

TO AMEND TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE, TO ESTABLISH AN AXLE
WEIGHT TOLERANCE FOR CERTAIN COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLES
TRANSPORTING DRY BULK GOODS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

NOVEMBER 26, 2024.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, from the Committee on Transportation
and Infrastructure, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 3318]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to whom
was referred the bill (H.R. 3318) to amend title 23, United States
Code, to establish an axle weight tolerance for certain commercial
motor vehicles transporting dry bulk goods, and for other purposes,
having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without
amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose of Legislation	2
Background and Need for Legislation	2
Hearings	2
Legislative History and Consideration	3
Committee Votes	3
Committee Oversight Findings and Recommendations	4
New Budget Authority and Tax Expenditures	4
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate	4
Performance Goals and Objectives	9
Duplication of Federal Programs	9
Congressional Earmarks, Limited Tax Benefits, and Limited Tariff Benefits ...	9
Federal Mandates Statement	9
Preemption Clarification	9
Advisory Committee Statement	10
Applicability to Legislative Branch	10
Section-by-Section Analysis of the Legislation	10
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported	10

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

The purpose of H.R. 3318 is to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish an axle weight tolerance for certain commercial motor vehicles transporting dry bulk goods, and for other purposes.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Notwithstanding legislative exemptions, the Federal Bridge Formula, enacted in 1975, sets the weight-to-length ratio of a commercial motor vehicle (CMV) when crossing a bridge.¹ This can be accomplished by spreading weight over additional axles or by increasing the distance between axles.² In addition to Bridge Formula weight limits, Federal law states that single axles are limited to 20,000 pounds, and axles spaced more than 40 inches, and not more than 96 inches apart (tandem axles), are limited to 34,000 pounds.³ Gross vehicle weight is limited to 80,000 pounds (23 U.S.C. § 127).⁴

Dry bulk commodities are small, unpackaged, granular items that can easily separate but are part of one whole product and include items such as aggregates, plastic pellets, grain, feed products, or flour.⁵ Even when properly loaded, dry bulk loads regularly shift within the hauler when transported on highways, at times disproportionately distributing weight among axles due to the normal acceleration and braking of the CMV, and as such must be transported in specialized commercial haulers.⁶ To mitigate these shifts and remain in compliance with Federal weight requirements, CMV operators often underload their vehicles, creating inefficiencies in the supply chain as more CMVs are needed to move the same amount of goods.⁷ H.R. 3318 will provide CMV operators a safe allowance for varying the weighted capacity of dry bulk goods transport, which will decrease overall truck volume and uphold safe vehicle weight ratios for road and bridge freight movement. This legislation will enhance efficiency in our Nation's supply chain by authorizing a ten percent axle weight variance allowance for CMVs on the Interstate Highway System that are transporting dry bulk goods, which regularly shift during transit.

HEARINGS

For the purposes of rule XIII, clause 3(c)(6)(A) of the 118th Congress, the following hearings were used to develop or consider H.R. 3318:

On Wednesday, February 1, 2023, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure held a hearing entitled, “*The State of Transportation Infrastructure and Supply Chain Challenges*.” The hearing provided an opportunity for Members of the Committee to

¹ 23 CFR § 658.17.

² U.S. DEPT OF TRANSP., FHWA, *Bridge Formula Weights* (Aug. 2019), available at https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/freight/publications/brdg_frm_wghts/.

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ Letter from Axle Variance Coalition to Peter DeFazio, Chairman, H. Comm. on Transp. & Infrastructure and Sam Graves, Ranking Member, H. Comm. on Transp. & Infrastructure, (March 1, 2021) (on file with Comm.).

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ Quality Carriers, What is Dry Bulk Trucking? (Jan. 29, 2024), available at <https://qualitycarriers.com/dry-bulk/what-is-dry-bulk-trucking/#:-:text=Dry%20bulk%20trucking%20involves%20transporting,cargo's%20efficient%20loading%20and%20unloading.>

discuss the current state of our Nation’s transportation infrastructure, the implementation of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) (P.L. 117–58) and receive updates on North American supply chain challenges. Members received testimony from Mr. Chris Spear, President and Chief Executive Officer, American Trucking Associations; Mr. Ian Jefferies, President and Chief Executive Officer, Association of American Railroads (AAR); Mr. Jeff Firth, President, Hamilton Construction, on behalf of Associated General Contractors of America (AGC); Mr. Roger Guenther, Executive Director, Port Houston; and Mr. Greg Regan, President, Transportation Trades Department, AFL–CIO (TTD). The witnesses testified about the need to address National supply chain policies, including surface transportation safety and efficiency challenges.

