

16-7754
1957

METROPOLITAN RAPID TRANSIT COMMISSION

*To the Honorable the Governors
and the Legislatures of
the States of New York and New Jersey*

INTERIM REPORT

ON

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMISSION
DURING 1956

New Jersey State Library

JANUARY 31, 1957

New Jersey State Library

METROPOLITAN RAPID TRANSIT COMMISSION

50 BROADWAY

New York 4, N. Y.

Commissioners from New York

CHARLES H. TUTTLE
Co-Chairman

ALLEN S. HUBBARD
Treasurer

CARL WHITMORE

ERNEST W. WILLIAMS, JR.

WILLIAM ZECKENDORF

FRANK H. SIMON — *Executive Director*

Commissioners from New Jersey

EDWARD J. O'MARA
Co-Chairman

WILLIAM F. YOUNG
Secretary

THOMAS J. HARKINS

JOHN A. KERVICK

JOHN F. SLY

CREATION AND DUTY

The Metropolitan Rapid Transit Commission came into being on June 14, 1954, as a bi-state agency created by Chapter 801, Laws of 1954, of the State of New York, and Chapter 44, Laws of 1954, of the State of New Jersey.

As stated in Section 5 of the legislation, the Commission was established to "study present and prospective rapid transit needs of the New York-New Jersey Metropolitan Area and develop, recommend and report as soon as possible measures for meeting such needs." The Commission has no governmental powers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
RAPID TRANSIT NEEDS OF THE METROPOLITAN AREA.....	2
INCREASING URGENCY FOR A SOLUTION TO RAPID TRANSIT PROBLEMS	4
SUPPORT FOR SOLUTION ON REGIONAL BASIS.....	5
COMMISSION'S STUDY ACTIVITIES DURING PAST YEAR.....	6
I. Interstate Studies	6
II. Intrastate Studies	8
III. Summary of Progress of all Studies	10
THE STATEN ISLAND-NARROWS BRIDGE RAPID TRANSIT REPORT.....	10
REMAINING TASK OF THE COMMISSION.....	12
REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMMISSION	12
(a) Legislative	12
1. New York	12
2. New Jersey	13
(b) Fiscal	13
1. New York	13
2. New Jersey	13
RECOMMENDATIONS	15
1. To Governor and Legislature of New York.....	15
2. To Governor and Legislature of New Jersey.....	15
APPENDIX A—Scope and Current Status of Engineering and Other Studies being conducted for the Commis- sion under Contract	19
APPENDIX B—Summary and Analysis of Report, dated Novem- ber 29, 1956, entitled "Comparative Studies of Proposed Rapid Transit Plans for Staten Island via the Proposed Narrows Bridge" submitted by Day and Zimmermann, Inc.	23
APPENDIX C—Draft of an Act to be Introduced in the Legisla- ture of the State of New York	35

METROPOLITAN RAPID TRANSIT COMMISSION

January 31, 1957

To: His Excellency, Governor AVERELL HARRIMAN, and
the Members of the New York Legislature

His Excellency, Governor ROBERT B. MEYNER, and
the Members of the New Jersey Legislature

The Metropolitan Rapid Transit Commission has the honor of submitting this Interim Report on its activities since the submission of its last Interim Report dated March 1, 1956.

The Commission reports steady and substantial progress in its study activities. The technical studies being made for the Commission are nearing conclusion. The steps contemplated thereafter are— (1) coordination and appraisal by the Commission's Project Director of the results of those studies and submission of his recommendations; (2) Public Hearings thereon to obtain the benefit of the viewpoints of all interests, public and private, and (3) preparation and submission of the Commission's own Final Report and Recommendations.

There has been a great public interest in the work of the Commission. The Press, in both New York and New Jersey, has covered the Commission's activities in many news articles and editorials. Many organizations of a civic nature have requested representatives of the Commission to describe its work, and individual Commissioners and staff members have accepted 19 such speaking engagements. The work of the Commission has been discussed on four radio programs and three television programs in the Metropolitan Area. Numerous requests for information on the transit situation in the Metropolitan Area have been received and such requests are complied with wherever possible.

THE RAPID TRANSIT NEEDS OF THE METROPOLITAN AREA

Transportation, and particularly rapid transit, occupies a position of unique importance and necessity in the New York-New Jersey Metropolitan Area. Virtually all those who work in the Area require some sort of transportation, public or private, from their home to their places of employment. This requirement for mass passenger transportation is to an extent unmatched by any other metropolitan area in this country.

This has led to the development within the Area of a vast network of mass transportation facilities comprising subways, elevated railways, buses and suburban railroad systems to serve those workers who reside in the suburban areas. It has also resulted in a vast network of highway facilities to accommodate the automobiles, buses and trucks that are in use in the Metropolitan Area.

For many years now, there has been occurring a most dramatic shift in the travel habits of suburban passengers in the New York-New Jersey Metropolitan Area, as evidenced by a sharp increase in the use of buses and automobiles and a marked decline in the use of the suburban railroads. This shift from railroad transportation to highway transportation has been most pronounced in the New Jersey Sector of the Metropolitan Area, where the trans-Hudson traffic by rail on a typical business day has declined 54.6 percent since 1930, while the trans-Hudson traffic by buses and automobiles on a typical business day has increased 356 percent.

This shift has been evident in commutation travel as well as in other daily travel. From 1930 to 1950 the number of rail commuters from New Jersey decreased by 39.7% while the number of bus and auto commuters from New Jersey increased by 75.2% (Regional Plan Association Bulletin #77). The trend has been accelerated since the War as shown by statistics of the Port Authority for the years 1948 to 1954 which indicate that trans-Hudson rail passengers destined for Manhattan, south of Central Park, on a typical business day between 7 a.m. and 10 a.m. declined by 24.6% while similar passengers by bus increased by 34.2% and similar passengers by auto increased by 73.7%.

The shift from the railroads to the highways has had far-reaching effects. It has increased the financial difficulties of the commuter

railroads and has led to steady efforts by them to eliminate what are said to be unprofitable trains, lines and ferries and to applications for permission to make further eliminations. These curtailments have forced even more passengers to use highway facilities and thereby have aggravated the problem of the commuter railroads. The process threatens to be progressive.

This shift from the use of the railroads has contributed greatly toward highway congestion, necessitating the construction of more and more vehicular facilities. In turn, these facilities have generated additional traffic and created the need for the construction of still more costly facilities. For the urban centers of the Metropolitan Area, the tremendous increase in the use of automobiles and buses has caused traffic and parking problems which, if allowed to get worse, will exert a most damaging effect on the life, economy and prosperity of the Metropolitan Area.

