

Public Roads

A JOURNAL OF HIGHWAY RESEARCH

PUBLISHED BY
THE BUREAU OF
PUBLIC ROADS,
U. S. DEPARTMENT



OF COMMERCE,
WASHINGTON



In this issue: Road-user and property taxes on selected vehicles
(New Jersey State Route 1 in Jersey City)

Public Roads

A JOURNAL OF HIGHWAY RESEARCH

Vol. 27, No. 7

April 1953

Published Bimonthly

Edgar A. Stromberg, Editor

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Washington 25, D. C.

REGIONAL HEADQUARTERS

870 Market St.

San Francisco 2, Calif.

DIVISION OFFICES

No. 1. 718 National Savings Bank Bldg., Albany 7, N. Y.

Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

No. 2. 707 Earles Bldg., Hagerstown, Md.

Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia.

No. 3. 50 Seventh St., N. E., Atlanta 5, Ga.

Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

No. 4. South Chicago Post Office, Chicago 17, Ill.

Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, and Michigan.

No. 5. (NORTH). Main Post Office, St. Paul 1, Minn.

Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

No. 5. (SOUTH). Federal Office Bldg., Kansas City 6, Mo.

Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska.

No. 6. 502 U. S. Courthouse, Forth Worth 2, Tex.

Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas.

No. 7. 870 Market St., San Francisco 2, Calif.

Arizona, California, Nevada, and Hawaii.

No. 8. 753 Morgan Bldg., Portland 8, Oreg.

Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington.

No. 9. Denver Federal Center, Bldg. 40, Denver 2, Colo.

Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

No. 10. Federal Bldg., Juneau, Alaska.

Alaska.

IN THIS ISSUE

| | |
|--|-----|
| Road-User and Property Taxes on Selected Motor Vehicles, 1953..... | 127 |
| Plotting Aggregate Gradation Specifications for Bituminous Concrete..... | 155 |
| New Publication..... | 158 |

PUBLIC ROADS is sold by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at \$1 per year (foreign subscription \$1.25) or 20 cents per single copy. Free distribution is limited to public officials actually engaged in planning or constructing highways, and to instructors of highway engineering. There are no vacancies in the free list at present. The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, January 5, 1952.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SINCLAIR WEEKS, Secretary

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

THOMAS H. MacDONALD, Commissioner

Contents of this publication may be reprinted. Mention of source is requested.

Road-User and Property Taxes on Selected Motor Vehicles, 1953

BY THE RESEARCH REPORTS BRANCH
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Reported by **EDWIN M. COPE**, Chief
Highway Statistics Section,
and **RICHARD W. MEADOWS**,
Transportation Economist

Faced with the need to find additional funds for the necessary acceleration of the highway improvement program, administrators, economists, and engineers are studying all available and prospective sources of highway revenue. Highway finance theories all seek a common aim—the equitable levying of costs, through taxation or other means, on those who use and benefit from our roads and streets.

The need for basic factual information in such studies is self-evident. In this article are presented data, by States, on the State road-user imposts—registration fees and motor-fuel taxes—which furnish the bulk of the current income for highways. Since direct property taxes levied on motor vehicles in many States are an important part of the cost of vehicle ownership and operation, data on these taxes are included even though they are not collected as highway revenue. For purposes of comparison, information is reported separately for some of the commercial vehicles according to their use in private operation, farm service, or contract hauling.

The data are reported for eleven typical vehicles, operating under uniform assumed conditions, with tax rates effective on January 1, 1953. Comparisons can thus be made of the taxes paid for similar vehicles in different States, for different types of vehicles in the same State, and for a particular vehicle in different types of operation.

The ranges found are extensive, varying in total amount paid annually from \$20 to \$4,475. The national average for a farm pickup truck is only \$44 a year (less than for a light passenger car), while for a six-axle diesel combination in contract operation it is more than \$3,000. Annual taxes on a stake truck average \$75 if in farm service, \$140 in private use, and \$230 in contract hauling operation. A three-axle combination in private use, on the average, pays \$256 in registration fees, \$422 in motor-fuel tax, and \$164 in property tax.


measurement of the amounts already being collected under existing tax rates. In the search for revenue, full consideration must be given to the burden of all direct taxes, including property taxes, on the vehicle owner.

