

The fact that so many voters neglected to cast ballots on the bridge question is clear evidence of the lack of understanding on the issue.

One fact that escaped many voters, and, apparently, one of the witnesses here this morning, was that without some type of bridge authorization bill, no bridge—neither northern, southern, nor parallel—could be built.

In considering this matter, the committee should be aware that the confusion and ultimate defeat of that proposal traces to a drive led by the Congressman from Baltimore County, who now opposes the inclusion of the parallel span in the bill before you. In the Congressman's home county, 102,093 votes were cast against the referred law, with only 28,000 in that county voting for it. This single county's vote defeated the proposal, despite the fact that residents of 15 other counties voted in favor of the parallel bridge.

The parallel bridge might have died there if the Maryland General Assembly had not recognized the voters' confusion and the seriousness of the traffic problem at the existing two-lane bridge.

That problem, no doubt, was vividly brought home to the members of this committee this summer when the congestion and delay at the Bay Bridge became more acute than ever. I am sure the motorists who were delayed for hours on both sides of the bridge would give an individual testimony here this morning on the needs for a parallel span. They would find little merit in the baseless allegations being espoused by the opponents of the parallel bridge.

In Congress last week, and here today, questions were raised about the need for a new design of a "duplicate" bridge. We have heard it over and over again. The use of terms as "duplicate" is excellent for confusing the public, but it is a far cry from the truth.

Due to the different horizontal curvature, the new bridge requires a new geometric layout, and thus a new set of plans. And those of you who have been over it realize the length of the bridge and the curve that it has to take, and you also realize from construction plans you cannot just dust off a set of plans, as was suggested in the record last week, and build a second bridge out of them.

Much continues to be said about land deals involving public figures in our State. This is ridiculous since no additional land acquisition is necessary for the parallel crossing. The State already owns all of the access roads to the bridge.

What about the claim that a northern or southern crossing would make a parallel bridge unnecessary? We have heard it here this morning.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Fornos, if you could sum up in 1 minute and complete your statement, we would give you permission to put the complete statement in the record.

Mr. FORNOS. Yes, sir. I think I have about 35 seconds.

Origin and destination studies for transbay traffic reveals that if all three crossings were in operation, 74 percent of the traffic would still choose the Sandy Point location. If either a northern or southern crossing were in operation together with the existing bridge, that 85 percent or more would still select the Sandy Point area. From these figures it can be seen that either the northern crossing or the southern crossing, or even both, would only offer temporary relief to the congestion on the existing two-lane bridge.

In the long run, Maryland needs a northern and southern crossing as well as a parallel span. This bill in no way establishes priorities or