The problem to be faced is to plan for and to bring into realization such improvements in the facilities for the movement of people by rail between their homes and their places of employment as will attract commuters and other passengers to the use of rail facilities and to restore a balance in commuting passenger transportation. Such improvements must be of a nature to provide rail transportation facilities with such characteristics of speed, comfort, convenience and cost as to make them competitive with the private automobiles.

To accomplish this aim, there must be comprehensive planning and the development of a broad-gauged program for administration, financing, construction and operation of rail transportation facilities throughout the whole Metropolitan Area, with the rail network so coordinated with highway plans that all means of transportation will be complementary to each other to the end that the Area will have the finest possible transportation system and offer the best possible service at the lowest possible cost.

To develop the comprehensive general program for rail transit, to determine the immediate improvements to be effected and to devise an agency to carry out the objectives of the program are the immediate needs of the Metropolitan Area toward which the Commission is applying its efforts.

THE INCREASING URGENCY FOR A SOLUTION TO RAPID TRANSIT PROBLEMS

The urgency of the need for a solution to the rapid transit problems of the Metropolitan Area has been stressed in previous reports of the Commission. Events of the last few months have actually increased the necessity for an adequate and comprehensive solution.

1. On May 2, 1956, the Public Utilities Commission of the State of New Jersey granted permission to the New York Central Railroad to reduce substantially the service on its River Division (West Shore Railroad); and on September 25, 1956, the Public Service Commission of the State of New York granted permission for a reduction of service to a different level on that Railroad. At the present time, efforts are being made by the Railroad, the Commissions and the Courts to straighten out this confused situation, but whatever plan is adopted the result will be sharply decreased service. On September 27, 1956, a Division of the Interstate Commerce Commission granted the Railroad permission to abandon its ferry service between Weehawken and New York, but the Commission has deferred compliance with its decision pending a review by the full Commission.

2. The petition of the New York, Susquehanna & Western Railroad for permission to abandon its passenger service is still being considered by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of New Jersey. This petition was later amended to a request for a substantial reduction of service rather than for total abandonment.

3. In New York State, the New York Central Railroad on September 10, 1956, petitioned the Public Service Commission to increase the fares for its suburban service for the purpose of eliminating the deficits incurred in providing that service. In the case of its Putnam Division, the requested increase in fares is unrealistic and the Railroad suggested to the Public Service Commission the alternative of abandonment of passenger service on that line.

4. Just recently, the railroads have completed negotiations with the Brotherhoods on new labor contracts calling for substantial increases in pay and benefits, including employees in passenger services.

These are only the latest developments in this period of progressively deteriorating commuter rail services. Others preceded them and were factors in this ever-worsening situation.

SUPPORT FOR A SOLUTION ON A REGIONAL BASIS

The importance of solving the rapid transit problems of the Metropolitan Area on a regional basis is receiving recognition by civic leaders. The tri-state Metropolitan Regional Conference, which was established last year, created a Steering Committee under the chairmanship of Mayor Wagner. This Committee has placed the problem of traffic and transportation high on its agenda. The Conference's Traffic and Transportation Committee, under the chairmanship of Mayor Bernard J. Berry of Jersey City, was activated on November 8, 1956 and submitted its Final Report to the General Assembly of the Conference on December 11, 1956. In that report, the Committee recognized the necessity of a regional approach by stating—"The proper solution of these traffic and transportation problems requires all affected communities to join together with their neighbors in the Metropolitan Regional Conference so that a united frontal attack may be carried through to a successful conclusion". In commenting on the work of the Metropolitan Rapid Transit Commission, the Committee Report stated—"It is my feeling that when the preliminary report and recommendations of the Commission are submitted next April, 1957, there will be much for the Conference to evaluate and possibly implement".

The City Administrator of the City of New York, Mr. Charles F. Preusse, was interviewed on Radio Station WNYC on November 18, 1956, and stressed the "necessity of a coordinated mass mode of transportation to link the city and suburbs * * * designed to enable people to travel quickly and cheaply into the city, linking the routes from outlying suburbs directly with city transit in the heart of New York". Mr. Preusse advocated a joint program in conjunction with other communities of the Metropolitan Area through some sort of special Authority.

The opportunity to develop a comprehensive plan for transit improvements in this area, as represented by this Commission, must not be lost. It cannot be postponed.

The study of the rapid transit needs of the New York-New Jersey Metropolitan Area being conducted by this Commission is the latest and by far the most comprehensive of a long series of studies on this subject made by various agencies and commissions over a period of

many years. Furthermore, it is the first such study conducted by a bi-state agency created expressly for the purpose and is the only study adequately financed to obtain concrete and comprehensive results. The best experts in the country have been employed, at a cost of nearly \$1,000,000. Seemingly, and in view of the augmenting crisis, the opportunity and the thoroughness of expert attention are here and now; and later may be too late.

THE COMMISSION'S STUDY ACTIVITIES DURING THE PAST YEAR

Prior to the submission of the last Interim Report of the Commission (March 1, 1956), the efforts of the Commission were directed to the following: (1) organization of its Study activities, (2) arrangements for the financing of the various technical studies required, (3) designation and employment of consulting engineers and other experts of the highest skill and repute, and (4) launching technical studies. These activities were described in the previous Interim Reports.

I Interstate Studies

The major group of projects, known as "Interstate Studies" and related problems, are being conducted under a Memorandum of Understanding between the Commission and The Port of New York Authority, which was approved January 13, 1955. The text of the Memorandum of Understanding was included in the Commission's Interim Report of February 18, 1955 as Appendix "C". In accordance with the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding, the study activities conducted thereunder have been placed under the coordinating direction, supervision and appraisal by a Project Director, Mr. Arthur W. Page, formerly Director of the Working Group of the President's Cabinet Committee on Transport Policy.

These interstate studies, made for the Commission with financial assistance of some Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$800,000) from the Port Authority, included—(1) studies of the distribution of population, employment and economic activity projected 20 years into the future; (2) a detailed analysis of the feasibility of various plans for improved rail transit between New Jersey and New York; (3) a

study of immediate railroad passenger service problems leading to recommendations for the maintenance or improvement of such services, pending, or in lieu of, more comprehensive solutions; (4) a detailed study of means of improving bus transportation in those areas where investment in additional rail facilities does not prove to be feasible; and (5) a study of the legal, financial and administrative devices required to carry out any recommended plan.

