



# RAPID TRANSIT PROGRESS

METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY

“MARTA REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE IT SERVES...”

AUG.-SEPT., 1968  
VOL. 3 — NO. 6

## TRANSIT CHIEF HAILS ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT PLANS

Paul L. Sitton, newly-named chief of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, U. S. Department of Transportation, has commended Atlanta leaders for taking the initiative in developing a proposal for a rapid transit system. Sitton, a native of DeKalb County and a graduate of Emory University, was in Atlanta August 27 to meet with transportation and government officials. At a news conference that afternoon, he praised Atlanta for having “a leadership that is concerned with the future.”

Sitton stated, “I think a mass transportation system for Atlanta is essential for future growth and development.” On the topic of available federal funds, he noted that in other cities which are building new rapid transit facilities, “The federal government has been prepared to meet its commitment to these programs.”

He commended Atlanta for having “a very well-balanced approach to transportation,” and observed that rapid transit in Atlanta would have a beneficial effect on the entire state.

The text of the news conference is printed in its entirety in succeeding paragraphs.

A number of local elected officials and business leaders attended the news conference to meet Mr. Sitton and to hear his comments. These included Atlanta Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr.; Fulton County Commission Chairman Charlie Brown; Nelson Severinghaus, Chairman of the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission; MARTA Vice-Chairman Roy Blount; and MARTA Directors John C. Wilson and Dr. Sanford Atwood. Georgia former Governor Carl Sanders introduced Sitton to the group of about 30 persons, including representatives of newspapers, radio and television.

Sitton opened the news conference by explaining that he has been traveling around the country since his nomination, visiting the cities to familiarize himself with their problems in transportation and their plans for solutions.

**SITTON:** I think Atlanta is a very unique city. . . . Atlanta is a center city—a central distribution area for a large part of the nation—for the Southeast. Atlanta has grown, it has developed, it has looked forward to its future. In fact, Atlanta has always anticipated its future. I think the Lockner Program for highway development in this area is indicative of this. I think the high-rise office development is a recognition that Atlanta will truly be the central service city of the Southeast for governmental services, for banking, for retailing, cultural activities and other activities of this nature that make up the critical activities of a classic city of the size of Atlanta.

Aristotle said that the people came together in cities to live, and they stayed there in order to live the good life. The Congress, when it enacted the Urban Mass Transit Act in 1964, recognized that there was a need for national support of programs in major urban areas of our country to improve their transportation. It reflected a recognition on the part of the Congress that our urban areas are changing. They are perhaps the most dynamic part of our economy; they are, there's no question about it. And there is a growing demand for services of an affluent society. Transportation is one of those services.

The Department of Transportation is attempting to take all of the programs concerned with transportation and which relate to our cities—highways, urban mass transportation, aviation, and so forth—and to weave them into a systematic pattern in which we can see how the central cities, or the central business districts, can best be served—how to move people back and forth to work, how to provide for recreational outlets—all of these cannot be carried out without a significant transportation service.

Atlanta to me, as I said, is a classical example of this city. I think, also, that Atlanta has a unique leadership among the cities that I've visited. Atlanta has a leadership that is concerned with its future, it is concerned with its growth, and recognizes the things that have to be done in the future, if Atlanta is to remain the cultural and business and economic center of this fast-growing section of our nation.

I came here to get a briefing on the mass transit program which is under study and under consideration by the region; (continued)



At news conference, left to right, are John Wilson, MARTA Director; Roy Blount, MARTA Vice Chairman; Paul Sitton, UMTA Director; and Carl Sanders, former Governor of Georgia.

## TRANSIT CHIEF (continued)

I wanted to see how it is integrated with the total plan of the development of the area, and try to understand this as one of the major component problems that we face on a national level.

I will be glad to answer any questions or discuss any issues that you may have, or specific points concerning the program that I administer.

**QUESTION:** There seems to be one key factor in Atlanta's rapid transit plan and that key factor is money. How far is the federal government going to participate in rapid transit?

**SITTON:** Well, let me put it this way—the federal government between 1964 and 1967 provided over 400 million dollars in grants to support certain cities that were prepared to move ahead with development of their transportation system. We have supported the San Francisco BARTD project; we have provided for replacement equipment in Chicago, in New York, in Philadelphia—there are active projects underway in those cities. In each case, the federal government has been prepared to meet its commitment to these programs. And I think that the political response of the two parties, the recognition by the Congress and the Administration of the critical federal role is an answer to the question of the willingness of the federal government to meet the matching requirements it has set forth in the federal grant program.