On Wednesday, May 10, 2023, the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit held a hearing entitled, “*Freight Forward: Overcoming Supply Chain Challenges to Deliver for America.*” At the hearing Members received testimony from Mr. William “Lewie” Pugh, Executive Vice President, Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association (OOIDA); Ms. Anne Reinke, President & Chief Executive Officer, Transportation Intermediaries Association (TIA); Mr. David Fialkov, Executive Vice President, Government Affairs for both NATSO, Representing America’s Travel Plazas and Truck Stops (NATSO) and SIGMA: America’s Leading Fuel Marketers (SIGMA); and Cole Scandaglia, Senior Legislative Representative and Transportation Policy Advisor, International Brotherhood of Teamsters (Teamsters). This hearing allowed Members to examine and discuss the trucking industry’s essential link within the Nation’s supply chain, as well as the challenges associated with moving freight by commercial motor vehicles.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY AND CONSIDERATION

H.R. 3318, “*To amend title 23, United States Code, to establish an axle weight tolerance for certain commercial motor vehicles transporting dry bulk goods, and for other purposes,*” was introduced in the United States House of Representatives on May 15, 2023, by Mr. Crawford of Arkansas, with Mr. Carbajal of California as an original cosponsor, and referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Within the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, H.R. 3318 was referred to the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit. The Subcommittee on Highways and Transit was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3318 on May 23, 2023.

The Committee considered H.R. 3318 on May 23, 2023, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, without amendment, by voice vote.

COMMITTEE VOTES

Clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires each committee report to include the total number of votes cast for and against on each record vote on a motion to report and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, and the names of those members voting for and against.

No recorded votes were requested during consideration of H.R. 3318.

COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

With respect to the requirements of clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee's oversight findings and recommendations are reflected in this report.

NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY AND TAX EXPENDITURES

Clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives does not apply where a cost estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the *Congressional Budget Act of 1974* has been timely submitted prior to the filing of the report and is included in the report. Such a cost estimate is included in this report.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

With respect to the requirement of clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 402 of the *Congressional Budget Act of 1974*, the Committee has received the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 3318 from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office:

At a Glance

Supply Chain Legislation

As ordered reported by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on May 23, 2023

On May 23, 2023, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure ordered the following 12 bills to be reported—all aimed at easing concerns about the U.S. supply chain. This single, comprehensive document provides estimates for those bills.

Pay-as-you-go procedures apply to three bills that would affect direct spending—and thus affect the deficit. One bill would affect only direct spending; two bills would affect direct spending and spending subject to appropriation. Nine bills would affect only spending subject to appropriation. None of the bills would affect revenues.

None of the bills would increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2034.

None of the bills would impose intergovernmental or private-sector mandates.

Details of the estimated costs of each bill are discussed in the text below.

Bill	Net Increase or Decrease (-) in the Deficit Over the 2023-2033 Period (Millions of Dollars)	Changes in Spending Subject to Appropriation Over the 2023-2028 Period (Outlays, Millions of Dollars)	Mandate Effects?
H.R. 915	0	*	No
H.R. 1500	0	30	No
H.R. 1836	0	7	No
H.R. 2948	0	*	No
H.R. 3013	0	*	No
H.R. 3316	*	*	No
H.R. 3317 ^a	*	0	No
H.R. 3318	0	*	No
H.R. 3365 ^a	*	*	No
H.R. 3372	0	*	No
H.R. 3395	0	*	No
H.R. 3447	0	*	No

* = between -\$500,000 and \$500,000.

a. Funding for programs affected by H.R. 3317 and H.R. 3365 was designated as an emergency requirement in keeping with section 4112(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress); the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2018; and section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Summary: On May 23, 2023, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure considered multiple pieces of legislation. This document provides estimates for 12 bills that were ordered reported.

The bills would, among other things, direct the Department of Transportation (DOT) or the Federal Maritime Commission to:

- Prioritize grant applications for projects that would improve the resiliency of the supply chain and revise the permitting process for certain port, airport, and pipeline projects, with the goal of accelerating approval;
- Change restrictions on the type, size, and weight of vehicles that can travel on the Interstate highways; and
- Require data collection and new studies aimed at improving the safety and efficiency of domestic transportation systems.

Estimated Federal cost: The bills’ estimated budgetary effects are shown in Table 1. This cost estimate does not include any effects of interaction among the bills. If all 12 bills were combined and enacted as a single piece of legislation, the effects could be different from the sum of the separate estimates, although CBO expects that any differences would be small. The bills’ costs fall within budget function 400 (transportation).

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF THE SUPPLY CHAIN LEGISLATION

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars—						
	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2023–2028
CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION							
H.R. 1500, Intelligent Transportation Integration Act							
Estimated Authorization	0	6	6	6	6	7	31
Estimated Outlays	0	5	6	6	6	7	30
H.R. 1836, Ocean Shipping Reform Implementation Act of 2023							
Estimated Authorization	0	1	1	1	2	2	7
Estimated Outlays	0	1	1	1	2	2	7

CBO estimates that H.R. 915, H.R. 2948, H.R. 3013, H.R. 3316, H.R. 3318, H.R. 3365, H.R. 3372, H.R. 3395, and H.R. 3447, would each increase spending subject to appropriation by less than \$500,000 in every year and over the 2023–2028 period.
CBO estimates that H.R. 3316, H.R. 3317, and H.R. 3365 would each affect direct spending by less than \$500,000 in every year and over the 2023–2033 period.

Basis of estimate: For this estimate, CBO assumes that the bills will be enacted near the end of fiscal year 2023 and that the authorized and estimated amounts will be appropriated each year. Outlays for discretionary programs are estimated based on historical spending patterns for similar programs.

