

Mr. CRAMER. Well, as I understand it, the testimony was to the effect that it would have a lesser length life by using the higher axle weights. That is the effect of it, is it not?

Mr. BRADY. Well, that would be the effect.

Mr. CRAMER. One of these days the bridge is going to fall down?

Mr. BRADY. They will not fall down, but you cut back the bridge life and this is a cost.

Mr. CRAMER. Of course, this legislation deals solely with the Interstate System and your testimony deals with substantially the primary system.

Mr. KACHLEIN. Not necessarily, Mr. Cramer. If you will take a look at it, the Interstate System, we stated, was designed on the bridge structure to the one which, if this law were passed, would decrease the useful life of the bridge—and according to Mr. Turner's testimony, overstress them by 30 percent. Because it is the Interstate System that is also defective in its design factor for the proposed legislation; namely, the 20,000 pounds and the 34,000 pounds tandem.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, I asked the previous question relating to single axle and tandem axle, and there has been a report made on the matter. I think perhaps that report answers the question, going from single axles, from 18,000 to 20,000, the equivalent factor of increased percentage of the relationship of load effect on road pavement structure is a 51-percent increase relating to single axles, and then 32,000 to 34,000 relating to tandem axles, 27 percent. So in effect, the effect is about double, going from single to tandem. I think that answers that question.

When we enacted this 1956 bill, there was talk about a grandfather clause. Now, there were some 19 States, according to the paper we have available, in which the single axle and tandem axle maximums in those States were in excess of the then proscribed interstate 18,000 and 32,000 maximums. Now, of course, those have been in existence and been permitted since 1956.

How do you justify in your testimony that we should not preclude those excesses?

Mr. KACHLEIN. We justify it on the ground, sir, that during the 12-year period we have learned our lessons. We have had tests made. We know what damage is being done.

As a result of it, just like we learn in connection with billboards and the like—we had billboards for many years, but we found that they were interfering with the natural beauty of the highways, and therefore we took steps to reduce the use of the billboards on the highways. And here is a case where we say we take steps to reduce certain types of trucks that are damaging the highways, and we give them a reasonable time in which to get off the highways.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, I think you could pick a better example [laughter] because it appears to me that the effect of billboard regulation at least relating to the Interstate System—of course, they have been in existence in many States and accepted under the bonus provision since 1958, so we have had billboard control on the Interstate System since 1958. But it appears to me that largely the effect has been they just build bigger billboards beyond 660 feet.

Mr. KACHLEIN. But you are asking legal justification and I attempted to give it to you; just like we do in any other manner where