The study of the present and prospective distribution of population, employment and economic activity throughout the Metropolitan Area, which was conducted for the project by the Regional Plan Association, Inc. of New York, has been completed and a final report was submitted to the Project Director on August 1, 1956.

The study of certain immediate railroad passenger service problems and of means of solving these problems pending, or in lieu of, a more comprehensive solution, which was conducted for the project by the consulting engineering firm of Coverdale & Colpitts of New York, has been completed and a report was submitted to the Project Director on December 31, 1956.

The study of the origin, destination and travel habits of commuters between New Jersey and New York, which was conducted for the project by Mr. Charles E. DeLeuw of Chicago, has been completed and his report to the Project Director will be submitted shortly.

The study of the feasibility of various plans for improving rail transit between New Jersey and New York, also conducted for the project by Mr. Charles E. DeLeuw, has been completed. His organization is in the process of developing engineering and economic data concerning those projects and is in the process of writing their final report. The first draft of the report was submitted to the Project Director on December 31, 1956.

The other interstate studies under way, namely, the study of ways and means of improving bus transportation in those areas where additional investment in rail transit facilities does not appear to be feasible (conducted for the project by the consulting engineering firm of Ford, Bacon & Davis, Inc. of New York) and a study of the legal, administrative and financial devices required for recommended transit improvements (being conducted for the project by Dr. William Miller of Princeton, N. J., an eminent authority on government, taxation and law) have progressed in a satisfactory manner but cannot be concluded until Mr. DeLeuw submits his recommended plans for rail transit improvements.

In November 1956 there was commenced a study of the feasibility of providing rapid transit service to Staten Island via the Bayonne Peninsula. The results of this study are to be compared with the results of a study of providing such service via the Narrows Bridge and described in the next section of this Report. This study as to transit via the Bayonne Peninsula is being conducted by Mr. Charles E. DeLeuw as an extension of his other study activities, and is to be completed by February 1, 1957.

The current unsatisfactory financial situation regarding the commuter services of suburban railroads and the realization that those services are an important segment in the comprehensive transportation system of the Metropolitan Area have led the Project Director to recommend that an investigation be made as to the extent of deficits incurred by the railroads in providing such service and of possible ways of reducing or eliminating them. The Port Authority and the Commission have both approved the conduct of this study and both Agencies will share in its cost. This study, which is being made by Ford, Bacon & Davis, Inc., was started in November, 1956, and is to be completed by February 1, 1957.

II Intrastate Studies

Since March 1, 1956, the Commission has arranged for and its engineering consultants have begun certain other studies of an intrastate nature to round out the Commission's comprehensive study program for the entire Metropolitan Area.

The Commission's intrastate studies are financed by appropriations from the States of New York and New Jersey. The appropriation from each state is being used to finance the studies concerning that particular state. These studies include the characteristics of commuter travel by rail and auto from both the Westchester Sector and Long Island Sector to other parts of the Metropolitan Area, and by ferry and auto from the Staten Island Sector to other parts of the Metropolitan Area; the feasibility of specific proposals for transit improvements in the Staten Island and Long Island Sectors; and a review of the rapid transit problems within New Jersey. The object is to guide the Commission in its approaches to these local problems and to judge their relationships with the interstate problems.

As it is the intention of the Commission that its activities should result in a plan of a comprehensive nature, covering the entire New York-New Jersey Metropolitan Area, these intrastate studies have also been placed under the coordinating direction and supervision of Mr. Page as Project Director.

The Commission, on February 29, 1956, contracted with Ford, Bacon & Davis, Inc. to conduct a study of the origins, destinations and characteristics of commuter travel between the Westchester Sector and the other Sectors of the Metropolitan Area. This study has been completed and a final report was submitted to the Project Director on September 17, 1956.

The Commission, on April 26, 1956, contracted with the consulting firm of Wm. Wyer & Co., of East Orange, N. J., to conduct a general review and study of the various economic and geographic characteristics of Northeastern New Jersey and to conduct a review of previous transit studies in New Jersey for the purpose of advising the Commission what proposals for the improvement of local intrastate rapid transit within the State of New Jersey merit study by the Commission. This study has been completed and a final report was submitted to the Project Director and the Commission on July 13, 1956.

The Commission on March 13, 1956 contracted with the consulting engineering firm of Day and Zimmermann, Inc. of Philadelphia to conduct studies of the origins, destinations and characteristics of travel between both the Staten Island and Long Island Sectors and other Sectors of the Metropolitan Area. The contract with Day and Zimmermann also included a study of certain specific proposals for transit improvements in the Long Island Sector and a study of the feasibility of providing rapid transit service from Staten Island to other parts of New York City via the Narrows Bridge. The studies of commuter characteristics and the study of rapid transit across the Narrows Bridge have been completed and reports were submitted to the Project Director under dates of September 27, 1956 and November 29, 1956, respectively. The report on the study of the feasibility of specific proposals in the Long Island Sector is expected to be submitted on or about January 30, 1957.

III Summary of Progress of all Studies

The study activities of the Commission and its consultants and engineers have proceeded expeditiously and in accordance with the timetable set up for the consultants by the Commission and the Project Director. A list of studies being performed by experts under contract and payments therefor through November 30, 1956 is included as Appendix A.

THE STATEN ISLAND-NARROWS BRIDGE RAPID TRANSIT REPORT

Realizing the desire for early decisions and expeditious design of the Narrows Bridge the results of the Commission's study of the feasibility of providing rail rapid transit to Staten Island across the Narrows Bridge is being included in this Report instead of being held until the Commission's comprehensive final Report is prepared. A summary of the findings of the Engineers, Day and Zimmermann, Inc., and an analysis by the Commission's staff are included as Appendix B of this Report.

The Commission's Interim Report of February 18, 1955 stated (on page 29)—

“The proposed Narrows Bridge and the Bayonne Bridge present far too important opportunities for the development of mass transportation by some form of rail not to challenge and receive thorough scientific study of their availability for such purpose, either separately or in conjunction, before the final commitment of either to some other method of transportation exclusively.”

It was on that basis that the completed Commission's study of rail transit across the Narrows Bridge and the pending study of rail transit via Bayonne were undertaken.