As discussed below, one bill would affect direct spending only and two bills would affect both direct spending and spending subject to appropriation. CBO estimates that the effects of each bill on direct spending would be insignificant over the 2023–2033 period. The other bills would affect spending subject to appropriation alone. None of the bills would affect revenues.

Bill that affects direct spending only: CBO estimates that just one bill would have an insignificant effect on direct spending and no effects on revenues or spending subject to appropriation.

H.R. 3317, the Rolling Stock Protection Act, would remove an exemption from current law that allows a small number of public transit agencies to procure rolling stock from entities owned, controlled, or associated with certain countries. CBO estimates that enacting the bill could change the pace of spending for amounts previously appropriated for the Federal Transit Administration’s Capital Investment Grants, relative to current law. (Those amounts could include funds that were designated as an emergency requirement under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.) However, because few transit agencies would be affected, CBO expects that any changes in spending would total less than \$500,000 in any year and over the 2023–2033 period.

Bills that affect direct spending and spending subject to appropriation: CBO estimates that two bills could have insignificant effects on direct spending and spending subject to appropriation but would not affect revenues.

H.R. 3316, a bill to amend titles 46 and 49, United States Code, to streamline the environmental review process for major projects,

and for other purposes, would require DOT to revise the permitting process for certain port, airport, and pipeline projects, with the aim of making the process more efficient. The bill also would require DOT to maintain a database of projects and to update agency regulations.

Under current law, if an agency fails to meet certain permitting deadlines, specified amounts of funding would be rescinded from that agency's account. Because the bill would expand the number of projects subject to those conditions, enacting H.R. 3316 could reduce direct spending. CBO estimates that any effect would not be significant over the 2023–2033 period because of the small number of projects likely to be affected.

CBO estimates that implementing the bill would increase spending subject to appropriation by less than \$500,000 over the 2023–2028 period, mostly for administrative activities.

H.R. 3365, the Supply Chain Improvement Act, would direct DOT to prioritize consideration of grant applications for projects aimed at improving resiliency in the supply chain, unless those projects support the use of electric vehicles. In particular, the requirement would apply to grants under the Nationally Significant Multimodal Freight and Highway Projects program (known as the INFRA grant program) and the National Infrastructure Project Assistance program. The bill would increase the share of INFRA grants that could be used for intermodal freight rail projects.

The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act provided \$21 billion for those two programs over the 2022–2026 period. (The appropriated amounts were designated as an emergency requirement.) CBO estimates that H.R. 3365 could alter the spending patterns for those previously appropriated amounts, which would be recorded as changes in direct spending. CBO estimates that, on net, those changes would amount to less than \$500,000 in any year and over the 2023–2033 period.

H.R. 3365 also would direct the Government Accountability Office to report on the effects of electric vehicles in several areas, including infrastructure integrity and grid security. The bill also would prevent agencies from prioritizing any project seeking to use grants that would support electric vehicles until a subsequent act of Congress has been passed allowing such prioritization. Using information about similar reports, CBO estimates that the report would cost less than \$500,000 over the 2023–2028 period; such spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated amounts.

Bills that affect spending subject to appropriation by a significant amount: CBO estimates that two bills would affect spending subject to appropriation by more than \$500,000 over the 2023–2028 period. The costs for those two bills are shown in Table 1. Neither bill would affect direct spending or revenues.

H.R. 1500, the Intelligent Transportation Integration Act, would require DOT to purchase certain data from public and private entities to help improve the department's management of traffic and transportation infrastructure. DOT would be required to report to the Congress annually on those activities. Using information from the agency about similar contracting activities, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1500 would cost \$30 million over the 2023–2028 period, assuming appropriation of the estimated amounts.

H.R. 1836, the Ocean Shipping Reform Implementation Act of 2023, would create additional administrative and reporting requirements for the Federal Maritime Commission, including a requirement to issue two new regulations and publish a study. The bill also would establish two advisory committees to assist the commission in creating policies to ensure competitiveness, reliability, and efficiency in international ocean shipping.

Using information on similar administrative requirements and accounting for anticipated inflation, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1836 would cost \$7 million over the 2023–2028 period; any spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated amounts.

Bills that affect spending subject to appropriation by an insignificant amount: CBO estimates that implementing the following seven bills would cost less than \$500,000 each over the 2023–2028 period. None of the bills would affect direct spending or revenues.

H.R. 915, the Motor Carrier Safety Selection Standard Act, would create new standards for certain motor carriers that transport goods, require DOT to update regulations to be consistent with those standards, and direct the department to stipulate the method for revoking a motor carrier’s registration.

H.R. 2948, the CARS Act, would require states to allow certain stinger-steered automobile transporters to operate on Interstate highways. (Such transporters have a fifth wheel located below the rear-most axle of the power unit.)

H.R. 3013, the LICENSE Act of 2023, would require DOT to issue regulations updating the qualifications to be a commercial driver’s license examiner. The bill also would allow states to administer those tests to out-of-state applicants.

H.R. 3318, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish an axle weight tolerance for certain commercial motor vehicles transporting dry bulk goods, and for other purposes, would increase the maximum weight per axle that a commercial vehicle transporting dry bulk goods can carry on an Interstate highway. The bill would not change the overall gross vehicle weight limits for such vehicles.

