

BOARD OF ESTIMATE
CITY OF NEW YORK

TRANSCRIPT OF THE STENOGRAPHIC RECORD OF THE DISCUSSION

ON

CALENDAR NUMBERS 1, 2 AND 3 AT THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF

ESTIMATE HELD ON

DECEMBER 6, 1962

RUTH W. WHALEY,

SECRETARY.

CHARLES TEPPER,
NATHAN GREENBERG,
PRINCIPAL SHORTHAND REPORTERS

TRANSCRIPT OF THE STENOGRAPHIC RECORD OF THE DISCUSSION
ON CALENDAR NUMBERS 1, 2 AND 3 AT THE MEETING OF THE BOARD
OF ESTIMATE HELD ON DECEMBER 6, 1962.

- - - - -

THE CLERK: Calendar numbers 1, 2 and 3.

THE DEPUTY MAYOR: We will consider items 1, 2 and 3 together. Does anyone wish to be heard in opposition?

REVEREND GERARD La MOOMTAIN: I am Reverend Gerard La Moomtain, Pastor of the Most Holy Crucifix Church on Broome Street. I am also the Secretary of the Joint Committee to stop the lower Manhattan expressway.

Gentlemen, in our panel of speakers this morning we have as our first speaker the very well known, the Honorable Louis De Salvio, the Assemblyman of the Second Assembly District who, as you all know, is a fighter of city causes and who will now have something to say about the expressway.

ASSEMBLYMAN LOUIS De SALVIO: Mr. Screvane, the Deputy Mayor, and members of the Board of Estimate: At this time I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the courtesies, the time that you have given me in hearing my cries in this past three years. I know that this is the ninth inning, two men are out, so either we do it or we do not do it.

I am Louis De Salvio, State Assemblyman for the

Second Assembly District, Manhattan, containing the area most immediately affected by this matter before you at this time.

As you well know, I have appeared many times before this Board and before the various bureaucratic agencies involved in this attempt to foist this monstrosity of a blight producing, traffic jam and bottleneck producing, City throat-cutting, so-called expressway to and from nowhere.

First, let me answer this release of December 3rd that was put out by the report submitted by the Relocation Commissioner, Herman Badillo. Mr. Screvane, Deputy Mayor Cavanaugh, even though Mayor Wagner in his statement of December 3rd, did say that this Board would go into -- and I quote:

"The consideration of the project from a traffic and planning viewpoint is the next and final step."

-- I still feel called upon, in the interests of the people of my Second Assembly District, and in the interests of all of the people of New York City, to refute this so-called relocation report of Commissioner Badillo, as both fallacious, without basis in fact, and without regard for realities.

Mr. Badillo speaks gibbly, quoting numbers left and right. The City's new Commissioner of Relocation falls into the same rut that all of our past City planners could not seem to avoid. Numbers are much easier to handle than people.

Mr. Badillo, from his background, should know that these numbers which he so glibly spouts are actually people, and these people cannot be erased in the same way as a written number may be erased. Mr. Badillo cites numbers, speaks of relocation apartments in the yet unbuilt Gompers and Rutgers Houses. I cannot for the life of me understand how he can refer to these unfinished houses as in the neighborhood for people from Mott Street, Broome or Mulberry Street. These places have five ethnic groups and 30 blocks apart -- Shades of Jacob Riis, and he calls this a social welfare outlook?

Besides this, does he forget that the housing in the unfinished Gompers and Rutgers Projects have been promised to and are required by law to be for the people who previously lived in those site areas and who were themselves displaced by these projects?

Mr. Badillo speaks of availability of apartments in present projects, due, he says, to what he calls a turn over rate. He, of all people, should know that at this time there are at least 10 families for each apartment who have been waiting in line, some of them for years, for these so-called turn over apartments.

Further, Mr. Badillo, in his report to the Mayor, wrote, and I quote:

"Chairman Feltz (phonetic) and myself met with Chairman Reid of the New York City Housing Authority,

at which time we arranged for a volume of public housing which could be utilized to absorb families to be relocated from the path of the lower Manhattan expressway."

Gentlemen, you will notice that the word used is "could" not "would".

To continue, Mr. Badillo wrote, and I quote:

"We anticipate that almost 6,200 apartments in the private housing inventory south of Houston Street will become available annually through turn over."

Gentlemen, this is a real hair-raiser. Just where are these 6,200 privately owned apartments? My people have been, without success, scouring that area for years, looking for better apartments to live in, and if his statement was true, and if there are available 6,200 apartments per year in this purely local area, why have we been forced, by the very true facts of life, to continue our system of rent controls?

Gentlemen, sure there are plenty of apartments below Houston Street, but Mr. Badillo and this Board of Estimate must know that all of the apartments are all occupied by people.

Looking further into this so-called relocation report, to my horror, I discovered that no thought was given,

December 6, 1962

or provisions apparently being contemplated, for the relocation of the 800 businesses now situated in the path of this proposed so-called expressway.

I shall now proceed with my statement, regarding the need for this elevated expressway -- which, would only accomplish, one thing, and that would be to cut the throat of Manhattan.

Yesterday, my friends, Mr. Driscoll, the Principal of Chelsea Vocational High School wrote a letter to the Mayor and some of the members of the Board of Estimate. He said:

"Dear Mayor Wagner:

"It was with considerable misgivings that I read the article in this morning's Times, concerning the relocation report on those affected by the lower Manhattan expressway. If this project is undertaken, it will mean the relocation of 1,300 pupils of this school. The expressway will go along the south side of the school on Broome Street. The construction of the expressway and the eventual fumes and noise will render the school building unsuitable for educational purposes.

"The school is located on a street one block from the Holland Tunnel. This morning at 9:00 A.M. There were only three or four cars on Watt Street and Broome Street, traffic from which feeds into

the tunnel. At many times throughout the day there is a minimum amount of traffic with the Holland Tunnel approaches almost deserted.

"May I request further consideration for the thousands of residents and others, including our school children who will be uprooted by the construction of this expressway?

"Sincerely yours,

"Joseph C. Driscoll, Principal"

At this time, I wish to read to you, and for the record, a brief setting forth valid facts of life and technical facts, which much better than any emotional appeals, such as I have made in the past, will set before the members of this Board, proper and for the public good, reasons why this stupid expressway proposal should and must be killed. A copy of this brief was delivered to Mayor Wagner on Monday of this week, and I am certain that the Mayor and you gentlemen of this Board can and will, in good judgement, kill this stupid, harmful proposal.

This is the people's brief:

Not once in all of the years since the lower Manhattan expressway was first proposed has there been put into evidence any valid, definitive reason for burdening New York City with such a construction.

Examination of the following excerpts from the

expressway planners' own statements, as taken from various official documents and from the minutes of 66 meetings, held by expressway planners, from 1957 to date, tend to support a view that this so-called evidence of need for such a lower Manhattan expressway construction is based entirely upon assumptions and personal opinions, unsupported by facts.

1. February 19, 1962, interdepartmental memorandum, from L. Lawton, Director of Traffic Planning to Traffic Commissioner Henry A. Barnes. It states:

"The 10 lanes of the expressway will take crosstown bridge-tunnel traffic off the congested local streets."

This assumption is false. 10 expressway lanes into two tunnel tubes and to four bridge lanes can only cause the 10 lanes of the so-called expressway and the surrounding areas to become staging and/or back up areas only, thereby creating traffic chaos.

Further, from the above noted memorandum, it states:

"At the point of maximum volume between the Bowery and 6th Avenue, the predicted 1975 average daily traffic is 166,500 vehicles of which 30 per cent are trucks."

Also, it states:

"It can be seen that the central portion of the expressway in 1975, will still have to carry

141,000 vehicles during a 24-hour period."

Here, Mr. Lawton seems to have misplaced or ignored 24,500 vehicles for 24-hour period.

2. Lower Manhattan expressway, traffic analysis of City of New York, Department of Traffic, Bureau of Traffic Planning, March 19, 1958 -- and updated to February 1962.

I quote page one:

"Thus, for the first time, an area-wide effort was made to blueprint traffic patterns by identifying the volume of vehicular movements, between primary areas of traffic generation within the metropolitan region."

Also I quote page two:

"The Manhattan Bridge, during the survey, carried 66,000 vehicles per day. The Williamsburg Bridge carried 79,400 per day. Of the 57,000 vehicles carried by the Holland Tunnel, 30,800 had a travel pattern which would have been served by the expressway. The West Side Highway estimate of expressway use is 17,000 vehicles per day. In this analysis the vehicular movement between the West Side Highway and the Holland Tunnel was not considered."

Here, once again, the expressway planners forgot to count. Here, again, we have a differential planners forgot

how to count. Here, again, we have a differential, or disappearance of 52,300 vehicles per day. That is, if we assume no increase in the area traffic load to 1957.

August 1958, Madigan - Hyland, study and report for the Lower Manhattan expressway -- contains reports and minutes of meetings held November 17, 1958. Here, we find expressway planners recording and submitting November 1958 meetings and reports in August 1958. It contains unchanged drawings dated 1949, with so-called up-dating of this drawings being limited to a change of date, to 1958. Expressway planners in this report do not call these drawings, plans; they refer to and call them schemes. It contains, a memorandum of a meeting on November 17, 1958 -- one must recall that this report was dated and submitted as of August 1958 -- held at Mr. T. F. Fitzgerald's office, New York State, Department of Public Works.

It states on page two, regarding a change in a ramp positioning at the Holland Tunnel:

"A discussion followed with the decision that this scheme would be satisfactory if the traffic movements from this ramp would be as illustrated."
-- 1949 illustration.

It states on page three:

"Mr. Koch, Bureau of Public Roads, asked if this ramp was the only means of trucks getting to

the tunnel, as it was against their standards to use City streets as a part of an F. A. I. Route. Mr. Passarelli of the Madigan - Hyland firm, pointed out that ramp number 14 was a direct connection to the tunnel and could -- not would -- "be used by trucks. Ramp number 5 also provided access to the tunnel, but City streets would have to be used from the Avenue of the Americas to the tunnel."

Continuing on page three,

"BY MR. PASSARELLI: However the cross-town peak our traffic demand has always been recognized to exceed the capacity of a practical expressway in this area of Manhattan."

On page four:

"The question of federal roads participation in the street work was discussed and decided to be left for determination at a later date."

Note: Mr. Koch's above statement on city streets as part of an expressway of an F. A. I. Route.

On page four, it states:

"Mr. Shrope, New York State Department of Public Works, brought out that the curvature of the spur to the Manhattan Bridge as it left the main line of the expressway was below standard. After some discussion, it was agreed that the land damage

problem at this location would prohibit a better radius."

This is not only a prime example of bad planning, but, it is also criminal, in its disregard of human safety.

