

In the face of protests, these new owners have forced limitations up and up again until some states allow 73,280 pounds on interstate routes—without much real consideration of how the monsters are to get to and from the newest highways without battering older and thinner pavements.

Now the small group of owners of rubber-tired freight cars are within reach of taking off the overall weight limit. They hope to be allowed as much as 105,500 pounds as they spread it over nine axles. They want to operate highway trains of three trailers behind one tractor. They feel penned in by a 96-inch width and want 102 inches.

The House committee members, if they attend hearings or read the record, know the score. They have heard Ross G. Stapp, Wyoming highway chief and chairman of the transport committee of the American Association of State Highway Officials, testify that such size is dangerous.

Mr. Stapp says that even on the interstate system there are bridges unable to take heavier loads than the standards of the years during which they were designed. More than half of the bridges on primary and secondary highway systems are designed only for the old standards of loads.

The committee has heard Lowell K. Bridwell, federal highway administrator, say the proposals would result in higher costs for highway construction and reduced life of highways.

This is the choice before the Public Works Committee. The public that pays for these superhighways ought to be warned.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT,
Wethersfield, Conn., April 23, 1968.

Subject: Vehicle weights and sizes.

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO and HON. DONALD J. IRWIN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: This is in further regard to my letter of February 8, 1968, concerning Senate Bill 2658, a bill to amend Section 127, Title 23, U.S.C.

This bill has now passed the Senate in an amended form and presumably will be before the House in the near future. Therefore, I wish at this time to call attention to my previous comments on this bill and also with regard to its present form.

As presently written, Senate Bill 2658 is "permissible legislation" in that it would allow the individual states to increase their vehicle size and weight limits up to the maximums prescribed in this bill. Also, there is included therein a grandfather clause which would permit states having higher limits than those prescribed in the bill to retain same.

In view of the nature of this bill being "permissible legislation", if this provision and that of the grandfather clause are retained, I can offer no objection to its passage; however, may I reiterate my previous comment that it might be more appropriate to await the results of the investigation of the Point Pleasant disaster, and further, to await the results of studies presently underway by the various bridge and structures people throughout the country before legislating any increase in vehicle weights.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD S. IVES,
State Highway Commissioner.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT,
Wethersfield, Conn., February 8, 1968.

Subject: Vehicle weights and sizes.

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DADDARIO: Attached herewith is a copy of a letter forwarded to Senator Jennings Randolph, Chairman of the Committee on Public Works, relative to the February 19, 20 and 21 hearings to be held on the matter of vehicle sizes and weights, the subject of Senate Bill 2658.