In the report on the Joint Study of Arterial Facilities, New York-New Jersey Metropolitan Area, published by the Port of New York Authority and the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, there appears the following statement (page 40):

“In the opinion of the Port Authority, the public interest requires that the George Washington Bridge be able to accom-

moderate rail rapid transit at any future time. It is solely because of this look to the future that the second deck of the Bridge would be designed to permit conversion of two vehicular lanes to rapid transit use. Rail rapid transit across the Hudson does not appear to be in immediate prospect."

The Commission now has before it adequate factual data for a determination as to whether similar foresight should be applied to the design of the Narrows Bridge.

The Engineers' report indicates that it is feasible from an engineering and operational standpoint to extend the 4th Avenue (Brooklyn) Subway across the Narrows Bridge to Staten Island. To so provide direct rail transit service to Staten Island, however, would, as explained in Appendix B, require a capital outlay which, if the Bridge be built with fourteen lanes (instead of twelve) as the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority now states would be required, may amount to as much as \$101,000,000 and would result in an annual cost to the City of New York which may amount to as much as \$6,500,000.

The staff of the Commission has analyzed the Engineers' report and concludes that nearly equal public convenience and public benefits could be obtained from an alternative method of transportation, namely, direct bus service from various parts of Staten Island across the Narrows Bridge to the present subway terminal at 4th Av. and 95th St. (Brooklyn) or to any other desirable subway transfer point in Brooklyn. The initial capital investment and the annual cost to the City to provide such alternative service would be comparatively small.

The City of New York must determine, therefore, whether it is in the best public interest to incur the indicated initial and annual costs to provide the additional public convenience and other public benefits obtainable by construction of the rail transit extension to Staten Island via the Narrows Bridge.

The Commission's study of the feasibility of providing rail transit service from Manhattan to Staten Island via the Bayonne Peninsula is continuing.

THE REMAINING TASK OF THE COMMISSION

Now that the engineering and other technical studies being made for the Commission by the various Consultants are nearing completion there remains ahead the task of appraisal, evaluation and policy determination leading to the preparation of the Commission's Final Report and Recommendations.

It is expected that the Project Director will have completed his functions and will have submitted his reports to the Commission by April 1957. The reports of the Project Director will include all of the facts regarding the several plans for transit improvements as well as recommendations as to which plan or plans should be considered and accepted by the Commission. Upon submission by the Project Director of his factual reports and recommendations, the Commission will conduct public hearings throughout the Area in New York and New Jersey to obtain the views of the public and interested agencies regarding the proposals brought forth by the studies.

On the basis of the Commission's appraisal of the studies aforesaid, of the proposals of the Project Director and of the views brought forth in the hearings, the Commission will make its own determinations and prepare the recommendations to be included in its Final Report to the Governors and the Legislatures, which is expected to be submitted before the end of 1957.

REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMMISSION

(a) *Legislative*

(1) **New York**

Under the Constitution of the State of New York, the life of the Commission will expire unless it is extended by legislative action in the 1957 Session of the Legislature. Such legislative action is necessary to enable the Commission to complete its mandates and the Commission will arrange to have appropriate legislation introduced, a recommended draft of which is attached to this report as Appendix C.

(2) New Jersey

In New Jersey there is no such requirement for legislative action to continue the life of the Commission.

(b) Fiscal**(1) New York**

Although the Commission does not anticipate the necessity for the appropriation of any additional funds for the purpose of conducting studies, it will require an appropriation of funds to cover the New York share of the necessary administrative expenses during the fiscal year 1957-1958. It is the considered judgment of the Commission that the New York share of such expenses will amount to Seventy-five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000).

As legislation is necessary to extend the life of the Commission, the request for such administrative funds is not being included in the Budget to be submitted by the Director of the Budget of the State of New York and a section making the necessary appropriation has been included in the recommended legislation.

The amount of Seventy-five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000) requested for administrative expenses is the same as was appropriated in the Budget for the current fiscal year. Of that appropriation it is estimated that only about Forty-two Thousand Dollars (\$42,000) will have been expended by the end of the fiscal year. However, with completion of work by the Project Director, engineers and consultants and with submission of their reports the activities of the Commission and its staff will be substantially increased by the necessity of appraising the reports, conducting public hearings, preparing the Commission's Final Report and of performing related functions. An increase of staff and other expenses is anticipated leading to the request for an appropriation in the amount of Seventy-five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000).

(2) New Jersey

For the current fiscal year there has been appropriated and otherwise made available Seventy-four Thousand Nine Hundred Four Dollars and Ninety Cents (\$74,904.90) for the administrative expenses of the Commission and the unexpended remainder of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000) previously appropriated for the

costs of studies made for the Commission, including fees of experts retained. During the current fiscal year it is estimated that the New Jersey share of the administrative expenses of the Commission through June 30, 1957 will be about Forty-two Thousand Nine Hundred Four Dollars and Ninety Cents (\$42,904.90), leaving an unexpended balance estimated at Thirty-two Thousand Dollars (\$32,000).

As discussed in (1) above, it is the considered judgment of the Commission that the New Jersey share of the Commission's administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1957-1958 will amount to Seventy-five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000). A budget request has been submitted to the Legislative Director of Budget and Finance for an appropriation of Forty-three Thousand Dollars (\$43,000) of new funds and a reappropriation of Thirty-two Thousand Dollars (\$32,000), as the unexpended balance from the current fiscal year.

The difference in the estimated expenditures for administrative purposes for each state is due to the fact that each state operates on a different fiscal year basis, the New York fiscal year being April 1 to March 31 and the New Jersey fiscal year being July 1 to June 30. The administrative expenses of the Commission are shared equally by the two states.

No funds have been requested for the purpose of conducting studies, as distinct from administrative expenses, during the 1957-1958 fiscal year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is respectfully recommended that—

1. The Governor and the Legislature of the State of New York approve legislation continuing the life of the Commission and making an appropriation of funds for the administrative expenses of the Commission.

2. The Governor and the Legislature of the State of New Jersey approve the budget request of the Commission for funds for the administrative expenses of the Commission.

Respectfully submitted,

METROPOLITAN RAPID TRANSIT COMMISSION

Commissioners from New York

CHARLES H. TUTTLE
Co-Chairman

ALLEN S. HUBBARD
Treasurer

CARL WHITMORE

ERNEST W. WILLIAMS, JR.

