

Crumpton and Dudleys Corner. In the Dorchester County case, according to State Roads Commission figures, the road carried 627 vehicles a day in 1954 and is estimated to carry 1,447 vehicles a day in 1975. In the Queen Anne's County case, the road carried 905 vehicles a day in 1954 and is estimated to carry 2,058 cars a day in 1975. From the best information I am able to obtain, it appears that acceptable and nationally recognized standards do not call for the construction of a dual lane divided highway until a traffic volume far in excess of the figures mentioned in either of these cases for 1975 is reached. I am further advised that this same situation has occurred in numerous instances throughout the State.

Not only do I doubt the wisdom of this type of highway planning, but I feel it is an unwise expenditure of State highway funds. First, because it deprives the owners of the use of the land, and unless the State Roads Commission expends money for maintenance, it is likely to cause an unsightly roadside condition. Second, by taking the land off the assessable county tax rolls, it deprives the counties of a source of taxation. And third, the payment by the State Roads Commission for this additional land from highway construction funds means that the Commission has actually less money to spend for construction on urgently needed projects.

It should be pointed out here that the cautious approach toward acquiring land not needed in the foreseeable future should in no way preclude the Commission from taking bold and far-sighted steps when the future need for dual highways is clearly indicated. In this respect, I propose that the new State Roads Commission and the Director of Highways adhere to acceptable and nationally recognized engineering standards. The traffic count should justify dual lane construction in the foreseeable future before rights-of-way wide enough to accommodate a dual lane divided highway are purchased.

As a result of further information and my own observations, I am of the opinion that if the Commission is to function with the maximum effectiveness and efficiency, the internal organization of the agency should be streamlined and modernized.

The duties and functions of the office of the Chief Engineer should be changed so that the Chief Engineer, as the title implies, be directly in charge of the engineering functions of the Commission. His office should not be burdened with the general problems of office administration, and he should not be required to concern himself with administrative decisions. The Chief Engineer should be in charge of all the engineering functions of the Commission, and the several