

that will be parallel to the existing bridge and largely duplicative of that bridge; a second bridge, or tunnel, from a point in Baltimore County at or near Millers Island to a point in Kent County—which I shall hereafter refer to as the northern crossing, this bridge would be about 25 miles north of the present parallel bridge, which this bill proposes to add; and third, one bridge, or tunnel, from a point in Calvert County to a point in Dorchester County which I shall hereafter refer to as the southern crossing.

I wholeheartedly endorse the provisions in this bill to grant congressional authorization for northern and southern crossings of the Chesapeake Bay; that is to say, crossings at locations different from the one that now exists. But I respectfully urge the committee to delete from this legislation the authorization for a Chesapeake Bay bridge parallel to the existing bridge.

A close analysis of the wishes of the Maryland voters themselves, of actual traffic on the existing bridge and traffic estimates for the parallel bridge, and of the extent to which the proposed parallel bridge is neither financially feasible nor economically sound leads me to recommend that the committee refuse to go along with this game of "duplicate bridge."

Let us examine the wishes of the Maryland voters first, because all of us are ultimately here to be responsive to the needs and desires of the voters. In a November 8, 1966, referendum, Maryland voters decisively rejected the proposal to construct a second bridge parallel to the present bridge across the Chesapeake. This vote was by far the largest of that on any of the referendum questions. In Metropolitan Baltimore alone, 70 percent of the voters pulled the "No" lever against the parallel bridge.

Second, is the present bridge so inadequate that a duplicate crossing is required right beside it?

The fact is that traffic on the existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge is only 4.3 million vehicles a year, about half of the 8½ million capacity given in the 1950 report of the State roads commission. Forecasts for future traffic are clouded by an actual decline in 1964, and by a 1965 level still below 1963. Arguments that stoppages in traffic growth are only temporary cannot be proven or disproven for a number of years.

On only a few summer weekends a year is the traffic on the bridge congested. Even then, inconvenience to motorists is small in relation to the cost of a new bridge. Most of the year, by the standard of peak weekends in July or August, the bridge operates at half or a third of capacity or far below.

Various means of relieving congestion on the present bridge during summer weekends have yet to be explored. These include: Advertising extensively that people of northern Baltimore areas can get to shore resorts just as quickly by going around the head of the bay; opening more toll booths, especially at the eastern end of the bridge; keeping all toll booths open instead of closing one or more of them down during periods of fairly heavy traffic—for example, on Labor Day I crossed the bridge and they had one toll booth closed down during lunch hour, thereby slowing up to some extent traffic coming from the Eastern Shore; eliminating stoplight bottlenecks which now exist several miles west of the bridge—after crossing the bridge, coming back a week or so ago, there was heavy traffic on the weekend, I had no trouble getting