The principal current State road-user revenues are derived from the gasoline tax and from registration fees on motor vehicles, but in some States a relatively low gasoline tax is accompanied by above-average registration fees, while in others, higher gasoline taxes are accompanied by low registration fees. In Alabama an automobile can be registered for \$3.00 and the gasoline tax rate is 6 cents; in New York State it costs five times as much to register the same automobile but the gasoline tax is only 4 cents. The result is that the road-user taxes are about the same on that automobile in the two States.

The purpose of this study is to provide data that make it possible to compare the total direct State and personal-property taxes on the road user, as well as the yields from the individual levies. It supplies the needed tool of direct measurement of existing taxes, so that comparisons can be made between vehicles, between States, and between different services. This is accomplished through presentation of the amounts of State road-user taxes and all direct personal-property taxes that would be paid in each State (except Oregon) during one full year, at rates in effect January 1, 1953, for each of a group of vehicles that represent significant points in the tax range. The study is similar in many respects to the

TODAY there are 44 million automobiles and more than 9 million trucks and busses on the highways—53 million vehicles, a total undreamed of 10 years ago. Partly as a result of the great increases in the number of vehicles and partly because of enforced neglect of our highways during the war years and difficulties encountered since, public authorities, legislatures, and highway-user groups are engaged in a

desperate effort to accelerate the highway improvement program. The most pressing problem faced is that of finding the necessary funds. A considerable amount of study has been given to highway finance theories—the increment theory, the theory of ability to pay, the cost and the value of the service, and the portion that should be attributed to defense. As a preliminary to any work in tax theory, there is need for



one presented for 1950 in PUBLIC ROADS.¹ The 1953 information is summarized or illustrated in tables, bar charts, and maps. The presentations are intended to be self-explanatory and not every one is discussed in detail in the text.

The absence of data for Oregon is a regrettable deficiency. At the time the study was being prepared, the Oregon weight-distance tax was subject to popular referendum in the November 4, 1952, general election, and even if approved would have been invalidated by the approval of a constitutional amendment appearing on the same ballot.² Since the imposition of the Oregon weight-distance law was contingent upon both of these pending actions, and could have been invalidated by the outcome of either, data for the State were not included. Consequently, where the phrase "all States" is used, it includes the District of Columbia (in order to avoid the necessity of naming it separately) and all States except Oregon. The absence of Oregon data obviously affects the ranking of States according to total taxes that would be paid on specific vehicles under the prescribed conditions. If it had been possible to include data for Oregon, the ranking of taxes for most of the heavier vehicles would have been affected for all or nearly all States, particularly for vehicles in private, not-for-hire operation.

The Typical Vehicles

The bases for registering motor vehicles vary considerably among the States. As shown in table 1 (p. 129), passenger cars are registered in some States on a flat fee basis, with no regard for other factors. In Mississippi, at the other extreme, a flat fee rate is also in effect but is compounded by consideration of horsepower, gross weight, and vehicle age. The variations in registration bases are shown for passenger cars in figure 1, and for trucks in figure 2 (p. 130). State gasoline tax rates are represented in figure 3 (p. 130).

Eleven vehicles that are reasonably representative of the types and sizes that comprise the vehicle population were selected for the study—two passenger cars, four single-unit trucks, and five combinations. Their relative sizes and axle arrangements are shown in silhouette on page 127. Brief descriptions of the vehicles follow.

PASSENGER CARS:

No. 1.—A light-weight club coupe.

No. 2.—A medium-weight sedan.

SINGLE-UNIT TRUCKS:

No. 3.—A pickup truck registered for 4,700 pounds gross vehicle weight (commonly called a "½-ton" truck).

No. 4.—A stake truck registered for 12,500 pounds gross vehicle weight (commonly called a "1½-ton" truck).

No. 5.—A van registered for 19,000 pounds gross vehicle weight (commonly called a "2¾-ton" truck).

