

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

MAINE
LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
COMMITTEE

Report
to
Ninety-Eighth Legislature



MAINE FEDERAL INTERSTATE
HIGHWAY SYSTEM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| PART I. | |
| LEGISLATIVE INQUIRY | 5 |
| PART II. | |
| MAINE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY STATUS | 6 |
| A. Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 | 7 |
| B. Interstate Mileage Allocation | 7 |
| C. Preliminary Construction Line | 7 |
| D. Interstate Construction Schedule | 9 |
| 1. Proposed Construction Program | 10 |
| 2. Revised Construction Schedule | 13 |
| PART III. | |
| CONTROVERTED FEATURES OF MAINE INTERSTATE PROGRAM | 17 |
| A. In General | 17 |
| B. Portland-Brunswick-Gardiner Construction vs. Use of Turnpike ... | 17 |
| 1. Portland Loop | 24 |
| 2. Tukey Bridge | 25 |
| 3. East Deering-Cousins River (Yarmouth) | 27 |
| C. Priority Construction Augusta-North | 28 |
| PART IV. | |
| CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 28 |
| Majority Report | 28 |
| Minority Report | 29 |

State of Maine
Summary Report
to
Ninety-Eighth Legislature

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

From the Senate:

Miles F. Carpenter, Skowhegan, Vice Chairman
William R. Cole, Liberty
Earl W. Davis, Harrison
Alton A. Lessard, Lewiston
Clarence W. Parker, Sebec
Norman R. Rogerson, Houlton
J. Hollis Wyman, Milbridge

From the House:

Rodney E. Ross, Jr., Bath, Chairman
Harold Bragdon, Perham
Dana W. Childs, Portland
Lucia M. Cormier, Rumford
Albert W. Emmons, Kennebunk
Robert W. Maxwell, Winthrop
Robert G. Wade, Auburn

Ex Officio:

Joseph T. Edgar, Bar Harbor,
Speaker of the House
Robert N. Haskell, Bangor,
President of the Senate

Director:

Samuel H. Slosberg, Gardiner

Assistant Director:

Samuel S. Silsby, Jr., Augusta

January, 1958

MAINE FEDERAL INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be and hereby is directed to hold forthwith a public hearing or public hearings which shall ascertain the current progress of Federal Interstate Highway planning and construction in Maine.

They are directed to study any and all phases of the problem to the end that the interest of the entire state may best be served by the Federal Interstate System.

The Committee shall make a full and complete report of its findings and recommendations to the recessed session of this Special Session or to any Special Session next following.

PART I. LEGISLATIVE INQUIRY

The prelude to present legislative review of Maine State Highway Commission activities, with respect to the Federal Interstate Highway System in Maine, was initiated with the announcement of the Commission, on December 20, 1956, of the Commission's recommendations for the construction of projects on the Interstate System for the biennium ending June 30, 1959.

At the regular session of the 98th Legislature, these recommendations, after extensive consideration, secured the apparent approval and approbation of a majority of legislative membership.

Regional dissatisfaction with certain Commission recommendations continued unabated, manifested in a number of allegations and counter-allegations, which coupled with the request of the Commission for thorough legislative review of its Interstate Highway activities, culminated in the foregoing Joint Order of the Special Session of the 98th Legislature directing this study.

The Legislative Research Committee in obedience to the Joint Order conducted its first public hearing on November 12, 1957 in the House of Representatives, its Chairman, Rodney E. Ross, Jr., presiding. Present were the members of the full Committee, and by its invitation, the Maine State Highway Commission and certain members of its engineering staff. The hearing which received statewide publicity through press, radio and television media was attended by an estimated 300 persons. Visual aids detailing the proposed location of the Federal Interstate Highway in Maine were manned throughout the course of the hearing by Highway Department personnel. The hearing was reported and recorded in its entirety by a Court Reporter secured for the occasion by the Committee. The hearing was called to order at 1:30 P. M. and ran continuously with the exception of a limited number of scheduled "breaks" until its adjournment at 11:00 P. M. The entire hearing was devoted to proponent and opponent arguments addressed principally to the 35 page statement of the Maine State Highway Commission as presented by its Chairman David H. Stevens. Evidentiary material in the form of statements, petitions, notes, telegrams and letters was received by the Committee and filed for review at the conclusion of the hearing.

Following the public hearing, an Executive Session of the Legislative Research Committee was held, at which the following vote was taken:

VOTED: That since all sections of the State were represented at the hearing and since all facets of the problem were adequately covered, no useful purpose

could be served by holding separate meetings in various parts of the State. Nevertheless, the Committee realizes the state-wide interest in this project and desiring to allow both proponents and opponents an opportunity to appraise themselves of the contents of the Commission's statement, at the present time proposes to hold one more meeting in Augusta, at which time it will consider any additional information which was not presented at today's hearing.

On December 10, 1957, the Legislative Research Committee held its second and final hearing on the Maine Federal Interstate Highway System. The hearing, with members of the State Highway Commission and engineering staff present, was held in Hearing Room 228 at the State House, Chairman Ross, presiding. The Committee emphasized that it was interested only in new evidence and would not entertain repetitive arguments. The meeting was called to order at 1:30 P. M. and adjourned at 6:05 P. M. Principal arguments developed at the hearing were directed primarily to (1) the answers of the State Highway Commission to certain questions propounded by Wallace A. Ritchie, Chairman Highway Committee, Penquis Development Association, before the Legislative Research Committee at the public hearing on November 12, 1957, and (2) the statement of the Maine Turnpike Authority concerning the effect of Federal Interstate Highway construction on the revenues of the Maine Turnpike.

At the Executive Session of the Committee held following the adjournment of the public hearing, the following votes were taken:

VOTED: To hold no further public hearings on the Interstate Highway System problems.

VOTED: That interested parties, including the Penquis Development Association, would be given 2 weeks in which to file written comments with the Committee.

VOTED: To meet on Monday, December 30th, at 1:30 P. M. in Executive Session to reach conclusions on the Interstate Highway System problem, preliminary to filing its report to the Special Session.

The final meeting of the Legislative Research Committee relative to the Maine Federal Interstate Highway System was held on December 30, 1957 for the purpose of reviewing data and preparing this report.

PART II.

MAINE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY STATUS

A. FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

Sec. 7. There shall be designated within the continental United States a National System of Interstate Highways not exceeding forty thousand miles in total extent so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense, and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico. The routes of the National System of Interstate Highways shall be selected by joint action of the State highway departments of each State and the adjoining States, as provided by the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, for the selection of the Federal-aid system. All highways or routes included in the National System of Interstate Highways as finally approved, if not al-

ready included in the Federal-aid highway system, shall be added to said system without regard to any mileage limitation.

B. INTERSTATE MILEAGE ALLOCATION.

The United States Bureau of Public Roads as part of its responsibility, in cooperation with the several states, for administering Federal legislation relating to the Federal Interstate Highway System, of the authorized total of 40,000 miles of Interstate Highway, initially allocated 37,600 miles for apportionment among the states; of the 37,600 miles allocated, Maine's share was approximately 300 miles. The recommendations of the State Highway Commission as to the general location of this mileage were accepted by the Bureau of Public Roads August 2, 1947, and provided that the Interstate Highway should extend from the New Hampshire line in Kittery to the Canadian border at Houlton, via Portland, Brunswick, Augusta and Bangor.

The remaining 2,400 miles of the authorized 40,000 mile total were allocated by the Bureau of Public Roads in 1954, of which Maine, on the basis of the Commission's recommendations received an additional allocation of approximately 15 miles, consisting of the so-called "Portland Loop," in the vicinity of Portland, the "Industrial Spur," in Bangor, and the "Saco Spur," in the vicinity of Saco extending from the Maine Turnpike to Route 1.

