

## COPYRIGHT / USAGE

Material on this site may be quoted or reproduced for **personal and educational purposes** without prior permission, provided appropriate credit is given. Any commercial use of this material is prohibited without prior permission from The Special Collections Department - Langsdale Library, University of Baltimore. Commercial requests for use of the transcript or related documentation must be submitted in writing to the address below.

When crediting the use of portions from this site or materials within that are copyrighted by us please use the citation: *Used with permission of the University of Baltimore.*

If you have any requests or questions regarding the use of the transcript or supporting documents, please contact us:

Langsdale Library  
Special Collections Department  
1420 Maryland Avenue  
Baltimore, MD 21201-5779  
<http://archives.ubalt.edu>

# ROUGH DRAFT - MAD SLIDE SHOW

Nov. 1972

B. BOND

(1)

The present official explanation for the absolute necessity for an expressway system in Baltimore is that it is needed to provide access for trucks and to keep manufacturing in the city. This is a nice sounding explanation and a very difficult one to criticize since none of its advocates have ever actually made an overall study of Trucks in the Baltimore area. This may be a little hard to believe but unfortunately its true. In fact, the last traffic study was made in 1962 and was such a poor job that it actually was used in a text book as an example of how not to do it. ~~xx~~ But this doesn't matter too much to the road planners anyway since, as you can see, almost all of the major elements of the Expway plan were already present here in the 1957 plan which was designed for a completely different reason at a time when Baltimore's tax base had just increased by 50% over the past 15 years ~~and~~ the city contained 60% of the region's population and jobs and suburban ~~f~~ growth was in no way seen as a threat. The official explanation then was that the road system was absolutely necessary for through <sup>interstate</sup> traffic and inner city commuters. Some of that through traffic incidently, is that horde that flows between ~~f~~ Frederic and Philadelphia. But this plan too is a patch work of some 6 earlier plans dating back to 1942 each of which has a different rationalization.

If we go back to the 1949 plan we can see that the Franklin/Mulberry corridor was originally proposed as part of a system of radial and ring roads. It then became part of the East West Expway (which lost its east). Here also is I-95, which we are now told is needed so desperately for trucks, was originally suggested as a not to important possible future completion of the ring road system.

There is a tremendous amount of inertia in highway planning here. once the engineers have figured out a route they like to keep it and are quite willing and able to come up with new explanations for that which may conflict with the old ones.



It leads to such physical oddities as that funny right angle turn in the Jones Falls at Mt. Royal. It was originally designed to connect with the E/W expway, which disappeared. Now on the plans it comes down to connect with the inner harbor crossing, which is no longer there.

Franklin/Mulberry which was originally a radial from a ring road, becomes extended into the absolutely necessary E/W Expway then loses its right half, then becomes demoted to being a spur for the road which is now the really important one.

The absolutely necessary central portion of the 49 through 64 plans, the north-south expressway ring -proves to be not so necessary in the next plan and loses its top half. Then it gets it back again and becomes a distributor boulevard instead of an expway. Then it loses its top half again.

I could go on and on- the point is ~~z~~ not to be fooled into thinking that this is in anyway some sort of logical system planned on the basis of carefully researched facts and figures. More accurately, it is a bling reaction to the availability of federal funds which have created terrific pressure on the state and city to build a road system- ANY ROAD SYSTEM- and get their fair cut of the federal pie.

According to whqt arguments were needed the "facts and figures" found by engineering consutants have at various times "proved" that of the existing city traffic 6% was through traffic, then they showed 43%, and for the next time the figure became 29%.

As Larry Reich, the head of the city planning Dept says, " Traffic figures are very unscientific. We go through the motions like its all science and computers, but garbage in is garbage out. What we are forced to do is use our horse sense."

But the real problem is that the people who are using their horse sense are civil engineers-who know absolutely nothing about



cities or urban planning. During the last 30 years of highway planning ~~there has been~~ urban planners have been involved only once- the famous Concept Design Team. They came up with a plan almost identical to the earlier plans for the simple reason that they were forced to accept all the decisions that had already been made by the engineers about the location of the roads. When they questioned a spectacularly poor proposed route through the middle class black community of Rosemont, their contract was almost cancelled and further restrictions were put on them.

Perhaps the mosr signifigant example of the non-relationship between road planning and the needs of the city and reality in general is that a rapid rail system costing almost 2 billion dollars was proposed in 1962 and is in the process of being carried out. Yet there has been no change in the basic road plans. Does this mean that this 2 billion dollar rail system won't make any difference? It evidently doesn't to some people.

So here is the presently proposed system- a little shop worn after being patched together from 30 year old parts but it looks good on a map- from a distance, From closer up we can see what it is actually doing to the city.



There are many people who are aware of the faults in the expressway design and the severe damage it would cause to the environments and city communities but feel that inspite of it we must have the 3A system because Baltimore needs it in order to survive and compete with the counties.

This thinking is based on two major mistaken assumptions which, unfortunately, have become part of our conventional wisdom about cities.

The first assumption is that the counties are growing because they have roads and that by putting freeways in the city we will somehow put the city on top again. This is simply not true.

There are many reasons for county development one of the major ones being of course that there are a lot of people who want to live in single family houses on suburban lots. You can't build them in the city, there's not much vacant land, any land which is around costs many times more than in the county, and prospective home buyers find that by living in the counties they pay lower taxes, lower insurance rates, and can send their kids to nice fancy all white schools.

