

~~11281~~ 110261

SUPPLEMENT TO THE REPORT BY THE
Comptroller General
OF THE UNITED STATES

**Excessive Truck Weight:
An Expensive Burden We
Can No Longer Support**

Questionnaire Summary

GAO sent a questionnaire to all States asking for information on truck weight laws, enforcement programs and methods, and background data on their State Highway System. This report, summarizing the States responses, is provided to help States evaluate their weight enforcement programs.



Note: This report is a supplement to CED-79-94, 109884



~~006105~~
110261

CED-79-94A
July 16, 1979



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D C 20548

COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

B-164497(3)

PREFACE

On July 16, 1979, GAO issued a report to the Congress entitled "Excessive Truck Weight: An Expensive Burden We Can No Longer Support" (CED-79-94). That report discusses the impact heavy trucks have on highway deterioration and problems with Federal and State weight enforcement efforts. The digest of that report is included as an appendix to this report supplement.

We sent a questionnaire to all States to obtain information on general highway data, weight laws, and enforcement efforts. All States responded to the questionnaire and much of the data the States provided is summarized in the report to the Congress. The results of the questionnaire represent the most comprehensive State data on weight-related issues.

This report supplement summarizes the questionnaire information and presents individual State responses to the questions. We believe that this information will be useful to the Federal Highway Administration and, more importantly, to the States in comparing their programs to those in other States.

The questionnaire was sent to responsible State officials. The responses represent their opinions, perceptions, and engineering judgments. While GAO did not systematically verify the responses, followup inquiries were made to clarify some information.

B-164497(3)

Questions requiring narrative responses could not be readily summarized and are not included in this supplement. The major information not included relates to States policies of issuing permits and exemptions to haul more than the States legal weight limits. GAO's audit work in nine States showed that permit and exemption terminology, definitions, and practices vary widely. Questionnaire responses were often contradictory and followup inquiries indicated substantial confusion about categories and definitions; therefore, GAO did not include permit and exemption data in this report supplement.

Responses to questions on general highway information, weight laws, and weight-law enforcement are contained in chapters 1 through 3. Each chapter contains a brief narrative summary, aggregate responses where practical, and individual State responses.



Henry Eschwege
Director

C o n t e n t s

| | <u>Page</u> |
|----------|---|
| PREFACE | |
| CHAPTER | |
| 1 | BACKGROUND DATA 1 |
| | Highway mileage 1 |
| | Highway maintenance 1 |
| | Heavy trucks 2 |
| | State research 2 |
| | State responses 4 |
| 2 | WEIGHT LAWS AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS 25 |
| | Interstate weight limits 25 |
| | Noninterstate weight limits 26 |
| | Legal provisions 27 |
| | State responses 28 |
| 3 | ENFORCEMENT DATA 37 |
| | Organization 37 |
| | Money 37 |
| | Personnel 38 |
| | Equipment 38 |
| | Trucks weighed 39 |
| | State responses 40 |
| APPENDIX | |
| I | Digest from report entitled 61 |
| | "Excessive Truck Weight: An |
| | Expensive Burden We Can No |
| | Longer Support" |

CHAPTER 1,

BACKGROUND DATA

Through the responses to our questionnaire, we compiled data on State highway mileage, maintenance needs, the impact of heavy trucks on highway conditions, and the extent of State research on weight-related issues. States indicated that lack of funding and the consequent need to defer maintenance are presenting major problems to State highway departments. Truck traffic, generally recognized as a major cause of deterioration, has increased over the last 10 years.

The questions and individual State responses have been published on facing pages to allow the reader easy reference between the two items. For selected questions where the aggregate responses from all the States would be meaningful, we have shown them to the right of the question. Unless otherwise indicated, these aggregate numbers represent the total number of States that responded with the given answer. In some cases, the aggregate numbers indicate miles, costs, or other terms, as indicated.

HIGHWAY MILEAGE

Our questionnaire dealt only with highways under State control. State system mileage includes a large part of the Federal-aid system but only about one-fifth of national highway mileage. The following table shows the breakdown between highways under State control and highways under local control (cities and counties).

| | <u>Percent under State control</u> | <u>Percent under local control</u> |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| National mileage (3,900,000) | 21 | 79 |
| Federal-aid mileage (810,000) | 65 | 35 |

HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE

Responses on highway and maintenance needs indicated that the principal problem of State highway departments is too little money to adequately maintain their highway systems. The need to defer maintenance was a problem in every State that answered the question. Thirty-two States considered it a serious problem.

Over and above routine maintenance, States indicated that they will need \$66.8 billion over the next 20 years for

resurfacing, restoring, and rehabilitating noninterstate roads. States need an additional \$18.4 billion for similar work on interstate highways. State funding problems are likely to continue and intensify as the rate of deterioration increases.

HEAVY TRUCKS

Other than financial problems and age, States said heavy trucks and illegal overweight trucks were major causes of highway deterioration. No State believed that all their highways were capable of handling current truck volumes and weights without decreasing serviceable life, and only 17 States felt their interstate system could adequately handle this traffic.

States also felt that truck traffic had increased over the last 10 years in total number, percent of traffic, and average truck weight. The percentage of heavy truck traffic for State highway systems is shown below.

| <u>System</u> | <u>Percent of heavy trucks in average daily traffic</u> | | |
|---------------|---|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | <u>Highest response</u> | <u>Lowest response</u> | <u>Average response</u> |
| Interstate | 35 | 3 | 15 |
| Primary | 25 | 3 | 9 |
| Secondary | 30 | 3 | 7 |

STATE RESEARCH

States have done much research relating to weight enforcement and the impact of heavy and overweight trucks on highway condition. Much of this was related specifically to State needs, such as permanent scale site selection and cost allocation studies. There were many State studies indicating a duplication of State efforts in studies relating to engineering or economics.

BLANK

Highway mileage

1. What is the current highway mileage for the following types of highways in your State? (Enter number of miles.)

| <u>Type highway</u> | <u>Total mileage</u> |
|--|----------------------|
| A. All streets and highways in the State | 3,847,180 |
| 1) All Federal-aid highways in State | 825,651 |
| 2) All Federal-aid interstate highways | 40,413 |
| B. All Highways on State system <u>1/</u> | 799,314 |
| 1) Federal-aid highways on State systems | 521,295 |
| 2) Federal-aid interstate highways on state system | 39,506 |

1/ A number of States did not respond to this question. In those cases we used the data found in table SM-1, page 109, "Highway Statistics 1976," prepared by the Federal Highway Administration.

Q-1, Highway Mileage

| <u>State</u> | <u>All streets & highways</u> | <u>All Fed-aid highways</u> | <u>All Fed-aid interstate highways</u> | <u>State system highway</u> | <u>Fed-aid on State system</u> | <u>Fed -aid Interstate on State system</u> |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Alabama | 86,726 | 20,627 | 765 | 21,860 | 9,670 | 765 |
| Alaska | 9,037 | 3,979 | - | 6,248 | 3,979 | - |
| Arizona | 54,966 | 9,597 | 1,205 | 6,025 | 5,795 | 1,205 |
| Arkansas | 77,450 | 12,643 | 524 | 15,925 | 9,483 | 524 |
| California | 173,219 | 39,935 | 2,319 | 17,505 | 14,926 | 2,319 |
| Colorado | 74,019 | 10,828 | 934 | 9,130 | 8,845 | 934 |
| Connecticut | 19,108 | 5,209 | 289 | 3,892 | 3,201 | 289 |
| Delaware | 4,591 | 1,378 | 41 | 4,558 | 1,378 | 41 |
| Florida | 97,020 | 18,476 | 1,117 | 14,406 | 11,211 | 1,117 |
| Georgia | 103,137 | 27,944 | 1,117 | 18,366 | 17,071 | 1,117 |
| Hawaii | 963 | 963 | 35 | 1,000 | 878 | 35 |
| Idaho | 57,788 | 7,818 | 612 | 5,128 | 4,991 | 612 |
| Illinois | 132,981 | 29,988 | 1,655 | 17,304 | 15,155 | 1,655 |
| Indiana | 91,533 | 19,380 | 1,120 | 11,144 | 10,824 | 963 |
| Iowa | 112,451 | 25,141 | 728 | 10,432 | 10,141 | 728 |
| Kansas | 134,532 | 32,776 | 797 | 10,878 | 10,640 | 610 |
| Kentucky | 69,905 | 13,189 | 679 | 25,015 | 12,426 | 679 |
| Louisiana | 54,740 | 12,480 | 655 | 16,271 | 11,645 | 655 |
| Maine | 21,744 | 5,680 | 314 | 11,856 | 5,420 | 259 |
| Maryland | 25,676 | 6,389 | 378 | 5,439 | 4,379 | 367 |
| Massachusetts | 32,876 | 10,452 | 512 | 3,653 | 2,732 | 369 |
| Michigan | 119,165 | 30,956 | 1,114 | 9,630 | 9,455 | 1,114 |
| Minnesota | 128,459 | 28,395 | 827 | 13,169 | 12,097 | 827 |
| Mississippi | 68,341 | 19,527 | 684 | 10,895 | 10,206 | 684 |
| Missouri | 117,357 | 28,034 | 1,101 | 32,092 | 26,627 | 1,101 |
| Montana | 77,622 | 11,633 | 1,192 | 6,750 | 6,664 | 1,192 |
| Nebraska | 96,895 | 19,043 | 484 | 10,386 | 9,858 | 484 |
| Nevada | 50,170 | 5,270 | 545 | 7,004 | 5,270 | 545 |
| New Hampshire | 15,415 | 3,770 | 222 | 4,418 | 2,866 | 222 |
| New Jersey | 33,074 | 8,736 | 325 | 3,082 | 2,194 | 278 |
| New Mexico | 70,836 | 12,572 | 999 | 12,786 | 12,325 | 999 |
| New York | 110,000 | 25,000 | 1,400 | 17,580 | 14,300 | 1,400 |
| North Carolina | 91,492 | 17,121 | 698 | 75,843 | 17,093 | 698 |
| North Dakota | 106,482 | 16,840 | 571 | 7,075 | 7,070 | 571 |
| Ohio | 110,800 | 27,000 | 1,080 | 20,420 | 17,925 | 1,080 |
| Oklahoma | 109,631 | 16,450 | 811 | 12,990 | 10,810 | 811 |
| Oregon | 108,070 | 14,869 | 728 | 10,242 | 7,474 | 728 |
| Pennsylvania | 118,226 | 26,075 | 1,503 | 48,844 | 23,705 | 1,156 |
| Rhode Island | 5,793 | 1,455 | 72 | 1,165 | 719 | 72 |
| South Carolina | 61,500 | 15,743 | 692 | 38,417 | 15,563 | 692 |
| South Dakota | 82,474 | 17,644 | 625 | 9,073 | 8,815 | 625 |
| Tennessee | 81,832 | 17,715 | 1,004 | 10,128 | 8,713 | 1,004 |
| Texas | 259,785 | 60,496 | 3,215 | 70,066 | 56,221 | 3,215 |
| Utah | 49,800 | 7,000 | 938 | 5,559 | 5,450 | 938 |
| Vermont | 13,592 | 3,638 | 302 | 2,851 | 2,582 | 302 |
| Virginia | 64,523 | 19,491 | 886 | 53,134 | 18,000 | 886 |
| Washington | 83,622 | 17,243 | 764 | 17,549 | 7,262 | 764 |
| West Virginia | 37,078 | 9,831 | 453 | 33,476 | 9,537 | 453 |
| Wisconsin | 106,547 | 23,889 | 501 | 12,519 | 11,881 | 501 |
| Wyoming | 34,137 | 6,343 | 921 | 6,136 | 5,823 | 921 |
| Total | <u>3,847,180</u> | <u>826,651</u> | <u>40,453</u> | <u>799,314</u> | <u>521,295</u> | <u>39,506</u> |

Highway maintenance

2. What is your estimate of the resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation needs (RRR needs) for noninterstate roads on your State system over the next 20 years, in terms of miles and cost?

(Enter miles and cost.)

| | | <u>Aggregate response</u> | |
|----|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| A. | _____ Miles | 775,924 | Total miles |
| B. | _____ Cost | \$66,591,459 | Total cost |
| C. | _____ GAO calculation of States cost per mile | \$85,822 | Average cost per mile |

Note: Four States did not respond to this question.

