding plan submitted in 1982 by the local participating jurisdictions was adequate?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. We did.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Have any of the localities failed to meet the operating or local share match for the Federal grants?

Mr. DELLIBOVI. They have not.



Mr. FAUNTROY. So that we are pretty proud of the record, and we hope that your acknowledgement of the efficiency of the operation and the need, really, for completion of the system will have you thinking about this, as Mr. Parris suggested.

Before you leave and before you go to the other agency and you have to come before us again, we hope you leave some good news to your successor and to our very fine Secretary of Transportation.

Thank you so very much. May I simply say that your testimony has sparked a lot of interest on the part of several members, many of whom have asked that I indicate, if you would let me, that we would want to submit additional questions for the record.

I would hope that you will be amenable to answering them in all the detail.

Mr. DELLIBOVI. It would be a pleasure to do so. Thank you.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Thank you and best of luck. See you later.

Mr. DELLIBOVI. OK.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Now let us move to the next panelist. We are pleased to have our very esteemed general manager, Mrs. Carmen Turner; and our chairman of the board of directors of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, Mr. Richard Castaldi.

We are, and have been, looking forward to testimony, which we expect to be imminently convincing of this committee to do what is appropriate in this matter. You may proceed in whatever manner you choose.

#### TESTIMONY OF RICHARD J. CASTALDI, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

Mr. CASTALDI. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Thank you, Mr. Castaldi.

Mr. CASTALDI. I am Richard J. Castaldi, chairman of the board for Metro. I would just like to tell you a little bit about myself. I come from Prince Georges County. You, Mr. Chairman, know Prince Georges County well.

I am going to submit my testimony for the record. In view of the fact that I have had an opportunity to sit back and listen to some of the speakers before me, I would like to comment on some of the observations that I have heard. I will get right to the point.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Without objection, your statement will be entered into the record in its entirety at this point; and proceed.

Mr. CASTALDI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This, indeed, is the Nation's Capital and this is one reason why Metro should be treated differently. As the Nation's Capital, it is viewed not only throughout this region and this country but throughout the world, as a place that people come to judge how this Government works; how the free world works. We are America's Metro system in the Nation's Capital.

I would like to talk about who uses the Metro. I walked across the Mall area this afternoon. I am sorry Congressman Rohrabacher is not here because I had an opportunity to talk to some of the visitors from California. Of course, all of the Members of Congress, on occasion, have their constituents visit from time to time.

In addition, this is the seat of freedom and democracy, not only for this country, but for the world. Many people come here to talk about special interests. Whether they are demonstrating or are making speeches, they come to the Capital to have those rallies, to bring thousands and thousands of people.

It is Metro that supports that activity, Metro and the Congress, so that their voices can be heard.

If the Nation's Capital weren't here, we would not have that relationship. We do have a relationship. This relationship is born through our interstate compact, which established a special commitment by the Federal Government and the local governments with respect to construction of the adopted regional system.

That commitment was made. I couldn't help but step back a little when my good friend Al Dellibovi, my piasan, was up here and you talked about a hostile statement. I go back and think about relationship because you talked earlier about an attorney coming here who uses the system.

Well, I talk about this relationship. This coming together is a kind of political miracle that we have here in this region. You could also develop an analogy with respect to a commitment, a relationship, a union, almost a blessed event.

Here now, as the baby is born and growing up, we have a reluctant father. We have a father who doesn't want to live up to his commitment.

Mr. FAUNTROY. For shame.

Mr. CASTALDI. I think we should say, "For shame." You know, the father talks about other commitments based on economic concerns. We may have to look at our commitment today and see where we are. I would say, "For shame," also, Mr. Chairman.

I think we have to live up to our obligations. With that, we will have evidence that when this Government makes commitments, we are going to live up to them and we are going to follow through.

I would also like to comment on one other element with respect to the people that use this system. They love this system. I can attest to that. Whether it is the people I talk to on the street or at the most recent public hearing I went to in Prince Georges County—the people demand early service.

These aren't rich, high-income people. These are union people, everyday common folk who get up in the morning at 5 o'clock and want to go to work. They have testified before public hearing after public hearing, indicating that they need to have Metro operating early so that they can get to their jobs. They are who I call the common folk of this country.