Further, this Madigan - Hyland report contains minutes of a meeting in the office of the Borough President of Manhattan. It states:

"The Borough President agreed to write the Port of New York Authority to discuss a new Holland Tunnel tube."

This meeting was held on December 12, 1957, but no third tube was agreed upon, nor such a third tube being considered.

It further contains a memo of meeting held October 11, 1957, at the office of Consulting Engineer John T. Carrol, attended by various functionaries of various bureaus concerned, at this meeting. It states:

"It was agreed that comparison of number of families displaced by each of these right of ways would, at this time, be a secondary consideration, so that this part could be deferred for the time being."

4. Considering the half-baked, inept schemes put forth by these noted expressway planners and the disregard of law and safety standards displayed by them, we hold that all

of their estimates, assumptions and unsupported claims of a need for a lower Manhattan expressway, should be suspect, this statement being made without reflection on the personal probity of these expressway planners and governmental officials concerned.

5. The so-called benefits to the City, by means of State and Federal grants for road building are greatly outweighed by the very real loss to the City from real estate tax revenue, loss of business tax revenue, loss of employment potential for the people of the City and the cost in money and human misery, as would be caused by the massive relocation problem as would ensue.

6. Mayor Robert F. Wagner must have recognized the fallacies of this lower Manhattan expressway, prime example of bad City planning, when he issued his statement of February 4, 1962:

"That he," -- the mayor -- "saw no need for a lower Manhattan expressway, until such time as the Port Authority provided a third Holland tube capable of helping to take care of the increased traffic which such an expressway would generate."

7. The following, though not from the record, is germane to the issue. It is a quote from a Louis Mundford (phonetic) article, titled "The Skyline" published in the December 1, 1962 issue of the New Yorker magazine, and from

December 6, 1962

"This movement toward the rural periphery in search of things that were the proud possession of every pre-mechanized City has been helped by the most active enemies of the City -- the over budgeted highway engineers who have riddled metropolitan areas with their gapping expressways and transformed civic cores into parking lots."

8. Last, but not least, this New York City administration can effectuate a great gain for the City and give it's people and particularly the people resident and doing business in the area affected, a grand Christmas and many and prosperous New Years, by once and for all time eliminating this costly, inept and stupid proposal.

Now, gentlemen, in a very comprehensive research job, which I have had done on this proposal, I have been unable to discover one single, valid reason for consent by this Board to go ahead, for such a really bad proposal as this one is.

In fact, except for one old man, I have been unable to find anyone of technical competence, who truly is for this so-called expressway, and this old man is a cantankerous, stubborn old man, who has done many things, which may have, in their time, been good for New York City. It still remains a fact that he is a stubborn, old man, who has been blinded

by the arrogance of his supposedly efficient technicians, who always seem to wind up either owning, or in control of the firms who have a monetary gain, or interest in such constructions as the one in proposal here today.

Now, I, and the peoples of New York City, think that the time has come for the stubborn old man to realize that too many of his technicians' dreams turn out to be a nightmare for the City, and further, the stubborn old man should realize that it is not a cardinal sin to be wrong. After all, erasers are still being put on pencils. This stubborn old man, by this time, should know that what was bad planning 20-odd years ago is today so much more bad, that it is so rotten, that it stinks. And this Board must realize, that if he does not, now, once and for all time, kill this stupid example of bad City planning that the stench of it will haunt them and this great City of New York for many years to come.

I respectfully suggest that this Board of Estimate give New York City, its people and in particular, the people residing and doing business in the area most directly affected by this stupid proposal, a real Christmas and many Happy New Years, by fully lifting for all time the blight-producing state of limbo now existing in and for the area.

Now, I just want to take one more minute of your time. I realized I taxed your patience a little bit, but I

Cal. Nos. 1, 2 and 3 - 15 - December 6, 1962
must tell you this just one more time. You see here in this
front row here three elderly women, a woman back in there who
is 79 years old, whose husband is 80 and who is now home in
bed with a heart condition, and getting something like \$92.00
a month. Another one of these women here, \$50.00 a month.
Here is one 62 years old; another one here is 78 years old
and Mr. Wood here is 78 years olds.

Mr. Badillo, let me say to you, can you relocate
these women? You can't, with the money they get. Have a
heart. Let's kill this thing once and for all. Thank you.

REVEREND GERARD La MOOMTAIN: It is now my pleasure
to present the Honorable Leonard Farbstein, Representative
of the 19th Congressional District in the Congress of the
United States of America.

CONGRESSMAN LEONARD FARBSTEIN: I appear here for
the third or the fourth time in opposition to the Manhattan
expressway, and I want the record to show that I still oppose
the so-called lower Manhattan expressway.

I have been asked to read a statement signed by
various public officials -- elected officials from the area
and those who are interested in this, which I shall do, but
before reading this short statement, I should like to make a
few remarks.

It would appear to me that because of the lack of
a master plan for the City of New York and, particularly,

the Borough of Manhattan, I do not think, that it is discrete, at this time, to go on with the lower Manhattan expressway. I do not think that this is a time for haphazard building of such. I do not think we want to Los Angelize Manhattan, because that is in effect what we are going to do. We are going to have unsightly ribbons of steel and mortar going through our most valuable possession, the island of Manhattan. I do not think that this is advisable at this time.

There is no point into my going into specifics, because I feel somewhat like the acrobat who follows the star act. So I will leave specifics to the record, you gentlemen having heard Assemblyman De Salvio.

Now, I also haven't heard, though, anything with relation to the rentals that will be charged to those two thousand-odd families that are going to be displaced as a result of this lower Manhattan expressway. Of course, Mr. Badillo is a responsible public official, and I doubt very much that he would make a statement that was incorrect.

Of course, I don't remember reading the statement in its particulars. All that I read was the statement contained in the newspapers -- it was a newspaper version of it. And I would appreciate it very much that before you gentlemen vote upon this measure, that you ask Mr. Badillo to please give you the specifics of the means whereby he is going to relocate these two thousand-odd families and, also, the rentals

that are to be charged these two thousand-odd families. You have seen the old men and the old women who have risen here, who live in buildings undoubtedly 60 or 70 years old and who probably pay no more than about \$8.00 a room, and perhaps some of them even rent an apartment for maybe even less.

How are you going to relocate these people within their ability to pay? Obviously it is a virtual impossibility, and the proof of it is that those people who have been relocated for our present hi rise apartment houses had to pay higher rent.

I shall not continue further extemporaneously, except to read this short statement. As I say, Mr. De Salvio had delineated the particular objections to the expressway. I have added, in a small way, my own.

The statement I wish to read states the following:

"As elected officials of lower Manhattan, the undersigned urge the Mayor and other members of the Board of Estimate to drop the lower Manhattan expressway in view of the following points:

1. Through inter-state traffic should be encouraged to by-pass the City, since to drive it through the heart of a City results in: falling values, deadening effect, and environmental destruction."

I might say, parenthetically here, that with a highway that presently surrounds the Borough of Manhattan,

you could just as well, going on the Miller Highway, as I envision it myself at this moment, have some sort of a ramp or widening of streets to lead to the Williamsburg Bridge without cutting through lower Manhattan. Instead of going through right through Delancy Street in a direct line, I can envision, despite the fact that I am not an engineer, or planner, or traffic expert, that there could very well be a widening of streets and a ramp leading up to the Williamsburg Bridge on its southerly side, so that it would be unnecessary to have this lower Manhattan expressway running right through the heart of the City.

"2. The traffic congestion caused by bottlenecks at the Holland Tunnel and the East River bridges would not be relieved by the expressway. Instead, the expressway would only serve as an elevated parking lot for added traffic waiting to funnel into the bottlenecks.

"3. The expressway proposal, now 20 years old, has not been reassessed in the light of traffic pattern changes that will take place as a result of the through route offered by the Verrazano Bridge, cross-Bronx expressway, and other new facilities.

"4. Nor has the eventual cost to the City on this expressway been compared to that of a rational

development of the presently rudimentary, but potential modern loop route provided by the Miller Highway and East River Drive.

"5. The construction of the lower Manhattan expressway would necessitate inevitable following links such as the proposed Bushwick Expressway in Brooklyn, thereby adding to the City's relocation problems, reducing its tax rolls and increasing the threat of blight. Further elevated highways across the Manhattan, already predicted by traffic Commissioner Barnes and Robert Moses, would radically change the character of the City. The vital heart of the City would be in danger of becoming a crossover instead of a center."

This is signed by me, by State Senators Joseph R. Marro, by Assemblyman Louis De Salvio, William F. Passanante, Jerome Kretchmer and by City Councilman Theodore Kupferman, Manfred Ohrnstein, Saul Sharison, and Theodore Weiss. Thank you very much.

REVEREND GERARD La MOOMTAIN: Our next speaker is the Honorable John V. Lindsay representing the 17th Congressional District in the Congress of the United States of America.

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: Mr. Deputy Mayor, members of the Board of Estimage: I wish to say primarily that although I am in very very strong opposition to this proposal and although I have disagreed strongly with Mr. Moses in the past from time to time in other propositions and probably will again in the future, I regard him as a distinguished public servant and a man of the highest possible integrity and do not see that it serves any useful purpose to describe him as a stubborn old man.

I want to talk on the merits of this composition here today. For two years, supporters of the expressway have consistently failed to prove their case and the much trumpeted benedit to motorists seems to me are clearly out weighed by the severe harm that will be done to families and shopkeepers and the incalculable damage that will be wrought upon existing patterns of life in this area.

There is very little evidence that I have been able to discover that the proposed expressway will markedly improve the flow of traffic between the Holland Tunnell and the Manhattan and Williamsburg Bridges. In fact, it is more likely to increase traffic tie ups during rugh hours. On

August 14th, I wrote the Mayor the following letter which sums up my own views on this subject:

"Dear Mr. Wagner:

I have watched with growing concern the problems developing out of the proposed lower Manhattan expressway in Manhattan. There is no doubt in my mind that the proposal will deeply affect the residents of the entire Greenwich Village area. As near as can be determined, the plans for the expressway contemplate a number of off shoots; hence its impact will not be limited just to the single right of way and the immediate area on either side.

I do not see how anyone can take lightly the fact that the expressway will dislocate almost 2,000 families and over 800 businesses employing at least 10,000 persons. Apart from the appalling heartships involved, there remains the unanswered basic question as to the sense involved in disrupting neighborhoods and existing community values.

It is hardly consistent with modern City planning to dump countless numbers of tons of automobiles and trucks into the middle of Manhattan communities. If on the other hand, the idea is to by-pass Manhattan by creating a connecting link between the Hudson and East Rivers, then it seems

logical that the same can be done, far more cheaply, by expanding the loop around lower Manhattan formed by the Miller Highway and East River Drive.