Q-2, RRR Needs

| <u>State</u> | <u>Miles needing RRR</u> | <u>Total cost</u> (000s) | <u>Cost per mile</u> (000s) |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Alabama | 10,000 | \$ 415 000 | \$ 41 5 |
| Alaska | 2,500 | 750 000 | 300 0 |
| Arizona | 4 780 | 500 000 | 104 6 |
| Arkansas | 6 000 | 576 000 | 96 0 |
| California | 17 770 | 950 000 | 53 4 |
| Colorado | 7 911 | 396 000 | 50 0 |
| Connecticut | 2 500 | 200 000 | 80 0 |
| Delaware | 4 551 | 245,000 | 53 8 |
| Florida | 43 000 | 1 771 757 | 41 2 |
| Georgia | 37 000 | 999 000 | 27 0 |
| Hawaii | 1 000 | 120,000 | 120 0 |
| Idaho | 2 150 | 150 000 | 69 7 |
| Illinois | 15 000 | 7 000 000 | 466 7 |
| Indiana | 22 000 | 900 000 | 40 9 |
| Iowa | 4 560 | 1 140,000 | 250 0 |
| Kansas | 9 000 | 1 800 000 | 200 0 |
| Kentucky | 24 500 | 1 225 500 | 50 0 |
| Louisiana | 15,600 | 5 000,000 | 320 0 |
| Maine | 8,000 | 170 000 | 21 2 |
| Maryland | 325 | 35 000 | 107 7 |
| Massachusetts | 10 000 | 6 000,000 | 600 0 |
| Michigan | 10,900 | 920 000 | 84 4 |
| Minnesota | 10,000 | 500 000 | 50 0 |
| Mississippi | 20 000 | 1 000 000 | 50 0 |
| Missouri | - | - | - |
| Montana | 6 737 | 1 852,563 | 274 9 |
| Nebraska | 15 000 | 1 200 000 | 80 0 |
| Nevada | 2 000 | 900 000 | 450 0 |
| New Hampshire | 750 | 150 000 | 200 0 |
| New Jersey | 600 | 175,000 | 291 7 |
| New Mexico | 1 500 | 300,000 | 200 0 |
| New York | 41 000 | 8,200 000 | 200 0 |
| North Carolina | 53 500 | 1,250 000 | 23 4 |
| North Dakota | 6 500 | 195 000 | 30 0 |
| Ohio | 18 000 | - | - |
| Oklahoma | 5 200 | 936 000 | 180 0 |
| Oregon | 6 800 | 1 500 000 | 220 5 |
| Pennsylvania | 1 200 | 600 000 | 500 0 |
| Rhode Island | - | - | - |
| South Carolina | 20 310 | 1 145 200 | 56 4 |
| South Dakota | 8 272 | 368 104 | 44 5 |
| Tennessee | 9 946 | 2,060 000 | 207 1 |
| Texas | 72 389 | 8 230 000 | 113 7 |
| Utah | 4 600 | 350 000 | 76 1 |
| Vermont | 1 397 | 121 000 | 86 6 |
| Virginia | 156 000 | 1 500 000 | 9 6 |
| Washington | 7 000 | - | - |
| West Virginia | 32 000 | 1 280 000 | 40 0 |
| Wisconsin | 12 000 | 788 000 | 65 7 |
| Wyoming | 4 176 | 727 335 | 174 2 |
| Total | 775 924 | \$66 591 459 | |

3. At any given time, a highway maintenance organization may have a certain amount of maintenance work that must be temporarily deferred. In your opinion how much of a problem, if any, is deferred maintenance on your State system?

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| - | No response | 1 |
| 1 | A very serious problem | 9 |
| 2. | A serious problem | 23 |
| 3. | A moderate problem | 9 |
| 4. | A minor problem | 8 |
| 5. | Little or no problem | 0 |

4. To what extent, if any, do the following factors contribute to the need to defer maintenance on your State system?

| | | <u>Aggregate response</u> | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | | <u>-</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> |
| A | Inflation | 1 | 23 | 15 | 8 | 3 | 0 |
| B | Decreased tax revenues | 5 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 13 |
| C | Increased maintenance due to | | | | | | |
| a | Recent severe weather | 2 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 8 |
| b | Age of highways | 2 | 8 | 23 | 12 | 4 | 1 |
| c | Other | 32 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 |

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> |
|-------------|----------------------------|
| - | No response |
| 1 | Very large extent |
| 2 | Substantially large extent |
| 3 | Moderate extent |
| 4 | Some extent |
| 5 | Little or no extent |

Q-4, Causes of Deferred Maintenance

| <u>State</u> | <u>Q-3, Problem deferred maintenance</u> | <u>Infla- tion</u> | <u>Decrease tax revenue</u> | <u>Severe weather</u> | <u>Age of highway</u> | <u>Other</u> |
|----------------|--|------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Alabama | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Alaska | 2 | 3 | - | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Arizona | 2 | 1 | - | 3 | 1 | - |
| Arkansas | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| California | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | - |
| Colorado | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | - |
| Connecticut | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Delaware | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | - |
| Florida | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 2 | - |
| Georgia | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Hawaii | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Idaho | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Illinois | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4 | - |
| Indiana | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | - |
| Iowa | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Kansas | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | - |
| Kentucky | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Louisiana | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| Maine | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | - |
| Maryland | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | - |
| Massachusetts | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Michigan | 3 | 3 | - | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Minnesota | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Mississippi | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | - |
| Missouri | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | - |
| Montana | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | - |
| Nebraska | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | - |
| Nevada | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| New Hampshire | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | - |
| New Jersey | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| New Mexico | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | - |
| New York | 2 | 3 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| North Carolina | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | - |
| North Dakota | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | - |
| Ohio | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | - |
| Oklahoma | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | - |
| Oregon | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Pennsylvania | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | - |
| Rhode Island | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 5 | - |
| South Carolina | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| South Dakota | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | - |
| Tennessee | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | - |
| Texas | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Utah | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| Vermont | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | - |
| Virginia | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | - |
| Washington | 4 | 1 | - | 4 | 3 | - |
| West Virginia | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | - |
| Wisconsin | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - |
| Wyoming | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | - |

5. In your opinion are the following components of your State Highway System currently maintained better, worse, or the same compared to 5 years ago?

| | <u>Aggregate responses</u> | | | | | |
|---------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <u>-</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> |
| A. Pavement | 1 | 2 | 14 | 12 | 19 | 2 |
| B. Shoulders | 1 | 2 | 10 | 20 | 16 | 1 |
| C. Drainage | 1 | 1 | 5 | 27 | 14 | 2 |
| D. Guardrails | 1 | 2 | 14 | 23 | 8 | 2 |
| E. Others | 42 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> |
|-------------|----------------------|
| - | No response |
| 1 | Significantly better |
| 2 | Generally better |
| 3 | About the same |
| 4 | Generally worse |
| 5 | Significantly worse |

Q-5, Maintenance condition current versus 1973

| <u>State</u> | <u>Pavement</u> | <u>Shoulders</u> | <u>Drainage</u> | <u>Guardrail</u> | <u>Other</u> |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|
| Alabama | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Alaska | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Arizona | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Arkansas | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | - |
| California | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Colorado | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Connecticut | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Delaware | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 | - |
| Florida | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Georgia | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - |
| Hawaii | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Idaho | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - |
| Illinois | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | - |
| Indiana | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - |
| Iowa | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Kansas | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | - |
| Kentucky | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Louisiana | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | - |
| Maine | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | - |
| Maryland | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | - |
| Massachusetts | - | - | - | - | - |
| Michigan | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | - |
| Minnesota | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | - |
| Mississippi | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Missouri | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Montana | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Nebraska | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | - |
| Nevada | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| New Hampshire | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | - |
| New Jersey | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| New Mexico | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | - |
| New Yqrk | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| North Carolina | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| North Dakota | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Ohio | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | - |
| Oklahoma | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | - |
| Oregon | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| Pennsylvania | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | - |
| Rhode Island | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | - |
| South Carolina | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| South Dakota | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | - |
| Tennessee | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | - |
| Texas | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | - |
| Utah | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Vermont | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Virginia | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | - |
| washington | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| West Virginia | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Wisconsin | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Wyoming | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | - |

Highway deterioration

6. In your opinion, to what extent, if any, are the following factors contributing to highway deterioration on your State system?

| | | <u>Aggregate response</u> | | | | | |
|----|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | | <u>-</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> |
| A | Lack of funds | 3 | 18 | 19 | 9 | 0 | 1 |
| B | Deferred maintenance | 3 | 8 | 20 | 11 | 7 | 1 |
| C. | Age of roads | 1 | 15 | 18 | 13 | 3 | 0 |
| D. | Inadequate design | 3 | 1 | 9 | 15 | 16 | 6 |
| E. | Traffic: | | | | | | |
| a | Automobiles | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 28 |
| b. | Legal heavy trucks | 1 | 5 | 21 | 17 | 6 | 0 |
| c. | Trucks under special permits | 3 | 2 | 1 | 17 | 15 | 12 |
| d. | Illegal over-weight trucks | 2 | 7 | 12 | 16 | 11 | 2 |

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> |
|-------------|---------------------|
| - | No response |
| 1 | Very great extent |
| 2 | Substantial extent |
| 3 | Moderate extent |
| 4 | Some extent |
| 5 | Little or no extent |

Q-6, Causes of Highway Deterioration

| <u>State</u> | <u>Lack of funds</u> | <u>Deferred maintenance</u> | <u>Age of road</u> | <u>Design</u> | <u>Autos</u> | <u>Heavy truck</u> | <u>Truck under permit</u> | <u>Illegal overweight trucks</u> |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Alabama | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Alaska | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Arizona | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| Arkansas | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| California | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Colorado | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| Connecticut | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Delaware | 1 | 3 | 4 | - | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Florida | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Georgia | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Hawaii | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Idaho | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Illinois | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| Indiana | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| Iowa | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| Kansas | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Kentucky | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Louisiana | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| Maine | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| Maryland | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Massachusetts | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Michigan | - | - | 3 | - | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minnesota | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Mississippi | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| Missouri | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 |
| Montana | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Nebraska | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Nevada | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| New Hampshire | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| New Jersey | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| New Mexico | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | - | - |
| New York | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| North Carolina | - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| North Dakota | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| Ohio | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Oklahoma | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Oregon | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Pennsylvania | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Rhode Island | 3 | - | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | - | 3 |
| South Carolina | 5 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| South Dakota | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Tennessee | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Texas | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| Utah | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Vermont | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| Virginia | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Washington | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| West Virginia | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| Wisconsin | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| Wyoming | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 |

Heavy trucks

7. In your opinion, approximately what percentage of the average daily traffic on the following highways of your State system is heavy truck traffic (over 26,000 pounds)?

- A. Interstate _____ percent
- B. Noninterstate primary _____ percent
- C. Secondary system _____ percent
- D. Other roads (Please specify) _____ percent

8. Consider the fact that some roads currently in service may not have been designed or engineered to handle specific truck traffic loads for a specific design life. Other roads may have been designed to handle lower loadings than they are currently experiencing. In your opinion what percentage of the following types of highways on your State system is adequately engineered to accommodate the current volume of heavy truck traffic (over 26,000 pounds) without a reduction in serviceable life?

(Enter percents.)

| <u>Type highway on State system</u> | <u>Percent adequately designed for heavy truck traffic</u> |
|---|--|
| A. Interstate | _____ |
| B Primary | _____ |
| C Secondary | _____ |
| D. Other (Please specify) | _____ |

