

served Elizabeth with distinction and I think his record speaks for itself. Unfortunately, pressing business in Elizabeth has prevented Mayor Dunn from appearing in person today.

Mr. Chairman, Mayor Dunn and I stand in firm opposition to the proposal to increase the size and weight limitations on trucks using the interstate highway system.

The bill pending before your Subcommittee to allow larger and heavier trucks on the Interstate System is essentially anti-safety. This bill would increase present hazards and create new ones. As the American Automobile Association recently warned: "If acted, S. 2685 will turn our interstate highways into truckways, with highway freight trains making travel so uncomfortable and hazardous that passenger car operators will be forced off the newer highways onto other roads not frequented by trucks."

We cannot assume that we are talking about size and weight limitations on Interstate System roads alone. Vehicular traffic on the interstate highways must invariably make use of other non-interstate roads during the cycle of loading and delivery. It is clear to me that once larger and heavier trucks are introduced onto the Interstate System, then all roads must be considered.

This bill would authorize trucks with up to 102 inch wheelbases. At the present time, most States, including New Jersey, restrict trucks to 96 inches in width. Experts agree that lanes at least 12 feet wide are necessary to safely accommodate vehicles with 102 inch wheelbases, and these 12 foot lanes do not take into consideration protruding rear view mirrors and other protruding safety devices. 88 percent of the total road mileage in the United States is two-lane, and 66 percent of the two-lane roads on State primary systems are less than 24 feet in width. Nearly all State secondary roads are less than 24 feet wide. And, despite the glamour of the interstate highway complex, the bulk of truck traffic is now and will continue to be for many years travelling over these relatively narrow two-lane roads. For example, in my own State of New Jersey, over 91 percent of the total highway and city street mileage is county and municipal roadway. Almost all of these roads are less than 24 feet wide. In 1967, there were 5.2 million vehicles registered in the State, an increase of 68 percent over 1966. Annual travel, measured in vehicle miles, rose to 65 billion in 1967, 88 percent over 1966. It should be evident to even a casual observer that New Jersey, as an example, cannot even begin to accommodate larger and heavier trucks in the near future without a tremendous outlay of capital funds for road construction and improvement. And, if we pass this legislation, the pressures will be multiplied many times on the State legislature to increase State imposed limitations correspondingly.

Traffic congestion, even on the Interstate System roads, in New Jersey, during many periods, pushes far beyond the point of safety. And to increase the size and weights of trucks will compound this safety crisis. It, as I said before, will be impossible to maintain two sets of size-weight standards—one for the Interstate System and one, or more, for the States.

Aside from the obvious safety considerations, the increased weights authorized by this legislation will, to a significant degree, speed up the wear and tear on all of our highways and roads and bridges. The burden of maintaining these roads rests with the local and State governments. It seems to me that the decision to increase the allowable deterioration and increase repair costs should be left with the States, rather than being forced on them by an action of the Federal government. Although this bill ostensibly leaves States free to accept or reject the Interstate System Standard, there would be placed on the State decision-making process a great weight to conform to the Federal standard. Until the Federal government is prepared and able to increase substantially its contribution towards the construction and maintenance of non-interstate roads, it is only fair and reasonable to leave regulation of truck sizes and weights to the States who will bear the financial and safety burden.

As an additional consideration, I would like to point out to the Committee that the "1968 Highway Needs Report" recently transmitted to the Congress by the Department of Transportation cited highway transportation in urban and urbanizing areas as of primary concern during the next two decades. Increasing truck sizes and weights can only act to divert sorely needed State and local resources away from urban highway construction, forcing the States to put their efforts into maintenance and repair of other roads which will be adversely affected by increased truck traffic deterioration.