It seems to me essential that exhaustive public hearings be held and careful public reports be made available on the subject of the lower Manhattan expressway. The City planning commission, the Department of Highways and other interested City agencies should be required to come forward and publicly document both the need and the desirability for such an expressway. Sincerely, John V. Lindsay"

Now Mr. Deputy Mayor, as a member of Congress, I am especially concerned over certain provisions of the federal law which by their vagueness and ambiguity have tended to sanction a series of actions which were carried out without the public being adequately informed as to what was happening. The relevant provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 read as follows:

"Section C public hearing - any State highway department which submits plans for a federal-aid highway project involving the by passing of, or going through, any city, town, or village, either incorporated or unincorporated, shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had

public hearings, or has afforded the opportunity for such hearings, and has considered the economic effects of such a location: provided, that if such hearing had been held, a copy of the transcript of said hearings shall be submitted to the Commissioner of Public Roads, together with the certification."

Now, a number of questions have been raised; first, why was the public hearing on the expressway not held until December 9, 1959, more than three years after the plans had been submitted to the Bureau of Public Roads in Washington? The federal law states that

"Any State highway department shall submit plans, et cetera".

It also says that,

"Shall certify that it has had public hearings".

Of course, the law is subject to a number of interpretations because it has not indicated when public hearings shall be held in relation to the submission of plans. This would in effect allow preliminary engineering contracts and the like to be authorized before the public is given a chance to express its views before the proper authorities. Another ambiguity in the law concerns the definition of "plans". The term is not defined which obviously leaves the decision as to what constitutes a bona fide plan solely up to the Bureau of Public Roads. While it is true that the bureau

should be the most competent authority to judge the feasibility and quality of a plan, the absence of minimum standards is a serious omission. A third question relates to the economic effects. The federal law states that the economic effects should be considered. It does not say that an economic study is mandatory or that an economic report must be part of the public records.

It must be asked whether an economic study has been undertaken concerning this project. Is it in writing? If so, where is it?

A fourth area is the failure of the law to define "economic effects". There seems to be a widespread tendency to define it as narrowly as possible --

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: May I interrupt you at this point; have you asked anyone for these reports up until this point?

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: I most certainly have.

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: Whom did you ask?

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: I have been in close contact with the Bureau of Public Roads in Washington.

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: What do they say?

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: They have sketchy memorandum of their own, that is all, practically no detailed long range studies and plans, no economic study at all, nothing affecting community values, nothing about relocation.

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: What you are saying then is there is a question as to whether these are even required.

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: Yes, there is a question and for that reason I am submitting a conclusion in just a moment which is to the effect that when the new Congress, the 88th Congress convenes, I intend to submit legislation --

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: Which would have nothing to do with what we are talking about right now, is that right? I say it would have nothing to do with what went on previously. You are now talking about something that you want to correct for the future, is that right?

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: Yes.

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: I am trying to get your point relating to this issue.

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: I think it definitely relates to this issue because when this amount of federal money is going to be asked for by a locality, whether it is a State or whether it be a city, then it seems to me that the federal government has an obligation to insist that there be some planning which there has not been in this case.

This plan has not been related to the over-all needs of Manhattan. There had been no blueprints laid out from beginning to end defining all of the considerations which led to the proposal that is contained here. Nothing, as near as I can make out in any detail has been filed with the federal

government as it should have been if it existed telling us something about the economic impact of this on the community and so on.

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: You said before Congressman that there was an ambiguity here that perhaps it didn't have to be filed. Now you are saying it had to be filed, now which is it?

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: Under the present law, the present federal law, I think that undoubtedly the City administration would win its case in Court if it said it was so ambiguous that we are not required to file.

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: That's all I wanted to get straight, thank you.

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: All I am saying is that when local officials refuse to plan and refuse to take proper action of this kind, then the federal government unfortunately has to take the required action. Standards have to be fixed for this amount of federal money. Now the fourth area that I wanted to mention is the definition of economic effects. There seems to be a widespread tendency to define it as narrowly as possible -- i.e., as an estimate of profit and loss, causes and expenditures. Clearly there should be a definition which considers effects on "description of community, neighborhood character and problems of relocation for families and small businesses."

When the 88th Congress convenes in January, I plan to introduce legislation to repair the ambiguities in the public hearing provision in the federal-aid highway act; to spell out definitions and to more adequately safeguard community interests and the rights of the public.

I fear the the proposed expressway is another example of lack of proper planning in New York City. I myself am convinced that this proposal is inconsistent with a modern approach towards development of a great city. But even worse, I fear that this proposal may be another by product of the absence of any coherent planning for the whole future of Manhattan. For these reasons I am opposed to the proposal. Thank you very much.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: Mr. Congressman, we are glad to have you here today. I for one feel that you have done a very fine job on behalf of the city in many instances in Washington.

I believe however, that some of your remarks here today are a bit misleading. First of all, with respect to the question of planning technically, I would like to say that Mr. Moses has a representative here today, it is my information over the short time that I have been associated with this, and I say apart from the merits one way or the other, that the technicians have done a great deal of planning on this over the years and have complied with the rules and regulations

from Washington and from the State and from the City, and that there is a plan to file which has been formulated and approved by the State Highway Commission and by the City Planning Commission with respect to tie-ins as it goes into Brooklyn and into Long Island, to the Long Island Expressway and other arteries and that there is such a plan.

Also, there is not the attempt to divert traffic primarily of an inter-state character or even intra-state insofar as moving from out of the city. Only about 13 per cent of traffic we are told that would use this, in the event that it is built, comes from the Holland Tunnel. We are told that the great need and this is not only from our study but some of the State studies, that the great need would be to move traffic from the West side of Manhattan to the east side and from the east side to the west side.

Now, as a resident of this island here, I am sure that you are well aware that there is nothing that can be done to build up this island that can be done without some relocation or some hardship to someone, assuming that it is needed, whether it is a school or what not.

Now, I'd like to call your attention to the fact, over 10 times the number of people that you seem to be concerned with here have been dislocated on the east side of Manhattan as a result of luxury housing building and not a single voice has been raised here about this and my files are

full with letters and my telephone rings from people who are concerned about it in the area and I am concerned about it too.

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: So am I.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: I would hope that you would be.

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: I have spoken on this subject many times.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: And that has not had the same attention that you are giving to this for 10 times the number of people.

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: I am going to have to disagree with you on that. First of all --

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: You'll have a chance to rebut here, but I'm talking about this Board of Estimate when these matters come here. The other point I would like to call your attention to is this; rather shortly, we will be finished with the construction for the World's Fair and as a result of the new city's zoning code, this very luxury building that I am talking about that mainly occurred on the east side of Manhattan will come to a halt or a standstill, almost to a standstill with respect to the rate at which it had been traveling and it is my view that in the event and I have not taken a stand yet, I can tell you as of right now as to what my particular view is on this project, but in the event that it goes forward, I would anticipate

that upwards of a \$100,000,000 which some of our Congressmen called pork-barrel funds and I don't label them this way, would come here to give a shot in the arm to our construction industry as a result of what's been happening.

This, together with the public school project, the housing projects which are going up here and now are necessities for this island, it is just difficult that we who live in Manhattan must be faced with some relocation, no matter what happens.

We can't even build a park or school or housing project without relocating someone.

Now, one final thing that I'd like to say here and I'm sure that you are aware of it, all sorts of words have been called this morning with respect to stupid, ill-considered and so forth with respect to this project. I don't know what the actual merits are yet as I said to you; I want to point out that in every single newspaper in our city, from it's editorial standpoint, those that we call the conservative, those that we call the liberal and the inbetween newspapers, have come out in favor of this.

Now this doesn't necessarily mean anything as far as I am concerned, but it would mean that here is a body of opinion that in my judgement is sound to a certain extent and not necessarily stupid and that therefore there must be some merit on both sides of this particular project. This is all

I have to say.

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: Well, I will just make three short comments on each point that was made. The subject of luxury housing, I hope that you recall the Lindsay Amendment in the national law which has been enacted in order to bring to the surface and force public disclosure on some of the nonsense that was going on in this city with respect to the use of public funds including federal and Title one housing, to build luxury housing where middle income housing was intended.

Thanks to the abdication of responsibility on the part of the distinguished gentlemen who run our city -- I don't like federal legislation that requires this kind of thing but it has to be done under these circumstances.

The same is true with respect to the erection of private housing in New York, displacing families again and making room only for the very rich and this is a subject which I have discussed at some length.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: I'm very happy to hear you say that, maybe we can get something done about it.

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: Point number 2, on the subject of plans for an expressway of this kind, heaven knows the way things are done in Washington are not necessarily a model for good government for any locality or any city, but I

can assure you that if there was a hearing of this kind on an expressway of this kind, the city planning commission would be required to come forward and to spend if necessary, two weeks relating to a proposal of this kind, with every possible consideration affecting the public interest and this includes community values, et cetera, and again, going back to the Bureau of Public Roads, each time I made inquiry as to the extent to which there had been an examination and approval of local plans which would authorize the federal government to make available to the City of New York and the State of New York, this large amount of federal money, it came down to one single question which was technical approval only and that these are only technical matters that we are considering here and as near as I could make out, there does not seem to be any basis upon which even you distinguished busy gentlemen, can sit down here and listen to distinguished leading planners say,

"Here is what we have in mind for the benefit of Manhattan and the City of New York for the next 100 years".

This has not been done in this case and I think you've got to admit it.

This is the point that I am trying to make.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: It has been done in my case; I don't know whether its been done in your

case or not.

In the year and a half that I have been here, I have exhausted almost every source that I could think of to come to a conclusion and I haven't come to a conclusion yet.

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: I must commend you.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: Until I think it is proper.

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: Again, I wish to point out that everything I have said here today is on the merits. There are no personalities involved insofar as I am concerned and that is one reason why I opened my statement today the way I did and it was also why I refused to sign a joint statement made by a group of public servants not too long ago because I did not want to become involved in any controversy involving personalities.

This has no place here. My concern is whether or not the public interest has been safeguarded and whether or not we have honest to goodness planning in this town or not. I don't think that we do.

THE COMPTROLLER: Mr. Lindsay, may I ask you a question --

THE DEPUTY MAYOR: Officer, will you just ask Mr. Lindsay if he will come back a moment please? The reason we have asked Mr. Lindsay to come back, Mr. Beam wants to ask a question of the Congressman. Can you spare us another minute,

Mr. Beam wants to ask and possibly someone else would like to give us some information on a couple of points that you raised. Can you spare a minute, please?

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: Yes.