Q-7 Percent of Heavy Trucks In Traffic

Q-8, Percent of Highways Built
For Heavy Truck Traffic

| State | Q-7 Percent of Heavy Trucks In Traffic | | | | Q-8, Percent of Highways Built For Heavy Truck Traffic | | | |
|----------------|--|------------------------|------------------|-------------|--|---------|-----------|-------|
| | Interstate system | Non-Interstate primary | Secondary system | Other roads | Interstate | Primary | Secondary | Other |
| Alabama | 25 | 16 | 14 | - | 100 | 40 | 10 | - |
| Alaska | - | 10 | 6 | - | - | 15 | 25 | - |
| Arizona | 20 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 100 | 85 | 70 | - |
| Arkansas | 16 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 2 | - |
| California | 15 | 12 | 5 | - | 60 | 50 | 30 | - |
| Colorado | 8 | 3 | 3 | - | 100 | 50 | 10 | - |
| Connecticut | 13 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 80 | 70 | 25 | - |
| Delaware | - | - | - | - | 100 | 60 | 20 | 10 |
| Florida | 13 | 19 | 13 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Georgia | 18 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 50 | 20 | 10 | - |
| Hawaii | 7 | 5 | 3 | - | 90 | 30 | 30 | - |
| Idaho | 14 | 9 | 13 | 5 | 95 | 75 | 50 | - |
| Illinois | 22 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 40 | 50 | 75 | - |
| Indiana | 35 | 25 | 15 | 7 | 60 | 50 | 20 | - |
| Iowa | 17 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 80 | 70 | 60 | - |
| Kansas | 13 | 7 | 6 | - | 100 | 44 | 20 | - |
| Kentucky | 22 | 18 | 12 | 9 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 40 |
| Louisiana | 18 | 12 | 8 | 5 | 100 | 70 | 20 | - |
| Maine | 8 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 95 | 50 | 35 | 15 |
| Maryland | 5 | 6 | 7 | - | 100 | 90 | 70 | - |
| Massachusetts | 9 | 7 | 4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Michigan | 14 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 99 | 90 | 80 | - |
| Minnesota | 17 | 11 | 7 | - | 50 | 35 | 80 | 50 |
| Mississippi | 15 | 12 | 8 | - | 95 | 35 | 10 | - |
| Missouri | 20 | 9 | 7 | - | 100 | 50 | 10 | - |
| Montana | 18 | 14 | 10 | - | 20 | 60 | 40 | - |
| Nebraska | 14 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 100 | 60 | 30 | - |
| Nevada | 13 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 85 | 55 | 25 | - |
| New Hampshire | 6 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 100 | 50 | 30 | - |
| New Jersey | 11 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 100 | 98 | 35 | - |
| New Mexico | 19 | 11 | 7 | 6 | - | - | - | - |
| New York | 12 | 5 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| North Carolina | 11 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 93 | 75 | 50 | - |
| North Dakota | 23 | 19 | 17 | - | 93 | 35 | 20 | - |
| Ohio | 25 | 15 | 8 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| Oklahoma | 20 | 16 | 12 | 4 | - | - | - | - |
| Oregon | 23 | 17 | 15 | - | 20 | 15 | 10 | - |
| Pennsylvania | 15 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 30 | 70 | 80 | - |
| Rhode Island | 3 | 5 | 2 | - | 100 | 60 | 50 | - |
| South Carolina | 22 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 90 | 40 | 10 |
| South Dakota | 14 | 8 | 4 | - | 90 | 50 | 35 | - |
| Tennessee | 13 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 20 | 80 | 90 |
| Texas | 12 | 9 | 6 | 4 | - | - | - | - |
| Utah | 16 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 90 | 80 | 20 | - |
| Vermont | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 40 | 30 | - |
| Virginia | 10 | 3 | 1 | - | 100 | 25 | 10 | - |
| Washington | 10 | 7 | - | 5 | 50 | 25 | - | - |
| West Virginia | 13 | 13 | 7 | - | 100 | 50 | 20 | - |
| Wisconsin | 20 | 14 | 12 | 6 | 100 | 80 | 70 | - |
| Wyoming | 20 | 12 | 5 | - | 96 | 49 | 39 | - |

9. In your opinion, how much, if at all, have the following characteristics of heavy truck traffic, (over 26,000 pounds) on your State system changed over the past 10 years?

| | <u>Aggregate response</u> | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <u>-</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> |
| A. Total number of trucks | 4 | 24 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| B. Percent of trucks in overall traffic | 2 | 8 | 26 | 12 | 2 | 0 |
| C. Volume of through truck traffic | 3 | 17 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| D. Volume of local truck traffic | 3 | 9 | 32 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| E. Average truck weight | 3 | 7 | 31 | 8 | 1 | 0 |

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> |
|-------------|----------------------|
| - | No response |
| 1 | Increased greatly |
| 2 | Increased moderately |
| 3 | Remained the same |
| 4 | Decreased moderately |
| 5 | Decreased greatly |

Q-9, Change in Truck Traffic Since 1968

| <u>State</u> | <u>Total trucks</u> | <u>Percent in traffic</u> | <u>Through trucks</u> | <u>Local trucks</u> | <u>Average truck weight</u> |
|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Alabama | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Alaska | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Arizona | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Arkansas | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| California | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Colorado | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Connecticut | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Delaware | - | - | - | - | - |
| Florida | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Georgia | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Hawaii | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Idaho | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Illinois | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Indiana | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Iowa | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Kansas | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Kentucky | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Louisiana | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Maine | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Maryland | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | - |
| Massachusetts | - | - | - | - | - |
| Michigan | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Minnesota | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Mississippi | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Missouri | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Montana | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Nebraska | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Nevada | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| New Hampshire | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| New Jersey | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| New Mexico | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| New York | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| North Carolina | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| North Dakota | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Ohio | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Oklahoma | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Oregon | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Pennsylvania | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Rhode Island | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| South Carolina | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| South Dakota | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Tennessee | 2 | 2 | - | - | 3 |
| Texas | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Utah | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Vermont | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Virginia | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Washington | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| West Virginia | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Wisconsin | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Wyoming | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |

Attempts to raise weight limits

10 Since January 1, 1974, how many times have bills been introduced in your legislature to raise the interstate weight limit?
(Enter number)

_____ Number of times bills introduced

11 If your interstate weight limits have been raised since January 1, 1974, what was your Highway Department's position on the weight increase?

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| - | No response | 1 |
| 1 | Supported the weight increase | 25 |
| 2 | Did not support the weight increase | 3 |
| 3 | No opinion | 9 |
| 4 | Weight limits have not been raised | 12 |

12 If your interstate weight limits have not been raised since January 1, 1974, what is the current opinion of your State Highway Department on raising the interstate weight to the new Federal limit?

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| - | No response | 5 |
| 1 | Support increased weight limit | 4 |
| 2 | Do not support increased weight limit | 6 |
| 3 | No opinion | 2 |
| 4 | Weight limits have been raised | 33 |

| <u>State</u> | <u>Q-10, Bills to Raise Weight Limits</u> | <u>Q-11, State Highway Dept. Position</u> | <u>Q-12, State Highway Dept Current Position</u> |
|----------------|---|---|--|
| Alabama | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Alaska | 0 | - | - |
| Arizona | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Arkansas | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| California | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Colorado | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Connecticut | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| Delaware | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| Florida | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Georgia | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| Hawaii | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Idaho | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Illinois | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Indiana | 5 | 4 | 2 |
| Iowa | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Kansas | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Kentucky | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Louisiana | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Maine | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Maryland | 6 | 4 | - |
| Massachusetts | 4 | 1 | - |
| Michigan | 1 | 1 | - |
| Minnesota | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Mississippi | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Missouri | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| Montana | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Nebraska | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| Nevada | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| New Hampshire | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| New Jersey | 6 | 2 | 4 |
| New Mexico | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| New York | 0 | 1 | - |
| North Carolina | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| North Dakota | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Ohio | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Oklahoma | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Oregon | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Pennsylvania | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| Rhode Island | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| South Carolina | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| South Dakota | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Tennessee | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Texas | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Utah | - | 1 | 4 |
| Vermont | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Virginia | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Washington | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| West Virginia | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Wisconsin | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Wyoming | 3 | 1 | 4 |

13. In the last 3 years, has your State completed any studies in the following areas?

| | <u>Aggregate response</u> | | |
|--|---------------------------|------------|-----------|
| | <u>No response</u> | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
| A. Weight enforcement problems nationwide | 5 | 2 | 43 |
| B. Weight enforcement problems in your State | 5 | 22 | 23 |
| C. Site selection of permanent scales | 3 | 28 | 19 |
| D. Actual or potential impact of Federal weight limit increase | 6 | 10 | 34 |
| E. User tax structure or tax allocation | 7 | 14 | 29 |
| F. Economic benefit of overweight heavy trucking versus their effect on highways | 5 | 11 | 34 |

Q-13, State Research In Last 3 Years

| <u>State</u> | <u>National problem</u> | <u>State problem</u> | <u>Site selection</u> | <u>Impact of federal limits</u> | <u>Tax structure</u> | <u>Heavy truck economic benefit</u> |
|----------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Alabama | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Alaska | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |
| Arizona | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| Arkansas | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| California | Yes | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colorado | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Connecticut | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |
| Delaware | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Florida | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Georgia | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Hawaii | No | Yes | No | No | - | No |
| Idaho | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Illinois | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| Indiana | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Iowa | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Kansas | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Kentucky | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| Louisiana | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |
| Maine | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Maryland | - | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |
| Massachusetts | - | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |
| Michigan | - | - | Yes | - | - | - |
| Minnesota | No | Yes | Yes | - | - | No |
| Mississippi | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| Missouri | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Montana | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Nebraska | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Nevada | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| New Hampshire | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| New Jersey | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| New Mexico | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| New York | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| North Carolina | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| North Dakota | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Ohio | No | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| Oklahoma | No | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Oregon | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Pennsylvania | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Rhode Island | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |
| South Carolina | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| South Dakota | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Tennessee | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| Texas | No | - | - | No | No | Yes |
| Utah | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vermont | No | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Virginia | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Washington | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| West Virginia | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |
| Wisconsin | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| Wyoming | No | No | No | No | No | No |

13. (Continued)

In the last 3 years, has your State completed any studies in the following areas?

| | <u>Aggregate response</u> | | |
|---|---------------------------|------------|-----------|
| | <u>No response</u> | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
| G. Economic benefit of overweight truck operation | 5 | 9 | 36 |
| H. Impact of overweight trucks on: Pavement and bridge conditions | 2 | 17 | 31 |
| I. Maintenance costs | 1 | 15 | 34 |
| J. Highway serviceable life | 1 | 16 | 33 |
| K. Truck safety | 4 | 8 | 38 |
| L. Accidents or fatalities | 3 | 8 | 39 |

Q-13, State Research In Last 3 Years (Cont)

| <u>State</u> | <u>Overweight truck econ benefit</u> | <u>Payment & bridge</u> | <u>Maintenance cost</u> | <u>Highway life</u> | <u>Truck safety</u> | <u>Accident or fatalities</u> |
|----------------|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Alabama | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Alaska | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Arizona | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Arkansas | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| California | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colorado | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Connecticut | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Delaware | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Florida | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Georgia | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| Hawaii | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Idaho | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Illinois | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
| Indiana | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Kansas | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Kentucky | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Louisiana | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | - |
| Maine | No | No | No | No | No | - |
| Maryland | - | - | - | - | - | No |
| Massachusetts | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Michigan | - | - | No | Yes | - | No |
| Minnesota | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | No |
| Mississippi | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Missouri | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Montana | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Nebraska | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Nevada | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| New Hampshire | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| New Jersey | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| New Mexico | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| New York | - | No | No | No | - | - |
| North Carolina | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| North Dakota | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Ohio | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Oklahoma | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Oregon | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| Pennsylvania | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Rhode Island | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| South Carolina | - | No | No | No | No | No |
| South Dakota | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Tennessee | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
| Texas | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Utah | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vermont | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Virginia | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Washington | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| West Virginia | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Wyoming | No | No | No | No | No | No |

CHAPTER 2

WEIGHT LAWS AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

State weight laws vary widely across the Nation for both interstate highways and noninterstate roads. Similarly, the legal framework provided to State weight enforcement authorities varies.

INTERSTATE WEIGHT LIMITS

Currently, 20 States have weight limits which exceed Federal limits in at least one weight category--single axle, tandem axle, or gross vehicle. As a result, Federal limits do not fully apply on almost 13,000 miles, or 32 percent, of the interstate system.

Single-axle limits

The 1956 Federal interstate single-axle limit of 18,000 pounds was raised in early 1975 to 20,000 pounds. State's single-axle limits for interstate highways at the time of our review appear below.

States single-axle weight limits for interstate highways

| <u>Limit</u> (pounds) | <u>Number of States</u> <u>a/</u> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Less than 20,000 | 10 |
| Exactly 20,000 | 26 |
| More than 20,000 | 13 |

a/Alaska does not have interstate highways.

Weight limits above the current Federal limit range from 20,340 to 24,000 pounds, with eight States listing 22,400 pounds.

Tandem-axle limits

The 1956 Federal interstate weight limit for tandem axles was raised from 32,000 to 34,000 pounds in early 1975. At the time of our review, State limits were:

States tandem-axle weight limits
for interstate highways

| <u>Limit</u> (pounds) | <u>Number of States a/</u> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Less than 34,000 | 9 |
| Exactly 34,000 | 25 |
| More than 34,000 | 15 |

a/Alaska does not have interstate highways.

Weight limits above the current Federal limit range from 34,320 pounds to 44,800 pounds, with nine States showing 36,000-pound tandem limits.

Gross vehicle limits

The 1956 interstate gross weight limit, 73,280 pounds, was raised to 80,000 pounds in early 1975. At the time of our review, State limits were:

States gross weight limits
for interstate highways

| <u>Limit</u> (pounds) | <u>Number of States a/</u> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Less than 80,000 | 14 |
| Exactly 80,000 | 32 |
| More than 80,000 | 3 |

a/Alaska does not have interstate highways.

Weight limits above the current Federal limit range from 80,800 pounds to 154,000 pounds.

NONINTERSTATE WEIGHT LIMITS

At least 27 States, with over 47 percent (360,000 miles) of all noninterstate Federal-aid mileage, have higher weight limits on their noninterstate Federal-aid highways than the Federal Government prescribes. These limits are as high as 24,000 pounds for single axles; 44,800 pounds for tandem axles; and 105,000 pounds for gross weight. One State has a 154,000-pound gross weight limit for trucks with 11 axles.

LEGAL PROVISIONS

On the basis of our visits to States, we identified a number of legal provisions that State enforcement officials believed were valuable in enforcing weight limits. We asked the State officials if their State law contained these provisions. Positive responses do not necessarily reflect the degree or frequency of use but whether or not the provision is available.

Responses to these questions showed that there is little uniformity in the enforcement provisions available in the States. Based on our review of State enforcement activities, many States could improve their enforcement by adopting legal provisions proven effective in other States.