**QUESTION:** Is there enough money available now to get Atlanta off the ground?

**SITTON:** There is not enough money available to get any one city off the ground, because you have to approach these projects in developmental stages. One Congress cannot commit itself from one term to the next. We are trying to work out long term programs of authorizations that will permit the cities to plan and to look to the future. I feel that with

the support of the cities and of our Congress, we can provide the kind of sound program that will permit the cities to proceed with the assuredness that the federal support required to sustain these programs will go ahead.

At the present time, we have 190 million dollars in grants that are available for this fiscal year.

I might also add that, in terms of this, we provide support under research programs looking to what the future prospects are for augmenting systems that are provided and for looking at new technology that may come along.

**QUESTION:** From your knowledge of Atlanta and from what you've seen on your visit this time, how important is a rapid transit system of some type to Atlanta?

**SITTON:** I think a mass transportation system for Atlanta is essential for future growth and development. With a city with the projected population that you envision in the next 20 or 30 years, one cannot see its future development taking place at the pattern that you anticipate in terms of your economic growth without providing the key service that is necessary to serve a central city like this. And this can only come about through some very effective, convenient, rapid, and viable form of mass transportation.

The people of Atlanta have a choice—the choice is to move ahead with the transportation that you are planning and anticipate the future growth of your city in a constructive and a progressive manner, taking into account what the economic growth potentials of this area are, what the population is, and by providing the services that are essential to sustain these jobs, this economy at a high level. And to provide the qualities of excellence that are necessary in our society today to provide the kind of life that our people demand and will want. The other alternative is to let "drift" take place—no planning, no prospective analysis of what will happen in the future, and permit things to proceed in a kind of a "drift pattern," and I don't think Atlanta will take that choice.

**QUESTION:** How does it tie-in with the development of highway programs?

**SITTON:** I'm glad you mentioned that, because we are working—in fact, I came from a meeting this morning out at the airport with regional highway officials from all over the United States, explaining the program, how the mass transit program ties in very closely with the highway system. It doesn't compete with highways, it augments highways. We have highway demands that far exceed the revenues that are available, even under existing laws, to meet those demands. What we are trying to do is to make highways more efficient in terms of moving more people who want to use their automobile along these highways, and remove the clogging and congestion that restrict the use of them at this time, and, prospectively, in the future. So, it's an augmentation of existing forms of transportation and existing services.

**QUESTION:** If Atlanta is successful in passing a bond referendum this fall, how long will it have to wait for matching funds from the federal government?

**SITTON:** Well, let me put it in this light—the federal government has been prepared whenever a major city has come forward with a plan and with a viable financing scheme to provide the grants that are needed. We have done this on a timely basis. And, in planning the future of this program, we are certainly taking into account the prospective demands that will be placed upon this program by Atlanta and other cities.

**QUESTION:** Are you familiar enough with Atlanta's plan to say whether or not it's a well-integrated and adequate plan?

**SITTON:** I have followed Atlanta's plan from Washington over the past several years, primarily when I was working on the highway program, and trying to make sure that federal programs at the local level were being placed as part of an integrated plan. I would say that in no city that I've been in and worked with has there been a more constructive effort on the part of all parties to bring together into a systematic approach to the problem of transportation the solution that we are seeking in a balanced transportation system. The answer is, Atlanta has, as far as I've seen in Washington, a very well-balanced approach to transportation.

**QUESTION:** Would you elaborate on a situation where one metropolitan county did not participate in the rapid transit program?

**SITTON:** I can't elaborate in detail, but I can point to an example where, in San Francisco, I believe, the plan is proceeding without the participation of Marin County, which is across the Bay from San Francisco, and which was part of the initial system. That's the only example I know of. The essential thing to focus upon, however, is the need for an initial core system. The need for experience, the need for trying to adjust the travel patterns. There is no question in my mind, once a system is developed and the economic benefits flow from it, that you will see a full regional participation at some point in the future.

**QUESTION:** How would it affect the county not participating?

**SITTON:** I think it certainly would affect the county, in terms of its integration into the total system, of the total metropolitan growth and economy of the metropolitan area. Like having an arm cut off, you know, it's lying there not very effective.

