

That was the very purpose we asked for this kind of legislation.

Mr. FALLON. Will the gentleman yield?

I mentioned earlier the 1956 Interstate Act clearly states in there location must originate with the local authorities, Governor and State roads commission. Congress did not want any part in decisions concerning the Interstate System, even though we are putting up 90 percent of the money, and wisely so, I think.

Mr. WOLFF. Sir, I think there are good rational and sound reasons for selection of bridge locations and the State of Maryland deserves the right to make its position.

Thank you very much.

Mr. FALLON. Are there any questions?

Thank you very much, Mr. Wolff.

Mr. BUSCHER. One further observation. The attorney general of Maryland approved this bill as to form and legal sufficiency before the Governor signed it, and the attorney general of Maryland, and, as far as I know, his entire staff is 100 percent behind the legislation now pending before your committee.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you very much, Mr. Buscher.

Thank you again, Mr. Wolff.

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you very much.

Mr. BUSCHER. Thank you.

(Statement of the Honorable Jerome B. Wolff, chairman-director of the State roads commission follows:)

STATE OF MARYLAND,
STATE ROAD COMMISSION,
Baltimore, Md., September 19, 1967.

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FALLON AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: I would like like to endorse and urge adoption of H.R. 11627 which was introduced by you and jointly sponsored by Congressmen Garmatz, Friedel, Mathias, Machen, Mor-ton and Gude. This bill was prepared for the purpose of obtaining Congressional approval for the construction by the Maryland State Roads Commission of (1) a Second Baltimore Harbor Crossing; (2) a Parallel Chesapeake Bay Bridge; (3) a Northern Crossing of Chesapeake Bay between Baltimore County and Kent County; and (4) a Southern Chesapeake Bay Crossing between Calvert County and Dorchester County.

Under the provisions of House Bill 348 enacted by the Maryland General Assembly during the 1967 Session, the Maryland State Roads Commission has authorization to construct an additional tunnel under Baltimore Harbor and three crossings of the Chesapeake Bay as described above. It is proposed that all of these crossings will be financed from toll revenues.

Under the provisions of this Legislature the State Roads Commission is authorized to establish the priority of construction of the above described facilities. The Commission is currently planning on the immediate construction of a Parallel Chesapeake Bay Bridge adjacent to the existing bridge, and in addition will construct either a Second Baltimore Harbor Tunnel or, alternatively, a Northern Crossing of the Chesapeake Bay. In any event, the acquisition of rights of ways for these three facilities will proceed immediately. Selection of the two facilities to be constructed will be made immediately prior to the time that bonds will be sold early in 1968 to finance the construction of these facilities.

The need for the Second Baltimore Harbor Tunnel and a new bridge parallel to the existing Bay Bridge is immediate and urgent. Traffic using the Baltimore Harbor Tunnel queues up for miles every weekend during the year in both directions. It is estimated that congestion occurs in excess of nearly 1200 hours a year.

Traffic using the existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge is badly congested every weekend between May and October. During the past five years a system has been devised to stop traffic in one direction in order to permit single direction opera-