Weight limits

14. What interstate weight limits were in effect in your State on July 1, 1956, and what are the current (as of September 30, 1978) interstate weight limits? (Enter weights.)

| | <u>July 1, 1956</u> | <u>Current</u> |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Single axle weight | _____ | _____ |
| Tandem axle weight | _____ | _____ |
| Gross vehicle weight | _____ | _____ |

Q-14, Interstate Weight Limits

| State | Single axle | | Tandem axle | | Gross Weight | |
|----------------|-------------|---------|-------------|---------|--------------|----------|
| | 7/1/56 | Current | 7/1/56 | Current | 7/1/56 | Current |
| Alabama | 18,000 | 20,000 | 36,000 | 34,000 | 64,650 | 80,000 |
| Alaska | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Arizona | 18,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 76,800 | 80,000 |
| Arkansas | - | 18,000 | - | 32,000 | - | 73,280 |
| California | 18,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 76,800 | 80,000 |
| Colorado | 18,000 | 20,000 | 36,000 | 36,000 | 76,200 | 80,000 |
| Connecticut | 22,400 | 22,400 | 36,000 | 36,000 | 73,000 | 73,000 |
| Delaware | - | 20,000 | - | 40,000 | - | 80,000 |
| Florida | 22,000 | 22,000 | 44,000 | 44,000 | 73,271 | 80,000 |
| Georgia | 20,340 | 20,340 | - | 34,000 | 73,280 | 80,000 |
| Hawaii | 24,000 | 24,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 80,800 | 80,800 |
| Idaho | 18,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 76,800 | 80,000 |
| Illinois | 18,000 | 18,000 | 32,000 | 32,000 | 73,280 | 73,280 |
| Indiana | 18,000 | 18,000 | 32,000 | 32,000 | 72,000 | 73,280 |
| Iowa | 18,000 | 18,000 | 32,000 | 32,000 | 73,280 | 73,280 |
| Kansas | 18,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 63,890 | 80,000 |
| Kentucky | 18,000 | 20,000 | - | 34,000 | 42,000 | 80,000 |
| Louisiana | 19,800 | 20,000 | 35,200 | 34,000 | 83,400 | 80,000 |
| Maine | 22,000 | 22,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 50,000 | 80,000 |
| Maryland | 22,400 | 22,400 | 18,000 | 36,000 | 65,000 | 73,280 |
| Massachusetts | 22,400 | 22,400 | 36,000 | 36,000 | 73,280 | 80,000 |
| Michigan | 18,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | - | a/80,000 |
| Minnesota | 18,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 73,280 | 80,000 |
| Mississippi | 18,000 | 18,000 | 24,000 | 32,000 | 57,650 | 73,280 |
| Missouri | 18,000 | 18,000 | 32,000 | 32,000 | 60,010 | 73,280 |
| Montana | 18,000 | 18,000 | 32,000 | 32,000 | 76,800 | 76,800 |
| Nebraska | 18,000 | 18,000 | 32,000 | 32,000 | 64,650 | 71,146 |
| Nevada | 18,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 76,800 | 80,000 |
| New Hampshire | - | 18,000 | - | 36,000 | - | 80,000 |
| New Jersey | 22,400 | 22,400 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 60,000 | 80,000 |
| New Mexico | 21,600 | 21,600 | 34,320 | 34,320 | 86,400 | 86,400 |
| New York | 22,400 | 22,400 | 36,000 | 36,000 | 71,000 | 80,000 |
| North Carolina | 19,000 | 20,000 | 38,000 | 38,000 | 58,800 | 79,800 |
| North Dakota | 18,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 73,280 | 80,000 |
| Ohio | 19,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 78,000 | 80,000 |
| Oklahoma | - | 20,000 | - | 34,000 | - | 80,000 |
| Oregon | 18,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 76,000 | 80,000 |
| Pennsylvania | 18,000 | 22,400 | 26,000 | 36,000 | 68,200 | 73,280 |
| Rhode Island | - | 22,400 | - | 44,800 | - | 80,000 |
| South Carolina | 20,000 | 20,000 | - | 35,200 | 73,280 | 80,000 |
| South Dakota | 18,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 73,280 | 80,000 |
| Tennessee | 18,000 | 18,000 | 32,000 | 32,000 | 55,980 | 73,280 |
| Texas | 18,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 58,420 | 80,000 |
| Utah | 18,000 | 20,000 | 33,000 | 34,000 | 79,900 | 80,000 |
| Vermont | - | 22,400 | - | 36,000 | - | 80,000 |
| Virginia | 18,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 56,800 | 76,000 |
| Washington | 18,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 72,000 | 80,000 |
| West Virginia | 18,000 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 70,000 | 80,000 |
| Wisconsin | 19,500 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 | 73,000 | 80,000 |
| Wyoming | 18,000 | 20,000 | 36,000 | 36,000 | 73,900 | 80,000 |

a/ With multiple, but lighter axles, higher gross weight is allowed. Maximum practical gross weight is 154,000 pounds with 11 axles.

15. Does your State currently have different weight limits for noninterstate highways?

| | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------|---------------------------|
| No response | 0 |
| Yes | 22 |
| No | 28 |

16. To what highways do these different weight limits apply?

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | All noninterstate | 14 |
| 2 | Noninterstate primaries only | 5 |
| 3 | Other highways | 3 |
| - | No response | 28 |

17. What noninterstate weight limits are currently in effect in your State (as of September 30, 1978). (Enter weights.)

| | <u>Current</u> |
|----------------------|----------------|
| Single axle weight | _____ |
| Tandem axle weight | _____ |
| Gross vehicle weight | _____ |

18. Does your State have any general restrictions (i.e., seasonal, type of road etc.) on its basic maximum weight limits?

| | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| No response | 0 |
| Yes | 16 |
| No | 28 |
| May issue limited instructions | 6 |

| State | Q-15, Different limits for non- <u>interstate</u> | Q-16, Highway weight limits apply to | Q-17, Noninterstate limits | | | Q-18, Any general <u>restriction</u> |
|----------------|---|--|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|---|
| | | | Single axle | Tandem axle | Gross vehicle weight | |
| Alabama | Yes | 1 | 20,000 | 40,000 | 84,000 | No |
| Alaska | No | - | - | - | - | Yes |
| Arizona | No | - | 20,000 | 34,000 | 80,000 | May |
| Arkansas | Yes | 3 | - | - | - | No |
| California | Yes | 3 | - | - | - | No |
| Colorado | Yes | 1 | 18,000 | 36,000 | 85,000 | No |
| Connecticut | No | - | 22,400 | 36,000 | 73,000 | No |
| Delaware | No | - | 20,000 | 40,000 | 80,000 | No |
| Florida | No | - | 22,000 | 44,000 | 80,000 | No |
| Georgia | Yes | 3 | 20,340 | a/34,000 | 80,000 | No |
| Hawaii | Yes | 1 | 24,000 | 32,000 | 88,000 | No |
| Idaho | Yes | 1 | 20,000 | 34,000 | 105,500 | Yes |
| Illinois | No | - | 18,000 | 32,000 | 73,280 | No |
| Indiana | No | - | 18,000 | 32,000 | 73,280 | Yes |
| Iowa | No | - | 18,000 | 32,000 | 73,280 | Yes |
| Kansas | Yes | 1 | 20,000 | 34,000 | 85,500 | No |
| Kentucky | Yes | 2 | - | - | a/ - | No |
| Louisiana | Yes | 1 | 22,000 | 37,000 | 80,000 | May |
| Maine | Yes | 1 | 22,000 | 38,000 | 80,000 | Yes |
| Maryland | No | - | 22,400 | 36,000 | 73,280 | No |
| Massachusetts | No | - | 22,400 | 36,000 | 80,000 | No |
| Michigan | No | - | 20,000 | 34,000 | b/ 80,000 | Yes |
| Minnesota | Yes | 2 | 18,000 | 32,000 | a/ 73,280 | Yes |
| Mississippi | Yes | 2 | - | - | a/ - | No |
| Missouri | No | - | 18,000 | 32,000 | 73,280 | No |
| Montana | No | - | 18,000 | 32,000 | 76,800 | May |
| Nebraska | Yes | 1 | 20,000 | 34,000 | 95,000 | Yes |
| Nevada | No | - | 20,000 | 34,000 | 80,000 | May |
| New Hampshire | Yes | 2 | a/ 22,400 | 36,000 | 80,000 | Yes |
| New Jersey | Yes | 2 | 22,400 | 34,000 | 80,000 | No |
| New Mexico | No | - | 21,600 | 34,320 | 86,400 | No |
| New York | No | - | 22,400 | 36,000 | 80,000 | No |
| North Carolina | No | - | 20,000 | 38,000 | 79,800 | No |
| North Dakota | Yes | 1 | 20,000 | 34,000 | 82,000 | Yes |
| Ohio | No | - | 20,000 | 34,000 | 80,000 | No |
| Oklahoma | Yes | 1 | 20,000 | 34,000 | 90,000 | Yes |
| Oregon | No | - | 20,000 | 34,000 | 80,000 | No |
| Pennsylvania | No | - | 22,400 | 36,000 | 73,280 | May |
| Rhode Island | No | - | 22,400 | 44,800 | 80,000 | No |
| South Carolina | Yes | 1 | 20,000 | 36,000 | 73,280 | No |
| South Dakota | Yes | 1 | 20,000 | 34,000 | 95,000 | Yes |
| Tennessee | No | - | 18,000 | 32,000 | 73,280 | No |
| Texas | No | - | 20,000 | 34,000 | 80,000 | No |
| Utah | No | - | 20,000 | 34,000 | 80,000 | May |
| Vermont | No | - | 22,400 | 36,000 | 80,000 | Yes |
| Virginia | No | - | 20,000 | 34,000 | 76,000 | No |
| Washington | No | - | 20,000 | 34,000 | 80,000 | Yes |
| West Virginia | Yes | 1 | 20,000 | 32,000 | 65,000 | Yes |
| Wisconsin | No | - | 20,000 | 34,000 | 80,000 | Yes |
| Wyoming | Yes | 1 | 20,000 | 36,000 | 101,000 | No |

a/ State has variable formula for weight, or highway classification for noninterstate limits
Upper limits appear in the table

b/ Same as a/ on page 29

19. Does your State weight law contain the following provisions? (Check one box for each row)

| | <u>Aggregate response</u> | | |
|---|---------------------------|------------|-----------|
| | <u>No Response</u> | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
| 1. If cargo cannot be made legal by shifting load or other means, require mandatory offloading of the overweight portion of the cargo before allowing the truck to proceed. | 2 | 30 | 18 |
| 2. Make bill of lading or certified weight slip, legal basis for overweight citation. | 2 | 4 | 44 |
| 3. Make it illegal for a person or firm to ship an overweight load. | 1 | 20 | 29 |
| 4. Hold both the shipper and the driver responsible for overweight violations | 3 | 16 | 31 |
| 5. Require simultaneous weighing of all axles | 1 | 6 | 43 |
| 6. Allow the same people who run the scales to issue overweight citations | 2 | 35 | 13 |
| 7. Retain and use overweight truck citation records to identify chronic violators | 1 | 18 | 31 |
| 8. Make driving an overweight truck a moving violation | 4 | 39 | 7 |

Q-19, Legal Provisions

| <u>State</u> | <u>Mandatory off loading</u> | <u>Use of bill of lading</u> | <u>Illegal to ship over-weight</u> | <u>Shipper & driver re-sponsible</u> | <u>All axles simultaneous weighing</u> | <u>Scale operators issue citations</u> | <u>Identify chronic violators</u> | <u>Driving O W Truck moving violation</u> |
|----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Alabama | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Alaska | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Arizona | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
| Arkansas | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| California | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
| Colorado | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| Connecticut | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Delaware | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Florida | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Georgia | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| Hawaii | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Idaho | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Illinois | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Indiana | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Iowa | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Kansas | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Kentucky | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Louisiana | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| Maine | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| Maryland | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| Massachusetts | - | No | no | No | No | No | No | - |
| Michigan | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| Minnesota | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |
| Mississippi | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| Missouri | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Montana | Yes | No | No | - | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Nebraska | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| Nevada | Yes | - | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | - |
| New Hampshire | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| New Jersey | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
| New Mexico | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| New York | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| North Carolina | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| North Dakota | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Ohio | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Oklahoma | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
| Oregon | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Pennsylvania | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Rhode Island | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| South Carolina | Yes | No | Yes | - | No | No | No | No |
| South Dakota | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| Tennessee | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| Texas | No | No | No | No | No | - | Yes | - |
| Utah | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Vermont | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Virginia | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Washington | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| West Virginia | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Wisconsin | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Wyoming | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |

20. How many miles, if any, does your State law permit an enforcement officer to require a truck to drive to a scale for weighing?

| <u>Haul-in distance provision</u> | <u>Number of States</u> |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Not allowed | 4 |
| 1-5 miles | 24 |
| 6-10 miles | 3 |
| Nearest scale | 9 |
| No limit or not specified | 9 |
| No response | 1 |

