

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)

Transmitted by Director of Legislative Research pursuant to joint order.

N I N E T Y - S E V E N T H L E G I S L A T U R E

Legislative Document

No. 849

S. P. 310

In Senate, February 22, 1955.

Referred to Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs. Sent down for concurrence and ordered printed.

CHESTER T. WINSLOW, Secretary.

Presented by Senator Brown of Washington.

STATE OF MAINE

IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD NINETEEN HUNDRED
FIFTY-FIVE

RESOLVE, in Favor of the Eastport Highway Bridge.

Highway fund; reimbursed. Resolved: That the sum of \$500,000 be, and hereby is, appropriated from the unappropriated surplus of the general fund to reimburse the highway fund for excess costs required in the construction of the Perry-Eastport Highway, including a causeway with spillway sections to replace the existing Eastport bridge.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The State Highway Commission on February 9, 1955 opened bids on certain road construction between Perry and Eastport. A road 4.461 miles in length designated Perry-Eastport in Federal Aid Project No. F-045-1 (1) can be constructed under the following cost schedule estimated at contract prices:

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Estimate at Contract Prices | \$451,596.00 |
| Engineering and Contingencies | 45,154.00 |
| Right of Way | 35,000.00 |
| Total | \$531,750.00 |
| Federal Participation | 248,375.00 |
| Cost to State | \$283,375.00 |

This is the so-called Carlow Island Road and would be an entirely new road connecting Route 1 at Perry to Eastport.

The Commission also on February 9, received bids on an alternate route, part of which is State Project No. 2658, a project 1.6 miles in length. Items 1, 2, and 3 in the below tabulation indicated the total cost of this project to be \$853,932:

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Estimate at Contract Prices | \$749,030.50 |
| Engineering and Contingencies | 74,901.50 |
| Right of Way | 30,000.00 |
| | <hr/> |
| (A) Sub-total | \$853,932.00 |

To complete a Perry-Eastport Road would require road construction in addition to the above 1.6 miles amounting to 2.8 miles. The cost of construction is indicated in items 3, 4, and 5 and the tabulation shows a gross cost of \$1,203,932 as follows:

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Rough Estimate at \$100,000/mile | \$280,000.00 |
| Engineering and Contingencies | 28,000.00 |
| Right of Way | 42,000.00 |
| | <hr/> |
| (B) Sub-total | \$350,000.00 |
| Total | \$1,203,932.00 |

The position of the Highway Commission is that in their opinion the Bureau of Public Roads will limit their participation in the alternate route proposal to what their participation would be had the Carlow Island Road been followed. If this is a correct assumption, the net cost to the State under the Carlow Island would be \$283,375; while the net cost to the State under the alternate proposal would be \$920,557. The sponsors recognize the position of the Highway Commission in indicating preference for the Carlow Island route, with the cost differential of \$637,182. It is the purpose of this Resolve to appropriate from general fund sources \$500,000 of this difference, leaving \$137,182 to be a charge against highway funds, a sum well justified for the better route.

The principle involved in the use of general funds for highway purposes has been established on occasion by legislative action. In this case, the construction of the causeway that is part of the alternate route will greatly enhance the economic development of the entire Washington county area. It would provide for a substantial "salt water pool" and develop a facility of great attraction to recreation in an area of the State where economic development is of utmost importance.

The causeway is admittedly not entirely a part of the highway and can properly be an area development financed from the unappropriated surplus of the general fund.

The 96th Legislature recognized the value of the pool development by creating the Washington County Recreational Authority, specifically designed to develop the "pool" area, which would be created by the causeway construction. There would be no public funds required under the terms of the Authority Act and private capital is ready and anxious to proceed in this development once the essential causeway is constructed.