C. PRELIMINARY CONSTRUCTION LINE.

The Federal-aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 374), section 108 (a) declares it ". to be essential to the national interest to provide for the early completion of the 'National System of Interstate Highways,' as authorized and designated in accordance with section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838). It is the intent of the Congress that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over a thirteen-year period and that the entire System in all the States be brought to simultaneous completion." The act further provides under section 108 (d) that the Secretary of Commerce (Bureau of Public Roads) ". in cooperation with the State highway departments, shall make a detailed estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate System after taking into account all previous apportionments made based upon such standards and in accordance with rules and regulations adopted by him and applied uniformly to all of the States. The Secretary of Commerce shall transmit such estimate to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1958."

The Bureau of Public Roads pursuant to the requirements of section 108 (d), previously cited, requested the Highway Departments of the several states to submit estimated construction cost data. For the purpose of complying with the Bureau's request, the State Highway Commission reviewed the general location of the Interstate System as previously approved by the Bureau and upon establishing a preliminary construction line submitted it to the Bureau for approval; approval by the Bureau being a necessary prerequisite to determination of construction cost estimates. The preliminary construction line recommended by the State Highway Commission for the main line location of the Maine Federal Interstate Highway System was as follows:

- (a) The construction of a new bridge across the Piscataqua River between Portsmouth, New Hampshire and Kittery, Maine, with a connection to the toll plaza of the Maine Turnpike in Kittery.
- (b) From the toll plaza in Kittery, then along the Turnpike past Portland to the Falmouth Spur; then along the Falmouth Spur to a point between U. S. Route 1 and the railroad paralleling it to the west.
- (c) From the point located between U. S. Route 1 and the railroad, then in the general direction of U. S. Route 1 through the Towns of Falmouth, Cumberland, Yarmouth and Freeport to Brunswick.
- (d) From Brunswick, then across a new bridge to be constructed over the Androscoggin River; then in the general direction of U. S. Route 1 to Gardiner, to connect there with the Maine Turnpike.
- (e) From the Turnpike connection in Gardiner, then along the Turnpike to the toll plaza in Augusta.
- (f) From the toll plaza in Augusta, then along the West side of the Kennebec River through Sidney to Waterville.
- (g) From Waterville, then along the West side of the Kennebec River to a point north of Fairfield; then across the Kennebec River to Benton.
- (h) From Benton, then to Pittsfield, Newport and Bangor.
- (i) From Bangor, then along on the West side of the Penobscot River, crossing it in the vicinity of Medway.
- (j) From Medway, then to Island Falls, Houlton and the Canadian boundary.

The preliminary construction line recommendations, in addition to the main line location, included the Portland Loop, and the Bangor Industrial and Saco Spurs.

Recommendations of the State Highway Commission covering the main line, the Portland Loop and the Bangor Industrial and Saco Spurs were approved by the Bureau of Public Roads for the determination of construction cost estimates, and the entire system, with the exception of (1) the Portsmouth-Kittery river crossing, (2) Waterville-Fairfield location, (3) the Saco Spur, and (4) the southern part of the Portland Loop, was approved for construction purposes by the Bureau of Public Roads on December 12, 1956. The issue as to the location of the Waterville-Fairfield section was subsequently determined, and its location, as recommended by the Commission, was approved on October 28, 1957. Two of the remaining unapproved sections, namely, the Portsmouth-Kittery river crossing and the Saco Spur will receive further study before the State Highway Commission makes its recommendation to the Bureau of Public Roads for the location of the preliminary construction line.

The location of the northern part of the Portland Loop or Portland Expressway included in the recommendations approved December 12, 1956 is as follows:

- (a) From the Falmouth Spur of the Maine Turnpike, then southerly through East Deering and across the Tukey Bridge.

(b) From the Tukey Bridge, then southerly over made land along the margin of Back Cove, thence around that part of Deering Oaks lying adjacent to the railroad to the intersection of Valley Street and Park Avenue.

The location of the southern part of the Portland Loop has been studied by the State Highway Commission, but recommendations as to its final location have not been made. Under consideration are 2 alternate proposals as to location which are as follows:

(a) From the intersection of Valley Street and Park Avenue, then by Valley Street across the Veterans Memorial Bridge to the Turnpike, via its South Portland Spur.

(b) From the intersection of Valley Street and Park Avenue, then westerly through the City of Portland to connect with the Maine Turnpike at a point somewhere between the South Portland Spur and the Brighton Avenue Interchange.

The Maine State Highway Commission in making its recommendation for the location of the preliminary construction line suggested to the Bureau of Public Roads that the location of the Interstate System be approved, but that construction of that section of the Interstate Highway from Brunswick to Gardiner be deferred until the latter part of the construction period estimated by Congress for the completion of the System, or until Turnpike earnings are not in jeopardy. The Commission's reason in requesting this deferment was the possibility that construction of the Brunswick-Gardiner section of the Interstate Highway would adversely effect the earnings of the Maine Turnpike, particularly that part of the Turnpike from Portland to Augusta. The Bureau of Public Roads has subsequently indicated approval of this recommendation.

The final location of the Interstate Highway in Maine, based on the approved preliminary construction line, will be determined by field surveys made as particular sections of the Interstate Highway are scheduled for construction. The final location of the Interstate Highway will follow the preliminary construction line except where local topography and engineering needs necessitate deviation.

D. INTERSTATE CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE.

Federal Interstate funds have been made available to the several states for Interstate Highway construction on the basis authorized by the following Federal Highway Acts:

| | Basis | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | Federal | State |
| Federal Highway Act of 1952 | 50 | 50 |
| Federal Highway Act of 1954 | 60 | 40 |
| Federal Highway Act of 1956 | 90 | 10 |

Interstate funds apportioned under the Federal Highway Acts of 1952 and 1954 have been authorized by the State Highway Commission, prior to the construction program announced in 1956, in financing the Brunswick-Freeport interstate section and the Main Street Interchange in Bangor.

The following table shows the Apportionment of Federal Funds since fiscal year 1946.

Federal Funds Apportioned to Maine

| Fiscal Year | Primary | Secondary | Urban | Interstate | Total |
|-------------|-----------|-----------|---------|------------|------------|
| 1946 | 1,948,954 | 1,404,017 | 560,538 | | 3,913,509 |
| 1947 | 1,948,844 | 1,403,942 | 560,538 | | 3,913,324 |
| 1948 | 1,924,224 | 1,386,183 | 553,352 | | 3,863,759 |
| 1949 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| 1950 | 1,721,234 | 1,240,539 | 498,017 | | 3,459,790 |
| 1951 | 1,717,684 | 1,238,176 | 498,017 | | 3,453,877 |
| 1952 | 1,887,806 | 1,349,802 | 509,899 | | 3,747,507 |
| 1953 | 1,864,396 | 1,333,474 | 505,956 | | 3,703,826 |
| 1954 | 2,061,148 | 1,474,586 | 560,854 | 210,101 | 4,306,689 |
| 1955 | 2,065,955 | 1,478,426 | 563,746 | 210,595 | 4,318,722 |
| 1956 | 2,649,624 | 1,896,107 | 723,013 | 1,387,518 | 6,656,262 |
| 1957 | 2,657,051 | 1,901,353 | 724,853 | 1,391,238 | 6,674,495 |
| 1957 (Supp) | 465,906 | 334,070 | 131,369 | 8,042,145 | 8,973,490 |
| 1958 | 3,168,163 | 2,271,676 | 893,309 | 13,671,647 | 20,004,795 |
| 1959 | 3,239,093 | 2,322,866 | 914,985 | 15,988,534 | 22,465,478 |

1. PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.

The proposed construction program announced by the State Highway Commission in December, 1956, for the biennium, July 1, 1957 - June 30, 1959, suggested certain interstate projects which the Commission, in its judgment, felt should be authorized for that period. The program, as announced, proposed simultaneous interstate construction in 3 different areas of the State, namely:

- (a) The Cumberland County area, consisting of Tukey Bridge and the East Deering-Cousins River Interstate section.
- (b) The Augusta area, consisting of extending the Interstate Highway from the Augusta terminal of the Maine Turnpike toward Waterville.
- (c) The Bangor area, consisting of the interstate section through the City.