**QUESTION:** How will rapid transit benefit the rest of the state?

**SITTON:** That's a very good question; I'm glad you asked that. What benefits Atlanta benefits the State of Georgia. What benefits Atlanta benefits the Southeast. What benefits Atlanta benefits the nation. The benefits that grow from an efficient form of transportation service to a core area like this spreads throughout the economy. It has a very distinct "multiplier effect," if I may use a word of BARTD, and it will have very large implications for people in other parts of the state. They come here to perform many functions and services; they rely upon Atlanta as a distribution center. All of this affects the cost of doing business. Thank you, gentlemen. (End of news conference.)

# MARTA REJECTS "BUCKHEAD ALTERNATE"

The proposed "Buckhead Alternate" was rejected by the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority at its regular meeting September 3, 1968. After hearing a report of the Engineering and Design Review Committee, presented by Mitchell C. Bishop, the Board agreed unanimously that future planning of the Northeast rapid transit line should proceed on the Southern Railroad alignment as proposed earlier.

The following is the text of the EDR Committee report:  
REPORT OF THE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN  
REVIEW COMMITTEE METROPOLITAN ATLANTA  
RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY  
SEPTEMBER 3, 1968

SUBJECT: "Buckhead Alternate"

In accordance with the decision of the Board at the August meeting, a public hearing was held Thursday night, August 15, at the gymnasium of North Fulton High School on the subject of the proposed "Buckhead Alternate" alignment for the Northeast rapid transit route. Director John Wilson presided, Director Rawson Haverty assisted Mr. Wilson.

Advantages and disadvantages of both lines were presented by MARTA consultants at the public hearing. Among the advantages which Leon Eplan, of Eric Hill Associates, attributed to the "Buckhead Alternate" were the following:

1. Direct service to the Buckhead business district;
2. Two additional stations;
3. Better access by residents of Peachtree Road and Roswell Road;
4. Improved possibilities for orderly growth and development of the area, especially in the vicinity of stations; and,
5. Probability of greater patronage in the future.

The disadvantages which were voiced included the following:

1. The requirement for a greater number of homes, businesses, and other private property for right-of-way.
2. The need for some right-of-way on, or adjacent to, property now being used for parks, schools and churches;
3. The inconvenience of major construction through established neighborhoods; and,
4. The additional cost of \$48 million for the "Buckhead Alternate" over that of the railroad alignment.

One thousand people attended the public hearing. About forty-five persons, other than MARTA consultants, addressed the hearing. Two of these spoke in favor of the "Buckhead Alternate"; others spoke against it, generally because of the disadvantages referred to earlier.

The audience almost in its entirety supported the statements made by those opposing the "Buckhead Alternate." They lis-



MARTA Director John Wilson presides at Public Hearing on "Buckhead Alternate."

tened to the arguments favoring the Alternate alignment, but gave clear indication of their opposition to the proposed Alternate.

It should be mentioned here that when the audience was given opportunity, on four different occasions, to express their opinion of rapid transit generally, they showed just as great enthusiasm for rapid transit as originally proposed as they showed opposition to the proposed Alternate.



Atlanta Alderman Douglas L. "Buddy" Fowlkes was one of about 40 persons who gave their views on the suggested alternate route.

In addition to the comments made by the speakers, additional comments were registered in writing, and several petitions of opposition were submitted, including the one given to this Board at its previous meeting. In addition, in response to a request from the audience, the formal record was held open until the following Thursday to allow the submission of written statements for the record. The written comments submitted reflected the same opinions in the same proportion as the spoken comments at the meeting—the majority opposing the "Buckhead Alternate."

This Authority was given the responsibility by the people of this area, and by their elected officials, to develop a proposal for a rapid transit system which will serve the people of this area in the best manner at the lowest possible cost. While there are advantages and benefits to the "Buckhead Alternate," the disadvantages and additional cost in this situation would appear to indicate the adoption of the route proposed along Southern Railway right-of-way.

It is for the reasons outlined herein, that the Engineering and Design Review Committee therefore recommends that the "Buckhead Alternate" alignment be rejected and the alignment along the Southern Railway rights-of-way be adopted for further planning in the development of a proposed system of routes and station locations for the regional rapid transit system.



About 1,000 persons attended the hearing, held in the gymnasium of North Fulton High School.

# THE INFLUENCE OF RAPID TRANSIT ON REAL ESTATE VALUES IN TORONTO

G. Warren Heenan, past president of the Toronto Real Estate Board, was a principal speaker at Georgia Tech's "Conference on Impending Technology, Its Challenge to Livable Cities," on May 8.

