

across the bridge, but having gotten across, on the western side we were tied up for several miles by a stoplight up by the Howard Johnson, eliminating delays caused by the nearby Kent Narrows Bridge, which is lifted up to 50 times daily; raising the toll for the summer weekends and lowering it during the week, to induce motorists to adjust travel plans; and scheduling express bus service from Sandy Point to Ocean City. These are all possibilities that have not yet been explored.

But the main point I want to make is that if we built bridges in other locations, they would divert enough traffic, so that you would never conceivably have any congestion at the present location.

Now, let us next examine the relative economic impact of alternative bridge locations. Any new transportation channels—bridge, tunnel, beltway, or expressway—is a powerful determinant of future population, traffic, and economic development.

A new bridge location would generate new traffic patterns, and therefore new economic growth; a parallel bridge would bring no such potential with it, since it would merely duplicate an existing facility.

Moreover, building a parallel bay bridge will prevent the Baltimore area from getting a northern crossing for decades to come, and will abort the future economic and population development of that vital area.

Nor should we forget the potential value of a new bridge location in the event of natural disaster or enemy attack. One bomb could conceivably wipe out both bridges if you had two bridges right beside each other. If you have a 7-mile crossing, it would be really disastrous in time of national emergency.

Finally, pessimistic estimates of traffic on the proposed northern or southern bridge, based on "origin-destination" studies of traffic in 1965, did not forecast the potential traffic explosion that might be created by the new communities and new travel habits generated by a new bridge in a new location.

A really bleak financial future can be forecast for the State if a parallel bay bridge is built. Building a parallel bay bridge in addition to a second harbor tunnel could use up, possibly to the year 2000, any money or borrowing capacity that might have been available to build a bay bridge in another location, such as in Baltimore or in southern Maryland. Moreover, the costs of this bridge will prevent all existing toll facilities from becoming free, as they otherwise would in a couple of years.

A parallel bridge would be a money loser during the entire period projected by the State roads commission to 1985, although this loss would no doubt be concealed by paying the cost of the new parallel bridge out of the revenue of existing bridges and the Harbor Tunnel. Because, keep in mind, all toll facilities in Maryland are in one package. So although this is a deficit proposal, they can swing it by forcing people who travel across other bridges to pay for the deficit cost of this second parallel bridge.

The original cost of the bridge, including interest during construction has been estimated by the State roads commission at \$73 million. This original cost would mean an annual cost of \$31 $\frac{1}{3}$ to \$31 $\frac{1}{2}$ million, very conservatively estimated, for operating expenses, interest and amortization. Extra traffic compared with 1965 would not yield suf-