The outlined construction program announced by the State Highway Commission in December, 1956, for the fiscal years 1957-1958 and 1958-1959 was as follows:

INTERSTATE

| Location | Length | Est. Cost Year 1958 | Est. Cost Year 1959 | Remarks |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Falmouth-Cumberland- Yarmouth | 9.0 miles | \$ 7,900,000 | — | |
| Portland-Falmouth | 3.0 " | — | \$ 3,100,000 | |
| Portland | 0.61 " | 3,100,000 | — | Tukey Bridge |
| Augusta | 2.92 " | 2,800,000 | — | |
| Augusta-Sidney | 10.0 " | — | 9,200,000 | |

| Location | Length | Est. Cost Year 1958 | Est. Cost Year 1957 | Remarks |
|--|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Bangor | 2.8 " | 3,600,000 | — | Ind. Spur and Hammond St. Conn. Hammond-Hogan Rd. |
| Bangor | 4.0 " | — | 5,600,000 | |
| Sub-total | 29.33 miles | \$17,400,000 | \$17,900,000 | |
| Total Estimated Cost | | | | \$35,300,000 |
| Federal Funds | | \$16,250,000 | \$15,350,000 | |
| State Funds | | 2,550,000 | 1,950,000 | |
| Sub-total | | \$18,800,000 | \$17,300,000 | |
| Contingencies for overruns and Highway Planning Survey | | | | \$ 800,000 |
| Total Available | | | | \$36,100,000 |

The program was based on the following qualifications:

(a) That there would be a minimum amount available for construction over the 2-year period, as follows:

Fiscal Year 1958

| | Federal Funds | State Funds | Total |
|------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| Interstate | \$16,250,000 | \$2,550,000 | \$18,800,000 |

Fiscal Year 1959

| | Federal Funds | State Funds | Total |
|------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| Interstate | \$15,350,000 | \$1,950,000 | \$17,300,000 |

(b) That plans for the Federal projects would be approved by the U. S. Bureau of Public Roads.

(c) That construction materials, contractors' services and engineering manpower would be available to carry out the program.

(d) That the amounts shown for each project were approximate and were subject to increase or decrease as construction plans were developed and construction bids were received.

The 98th Legislature, realizing the need for advance planning, recommended a \$24,000,000 bond issue, submitting the act (P. & S. L., 1957, c. 173) to the voters of Maine for referendum. Favorable action by the voters, resulted in its approval on September 9, 1957. Further action, taken by the Legislature at the regular session, included an act providing for motor vehicle operator and registration fees (P. L., 1957, c. 330). The final status of this act will depend on the outcome of a state-wide referendum to be held in March, 1958.

These increased revenues, together with revenue from existing sources and Federal revenue, would provide funds for the four fiscal years beginning July 1, 1957 and ending June 30, 1961, of \$271,000,000.

The specific 4-Year Program is indicated below:

**Highway Financing Program
4 Years (1958 Thru 1961)**

1. Construction

| | State | Federal | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Primary | 15,022,000 | 13,368,000 | 28,390,000 | |
| Secondary | 10,778,000 | 9,572,000 | 20,350,000 | |
| Urban | 6,050,000 | 5,380,000 | 11,430,000 | |
| State | 8,200,000 | — | 8,200,000 | |
| Interstate | 10,960,000 | 84,600,000 | 95,560,000 | |
| Total | 51,010,000 | 112,920,000 | 163,930,000 | \$163,930,000 |
| 2. State Aid Special | | | | 4,000,000 |
| 3. State Aid Regular | | | | 11,650,000 |
| 4. Town Road Improvement | | | | 6,000,000 |
| 5. Bridge Construction & Maintenance | | | | 6,950,000 |
| 6. Maintenance | | | | 31,460,000 |
| 7. Snow Removal | | | | 18,245,000 |
| 8. Other Agencies | | | | 8,780,000 |
| 9. PAS Plan | | | | 2,920,000 |
| 10. Miscellaneous & Administration | | | | 4,850,000 |
| 11. Debt Service (Existing Bonds) | | | | 12,200,000 |
| Total | | | | \$270,985,000 |

Revenue

| | | |
|--|------------|---------------|
| Fuel & Allied Taxes (Existing Sources) | | 89,510,000 |
| Motor Vehicle Registrations & Fees (Existing Sources) | | 35,354,000 |
| Motor Vehicle Registrations & Fees (Increase) | | 4,000,000 |
| Other Undedicated Revenue | | 1,460,000 |
| Bond Authorizations | 24,000,000 | |
| Less Debt Service (1st 4 Yrs.) | 1,600,000 | 22,400,000 |
| Federal Revenue | | 112,920,000 |
| Town Matching Funds (State Aid & Bridge) | | 6,000,000 |
| Total | | \$271,644,000 |

The State Highway Commission, in view of the approval of the \$24,000,000 bond authorization and the fact that Federal grant in aid funds have already been apportioned by Congress for interstate construction for the fiscal year 1959, has since supplemented its program of December, 1956 with a revised construction schedule. This schedule will be found under section D-2 of the report. Of the \$24,000,000, the State Highway Commission has been authorized to spend \$6,807,000 during the fiscal year 1957-1958,

and \$1,500,000 during the fiscal year 1958-1959. A supplemental appropriation for \$850,000 will be requested during the second special session of the 98th Legislature.

The reasons which prompted the State Highway Commission to propose priority construction of those interstate projects specified in its program of December, 1956 will be found under Part III relating to controverted features of the Maine interstate program.

2. REVISED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE.

The interstate construction program proposed by the State Highway Commission on December 20, 1956 has been more recently supplemented by the following revised construction schedule:

REVISED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

| Location | Construction Plans | Estimated Cost | Contract Award Date | Completion Date |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Maine-New Hampshire line to Kittery toll plaza | ----- | ----- | | Not determined |
| Kittery toll plaza to Falmouth Exit (on Turnpike) including Falmouth Spur | ----- | ----- | | Not determined |
| Saco Spur | ----- | ----- | | Not determined |
| Portland Loop - Park Avenue and Valley Street south and west to Turnpike | ----- | ----- | | Not determined |
| Portland Loop - Park Avenue and Valley Street to south end of Tukey Bridge | Preliminary plans in process | ----- | | Not determined |
| Tukey Bridge | Completed | \$4,000,000 | Jan. 1958 | Jan. 1960 |
| Tukey Bridge to Marine Hospital (adjustments to East Deering Bypass) | ----- | ----- | | Not determined |
| Marine Hospital Interchange | In process | 300,000 | Mar. 1958 | Sept. 1959 |
| Presumpscot River Bridge | In process | 550,000 | Mar. 1958 | Sept. 1959 |
| Depot Road and Turnpike Spur Overpasses | In process | 600,000 | Mar. 1958 | July 1959 |
| Johnson Road Overpass | Completed | 300,000 | Dec. 1957 | June 1959 |
| Tuttle Road Overpass, Route 1 Interchange south of Yarmouth and U. S. Route 1 relocation (south of Tuttle Road to Interchange south of Yarmouth) | In process | 1,200,000 | Feb. 1958 | July 1959 |
| Route 88 and Royal River Crossing | In process | 920,000 | Mar. 1958 | Nov. 1959 |
| Bayview Overpass | In process | 115,000 | Sept. 1958 | Aug. 1959 |
| Route 1 Interchange north of Yarmouth | In process | 465,000 | June 1958 | Nov. 1959 |
| Marine Hospital to Johnson Road (Grading) | In process | 2,700,000 | June 1959 | July 1960 |
| Johnson Road to Cousins River (Grading) | In process | 2,300,000 | June 1959 | Oct. 1960 |
| Marine Hospital to Cousins River (Paving) | In process | 4,500,000 | Jan. 1961 | Oct. 1961 |

