

Mr. CRAMER. Yes.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Have there been any studies addressed to the question of the bridge to the north, if that would relieve any of the pressure?

Mr. WOLFF. Yes, sir. Yes, sir. I have with me and I would be very happy to make available for the committee a report on priority of need of the proposed northern crossing Chesapeake Bay Bridge and all of the other bridges, together with the tunnel. We had this made specifically in connection with the permissive legislation which granted us the authority to establish these priorities.

To answer your question directly, our consultants, who are considered to be the outstanding consultants in the United States in this regard, when the question was asked of Mr. Long about whether they had any successes, the answer is that they have had 124 unequivocal successes on toll facilities. They have been involved in toll facilities that exceed the value of \$5 billion. And further, they have been eminently successful in connection with all of the other toll facilities in the Maryland area, all of the four facilities that we presently have. So I think you can understand why we have great confidence in their judgment. They probably do more work than the other four firms involved in this work put together.

But the point is that with respect to their study of traffic projections here, we have found that even if a northern bridge were constructed, that because of the nature of the traffic flows, origin, and destination studies which were completed in 1965, that even if the northern were constructed, let's say by 1971, and that we waited for some 5 years later to construct a parallel bridge, parallel to the existing bridge, that the congestion in 1971 would have returned to the Chesapeake Bay Bridge, the present one, precisely at the point it is today. So it would have a very, very limited effect in relieving any congestion on the existing bridge.

We have made those studies and we are convinced that if it is a question as between the parallel and the northern and considering that we are talking about toll facilities, not the development of economy in the area—this is the difficulty. You have a natural competition with varying requirements and motivations when you talk about tolls. Tolls have to pay. You have to put the toll where you expect the traffic to be.

I feel that if Mr. Long is so strong about putting a northern bridge in, then he should attempt to persuade the State legislature and the Governor of our State to put them under special taxes of some sort. But tolls are a different animal. Tolls have to support and are based upon traffic expectations, and this, of course, puts it in a somewhat different light.

There is no question that a bridge generally, and it is known, will induce economic development. We are aware of that.

Mr. CRAMER. When did the study of the toll facilities reveal there might be financed a bridge north of Chesapeake Bay Bridge? A bridge to the north?

Mr. WOLFF. We feel that the toll facility to the north, if the present toll package remains as is, can become a reality in the late 1970's. However, we have a possibility—and I say this, a possibility—of bringing under the present toll umbrella the Kennedy Expressway, which itself