H.R. 3372, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a safety data collection program for certain 6-axle vehicles, and for other purposes, would create a pilot program allowing certain six-axle vehicles to be operated on Interstate highways. Under the bill, participating states would issue permits by vehicle or by group of vehicles that would specify acceptable routes and require permit holders to report on accidents and other details. The program would be discontinued after five years, although DOT could extend the program for five years.

H.R. 3395, the U.S. Supply Chain Security Review Act of 2023, would require the Federal Maritime Commission to study the effects of foreign ownership of domestic marine terminals on U.S. economic security and report those findings to the Congress.

H.R. 3447, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize a hydrogen powered vehicle to exceed certain weight limits on the Interstate Highway System, and for other purposes, would authorize hydrogen-powered vehicles to exceed certain weight limits specified under current law.

Pay-As-You-Go considerations: The Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 establishes budget-reporting and enforcement procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or revenues. Over the 2023–2033 period, CBO estimates that none of the bills would increase direct spending by more than \$500,000.

Increase in long-term net direct spending and deficits: None.

Mandates: None.

Estimate prepared by: Federal costs: Aaron Krupkin (for Federal Maritime Commission); Robert Reese (for Department of Transportation). Mandates: Brandon Lever.

Estimate reviewed by: Susan Willie, Chief, Natural and Physical Resources Cost Estimates Unit; Kathleen FitzGerald, Chief, Public and Private Mandates Unit; H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Director of Budget Analysis.

Estimate approved by: Phillip L. Swagel, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

With respect to the requirement of clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the performance goal and objective of this legislation is to authorize a 10 percent axle variance for CMVs on the Interstate Highway System transporting dry bulk goods.

DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(5) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds that no provision of H.R. 3318 establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal government known to be duplicative of another Federal program, a program that was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111–139, or a program related to a program identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, AND LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

In compliance with clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this bill, as reported, contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(e), 9(f), or 9(g) of the rule XXI.

FEDERAL MANDATES STATEMENT

The Committee adopts as its own the estimate of Federal mandates prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 423 of the *Unfunded Mandates Reform Act* (Public Law 104–4).

PREEMPTION CLARIFICATION

Section 423 of the *Congressional Budget Act of 1974* requires the report of any Committee on a bill or joint resolution to include a statement on the extent to which the bill or joint resolution is intended to preempt state, local, or tribal law. The Committee finds that H.R. 3318 does not preempt any state, local, or tribal law.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE STATEMENT

No advisory committees within the meaning of section 5(b) of the *Federal Advisory Committee Act* were created by this legislation.

APPLICABILITY TO LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The Committee finds that the legislation does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the *Congressional Accountability Act* (Public Law 104–1).

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE LEGISLATION

Section 1. Dry bulk weight tolerance.

This section authorizes a ten percent axle weight tolerance for commercial motor vehicles transporting dry bulk goods and defines the term for purposes of the legislation.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (new matter is printed in italics and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE

* * * * *

CHAPTER 1—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

* * * * *

§ 127. Vehicle weight limitations—Interstate System

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) The Secretary shall withhold 50 percent of the apportionment of a State under section 104(b)(1) in any fiscal year in which the State does not permit the use of The Dwight D. Eisenhower System of Interstate and Defense Highways within its boundaries by vehicles with a weight of twenty thousand pounds carried on any one axle, including enforcement tolerances, or with a tandem axle weight of thirty-four thousand pounds, including enforcement tolerances, or a gross weight of at least eighty thousand pounds for vehicle combinations of five axles or more.

(2) However, the maximum gross weight to be allowed by any State for vehicles using The Dwight D. Eisenhower System of Interstate and Defense Highways shall be twenty thousand

pounds carried on one axle, including enforcement tolerances, and a tandem axle weight of thirty-four thousand pounds, including enforcement tolerances and with an overall maximum gross weight, including enforcement tolerances, on a group of two or more consecutive axles produced by application of the following formula:

LN

$W=500 \text{ AXXXXX}+12N+36B$

N-1

where W equals overall gross weight on any group of two or more consecutive axles to the nearest five hundred pounds, L equals distance in feet between the extreme of any group of two or more consecutive axles, and N equals number of axles in group under consideration, except that two consecutive sets of tandem axles may carry a gross load of thirty-four thousand pounds each providing the overall distance between the first and last axles of such consecutive sets of tandem axles (1) is thirty-six feet or more, or (2) in the case of a motor vehicle hauling any tank trailer, dump trailer, or ocean transport container before September 1, 1989, is 30 feet or more: *Provided*, That such overall gross weight may not exceed eighty thousand pounds, including all enforcement tolerances, except for vehicles using Interstate Route 29 between Sioux City, Iowa, and the border between Iowa and South Dakota or vehicles using Interstate Route 129 between Sioux City, Iowa, and the border between Iowa and Nebraska, and except for those vehicles and loads which cannot be easily dismantled or divided and which have been issued special permits in accordance with applicable State laws, or the corresponding maximum weights permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws or regulations established by appropriate State authority in effect on July 1, 1956, except in the case of the overall gross weight of any group of two or more consecutive axles on any vehicle (other than a vehicle comprised of a motor vehicle hauling any tank trailer, dump trailer, or ocean transport container on or after September 1, 1989), on the date of enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Amendments of 1974, whichever is the greater.