| Location | Construction Plans | Estimated Cost | Contract Award Date | Completion Date |
|--|--|----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| Cousins River to Desert of Maine Road (additional two lanes to be constructed under controlled access) | | ----- | | |
| Desert of Maine Road to Brunswick | Completed | ----- | ----- | Completed |
| Brunswick to Gardiner | (To be deferred until Turnpike revenues) | | construction does not jeopardize | |
| Gardiner to Augusta on Turnpike | | | | |
| Turnpike connection to Old Winthrop Road—Augusta (grading-structure-paving) | In process | \$ 600,000 | July 1958 | July 1959 |
| Old Winthrop Road Overpass—Augusta | Completed | 170,000 | Nov. 1957 | Aug. 1958 |
| Bond Brook and Mt. Vernon Ave. Bridges—Augusta | In process | 650,000 | Jan. 1958 | June 1959 |
| Route 27 Interchange—Augusta | In process | 300,000 | July 1958 | Nov. 1959 |
| Old Winthrop Road to Route 27 (Grading) | Completed | 1,000,000 | Dec. 1957 | July 1959 |
| Old Winthrop Road to Route 27 (Paving) | In process | 400,000 | June 1959 | Oct. 1959 |
| 4 Overpasses Sidney Route 27, northerly | In process | 700,000 | Aug. 1958 | July 1959 |
| 3 Overpasses southerly of Route 11 in Waterville | ----- | 350,000 | Oct. 1958 | Sept. 1959 |
| Route 27 to Sidney Interchange (Grading) | In process | 3,000,000 | July 1958 | Oct. 1959 |
| Sidney Interchange to Route 11 Waterville (Grading) | ----- | 4,500,000 | Sept. 1958 | Nov. 1959 |
| Route 27 Augusta to Route 11 (Oakland Road) Waterville (Paving) | ----- | 2,900,000 | Jan. 1960 | Oct. 1960 |
| Oakland Road (Route 11) to Main Street Waterville (Grading and Bridges) | ----- | 2,900,000 | Aug. 1958 | Nov. 1960 |
| Main Street Waterville to Route #201 Fairfield (Grading and Bridges) | ----- | 2,400,000 | Dec. 1958 | Nov. 1960 |
| Oakland Road (Route 11) to Route #201 Fairfield (Paving) | ----- | 1,450,000 | Jan. 1961 | Nov. 1961 |
| Kennebec River Bridge—Fairfield, Benton | ----- | 2,500,000 | June 1959 | July 1961 |
| Kennebec River Bridge—Benton to Pittsfield (Mosher Corner Road) | ----- | ----- | Not determined | |
| Pittsfield to Newport (Grading-structures-paving) | ----- | 6,000,000 | 1961-62 | 1963-64 |
| Newport to Bulge Interchange, Bangor | ----- | 24,000,000 | 1960-61 | 1962-63 |
| From Interchange at Main St. to Interchange at Bulge to and including Hammond Street Interchange, Bangor | Completed | 4,000,000 | Nov. 1957 | Nov. 1959 |
| Interchange at Main St., Bangor | Completed | 1,000,000* | June 1957 | June 1958 |
| Ohio and Kenduskeag Stream, Bangor (Bridges and approaches) | Dec. 1957 | 1,300,000 | Jan. 1958 | Dec. 1958 |
| Broadway Bridge—Bangor | Jan. 1958 | 370,000 | Feb. 1958 | Dec. 1958 |
| Essex St. Bridge—Bangor | Jan. 1958 | 300,000 | Feb. 1958 | Dec. 1958 |
| Stillwater Ave. Bridge—Bangor | April 1958 | 370,000 | May 1958 | June 1959 |
| Hammond St. to Hogan Road (Grading) including Union St. Kenduskeag Ave. and Hogan Road bridges | May 1958 | 4,200,000 | July 1958 | Nov. 1959 |

| Location | Construction Plans | Estimated Cost | Contract Award Date | Completion Date |
|---|--------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Hammond St. to Hogan Road Bangor (Paving) | May 1958 | \$ 500,000 | Jan. 1960 | Oct. 1960 |
| Hogan Road, Bangor to Kelley Road, Orono | ----- | 3,500,000 | June 1960 | Nov. 1962 |
| Kelley Road to Stillwater Avenue, Orono | ----- | 4,000,000 | June 1960 | Nov. 1962 |
| Stillwater Ave., Orono to Route #2, Dyer Brook | ----- | ----- | Not determined | |
| Dyer Brook to Houlton | ----- | ----- | Not determined | |

* Financed from 60-40 funds—not included in current program.

Note: (a) Reconnaissance and Field Survey Data omitted.

- (b) Most of the cost figures shown in the revised construction schedule are very rough estimates based on a cost per mile for highways and a cost per square foot for bridge structures and were developed from reconnaissance surveys and preliminary plans. After the on the ground surveys are completed more accurate estimates will be available although the cost of the projects will not be known until the bids are received. While each project taken individually might be too high or too low, it is believed that the total for the four year program is realistic.

Estimated costs of interstate construction projects for the current biennium, July 1, 1957 to June 30, 1959, are reflected in the following schedule:

PROPOSED INTERSTATE PROGRAM

(December 1956 Work Program as Revised December 10, 1957.)

| Location | Length | Est. Cost Year 1958 | Est. Cost Year 1959 | |
|--|----------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Portland-Falmouth | | | | |
| Cumberland-Yarmouth | | | | |
| ¹ (E. Deering to Cousins River) | 10.7 mi. | \$ 4,450,000 | \$ 5,000,000 | |
| Portland (Tukey Bridge) | 0.6 | 3,600,000 | | |
| Augusta | 3.0 | 1,820,000 | 1,300,000 | |
| ² Augusta-Sidney-Waterville- | | | | |
| Fairfield-Benton | 21.0 | | 16,350,000 | |
| ² Bangor | 6.2 | 6,340,000 | 4,200,000 | |
| | 41.5 | \$16,210,000 | \$26,850,000 | |
| Total Estimated Cost | | | | \$43,060,000 |
| Contingencies for overruns and Highway Planning Survey | | | | 890,000 |
| Federal Funds | | \$16,250,000 | \$22,350,000 | |
| State Funds | | 2,550,000 | 2,800,000 ³ | |
| Sub-total | | \$18,800,000 | \$25,150,000. | |
| Total Available | | | | \$43,950,000 |

¹ Does not include pavement

² Includes only 30 miles of pavement

³ Contingent upon additional allocation of \$850,000.

Note: Mileage shown for grading projects only.

The revised construction schedule for the current biennium, July 1, 1957-June 30, 1959, provides for contractual obligations in the amount of \$43,700,000 (Note previous schedule for latest figures). \$4,500,000 in inter-

state matching funds were provided by the 98th Legislature to finance a total Interstate Highway program of \$36,100,000, as follows:

| Fiscal Year 1958 | | |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| State | \$ 2,550,000 | |
| Federal | 16,250,000 | |
| | | <hr/> |
| Total | \$18,800,000 | |
| Fiscal Year 1959 | | |
| State | \$ 1,950,000 | |
| Federal | 15,350,000 | |
| | | <hr/> |
| Total | \$17,300,000 | |
| Total provided | | \$36,100,000 |

The Highway Allocation Act of 1957 provided State funds to match all Federal apportionments except \$7,000,000 in the Interstate category. The \$850,000 in State matching funds was to have been provided in fiscal year 1960. In order to provide funds necessary to finance the \$43,700,000 program as proposed in the revised construction schedule for the current biennium, the State Highway Commission has urged before the Committee that the State matching funds in the amount of \$850,000 be provided from the \$24,000,000 bond issue. The \$7,000,000 if so matched, would cover those contractual obligations as proposed in the revised construction schedule.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION ALLOCATIONS

