

construct a tunnel costs about 40 million dollars more than to construct a comparable lane crossing, a bridge. Secondly, the crossing by bridge as opposed to the tunnel can be extended another two lanes, to be three in each direction, for only 10 million dollars in additional expense, whereas the tunnel would require a total new tunnel at the same cost and maybe more than the original. And third and almost of the most importance, in the total picture, the maintenance cost of the tunnel is 3 million dollars annually more than that of the bridge crossing. Now I know that there are some feelings that a bridge could impede navigation, but I point out that the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge and the bridge across the York had the same objections raised against them and there has been no trouble thus far. It just seems that the bridge crossing is cheaper and it gives greater flexibility, that it allows for future expansion at a much cheaper rate, and it is something we ought to look at very carefully before we reject it. And I'm sad when I consider that the bill as it is apparently going to be enacted, if it does get enacted, would mandate a tunnel instead of a crossing.

Q. One of the countervailing arguments, isn't it, is that considerable money would go down the drain in starting over, on engineering and such?

A. The amount of money that would be lost in reversing course would be infinitesimal compared to the cost of the facilities and the savings to be made by making the proper solution. And as a matter of fact, as far as approaches are concerned, I'm sure not all that money would be wasted.

Q. Does the \$300,000 that was stripped from the budget's capital improvements section present a serious problem?

A. I want to be frank and say that I had hoped that they would approve it all but I am very happy they approved 10 million, and it's more than I honestly expected. Again I think it is a reflection of the responsible course that this Legislature has taken in resisting attempts to make themselves look good instead of voting for the public welfare. They saw the need for the down payment on capital improvements and they enacted it, and I'm very pleased that they did stick with the 10 million dollars thus far.

Q. Do the provisions of the Snyder Committee plan for fiscal reorganization fit in with the Michaelson Commission study of prison reform?

A. Yes. I have had several consultations with Senator Snyder and the bills that have been introduced seem to go about effectuating the