(3) Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to the foregoing provisions shall lapse if not released and obligated within the availability period specified in section 118(b).

(4) This section shall not be construed to deny apportionment to any State allowing the operation within such State of any vehicles or combinations thereof, other than vehicles or combinations subject to subsection (d) of this section, which the State determines could be lawfully operated within such State on July 1, 1956, except in the case of the overall gross weight of any group of two or more consecutive axles, on the date of enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Amendments of 1974.

(5) With respect to the State of Hawaii, laws or regulations in effect on February 1, 1960, shall be applicable for the purposes of this section in lieu of those in effect on July 1, 1956.

(6) With respect to the State of Colorado, vehicles designed to carry 2 or more precast concrete panels shall be considered a nondivisible load.

(7) With respect to the State of Michigan, laws or regulations in effect on May 1, 1982, shall be applicable for the purposes of this subsection.

(8) With respect to the State of Maryland, laws and regulations in effect on June 1, 1993, shall be applicable for the purposes of this subsection.

(9) The State of Louisiana may allow, by special permit, the operation of vehicles with a gross vehicle weight of up to 100,000 pounds for the hauling of sugarcane during the harvest season, not to exceed 100 days annually.

(10) With respect to Interstate Routes 89, 93, and 95 in the State of New Hampshire—

(A) State laws (including regulations) concerning vehicle weight limitations that were in effect on January 1, 1987, and are applicable to State highways other than the Interstate System, shall be applicable in lieu of the requirements of this subsection; and

(B) effective June 30, 2016, a combination of truck-tractor and dump trailer equipped with 6 axles or more with a gross weight of up to 99,000 pounds shall be permitted if the distances between the extreme axles, excluding the steering axle, is 28 feet or more.

(11)(A) With respect to all portions of the Interstate Highway System in the State of Maine, laws (including regulations) of that State concerning vehicle weight limitations applicable to other State highways shall be applicable in lieu of the requirements under this subsection.

(B) With respect to all portions of the Interstate Highway System in the State of Vermont, laws (including regulations) of that State concerning vehicle weight limitations applicable to other State highways shall be applicable in lieu of the requirements under this subsection.

(12) HEAVY DUTY VEHICLES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), in order to promote reduction of fuel use and emissions because of engine idling, the maximum gross vehicle weight limit and the axle weight limit for any heavy-duty vehicle equipped with an idle reduction technology shall be increased by a quantity necessary to compensate for the additional weight of the idle reduction system.

(B) MAXIMUM WEIGHT INCREASE.—The weight increase under subparagraph (A) shall be not greater than 550 pounds.

(C) PROOF.—On request by a regulatory agency or law enforcement agency, the vehicle operator shall provide proof (through demonstration or certification) that—

(i) the idle reduction technology is fully functional at all times; and

(ii) the 550-pound gross weight increase is not used for any purpose other than the use of idle reduction technology described in subparagraph (A).

(13) MILK PRODUCTS.—A vehicle carrying fluid milk products shall be considered a load that cannot be easily dismantled or divided.

(b) REASONABLE ACCESS.—No State may enact or enforce any law denying reasonable access to motor vehicles subject to this title to and from the Interstate Highway System to terminals and facilities for food, fuel, repairs, and rest.

(c) OCEAN TRANSPORT CONTAINER DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “ocean transport container” has the meaning given the term “freight container” by the International Standards Organization in Series 1, Freight Containers, 3rd Edition (reference number ISO668–1979(E)) as in effect on the date of the enactment of this subsection.

(d) LONGER COMBINATION VEHICLES.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—

(A) GENERAL CONTINUATION RULE.—A longer combination vehicle may continue to operate only if the longer combination vehicle configuration type was authorized by State officials pursuant to State statute or regulation conforming to this section and in actual lawful operation on a regular or periodic basis (including seasonal operations) on or before June 1, 1991, or pursuant to section 335 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991 (104 Stat. 2186).

(B) APPLICABILITY OF STATE LAWS AND REGULATIONS.—All such operations shall continue to be subject to, at the minimum, all State statutes, regulations, limitations and conditions, including, but not limited to, routing-specific and configuration-specific designations and all other restrictions, in force on June 1, 1991; except that subject to such regulations as may be issued by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (5) of this subsection, the State may make minor adjustments of a temporary and emergency nature to route designations and vehicle operating restrictions in effect on June 1, 1991, for specific safety purposes and road construction.

(C) WYOMING.—In addition to those vehicles allowed under subparagraph (A), the State of Wyoming may allow the operation of additional vehicle configurations not in actual operation on June 1, 1991, but authorized by State law not later than November 3, 1992, if such vehicle configurations comply with the single axle, tandem axle, and bridge formula limits set forth in subsection (a) and do not exceed 117,000 pounds gross vehicle weight.

(D) OHIO.—In addition to vehicles which the State of Ohio may continue to allow to be operated under subparagraph (A), such State may allow longer combination vehicles with 3 cargo carrying units of 28½ feet each (not including the truck tractor) not in actual operation on June 1, 1991, to be operated within its boundaries on the 1-mile segment of Ohio State Route 7 which begins at and is south of exit 16 of the Ohio Turnpike.