WILLIAM ZECKENDORF

Commissioners from New Jersey

EDWARD J. O'MARA
Co-Chairman

WILLIAM F. YOUNG
Secretary

THOMAS J. HARKINS

JOHN A. KERVICK

JOHN F. SLY

APPENDICES

Appendix A—Scope and Current Status of Engineering and Other Studies being conducted for the Commission under Contract

Appendix B—Summary and Analysis of Report, dated November 29, 1956, entitled “Comparative Studies of Proposed Rapid Transit Plans for Staten Island Via the Proposed Narrows Bridge” submitted by Day and Zimmermann, Inc.

Appendix C—Draft of an Act to be Introduced in the Legislature of the State of New York

APPENDIX A

**The Scope and Current Status of Engineering and Other Studies
Being Conducted for the Commission Under Contract**

1. Studies being performed under the Memorandum of Understanding with The Port of New York Authority and paid for by the Port Authority:

<i>Description</i>	<i>Maximum Estimated Cost</i>	<i>Cost Through Nov. 30, 1956</i>
<p>REGIONAL PLAN ASSOCIATION, INC. OF NEW YORK</p> <p>To undertake various economic studies to determine for the present, and to estimate for 20 years in the future, the distribution of population, employment, industry and commercial and cultural centers throughout the Metropolitan Area as a basis for determining the future demand for mass transportation in the Metropolitan Area. This Study has been completed.</p>	\$140,000	\$136,928.34
<p>CHARLES E. DE LEUW OF CHICAGO</p> <p>To conduct a survey of the present travel habits of passengers by rail, bus and auto, including origin and destination; to determine by canvass the factors that cause a commuter to choose a particular means of transportation; and to analyze the results thereof along with the data developed by the Regional Plan Association to determine the present and future demand for interstate mass transportation. As a separate study to make a preliminary evaluation of the physical and financial feasibility of four typical systems for improving interstate rapid transit, including new concepts of transportation media, and a detailed engineering and economic study if one or more of the systems is found to be physically and financially feasible. To study the feasibility of providing rapid transit service to Staten Island via the Bayonne Peninsula. Expected time of completion—January, 1957.</p>	\$290,000	\$258,553.24

<i>Description</i>	<i>Maximum Estimated Cost</i>	<i>Cost Through Nov. 30, 1956</i>
COVERDALE & COLPITTS OF NEW YORK		
For studies and recommendations relative to presently existing rail passenger service problems and methods of resolving them to maintain and improve existing services pending, or in lieu of, more comprehensive solutions. The specific projects are described in Section (e), pg. 51, of the Interim Report of the Commission dated Feb. 18, 1955. This study has been completed.	\$ 80,000	\$ 71,257.00
FORD, BACON & DAVIS, INC. OF NEW YORK		
To study means and methods of improving bus transportation by expediting travel time and providing off-street bus terminals where new investments in rail lines do not appear to be justifiable and of integrating feeder bus routes with interstate rail routes. Expected time of completion—January, 1957.	\$ 70,000	\$ 49,374.51
DR. WILLIAM MILLER OF PRINCETON, N. J.		
To organize a group of experts to conduct studies leading to recommendation of the financial and administrative devices to be used in the development and operation of a multi-community transit system, including methods of financing capital investments and of meeting deficits if they should appear to be inevitable. The group would also determine the legislation required to effect any transit improvements to be recommended. Expected time of completion—February, 1957.	\$ 87,000	\$ 46,940.72

2. Study being performed under an Agreement with the Port Authority whereby that agency and the Commission share the cost equally.

<i>Description</i>	<i>Maximum Estimated Cost</i>	<i>Cost Through Nov. 30, 1956</i>
FORD, BACON & DAVIS, INC. OF NEW YORK		
To study the extent of the deficits of railroad suburban commuter services in New Jersey and the effect on such deficits of whatever proposals for trans-Hudson transit the Project Director may submit. Expected time of completion—February, 1957.	\$ 10,000	None

3. Studies contracted for and paid for by Commission funds made available by State appropriations:

<i>Description</i>	<i>Maximum Estimated Cost</i>	<i>Cost Through Nov. 30, 1956</i>
FORD, BACON & DAVIS, INC. OF NEW YORK		
To study the characteristics of commuter travel by rail and auto from the Westchester Sector to other Sectors of the Metropolitan Area, including origin-destination counts and a survey of the factors causing the commuter to choose his means of transportation. This study has been completed and paid for with New York State funds.	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000.00
DAY & ZIMMERMANN, INC. OF PHILADELPHIA, PENNA.		
To study the characteristics of commuter travel by ferry, rail and auto from both the Staten Island and Long Island Sectors to other Sectors of the Metropolitan Area and to study the physical, service and financial feasibility of certain plans for transit improvements from these Sectors. Expected time of completion—January, 1957. Paid for with New York State funds.	\$105,000	\$104,887.85

<i>Description</i>	<i>Maximum Estimated Cost</i>	<i>Cost Through Nov. 30, 1956</i>
<p>WM. WYER & CO. OF EAST ORANGE, N. J.</p> <p>Review all previous studies and to review the geographical and economic factors in the New Jersey part of the Metropolitan Area and to recommend which studies of intrastate transit in New Jersey the Commission should undertake. This study has been completed and paid for with New Jersey State funds.</p>	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,000.00

APPENDIX B

Summary and Analysis of Report, dated November 29, 1956, entitled "Comparative Studies of Proposed Rapid Transit Plans for Staten Island via the Proposed Narrows Bridge" submitted by Day and Zimmermann, Inc.

The purpose and scope of the study was to determine the feasibility of providing rail rapid transit to Staten Island over the proposed Narrows Bridge and connecting with the 4th Av. (Brooklyn) Subway. Five proposed plans for the Staten Island portion of the system were studied consisting of two basic proposals and three alternate variations thereof, including basic routings via the proposed Clove Lakes Expressway and the existing Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway facilities. These Plans are:

PLAN A—A rapid transit line with two (2) branches using the Tottenville and North Shore branches of the Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway.

PLAN B—A line via the route of the Clove Lakes Expressway.

PLAN C—A shortened transit line via the Narrows Bridge terminating at a transfer station at an intersection with the Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway.

PLAN D—A line extending south from the proposed Bridge via the Tottenville Line of the Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway, and including a shuttle line between St. George and Grasmere via the Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway.

PLAN E—A rapid transit line via the proposed Clove Lakes Expressway and including a transfer station at the intersection with the Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway.

Summary of the Engineers' Findings

1. It is physically practicable to extend rail rapid transit service from Brooklyn across the proposed Narrows Bridge to Staten Island.