No. 6.—A tandem-axle dump truck registered for 40,000 pounds gross vehicle weight, of the type used in hauling coal, building materials, etc.

COMBINATIONS:

No. 7.—A three-axle tractor-semi-trailer registered for 40,000 pounds gross vehicle weight, chosen so that it falls within the maximum length and weight limits of all States.

No. 8.—A four-axle tractor-semitrailer (tandem axles on the semitrailer), gasoline powered, and registered for 50,000 pounds gross vehicle weight (No. 9 is the same vehicle, but with diesel power).

No. 9.—A four-axle tractor-semitrailer (tandem axles on the semitrailer), diesel powered, and registered for 50,000 pounds gross vehicle weight (No. 8 is the same vehicle, but with gasoline power).

No. 10.—A five-axle tractor-semitrailer (tandem axles on both units), registered for 64,000 pounds gross vehicle weight.

No. 11.—A six-axle truck and full trailer combination (tandem axles on both units), registered for 72,000 pounds gross vehicle weight.

The 40,000-pound combination (No. 7) would be permitted to register and operate in all States, but the 40,000-pound tandem-axle single-unit truck (No. 6) would not. Washington has a flat limitation of 36,000 pounds on a truck with three axles, and Mississippi has a limit of 37,650 pounds for such vehicles. Because of axle spacing and axle-load limits, the 40,000-pound single-unit truck is on the borderline of legality in some of the States with respect to registration and operation, but it has been included in order to show that point in the tax schedules. Although the 40,000-pound single-unit truck is found chiefly in specialized operations, the 40,000-pound three-axle combination is in almost universal use and is undoubtedly the most commonly found heavy unit.

Three States have size and weight limitations that prohibit the use of tractor-semi-trailer combinations as heavy as 50,000 pounds, but all others permit them. The limit in Kentucky and Tennessee is 42,000 pounds for any combination and Pennsylvania permits a maximum of 45,000 pounds for tractor-semitrailers and 62,000 pounds for other combinations.

In order to present a comparison of the taxes on vehicles similar in most respects except type of fuel used, two 50,000-pound

four-axle combinations are included in the study, one with a gasoline engine, the other with diesel power. The assumption made that the gasoline combination operates 4 miles to the gallon and that the fuel consumption rate of the diesel combination is 6 miles per gallon is arbitrary, but believed to be reasonable. It is recognized that the difference in the miles-per-gallon rates of two individual vehicles might fall substantially short of, or could exceed, the assumed 50-percent differential. (A 50-percent difference in consumption may also be expressed as a one-third saving in fuel.) It is of interest that New York also assumed a 50-percent differential in recently increasing the tax on diesel fuel from 4 cents to 6 cents per gallon.

The 64,000-pound combination (No. 10) selected is a five-axle, diesel-powered, tractor-semitrailer combination, 49 feet long, that can be operated in the Western States and a few Eastern States that are not contiguous, as shown in figure 5 (p. 131). The 64,000-pound combination in the 1950 study had a gasoline engine, but the growing popularity of diesel power for busses and heavy trucks dictated the selection of diesel power for both the 64,000-pound and the 72,000-pound combinations in the present study. The 72,000-pound truck and full trailer combination (No. 11) is permitted in Ohio, Louisiana, and all of the Western States. Ohio is the only State that permits vehicle No. 11 but prohibits vehicle No. 10 (see fig. 5). This is because of differences in the State's length limitations for the two types of combinations.

As shown in figure 6, tractor-semitrailer combinations are registered as single units in all 6 of the New England States, in 12 of the States in the Mississippi and Ohio River valleys, and in Virginia. In the remainder of the States, tractor-trucks and semitrailers are registered as separate units. Combinations are considered to be registered as single units where the fee for either the tractor or the semitrailer is based on the gross weight or capacity of the combination, even though in most of these States a relatively small fee is also levied on the other unit of the combination.

In some States the registration fee schedule is so established that from a tax standpoint it is more economical to operate a combination than a single-unit truck at a given gross vehicle weight. In Montana, for example, registration of a 40,000-pound single-unit truck costs \$300.00, but the tractor and semitrailer components of a 40,000-pound combination, registered separately, cost only \$92.50 in total.