I ask you for continued support, completing the commitment that was made some 23 years ago. I thank you for the opportunity to speak before you. I appreciate any consideration you can give us on this.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Castaldi follows:]

**STATEMENT BY**

**RICHARD J. CASTALDI**

**CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY**

**BEFORE THE**

**GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS & METROPOLITAN**

**AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE**

**OF THE**

**U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**MAY 4, 1989**



I CONSIDER THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY TO BE SOMETHING LIKE A POLITICAL MIRACLE - BUT A MIRACLE BORN OF NECESSITY AND THE LEADERSHIP OF CONGRESS. AS CHAIRMAN OF THE METRO BOARD, I PRESIDE OVER REPRESENTATIVES OF TWO STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. EIGHT SEPARATE LOCAL POLITICAL JURISDICTIONS, OFTEN WITH DIFFERING GOALS, INTERESTS, AND NEEDS, SUBSIDIZE THE OPERATIONS OF THE TRANSIT SYSTEM. YET, DESPITE THE DISPARATE OBJECTIVES, THESE ENTITIES HAVE COME TOGETHER IN A PARTNERSHIP WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO CREATE AND OPERATE A TRANSIT SYSTEM FOR THIS REGION AND FOR THE NATION.

AS A MEMBER OF THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY COUNCIL, I AM, OF COURSE, AWARE OF THE AMOUNTS WE PAY FROM COUNTY AND STATE FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE THE SYSTEM. BUT I AM ALSO AWARE THAT THE ECONOMIC WELL-BEING OF THE COUNTY IS DEPENDENT UPON A VIBRANT REGIONAL ECONOMY, WHICH IN TURN REQUIRES AN EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE. THAT IS WHY, AS A METRO BOARD, WE STRIVE TO RISE ABOVE OUR DIFFERENCES, TO ACHIEVE THE COMMON GOOD, AND TO ACT IN THE INTERESTS OF THE

REGION, WHICH INCLUDES A SUBSTANTIAL FEDERAL COMPONENT. THAT IS WHY, AS INDIVIDUAL JURISDICTIONS, WE HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE OPERATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF METRORAIL, EVEN THOUGH SERVICE TO OUR JURISDICTION MAY BE MANY YEARS IN THE FUTURE.

### REGIONAL COMMITMENT

IN PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, ONLY SEVEN OF THE 17 MILES OF METRORAIL IN THE FULL ADOPTED REGIONAL SYSTEM ARE IN OPERATION. THE CITIZENS OF THE COUNTY HAVE WAITED PATIENTLY FOR THE REMAINDER TO BE BUILT, CONFIDENT THAT THE COMMITMENT OF THE FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO COMPLETE THE SYSTEM WILL BE HONORED.

OVER THE YEARS, THIS COMMITMENT HAS BEEN DEMONSTRATED BY THE ACTIONS OF THE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS IN THIS REGION. WE HAVE ALWAYS MET OUR OBLIGATION TO PROVIDE THE LOCAL SHARE OF FEDERAL GRANTS, TO SET ASIDE FUNDING TO RETIRE CONSTRUCTION BONDS, AND TO SUBSIDIZE SYSTEM OPERATIONS. WHEN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REQUESTED THAT WE ESTABLISH A STABLE AND RELIABLE SOURCE OF FUNDING FOR SYSTEM OPERATIONS, WE DID SO, AND RECEIVED U.S. DOT

CERTIFICATION OF ITS ADEQUACY. WHEN THE FEDERAL COURTS DEMANDED ACCESS TO THE SYSTEM BY DISABLED PERSONS, WE BUILT ELEVATORS, AND WHEN FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS CHANGED, WE ADAPTED OUR PROCEDURES AND CONSTRUCTION TO MEET THOSE REQUIREMENTS.

### THE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

TRANSPORTATION HAS BECOME, IF NOT THE PREMIER ISSUE, THEN CERTAINLY ONE OF THE MAJOR PRIORITIES IN THIS REGION. ONE MEASURE OF THIS IMPORTANCE IS REFLECTED BY THE FACT THAT YOU CANNOT OPEN ANY WASHINGTON AREA NEWSPAPER OR MAGAZINE WITHOUT FINDING ONE OR MORE STORIES ABOUT STREETS, HIGHWAYS, OR TRANSIT. EFFECTIVE MOBILITY IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL IS AN ISSUE NOT ONLY FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT, BUT FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS WELL. THE NEW VITALITY OF THIS REGION, THE EXPANDING ECONOMY, AND THE BURGEONING DEVELOPMENT HAVE BROUGHT WITH THEM AN INCREASING BURDEN ON THE EXISTING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM. SUCCESS HAS ITS PRICE, AND IN OUR REGION THAT PRICE IS TRAFFIC. CONGESTED ROADS HAVE BECOME A WAY OF LIFE HERE.