21. At least one State has a provision assessing overweight trucks for damage based on a per pound charge for the amount of overweight. This charge is automatically assessed against anyone found guilty of an overweight violation, and is in addition to any discretionary fine or court cost assessment. Does your State law contain this or a similar nondiscretionary damage assessment?

| <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|--------------------|---------------------------|
| No response | 0 |
| Yes | 12 |
| No | 23 |
| Similar | 15 |

22. In addition to the provision mentioned in question 19-21, do you have any other provisions of your State law that you feel are particularly effective?

| | |
|-------------|----|
| No response | 7 |
| Yes | 8 |
| No | 35 |

| <u>State</u> | <u>Q-20, Miles to Scales</u> | <u>Q-21, Non- discre- tionary Damage Assessment</u> | <u>Q-22, Other Effective Provisions</u> |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Alabama | 5 | No | No |
| Alaska | Nearest | Similar | - |
| Arizona | 2 | No | No |
| Arkansas | 2 | yes | No |
| California | 5 | Similar | Yes |
| Colorado | 2 | Yes | No |
| Connecticut | Nearest | Similar | - |
| Delaware | - | Yes | No |
| Florida | 2 | Similar | No |
| Georgia | Not spec | Yes | No |
| Hawaii | 2 | No | No |
| Idaho | Not all | No | No |
| Illinois | Nearest | Similar | No |
| Indiana | 2 | No | - |
| Iowa | No limit | No | No |
| Kansas | 5 | No | No |
| Kentucky | 5 | Similar | No |
| Louisiana | Nearest | No | - |
| Maine | 3 | Similar | No |
| Maryland | Not spec | Similar | Yes |
| Massachusetts | 5 | Yes | No |
| Michigan | Nearest | Yes | No |
| Minnesota | 5 | No | Yes |
| Mississippi | No limit | Similar | No |
| Missouri | Not all | Yes | No |
| Montana | 2 | Similar | No |
| Nebraska | Nearest | No | No |
| Nevada | No limit | Yes | No |
| New Hampshire | 10 | No | No |
| New Jersey | 2 | No | No |
| New Mexico | 5 | No | No |
| New York | 3 | No | - |
| North Carolina | 2 | Similar | No |
| North Dakota | No limit | Yes | No |
| Ohio | 3 | No | No |
| Oklahoma | Nearest | No | No |
| Oregon | 5 | No | Yes |
| Pennsylvania | 2 | Similar | No |
| Rhode Island | No limit | Similar | - |
| South Carolina | Nearest | No | - |
| South Dakota | 2 | Yes | No |
| Tennessee | Not all | No | Yes |
| Texas | No limit | No | No |
| Utah | 2 | No | No |
| Vermont | 10 | No | Yes |
| Virginia | 10 | Yes | No |
| Washington | Not all | Yes | Yes |
| West Virginia | 2 | No | No |
| wisconsin | Nearest | Similar | No |
| Wyoming | Not spec | Similar | Yes |

CHAPTER 3

ENFORCEMENT DATA

Our review showed that State weight enforcement programs differ widely in organization, equipment, and enforcement philosophy. These differences were apparent in the responses to the enforcement section of our questionnaire.

ORGANIZATION

In most States a single agency is responsible for enforcing weight limits--20 States have more than one agency weighing trucks. While in most States police agencies are involved in weight enforcement, at least 14 States have no police agency enforcing weight laws. There are 32 nonpolice State agencies enforcing weight limits.

We compared the mileage on which State enforcement officials said they enforce weight laws with the total mileage in the State as shown in chapter 1. While 11 States indicated they enforced weight laws on over 95 percent of their highways, 13 indicated they weigh trucks on less than 15 percent. A breakout of the responses for the 46 States which answered both questions is shown below.

Percent of total miles with weight
enforcement by States agencies

| | <u>0-20</u> | <u>21-40</u> | <u>41-60</u> | <u>61-80</u> | <u>81-100</u> | <u>No response</u> |
|---------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Number of States | 17 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 4 |

At least 38 States do not enforce weight laws on all their highways, but no State provided the Federal Highway Administration with information on county and city enforcement. Based on the mileage on which States said they enforced weight laws, we compared State budget levels, manpower commitments, and number of scales. While this does not measure the effectiveness of State enforcement, we feel that it highlights the differences in State resources committed to weight enforcement.

MONEY

Expenditures per enforcement mile ranged from \$4 to \$406 as shown below.

Expenditures per enforcement mile
(dollars)

| <u>1-50</u> | <u>51-100</u> | <u>101-150</u> | <u>151-200</u> | <u>Over 200</u> | <u>No response</u> |
|-------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| 21 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4 |

PERSONNEL

The ratio of full-time or equivalent personnel to mileage on which the State enforced weight laws ranged from 1 officer for every 59 miles to 1 for every 5,000 miles. The range of responses appears below.

Enforcement miles for each enforcement officer

| <u>1-500</u> | <u>501-1,000</u> | <u>1,001-1,500</u> | <u>1,501-2,000</u> | <u>Over 2,000</u> | <u>No response</u> |
|--------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 27 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 6 |

Equipment

The highest ratio of scales to miles was 1 set per 93 enforcement miles; the lowest was 1 set per 4,000 enforcement miles. The range of responses is shown below.

Enforcement miles per scale sets (Note a)

| <u>1-500</u> | <u>501-1,000</u> | <u>1,001-1,500</u> | <u>1,501-2,000</u> | <u>Over 2,000</u> | <u>No response</u> |
|--------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 17 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 9 |

a/A scale set is one permanent scale or four portable scales.

The number and type of scales available differed greatly. Although 49 States had portable scales, the number available ranged from 2 to 556. Similarly, while 5 States had no permanent scale sites, the number in use in the remaining States ranged from 1 to 64. A total of 28 States indicated they use public or commercial scales as part of their weight enforcement programs.

The States rated how easily their permanent scales could be bypassed as shown below.

Ease of bypassing permanent scales

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Very easily | 133 | 18 |
| Easily | 364 | 48 |
| Borderline | 71 | 9 |
| Difficult | 104 | 14 |
| Very difficult | <u>80</u> | <u>11</u> |
| Total rated | <u>752</u> | <u>100</u> |

The States also provided data on the number of hours their permanent scale sites are operated each week. The range was from less than 24 hours to being continuously open 24 hours a day--168 hours a week.

Permanent scale operating hours

| <u>Hours per week</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
|-----------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 168 | 159 | 21 |
| 120-167 | 98 | 13 |
| 72-119 | 161 | 21 |
| 24-71 | 206 | 27 |
| Less than 24 | <u>142</u> | <u>18</u> |
| Total shown | <u>766</u> | <u>100</u> |

Although a number of reasons were given, most States responded that lack of money or lack of personnel were the principal reasons scales were not operated more often.

TRUCKS WEIGHED

The number of trucks weighed also varied greatly. States that rely heavily on permanent scales generally weighed many trucks but cited a low percentage of those weighed. States using portable scales tended to weigh fewer trucks but issued a much higher percentage of citations.

23. In your State how many State agencies are involved in weighing trucks for weight enforcement purposes?

(Enter number)

_____ Number of agencies

24. Which of the following State agencies weigh trucks for weight enforcement purposes?

A. State Highway Patrol

B. State Police

C. Highway Department

D. Motor Vehicle Registration Division

E. Other (Please specify) _____

Q-24, Agencies Weighing Trucks

| <u>State</u> | <u>Q-23, Agencies Weighing Trucks</u> | <u>State highway patrol</u> | <u>State police</u> | <u>Highway Dept</u> | <u>Motor Vehicle Regis- tration Division</u> | <u>Other</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|--------------|
| Alabama | 2 | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
| Alaska | 1 | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Arizona | 3 | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| Arkansas | 1 | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| California | 1 | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Colorado | 2 | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |
| Connecticut | 2 | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Delaware | 1 | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Florida | 2 | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Georgia | 1 | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| Hawaii | 2 | No | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Idaho | 1 | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| Illinois | 1 | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Indiana | 1 | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Iowa | 1 | no | No | No | No | Yes |
| Kansas | 2 | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |
| Kentucky | 1 | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| Louisiana | 1 | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| Maine | 1 | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Maryland | 1 | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Massachusetts | 2 | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Michigan | 1 | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| Minnesota | 1 | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Mississippi | 1 | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Missouri | 1 | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Montana | 1 | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| Nebraska | 2 | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
| Nevada | 2 | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |
| New Hampshire | 2 | No | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| New Jersey | 2 | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |
| New Mexico | 1 | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| New York | 1 | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| North Carolina | 1 | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| North Dakota | 2 | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
| Ohio | 2 | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
| Oklahoma | 1 | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Oregon | 2 | No | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Pennsylvania | 2 | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
| Rhode Island | 1 | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| South Carolina | 1 | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| South Dakota | 1 | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Tennessee | 1 | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| Texas | 1 | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| Utah | 1 | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Vermont | 2 | No | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| Virginia | 2 | No | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Washington | 1 | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| West Virginia | 1 | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| Wisconsin | 2 | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |
| Wyoming | 3 | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |

25. Approximately what is the current fiscal year operating budget (noncapital) for weight enforcement activities in your State? (Enter amount)

| | | | |
|----------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| \$ _____ | Budget amount | National total | \$68,472,000 |
| | | No response | 5 |

26. How many positions (full time or equivalent) are currently filled by people who have as their primary responsibility the weighing of trucks as part of your State weight enforcement program? (Enter number.)

| | | | |
|-------|---------------------|----------------|-------|
| _____ | Number of positions | National total | 3,722 |
| | | No response | 1 |

27. Approximately on how many miles of highway (all types) are your State-level enforcement efforts carried out? (Enter miles.)

| | | | |
|-------|-------|----------------|-----------|
| _____ | Miles | National total | 1,513,803 |
| | | No response | 4 |

GAO calculations.

_____ Percentage of total mileage in State that enforcement activity covers.

_____ Dollars spent per enforcement official.

_____ Enforcement miles per enforcement official.

| State | Q-25, Budget for Enforcement | Q-26, Number of Positions | Highway miles with enforcement | Percent of total State miles | Dollar/ enforce- ment mile | Enfor mile per enfor official |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | (000 s) | | | | | |
| Alabama | \$915 | 55 | 10,500 | 12 | 11 | 191 |
| Alaska | 895 | 6 | 7,200 | 24 | 406 | 366 |
| Arizona | a/ 216 | 14 | 7,882 | 14 | 27 | 563 |
| Arkansas | 3,066 | 181 | 16,000 | 20 | 191 | 88 |
| California | 9,000 | 166 | 89,027 | 51 | 101 | 536 |
| Colorado | 2,815 | 127 | 9,200 | 12 | 306 | 72 |
| Connecticut | 300 | 16 | 5,000 | 26 | 60 | 312 |
| Delaware | - | 6 | - | - | - | - |
| Florida | 2,371 | 84 | 13,886 | 14 | 170 | 165 |
| Georgia | 1,000 | 101 | 18,250 | 17 | 54 | 180 |
| Hawaii | b/ 150 | 0 | 878 | 91 | 170 | - |
| Idaho | 1,500 | 81 | 57,788 | 100 | 26 | 713 |
| Illinois | 1,367 | 132 | 17,102 | 12 | 79 | 129 |
| Indiana | c/ 647 | 110 | 12,000 | 13 | 53 | 109 |
| Iowa | 1,800 | 95 | 112,451 | 100 | 16 | 1,183 |
| Kansas | 1,265 | 63 | 10,000 | 7 | 126 | 158 |
| Kentucky | 1,740 | 88 | 25,000 | 35 | 69 | 284 |
| Louisiana | 3,700 | 167 | 16,290 | 29 | 227 | 97 |
| Maine | 140 | 7 | 21,000 | 96 | 6 | 3,000 |
| Maryland | 1,300 | 73 | 20,000 | 77 | 65 | 273 |
| Massachusetts | 273 | 16 | 32,000 | 97 | 8 | 2,000 |
| Michigan | - | 88 | - | - | - | - |
| Minnesota | 1,010 | 49 | 12,300 | 9 | 82 | 251 |
| Mississippi | 3,251 | 184 | 10,890 | 15 | 298 | 59 |
| Missouri | 2,290 | 195 | 32,000 | 27 | 71 | 164 |
| Montana | 880 | 57 | 8,937 | 11 | 98 | 156 |
| Nebraska | 1,500 | 68 | 9,858 | 10 | 152 | 144 |
| Nevada | 550 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| New Hampshire | 72 | 6 | 15,415 | 100 | 4 | 2569 |
| New Jersey | 450 | 29 | 33,074 | 100 | 13 | 1,140 |
| New Mexico | 1,500 | 158 | 70,000 | 98 | 21 | 443 |
| New York | 632 | 156 | 108,000 | 98 | 6 | 692 |
| North Carolina | 2,500 | 173 | 55,300 | 60 | 45 | 319 |
| North Dakota | 3,000 | 93 | 106,482 | 120 | 28 | 1,298 |
| Ohio | - | 73 | 19,000 | 17 | - | 260 |
| Oklahoma | 875 | 21 | 109,631 | 100 | 8 | 5,220 |
| Oregon | 1,456 | 85 | 7,592 | 7 | 191 | 89 |
| Pennsylvania | 500 | 26 | 23,946 | 20 | 20 | 921 |
| Rhode Island | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| South Carolina | 596 | 23 | 27,000 | 43 | 221 | 1,173 |
| South Dakota | 450 | 20 | 8,800 | 10 | 51 | 440 |
| Tennessee | 2,499 | 125 | 81,932 | 100 | 30 | 655 |
| Texas | 2,813 | 156 | 65,000 | 25 | 43 | 410 |
| Utah | 1,418 | 60 | 4,109 | 8 | 345 | 68 |
| Vermont | a/ 110 | 6 | 13,592 | 100 | 8 | 2,265 |
| Virginia | 1,870 | 121 | 52,000 | 80 | 36 | 429 |
| Washington | 1,250 | 71 | 47,491 | 56 | 26 | 668 |
| West Virginia | 1,200 | 55 | 25,000 | 67 | 98 | 454 |
| Wisconsin | 1,340 | 36 | 64,000 | 60 | 20 | 1,777 |
| Wyoming | - | 0 | 6,000 | 17 | - | - |
| Total | \$68,472 | 3,722 | 1,513,803 | | | |

a/ Provided data on only one agency

b/ Estimated amount

c/ Budget includes other regulatory functions

28. To your knowledge, do any local governments in your State currently have independent weight enforcement programs?

| | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-----------|---------------------------|
| Yes | 21 |
| No | 26 |
| Uncertain | 3 |