(E) ALASKA.—In addition to vehicles which the State of Alaska may continue to allow to be operated under subparagraph (A), such State may allow the operation of longer combination vehicles which were not in actual operation on June 1, 1991, but which were in actual operation prior to July 5, 1991.

(F) IOWA.—In addition to vehicles that the State of Iowa may continue to allow to be operated under subparagraph (A), the State may allow longer combination vehicles that were not in actual operation on June 1, 1991, to be operated on Interstate Route 29 between Sioux City, Iowa, and the border between Iowa and South Dakota or Interstate Route 129 between Sioux City, Iowa, and the border between Iowa and Nebraska.

(2) ADDITIONAL STATE RESTRICTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this subsection shall prevent any State from further restricting in any manner or prohibiting the operation of longer combination vehicles otherwise authorized under this subsection; except that such restrictions or prohibitions shall be consistent with the requirements of sections 31111–31114 of title 49.

(B) MINOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Any State further restricting or prohibiting the operations of longer combination vehicles or making minor adjustments of a temporary and emergency nature as may be allowed pursuant to regulations issued by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (5) of this subsection, shall, within 30 days, advise the Secretary of such action, and the Secretary shall publish a notice of such action in the Federal Register.

(3) PUBLICATION OF LIST.—

(A) SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY.—Within 60 days of the date of the enactment of this subsection, each State (i) shall submit to the Secretary for publication in the Federal Register a complete list of (I) all operations of longer combination vehicles being conducted as of June 1, 1991, pursuant to State statutes and regulations; (II) all limitations and conditions, including, but not limited to, routing-specific and configuration-specific designations and all other restrictions, governing the operation of longer combination vehicles otherwise prohibited under this subsection; and (III) such statutes, regulations, limitations, and conditions; and (ii) shall submit to the Secretary copies of such statutes, regulations, limitations, and conditions.

(B) INTERIM LIST.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall publish an interim list in the Federal Register, consisting of all information submitted pursuant to subparagraph (A). The Secretary shall review for accuracy all information submitted by the States pursuant to subparagraph (A) and shall solicit and consider public comment on the accuracy of all such information.

(C) LIMITATION.—No statute or regulation shall be included on the list submitted by a State or published by the Secretary merely on the grounds that it authorized, or could have authorized, by permit or otherwise, the operation of longer combination vehicles, not in actual operation on a regular or periodic basis on or before June 1, 1991.

(D) FINAL LIST.—Except as modified pursuant to paragraph (1)(C) of this subsection, the list shall be published as final in the Federal Register not later than 180 days

after the date of the enactment of this subsection. In publishing the final list, the Secretary shall make any revisions necessary to correct inaccuracies identified under subparagraph (B). After publication of the final list, longer combination vehicles may not operate on the Interstate System except as provided in the list.

(E) REVIEW AND CORRECTION PROCEDURE.—The Secretary, on his or her own motion or upon a request by any person (including a State), shall review the list issued by the Secretary pursuant to subparagraph (D). If the Secretary determines there is cause to believe that a mistake was made in the accuracy of the final list, the Secretary shall commence a proceeding to determine whether the list published pursuant to subparagraph (D) should be corrected. If the Secretary determines that there is a mistake in the accuracy of the list the Secretary shall correct the publication under subparagraph (D) to reflect the determination of the Secretary.

(4) LONGER COMBINATION VEHICLE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “longer combination vehicle” means any combination of a truck tractor and 2 or more trailers or semitrailers which operates on the Interstate System at a gross vehicle weight greater than 80,000 pounds.

(5) REGULATIONS REGARDING MINOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall issue regulations establishing criteria for the States to follow in making minor adjustments under paragraph (1)(B).

(e) OPERATION OF CERTAIN SPECIALIZED HAULING VEHICLES ON INTERSTATE ROUTE 68.—The single axle, tandem axle, and bridge formula limits set forth in subsection (a) shall not apply to the operation on Interstate Route 68 in Garrett and Allegany Counties, Maryland, of any specialized vehicle equipped with a steering axle and a tridem axle and used for hauling coal, logs, and pulpwood if such vehicle is of a type of vehicle as was operating in such counties on United States Route 40 or 48 for such purpose on August 1, 1991.

(f) OPERATION OF CERTAIN SPECIALIZED HAULING VEHICLES ON CERTAIN WISCONSIN HIGHWAYS.—If the 104-mile portion of Wisconsin State Route 78 and United States Route 51 between Interstate Route 94 near Portage, Wisconsin, and Wisconsin State Route 29 south of Wausau, Wisconsin, is designated as part of the Interstate System under section 103(c)(4)(A), the single axle weight, tandem axle weight, gross vehicle weight, and bridge formula limits set forth in subsection (a) shall not apply to the 104-mile portion with respect to the operation of any vehicle that could legally operate on the 104-mile portion before the date of the enactment of this subsection.

(g) OPERATION OF CERTAIN SPECIALIZED HAULING VEHICLES ON CERTAIN PENNSYLVANIA HIGHWAYS.—If the segment of United States Route 220 between Bedford and Bald Eagle, Pennsylvania, is designated as part of the Interstate System, the single axle weight, tandem axle weight, gross vehicle weight, and bridge formula limits set forth in subsection (a) shall not apply to that segment with respect to the operation of any vehicle which could have

legally operated on that segment before the date of the enactment of this subsection.