WE RECOGNIZE THE NEED TO CREATE A COMPREHENSIVE, FULLY INTEGRATED REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION NETWORK, WHICH TAKES ADVANTAGE OF THE EFFICIENCIES OF BOTH HIGHWAYS AND TRANSIT. OUR METROBUSES ARE DEPENDENT ON A WELL-MAINTAINED NETWORK OF HIGHWAYS AND LOCAL STREETS. MANY RIDERS ARRIVE AT OUR RAIL STATIONS BY PRIVATE AUTOMOBILES, AND WE ARE EXPANDING OUR PARKING FACILITIES TO MEET A GREATER PORTION OF THAT DEMAND.

WE ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE METRORAIL SYSTEM CANNOT PROVIDE FOR ALL OF THE TRANSIT NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE OF THIS REGION, NOR WAS IT MEANT TO DO THAT. IT IS ONLY ONE PART OF THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM WHICH INCLUDES TAXIS, LOCAL BUSES, RIDE SHARING, AND PRIVATE AUTOMOBILES. AS CONGRESS ENVISIONED, METRORAIL DOES HAVE ITS OWN NICHE: FOCUSING DEVELOPMENT, CHANNELING HIGH-VOLUME PERSON TRIPS, AND COMPLEMENTING A HIGHWAY NETWORK.

### INTEGRATED SYSTEM

AS PRESIDENT NIXON STATED, "THE NATIONAL CAPITAL NEEDS AND DESERVES A MASS TRANSIT SYSTEM THAT IS TRULY METROPOLITAN, UNIFYING THE CENTRAL CITY WITH THE SURROUNDING SUBURBS. AS A

PART OF ITS RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD SUPPORT DELIBERATE ACTION, BASED UPON EFFECTIVE PLANNING, TO MEET THE FUTURE TRANSPORTATION NEEDS OF THE REGION." IN ORDER FOR THE INTEGRATED SYSTEM TO WORK, THE ADOPTED REGIONAL METRORAIL SYSTEM MUST BE COMPLETED.

SINCE ITS INCEPTION, CONSTRUCTION OF THE METRORAIL SYSTEM HAS PROCEEDED WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF AN AGREEMENT AMONG THE PARTICIPATING JURISDICTIONS, AND WITH THE UNDERSTANDING AND SUPPORT OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, WHICH PRESUMED THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE FULL ADOPTED REGIONAL SYSTEM. NOT ONLY DOES THIS AGREEMENT FORM THE BASIS FOR A POLITICAL COALITION, IT ALSO REPRESENTS THE RESULTS OF A TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS BEGUN BY THE CONGRESS IN THE 1950'S TO CREATE AN INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK FOR THE NATION'S CAPITAL.

### FEDERAL COMMITMENT

IN ENACTING THE ORIGINAL AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION, CONGRESS DELIBERATELY CREATED A SPECIAL FEDERAL/LOCAL PARTNERSHIP IN ORDER TO CONSTRUCT A PREMIER SUBWAY WORTHY OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL. THE SYSTEM WAS DESIGNED TO SERVE THE



- 7 -

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS OF THIS REGION'S CITIZENS, INCLUDING THE MANY PEOPLE WHO ARE EMPLOYED BY THE CONGRESS AND FEDERAL AGENCIES, THOSE WHO DO BUSINESS IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, AS WELL AS NUMEROUS VISITORS FROM ALL OVER THE COUNTRY AND AROUND THE WORLD.