The inclusion or exclusion of data for a given vehicle in each State was determined solely on the basis of whether the vehicle as specified would be permitted to register and operate. Numerous instances were found in which the vehicle or combination might be registered, but could not legally be operated with a full load. In New York, for instance, vehicle No. 10 could be registered

¹ State road-user and personal-property taxes on selected motor vehicles, 1950, by R. W. Meadows and S. F. Bielak. PUBLIC ROADS, vol. 26, No. 2, June 1950.

² In the election, Oregon voters approved the increased weight-distance taxes enacted into law by the 1951 State legislature.

Table 1.—Basis for registration of passenger cars

| FLAT FEE: | EMPTY WEIGHT | SHIPPING WEIGHT |
|---|---|---|
| Alabama Arizona California Idaho Kentucky Louisiana Nevada Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Utah Virginia Washington Wisconsin Wyoming Vermont | WEIGHT GROUPS: Connecticut Delaware Florida Maryland Montana North Carolina Texas Tennessee District of Columbia AND HORSEPOWER: Indiana AND AGE: North Dakota South Dakota | WEIGHT GROUPS: Nebraska 500-POUND INTERVALS: New York South Carolina Minnesota |
| FLAT FEE AND AGE: | 100-POUND INTERVALS: Colorado Michigan West Virginia 100-POUND INTERVALS AND AGE: New Mexico 100-POUND INTERVALS, VALUE AND AGE: Iowa Georgia 500-POUND INTERVALS: Georgia | 100-POUND INTERVALS: New York 500-POUND INTERVALS: South Carolina Minnesota |
| HORSEPOWER GROUPS: | GROSS WEIGHT | FACTORY DELIVERED PRICE AND AGE: Oklahoma |
| Illinois Maine Massachusetts Missouri New Jersey | 100-POUND INTERVALS: Kansas | FACTORY DELIVERED PRICE AND AGE: Oklahoma |
| FLAT FEE AND AGE: | WEIGHT GROUPS: New Hampshire Rhode Island AND HORSEPOWER: Arkansas | FACTORY DELIVERED PRICE AND AGE: Mississippi |

Table 2.—Data used in computing State road-user taxes and property taxes on selected vehicles, 1953 registration year

| Factors affecting taxation | Passenger cars | | | | Single-unit trucks | | | | Tractor-semitrailer combinations | | | | Truck and full trailer | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|
| | No. 1: Light | | No. 2: Medium | | No. 3: Pickup | | No. 4: State | | No. 5: Van | | No. 6: Dump | | No. 7 | | No. 8 (gasoline) | | No. 9 (diesel) | | No. 10 | | No. 11 | | | | | |
| | Club coupe, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | |
| Body type..... | Club coupe, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | 4-door, 6-pass. | | |
| Price, f.o.b. factory (1951)..... | \$1,575 | \$2,148 | \$1,250 | \$1,784 | \$4,859 | \$11,270 | \$6,102 | \$4,400 | \$6,350 | \$6,862 | \$10,327 | \$8,931 | \$6,000 | \$10,987 | \$7,000 | \$18,399 | \$7,500 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | |
| Insurance (S. A. E.)..... | 25 | 35 | 26 | 10 | 33 | 75 | 40 | 84 | 38 | 40 | 84 | 150 | 134 | 50 | 52 | 63 | 60 | 63 | 60 | 63 | 60 | 63 | 60 | 63 | 60 | 63 |
| Maximum brake..... | 97 | 124 | 95 | 92 | 137 | 147 | 155 | 155 | 135 | 135 | 155 | 155 | 155 | 155 | 155 | 155 | 155 | 155 | 155 | 155 | 155 | 155 | 155 | 155 | 155 | 155 |
| Weight..... | 3,059 | 3,755 | 1,480 | 7,180 | 10,375 | 21,138 | 13,175 | 10,680 | 15,600 | 17,300 | 19,750 | 16,010 | 19,750 | 16,010 | 19,750 | 16,010 | 19,750 | 16,010 | 19,750 | 16,010 | 19,750 | 16,010 | 19,750 | 16,010 | 19,750 | 16,010 |
| Manufacturer's rated capacity..... | 3,959 | 4,555 | 4,700 | 12,500 | 19,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 18,000 | 24,000 | 26,000 | 36,000 | 25,000 | 36,000 | 25,000 | 36,000 | 25,000 | 36,000 | 25,000 | 36,000 | 25,000 | 36,000 | 25,000 | 36,000 | 25,000 | 36,000 | 25,000 |
| Chassis weight..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Empty weight..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Load capacity..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gross vehicle weight..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gross weight of combination..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Leads..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wheelbase..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Distance between tandem axles..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Length of combination..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trailer..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Size..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ply rating..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Front arrangement..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rear arrangement..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total annual travel..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total annual travel..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private operation..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contract carrier..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Average miles per gallon..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private operation..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contract carrier..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Annual motor-fuel consumption..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private operation..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contract carrier..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total revenue ton-miles (average load)..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Average gross weight..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gross annual earnings..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |




Figure 1.—Passenger-car registration fee basis.




Figure 2.—Truck registration fee basis.




Figure 3.—State gasoline tax rates.






Figure 4.—Application of personal-property taxes to motor vehicles.




COMBINATION REGISTERED AS SINGLE UNIT

Figure 6.—Registration of tractor-semitrailer as a single unit.




BOTH NO. 10 AND NO. 11 ARE LEGAL
 NO. 10 IS LEGAL BUT NO. 11 IS NOT
 NO. 11 IS LEGAL BUT NO. 10 IS NOT

Figure 5.—Legality of 64,000-pound tractor-semitrailer (No. 10) and 72,000-pound truck and full trailer (No. 11).



FEE REDUCTION:
 LESS THAN 50 PERCENT
 50 TO 75 PERCENT
 MORE THAN 75 PERCENT

Figure 8.—Reduced registration fees for farm truck (No. 4, stake truck).



FEE REDUCTION:
 LESS THAN 50 PERCENT
 50 TO 75 PERCENT
 (NONE REDUCED MORE THAN 75 PERCENT)

Figure 7.—Reduced registration fees for farm truck (No. 3, pickup truck).

but would be permitted to operate at a maximum gross weight of approximately 62,000 pounds. Consequently, it was omitted from the study even though it was eligible to be registered for a slightly smaller gross weight. Several similar situations existed with respect to the heavy vehicles and all were omitted unless they could be legally operated at the gross vehicle weights and sizes specified. Minor adjustments of axle spacing were assumed in a few cases, however, in order to include vehicles that otherwise were within the legal limits.

Specifications and Use Factors

In order to obtain the tax data on a uniform basis in all of the States, a detailed outline of the specifications of each of the 11 vehicles selected was submitted to the State authorities in the latter part of 1952 for determination of the specific fees and taxes that would be payable during a full year under laws existing January 1, 1953 (it was the uncertainty on this point that necessitated the exclusion of Oregon). Table 2 (p. 129) gives these specifications, with the assumed annual mileage traveled, motor fuel consumed, and other factors needed to compute the various taxes. The taxes to be reported were the State road-user taxes—on motor fuel, on vehicle registration, other annual vehicle fees closely related to registration, and the applicable motor-carrier taxes—and all direct personal-property taxes levied on motor vehicles at all levels of government. The property taxes for 1953 were to be estimated by the State authorities on the basis of 1952 property valuations and tax rates.

The same care that was taken in the selection of vehicles was taken in the selection of use factors. "Average" values are not available, however, for the mileages, fuel consumption rates, and earnings. It was therefore necessary to assign these values arbitrarily, but sincere effort was made to select amounts that are reasonable. The primary objective was to supply specific factors to which rates could be applied uniformly in all States, and ones that would reflect these rates in a way that makes possible valid comparisons between States, vehicles, and services.