THE COMPTROLLER: I think it would be very helpful and very good for information for both you and for us and for all of the people out in the audience to have Mr. Hotchkiss who apparently has stayed with this project from perhaps its very inception, to try to clear up in our mind as well as in yours and the audience, some of the points you made which indicated that what should have been done was not done.

So if you wouldn't mind waiting a moment and if Mr. Hotchkiss can help us out on this, I think it would be very helpful.

THE DEPUTY MAYOR: Is Mr. Hotchkiss here?

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: Yes, he's coming.

MR. ARTHUR HOTCHKISS: Acting Mayor, members of the Board, Congressman, I am Arthur Hotchkiss of the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority. I would like to make it clear that I am not here representing the Authority but I represent Mr. Moses who has been designated by the Mayor to act for him in matter pertaining to the federal highway program in New York City.

The Authority has no direct interest in this project.

The question was raised as to whether or not we had conformed to the rules and regulations of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads in presenting this project to the Board of Estimate and to the State Department of Public Works and through them to the Federal Bureau.

I would like to say that we have. The State Department of Public Works which is required to hold public hearings on these projects, has accepted and has had a representative at the City planning commission hearings and that takes the place of the public hearing required by law.

You will recall that it was said that they had arranged for a hearing and they did arrange it through the City planning commission. With respect to whether or not the State has complied with the requirements for an economic report, it has been done.

That report is made after the public hearings, before the planning commission. They received a complete verbatim report of everything that was said and on the basis of the comments made at that hearing and on their own studies, they prepared a report which was submitted to the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. That report was submitted.

I have not seen it myself but the Bureau, on the basis of that report, approved the route of the lower Manhattan expressway as it has been mapped and authorized an expenditure of \$1,000,000 for the construction of the Chrystie

Street Underpass.

THE COMPTROLLER: Pardon me just a moment, Mr. Hotchkiss. Congressman Lindsay, you heard Mr. Hotchkiss indicate that the Federal Bureau has such a report. You indicated that you inquired and that they said they hadn't.

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: The Federal Bureau has made it very clear that the only authorization they have given has been for the engineers study which has no relation at all to the over-all problem. In fact, there has been no federal authorization for the expenditure of the proposed federal money that the City is asking for here for this expressway, because they do not have any of the material that should be required although I will have to agree, and this is where I think legislation is necessary, that the law is sufficiently ambiguous so that anything can go or can be supplied under the name "plan".

Right now all they have is technical studies and this is the only information that I have been able to discover. I would like to ask the Board of Estimate whether they have seen the economic plan here.

THE COMPTROLLER: Mr. Hotchkiss said there is such an economic report.

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: May I interrupt just one minute, Mr. Beam; Ladies and Gentlemen, I would suggest that you keep in your minds the fact that we sitting here must

decide this issue either for or against. We are trying to listen to discussion in order to assist us in making up our minds.

Any demonstration that you put on is only going to work against your case I assure you of that, so I ask you please, be cooperative, don't resort to demonstrations, let us hear these speakers in order that we can then use our judgement in connection with this item.

You are not helping your case at all, I assure you, by this type demonstration. Thank you, go ahead.

THE COMPTROLLER: Congressman Lindsay, if the statement made by Mr. Hotchkiss is accurate, I want to be sure that such a record or such a record existed where under the law it was supposed to have been sent and he has indicated that such a report existed and was sent to the federal people, therefore, one of the two of you has gotten the wrong information.

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: Well, if I may just comment on that, this thing is a weird charade that we are going through. One of the questions I asked the federal government was, supposing this thing never develops, you don't know if it's going to develop, you haven't seen the plans, you know nothing about it, isn't that correct?
Correct.

All you know, is, that you have supplied engineering

money and money for the Chrystie Street subway stop. Supposing this thing is not approved by you eventually on the basis of your studies which you haven't made yet, this is the federal government, or supposing the New York State doesn't go through with this, what happens to the money that Uncle Sam has made available to the State?

Do they have to give it back again? Does the City have to return it and there was some thinking and they said technically I suppose yes, they will. So I said what do you rely on when you made this preliminary federal money available, what makes you think that anyone is going forward with anything further or that you are going to approve what's occurred or will occur, and they said well, we have to begin somewhere so we are relying on the good faith of local government to take the engineering money and to do something with it and then we will figure out what to do next.

THE COMPTROLLER: What you are saying of course is auxiliary to the question. The point that I am trying to nail down is namely, was there such a report and you said there was not and Mr. Hotchkiss said there is, therefore somebody has got the wrong information.

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: The only thing the Bureau of Public Roads has is the technical information, engineering data which has nothing to do with the substance and idea --

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: Which is all that is required, is that correct?

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: I think so.

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: I think the point that you are making here is that the present law in your opinion is inadequate and that there are many other things that ought to be in there. Insofar as the present law is concerned, the City construction coordinator and the people who have been working on this have complied with the law, is that right?

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: That's right, I can't make a statement that anybody has violated any law.

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: What you are saying further is that you are proposing to have an amendment to this law to provide all of the things which you think ought to be done in connection with this project, is that right?

HONORABLE JOHN V. LINDSAY: Correct.

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: All right, thank you.

THE COMPTROLLER: Anything else?

MR. ARTHUR HOTCHKISS: Not at the moment.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF BROOKLYN: Mr. Hotchkiss, as long as you are up there -- possibly Mr. Lindsay would like to stay for a moment -- assuming that this project may be approved, I understand there are approximately, about 700 small businessmen in that area that will have to be relocated or put out of business, which is quite a serious problem generally.

I believe, too, there is a depressed area somewhere in the heart of this highway. Would it be possible to build somewhere within that area, in this depressed part of this project, a sort of shopping center to take care of the 700, or as near to that as possible, the small businessmen that would be put out of businesses should this go through?

MR. HOTCHKISS: I think, Mr. President, the only way I can answer that is to say that it is permissible under the federal law. I frankly do not know how it could be financed. It certainly would not be paid for out of federal highway funds. But there are areas where such a thing could be done both underneath the elevated structures which is presently contemplated being used for parking space, or over the depressed section between the Bowery and the Williamsburg Bridge.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF BROOKLYN: Have some studies been made by your people in regard to that?

MR. HOTCHKISS: We have not.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF BROOKLYN: Congressman Lindsay, have you, in your studies, gone through the possibility of -- assuming this thing goes through -- to build a shopping center there for the 700 small businessmen that would be put out of business in that area?

CONGRESSMAN LINDSAY: I have not.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF BROOKLYN: Where the federal government can play a part in this too?

CONGRESSMAN LINDSAY: I have not.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF BROOKLYN: I am throwing this out for additional thinking on the part of all of us, how much consideration is being given to the small businessman, who unfortunately get very little for themselves to be able to move into a different area.

In many cases it puts them out of business and ruins them. I'm just throwing that in for some thought and study by all.

REVEREND La MOOMTAIN: Gentlemen, Mr. Marshall Scolnick has one or two points that he would like to clarify regarding the previous speakers.

MR. MARSHALL SCOLNICK: I am a resident and life-long resident of the community affected by this crossover expressway proposal. Mr. Dudley, you mentioned before the fact that every metropolitan daily carried editorials favoring this so-called expressway.

I must relate to this Board that a meeting which I held, personally, with the chief editorial writer of one of our greatest -- greater metropolitan dailies, during the month of June 1962, when I was prepared to present to him data, fact sheets, and so forth, showing that the expressway was a fallacy and should not be, he looked at me and said, "Now Marshall, don't show me those papers. I won't look at them." And I said, "Why, sir?" He said, "My boss said the expressway is a good thing." I said, "How does your boss know the expressway is a good thing?" He said, "His good friend Robert Moses told him it was a good thing," and that is why the editorials are being published.

Thank you very much.

REVEREND La MOONTAIN: Our next speaker is State Senator Joseph Marro.

SENATOR JOSEPH MARRO: I do not propose to attack the construction of this expressway from a standpoint of an engineer, nor do I come here to attack the report of Commissioner Badillo, for whom I have a great deal of respect. But I am here, ladies and gentlemen, to vehemently oppose this construction, and for only one reason: and that reason is that there are human rights that are affected here, there are 2400 families.

If we are to assume that there are a minimum of 4 or 5 people to a family, then we can safely say some 10,000

people will be affected.

I have lived in Greenwich Village all my life. I now live on the west portion of Greenwich Village, and I know when I leave my office on a Thursday or a Friday, and I come home on Morton Street, where I live, it has taken me sometimes an hour. I have not heard one single word here today which would indicate that although this project is for progress, yet I have not seen where it will do the people of the City of New York any good.

Yes, it will alleviate the people up in Westchester, yes, it will help the people from Brooklyn and those who travel our highways to go east and west.

Not too long ago a similar situation arose when I was a member of the State Senate -- I have been for the past 10 years, -- when we had practically a similar situation where people were affected, their families, their conveniences. You recall not too long ago, gentlemen, that we had the demolition of the 3rd Avenue railway.

At that time I arose on the floor of the Senate and vehemently opposed the demolition of the 3rd Avenue railway. And the argument was that well, yes, these people along your route, Senator Marrow -- and at that time I was joined by McNeil Mitchell and former State Senator Alfred Santangelo whose district joined mine on the north -- that we proposed to build a 2nd Avenue railway.

Gentlemen, you know today we do not have a 2nd Avenue railway, so that the conveniences of the people in my district were affected.

Bringing it up today, I said this: These people have been promised to be relocated. Oh, yes, I have read the newspaper reports of the New York Times. I have not read it thoroughly with respect to Commissioner Badillo's report, and I don't profess to say that I know what is in there, other than the statement that there are sufficient apartments.

In my 10 years in the State Senate, I have, on a number of occasions, communicated with the New York City Housing Authority to secure apartments for people who were inconvenienced not because of any project, but because of renovations or demolitions or for projects. And although I have received every courtesy from the New York City Housing Authority -- and I do not profess to criticize them -- but it did take a lot of red tape to take these people's applications, to process them, and then eventually give them apartments.

And what has happened? These people have gone outside of New York City. I can show you that in my district alone I have lost thousands and thousands of people because they were unable to secure apartments. I will show you files, ladies and gentlemen, that will occupy a small room 10 by 15,

where a great number of letters have been written for people, justly so, rightfully so, that were entitled to immediate relief.

Yet, did they receive it? Absolutely not.

I do not mean to criticize any particular report here. I do not wish to criticize Congressman Lindsay who says and I quote, "That I did not affix my signature to the statement that was presented here today and read by Congressman Farbstein."

Well, let me say for the record, that I am proud to have affixed my name to the paper that was written here and is now part of the record today. And I do not want the people in my district to be inconvenienced, members of the Board.