Buisnesses and stores look at the same costs and land availability factors when deciding where to locate and also see the county as a good place to go for the obvious reason that that is where <sup>a large portion of</sup> their workers and market now live. Reducing the travel time by 5 minutes is not going to affect these factors.

But it seems like common sense that roads will change things and the road lobby has depended on this. They have not hurried us under a mbuntain of facts and figures showing how expressways will save the city for the very good reason that they do not exist. In fact any survey of city's comparable to Balto that have put in expressways such as St.Louis or Cleveland would show that not only have development trends continued but they have gotten worse.



~~And finally attempting to get~~

Finally, attempting to rebuild our tax base by getting industry overlooks some facts which evidently the left hand of the planners knows but the right hand doesn't. That is that over the last 20 years in the US goods producing manufacturing jobs have increased by only 15 1%- service jobs on the otherhand have increased by 61%. In absolute numbers in the Baltimore Region there were 6,000 new manufacturing jobs and 175,000 service retail and government jobs.

Even if these expressways would make the city as equally attractive as the counties fo manufacturers it would be a useless victory.

The other mistaken assumption is that ~~is~~ it is possible to reduce traffic congestion and make the city work by building more roads. This ~~is~~ also is simply not true. In all cities everywhere traffic congestion has increased. The Federal Govt. recently had a study done for them on all the possible ways for reducing congestion that covered everything from building new roads to computer operated stoplights ~~xxxxxx~~ the report is about the size of a phone book. They found that any reduction in traffic congestion is eliminated in 4 to 5 years by a combination of normal traffic growth and the induced traffic growth brought about by the presenee of the improvements themselves(!) Anothe federal study of the new congress Street Expressway in Chicago found that a 21% increase in traffic was generated by the opening of the road over a two year period.

Building roads to reduce congestion is like trying to bail out a boat with a bucket that knocks a bigger hole in the bottom each time you use it.

And the question remains what are all those cars going to do after they get to the downtown? What is going to happen to these streets with twice as much traffic on them as there is now? Already about half of the downtown area is used of automobiles.



The city does have certain advantages over the counties, especially for service and governmental work. Things are convenient, you can walk to another business or to lunch and you don't have to wait all day for someone to come to fix the typewriter. And it's an interesting place to be with lots of different things happening. By increasing the necessity for cars, jamming the streets and making the city intolerable for pedestrians we are ~~losing~~ undercutting the advantages we've got.

We have to face up to the fact, as many cities in other countries are doing, that automobiles are suited for low density travel and they simply do not work in cities. There are workable alternatives which are again being implemented mainly in other countries, but they are beginning to be considered here.

These are called people movers or Personal Rapid Transit. They fill in the missing spots in our transportation technology. They are completely computer controlled and can travel very closely to one another without danger. When you go to a station a vehicle will come by every 90 seconds- it will stop only if there is a person at the station who wants to get on or someone who wants to get off, otherwise it will just keep going- they are sometimes referred to as horizontal elevators.

These systems cost about 1/6 to 1/3 as much as traditional rail rapid because of their light weight and rock bottom labor costs. At the present time the New York transit system pays out \$1.12 in wages for every \$1.00 it takes in (its subsidized for the rest) An entire people mover system would be controlled by one man who would actually be spending most of his time on security, watching the stations over tv. Because of their low cost the system can be built on a very tight grid and provide much more door to door service than any other system. The same lines can carry large vehicles and smaller ones that seat 3 or 4 passengers so that for a slightly higher fare a passenger can get a vehicle that is his along e traveling directly to their destination with out any stops.



D /

The same system can carry containerized cargo and have it directed by the computer to transportation centers where the containers can be loaded directly onto planes or boats, or interstate trucks.

This is not futuristic dreaming, these systems are already in use at several major airports in the US <sup>(Tampa FLA)</sup> and are going to be installed at 9 others soon. A 2 mile system has just been opened up in Morgantown <sup>W</sup>, Va. ~~and~~ DOT is now deciding on a major city, probably Boston, in which to construct an extensive system. Atlanta plans to use peplemovers as part of their plan to keep city transportation moving. \*

Atlanta has realized that its expressways have simply increased the number of people who want, and need, to use cars, and made congestion much worse. They have decided that the only way to improve access to the city and reduce congestion is to eliminate the dependance on ~~the~~ cars.

What Atlanta is doing, and what Baltimore should be doing is to set up a system of fringe parking lots and commuter rail which connects to an inner city system of peplemovers which will carry people over the whole inner city area. The streets can be turned back to people as they are being in many places all over the world, and we ~~can~~ could redevelop the cleared areas of the city for people ~~and~~ as nice places to live instead of pollution generators.

~~You can find an excellent explanation of these systems~~

<sup>city's award winning</sup>

In the MetroCenter report the need for this kind of ~~kind~~ planning is discussed. They acknowledge that traditional types of transportation are approaching the breakdown point, We feel that it would be a terribly sad joke on ourseoves ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> spend a billion dollars and cause irreparable harm to the city in order to construct a transportation system that will be obsolete years before it is finished.

\* on costs - a study by the Stanford Research Inst. Estimated national savings of up to \$62 BILLION if these systems were used instead of gasoline Engines & highways.

Pay its own way -  
subsidized highways.