In order to avoid the complex situations that would have been encountered in computing taxes on vehicles in interstate operation, intrastate use was specified. Without this stipulation, the study would have been impractical. Obviously, however, it is almost unthinkable that large combinations would travel entirely in one State for a whole year—particularly in such States as Rhode Island, Delaware, or for that matter, almost any of the smaller States; and it is improbable that their travel would be restricted to just one of the larger States. However, the stipulation of intrastate travel is permissible, even indispensable, when it is remembered that the purpose of the study is to compare tax rates, rather than to select the most typical vehicles or the most probable amount and kind of service, or the most probable earnings.

It was also specified that the vehicles had been operated in the same State since purchased new in 1951. This made 1953 the third year of registration, thus excluding from the study such nonrecurring taxes

as those on sales and titling, and removing the vehicles from the top property-tax brackets.

Another large group of taxes omitted are those imposed by the Federal Government on gasoline, oil, vehicles, and accessories and parts, which yielded over \$2 billion in 1952. These are excise taxes, identical in nature with those levied on tobacco, cosmetics, etc. Their exclusion has no effect on the comparisons between States of the data presented in this article, since the levies are uniform throughout the nation.

The data received from the States are presented in tables 4-12. In all of these tables the States are arranged in groupings so as to permit ready comparison of data for each State with those of its neighbors. The national averages and extremes are shown in table 3. The averages are simple unweighted averages of the totals for all States where the vehicles are permitted. In the case of property taxes they are averages reflecting only the States where such taxes are levied. Figures 10-21 portray the data graphically, permitting quick comparisons of the several elements reported (pp. 143-153).

Property Taxes

In most cases the property taxes on motor vehicles have little or no direct relation to the use of highways, and the revenues from them are not available for highways. They are, however, so closely associated with registration fees in their application and their relation to costs of operation, and comprise such a large portion of the total

Table 3.—Average, low, and high road-user and property taxes on selected motor vehicles