(Proposed Estimates of May 28, 1957)

| | Fiscal Year 1958 | | |
|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| | State Funds | Federal Funds | Total |
| Primary | \$ 3,571,837 | \$ 3,168,163 | \$ 6,740,000 |
| Secondary | 2,558,324 | 2,271,676 | 4,830,000 |
| Urban | 2,120,000 | 1,880,000 | 4,000,000 |
| Interstate | 2,550,000 | 16,250,000 | 18,800,000 |
| State Projects | 2,099,839 | 0 | 2,099,839 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| TOTAL | \$12,900,000 | \$23,569,839 | \$36,469,839 |
| | Fiscal Year 1959 | | |
| | State Funds | Federal Funds | Total |
| Primary | \$ 3,700,000 | \$ 3,300,000 | \$ 7,000,000 |
| Secondary | 2,700,000 | 2,400,000 | 5,100,000 |
| Urban | 1,000,000 | 900,000 | 1,900,000 |
| Interstate | 1,950,000 | 15,350,000 | 17,300,000 |
| State Projects | 2,000,000 | 0 | 2,000,000 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| TOTAL | \$11,350,000 | \$21,950,000 | \$33,300,000 |

Fiscal Year 1960

| | State Funds | Federal Funds | Total |
|------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Primary | \$ 3,800,000 | \$ 3,400,000 | \$ 7,200,000 |
| Secondary | 2,700,000 | 2,400,000 | 5,100,000 |
| Urban | 1,800,000 | 1,600,000 | 3,400,000 |
| Interstate | 3,460,000 | 28,000,000 | 31,460,000 |
| State | 2,050,000 | 0 | 2,050,000 |
| TOTAL | \$13,810,000 | \$35,400,000 | \$49,210,000 |

Fiscal Year 1961

| | State Funds | Federal Funds | Total |
|------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Primary | \$ 3,950,000 | \$ 3,500,000 | \$ 7,450,000 |
| Secondary | 2,820,000 | 2,500,000 | 5,320,000 |
| Urban | 1,130,000 | 1,000,000 | 2,130,000 |
| Interstate | 3,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 28,000,000 |
| State | 2,050,000 | 0 | 2,050,000 |
| TOTAL | \$12,950,000 | \$32,000,000 | \$44,950,000 |

4 YEAR TOTALS

| | State | | Federal | | Total | |
|------------|--------------|-------|---------------|-------|---------------|-------|
| Primary | \$15,021,837 | 29.4% | \$13,368,163 | 11.8% | \$28,390,000 | 17.3% |
| Secondary | 10,778,324 | 21.1% | 9,571,676 | 8.5% | 20,350,000 | 12.4% |
| Urban | 6,050,000 | 11.9% | 5,380,000 | 4.8% | 11,430,000 | 7.0% |
| Interstate | 10,960,000 | 21.5% | 84,600,000 | 74.9% | 95,560,000 | 58.3% |
| State | 8,199,839 | 16.1% | 0 | | 8,199,839 | 5.0% |
| TOTAL | \$51,010,000 | 100% | \$112,919,839 | 100% | \$163,929,839 | 100% |

PART III.

CONTROVERTED FEATURES OF MAINE INTERSTATE PROGRAM

A. IN GENERAL.

The proposed construction schedule outlined in the Interstate Highway program of December, 1956 (and as revised on November 12, 1957), which provides for a simultaneous interstate construction in the Portland, Augusta, and Bangor areas, while apparently enjoying general, state-wide support, has nevertheless been the subject of considerable criticism. For the most part, this criticism is regional in origin, and is directed primarily toward specific features of the program rather than the interstate program as a whole. These controverted features are identified in the sections following, which set forth the facts underlying the pertinent decisions of the State Highway Commission in dispute, and briefly indicate the nature of opposition.

B. PORTLAND-BRUNSWICK-GARDINER CONSTRUCTION VS. USE OF TURNPIKE.

The designation of the Interstate System from Portland to Augusta has been located via Brunswick since 1947. This designation was submitted in the recommendations made to the U. S. Bureau of Public Roads for the lo-

cation of the preliminary construction line, which were approved by the Bureau for construction purposes on December 12, 1956. The possibility of designating the entire Maine Turnpike as Federal Interstate Highway was discussed with the Bureau of Public Roads in 1954, but was rejected in favor of the specific location through Brunswick. The decision of the Commission recommending the location of the Interstate Highway through Brunswick rather than Lewiston was based on traffic surveys made in 1947, which indicated that the main corridor of traffic from Portland to Augusta was through Brunswick. Continuing traffic surveys made during the period 1947-1957, indicate that this is still the main traffic corridor, regardless of the utilization of the Turnpike extension. Irrespective of whether the entire Maine Turnpike were to be designated as Federal Interstate Highway would neither alter the traffic pattern in the Portland-Brunswick area, nor would it reduce the amount of traffic. The Portland-Brunswick section of the Interstate System comes within a different traffic corridor than that of the Maine Turnpike, serving traffic from Portland to Brunswick and along the Maine coast. Irrespective of the final outcome of the Portland-Lewiston-Augusta section of the Turnpike with respect to the location of the Interstate Highway System, the fact remains that sections of present Route 1 from Portland to Brunswick are unsafe and inadequate sections of highway. The State Highway Commission which has the responsibility of providing safe and adequate highway facilities, believes that construction of such facilities for traffic moving in the Route 1 traffic corridor between Portland-Brunswick and along the east coast is essential and should be carried out according to the proposed plans of the Commission. The present 4-lane controlled access highway serving the Lewiston-Auburn area, despite the fact that it is a toll highway, nevertheless, is a safe and adequate highway. Designation of the Turnpike through this area as a part of the Interstate System would not result in a removal of tolls, nor would it decrease the current traffic flow along the Route 1 corridor.

Cost estimates for constructing the 4-lane controlled access highway from Portland to Gardiner via Brunswick using Interstate Funds as compared with an additional 2 lanes constructed along Route 1 using Federal Primary Funds, with this type of construction continued from Brunswick to Gardiner, are as follows:

| Cost Estimates Portland-Brunswick-Gardiner | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| | Federal Funds | State Funds | Total |
| 4-lane controlled access highway using Interstate Funds | \$35,000,000 | \$ 6,000,000 | \$41,000,000 |
| 4-lane non-controlled access highway using Federal Primary Funds | \$19,000,000 | \$15,000,000 | \$34,000,000 |

The State Highway Commission in its recommendations made to the Bureau of Public Roads for the location of the preliminary construction line has suggested that construction of the Brunswick-Gardiner section should be deferred until the latter part of the construction program established for the Interstate System, or until such construction would no longer adversely affect Turnpike revenues. The Bureau of Public Roads, in its approval of the preliminary line for construction purposes, has indicated that this construction

would be authorized only in event that Turnpike revenues were not in jeopardy. The section, however, has been accepted by the Bureau of Public Roads as a part of the Interstate System, though the time of construction has been indefinitely postponed. As such, Federal Interstate Funds will be available for construction of this section, whenever conditions warrant.

The Federal Highway Act of 1956, section 114, with respect to the possibility of reimbursement for those toll highways designated as a part of the Federal Interstate Highway System, provides as follows:

It is hereby declared to be the intent and policy of the Congress to determine whether or not the Federal Government should equitably reimburse any State for a portion of a highway which is on the Interstate System, whether toll or free, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which is either in actual use or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957: provided, that such highway meets the standards required by this title for the Interstate System. The time, method, and amounts of such reimbursement, if any, shall be determined by the Congress following a study which the Secretary of Commerce (Bureau of Public Roads) is hereby authorized and directed to conduct, in cooperation with the State highway departments, and other agencies as may be required, to determine which highways in the Interstate System measure up to the standards required by this title, including all related factors of cost, depreciation, participation of Federal funds, and any other items relevant thereto. A complete report of the results of such study shall be submitted to the Congress within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1958.

Existing Federal law does not provide for paying off the indebtedness of those toll highways designated as a part of the Interstate System, though the possibility of such action has been considered, as indicated by section 114. The prospect, however, of any such action in the foreseeable future seems remote as the following reasons indicate: (a) the apparent intention of Congress that the completion of the freeway sections of the Federal Interstate Highway shall have first priority with respect to expenditures of Interstate funds, (b) that Federal highway user taxes have proved insufficient for completion of the freeway sections of the Federal Interstate System within the 13-year period initially contemplated, now estimated at a minimum of 16 years, (c) that the revised estimates of cost for completion of the freeway sections of the Federal Interstate Highway to be filed with Congress by the Secretary of Commerce in January, 1958 will reflect substantial increases in previous cost estimates.