(h) WAIVER FOR A ROUTE IN STATE OF MAINE DURING PERIODS OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, may waive or limit the application of any vehicle weight limit established under this section with respect to the portion of Interstate Route 95 in the State of Maine between Augusta and Bangor for the purpose of making bulk shipments of jet fuel to the Air National Guard Base at Bangor International Airport during a period of national emergency in order to respond to the effects of the national emergency.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—Emergency limits established under paragraph (1) shall preempt any inconsistent State vehicle weight limits.

(i) SPECIAL PERMITS DURING PERIODS OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a State may issue special permits during an emergency to overweight vehicles and loads that can easily be dismantled or divided if—

(A) the President has declared the emergency to be a major disaster under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.);

(B) the permits are issued in accordance with State law; and

(C) the permits are issued exclusively to vehicles and loads that are delivering relief supplies.

(2) EXPIRATION.—A permit issued under paragraph (1) shall expire not later than 120 days after the date of the declaration of emergency under subparagraph (A) of that paragraph.

(j) OPERATION OF VEHICLES ON CERTAIN OTHER WISCONSIN HIGHWAYS.—If any segment of the United States Route 41 corridor, as described in section 1105(c)(57) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, is designated as a route on the Interstate System, a vehicle that could operate legally on that segment before the date of such designation may continue to operate on that segment, without regard to any requirement under subsection (a).

(k) OPERATION OF VEHICLES ON CERTAIN MISSISSIPPI HIGHWAYS.—If any segment of United States Route 78 in Mississippi from mile marker 0 to mile marker 113 is designated as part of the Interstate System, no limit established under this section may apply to that segment with respect to the operation of any vehicle that could have legally operated on that segment before such designation.

(l) OPERATION OF VEHICLES ON CERTAIN KENTUCKY HIGHWAYS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If any segment of highway described in paragraph (2) is designated as a route on the Interstate System, a vehicle that could operate legally on that segment before the date of such designation may continue to operate on that segment, without regard to any requirement under subsection (a).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF HIGHWAY SEGMENTS.—The highway segments referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) Interstate Route 69 in Kentucky (formerly the Wendell H. Ford (Western Kentucky) Parkway) from the Interstate Route 24 Interchange, near Eddyville, to the Edward T. Breathitt (Pennyrile) Parkway Interchange.

(B) The Edward T. Breathitt (Pennyrile) Parkway (to be designated as Interstate Route 69) in Kentucky from the Wendell H. Ford (Western Kentucky) Parkway Interchange to near milepost 77, and on new alignment to an interchange on the Audubon Parkway, if the segment is designated as part of the Interstate System.

(3) ADDITIONAL HIGHWAY SEGMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If any segment of highway described in clauses (i) through (v) is designated as a route of the Interstate System, a vehicle that could operate legally on that segment before the date of such designation may continue to operate on that segment, without regard to any requirement under subsection (a), except that such vehicle shall not exceed a gross vehicle weight of 120,000 pounds. The highway segments referred to in this paragraph are as follows:

(i) The William H. Natcher Parkway (to be designated as a spur of Interstate Route 65) from Interstate Route 65 in Bowling Green, Kentucky, to United States Route 60 in Owensboro, Kentucky.

(ii) The Julian M. Carroll (Purchase) Parkway (to be designated as Interstate Route 69) in Kentucky from the Tennessee state line to the interchange with Interstate Route 24, near Calvert City.

(iii) The Wendell H. Ford (Western Kentucky) Parkway (to be designated as a spur of Interstate Route 69) from the interchange with the William H. Natcher Parkway in Ohio County, Kentucky, west to the interchange of the Western Kentucky Parkway with the Edward T. Breathitt (Pennyrile) Parkway.

(iv) The Edward T. Breathitt (Pennyrile) Parkway (to be designated as a spur of Interstate Route 69) from Interstate 24, north to Interstate 69.

(v) The Louie B. Nunn Cumberland Expressway (to be designated as a spur of Interstate Route 65) from the interchange with Interstate Route 65 in Barren County, Kentucky, east to the interchange with United States Highway 27 in Somerset, Kentucky.

(B) NONDIVISIBLE LOAD OR VEHICLE.—Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit the State from issuing a permit for a nondivisible load or vehicle with a gross vehicle weight that exceeds 120,000 pounds.

(m) COVERED HEAVY-DUTY TOW AND RECOVERY VEHICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The vehicle weight limitations set forth in this section do not apply to a covered heavy-duty tow and recovery vehicle.

(2) COVERED HEAVY-DUTY TOW AND RECOVERY VEHICLE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “covered heavy-duty tow and recovery vehicle” means a vehicle that—

(A) is transporting a disabled vehicle from the place where the vehicle became disabled to the nearest appropriate repair facility; and

(B) has a gross vehicle weight that is equal to or exceeds the gross vehicle weight of the disabled vehicle being transported.