2. The 4th Av. (Brooklyn) Subway would have adequate capacity available to accommodate the traffic of the Narrows Bridge Line, in addition to its present Brooklyn traffic, for an extensive future period *if the St. George ferry continues in operation.*

3. If ferry service were discontinued, the 4th Av. Subway could accommodate the anticipated traffic from Staten Island until about 1965, based upon the estimated rate of future growth of Staten Island population and number of passengers. Beyond 1965, the capacity of the subway would not be adequate for both Brooklyn and Staten Island traffic.

4. Of the five Plans studied, Plans C and E are the most advantageous.

(a) Plan C could be constructed and operated as a first step toward completion of the more comprehensive Plan E.

(b) There will be greater justification for Plan E as total traffic volumes increase.

(c) Plan E is the most advantageous plan *for ultimate development*, based upon due consideration of capital costs, estimated annual deficits involved, provision of direct service to the maximum number of passengers, relative savings in travel time and other public convenience factors.

(d) Plan C has a substantial advantage if consideration is only given to financial aspects, *i.e.*: smaller capital investment and lower annual operating deficits in the early years, but will only directly serve 75%-80% of the traffic directly served under Plan E.

5. The use and benefits of the Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway would be increased by integration of its service and fares with the new rapid transit system studied and with integrated bus feeder lines. A universal 15¢ fare is preferred for the Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway.

6. Passengers in Staten Island, under both plans, would rely largely on a bus feeder system, private automobiles, and the Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway to reach the rapid transit line stations.

7. Public Benefits of Engineers' Plans C and E

(a) Time Savings

The Engineers (Day and Zimmermann, Inc.) calculated the savings over present travel time to Manhattan-bound passengers if rail rapid transit were developed as studied and they are summarized below. Time savings for Brooklyn-bound passengers were not computed but would be substantially larger.

Percent of Present Passengers Within Time-Saving Influence

<i>Time Saving (Minutes)</i>	<i>To Midtown Manhattan</i>		<i>To Lower Manhattan</i>	
	<i>Plan C</i>	<i>Plan E</i>	<i>Plan C</i>	<i>Plan E</i>
Over 0-5 min.	11.0%	5.2%	6.8%	7.2%
Over 5-10 "	30.4	24.3	18.3	26.8
Over 10-15 "	10.0	15.0	12.8	14.1
Over 15-20 "	26.6	36.3	3.4	5.7
Over 20 "	10.4	12.8	1.5	1.5
TOTAL (Saving)	88.4	93.6	42.8	55.3
LOSS	11.6	6.4	57.2	44.7
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
NUMBER OF PASSENGERS	17,242		10,352	

(b) Effect on Fares

Comparison of present and proposed fares, excluding the Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway, shows that the proposed rate (30¢) for through-passengers represents a saving of 5¢ compared with present total fares to mid-Manhattan, and an increase of 10¢ for those walking from the ferry to lower Manhattan points. (Assuming that passengers use Staten Island buses to reach the ferry.)

Fare savings comparisons with Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway fares vary widely depending upon the type of Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway fare paid (commutation or single trip) and the points of origin and destination of passengers. Generally, savings are effected for all except those walking to their destinations from the ferry in lower Manhattan and except for those originating north of Great Kills Station.

(c) Direct Service

The basic convenience of the studied rapid transit lines lies in the provision of direct service from Staten Island to Brooklyn and midtown Manhattan, eliminating, for a large percentage of commuters, the presently required second transfer at South Ferry.

8. The required capital costs of Plans C and E, as estimated by the Engineers, are shown in the following Table. They include in such capital costs \$10,000,000 estimated by the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, at the time the Engineers commenced the study, as the additional cost of the Bridge and approaches to provide for rail rapid transit in two of the proposed twelve lanes:

*Estimated Capital Cost At Traffic Levels of 1955, 1965 and 1975
(Including \$10,000,000 for Revision to Bridge and Approaches)
(Thousands)*

<i>Traffic Level</i>	<i>Plan C</i>			<i>Plan E</i>		
	<i>Rapid Transit Line</i>	<i>Cars</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Rapid Transit Line</i>	<i>Cars</i>	<i>Total</i>
1955	\$25,284	\$ 7,293	\$32,577	\$39,944	\$12,155	\$52,099
1965	25,284	11,869	37,153	40,754	20,878	61,632
1975	25,284	16,302	41,586	41,564	29,601	71,165

(If Plan C is constructed as a first step of Plan E, the cost of Plan C should be increased by \$1,200,000 for acquisition of right-of-way and required changes when the Clove Lakes Expressway is constructed. This cost is included above under Plan E.)

Plan C has the lowest estimated cost of any plans presented in this Report. (The costs of the Plans other than C and E are included in Table K of the Day and Zimmermann Report.)

(Three months after the commencement of the study the Commission was informed that the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority had taken the position that two vehicular lanes cannot be spared; that if rail transit were provided the Bridge would have to be correspondingly widened to provide fourteen lanes rather than twelve; and that if rail transit is to be included, the estimated addi-

tional cost of the Bridge, with fourteen lanes, and approaches would be \$50,000,000 rather than the earlier estimate of \$10,000,000 used by Day & Zimmermann.)

9. Estimated Financial Results of Operation, Based on the \$10,000,000 Estimate.

(a) Annual Net Income or Deficit

Year	Before Interest & Depreciation		After 6% Allowance for Interest & Depreciation	
	Plan C	Plan E	Plan C	Plan E
1955	(\$ 49,000)	(\$ 425,000)	(\$2,004,000)	(\$3,551,000)
1965	362,000	291,000	(1,867,000)	(3,407,000)
1975	933,000	1,575,000	(1,562,000)	(2,695,000)

NOTE: Figures in parentheses are deficits. The results for other Plans are given in Table L of the Day and Zimmermann Report.