Heenan spoke on "The Influence of Rapid Transit on Real Estate Values in Toronto." He observed that in many ways, the Atlanta of today is remarkably similar to Toronto in the late 1940's when Toronto embarked on building its rapid transit system. Excerpts from Heenan's speech are reproduced below.



I have enjoyed the cultural, social and historical features, and witnessed the community pride and spirit, which have made Atlanta one of North America's truly great cities. Metropolitan Toronto, like Atlanta, is a fabulous boomtown. In the next few minutes at my disposal, I would like to relate to you what has happened, and the exciting developments about to take place in Toronto, as a direct result of the existence of a balanced transportation system. Balanced transportation, featuring Rapid Transit as the main component, is the key to phenomenal urban growth.

Above all, the one thing that all large North American cities have in common is the problem of automobile traffic congestion. More and more great cities are working toward Rapid Transit as a solution to traffic strangulation.

For example, of the existing Rapid Transit cities, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Chicago and Toronto, all have extensions now under construction. A number of other cities are in the advanced stages of planning entirely new systems. Amongst these are: Seattle, Baltimore, Atlanta, Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis. However, in spite of this spectacular pace of expansion and planning of mass transit facilities, there is more and more evidence that traffic congestion is strangling the growth of many of North America's great cities because they have neglected to provide for total transportation needs.

Local and state leadership must take the initiative in identifying transportation problems and developing solutions. The Federal Government, whose transit role has only recently been defined, can play an important supporting role in helping cities achieve balanced metropolitan transportation systems.

There is no doubt that it would be a great service to your community if the real estate people and business and civic organizations continued to insist that rapid transit become the major element in the overall transportation requirements for your metropolitan area.

We must look to a balanced transportation system and not fall into the trap of putting all our eggs in one basket, as has been done in Los Angeles where transportation is almost entirely oriented to expressways.

There is only one way to prevent large cities and their surrounding suburbs from being strangled by traffic, poisoned by exhaust fumes and forced to devote more of their living and working space to parking lots. That is to provide inexpensive public transportation service that is frequent, fast and reliable enough to induce citizens to leave their cars at home when they go to places of work or pleasure.

Mass rapid transit is about the best bargain since Peter Minuit, Governor of New Netherlands, bought Manhattan Island from the Indians for \$24 worth of trinkets in the early 1600's. The Dutchman's investment of \$24 in 30 square miles of land now has a physical value of \$250 billion.

I am convinced that for any major urban area, mass rapid transit as the main base of a balanced transportation system

creates and enhances property values like nothing else on earth.

If an urban rapid transit system never earned a dime, it would still pay for itself a thousand times over through its beneficial impact on real estate values and increased assessments. The greatest cities in the world have that essential common facility—an efficient rapid transit complex.

The major achievement in public transit in Metropolitan Toronto has been the successful creation of a subway system.

As far back as 1942 it was realized that the growth and expansion of Toronto would in a few years result in a transit situation which would be beyond the capacity of surface street car routes. Separation of street car and automobile traffic was the obvious solution, and the Commission began to study a rapid transit system for Toronto.

In 1946, when plans were completed and the war was over, the subway project was submitted to a vote of citizens who, by a 10 to 1 majority, endorsed the construction of a subway. Construction began on a 2-track route from Union Station to Eglinton Avenue, in September 1949, and on March 30, 1954, Yonge Street Subway, the first subway in Canada, was open for business. The total length at that time was 4½ miles, of which approximately 3 miles is underground and 1½ miles is in open-cut.

The total cost of Canada's first subway, including right-of-way, rails, electrical distribution system, signal system and rolling stock was \$67,000,000.

This small investment ignited a \$10 billion development explosion along the route from Front and York Streets to its northern terminal, Eglinton Avenue.

The appraised value of all the land and facilities in Metropolitan Toronto is now over \$50 billion. \$15 billion of this appreciation in physical value has been added in the last 10 years and two-thirds of this is attributable to the existence of the Yonge Street Subway.

Properties along the subway route doubled and tripled and sometimes increased as much as tenfold in value. Land prices would have increased anyway, but sales at \$125 to \$150 per square foot near the downtown stations became commonplace.

The 1952-1962 ten year increase in tax assessment in districts contiguous to the Yonge Subway line was 45% in the downtown area. The assessment increase for the rest of the city during the same period averaged 25%. On this basis, the subway has earned enough new tax dollars to pay its annual amortization costs.

