

© A. Oct. 19 1973



J. O. Patterson Jr.

### Effort To Solve I-40 Issue Gets Initial Rejection

A compromise proposal on the Overton Park expressway controversy offered by City Councilman J. O. Patterson was rejected yesterday by at least two persons associated with Citizens To Preserve Overton Park.

Patterson, in an open letter to expressway opponents, suggested a four-point program to resolve the controversy.

**"I know park supporters** are aware of my personal sympathy and support of their cause," the letter said. "Accordingly, I believe I can in good conscience make the following suggested compromise plan:

- "Both sides agree to the cut-and-cover alternate design. Admittedly the peaceful existence of the park will be interrupted but this will only be temporary. After the expressway has been completed and covered over, the area can be replanted with all of the grass and trees desired.

- "Let Citizens To Preserve Overton Park either themselves design, or approve a design for, the ultimate replanting.

- "Let the compromise agreement be incorporated in an order of the court so as to give assurance it will be carried out.

- "Let the government(s) pay all of the costs and legal fees incurred by Citizens to Preserve Overton Park as a result of being forced to take their case to court."

**Mrs. Michael R. Lackner**, a member of Citizens To Preserve Overton Park, said she is not in favor of the compromise.

"I cannot speak for the organization, but personally, I could not accept that," she said. "Mr. Patterson is a man of good will, but the real compromise would be to complete the north circumferential (freeway) and initiate mass transit for the city.

"I really don't think the (Interstate 40) expressway is necessary. I feel it would be a disaster. In view of the energy shortage, and of federal regulations for air quality and noise control, this (cut-and-cover Project) would be all wrong."

**Charles F. Newman**, attorney for the organization which is opposed to building a superhighway through the park, also said he felt the proposal was unacceptable.

"I can't speak for all the members," he said, "but I have discussed it with them enough to be sure they would not find it acceptable.

"Cut and cover is really a trench with a roof, and it would be devastating to the park," he said.

0PE 21-62