Obviously, the possibility of converting a toll highway incorporated in the Federal Interstate System to a freeway based upon the payment of the toll highway's indebtedness by the Federal Government depends upon these same factors. The bare possibility of this contingency occurring has been considered as an immaterial factor by the State Highway Commission in making its decision as to the location of the Interstate Highway from Portland to Augusta.

The following is an outline of substantive action taken by the State Highway Commission, the Maine Turnpike Authority, and the Bureau of Public

Roads with respect to interstate construction in Maine and its effect on the Maine Turnpike:

Turnpike Authority

Highway Commission

Bureau Public Roads

1. (11/21/56) Proposed deferment to BPR of Brunswick-Gardiner constr. until end of 13-year constr. period or until TA revenues out of jeopardy.
2. (12 / 20 / 56) Announced approval by BPR of Commission's recommendations for preliminary location of interstate highway.
3. (7/8/57) Advised HC and TA that Brunswick - Gardiner constr. would be auth. only when such constr. would not jeopardize TA revenues. Further that approval by BPR of constr. projects south of Falmouth Spur would require as prerequisite an expression of opinion by the TA.
4. (11/12/57) Statement made before Legislative Research Committee outlining interstate activities; revised constr. schedule presented.
5. (11/21/57) Voted to survey effect of interstate constr. on TA traffic and revenues; also to request the HC and BPR to delay interstate constr. south of Augusta until results of study analyzed.
6. (11/25/57) Advised the HC and BPR of this action.
7. (12/2/57) Advised TA of its suggestion made to BPR on 11/21/56 that Brunswick - Gardiner constr. be delayed for purpose of protecting TA revenues. Directed TA's attention to statement made before the Legislative Research Committee on 11/12/57 for clarification of HC's position.
8. (12 / 5 / 57) Requested BPR's permission to advance Tukey Bridge to Program Stage II for the purpose of ear - marking \$3,258,000 in Federal Interstate funds; also clearance for similar

Turnpike Authority

Highway Commission

Bureau Public Roads

action East Deering - Cousins River section at later date. Status of Tukey Bridge and East Deering-Cousins River section reviewed in reference to TA action on 11/21/57.

9. (12/10/57) Statement made before Legislative Research Committee outlining possible effects of interstate constr. on the t u r n p i k e, including a statement as to its current financial status.

10. (12/10/57) Second appearance before the Legislative Research Committee.

The following telegram was sent by Governor Muskie to the Federal Highway Administrator on December 20, 1957, urging approval of the State Highway Commission's request for permission to advance Tukey Bridge to Program Stage II:

December 20, 1957
Honorable B. D. Tallamy
Federal Highway Administrator
Department of Commerce
Bureau of Public Roads
18th and F. Streets, N.W.
Washington 25, D. C.

On November 25, 1957, the Chairman of the Maine Turnpike Authority wrote to you requesting that all interstate highway and bridge construction in Maine south of Augusta be deferred to permit the Authority the opportunity of securing a nationally recognized firm of traffic engineers to study the probable effects of such construction upon the revenues of the Turnpike Authority.

On December 5, 1957, the Chairman of the Maine State Highway Commission requested permission from the Bureau of Public Roads to advance to Program Stage 2, Project I-082-1 (4), Tukey Bridge in Portland, and also clearance for similar action at a later date for projects extending northeast from Tukey Bridge in Portland to Cousins River in Yarmouth. I believe that this request on the part of the State Highway Commission should be granted for the following reasons:

1. The Maine State Highway Commission has recognized the necessity for safeguarding revenues of the Maine Turnpike Authority and for that reason suggested to the Bureau that construction of the Brunswick-Gardiner section of the Interstate system be deferred until it would not jeopardize income of the Authority. As you know, the Bureau has concurred in this suggestion.

2. From a study of the data submitted to the Bureau by the Maine State Highway Commission I am convinced that the arrangement in regard to the Brunswick-Gardiner section of the Interstate System constitutes adequate protection insofar as the construction of the Interstate System is concerned for the revenues of the Turnpike.

3. It is my understanding that the Planning Division of the Maine State Highway Department has made a careful study of traffic data and this data bears out the decision of the Commission and the Bureau as to the effect on revenues of the Turnpike by the construction of the Brunswick-Gardiner section of the Interstate System.

4. A delay of several months in authorizing contracts for the construction of Tukey Bridge and the East Deering in Portland to Cousins River in Yarmouth section of the Interstate System could be detrimental to both the State and Federal Government because of the following:

(A) Plans for Tukey Bridge have been completed and I am informed by the State Highway Commission that bids could be requested on this project in January 1958. The present bridge is inadequate and construction of the new bridge should start at once.

(B) The authorization of approximately eight million dollars worth of contracts on the Interstate System in Cumberland County during the next three to four months would provide important employment opportunities at a time when they might be increasingly important for the economy of the State.

(C) The State Highway Commission advises me that bids currently being received from contractors on highway work in Maine are very advantageous to the State. This condition might not prevail if the work on the Interstate System in Cumberland County is delayed.

(D) It is my understanding that the Commission has expended approximately \$450,000 on preliminary engineering on Tukey Bridge and the East Deering to Cousins River section which the State is currently financing. I also understand that reimbursement by the Federal Government can not be made until such time as contracts are awarded and a project agreement is signed by the Bureau and the State; and thus these State funds are tied up until such time.

I am fully conversant with the present financial status of the Maine Turnpike Authority, the deficits in anticipated revenues to date and the reasons therefor. I am also convinced that a delay in the construction of the Interstate System south of Augusta as requested by the Maine Turnpike Authority will not result in any increase in Maine Turnpike Authority revenues nor is a survey by traffic engineers likely to provide traffic data more reliable than is now available. Such data now available constitutes ample evidence, in my opinion, that the revenues of the Maine Turnpike Authority will not be materially affected by the construction on the Interstate System as proposed by the Maine State Highway Commission during the next four years and, in fact, may result in some increase in revenues to the Authority. Not to be overlooked is the fact that a vigorous construction program on the Interstate System, as planned, will provide substantial impetus to the general economy

of the State of Maine and would greatly benefit the revenues of the Maine Turnpike Authority. I am therefore requesting that the Bureau take no action which will delay completion of the Interstate System from the south end of Tukey Bridge in Portland to Cousins River in Yarmouth.

I should like to bring to your attention the fact that construction of the Interstate System is now under study by the Legislative Research Committee of the Maine Legislature; and that the Committee will report its findings to a special session of the Legislature which will be convened in January, 1958. Under these circumstances, an expeditious decision in this matter would be most helpful.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

Governor Edmund S. Muskie
Governor of the State of Maine.

The statement of operating gains or losses of the Maine Turnpike for the years 1956-1957, as presented to this Committee on December 10, 1957, is as follows:

**Maine Turnpike Authority
Operating Gains or Losses 1956-1957**

| | Financing Estimate | Actual (or projected) | Difference |
|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| 1956 | | | |
| Gross Revenues | \$4,715,000 | \$3,761,056 | (—) \$ 953,944 |
| Disbursements: | | | |
| Operating Expense | \$ 750,000 | \$ 750,000 | |
| Reserve Maintenance | 100,000 | 120,993 | (+) \$ 20,993 |
| Annual Interest | 3,144,000 | 3,144,000 | |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | |
| | \$3,994,000 | \$4,014,993 | (+) \$ 20,993 |
| Net Gain (+) | | | |
| Or loss (—) | (+) \$ 721,000 | (—) \$ 253,937 | (—) \$ 974,937 |
| 1957 | | | |
| Gross Revenues | \$5,104,000 | \$4,075,000 | \$1,029,000 |
| Disbursements: | | | |
| Operating Expense | \$ 750,000 | \$ 900,000 | (+) \$ 150,000 |
| Reserve Maintenance | 75,000 | 162,000 | (+) 87,000 |
| Annual Interest | 3,144,000 | 3,144,000 | |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | |
| | \$3,969,000 | \$4,206,000 | (+) \$ 237,000 |
| Net Gain (+) | | | |
| Or loss (—) | (+) \$1,135,000 | (—) \$ 131,000 | (—) \$1,266,000 |
| Total—Two Years | | | |
| Net Gain (+) | | | |
| Or loss (—) | (+) \$1,856,000 | (—) \$ 384,937 | (—) \$2,240,937 |

Based on the fact that the location of the Interstate Highway from Portland to Gardiner via Brunswick is not in the same traffic corridor as the Maine Turnpike, and upon the fact that construction of the Brunswick-

Gardiner section has been indefinitely postponed, it would appear (a) that Turnpike revenues would not be jeopardized by scheduled Interstate Highway construction projects, and (b) that the bondholders of the Maine Turnpike have been adequately protected. The losses to the Maine Turnpike as shown by its statement of December 10, 1957, are not the effect of competition with an Interstate Highway yet in the preliminary stages of construction, and should not be used as a valid basis for setting aside the decision of the State Highway Commission as to the location of the Portland-Brunswick-Gardiner section of the Interstate Highway.

