

tion over the bridge several times each weekend. This has caused delays which extend from 30 minutes to 1½ hours while the one-way operation is in effect. During the present summer the backups have approached 10 miles in length.

Construction of the Second Baltimore Harbor Tunnel will greatly relieve congestion to traffic using the Baltimore-Washington Expressway and the Baltimore Harbor Tunnel-I-95 corridor. The need for considering alternative construction scheduling between the Northern Crossing and the Second Harbor Tunnel stems from the problem of timing the I-70 and I-95 corridor construction through Baltimore City as part of the Interstate System. It is presently estimated that it will require approximately 8-9 years to complete the Interstate construction through Baltimore City. During this period, the existing tunnel as well as the proposed Second Harbor Tunnel will carry this traffic. When I-70 and I-95 through the City are completed traffic in the tunnel will be reduced from 30 to 40 percent. It is possible that the Northern Chesapeake Bay Crossing may be substituted for the Second Harbor Tunnel if the City Expressway System construction is greatly accelerated. Studies are now in progress to evaluate this possibility. It is hoped that they will be available by December, 1967 or January, 1968. In the interim, preliminary engineering and surveys will be carried on for all three facilities.

The construction of the proposed Parallel Bay Bridge will completely relieve traffic congestion on the present bridge. This traffic is presently utilizing both the U.S. 50 and U.S. 301 corridors. Our traffic analyses indicates that a substantial amount of northbound and southbound interstate traffic uses Maryland 301 and the Chesapeake Bay Bridge as an alternate North-South route.

With respect to the Northern Crossing of the Chesapeake Bay, the State Roads Commission is proceeding with the planning and construction of an expressway system in the eastern end of Baltimore County. When this system is completed, the Northern Crossing will be required as a component part of the system and will be admirably placed to serve the industrial growth and Harbor development which is rapidly expanding on the western shore. As indicated above, the possibility presently exists that this bridge will be substituted for the Second Harbor Tunnel crossing if studies indicate that it is appropriate to make such a substitution.

Finally, the State Roads Commission believes that a crossing of the southern portion of the Chesapeake Bay will become necessary to serve the lower Eastern and Western shores of Maryland. The growing needs of Washington and Arlington Counties in Virginia and Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland will undoubtedly create such pressures for further expansion that ultimate growth of industrial development into the eastern shore of Maryland appears inevitable. Only a new crossing of the Chesapeake Bay in this area will answer the need for reinforcement of the existing highway network. Further indication of the commercial and industrial growth in this part of the State can be seen in the proposed development of a deep water port near the mouth of the Patuxent River in Maryland.

The immediate need for two of the three structures being planned for construction by the State Roads Commission is both urgent and critical. The remaining two structures will become necessary as population and traffic growth continues in the areas which they are to serve.

It is respectfully urged that H.R. 11627 be given favorable action by your Committee and Congress during its present session.

Respectfully submitted.

JEROME B. WOLFF,
Chairman-Director.

Mr. FALLON. The Honorable Frank J. McCourt, State senator from Maryland.

I happen to be one of Senator McCourt's constituents.

STATEMENT OF FRANK J. MCCOURT, STATE SENATOR, MARYLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Senator McCOURT. And you mine, sir.

Mr. FALLON. Welcome to the committee.

Senator McCOURT. Thank you.