29. If any local governments have independent weight enforcement programs, please identify the localities below.

| <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| No response | 29 |
| State Identified locality | 21 |
| City enforcement only | 6 |
| County enforcement only | 8 |
| City and county enforcement | 7 |

30. Did your 1977 weight enforcement certification to the Federal Highway Administration include only data and statistics regarding your State level enforcement efforts or did it also include data and statistics regarding any independent local weight enforcement efforts (non-State)?

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| - | No response | 0 |
| 1 | State data only | 50 |
| 2 | Other data included | 0 |

| <u>State</u> | Q-28, Any Non-State Enforcement Programs | Q-29, Local Government Enforcement Program | | Q-30, Type info provided in 1977 Cert |
|----------------|---|--|---------------|--|
| | | <u>City</u> | <u>County</u> | |
| Alabama | Yes | - | 1 | 1 |
| Alaska | No | - | - | 1 |
| Arizona | Yes | 1 | - | 1 |
| Arkansas | No | - | - | 1 |
| California | No | - | - | 1 |
| Colorado | No | - | - | 1 |
| Connecticut | Unc | - | - | 1 |
| Delaware | No | - | - | 1 |
| Florida | No | - | - | 1 |
| Georgia | No | - | - | 1 |
| Hawaii | No | - | - | 1 |
| Idaho | Yes | - | 1 | 1 |
| Illinois | Yes | 1 | - | 1 |
| Indiana | Yes | - | 1 | 1 |
| Iowa | No | - | - | 1 |
| Kansas | Yes | - | 1 | 1 |
| Kentucky | No | - | - | 1 |
| Louisiana | Yes | 1 | - | 1 |
| Maine | No | - | - | 1 |
| Maryland | No | - | - | 1 |
| Massachusetts | No | - | - | 1 |
| Michigan | Yes | 1 | - | 1 |
| Minnesota | Yes | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mississippi | Yes | - | 1 | 1 |
| Missouri | Unc | - | - | 1 |
| Montana | Yes | - | 1 | 1 |
| Nebraska | No | - | - | 1 |
| Nevada | No | - | - | 1 |
| New Hampshire | Yes | 1 | - | 1 |
| New Jersey | No | - | - | 1 |
| New Mexico | No | - | - | 1 |
| New York | Yes | - | 1 | 1 |
| North Carolina | No | - | - | 1 |
| North Dakota | Yes | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Ohio | Yes | - | 1 | 1 |
| Oklahoma | No | - | - | 1 |
| Oregon | Yes | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Pennsylvania | Unc | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Rhode Island | Yes | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| South Carolina | No | - | - | 1 |
| South Dakota | No | - | - | 1 |
| Tennessee | No | - | - | 1 |
| Texas | Yes | 1 | - | 1 |
| Utah | No | - | - | 1 |
| Vermont | No | - | - | 1 |
| Virginia | Yes | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Washington | Yes | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| West Virginia | No | - | - | 1 |
| Wisconsin | No | - | - | 1 |
| Wyoming | Yes | - | - | 1 |

Note Answers to questions 31 through 47 deal only with State enforcement efforts, and do not consider local enforcement efforts

Weight enforcement efforts

31 How often, if ever, do State enforcement personnel weigh trucks for enforcement purposes on the following types of highways in your state?

| | | <u>Aggregate response</u> | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <u>A. Urban Interstate</u> | | 2 | 20 | 14 | 7 | 4 | 3 |
| <u>B Urban noninterstate</u> | | | | | | | |
| 1 On State Highway | | | | | | | |
| | <u>System</u> | 0 | 20 | 20 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 2 Not on State | | | | | | | |
| | <u>Highway System</u> | 0 | 2 | 7 | 19 | 7 | 15 |
| <u>C Roads under other local</u> | | | | | | | |
| <u>jurisdiction</u> | | | | | | | |
| 1. On State Highway | | | | | | | |
| | <u>System</u> | 6 | 18 | 10 | 11 | 3 | 2 |
| 2 Not on State High- | | | | | | | |
| | <u>way System</u> | 5 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 12 | 9 |

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> |
|-------------|--------------------|
| - | No response |
| 1 | Very often |
| 2 | Often |
| 3 | Occasionally |
| 4 | Rarely |
| 5 | Never |

Q-31, How Often Does Enforcement Occur On The Following Roads

| <u>State</u> | <u>Urban inter-state</u> | <u>State system</u> | <u>Non-State system</u> | <u>State system</u> | <u>Non-State System</u> |
|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Alabama | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Alaska | - | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Arizona | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Arkansas | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| California | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Colorado | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| Connecticut | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Delaware | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| Florida | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Georgia | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Hawaii | 2 | 2 | 5 | - | 5 |
| Idaho | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Illinois | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Indiana | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| Iowa | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Kansas | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Kentucky | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Louisiana | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| Maine | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Maryland | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Massachusetts | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Michigan | 3 | 3 | 5 | - | - |
| Minnesota | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| Mississippi | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Missouri | 3 | 2 | 5 | - | 5 |
| Montana | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Nebraska | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | - |
| Nevada | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| New Hampshire | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| New Jersey | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| New Mexico | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| New York | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| North Carolina | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| North Dakota | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Ohio | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Oklahoma | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Oregon | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Pennsylvania | 4 | 2 | 4 | - | - |
| Rhode Island | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| South Carolina | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| South Dakota | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| Tennessee | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Texas | 5 | 5 | 5 | - | - |
| Utah | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Vermont | - | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Virginia | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Washington | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| West Virginia | 1 | 1 | 5 | - | - |
| Wisconsin | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Wyoming | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 |

Permanent scales

32 How many State-owned permanent scale sites are currently in use in your State's weight enforcement program?
(Enter number.)

_____ Number permanent scale sites National total 769

33. Consider how easily overweight trucks can bypass your existing permanent scales. How many of the permanent scales in your State fall into each of the categories below. (Enter number of scales, if any, for each category.)

| | <u>Number</u> | | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|----|---------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| A | _____ | Very easily bypassed | 133 |
| B. | _____ | Easily bypassed | 364 |
| C. | _____ | Borderline | 71 |
| D. | _____ | Difficult to bypass | 104 |
| E. | _____ | Very difficult or impossible | <u>80</u> |
| | | Total classified | <u>752</u> |

Note: Arizona did not classify two of its scales;
Missouri did not classify 15.

Q-33, Ease With Which Permanent Scales Are Bypassed

| State | Q-32 | Very easily bypass | Easily bypass | Border- line | Difficult to bypass | Difficult or impossible |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Number of permanent scale sites | | | | | |
| Alabama | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Alaska | 10 | - | 2 | - | 8 | - |
| Arizona | 13 | - | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Arkansas | 19 | - | 10 | 5 | 4 | - |
| California | 49 | - | 10 | 3 | 16 | 20 |
| Colorado | 25 | 4 | 20 | - | - | 1 |
| Connecticut | 6 | - | 6 | - | - | - |
| Delaware | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Florida | 21 | - | - | 1 | 20 | - |
| Georgia | 6 | - | 6 | - | - | - |
| Hawaii | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Idaho | 23 | - | 23 | - | - | - |
| Illinois | 32 | - | 32 | - | - | - |
| Indiana | 15 | 15 | - | - | - | - |
| Iowa | 37 | - | 37 | - | - | - |
| Kansas | 16 | - | - | 12 | 4 | - |
| Kentucky | 15 | 2 | 10 | 2 | - | 1 |
| Louisiana | 11 | - | 11 | - | - | - |
| Maine | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Maryland | 3 | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| Massachusetts | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Michigan | 19 | - | 19 | - | - | - |
| Minnesota | 8 | 8 | - | - | - | - |
| Mississippi | 40 | 13 | 21 | - | 2 | 4 |
| Missouri | 37 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| Montana | 35 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 12 |
| Nebraska | 15 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4 | - |
| Nevada | 2 | 2 | - | - | - | - |
| New Hampshire | 4 | - | - | 4 | - | - |
| New Jersey | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| New Mexico | 15 | - | 9 | - | 6 | - |
| New York | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| North Carolina | 12 | - | 12 | - | - | - |
| North Dakota | 13 | - | 13 | - | - | - |
| Ohio | 23 | 23 | - | - | - | - |
| Oklahoma | 9 | 9 | - | - | - | - |
| Oregon | 64 | 9 | 14 | 9 | 13 | 19 |
| Pennsylvania | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Rhode Island | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| South Carolina | 9 | 9 | - | - | - | - |
| South Dakota | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | - | - |
| Tennessee | 12 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2 | - |
| Texas | 3 | - | 3 | - | - | - |
| Utah | 10 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Vermont | 4 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - |
| Virginia | 14 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Washington | 62 | - | 52 | - | - | 10 |
| West Virginia | 3 | - | 1 | 2 | - | - |
| Wisconsin | 24 | 6 | 17 | 1 | - | - |
| Wyoming | 20 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 3 | - |
| Total | <u>769</u> | <u>133</u> | <u>364</u> | <u>71</u> | <u>104</u> | <u>80</u> |

34. How many of the total number of permanent scale sites currently in use in your State are open for the following lengths of time? (Enter number of scales, if any, for each category.)

| <u>Number of scales</u> | <u>Length of time open</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| _____ | 168 hours a week | 159 |
| _____ | 120-167 hours a week | 98 |
| _____ | 72-119 hours a week | 161 |
| _____ | 24-71 hours a week | 206 |
| _____ | Less than 24 hours a week | <u>142</u> |
| | Total scales shown | <u>766</u> |

35. If you do not operate all permanent scale sites 168 hours a week, briefly explain why.

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| - | No response | 7 |
| 1 | Not cost effective | 2 |
| 2 | Lack of manpower | 17 |
| 3 | Lack of traffic | 4 |
| 4 | Lack of funds | 2 |
| 5 | Used as needed | 7 |
| 6 | Use portable scales instead | 1 |
| 7 | 1 + 3 | 3 |
| 8 | 2 + 3 | 3 |
| 9 | Easily bypassed | 4 |

36. Overall, to what extent, if any, are permanent scales effective in apprehending overweight trucks on the entire interstate system in your State?

