

In Congress last week, questions were raised about the need for a new design of a "duplicate" bridge. The use of terms as "duplicate" is excellent for confusing the public but 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.

Much continues to be said about land deals involving public figures. This is ridiculous since no additional land acquisition is necessary for the parallel crossing. The approach roadways are already four-lane divided highways.

What about the claim that a Northern or Southern crossing would make a parallel bridge unnecessary?

Origin and destination studies for trans-bay traffic reveal 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, 85 percent or more would select the Sandy Point location.

From these figures, it can be seen that either the Northern crossing or Southern crossing, or even both, would offer only 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 sets a time limit on construction. Passage of this legislation would leave technical questions to be answered by engineers and would leave the systems of priorities to the State Roads Commission, as was done by the 1938 Act authorizing the Potomac and Susquehanna River Bridges, the present Harbor Tunnel and the Bay Bridge.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, Maryland is attempting to provide the kinds of services the people of the state need. The financial and technical needs of the state are constantly being increased and our state is meeting its responsibilities to the point where it is rapidly being recognized throughout the Nation as a viable force for constructive change and progress.

As other states, we are confronted with rapidly increasing costs of health, education and welfare programs, coupled with dynamic expansion of our population. Despite a massive tax increase this year, we are confronted with financial burdens beyond the capacity of traditional tax resources.

Delay in this authority will put additional burdens on our state. If the bridge had been approved in 1966 it was estimated that it would have cost \$73 million. Today we hear that it will cost \$90 million. The controversy has already cost us \$17 million. Further delay could mean additional millions, not to mention the long wait bridge users will continue to experience.

Thank you.

STATE-WIDE REFERENDUMS (CH. 517, 1966)

QUESTION NO. 17.—TO AUTHORIZE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE CHESAPEAKE BAY GENERALLY PARALLEL TO THE EXISTING CHESAPEAKE BAY BRIDGE, AND OTHER CROSSINGS OF THE BAY

Counties and Baltimore City	For the referred law	Against the referred law
Allegany.....	7,686	2,907
Anne Arundel.....	28,102	15,593
Baltimore.....	28,817	102,093
Calvert.....	1,361	1,388
Caroline.....	2,820	690
Carroll.....	3,367	6,887
Cecil.....	2,544	3,968
Charles.....	2,049	1,578
Dorchester.....	1,711	3,425
Frederick.....	3,173	3,406
Garrett.....	1,136	970
Harford.....	2,428	15,632
Howard.....	4,111	5,364
Kent.....	1,873	1,804
Montgomery.....	56,706	23,681
Prince Georges.....	40,490	19,354
Queen Annes.....	3,722	518
St. Marys.....	1,961	1,180
Somerset.....	1,771	626
Talbot.....	4,567	959
Washington.....	8,824	3,119
Wicomico.....	6,757	1,985
Worcester.....	2,685	659
Total counties.....	218,661	217,786
Baltimore City.....	30,281	71,632
Grand totals.....	248,942	289,418
Did not vote.....		381,400