(n) OPERATION OF VEHICLES ON CERTAIN HIGHWAYS IN THE STATE OF TEXAS.—If any segment in the State of Texas of United States Route 59, United States Route 77, United States Route 281, United States Route 84, Texas State Highway 44, or another roadway is designated as Interstate Route 69, a vehicle that could operate legally on that segment before the date of the designation may continue to operate on that segment, without regard to any requirement under this section.

(o) CERTAIN LOGGING VEHICLES IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall waive, with respect to a covered logging vehicle, the application of any vehicle weight limit established under this section.

(2) COVERED LOGGING VEHICLE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “covered logging vehicle” means a vehicle that—

(A) is transporting raw or unfinished forest products, including logs, pulpwood, biomass, or wood chips;

(B) has a gross vehicle weight of not more than 98,000 pounds;

(C) has not less than 6 axles; and

(D) is operating on a segment of Interstate Route 39 in the State of Wisconsin from mile marker 175.8 to mile marker 189.

(p) OPERATION OF CERTAIN SPECIALIZED VEHICLES ON CERTAIN HIGHWAYS IN THE STATE OF ARKANSAS.—If any segment of United States Route 63 between the exits for highways 14 and 75 in the State of Arkansas is designated as part of the Interstate System, the single axle weight, tandem axle weight, gross vehicle weight, and bridge formula limits under subsection (a) and the width limitation under section 31113(a) of title 49 shall not apply to that segment with respect to the operation of any vehicle that could operate legally on that segment before the date of the designation.

(q) CERTAIN LOGGING VEHICLES IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall waive, with respect to a covered logging vehicle, the application of any vehicle weight limit established under this section.

(2) COVERED LOGGING VEHICLE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “covered logging vehicle” means a vehicle that—

(A) is transporting raw or unfinished forest products, including logs, pulpwood, biomass, or wood chips;

(B) has a gross vehicle weight of not more than 99,000 pounds;

(C) has not less than 6 axles; and

(D) is operating on a segment of Interstate Route 35 in the State of Minnesota from mile marker 235.4 to mile marker 259.552.

(r) EMERGENCY VEHICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a State shall not enforce against an emergency vehicle a vehicle weight

limit (up to a maximum gross vehicle weight of 86,000 pounds) of less than—

- (A) 24,000 pounds on a single steering axle;
- (B) 33,500 pounds on a single drive axle;
- (C) 62,000 pounds on a tandem axle; or
- (D) 52,000 pounds on a tandem rear drive steer axle.

(2) EMERGENCY VEHICLE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “emergency vehicle” means a vehicle designed to be used under emergency conditions—

- (A) to transport personnel and equipment; and
- (B) to support the suppression of fires and mitigation of other hazardous situations.

(s) NATURAL GAS AND ELECTRIC BATTERY VEHICLES.—A vehicle, if operated by an engine fueled primarily by natural gas or powered primarily by means of electric battery power, may exceed the weight limit on the power unit by up to 2,000 pounds (up to a maximum gross vehicle weight of 82,000 pounds) under this section.

(t) VEHICLES IN IDAHO.—A vehicle limited or prohibited under this section from operating on a segment of the Interstate System in the State of Idaho may operate on such a segment if such vehicle—

- (1) has a gross vehicle weight of 129,000 pounds or less;
- (2) other than gross vehicle weight, complies with the single axle, tandem axle, and bridge formula limits set forth in subsection (a); and
- (3) is authorized to operate on such segment under Idaho State law.

(u) VEHICLES IN NORTH DAKOTA.—A vehicle limited or prohibited under this section from operating on a segment of the Interstate System in the State of North Dakota may operate on such a segment if such vehicle—

- (1) has a gross vehicle weight of 129,000 pounds or less;
- (2) other than gross vehicle weight, complies with the single axle, tandem axle, and bridge formula limits set forth in subsection (a); and
- (3) is authorized to operate on such segment under North Dakota State law.

(v) OPERATION OF VEHICLES ON CERTAIN NORTH CAROLINA HIGHWAYS.—If any segment in the State of North Carolina of United States Route 17, United States Route 29, United States Route 52, United States Route 64, United States Route 70, United States Route 74, United States Route 117, United States Route 220, United States Route 264, or United States Route 421 is designated as a route on the Interstate System, a vehicle that could operate legally on that segment before the date of such designation may continue to operate on that segment, without regard to any requirement under subsection (a).

(w) OPERATION OF VEHICLES ON CERTAIN OKLAHOMA HIGHWAYS.—If any segment of the highway referred to in paragraph (96) of section 1105(c) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–240; 105 Stat. 2032) is designated as a route on the Interstate System, a vehicle that could operate legally on that segment before the date of such designation may continue to operate on that segment, without any regard to any requirement under this section.

(x) *DRY BULK WEIGHT TOLERANCE.*—

(1) *WEIGHT TOLERANCE.*—*Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, except for the maximum gross vehicle weight limitation, a commercial motor vehicle transporting dry bulk goods may not exceed 110 percent of the maximum weight on any axle or axle group described in subsection (a), including any enforcement tolerance.*

(2) *DRY BULK GOODS DEFINED.*—*In this subsection, the term “dry bulk goods” means any homogeneous unmarked nonliquid cargo being transported in a trailer specifically designed for that purpose.*

* * * * *