The withdrawal of the Portland-Brunswick-Gardiner section of the Interstate Highway, should such action be taken, raises the possibility of State reimbursement to the Federal Government for the \$2,000,000 in Federal Interstate funds expended in the construction of the Brunswick-Freeport section. Such reimbursement, should it be required by the Federal Government, would be from Federal Primary funds, and would entail unnecessary losses to the State in the form of delay and postponement of urgently needed construction in the Primary System. The withdrawal of the Portland-Brunswick-Gardiner section in favor of interstate designation of the Portland-Gardiner section of the Maine Turnpike, in effect decreases the construction mileage of the system as now designated, and would not result in the re-allocation of these available funds for interstate construction elsewhere in the State. Federal Interstate funds available under the Federal Highway Act of 1956 have been apportioned by formula for the first 3 years of the interstate program, but subsequent apportionments from funds available for the completion of the designated system will be made by Congress according to need. The withdrawal of this mileage decreases both construction need and corresponding interstate funds. For this reason, the funds available for interstate construction in Maine would be substantially reduced if the Portland-Gardiner section of the Maine Turnpike were now designated as a part of the Interstate Highway System.

1. PORTLAND LOOP.

The Portland Loop location, as approved for construction purposes on December 12, 1956 (previously discussed on page 8 of this report), is repeated here for purposes of clarification. The northern part of the loop is located as follows:

- (a) From the Falmouth Spur of the Maine Turnpike, then southerly through East Deering and across the Tukey Bridge.
- (b) From the Tukey Bridge, then southerly over made land along the margin of Back Cove, thence around that part of Deering Oaks lying adjacent to the railroad to the intersection of Valley Street and Park Avenue.

The location of the southern part of the Portland Loop has been studied by the State Highway Commission, but recommendations as to its final location have not been made. Under consideration are 2 alternative proposals as to location which are as follows:

- (a) From the intersection of Valley Street and Park Avenue, then by Valley Street across the Veterans Memorial Bridge to the Turnpike, via its South Portland Spur.

(b) From the intersection of Valley Street and Park Avenue, then westerly through the City of Portland to connect with the Maine Turnpike at a point somewhere between the South Portland Spur and the Brighton Avenue Interchange.

The Interstate System south of Tukey Bridge in Portland has been constructed with the exception of (a) the Portland Loop, (b) the Saco Spur, and (c) the New Hampshire crossing. The State Highway Commission has indicated that there are no plans for the construction of these sections in the immediate future. None of these 3 projects has been scheduled for construction during the 4-year period ending June 30, 1961. Should construction plans be developed for the Portland Loop, the approval of such plans by the Bureau of Public Roads will require the opinion of the Maine Turnpike Authority as to the effect of construction on Turnpike traffic. This qualification for approval by the Bureau of Public Roads (as before noted) comprehends all Interstate construction projects south of the Falmouth Spur of the Maine Turnpike. The qualification does not apply to those construction projects north of the Falmouth Spur, with the exception of the Brunswick-Gardiner section.

The State Highway Commission, for those reasons set forth in section B, has designated the location of the Federal Interstate Highway from Portland to Gardiner via Brunswick. The highway, as designated, will leave the Maine Turnpike at Portland, pass through the City of Portland and across Tukey Bridge to connect with the 4-lane expressway from East Deering to Brunswick. With the completion of this section, Portland will be served by expressways along all major corridors of traffic: (a) Kittery to Portland, (b) Portland to Brunswick, and (c) Portland to Lewiston. This fact alone, however, does not solve the problem of traffic in downtown Portland, and it is for this reason that the State Highway Commission has recommended the construction of the Portland Loop. Consulting engineers, hired by the Commission, at the present time are preparing preliminary plans toward the eventual construction of this project.

2. TUKEY BRIDGE.

Priority construction of the Tukey Bridge and the East Deering-Cousins River (Yarmouth) interstate sections specified by the State Highway Commission in its program of December, 1956, was decided primarily on the basis of traffic volume. Following are the results of traffic survey made by the State Highway Commission for the year ending October, 1957:

TRAFFIC VOLUMES AT REPRESENTATIVE LOCATIONS 24-Hour Daily Traffic Volume

| | October 1956 to October 1957 | August 1957 | Peak Day Traffic Volume 1957 |
|--|------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Portland, Tukey Bridge U.S. Route 1 Alt. | 16,552 | 18,895 | 20,884 |

| | October 1956 to October 1957 | August 1957 | Peak Day Traffic Volume 1957 |
|---|---|--------------------|---|
| 2. Yarmouth, U.S. Route 1, one mile north of village | 8,612 | 12,805 | 14,644 |
| 3. Danville in Auburn, U. S. Routes 202 and 100 | 3,470 | 4,073 | 5,111 |
| 4. Waldoboro, U.S. Route 1, intersection U.S. Routes 1 and 32 | 4,460 | 7,716 | 8,407 |
| 5. Vassalboro, U.S. Route 201, Augusta-Vassalboro Town line | 5,721 | 7,523 | 9,630 |
| 6. Newport, intersection U.S. Routes 2 and 100 | 4,800 | 7,102 | 8,407 |
| 7. Newport, U.S. Routes 2 and 100, one mile east of vil- lage railroad crossing | 4,540 | 6,670 | 7,945 |
| 8. Clinton Village Route 100 | 3,430 | 5,040 | 6,003 |
| 9. Bangor, U.S. Route 2, north of Bangor Pumping Station | 9,220 | 11,230 | 12,350 |
| 10. Greenbush, intersection U.S. Route 2 and road to Cardville | 2,715 | 3,665 | 3,858 |
| 11. Winn, U.S. Route 2, north of Route 168 | 2,410 | 3,254 | 3,425 |
| 12. Haynesville, U.S. Route 2—Alt. | 1,770 | 2,390 | 2,478 |
| 13. Island Falls, U.S. Route 2, north of Route 159 | 2,130 | 2,685 | 3,238 |
| 14. New Limerick, U.S. Route 2, near Smyrna Town line | 880 | 1,110 | 1,338 |
| 15. Houlton, U.S. Route 1, near State Police Barracks | 3,167 | 3,868 | 4,678 |

The reasons which the State Highway Commission has advanced for its decision to give priority to the construction of Tukey Bridge are as follows:

- (a) Bridge inadequate to handle present traffic volume which is currently in excess of 16,000 vehicles per day. 1975 estimates indicate a

minimum increase of 100%, with possible traffic volume of 39,400 per day.

(b) Present bridge, constructed in 1898, is a low level structure; its draw has been inoperable since early this year.

(c) Bridge piers and abutments are supported on log mats or cribwork which have disintegrated so that settlement has occurred. Replacement of the structure is urgent.

Construction plans for the new structure were filed by the Commission with the Bureau of Public Roads on November 20, 1957. These provide for a 6-lane bridge with sufficient navigational clearance to eliminate the need for a draw. The 6-lanes are necessary to handle merging traffic on both approaches. The estimated cost with approaches is \$3,620,000.