THIS RELATIONSHIP PLACED A SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY UPON METRO TO CONSTRUCT NOT ONLY A FUNCTIONAL TRANSIT SYSTEM, BUT ALSO ONE OF DISTINCTION, WHICH COULD BE CHARACTERIZED AS THE NATION'S SUBWAY. AS PRESIDENT JOHNSON INSTRUCTED IN A LETTER TO THE AGENCY, "WHILE WE SEEK TO RESOLVE PROBLEMS OF MOVING PEOPLE AND GOODS WITHIN THE CONGESTED NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA, OUR CONCERNS MUST NOT BE CONFINED TO THE UTILITARIAN REQUIREMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION ALONE. WE MUST TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE OUR CAPITAL A MORE ATTRACTIVE AND INSPIRING PLACE IN WHICH TO LIVE AND WORK."

THE CONGRESS HAS REGULARLY REVIEWED AND REAFFIRMED THE SPECIAL STATUS AND RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN METRO AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. AT THE REQUEST OF CONGRESS, AN ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS WAS CONDUCTED FOR ALL UNBUILT RAIL LINES. THE RESULT,

VALIDATED BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, SUPPORTED THE COMPLETION OF THE SYSTEM AS DESIGNED. BOTH THE HOUSE AND THE SENATE REPORTS ACCOMPANYING THE STARK-HARRIS AUTHORIZATION BILL STATE THAT THE SUBWAY IS "ESSENTIAL FOR THE CONTINUED AND EFFECTIVE PERFORMANCE OF THE FUNCTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES, FOR THE WELFARE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, FOR THE ORDERLY GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, AND FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE BEAUTY AND DIGNITY OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL," AND THEREFORE REPRESENTS A SYSTEM "IN WHICH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS A UNIQUE INTEREST AND RESPONSIBILITY."

BOTH REPORTS ALSO REAFFIRM THE STATEMENT IN THE ORIGINAL 1960 ACT WHICH INITIATED PLANNING FOR METRORAIL: "THE CONGRESS THEREFORE DECLARES THAT IT IS THE CONTINUING POLICY AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, IN COOPERATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, TO ENCOURAGE AND AID IN THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF A UNIFIED AND COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION."

## PROPOSED REAUTHORIZATION

IT IS OUR BELIEF THAT WE HAVE UPHELD OUR PART OF THE BARGAIN. WE ARE BUILDING A SYSTEM WHICH IS TRULY "AMERICA'S SUBWAY," AND ARE MEETING THE FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS WHICH WE UNDERTOOK. WE ARE BEFORE YOU TODAY TO ASK FOR A REAUTHORIZATION OF THE STARK-HARRIS LEGISLATION WHICH HAS PROVIDED THE FEDERAL SHARE TO COMPLETE 89.5 MILES OF THE SYSTEM. THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AMENDMENTS OF 1989 WILL AUTHORIZE \$2.16 BILLION, THE FUNDING NECESSARY TO COMPLETE THE FULL 103-MILE METRORAIL SYSTEM. PASSAGE OF THIS LEGISLATION IS ESSENTIAL TO THE EFFICIENT OPERATION OF THE RAIL SYSTEM. IT IS ESSENTIAL TO SUPPORT THE REGIONAL ECONOMY. AND IT IS ESSENTIAL FOR THE EFFECTIVE FUNCTIONING OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. I KNOW YOU WILL SUPPORT THIS IMPORTANT LEGISLATION.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I thank you, Mr. Castaldi. I just have one request. Do not share that metaphor with Barbara Mikulski. I want to use that one, and I can't wait to get to the floor of the House.

Mr. CASTALDI. OK.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I really can't wait. So please don't use it anymore. I'll request you not to report it. But it is awful to give birth to this system and then walk away. It's unconscionable. I can't wait. I'm sorry you weren't the first witness. That's where I'm sorry. Excuse me.

Now, may we move to the next witness, our distinguished general manager.

**TESTIMONY OF CARMEN E. TURNER, GENERAL MANAGER, WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY, ACCOMPANIED BY JOHN McELHENNY AND WILLIAM BOLEYN**

Mrs. TURNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee. I am pleased to testify before you today on H.R. 1463, the National Capital Transportation Amendments of 1989, which will authorize the necessary funding to complete America's subway.

I, too, would like to submit my full testimony for the record. In addition to that, I would like to submit the full testimony of Hon. William T. Coleman, Jr., former Secretary of Transportation, for the record.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Without objection, both will be included in the record at this point.

Mrs. TURNER. Thank you.