If I were assured that each and every one of them would receive an apartment in a very short time, I might reserve a decision on that, but I know that it is physically impossible. And I have been elected to the 24th Senatorial District because of these people who have had faith and trust in me, and I have in them.

I take this position: that the judgement and the decision rests with you today, and I know from what I have read and my own observations, and having lived in the community not too far from where this proposal is expected to be constructed, that these people and the entire community will

be set back and will not enure to their benefit.

For those reasons, ladies and gentlemen, I am vehemently opposed to this expressway.

REVEREND La MOONTAIN: The next speaker on our list is Councilman Theodore Weiss.

COUNCILMAN THEODORE WEISS: I am going to be very brief, because I think that the previous speakers have really covered this subject quite thoroughly. Just a very, very few comments. I think previous mention was made a couple of times about the press and other positions -- editorial positions on this proposed project, and, of course, I too am impressed when the press seems to take a unified position on a particular matter.

However, I recall that about a year and a half ago, in the mayoralty election, the press and the general election took a fairly unified position, which I completely disagreed with and so did the people of this city. So that I do not think that that should necessarily be persuasive.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: You missed the entire point, if you were listening. The point was that there had been a number of names called this particular project, which I thought were out of character, and I only indicated this to say to you that I thought there might have been a controversial subject here, and I think you did miss the point.

COUNCILMAN WEISS: Right. I may have. I agree

that it is a controversial subject also, but I think that one of the big points that the press or the editorial position of the press has been making over and over again is that here is a project that has been pending for some 16 years, now, and that it is high time to complete it.

Well, I think that you gentlemen know that there was another expressway project which was pending probably for about the same length of time, the so-called mid-town expressway at 30th Street. And just within the past six months or so, by general consensus, it was recognized that although that proposal may have been a good idea when initially conceived, it certainly was not a good idea today because we have learned so much since the idea was proposed, as far as traffic and other problems of the City was concerned.

I only say that I don't not think that this Board ought to feel that simply because an idea has been kicking around for a long time, that you are bound to adopt it. There may have been perfectly valid reasons why, in fact, the idea has been kicking around for a long time.

It may be that it was not such a hot idea, or it would have been adopted much, much quicker.

I think that -- I do not want to get into a dialogue that Borough President Dudley and Congressman Lindsay indulged in previously, but I think, sir, that you know that I have not been scarce in my appearances before the Board of

Estimate, particularly when it came to problems concerning housing and relocation. And the point that I have been making repeatedly at this body is exactly the fact that we have been tearing down so much housing of low and low income category and replacing it to a great extent with upper, middle and luxury type housing, that except for the very rich, or the very, very poor, who are in public housing, there is no place else for people to live in this City, or it is getting to be that situation.

I think that you, Mr. Borough President have not only recognized that point, but have used your influence to try to reverse that trend. I think in this contention then, the participation of the people of this community involved by this expressway ought to be considered very seriously.

I saw a TV program last night -- it was on the second time -- entitled "The Superfluous People". The point, really, that was made in that show, quite dramatically, is that one of the big tragedies is that people are so beaten, by circumstances beyond their control, that they stop fighting, they stop caring. They react as if there was no place to turn to, or no place to go and no hope in the future.

Well, here is a community of people proud of themselves, proud of their community. I think that is a good thing for the City, and I would hate to see a questionable traffic project destroy a valuable community in this City of

ours. Thank you.

REVEREND La MOOMTAIN: Our next speaker is Mrs. Carol Greitzer, Democratic Distric Leader of the 1st Assembly District, south.

MRS. CAROL GREITZER: I am also speaking for the Village Independent Democratics, my club.

Although the lower Manhattan expressway would just about coincide with the southern boundary of Greenwich Village, bringing in its wake traffic conditions that would adversely affect my community, I am not here to oppose the expressway on purely parochial grounds. There is a larger issue -- the matter both of over-all planning and of a municipal philosophy.

We must stop the machine from taking over; we must call a halt to the policies of putting cars before people. People are more important than automobiles, and long-established communities are the very pulse of our City.

Approval of this road would call for the destruction not merely of buildings, but of homes, -- an entire neighborhood. No amount of relocation in new projects can recreate a neighborhood.

We must arrive at the decision that there should be less traffic, not more traffic. We must come to a determination that cars have got to be kept away from certain areas of Manhattan; and we must seek their ends through over-all planning, not piece-meal solutions that relieve the symptoms while killing

the patient.

We strongly urge you to defeat this ill-conceived proposal and come up with a master traffic plan for Manhattan and the City. Thank you.

REVEREND LA MOONTEIN: Our next speaker is Mr. Gilbert Millstein. Mr. Millstein is speaking as an individual, a private citizen, but I believe he is employed by one of the newspapers, the New York Times, if I am not mistaken.

MR. GILBERT MILLSTEIN: Gentlemen, my credentials for speaking before this legislative body, the first that I have ever addressed in my life, since my experience as a newspaper man has taught me that ordinarily it is not of much value. At any rate, my credentials are these: I was born in the City of New York. I was educated in the City of New York, I have lived here all but five years of my life, and I have become increasingly ashamed and dismayed at the lack of responsiveness toward the people of New York that is being made by the men who govern it.

All of you are either immigrants, or the sons of immigrants. You have lived all, or most of your lives in the City of New York. You have seen, you have experienced the second, third and sixth and ninth Avenue Els. If it is money that you are interested in, you have seen how real estate values were destroyed by the Els.

If it is people you are interested in, you have

seen the same thing happen. Aren't there many of you here who remember that 53rd Street turn at 6th Avenue that ran over to join the 9th? How many retired policemen, how many retired fire officers are there who will tell you what sort of a fire and criminal menace that was?

Now, if you build an expressway across lower Manhattan, you are going to create exactly the same kind of thing. And what you are going to create is not blight, but death. Have any of you been to Los Angeles and seen downtown Los Angeles? There is no more downtown Los Angeles. It is a series of ribs divided by air. Of course, there is a \$100,000,000 at stake here, and concrete and steel, and buildings to be put up elsewhere and demolition to be accomplished in other places.

Certainly there is money but you gentlemen, if you vote for this expressway, you will have destroyed one more thing that you can put in the guide books to attract people to the City of New York.

You will have destroyed not just 2400 families or 800 businesses, but take my word for it, you are all sophisticated men, and you know how wide a swathe an expressway of that type cuts. You will have destroyed all of little Italy, and unquestionably some of the favorite restaurants in which you have eaten, some of the favorite streets on which you have walked.

You will have destroyed, for example, such historic monuments as a thing called the Howard Store.

I wonder how many of you know of the Howard Store? It is a perfectly preserved cast iron building at Broadway and Broome Street, which the first passenger elevators in this country were installed. The first in the world for that matter. I could go on talking about monument after monument. I could talk about that silly but endearing Odd Fellows Hall right at the south end of police headquarters. I could go on, and on, and on and talk about that.

However, let me instead, bring up a little item that was in my own newspaper this morning. It was two paragraphs devoted to a statement from the Regional Plan Association. The Regional Plan Association, let me add, formed something like 40 years ago, has always had as its philosophy that the relief of traffic could be accomplished by more tunnels, more by-passes, more express highways, and so on. Isn't it incredible that in the 40 years of advocacy by the Regional Plan Association, traffic in New York City has become not simply worse, but utterly anarchic?

Now here, the Regional Plan makes what is probably an inadvertent confession. It says of the lower Manhattan expressway, and it should be of particular interest to you gentlemen who run the City of New York, that it is essential as a link between the eight million people expected to live on

Long Island and northern New Jersey, seven million future population. Not one word about the City of New York. What the Regional Plan envisions is a skeleton denuded of its flesh, denuded of its life, lying beneath a series of highways that will transport people from New Jersey to Long Island and back. Is that what you want New York to become?

Would you permit the same thing to happen at 95th Street, as Commissioner Barnes has proposed? What are you thinking of?

This is not simply an emotional appeal. You are all New Yorkers. Do not destroy your city. Los Angeles destroyed itself.

Obviously I have never met a payroll. Obviously I am a woolly headed idealist. However, anything of beauty that you have in this city, let me add, was created by so-called woolly headed idealists, including the very city hall in which you sit now.

One further thing I may add. You do not have to go out to Los Angeles to see the effect of expressways and freeways. You have only to walk out of city hall, turn to your left, and take a good long walk underneath those Brooklyn Bridge approaches, and you will see how a city can be gutted. There is no more than a few hundred square yards involved back in the Municipal Building, but go and take a look, go and smell it because it has the smell of death and dust on it.

There are no people there and there are no things there. And if you have any consciences, not simply toward the City, not simply toward your constituents, but toward yourselves, you will vote against this expressway. Thank you.

REVEREND La MOOMTAIN: Our next speaker is Mrs. Esther Rand of the Metropolitan Council on Housing.

MRS. ESTHER RAND: My name is Esther Rand, and I am speaking here today for the Metropolitan Council on Housing. I want you to know that I have lived on the east side of our City, opposite the area which is going to be affected by this devious plan, for more than 20 years. I am well acquainted with the area, I know the housing in this community, I know the rents that are being paid by the people who live there.

I want to speak against all three items on your calendar and urge that they be voted in the negative for the following reasons:

The plan itself has been criticized by experts, who have stated that it does not meet by 20 years the traffic demands of the City of New York. I can understand what these experts are saying; I cannot understand why the City fathers are treating a community of some 2200 families and 10,000 working people as though they were step-children.

It is conceivable that the Board is more concerned

with getting a 90 per cent pork-barrel and -- and I, President Dudley, am not a politician -- that it is with the welfare of citizens of the City of New York. If this last is anything more than a slanderous attack on the City authorities, then it can be refuted by the Board's voting against the taking of this land.

We come now to the report of Mr. Badillo, the newly appointed commissioner of the newly-established department of relocation. I may say as a representative of the Metropolitan Council, I voted and urged that there be such a department in the City of New York.

We have been properly impressed with the numerous public relations article to show how very qualified Mr. Badillo is for his job. We have not been so impressed with his report to the Mayor to prove that the Broome Street Expressway is feasible because relocation is feasible.

To take but two examples: Mr. Badillo states categorically that there will be a turn over in vacancies in the low-income projects down by the river of some 741 units each year, in the \$10.00 - \$14.00 per room per month range. Since there are 2200 families and he plans the relocation over a 4-year period, he makes the new figures come out even by multiplying 741 by the number 4, and presto -- enough housing for everyone.

He also states that the Housing Authority has

graciously given the people who will lose their homes a sizeable group of units out of the Gompers and Rutgers Housing, although this will be in the \$18.00 per room category. And how many of these vacancies in housing which may not even yet have been built has Mr. Badillo promised for the west side relocation area?

