

February 3, 1969

HOUSE FILE 142

Transportation, *Pass 2-18*
Jan. 2-26, Pass 4-10

By BAILEY

Passed House, Date *2-24-69* Passed Senate, Date *5-9-69*

Vote: Ayes *111* Nays *0* Vote: Ayes *40* Nays *0*

Approved *May 19, 1969*

A BILL FOR

1 An Act relating to the movement of oversized vehicles.

2 *Be It Enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:*

3 Section 1. Chapter two hundred eighty-five (285), Acts of
4 the Sixty-second General Assembly, is hereby amended by strik-
5 ing all of section seven (7) and inserting in lieu thereof the
6 following:

7 "A movement of an indivisible load over a highway or high-
8 ways having sections carrying varying volumes of traffic and
9 having varying surface widths shall have its permissible total
10 distance computed on the basis of the lowest volume of traffic
11 or the greatest highway width, whichever produces the greatest
12 distance by the foregoing schedule. However, no movement over
13 a section or sections carrying a given shorter permissible
14 maximum shall be greater than that shorter maximum and, in com-
15 puting the distance which would be traveled on a section or
16 sections having a certain width and traffic volume, distances
17 which would be traveled on sections carrying shorter permis-
18 sible move distances shall be included."

EXPLANATION OF HOUSE FILE 142

The purpose of this bill is to restate in language which is hoped to be somewhat more clear, the concepts which it is believed were intended to be expressed in section 7 as it presently stands. Particularly it is desired to eliminate any implication that permissible maximum move distances may be added together when sections of highway which are of varying width are to be traversed in a proposed move. For example, as written, section 7 might be interpreted to permit a seven mile move on a twenty foot paving after a four and a half mile move on eighteen foot paving, making a total of eleven and a half miles, when the total permitted would have been seven miles if all of the paving were twenty feet wide. Such, it is believed, is not in accord with the legislative intent.