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| - | No response | 10 |
| 1 | Very great extent | 1 |
| 2 | Substantial or great extent | 20 |
| 3 | Moderate extent | 10 |
| 4 | Some extent | 4 |
| 5 | Little or no extent | 5 |

Q-34, Hours Per Week Permanent Scales Are Operated

| <u>State</u> | <u>168</u> | <u>120- 167</u> | <u>72- 119</u> | <u>24- 71</u> | <u>less than 24</u> | <u>Q-35, Reason Scales Open Less Than 168 Hours</u> | <u>Q-36, Effect- iveness Per- manent Scales</u> |
|----------------|------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| Alabama | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Alaska | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | - |
| Arizona | 5 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 |
| Arkansas | 14 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| California | 0 | 6 | 28 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Colorado | 19 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Connecticut | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 4 |
| Delaware | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | - |
| Florida | 9 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Georgia | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| Hawaii | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Idaho | 11 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 3 |
| Illinois | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| Indiana | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Iowa | 0 | 0 | 17 | 20 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Kansas | 1 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Kentucky | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Louisiana | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Maine | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 5 |
| Maryland | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 5 |
| Massachusetts | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Michigan | 0 | 6 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Minnesota | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Mississippi | 29 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Missouri | 0 | 4 | 25 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Montana | 2 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 3 |
| Nebraska | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Nevada | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | - |
| New Hampshire | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 2 |
| New Jersey | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| New Mexico | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 |
| New York | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| North Carolina | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 7 | - |
| North Dakota | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 |
| Ohio | 0 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 0 | 9 | 3 |
| Oklahoma | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 |
| Oregon | 2 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 34 | 2 | 2 |
| Pennsylvania | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | - |
| Rhode Island | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| South Carolina | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| South Dakota | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 4 |
| Tennessee | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Texas | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Utah | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 |
| Vermont | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Virginia | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Washington | 4 | 2 | 6 | 17 | 33 | 2 | 2 |
| West Virginia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| Wisconsin | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 10 | 5 | 3 |
| Wyoming | 8 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| Total | <u>159</u> | <u>98</u> | <u>161</u> | <u>206</u> | <u>142</u> | | |

Portable scales

37. How many State-owned portable scales are currently in use in your State's enforcement program? (Enter number.)

_____ Number portable scales National total 4,570

38. How often, if at all, do you use your portable scales for each of the following reasons?

| | <u>Aggregate response</u> | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <u>-</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> |
| A. Preventing bypassing of permanent scales | 5 | 20 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 5 |
| B. Patrolling industrial or construction areas | 3 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 4 | 3 |
| C. Patrolling geographic areas of responsibility | 3 | 36 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| D. Responding to complaints | 2 | 22 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 2 |
| E. Other (Please specify) | 47 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> |
|-------------|----------------------|
| - | No response |
| 1 | Regularly |
| 2 | Frequently |
| 3 | Occasionally |
| 4 | Seldom |
| 5 | Very seldom or never |

Q-38, How Do You Use Your Portable Scales

| <u>State</u> | <u>Q-37, Number of portable scales</u> | <u>Prevent bypass perm scales</u> | <u>Patrol industrial construction</u> | <u>Patrol geographic area</u> | <u>Response to complaint</u> | <u>Others</u> |
|----------------|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Alabama | 100 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 | - |
| Alaska | 48 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Arizona | 10 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | - |
| Arkansas | 68 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | - |
| California | 321 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Colorado | 12 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | - |
| Connecticut | 20 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | - |
| Delaware | 2 | 3 | - | 1 | 3 | - |
| Florida | 167 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Georgia | 272 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | - |
| Hawaii | 4 | 5 | 3 | - | 5 | - |
| Idaho | 28 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | - |
| Illinois | 16 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | - |
| Indiana | 120 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Iowa | 80 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - |
| Kansas | 61 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | - |
| Kentucky | 260 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Louisiana | 30 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Maine | 64 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Maryland | 90 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | - |
| Massachusetts | 52 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Michigan | 124 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | - |
| Minnesota | 71 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | - |
| Mississippi | 60 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | - |
| Missouri | 15 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | - |
| Montana | 29 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | - |
| Nebraska | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | - |
| Nevada | 6 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | - |
| New Hampshire | 44 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | - |
| New Jersey | 32 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | - |
| New Mexico | 10 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - |
| New York | 156 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| North Carolina | 352 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| North Dakota | 84 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Ohio | 98 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Oklahoma | 98 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | - |
| Oregon | 70 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Pennsylvania | 121 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Rhode Island | 12 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| South Carolina | 82 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| South Dakota | 10 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Tennessee | 176 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | - |
| Texas | 556 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Utah | 3 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Vermont | 56 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Virginia | 146 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Washington | 126 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| West Virginia | 90 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - |
| Wisconsin | 110 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | - |
| Wyoming | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | <u>4,570</u> | | | | | |

39 If you had \$1 million to use for the purchase of additional weight enforcement equipment, in your opinion, what would be the most effective way to spend money?

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| - | No response | 4 |
| 1 | Permanent scales | 10 |
| 2 | Portable scale sites | 21 |
| 3 | Weigh-in-motion scales | 7 |
| 4 | Portable scales | 5 |
| 5 | Other permanent scales | 3 |

40 Other than State-owned permanent or portable scales, do you use any other scales as part of your State's weight enforcement program?

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| - | No response | 0 |
| 1 | No | 22 |
| 2 | Yes Commercial scales | 11 |
| 3 | Yes Not specified | 2 |
| 4 | Yes public scales | 9 |
| 5 | Yes private scales | 6 |

41 Do all, some or none of weight enforcement scale operators have the authority to issue overweight citations to the trucks they weigh?

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| - | No response | 0 |
| 1 | All | 39 |
| 2 | Some | 7 |
| 3 | None | 4 |

42 If scale operators cannot issue overweight citations to the trucks they weigh, how are citations usually issued to the violators they detect?

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| - | No response | 38 |
| 1 | Policemen accompany team | 8 |
| 2 | Police on call | 1 |
| 3 | 1 + 2 | 3 |

43. To what extent, if at all, does the need for police assistance to issue citations hamper weight enforcement in your State?

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| - | No response | 36 |
| 1 | Very great extent | 0 |
| 2 | Substantial or great extent | 0 |
| 3 | Moderate extent | 4 |
| 4 | Some extent | 3 |
| 5 | Little or no extent | 7 |

44 In your State, do individuals other than those hired primarily to weigh trucks currently weigh trucks for enforcement purposes?

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|-------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| - | No response | 0 |
| 1 | No | 28 |
| 2 | Yes State Highway Patrol | 22 |

| <u>State</u> | <u>Q-39, Best Use of \$1 Million</u> | <u>Q-40, State Use of Other Scales</u> | <u>Q-41, Do Scale Operators Issue Citations</u> | <u>Q-42, If Not by Scale Operator How</u> | <u>Q-43, Lack of Police Hamper Enforcement</u> | <u>Q-44, Do Others Weigh Trucks</u> |
|----------------|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| Alabama | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Alaska | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Arizona | 3 | 4 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Arkansas | 4 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| California | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| Colorado | 2 | 4 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Connecticut | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| Delaware | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | 5 | 2 |
| Florida | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Georgia | 4 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Hawaii | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| Idaho | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Illinois | 1 | 5 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Indiana | 2 | 4 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Iowa | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Kansas | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Kentucky | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 5 | 1 |
| Louisiana | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Maine | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Maryland | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| Massachusetts | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Michigan | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Minnesota | 4 | 4 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Mississippi | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Missouri | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| Montana | 1 | 4 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Nebraska | 2 | 3 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Nevada | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| New Hampshire | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| New Jersey | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| New Mexico | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| New York | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| North Carolina | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| North Dakota | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Ohio | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| Oklahoma | 1 | 4 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Oregon | 5 | 4 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Pennsylvania | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Rhode Island | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| South Carolina | 2 | 4 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| South Dakota | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Tennessee | 1 | 3 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Texas | 3 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Utah | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Vermont | 5 | 5 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Virginia | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| Washington | 5 | 5 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| West Virginia | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Wisconsin | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Wyoming | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |

45. From October 1, 1976, to September 30, 1977, approximately how many trucks were weighed, as part of your weight enforcement efforts, on permanent scales and how many were weighed on portable scales?

| | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| _____ Weighed on permanent scales | 63,773,001 |
| _____ Weighed on portable scales | 1,494,740 |
| _____ Type of scale not shown | <u>4,695,601</u> |
| | <u>69,963,342</u> |

Note: Seven States did not respond.

46. From October 1, 1976, to September 30, 1977, approximately how many citations were issued to overweight trucks as a result of permanent scale weighings and how many were issued as a result of portable scale weighings?

| | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|---|-------------------------------|
| _____ Citations issued at permanent scales | 255,068 |
| _____ Citations issued at portable scales | 80,048 |
| _____ Type of scale not shown | <u>120,923</u> |
| | <u>456,039</u> |

Note: Six States did not respond.

| State | Q-45, Trucks Weighed | | | Q-46, Citations Issued | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Weighed on permanent scales | Weighed on portable scale | Type of scale not shown | Citation permanent scale | Citation portable scales | Type of scale not shown |
| Alabama | - | 11,075 | - | - | 4,646 | - |
| Alaska | - | - | 26,149 | - | - | 439 |
| Arizona | - | - | 20,031 | - | - | 226 |
| Arkansas | 4,130,861 | 35,210 | - | 2,269 | 4,822 | - |
| California | 4,491,000 | 79,000 | - | 45,733 | 7,644 | - |
| Colorado | 1,724,723 | 434 | - | 4,004 | 138 | - |
| Connecticut | 1,000 | 300 | - | 1,000 | 300 | - |
| Delaware | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Florida | - | - | 3,433,534 | - | - | 24,511 |
| Georgia | - | 263,290 | - | - | 4,461 | - |
| Hawaii | - | 188 | - | - | 12 | - |
| Idaho | 250,000 | 17,000 | - | 1,000 | 2,000 | - |
| Illinois | 5,176,300 | - | - | 30,090 | - | - |
| Indiana | 813,067 | 126,453 | - | 11,122 | 6,891 | - |
| Iowa | - | - | 804,733 | - | - | 15,101 |
| Kansas | 612,735 | 19,691 | - | 2,149 | 739 | - |
| Kentucky | 188,500 | 8,000 | - | 1,266 | 5,257 | - |
| Louisiana | 3,000,000 | 30,000 | - | 4,967 | 2,632 | - |
| Maine | 3,992 | 4,126 | - | 36 | 1,492 | - |
| Maryland | 309,779 | 7,461 | - | 1,858 | 4,238 | - |
| Massachusetts | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Michigan | 1,764,756 | 1,238 | - | - | - | 3,341 |
| Minnesota | - | - | 424,146 | - | - | 5,570 |
| Mississippi | 8,964,000 | 48,200 | - | 7,128 | 2,249 | - |
| Missouri | 3,800,000 | 104,000 | - | 9,478 | 938 | - |
| Montana | 509,143 | 22,443 | - | 4,186 | 963 | - |
| Nebraska | 1,188,100 | 13,767 | - | 19,800 | 4,587 | - |
| Nevada | 602 | 147 | - | 116 | 136 | - |
| New Hampshire | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Jersey | - | - | 21,851 | - | - | 4,436 |
| New Mexico | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New York | - | 39,968 | - | - | 9,992 | - |
| North Carolina | a/4,000,000 | a/500,000 | - | a/10,000 | a/4,300 | - |
| North Dakota | 936,752 | 2,529 | - | 25 | 123 | - |
| Ohio | 4,200,000 | - | - | 10,000 | - | - |
| Oklahoma | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Oregon | 1,066,173 | 9,504 | - | 43,033 | 1,102 | - |
| Pennsylvania | - | - | 12,960 | - | - | 378 |
| Rhode Island | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| South Carolina | - | - | 314,197 | - | - | 7,804 |
| South Dakota | - | - | 20,000 | - | - | 1,500 |
| Tennessee | 2,772,000 | 693,000 | - | 18,000 | 5,000 | - |
| Texas | - | - | - | - | - | 39,071 |
| Utah | 1,727,483 | 15,931 | - | 3,293 | 1,122 | - |
| Vermont | 4,110 | 2,248 | - | 240 | 150 | - |
| Virginia | 6,881,022 | 9,688 | - | 11,726 | 1,881 | - |
| Washington | 4,047,206 | 42,994 | - | - | - | 18,546 |
| West Virginia | 75,538 | 8,555 | - | 221 | 2,233 | - |
| Wisconsin | 1,107,459 | 2,000 | - | 11,882 | - | - |
| Wyoming | 26,700 | - | - | 446 | - | - |
| Total | 63,773,001 | 1,494,740 | 4,695,601 | 255,068 | 80,048 | 120,923 |

a/ Estimates

47. Of the total number of citations issued from October 1, 1977, to September 30, 1977, to overweight trucks, approximately how many were disposed of in the following ways? Totals include estimates.

| <u>Number</u> | <u>Disposition</u> | <u>Aggregate response</u> |
|---------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| _____ | Convicted | 224,916 |
| _____ | Acquitted | 462 |
| _____ | Dismissed | 11,394 |
| _____ | Other | 16,733 |
| _____ | Unknown | <u>159,428</u> |
| | | <u>412,933</u> |

Note: Nine States did not respond.