You know, we have worked very hard for our alternate plan for Cooper Square, which is yet to come before you. I want to say that many of the people who oppose our alternate plan for Cooper Square say, "You can't develop a little area, you must think of the City as a whole."

Well, is this report thinking in terms of the City as a whole, when Mr. Badillo will have the job in this year of relocating 29,000 families and promising to this group of 2200, 741 units a year which will be vacated, maybe, for four years?

How many of these, as I asked you before, has Mr. Badillo promised in his relocation plan for the west side urban renewal area? And for how many others has he promised the same number of units for his 29,000 people who are due for relocation?

It sounds lovely, on paper. But there is no substance in the report. Do you know how many units in the houses along the river are renting at from \$10.00 - \$14.00 per room? Do you know which of the projects even have

rentals in this bracket? Do you know that none of the State subsidized housing, even that built years ago, like Wald, has any \$10.00 - \$14.00 per room housing? I will answer that last question myself, and tell you that there isn't a single apartment in Wald which rents under \$14.00 a room.

And, as a matter of fact, one room apartments in Wald rent from 43 to \$60.00 a room, you know, an apartment -- one room. There are three room apartments there for \$43.00, but there is nothing there for \$29.00 for three rooms as there is in Vladeck.

I know someone who lives in Vladeck in a lovely apartment for \$29.00 for three rooms, with cross ventilation, looking out on the river. She is delighted with it. Is she going to move? Only when she is carried out, and she is 75 years old. Is Mr. Badillo going to do what many people in our area do, watch the obituary columns to discover where there is a vacant apartment?

The answers are that none but Vladeck and First Houses, the oldest projects in the federal category, has such rentals.

Since the figure 741 is taken on the basis of 10 per cent of the total number of units in all housing, it follows that there will not be enough housing in this rental range to relocate the people from this area over a 10 year period let alone a four year span.

Mr. Badillo's report states that as a result of the agreement between the Housing Authority and his department, there will be no barriers set in the way as he will be relocating these people in public housing, except those built into the Federal Housing Law.

Now Mr. Badillo has also made the same comment with respect to the west side, in other words, the only two items to be considered for eligibility will be age and income. Since most of the Broome Street people obviously will meet these two requirements, it would seem if there are apartments in this rental range, everyone will be happy, but is this so?

Why is the City still considering a pimple on its body and not considering the cancerous body of housing outside of the Broome Street area? You know and I know that the Housing Authority has 200,000 applications in its files of people who want and need public housing, that some of them have been waiting for 10 years, the fact that each application is valid for two and they have had five applications, is this arithmetically correct?

Many of them have been barred by the Housing Auth-

ority under its secret eligibility rules from entering public housing. Why the sudden concern for 2200 families when 200,000 families need housing? Why are you not concerned for example, with the family in Brownsville who is living in one room, a father, a mother, two children and a third on the way.

They are not welfare recipients. The father earns \$3500 a year, they need public housing, they have had two applications filed and they have been given nothing. The family, incidentally, is Negro.

Why are you not concerned with the family of eight living in two rooms on the east side about whom I spoke to the Mayor the last time I was before this microphone and he said where is it, where is it? Two rooms on the east side gentlemen.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: What is the point you are directing your remarks to now? What point are you making?

MRS. RAND: The point that I am making President Dudley is that the concern of the Housing Authority in relaxing its rules in order to make housing and public housing available for the people from the Broome Street expressway is an unjust relaxation when you consider the number of people who need housing and who have had to wait for it for so many years who are not in the path of this Broome Street expressway.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: Are you in favor of the expressway?

MRS. RAND: I am not in favor of the expressway but I am in favor of more housing and it seems to me that first things should come first and that people come before cars. I am not playing to the gallery, Mr. Dudley, but I am urging upon you the question that here we have a situation --

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: With respect to your last statement, there have been a number of such statements made by people about people coming before cars. I think if you know Mr. Badillo and if you read his report carefully -- would you mind waiting until I finish and I'll let you continue -- if you know him and if you read his report, you will understand that one thing underlines this entire thesis and that is that no one and I am talking about people and not cars, no one will be removed from any housing area in this city until suitable and better quarters are found for them and this is the thesis that this Board goes along with and it is concerned about people and there is no need of your continuing talking about people versus cars. That is not the argument.

MRS. RAND: Yes it is President Dudley, that is the argument. On paper you and Mr. Badillo are deeply concerned with people, but we know from the manner in which the relocation of people is driven, when a sudden project has to be made

on schedule, that you don't give a damn about people and they are therefore being put into substandard apartments in order to get the last one out and the housing torn down.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: I can give you an example which belies what you are saying, this is not true in this city. For example, P. S. number 70 down in the Chelsea area, when we had a large number of people who came in and talked about getting housing and what not and this Board put it over for an entire year and we still haven't done anything about it.

We are concerned about people and the fact that you continue to repeat yourself and say that we are not doesn't make it so. This is the point that I want to make to you.

MRS. RAND: All I can say President Dudley is if I may as a woman have the last word --

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: You are going to have the last word because I can see that.

MRS. RAND: This is the exception that proves the rule.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: We are still in favor of people.

MRS. RAND: We have a family on the east side, a mother who has a child born out of wedlock. The child is now 15 years old and she still can't get public housing because of that damn rule of the Housing Authority and I say that

there may not be any people in the Broome Street expressway area who will have to comply with such a qualification, but I maintain, that what is good enough for the Broome Street people is good enough for all the people who need public housing in the City of New York and this you are not taking into consideration.

There is only one way to solve this question of housing and it is not by an arterial stretch of highway that we are calling the Broome Street expressway but you yourself this morning stated that it is but one area of a group of areas where people stand in danger of losing their homes.

You know, everybody has been very polite here today and has said we don't want to indulge in personalities but because I come from an area of Cooper Square where Mr. Moses was the czar of slum clearance and where today the only czar, the only throne that he retains is that which controls the Broome Street expressway, I must indicate that he is still controlling slum clearance, only instead of building luxury housing on it, he is seeking to build spans and bridges and highways for cars and not people and finally in conclusion, I think that you should entertain serious consideration of the idea that Mr. Badillo's new department be renamed and that it be called the department to find areas in which to build new low and low middle income housing for people who need it instead of relocation into housing that does not exist.

Last week there was a story in the New York Times stating that the Federal Government was going to withdraw the funds it had promised New York City for the building of subsidized housing if the Authority did not get on the ball and start moving on the housing it has requested. You think this involves housing for 200,000 families waiting for public housing? Oh no. It involves 5300 units of which 877 have already been withdrawn by the federal authorities.

Today there are 1500 units of housing guaranteed for subsidy by the regional office of the FHA but sites have not been absolutely approved. 2,923 units of housing on which sites have not been approved by you and the City Planning Commission and have not been guaranteed by the regional office either and you have only until June 30 to act on these.

It would seem that the truth is slowly coming out into the open. You don't want to see any more publicly subsidized low income housing built. Gentlemen, you are not concerned about the needs of the low income people, you are more deeply concerned with trucks and automobiles and the 90 percent grant from the Federal Government.

You are throwing gold dust into the air in the hope that the people of the City of New York will be fooled into believing that you care about parks, about decent housing, about code enforcement. If you vote for the expressway gentlemen, no amount of protesting by you and the office of the

Mayor will continue to fool the people. The Metropolitan Council on Housing urges that you listen to all the organizations who voted and have resolutions passed against the Broome Street expressway, that you examine Mr. Badillo's report and read between the lines, that you become concerned with the fact that the City is deliberately dragging its heels on the building of more low income housing, that you take steps to clear up the backlog of the 200,000 applicants who need and want public housing, not on the applications, not by letting them die at the expiration of the two year period, but by filling the need and that finally, you vote down the condemnation of land in the path of the Broome Street expressway. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: Reverend La Mountain I think the last speaker represented, said that she represented the Metropolitan Housing Council.

REVEREND GERARD LA MOOMTAIN: Yes, the Metropolitan Council on Housing.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: I have heard of this, I thought it was a responsible organization, but she has mentioned here that I don't care about people and I say that any organization that makes this statement cannot be a responsible organization because I have the greatest regard for the people of my borough and I have had and will continue to have this as long as I occupy this position.

REVEREND GERARD LA MOOMTAIN: I'm sure that you will President Dudley, I appreciate that very much.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: May I ask you Reverend, how many more speakers do you have?

REVEREND GERARD LA MOOMTAIN: Approximately 20 to 25.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: 25 more?

REVEREND GERARD LA MOOMTAIN: 20 to 25.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL: Then, just for your own timing and scheduling here, we are going to recess at 1:30 so that you can plan your speakers up until 1:30 and then when we resume and begin again, you will know where you stand.

REVEREND GERARD LA MOOMTAIN: Very good, thank you, Mr. Screvane. Our next speaker is Mr. Harold Harnatz representing the East Side Chamber of Commerce.

MR. HAROLD HARNATZ: Members of the Board of Estimate; my name is Harold Harnatz, I am a co-owner of Ratner's Restaurant located at 138 Delancey Street, I am Chairman of the Traffic and Expressway Committee of the East Side Chamber of Commerce, I am a member of the Board of Directors of both the East Side Chamber of Commerce and Lena and I am also a member of the Borough President's Planning Board Number 3.

I am speaking here today on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce, also on behalf of Barnett August, Executive Dir-

ector of the Chamber.

With the above affiliations that I have gentlemen, I believe that I can be classified as being civic minded, but I have been hearing so much that those who oppose this expressway are standing in the way of progress that I would like to comment that with a few more projects of this type the only progress that the city will make will be in moral and financial bankruptcy.

Does it make any sense to have the terminal point of this expressway almost coincide with the terminal point of the Brooklyn Battery Tunnel? In effect you are placing in competition a toll free artery with a road on which a toll has to be paid. Why pay 35 cents at the Brooklyn Battery Tunnel when you can use this expressway free of charge?

Most certainly, this expressway will short circuit the maximum efficiency of the Brooklyn Battery Tunnel and this at a time when traffic to and from Brooklyn and New Jersey will be alleviated by the completion of the Verrazano Bridge.

Gentlemen this is not progress, this is crass erosion of the taxpayers money. The purpose of this expressway as set forth by the City was to take 75,000 cars off the city streets without going into the question of expressways which invariably attract more and more cars and are self defeating, doesn't the city owe as much allegiance to the people of the

lower east side as they do to the non-taxpaying suburbanites who wish to bypass our city?

I am sure that this administration is not at all certain that the expressway is desirable, but in effect they have a bull by the tail and can't let go but statesmanship and real administrative and business foresight calls for the right action to kill this expressway.

Let us not be blinded by this not looking a gift horse in the mouth idea. That may look like a giveaway and in one respect it is a giveaway. The city is giving away part of its heritage.