Another \$2 billion in building is underway and in the planning stages in downtown Toronto. There is no doubt that the subway to downtown, and our new \$35 million City Hall, are the catalysts speeding the redevelopment of Toronto's downtown.

Each year between 2 and 3 million square feet of new office space and 5,000 apartment suites, of which 3,000 are within walking distance of the Yonge Street Subway, are being added to Toronto's skyline.

Up home, they call it boomtown Metro. That it is — with the highest per capita construction expenditures in North America.

Just for comparison, here are some figures: Metro Toronto issued permits to allow \$800 million in construction in 1967. This building volume compares with \$451.6 million in permits last year in the Atlanta standard metropolitan statistical area.

Toronto is now fourth spot in total building in North America behind Los Angeles, Chicago and New York, cities which all have more than double metro Toronto's population.

Real estate sales in Metro totalled over \$1 billion in 1967 — the highest per capita volume of transfers in North America. Sales through The Toronto Real Estate Board's Multiple Listing Service will hit a record \$400 million this year compared

to \$367 million last year.

The City of Toronto is divided into 24 Planning Districts. A detailed "Planning District Appraisal" has been, is being or will be prepared for each Planning District. The character of each Planning District is thoroughly described in the planning reports. From these it may be discerned what type of neighborhoods benefit most from the subway.

For example, in a five year period between 1959 and 1963, 48.5% of all high rise apartment development in the City of Toronto occurred in four Planning Districts. The Yonge Street Subway runs right through the center of each of these Planning Districts.

Similarly, 90% of all office construction in the same period occurred in three Planning Districts. The Subway cuts right through these areas.

In other words, two-thirds of all new development in a five year period was put in place within five minutes walk from the Yonge Street Subway. Hundreds of large residential lots, 175 feet wide and 200 feet in depth, were rezoned to accommodate high-density apartment buildings. The apartment land boom brought as much as \$4,000 per suite to speculators.



Heenan, next to lectern, talks rapid transit with MARTA Chairman Richard H. Rich.

Going rates offered to home owners were \$1,000 to \$2,000 per front foot. Many families who bought modest houses at \$15,000 to \$25,000 each, sold them to developers for \$50,000 to \$75,000. Downtown land is selling at upwards to \$200 per square foot or at the rate of \$8.7 million per acre.

There is no doubt that a subway has a tremendous impact on land use and consequently on land values.

Now the 8-mile crosstown leg of the \$200 million project has been completed to assume a major role in Metro's balanced transportation system.

But there is no lull in subway construction activity in Metropolitan Toronto. Work on two more extensions is taking the subway into suburban districts. Total cost of the extensions will be \$77 million. Now completed, the Bloor-Danforth line is over fourteen miles in length and Metropolitan Toronto is criss-crossed by a total of 21 miles of fast, modern subway lines.

The city section of the Bloor-Danforth line is carrying 25,000 passengers hourly. It is expected to step up to from 35,000 to 37,000 passengers hourly now with the opening of the extensions. The subway line is designed to carry 40,000 hourly, triple the number of passengers transported on the former street car and bus service in the Bloor-Danforth area.

The proposal for a Bloor-Danforth subway line was made by the TCC in 1955. Plans were completed in 1958. Construction started in 1962.

Money was rolling along the tracks, even ahead of the trains. New business and higher assessments are following the transit lines like bears after honey. The east-west subway is adjacent to properties which were valued at \$250 million before the project was announced. These same properties have already doubled in value to \$500 million.

The subway's influence on rezoning along the line will generate \$2 billion worth of office and apartment building in the next ten years.

So you see, land values are directly related to public transportation.

Real estate value is created by two fundamental things: people and accessibility. The more accessible any land area is, the more valuable it becomes. As a result of their lack of

accessibility, many of our cities are in danger of losing their economic and cultural vitality, and all of us are paying an increasingly higher price in terms of tension, time and money just to move about.

Rapid transit is a continuing program. In Toronto we do not just build a subway line and forget about it. A decision has been made and detailed planning is in progress to add a 4½ mile, \$87 million northern extension to the Yonge Street Subway, and acquire the right-of-way for a possible future 1¼ mile extension to Finch Avenue at an estimated cost of \$2 to \$2½ million. A six-mile rapid transit line is also proposed in connection with the Spadina Expressway.

