

Mr. BRADY. I was talking about the need to establish the parameter of the problem.

We are building highways, which, if properly maintained and if used to their best advantage, we hope will last 50 years.

Now, after we put these highways in place, even before we put them in place, we should know the size of the vehicles that we expect to operate over them so that we can design them sufficiently so that they will operate the way we expect them to operate.

Now, we have been in this interstate program now for 12 years. We have designed for a specific size of vehicle, 18-32 according to the testimony of the Bureau of Public Roads and AASHO. This is the size of the vehicle that we have designed for. Now we are asked to increase these weights.

We had an overall gross weight when we started, 73,280 pounds. There will be no overall gross weight under the present legislation.

What we are doing, in effect, we are asking the highway engineers to design a highway to bear whatever weights we may at some date in the future determine shall be using this facility. We should design our bridges for practically any weight or any width vehicle that will be using it. This is a pretty unreasonable situation to put the highway engineer in when he is expected to design a facility that is going to last x number of years.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Well, I am sure I am no expert in traffic engineering, but one thing that strikes me, based upon your comments, that we are all sort of paying the price here to answer technology in demands and so on. It is sort of like a cat chasing its own tail. We are describing circumstances. Because of all the economic factors involved, what economic pressures we have would change the size of equipment that would be put to use and that sort of thing.

It does point out one thing, we certainly are going to be extremely busy in all of these categories.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Any questions by the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. McEwen from New York.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Kachlein. I want to clarify if you could an item in your statement. You speak of the proposed 102-inch width, meaning an overall width across the tires of 106 inches. You say this, referring to the 102 inches, does not include tire chains or flexible fenders. When such items are added, you say this brings the overall width to 108 inches, or 12 inches above the present statutory limit.

Now, what I want to clarify, are you saying that the present 96-inch width is held specifically to that width?

Mr. KACHLEIN. No, sir; I do not want to leave that impression. There is approximately 6 inches difference because you have your overhang under your 96 inches presently, sir. Therefore, you would be talking about 102 and 108 inches.

Mr. McEWEN. Right.

Mr. KACHLEIN. When you get your overhang and your hardware on it.

Mr. McEWEN. I take it you would amend your statement and say it would not add 12 inches over the present statutory limit?

Mr. KACHLEIN. That is correct, sir.