I dare say that within a comparatively short time, not more than five years at the most, it will cost the city itself more than \$100,000,000 that is being expended by the Federal Government and State Government. This is as a result of the following:

The loss of property on the tax rolls, the loss of sales taxes as a result of a decline in business in the area and the closing of close to 800 small businesses. Three, the loss of gross receipt taxes, four, the increase in the welfare work load as a result of the blight that will result and also the unemployment that will take place and let me say that these decreases in revenue and increases in cost will continue ad infinitum and this at a time when the city is faced with a record budget.

How inconsistent we are. The Federal Government expends \$13,000,000 for mobilization for youth programs in our area and we undercut this program with this monstrous and blight causing expressway, with the lower Manhattan expressway.

What the city proposes is connecting Brooklyn, a comparatively non-growth area as compared to other areas which will already have a traffic alleviation with the construction of the Verrazano Bridge, with the only Hudson River crossing facility that has not been improved on.

How ironic and how poorly planned. We improved the Lincoln Tunnel, we improved the George Washington Bridge and then we connect this expressway to the archaic Holland Tunnel.

If we are going to spend \$100,000,000, I say, let us try to get \$100,000,000 worth of traffic improvement and not just \$100,000,000 worth of steel and concrete, to say nothing of the misery and heartache caused to residents, who have to be ousted from their homes and relocated.

Also, Mr. Badillo in his report to the Mayor does not provide for any relocation to those business people who will be ousted from their business establishments. How callous can we get but I can tell you what a lot of business people will do, they will follow the featherbedding pattern of the city and they will land on the welfare rolls to stay there for the rest of their lives.

As I stated before, the increasing cost of the expressway to the city will be a lot greater than the direct cost borne by the Federal and State Governments. There is an important phase that has not been dealt with to any extent and that is this:

My own business and hundreds of others similarly situated businesses are not in the path of the expressway but we are convinced that this ugly swath will scar the lower east side and cause blight to such a degree, principally because of the closing of streets, that our businesses would be better off if taken in condemnation.

We are being left to wither on the vine. In essence, our properties will be partially condemned without the benefit of a partial condemnation award. Let us not be blinded by the fact that this expressway has been planned over 20 years ago so that it should be construed that the expressway is long overdue.

In the interval, we have had many improvements constructed or being constructed such as one, the Brooklyn Battery Tunnel; two, the periphery highway which connects the west side highway with the east river drive and which if properly studied and engineered, with a little imagination could efficiently take care of the traffic that wants to go from river to river; number three, the widening of Houston Street from river to river and number four and most important the

Verrazano Bridge which has to be of incalculable value in the over-all traffic picture.

The very least this Board can do is to wait until the Verrazano Bridge is completed and then reassess the entire picture. Thus, the passage of time in this case has most certainly eliminated the need for this expressway.

To sum up, the gist of my remarks is that this expressway will not help our traffic situation and will most certainly do infinite harm to our lower east side area. This is not alone a traffic problem, this is a moral and ethical problem as to whether our area should be offered up as a need-less sacrifice.

In closing, we ask you to search your consciences, to do what your minds and hearts dictate is the right thing to do. If you do that, we are confident of your decision. Thank you.

REVEREND GERARD LA MOOMTAIN: Gentlemen, the next speaker on your list is Mrs. Rachelle Wall, businesswoman of the downtown Independent Democrats and a very effective publicity agent for the Joint Committee. Mrs. Rochelle Wall.

MRS. RACHELLE WALL: Gentlemen, I have only one thing that I am an expert in and I think you know what that is. Between the date of the last meeting of the Board of Estimate and the present one, there has been a new communique to the press from Mr. Robert Moses.

I must admit that I find the Moses news releases interesting. Not so much for what they say but for what they leave unsaid. Of course Mr. Moses has a style all his own. If you were to ask me or my friends for a critique I think that we would term it early General Motors.

But the intent of these releases gentlemen, is not humorous. And it is not true that Moses can do no harm. For by implication if not stated fact, this Moses release implies that relocation is the only obstacle in the path of the lower Manhattan expressway.

Now I realize that you gentlemen know that isn't true, but the press is obliged to respect and accept the word of the expert. If Mr. Moses says that relocation is the only problem and puts it in writing then we must be prepared for the consequences. And I think the consequences are self-evident.

The press has accepted Mr. Moses' word and their headlines that the relocation report has hurdled all obstacles to the expressway shock those of us who know better. I think this Board of Estimate should request that the press correct this erroneous impression. Mr. Badillo ended his report with a comment that:

"The rest of the question is of course another question; the desirability of the expressway itself".

I am not prepared to cross words with a waspish Mr. Moses but his inclination to generalize on this matter and the apparent acceptance of his generalizations has made me curious about the exact nature of this project.

A plan based on out-dated experience and obsolete assumptions should certainly have been reassessed in light of traffic changes that will take place as a result of the through routes offered by the Verrazano Bridge, cross-Bronx expressway and other new facilities.

It is also amazing that in this 20 year period, no alternative plan for by-passing of the city by inter-state traffic or the using of a modern loop route around Manhattan have been forwarded.

If the relief of the crisis were in the interest of the majority of the people, wouldn't they most certainly have been? In a memorandum filed with the Federal and State Governments and dated November 17, 1958, the final discussions on the approved lower Manhattan expressway engineering plan make the job of meshing this local and inter-state traffic flow appear like a Rube Goldberg cartoon.

The memorandum reveals that, although it is against the standards of the Federal Bureau of Roads to use city streets as part of an inter-state federal arterial route, in the approved plan a number of city streets are utilized and become part of inter-state route 78.

All Williamsburg Bridge bound traffic instead of being removed from the surface streets as has been implied must stay on the roadway under the expressway to Elizabeth Street. The expressway is admitted to be below standard at certain points.

By converging and mixing local and inter-state traffic at this point, the report indicates that the purpose of the expressway is defeated entirely, and we quote:

"The cross-town peak hour traffic demand has always been recognized to exceed the capacity of a practical expressway in this area of Manhattan"

Now, this admission makes it obvious that the solution is an inter-state by-pass. Practically every major city today employs this method of rerouting inter-state traffic.

To consider using the island of Manhattan as a base for the building of numerous inter-state highways is destructive and deceptive. Gentlemen, it's bad news. Thank you.

REVEREND GERARD LA MOOMTAIN: Gentlemen, the next speaker is Mr. Lloyd Paperno, representing the lower east side neighborhood association. Mr. Paperno.

MR. LLOYD PAPERNO: Gentlemen my name is Lloyd Paperno, I am the Co-chairman of the housing division of Lena, the lower east side neighborhood association. I am also Secretary of the local Borough President's Community Planning Board number 3, and a member of the lower east side Democratic

Association, however I speak primarily as a representative of Lena which is interested vitally in this matter.

The Board of Directors of Lena has considered this matter on numerous occasions and on March 27, 1962 resolved that it opposes consideration of the lower Manhattan expressway as a solution to the traffic congestion problem of lower Manhattan and that it urges in concurrence with the Mayor of the City of New York and the Borough President of Manhattan and the City Planning Commission to consider the many other available solutions to the traffic congestion in lower Manhattan in order to effect a comprehensive program of traffic patterns for the area.

I am not here to rehash the arguments that have been made by the speakers preceeding me nor to advance any argument which I am sure will be made by the many speakers who will follow me, however, I do believe that it is evident from the list of speakers considerable evidence as to why the lower Manhattan expressway in Manhattan as planned is undesirable and why in light of the recent removal of the overhead structures of the Third Avenue el and the consequential up-raising of neighborhoods surrounding them, the construction of another elevated expressway will necessarily result in blight.

We have seen evidence that in Los Angeles where similar expressways were advanced as a proposed solution to

recognized traffic problems, that it didn't solve the problem and they create blight in the area surrounding them. We have all heard how such recognized critics of city planning and city planners such as Jane Jacobs and Louis Mumford (phonetic) joined in opposition to this highway for reasons that have been stated here before.

With all this evidence motivated against the construction of this enormous undertaking, we merely ask where is the evidence for it? Where is the evidence that this rather than some other alternative method is the desired method? Where is the evidence that this method will solve the problem whereas other alternative methods which have not been advanced nor I believe seriously considered will not?

We have heard of numerous suggestions for the use of alternative methods, the use of Houston Street, the banning of parking on Canal Street and the use of that street as a thoroughfare from river to river. These alternatives have all been suggested by various organizations in the past.

The Board of Directors of Lena recognizes that there is a traffic problem just as the City recognizes that the construction of this highway will create a relocation problem but we believe before such an immense undertaking is brought about, the consideration of other alternatives should be in mind, that these other improvements that Mr. Harmatz mentioned, the Verrazano Bridge, the widening of Houston Street,

their effect on the local traffic planning should also be considered before we undertake to construct again an elevated highway which will necessarily cause blight.

Many of us in the lower east side are busily connected with the Mayor's operation, save the Bowery and to help raise the Bowery area to the surrounding neighborhoods. The reason for this operation and its comment was because the removal of the Third Avenue El finally allowed the opening up of this area and the use of the neighborhood surrounding it privately in a manner that will be both profitable both to the City and to the area.

Are we merely going to be faced after solving many problems posed by operation Bowery to similar problems in the area underneath this lower Manhattan expressway? We sincerely hope not and we urge that you gentlemen oppose the expressway. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: You raised some rather interesting points there, first of all I think that anything that Lena has done in the last few years to my knowledge has been done very well. Do you have any alternative suggestions coming from Lena as a result of its resolution to disagree with this?

Is the resolution based on Lena's distaste for example of an elevated highway or is Lena's fear in connection with the relocation problem that is involved here? You men-

tioned Houston Street; I am sure you are aware of the fact that when we talked about Houston Street last year, as a partial escape valve for some of the traffic, more or less a great deal of the same group was here and blocked the extension of Houston Street.

MR. LLOYD PAPERNO: I am familiar with that Mr. President but I do not believe that Lena was involved.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: I don't think so either. I'm simply asking, could you tell me whether or not the emphasis of Lena's objections is placed on number one the structure or number two the vastness of the problem?

MR. LLOYD PAPERNO: Our emphasis is placed primarily on the construction of an overhead structure in the area and secondarily and perhaps just as importantly, the relocation problem, however, since the date of this resolution Commissioner Badillo's report has been enacted and I am not prepared to make any comments based on that.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: Well I am not so sure that our Board does either, but assuming that the expressway did not go through as has been proposed, and assuming that responsible organizations such as Lena and others in the community would continue to be concerned about the problem which is there, it's not going to walk away -- you can't put the trucks in your pockets -- we know that, would you then think that Lena would be concerned with re-

spect to the widening of a street and maybe taking some buildings? We still have to take some buildings even if we did this as an alternative.