Considering a \$50,000,000 cost of adding two additional lanes for rail transit to the Narrows Bridge (as now stated by the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority) instead of a \$10,000,000 cost as originally estimated by that Authority, the annual deficits after allowance for interest and depreciation, as shown above, should be increased by \$2,400,000 annually and the Table would then read as follows:

Annual Net Income or Deficit, based on the \$50,000,000 Estimate

Year	Before Interest & Depreciation		After 6% Allowance for Interest & Depreciation	
	Plan C	Plan E	Plan C	Plan E
1955	(49,000)	(\$ 425,000)	(\$4,404,000)	(\$5,951,000)
1965	362,000	291,000	(4,267,000)	(5,807,000)
1975	933,000	1,575,000	(3,962,000)	(5,095,000)

(b) Effect on other City-owned Facilities

The studied rapid transit lines would materially affect the revenues and expenses of other City-owned transportation facilities. The ferry would lose revenue from the passengers diverted to rapid transit and operating costs could be substantially reduced because of a smaller

demand for service. In Manhattan the transit revenues from ferry passengers who cannot walk to their destination would be lost but no corresponding reduction in operating costs could be effected. In Staten Island the entire bus operation would have to be revised to be able to serve the rapid transit line as well as the ferry and both revenues and expenses would be affected. The above effects, based on 1955 traffic, were estimated by the Engineers and are tabulated below:

<i>Effect On</i>	<i>Plan C</i>	<i>Plan E</i>
Passenger Revenue, Subway System	—\$1,155,000	—\$1,316,000
Passenger Revenue, Manhattan Bus Lines	— 120,000	— 120,000
	—\$1,275,000	—\$1,436,000
Net Income Staten Island Bus Lines	—\$ 44,000	+\$ 127,000
Net Income Staten Island Ferry	+ 750,000	+ 750,000
Net Total, 1955	—\$ 569,000	—\$ 559,000

If these net effects are projected to 1965 and 1975, in proportion to projections of passenger traffic, and added to the estimated operating deficits (after interest and depreciation), the gross annual cost to the City of New York would be as follows: (Considering the \$10,000,000 estimate for revisions to the Bridge)—

<i>Year</i>	<i>Plan C</i>			<i>Plan E</i>		
	<i>Deficits On Proposed Rapid Transit Routes</i>	<i>Adverse Effect on Other City Facilities</i>	<i>Total Cost to N. Y. C.</i>	<i>Deficits On Proposed Rapid Transit Routes</i>	<i>Adverse Effect on Other City Facilities</i>	<i>Total Cost to N. Y. C.</i>
			<i>(Thousands)</i>			
1955	\$2,004	\$ 569	\$2,573	\$3,551	\$ 559	\$4,110
1965	1,867	868	2,735	3,407	881	4,288
1975	1,562	1,269	2,831	2,695	1,326	4,021

(Projections of the effects on other facilities to future years are regarded as very approximate indications.)

Considering a \$50,000,000 cost of revisions to the Narrows Bridge instead of a \$10,000,000 cost, the gross annual costs shown above should be increased by \$2,400,000 and the Table would read as follows:

Year	Plan C			Plan E		
	Deficits On Proposed Rapid Trans- it Routes	Adverse Effect on Other City Facilities	Total Cost to N. Y. C.	Deficits On Proposed Rapid Trans- it Routes	Adverse Effect on Other City Facilities	Total Cost to N. Y. C.
			(Thousands)			
1955	\$4,404	\$ 569	\$4,973	\$5,951	\$ 559	\$6,510
1965	4,267	868	5,135	5,807	881	6,688
1975	3,962	1,269	5,231	5,095	1,326	6,421

Analysis by the Commission Staff

1. Bases for Consideration of a Transit Proposal

In every metropolitan area in the country it has been the experience that rail transit revenues are sufficient to pay operating costs but fall short of paying taxes and debt service on capital investment. It has been found necessary and desirable for the community as a whole to provide the required capital and for the transit user to pay the operating costs. New York is no exception and, in fact, that procedure is required by law. The justification is the fact that the existence of transit facilities usually benefits all adjacent property whether or not the owners or occupants actually use the line as passengers, and also benefits as a whole the region and community served.

The primary consideration for determining adoption of any transit proposal, including this one, is, therefore, (1) public necessity or (2) public convenience, if necessity be lacking. In either case the value of the proposed transit must then be weighed against the cost to the community. This staff analysis of the transit proposal studied has been made accordingly, considering, *in the first instance*, the necessity (if any) for the service, and then, *in the second instance*, the public convenience and other public benefits that would be obtainable from the studied plan.

2. Public Necessity

From the recent study of present and prospective distribution of population and employment made by the Regional Plan Association for this Commission it may be assumed that the commuter traffic from Staten Island will almost double in the next 20 years but it also can be expected that some of the increase will be directed to New Jersey points. This is indicated by the following excerpt from the study which shows the estimated change in the relationship of resident workers to jobs in the next 20 years: (From Table 7, Regional Plan Association Report)—

<i>County</i>	<i>Change in Relationship of the Number of Resident Workers to the Number of Local Jobs</i>
Richmond	+ 40,000
Manhattan	+170,000
Bronx	— 60,000
Queens	— 80,000
Brooklyn	—115,000
Union	— 40,000
Middlesex	+ 20,000
Hudson	— 50,000

At present, commuters from Staten Island are served by ferry to South Ferry, where there exist transit connections to all other sections of the City, and, to a small extent, by ferry to 69th St., Brooklyn, which ferry terminal is ½ mile from the nearest subway station. (As automobiles constitute most of the traffic on the 69th St. Ferry it can reasonably be anticipated that the ferry will be discontinued when the Narrows Bridge is completed.) The ferry to Manhattan will be able to absorb the expected increase of traffic. The terminals at St. George and South Ferry have just been modernized and the New York City capital budget for 1957 will include an item for purchase of an additional boat. Still further purchases of boats can be made as required.

An alternate to rail transit across the Narrows Bridge would be direct bus service from Staten Island points across the Bridge to the present subway terminal at 95th St. & 4th Av. (Brooklyn), or to

any other desirable subway transfer point in Brooklyn. The capital cost for the provision of such service would be limited to construction of terminal and transfer facilities in Brooklyn, which cost would be in the order of \$1 to \$2 Million, and the cost of additional buses required which probably would not exceed \$2 Million. Such bus service could adequately accommodate expected traffic and, as shown later, would not seriously affect passenger convenience.

Thus, it has not been demonstrated that, in view of the cost, there is, in a strict sense, public necessity for rail transit across the Narrows Bridge in preference to other means of mass transportation.

3. Public Convenience

(a) Direct Service

Substantially all of the ferry passengers from Staten Island use buses, autos or the railroad to reach the ferry. The construction of the studied rail transit line would not materially alter the need for "feeder" service on Staten Island since the first step (Plan C) would only have 7.6% of the present population residing within ½ mile of the route and the second step (Plan E) would only have 17.1% of the present population residing within ½ mile of the route. As construction of the line would attract some population to its immediate vicinity these percentages could be expected to increase somewhat in the future.