3. EAST DEERING-COUSINS RIVER (YARMOUTH).

U. S. Route 1 from East Deering to Cousins River in Yarmouth, is a 2-lane highway of approximately 11 miles with a short section of 4-lane, undivided highway from East Deering to the junction of Routes 1 and 88. Its average daily traffic count during the year ending October, 1957 was 8,612 vehicles. This count is in excess of highway engineering standards which recommend a 4-lane highway when the average daily traffic count reaches 5,000-6,000 vehicles.

The following considerations guided Commission action as to the nature of proposed construction: (1) The construction of a 4-lane highway from East Deering to Cousins River in Yarmouth, per se, would not necessarily solve or adequately serve its highway needs. 4-lane highway design varies according to needs, and it is a recognized fact that a 4-lane highway without controlled access is inherently more dangerous than a 2-lane highway. This together with the fact that traffic accidents are reduced by 2/3 on highways having controlled access has resulted in the Commission's decision that a 4-lane, divided highway under controlled access, from East Deering to Cousins River was necessary. (2) The reconstruction of existing Route 1 to provide this 4-lane controlled access highway was considered by the Commission prior to its announced program of 1956, in view of the fact that a 4-lane right of way, sufficient by standards then existing, had been acquired by the Commission when construction of the present route was started in 1942. This construction, because of wartime delays, was finally completed in 1949. Since its completion, there has been an extensive residential and commercial growth which in the event of 4-lane construction would involve the payment of an amount estimated, in excess of \$2,000,000 in land damages. The Commission for this reason has advised 4-lane construction in a new location. (3) Interstate 90-10 matching funds provided by the Federal Highway Act of 1956 are available only for controlled access construction. The cost of the section as interstate is currently estimated at \$14,000,000 which would be apportioned between the State and Federal Government as follows:

| | |
|---------|--------------------|
| State | \$ 1,540,000 |
| Federal | 12,460,000 |
| Total | <hr/> \$14,000,000 |

The cost of construction of 2 additional lanes along existing Route 1, not under controlled access, using 50-50 Federal Primary matching funds, if such should be available for the project, is estimated at \$7,000,000, which would be apportioned as follows:

| | |
|---------|---------------------|
| State | \$ 1,750,000 |
| Federal | 5,250,000 |
| Total | <u>\$ 7,000,000</u> |

Based on the foregoing estimates, the difference in cost to the State in financing the re-construction of existing Route 1 over a 4-lane, controlled access highway financed with interstate funds, is in excess of \$200,000.

C. PRIORITY CONSTRUCTION AUGUSTA NORTH.

The State Highway Commission in its construction program of December, 1956 indicated that simultaneous construction of interstate projects would be carried on in 3 different areas of the State: (a) Tukey Bridge and the East Deering-Cousins River section in Cumberland County, (b) the Augusta-Waterville section in Kennebec County, and (c) the Bangor interchange in Penobscot County. The Commission's decision establishing a construction priority for these projects was determined in accordance with its policy "to authorize construction projects, not only on the Interstate System, but in other categories of highways where the greatest service will be afforded to the most people." Based on factual demands of traffic volume and highway safety, the decision reflects an objective appraisal by the Commission of the State's current highway needs. The Commission, by law, is charged with the responsibility of providing adequate and safe highways, and is the responsible State agency for the administration of the Maine Interstate program. The Commission, in making its decision, has exercised its discretion in determining the priorities of interstate construction projects, and has done so, not arbitrarily, but upon accepted engineering standards and procedures for determining highway needs. In the opinion of the Commission, the selection of those projects scheduled for construction under the program of December, 1956, have met these criteria. The Commission has indicated that although acceleration of interstate projects north of Augusta is desirable, from a standpoint of policy and perspective, the interests of the State will be better served, if interstate construction progresses in accordance with the most urgent priority need.

PART IV.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Majority Report

1. The majority of the Committee, convinced that the subject matter herein reviewed has had full and complete hearing and study, are well satisfied that

the Interstate plans of the State Highway Commission are such as to best serve the interests of the entire State. We approve the Commission's plans and urge upon the Commission such actions as will open the new highway projects at the earliest possible date.

2. We are convinced that the action of the Maine Turnpike Authority in seeking to delay the Cumberland County construction is without merit and that the Bureau of Public Roads should forthwith authorize construction in the Portland-Yarmouth area.
3. We are also well convinced that the objections to non-access construction raised by the residents of the Falmouth-Yarmouth area should not have our approval. We believe that the East Deering-Yarmouth construction, non-access, on new right of way, is the only proper solution in completing safe and adequate highway construction from Portland to Brunswick.
4. We recognize the urgent need, at the earliest possible date, of adequate highway facilities from Kittery to Houlton. But we also recognize that Federal Interstate construction progress in Maine will be measured by the year by year allocation from Congress. The 98th and subsequent Legislatures should provide State matching funds for all Federal Interstate monies to the end that the Kittery-Houlton Highway will be completed at the earliest possible date.
5. We view with some alarm the delays in Federal Interstate construction in Maine. While we recognize the rights of every citizen to offer his objections to the plans and the program of any department of government, we firmly point out that no good purpose can possibly be served by continuing obstructions to this Interstate construction program and in the interests of economy in the expenditure of State taxpayers' dollars, we urge a "green light" to the State Highway Commission in their efforts to bring Maine into line with our sister states in progress on the Federal Interstate Highway construction.

From the Senate:

Miles F. Carpenter, Skowhegan
William R. Cole, Liberty
Earl W. Davis, Harrison
Robert N. Haskell, Bangor
Alton A. Lessard, Lewiston
Clarence W. Parker, Sebec
J. Hollis Wyman, Milbridge

From the House:

Rodney E. Ross, Jr., Bath
Dana W. Childs, Portland
Lucia M. Cormier, Rumford
Joseph T. Edgar, Bar Harbor
Albert W. Emmons, Kennebunk
Robert W. Maxwell, Winthrop
Robert G. Wade, Auburn

Minority Report

Unless the 98th Legislature orders substantial changes in the current Interstate Highway Construction plans of the State Highway Commission, a distinct dis-

service will be done to the people of this State. These are the corrections which should be given recognition in the changes in over-all plans and philosophy:

(1) The entire 300 mile highway should be so planned and so developed as to provide for construction simultaneously in each of the major geographic areas of the State — south, central, and north. As currently planned, all of the four-year construction would be in a short section within Cumberland County, the section from Augusta to Fairfield, and the Pittsfield-Orono section, with no construction whatsoever along the Orono-Houlton route.

(2) Substantial and well-founded questions have been raised relating to many items in the Commission's plans. The Minority believes that many of the objections are well-founded and with more mature thought and study at least several doubtful projects should be curtailed or eliminated since failure to so curtail or eliminate may prove extremely expensive in later years.

(3) The Minority opposes the Highway Commission's philosophy that includes in the early stages the development of the expensive construction in urban areas. The minority is firm in the conviction that the luxury of urban spurs should not be indulged in until the main plan is constructed and so long as any reasonable doubt exists in the minds of the Maine Turnpike Authority related to possible income loss the Minority opposes any construction south of Augusta.

(4) The Minority opposes the expenditures currently a part of the Highway Commission's plan in the Portland area and the Minority, with more firmness, opposes any further survey expenditures or construction in the so-called Portland Expressway.

(5) From the constructive viewpoint, the Minority believes that, with respect to the four-year interstate plans, Augusta to Bangor should be completed as soon as possible. With respect to the highway north of Orono, the Minority believes that field survey and construction plans should be completed as soon as may be, and that construction thereon shall be delayed no later than the 1961-65 period and sooner in the event that current four-year funds can be made available from curtailment or limitations in other areas south of Orono.

From the Senate:

* Norman R. Rogerson, Houlton

From the House:

Harold Bragdon, Perham

* Senator Rogerson, although signing the minority report, reserves the right to approve or disapprove portions of both reports. Time does not permit the consideration necessary to formulate the areas of agreement and disagreement.