Q-47, Disposition of Citations

| <u>State</u> | <u>Convicted</u> | <u>Acquitted</u> | <u>Dismissed</u> | <u>Other</u> | <u>Unknown</u> |
|----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Alabama | - | - | - | - | 4,646 |
| Alaska | - | - | - | - | - |
| Arizona | - | - | - | - | 226 |
| Arkansas | 6,941 | - | 150 | - | - |
| California | - | - | - | - | 53,377 |
| Colorado | a/ 3,500 | 50 | 600 | 100 | 150 |
| Connecticut | - | - | - | - | 1,300 |
| Delaware | - | - | - | - | - |
| Florida | - | - | - | - | - |
| Georgia | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hawaii | - | - | - | - | 12 |
| Idaho | 3,000 | - | - | - | - |
| Illinois | 28,100 | - | 1,990 | - | - |
| Indiana | - | - | - | - | 18,013 |
| Iowa | 19,400 | - | 200 | - | - |
| Kansas | 2,392 | - | 73 | 423 | - |
| Kentucky | 1,584 | - | - | - | 4,939 |
| Louisiana | 98 | 2 | - | - | 7,499 |
| Maine | 1,485 | - | - | - | 43 |
| Maryland | 6,059 | - | - | 37 | - |
| Massachusetts | 1,222 | - | 114 | - | - |
| Michigan | - | - | - | - | 3,341 |
| Minnesota | a/ 5,303 | 111 | 156 | - | - |
| Mississippi | 9,377 | - | - | - | - |
| Missouri | - | - | - | - | 10,416 |
| Montana | 5,149 | 47 | 21 | - | - |
| Nebraska | 23,802 | - | 324 | 261 | - |
| Nevada | 150 | 2 | 10 | - | - |
| New Hampshire | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Jersey | 3,234 | 25 | - | - | 1,177 |
| New Mexico | - | - | - | - | - |
| New York | 9,054 | - | 353 | 261 | 324 |
| North Carolina | - | - | - | 14,300 | - |
| North Dakota | 147 | - | - | - | 1 |
| Ohio | - | - | - | - | 10,000 |
| Oklahoma | - | - | - | - | - |
| Oregon | a/ 40,933 | - | 2,100 | - | - |
| Pennsylvania | - | - | - | - | 378 |
| Rhode Island | - | - | - | - | - |
| South Carolina | a/ 7,684 | - | 78 | 78 | - |
| South Dakota | 1,450 | 25 | 25 | - | - |
| Tennessee | 17,250 | - | 4,600 | 1,150 | - |
| Texas | - | - | - | - | 39,071 |
| Utah | - | - | - | - | 4,415 |
| Vermont | 388 | - | 2 | - | - |
| Virginia | 13,327 | - | 157 | 123 | - |
| Washington | - | - | - | - | - |
| West Virginia | 1,800 | 200 | 200 | - | 100 |
| Wisconsin | 11,644 | - | 238 | - | - |
| Wyoming | 443 | - | 3 | - | - |
| Total | 224,916 | 462 | 11,394 | 16,733 | 159,428 |

a/ Estimated

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S
REPORT TO THE CONGRESSEXCESSIVE TRUCK WEIGHT:
AN EXPENSIVE BURDEN WE
CAN NO LONGER SUPPORTD I G E S T

America moves on its roads and these roads are in trouble. They are deteriorating at an accelerated pace and sufficient funds are not available to cope with current needs or meet future requirements.

While there are many uncontrollable causes of highway deterioration, such as weather, excessive truck weight is one cause that can be controlled. By strictly enforcing their weight laws, States could virtually eliminate damage caused by overweight trucks. While controlling truck weights will not eliminate highway deterioration, applying Federal weight limits to all trucks on all Federal-aid highways could reduce it even further.

National statistics show that at least 22 percent of all loaded tractor-trailers exceed State weight limits. This percentage is even higher for other types of large trucks. (See p. 11.)

In 1956, Congress established weight limits for interstate highways as a precondition for Federal highway funding, but these limits do not apply to noninterstate Federal-aid highways--95 percent of the Federal-aid system. Even for interstate highways, higher weights are often allowed. The Federal investment in the Nation's highway system, over \$96 billion since 1956, must be protected. (See p. 37.)

Congress should amend the highway legislation to:

- Make Federal weight limits also apply to noninterstate Federal-aid highways in all States.
- Terminate current exceptions in Federal law that allow higher limits on some interstate highways.

CED-79-94

--Prohibit overweight permits and exemptions when loads can be reduced to meet normal State weight limits. (See p. 47.)

Appendix I of this report contains proposed draft legislation implementing these recommendations.

HIGHWAY DETERIORATION

In 1977, FHWA reported that excluding routine maintenance expenditures, States need over \$18 billion to offset deterioration on the Interstate System through 1996. States will need \$67 billion over the next 20 years to meet similar needs on noninterstate roads on State highway systems. As the rate of deterioration increases, these needs will undoubtedly increase. (See p. 5.)

The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials reported that concentrating large amounts of weight on a single axle multiplies the impact of the weight exponentially. Although a five-axle tractor-trailer loaded to the current 80,000-pound Federal weight limit weighs about the same as 20 automobiles, the impact of the tractor-trailer is dramatically higher. Based on Association data, and confirmed by its officials, such a tractor-trailer has the same impact on an interstate highway as at least 9,600 automobiles. Increasing truck weight causes an ever increasing rate of pavement damage. (See p. 23.)

In 1975, the Federal limits were raised about 10 percent which could increase traffic-related pavement damage by up to 35 percent. Only 63 percent of interstate mileage and 15 percent of interstate bridges can adequately accommodate current heavy truck weights and volume without reducing serviceable life.

Although the Department of Transportation supported the increased Federal weight limits, it has no program sufficient to offset related increased costs to preserve the quality of the highways. The Secretary should address this problem. (See p. 24.)

While the 1975 weight increases were made to save fuel for heavy trucks, all vehicles use more fuel on deteriorated roads; heavier trucks use more fuel; and additional highway repairs require more fuel. Even though pressure is growing to further increase the Federal weight limits, the Department has not determined whether there has been an overall fuel saving since the higher limits were allowed. (See p. 29.)

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1978 requires the Secretary of Transportation to study various aspects of truck weight limits including the desirability of uniform maximum truck weights and the appropriateness of current maximum vehicle weights.

The Congress should be given sufficient information to help it establish the most economical and fuel-efficient weight limits for the Federal-aid highway system and to help it preserve the system. GAO recommends that the Secretary include the following in the weight limit study:

- Determine the net fuel consumption resulting from the impact of heavier truck weights taking into consideration that all vehicles use more fuel on deteriorated highways and fuel is used in maintaining and replacing these highways.
- Identify the economic effect of changes in weight laws, the cost and benefits, who will pay the costs, and who will receive the benefits.
- Determine the impact of any weight limit change on the current highway user tax structure and what changes may be needed to assure equitable allocation of costs.

INADEQUATE WEIGHT LIMITS

Current Federal weight limits do not protect the Federal-aid highway system from deterioration caused by excessive truck weights. This system constitutes only 20 percent of the Nation's highway mileage but carries about 75 percent of the traffic. Federal limits do not

apply to the noninterstate Federal-aid highways, which are generally much less capable of handling heavy trucks than the interstate system. Currently, 27 States have at least one weight limit--single axle, tandem axle, or gross weight--higher than the Federal limits on these noninterstate roads.

For interstate highways, 20 States have at least one weight limit higher than Federal limits because a provision in Federal law allowed States to retain higher limits. This provision also allows States to issue permits and exemptions for millions of unnecessary excessively heavy truck shipments each year.

Differences in State weight laws and permit policies create enforcement problems in States with lower limits, accelerate deterioration in States with higher limits, and present problems for interstate trucking. (See p. 37.)

OVERWEIGHT TRUCKS ON FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

GAO's review of shipping records in 10 States showed numerous instances of routine overweight truck shipments involving the Federal Government and private industry. For example,

- 90 percent of 179 grain deliveries to a Texas port facility exceeded State weight limits; one truck weighing 38,040 pounds over the State gross weight limit had traveled over 470 miles;
- 65 percent of 107 trucks hauling sand and gravel in Ohio were overweight. The average excess weight was 10,395 pounds; and
- 91 percent of 312 shipments from a Government facility in Ohio were overweight; more than 25 percent exceeded the State limits by 30,000 pounds.

STATE ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS

A good weight enforcement program requires effective enforcement techniques, stringent penalties, and adequate staff and funds. GAO identified numerous effective elements, but they were scattered among 50 State programs.

GAO found that many States efforts need improvement. For example:

- State agencies enforce weight laws on only 40 percent of the Nation's highways.
- There is little weight enforcement in urban areas.
- Many States devote only minimal resources to weight enforcement.
- Most fines for overweight violations are too low to be effective deterrents.
- Many States do not have effective enforcement provisions.
- Most permanent scales are ineffective because they are easily avoided. (See p. 61.)

FEDERAL ROLE IN WEIGHT ENFORCEMENT

By law, States must certify annually that they are adequately enforcing their weight limits and provide information on their enforcement efforts. The Secretary of Transportation uses this information to evaluate the adequacy of State efforts. If the Secretary determines that a State is not adequately enforcing State weight limits on Federal-aid highways, he must withhold 10 percent of that State's Federal-aid highway funds.

Despite congressional concern about the adequacy of State enforcement efforts, the Federal Highway Administration has not provided the guidance and assistance necessary to improve State programs.

Recently proposed new certification procedures will not assure adequate enforcement on a national basis because they provide for different performance criteria in each State. Evaluation criteria must assure that all State programs are directed toward a national enforcement objective.

States need a standard to evaluate their program that will enable them to identify problems and reliable alternative solutions.

The Highway Administration could fulfill this need by developing a model program and providing technical assistance through a small full-time group.

The Secretary of Transportation should direct the Federal Highway Administrator to:

- Establish criteria for evaluating weight enforcement certifications and weight enforcement programs that will result in uniform and adequate levels of State enforcement on a national basis.
- Develop, in cooperation with the States, a model weight enforcement program containing effective weight enforcement organization structures, methods, equipment, penalties, and laws.
- Establish a small weight enforcement operating group within the Highway Administration to administer the certification requirement and act as a focal point for gathering and disseminating weight enforcement information and providing ongoing technical assistance to the States.

These and other recommendations are included in chapter 7.

OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

A number of Federal agencies, their contractors, and grantees, ship and receive cargoes in trucks that exceed State weight limits. The Director, Office of Management and Budget, in cooperation with the Secretary of Transportation, should formulate a Government-wide policy including legislation, if necessary, to prevent overweight truck shipments involving Federal agencies. (See p. 52.)

A QUESTION OF SAFETY

Although our review focused on truck weights, weight-related truck safety issues cannot be ignored. The public is being exposed to increasing vehicle size and weight differentials as automobiles get smaller and lighter while trucks become larger and heavier.

In 1969, the Highway Administrator told a congressional committee that he did not have enough reliable information to comment on the safety aspects of a proposed weight increase. As of June 1979, the agency was expecting a draft report on the relationship between truck weight and accidents. This is the first phase of a research project on truck safety scheduled to be completed by 1983. (See p. 30.)

AGENCY COMMENTS AND OUR EVALUATION

The Department of Transportation agreed with most of GAO's findings and supported its recommendations to the Congress. However, there were certain areas of disagreement and a lack of commitment to implement recommended agency action.

Department officials said that current diversity in State laws and practices clearly prevented them from establishing uniform enforcement criteria at this time. They agreed that a model program would be useful to the States but did not say they would develop one. Finally, the Department said it already had the basis for establishing a small operating group but did not discuss its plans to augment enforcement staffing.

Legitimate differences in State laws and practices do not preclude establishing uniform enforcement criteria because alternative approaches for effective enforcement currently exist in the States. Variances in State enforcement levels, methods, and laws will continue to reduce the effectiveness of weight enforcement. States need enforcement criteria to insure that their programs are directed toward a common objective. However, it must be broad enough to allow States to meet the criteria in the manner best suited to their particular needs.

The Department has information available to develop a model weight enforcement program but needs to make a commitment to do it. The Department's experience, the effective State enforcement elements identified in this report, and other information readily available in the

States is sufficient for both establishing the uniform criteria needed to evaluate and improve State weight enforcement and for developing a model program. In addition, the Department has not committed itself to establishing the small group needed to accomplish its enforcement objectives. (See p. 91.)

The Office of Management and Budget and the Department agreed that Federal agencies should be setting a better example in complying with State weight laws. They will discuss instituting a Government-wide policy to control overweight truck shipments and their ability to enforce it. GAO believes if such a policy cannot be developed under current law, OMB should propose new legislation because overweight shipments involving Federal agencies and their contractors and grantees need to be controlled by a unified Federal policy. (See p. 59.)

Single copies of GAO reports are available free of charge. Requests (except by Members of Congress) for additional quantities should be accompanied by payment of \$1.00 per copy.

Requests for single copies (without charge) should be sent to

U S General Accounting Office
Distribution Section, Room 1518
441 G Street, NW
Washington, DC 20548

Requests for multiple copies should be sent with checks or money orders to

U S General Accounting Office
Distribution Section
P O Box 1020
Washington, DC 20013

Checks or money orders should be made payable to the U S General Accounting Office. NOTE: Stamps or Superintendent of Documents coupons will not be accepted.

PLEASE DO NOT SEND CASH

To expedite filling your order, use the report number and date in the lower right corner of the front cover.

GAO reports are now available on microfiche. If such copies will meet your needs, be sure to specify that you want microfiche copies.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

**UNITED STATES
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D C 20548**

**OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300**

**POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U S GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE**



THIRD CLASS