At the Manhattan end of the ferry at least two-thirds of the foot passengers on the ferry must use still another means of public transportation to reach their destinations. Substantially all of the foot passengers on the St. George-69th St. Ferry must use another means of transportation. Thus rail transit across the Bridge would benefit a large portion of the riders by eliminating the need for the second transfer.

If transit service by bus across the Bridge to the present subway terminal at 95th St. & 4th Av. (Brooklyn) were provided in place of the subway extension contemplated in Plan E the same benefits of more direct service would still be available to 82.9% of the passengers benefited by the subway extension.

(b) Time Savings

The Day and Zimmermann Report shows that rail transit to Staten Island would reduce the travelling time for 93% of passengers for midtown-Manhattan and beyond, for 55% of passengers for downtown-Manhattan, and for all Brooklyn passengers. About 13% of the total passengers would actually suffer a loss of time if they used the transit line instead of the ferry.

Of the estimated future population growth it can be assumed that the share of out-commuters destined to Brooklyn will increase and the percentage of commuters who would receive time-saving benefits from a Narrows Bridge rail transit system will increase.

If transit service by bus across the Bridge to the present subway terminal at 95th St. & 4th Av. (Brooklyn) were provided in place of the subway extension contemplated in Plan E similar benefits of time-savings would be available, provided express or limited-stop bus service were operated on the Clove Lakes Expressway. Such buses would have an average speed at least as high as local-stop rail transit and, because of grades, buses could cross the Narrows Bridge more quickly than could rapid transit trains.

(c) Fare Savings

The Report indicates that, under the assumptions used, about 75% of the present passengers would be benefited by a lower fare (all except those who reside or work within walking distance of either ferry terminal or who reach the St. George ferry terminal by automobiles).

(d) Conclusion as to Public Convenience

Transit over the Narrows Bridge, whether by rail or bus, will provide substantially increased convenience to passengers from Staten Island to other points in New York City. Transit by bus will provide nearly the same added convenience as transit by rail. This added convenience, whether by rail or by bus, would, however, be provided to only a portion of the population. Consequently, Day and Zimmermann estimate that, assuming no other means of improved transit are provided, only the following percentages of total potential traffic would

be attracted to the Narrows Bridge transit line (From Table G-3 of the Day and Zimmermann Report):

1955.....	53.6%
1965.....	53.2%
1975.....	51.0%

4. *Other Considerations*

It has been demonstrated above that Narrows Bridge transit by bus with an initial required capital outlay of no more than about \$4 Million would provide nearly the same public benefits as the Narrows Bridge subway extension (Plan E) with a required capital outlay estimated by the Engineers on the basis of twelve lanes at \$71 Million, but which the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority claims should be increased by \$40 Million on the basis of fourteen lanes.

The only justifications for the large expenditure for rail transit over the Narrows Bridge (considering that the line would result in an annual total cost to the City of New York of about \$6,500,000, assuming the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority claim for a \$50,000,000 increase in the cost of the Bridge is valid) would be—

1. A traffic intensity too heavy for bus service to handle properly.
2. An induced development caused by rail transit which would return to the City taxes and other revenues greater than the gross annual cost.

The estimates of the future development of Staten Island made by the Regional Plan Association were based on the assumption that the Narrows Bridge would be built but not on any assumption that rail transit would be provided across the Bridge. The Commission's staff discussed this matter with the staff of the New York City Department of Planning who stated that their present policy was, generally, to set up zoning for a low to medium intensity of development for Staten Island with large areas reserved for needed recreational facilities for the population of the City as a whole. It is their thought that additional intensity of development on Staten Island will depend on the growth of employment in Staten Island itself and in adjacent areas such as New Jersey and Brooklyn rather than on the provi-

sion of direct transit facilities to Manhattan. Travel time by public transportation to mid-Manhattan usually determines intensity of growth due to transit. As regards mid-Manhattan, Staten Island lies in a time zone equivalent to Westchester County on the north and to Nassau County on the east, both of which lie outside the present area of high-intensity development.

Considering the above, and the fact that transit by bus would provide nearly equal public benefits as transit by rail, it appears that provision of transit by rail to Staten Island via the Narrows Bridge will not cause any important increase of development but would instead affect the distribution of the development currently estimated.

There is another factor that must be considered, namely, that transit traffic across the Bridge with the current level of estimated development will utilize (by 1975) most of the maximum available capacity of the 4th Av. Subway and that if rail transit, as studied, should induce an intense extra development of traffic across the Bridge it might become necessary to construct additional rail transit facilities in Brooklyn. With bus transit providing almost equal convenience as rail transit it is conceivable that a similar situation could arise if transit across the Bridge were provided by bus, but the flexibility of bus service would allow the diversion of excess passengers to other rail transit lines in Brooklyn, or to Manhattan via the Bayonne Bridge, in which case additional subway construction in Brooklyn would not be required.

APPENDIX C

**Draft of an Act To Be Introduced in the Legislature
of the State of New York**

STATE OF NEW YORK

AN ACT

To continue the life of the Metropolitan Rapid Transit Commission as a temporary bi-State Commission to study the prospective rapid transit needs of the New York-New Jersey Metropolitan Area, and to develop and recommend measures for meeting such needs, and making an appropriation therefor for expenses of such Commission.

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

Section 1. The Metropolitan Rapid Transit Commission as now constituted and empowered by law is continued as a temporary bi-State Commission.

Section 2. The Commission shall continue to study present and prospective rapid transit needs of the New York-New Jersey Metropolitan Area and develop, recommend and report as soon as possible measures for meeting such needs. The Commission may enter upon public or private property of either State in order to carry out its functions.

Section 3. All agencies of either State, having information, records or data helpful to the Commission, are hereby authorized and directed to render such assistance to the Commission as it may request, within the limits of available staffs and facilities.

Section 4. All railroads and other transportation services operating within either State are requested and authorized to provide the Commission with such technical and operating information and data as the Commission may request, within the limits of staffs and facilities.

Section 5. The sum of Seventy-five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000), or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the State Treasury in the General Fund to the credit of the State Purposes Fund not otherwise appropriated, and made available for the use of the Metropolitan Rapid Transit Commission in carrying out the provisions of this Act during the fiscal year ending March thirty-first, nineteen hundred fifty-eight. Such moneys shall be payable out of the State Treasury on the order and warrant of the Comptroller on vouchers certified or approved by the Chairman of the Commission or by an officer or employee designated by him.

The moneys appropriated by this Section shall only be expended to the extent that equal moneys are made available for the same purposes by the State of New Jersey.

Section 6. This Act shall take effect immediately.