I will note here that, as a general principle, is it clear that as the rapid transit system is extended further from downtown, the stations should be spaced at wider intervals, since this is the best way to achieve train speeds and traveling times from the outlying areas which are reasonably competitive with the private car. This is where the city rapid transit line should be integrated with or become a commuter train.

As all the bus and auto routes leading to commuter parking stations are improved through road widening, thousands of acres of land are brought within development range. I would estimate that each mile of rapid transit brings suburban and rural land three years closer to development.

The amount and intensity of new development and the volume of retail sales at a given point on the rapid transit line are directly proportionate to the passenger traffic to and from the closest subway station.

I believe I can prove this theory without giving you all the figures on passenger flows at each station in Toronto.

There are presently 36 stations in operation on the Toronto Subway network. The three busiest stations are Eglinton, St. Clair and Queen. Of a daily passenger traffic to all stations of 400,000 (April, 1966), the three stations handled 28 per cent of all daily traffic into the stations. The three station areas also accounted for three-quarters of all new development in the City of Toronto over the past two years.

In conclusion, I would like to say — as a guest in your country — I am deeply impressed with what I see. We truly appreciate the royal treatment we have enjoyed during our stay. Thank you for inviting us here to enjoy it.

## METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY

808 GLENN BLDG. • 120 MARIETTA ST., N. W.  
ATLANTA, GA. 30303 • PHONE 524-5711

"DIRECTED BY THE GEORGIA STATE LEGISLATURE TO DEVELOP A RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM FOR THE 5-COUNTY METROPOLITAN ATLANTA AREA."

Edited by KING ELLIOTT



## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

### OFFICERS:

RICHARD H. RICH, Chairman ROY A. BIDUST, Vice Chairman  
HERBERT J. DICKSON, Treasurer EDMUND W. HUGHES, Secretary

### CITY OF ATLANTA:

JOHN C. WILSON L. D. MILTON  
RICHARD H. RICH RAWSON HAVERTY

### CLAYTON COUNTY:

S. TRUETT CATHY

### DEKALB COUNTY:

ROY A. BIDUST DR. SANFORD ATWOOD

### FULTON COUNTY:

JOHN C. STATON MITCHELL C. BISHOP

### GWINNETT COUNTY:

K. A. McMILLEN

### COBB COUNTY (Observer):

OTIS A. BRUMBY, JR.

### MARTA STAFF:

HENRY L. STUART, General Manager  
EARL W. NELSON, Chief Engineer  
KING ELLIOTT, Director of Public Information  
H. N. JOHNSON, Administrative Assistant to General Manager

# WASHINGTON, D. C., PROTOTYPE GOES ON DISPLAY

The prototype of the new Washington, D. C., "Metro" rapid transit car is now in the midst of a series of appearances for public inspection in the four counties and four cities which will be served by the 97-mile rapid rail transit system, scheduled to begin initial operation in 1972. The prototype has sculptured, contemporary design, featuring a polished metal exterior and tinted panoramic windows. Passengers will enter the vehicle through three, 50-inch wide double doors on each side.

The interior of the car permits two-by-two seating for 82 passengers. The decor includes wall-to-wall, wool pile carpeting in gold and brown, with seating in black, saddle tan, and oyster white.

When the Metro is completed, more than 800 cars will carry millions of commuters per year in air-conditioned comfort at speeds up to 75 miles per hour.



*"The High Cost of Delay."*



## MARTACTION

At its regular meeting July 2, the MARTA Board of Directors approved a planning study for a line in the Perry Homes-Proctor Creek area. The study was estimated to cost \$16,000 and would take eight to ten weeks to complete.

At the August 6 meeting, the Board agreed to retain the planning firm of Eric Hall Associates to continue work to coordinate MARTA's plans with those of other public agencies and private development groups.

The Board adopted a resolution calling for a public hearing on the proposed "Buckhead Alternate" route; the hearing was set for Thursday, August 15, 1968, at 7:30 p.m. at the Garden Hills Elementary School. (See page 5.)



## RAPID TRANSIT PROGRESS

METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY

808 GLENN BLDG. · 120 MARIETTA ST., N.W. · ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303  
PHONE 524-5711 (AREA CODE 404)

AUG. - SEPT., 1968, VOL. 3 — NO. 6

BULK RATE

U.S. Postage

**PAID**

Atlanta, Ga.  
Permit No. 705

Mr. Dan E. Sweat, Jr., Director of  
Governmental Liaison, City of Atlanta  
City Hall  
Atlanta, Ga. 30303