MR. LLOYD PAPERNO; Well, without speaking for the Board Mr. President, I can say that many individuals on the Board recognize the problems, we recognize that something is going to have to be done about it and that necessarily if something is going to be done, it's going to effect people in the area and probably require removal of buildings, et cetera.

However, we just do not believe that this proposed method is the proper way.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN: Thank you.

REVEREND LA MOUNTAIN: The next speaker is Nicholas A. Rossi, President of the lower west side civic league.

MR. NICHOLAS A. ROSSI: I was going to say good morning, but I see it is good afternoon. Mr. Acting Mayor, gentlemen of the Board of Estimate; I am Nicholas A. Rossi, President of the lower west side civic league, and we are very much concerned with the lower Manhattan expressway.

We do not want it. I'm going to be very brief, because I have been here, many, many times before, and probably by this time you know me.

I believe the first time I came here, I had suggested that this expressway should take marginal streets, and not cut through the city, like the proposed 34th Street, or Broome Street expressway. Now, they do not add to the city, as we found out.

Now they are withdrawing 34th Street, and I pointed out before, because they have a hundred foot street there, and we similarly have a hundred foot street in Canal Street. We have a 150 foot street in Delancey Street. We have a slightly narrower street in Canal Street.

If Canal Street was pushed across Broome Street just a small triangle, you would not lose much building and it would serve the situation. However I must repeat that unless you, yourself, have spent some time at the tunnel, you cannot conscientiously vote on this project. I was there.

I tried to get to Hoboken. I was invited to a dinner, on the 13th of October, last. The dinner was for 7:30, and I thought if I left at 7:00 or 10 minutes of 7:00, I could easily get there 15 minutes ahead, because usually it takes 12 minutes from Washington Square to Washington Street in Hoboken.

Well, I got into Varick Street, and I could not move any more, and I stayed there for about three quarters of an hour. Finally, I got as far as West Houston Street, and I was lucky to make a right turn. I said, "Well, I will go to West Street, go south to Canal Street and approach the tunnel through the west instead of the east".

I got to West Street, but could not approach Canal Street at all, because you had traffic coming down the west side highway trying to get into the tunnel, and trucks that enclosed all the cross streets from -- well, at least Chambers Street anyway, because after waiting another three quarters of an hour I finally got out and drove down to past Chambers Street, turned around, went on the ramp and went to the Lincoln tunnel, where we have two mouths through Lincoln tunnel instead of one.

I got to Jersey, and when I got to my appointment it was 9:00 o'clock. So it took me over two hours to get to where I should have gotten to in 12 minutes. If you had been there, you would have convinced yourself that no matter how

many highways you are going to build overhead, you are not going to get any more cars and trucks in that two-lane tunnel. What you need there is an additional tunnel before we think of anything.

If we had an additional tunnel, we would not need a highway, because the traffic would flow smoothly through these side-streets, with the exception that you may have to widen a little bit crossing Lafayette Street into Broome Street from Canal Street. You would have no problem at all.

If you would consider it, take some time off, and you owe it to yourselves as much as to the people, and go and inspect that situation yourselves, and you will be convinced that this is not the time for this improvement, this is neither the time or place for the improvement.

So, gentlemen, please do that, and you will feel better yourselves when you realize this is not the time for this project.

Also, I want to comment on Mr. Badillo's remarks about the 2,000 families -- 2,400 families -- of course, omitting what Mr. Stark reminded us, of the 750-odd small businessmen -- insofar as the families is concerned, and the 6,200 families available every year in private ownership.

I have been in the real estate business as a broker and member of the Real Estate Board of New York City for 38 years now. We have some management, but I have never seen

available apartments comparable to the rents that these people are paying. Now certainly, you can get apartments for \$100.00 or \$150.00 a room, up to \$200.00 a room. There are plenty of those available and you can get a couple of months free rent with it.

However, you cannot put these people in private houses, because there are no such things available. Every landlord has a list of prospective tenants making application for them. And we have had in the last three years, I think five vacancies. There are 50 people who want those vacancies when one is available. So there is no such thing. You cannot possibly put those people in private dwellings.

You have got to take into consideration, if we have 2400 families, how many of these previously made applications for public housing? You would find very few, because these people are enjoying something that you cannot enjoy in public houses. They are living as free people, as free Americans.

I say, gentlemen, if you were in their position you would want to live the same way. If you can possibly help it, you wouldn't want to go in a City project, no matter how beautiful the rooms are. Let us not forget, that be it ever so humble, it is still their homes, and it is respected as such by them and by us, by everybody in fact.

Now let us come to Mr. Stark's position mentioned

about the small businessmen. It has never occurred yet that these small businessmen in any project in the City of New York in the last -- I think we have started this about 22 or 23 years ago -- any small businessman has ever been relocated.

Now we made buildings, we set up shopping centers, not for the small businessman -- for the chain store, yes, but the small businessman was thrown out entirely, and still we insist that the small businessman is the backbone of the nation. Backbone of what? -- He's being thrown out day after day.

THE PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF BROOKLYN: Just a minute; I referred to a shopping center. I did not refer to a shopping center that is built by private operators and so forth. I referred to make available land somewhere, if this thing goes through.

If it does not go through, this is out, of course, to make available land to the 700 - odd small businessmen in that area, where they could be removed to, and to provide for them to pay rent, as they do now, to the City of New York, just as a housing project, so they can remain in the area, because from the little I know about it, it is a very busy shopping area.

People come there not only from the city, but from many parts of the country. It is an outstanding shopping center. And I'm concerned when it involves 700 little busi-

nessmen, that if it does go through, that they are not thrown out.

MR. ROSSI: You are perfectly right, and I am 100 per cent with you. This should have been thought of not just now, but years ago, because never was there made any provision for the small businessmen. Small businessmen were always kicked out. It has happened in Harlem, in Brooklyn, in New York, and it has happened all over the City of New York.

As a matter of fact, probably it was our fault, when we, at the Constitution Convention in 1938, when we approved -- when we worked on the law establishing public housing, they -- some up there insisted that no stores be available in those areas, or those projects. For what reason I do not know.

But we were anxious to get something on the books to permit state aid to public housing, so we took it that way. From then on, as you see, when something is built, there are no stores available. If there are any stores available nearby, they set it up for chain stores, and the small businessman is out.

So, I think all these things here should be taken into consideration.

I think, as Mr. Stark said, you should continue from now on, whenever anything should be contemplated, so far

as public housing is concerned, to make provision for the small businessman. Ordinarily, a small businessman cannot get into a shopping center if he wants to because the rents there are not \$2.00 a foot or \$2.50 a foot, but it goes from \$8.00 to \$16.00 to \$20.00 a square foot.

The small businessmen that we have here certainly cannot afford that kind of rental, and still attract the people who want to do business with that particular small businessman.

So all in all, gentlemen, I think you should reconsider, if you have made any -- if you have any idea at all to vote in favor of this project, you should reconsider it right now and take a trip around there, take a walk, and you would find it is not necessary at all, and let's leave these people alone, because 2,400 families -- and all the newspapers have been talking about is the \$100,000,000 that we get.

We cannot justify ourselves in selling 2,400 families for \$100,000,000, even if \$100,000,000 was spent in New York City. Thank you. Please give this your honest consideration.

THE DEPUTY MAYOR: We will now take a recess for luncheon.

THE CLERK: Recess for approximately one hour for lunch.

(At 1:30 o'clock, the meeting was recessed.)

(The meeting reconvened at 3 o'clock P.M.)

THE CLERK: Calendar Numbers 1, 2 and 3, continued
Hearing.

REVEREND GERARD LA MOOMTAIN: Gentlemen, our
first speaker for the afternoon session will be Mrs. Katherine
Masullo, who is a housewife and resident of Broome Street.

MRS. KATHERINE MASULLO: I live at 529 Broome Street.
I'm a resident there, for forty-eight years in the same house.
My mother came here to this Country when she was eighteen
years old and brought twelve children in this neighborhood,
and we are all citizens of the United States.

We were all married here, and my mother was married
here, we were Christened in these churches, and we do not
want to leave this neighborhood.

I worked free-time in schools in this neighborhood.
I gave four hours of my time as a housewife for the Board
of Education to help the children in the schools in this
neighborhood. I worked very hard for these children, not be-
cause I'm a rich woman. I am not a rich woman, but because I
loved these children. And today they are all grown up. They
are all in their twenties. I meet them every day on the
street, and they all say hello to me, because they remembered
me from 1 A. So I beg you people, please, I have a mother
of ninety-two years old, and still alive, and she has great
grand, and great, great grandchildren all around her in this

neighborhood.

Do you know what my mother said when she heard about this? She said, "Please God, take me away before these buildings go down." How would you like to hear those words? Have you got old mothers? We have. "Please God, take me away before these buildings go down."

And do you know what else she said? She said, "Throw a bomb here in the heart of New York City and take us away all at one time, not inch by inch." That is what my ninety-two year old mother said.

She still goes out shopping. She is a healthy, strong woman. The doctor said she has ten more years, but she hasn't got any more. She is very sick. She won't eat, and she won't sleep, because all her children are around here-- we are twelve children, and only two she lost -- she has got ten around her yet. They range from seventy years old down to forty-seven, all in this neighborhood.

So I beg you, I'm not here -- I don't know why -- I beg you, please, don't do this thing -- not only for my mother -- we have many old people in this neighborhood. They all survived -- we survived polio, even the sidewalks are immune. They have not even got germs in this neighborhood. We have no delinquents, no gang wars. We are all a bunch of happy people.

So I beg you, please, do not do this thing to us.

December 6, 1962

I am sixty-two years old and I live in this house forty-eight years.

That is all I've got to say. I beg you, please do not do it. I thank you very much for listening to me.

REVEREND GERARD LA MOOMTAIN: Gentlemen, our next speaker is City Councilman Theodore Kupferman.

COUNCILMAN THEODORE KUPFERMAN: You have heard a good deal of argument in opposition to the proposed Expressway. I want to say that I concur fully in the remarks made by Congressman John Lindsay here this morning.

I won't take up any more of your time, because of all these arguments that you have heard, not that you do not deserve to listen to these arguments, because I think it may very well help you.

Thank you.

Just to have the record straight, I am against the proposed Lower Manhattan Expressway.

REVEREND GERARD LA MOOMTAIN: The next speaker of the afternoon session is Dr. Gottlieb Helpern, physician and tireless worker for City causes.

DR. GOTTLIEB HELPERN: I am Secretary of the committee to save homes and businesses in the Second Assembly District.

Mr. Deputy Mayor and members of the Board of Estimate; New York City is not only noted for blintzes and