Before submitting Secretary Coleman's testimony for the record, I would like to read 2 portions of it. I will do that quickly. The Secretary says, "When during my tenure as Secretary there were pressures to limit the extent of the Metrorail system, I initiated a \$1 million alternatives analysis study to take a second look at the original assumptions and forecasts made in the mid-1960's concerning the Metrorail system. The study took over 2 years and resoundingly reaffirmed the original decision that the investment of public dollars in Metrorail made sense for the Federal, State, and local governments.

"I discussed this analysis and its findings and recommendations with President Ford. After his careful review and based on the history and longstanding agreements that form the foundation of the adopted regional system, President Ford reaffirmed the Federal commitment to completion of the entire regional system."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like for you to take a look at this map. This is the adopted regional system. It has not changed dramatically over 25 years. This is the system that Congress committed to build so many years ago.

In addition, I would like to read one other excerpt from Secretary Coleman's testimony. The Secretary says, "Metro today stands as a shining example of excellence in the Nation's Capital, demonstrating that democratic government can function with foresight and vision and that politically disparate populations, administrations, and jurisdictions can cooperate effectively for the common good."

“I strongly urge you to recognize the legacy of Metro and the importance of completing this very critical centerpiece of our national transportation infrastructure.”

Now, I will submit the Secretary’s full testimony for the record.  
[The prepared statement of Mr. Coleman follows:]

STATEMENT OF  
WILLIAM T. COLEMAN, JR.  
BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
MAY 4, 1989

I AM PLEASED TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY ON H.R. 1463, THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AMENDMENTS OF 1989. DURING THE TWO YEARS, 1975 TO 1977, THAT I WAS SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE WASHINGTON METRORAIL SYSTEM WAS ONE OF THE IMPORTANT NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT'S PURVIEW. I BELIEVED THEN AND I BELIEVE NOW THAT MASS TRANSPORTATION IS AN ESSENTIAL COMPONENT OF THE TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE OF THIS NATION. METRORAIL HAS CERTAINLY DEMONSTRATED THAT IT IS ESSENTIAL TO THE EFFICIENCY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE ENTIRE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION.

AS SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, I WATCHED METRORAIL OPEN FOR BUSINESS ON MARCH 27TH, 1976. SINCE THAT DAY, METRORAIL HAS CARRIED OVER 1.1 BILLION PASSENGERS. METRORAIL IS NOW SECOND ONLY TO NEW YORK IN TERMS OF RIDERSHIP, AND CARRIES MORE PASSENGERS THAN CHICAGO WHICH HAS MORE ROUTE-MILES. METRO'S SUCCESS IN ATTRACTING RIDERS HAS RECEIVED NOTABLE ACCLAIM FROM ITS PEERS IN THE TRANSIT INDUSTRY. LAST FALL, METRO WAS AWARDED THE TRANSIT INDUSTRY'S HIGHEST HONOR, THE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT AWARD FOR 1988. THIS HONOR RECOGNIZES THE VERY HIGH QUALITY PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PRODUCT THAT METRO SO EFFICIENTLY DELIVERS.

WE MUST RECOGNIZE THAT THE MAJORITY OF METRO PASSENGERS ARE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, INDIVIDUALS ENGAGED IN BUSINESS WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, AND VISITORS TO OUR NATION'S CAPITAL FROM ACROSS THE COUNTRY AND AROUND THE WORLD. METRORAIL STATIONS DIRECTLY SERVE FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT CENTERS LOCATED AROUND THE REGION, SUCH AS THE PENTAGON, FEDERAL TRIANGLE, FEDERAL CENTER SOUTHWEST, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH AND NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER. A METRO STOP IS LOCATED IN THE COURTYARD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND ALSO SERVES THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

TOURISTS FROM ACROSS THE COUNTRY AND AROUND THE WORLD USE METRO TO TRAVEL TO ATTRACTIONS LOCATED NEAR THE SMITHSONIAN, ARLINGTON CEMETERY, AND ARCHIVES STATIONS, TO NAME A FEW. AND MOST IMPORTANTLY, THE CAPITOL COMPLEX INCLUDING THE CONGRESS, THE SUPREME COURT AND THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS IS SERVED BY TWO METRO STATIONS. INCLUDED IN THE REMAINING MILEAGE ARE STATIONS THAT WILL PROVIDE ACCESS TO ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, THE MAJOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT COMPLEX AT SUITLAND, AND THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION SPRINGFIELD CENTER.