| Vehicle and service | Average fee for all States ¹ | | | | | Lowest fee | | | | | Highest fee | | | | |
|--|---|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------|
| | Registration fee, etc. | Motor-fuel tax | Total road-user taxes | Property tax | Total | Registration fee, etc. | Motor-fuel tax ¹ | Total road-user taxes | Property tax ¹ | Total | Registration fee, etc. | Motor-fuel tax | Total road-user taxes | Property tax | Total |
| Passenger car: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Light-weight (No. 1) | \$11.95 | \$30.36 | \$42.31 | \$28.41 | \$58.88 | \$3.00 | \$17.28 | \$28.28 | (\$5.00) | \$28.28 | \$29.26 | \$40.32 | \$66.70 | \$54.32 | \$88.12 |
| Medium-weight (No. 2) | 14.67 | 38.16 | 52.83 | 38.45 | 75.26 | 3.00 | 21.72 | 32.72 | (8.00) | 38.96 | 37.26 | 50.68 | 84.82 | 74.51 | 115.71 |
| Pickup (No. 3): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Farm | 13.79 | 20.40 | 34.19 | 16.25 | 43.67 | 2.50 | 11.61 | 20.48 | (5.00) | 20.48 | 32.00 | 27.09 | 51.34 | 34.58 | 64.35 |
| Private | 16.97 | 31.63 | 48.60 | 23.86 | 62.52 | 2.50 | 18.00 | 32.00 | (5.00) | 44.00 | 34.80 | 42.00 | 68.00 | 55.06 | 94.31 |
| Stake truck (No. 4): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Farm | 32.80 | 28.99 | 61.79 | 22.31 | 74.80 | 4.00 | 16.50 | 31.50 | (5.17) | 44.50 | 86.00 | 38.50 | 113.50 | 51.05 | 127.57 |
| Private | 51.07 | 70.26 | 121.33 | 32.96 | 140.55 | 10.00 | 39.99 | 81.65 | (15.00) | 100.99 | 132.50 | 93.31 | 199.15 | 77.50 | 199.15 |
| Contract | 94.16 | 117.12 | 211.28 | 32.96 | 230.51 | 25.00 | 66.66 | 127.66 | (15.00) | 127.66 | 289.00 | 155.54 | 401.54 | 77.50 | 401.54 |
| Van (No. 5): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 104.65 | 121.60 | 226.25 | 75.92 | 270.53 | 26.00 | 69.21 | 142.53 | (18.25) | 160.21 | 285.00 | 161.49 | 400.35 | 156.16 | 434.88 |
| Contract | 170.12 | 202.72 | 372.84 | 75.92 | 417.13 | 59.00 | 115.38 | 206.38 | (18.25) | 206.38 | 497.50 | 269.22 | 766.72 | 156.16 | 766.72 |
| Dump (No. 6): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 295.20 | 390.49 | 685.69 | 182.66 | 792.90 | 50.00 | 225.00 | 427.00 | (40.18) | 466.00 | 877.50 | 525.00 | 1,252.50 | 471.95 | 1,252.50 |
| Three-axle combination (No. 7): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 255.83 | 421.67 | 677.50 | 164.37 | 773.38 | 46.00 | 240.00 | 442.00 | (45.00) | 442.00 | 640.00 | 560.00 | 1,040.00 | 371.32 | 1,122.37 |
| Contract | 399.27 | 421.67 | 820.94 | 164.37 | 916.82 | 115.00 | 240.00 | 442.00 | (45.00) | 442.00 | 915.00 | 560.00 | 1,275.00 | 371.32 | 1,284.45 |
| Four-axle combination, gasoline (No. 8): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 342.84 | 845.00 | 1,187.84 | 197.79 | 1,306.52 | 66.00 | 487.50 | 749.50 | (45.00) | 749.50 | 961.50 | 1,137.50 | 1,637.50 | 378.13 | 1,767.00 |
| Contract | 588.37 | 845.00 | 1,433.37 | 197.79 | 1,552.04 | 130.00 | 487.50 | 749.50 | (45.00) | 749.50 | 1,824.00 | 1,137.50 | 2,555.25 | 378.13 | 2,589.54 |
| Four-axle combination, diesel (No. 9): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 415.85 | 579.05 | 956.30 | 259.51 | 1,112.04 | 66.00 | (324.99) | 543.32 | (45.00) | 586.99 | 1,524.90 | 866.64 | 1,617.98 | 603.82 | 1,617.98 |
| Contract | 657.53 | 579.05 | 1,197.98 | 259.51 | 1,353.68 | 135.00 | (324.99) | 586.99 | (45.00) | 586.99 | 1,816.67 | 866.64 | 2,304.16 | 603.82 | 2,304.16 |
| Five-axle combination, diesel (No. 10): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 605.69 | 955.07 | 1,465.25 | 413.21 | 1,713.18 | 101.00 | (680.84) | 860.84 | (45.00) | 1,031.05 | 2,926.40 | 1,191.47 | 2,926.40 | 777.33 | 2,926.40 |
| Contract | 1,148.47 | 955.07 | 2,008.03 | 413.21 | 2,255.96 | 135.00 | (680.84) | 986.05 | (45.00) | 1,031.05 | 2,926.40 | 1,191.47 | 3,581.29 | 777.33 | 3,581.29 |
| Six-axle combination, diesel (No. 11): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 736.19 | 1,132.12 | 1,773.97 | 453.64 | 2,000.79 | 108.50 | (837.20) | 1,057.20 | (310.79) | 1,367.99 | 3,427.20 | 1,465.10 | 3,427.20 | 741.23 | 3,427.20 |
| Contract | 1,844.07 | 1,132.12 | 2,881.85 | 453.64 | 3,108.67 | 445.00 | (837.20) | 1,491.50 | (310.79) | 1,560.95 | 3,427.20 | 1,465.10 | 4,320.18 | 741.23 | 4,475.09 |

¹ In 20 States, personal-property taxes are not imposed, and in 3 States diesel fuel is not taxed directly. The average fees given are for the States where the respective taxes are collected. The fees in parentheses are the lowest for the same States.




Figure 9.—Comparison of private operation and farm service registration fees on a 12,500-pound stake truck (No. 4).

revenue standpoint, particularly in predominantly agricultural States. In 4 States, as indicated in figure 8, the farm classification allows the 12,500-pound stake truck (No. 4) a reduction of more than 75 percent in registration fee, in 13 States the reduction is from 50 to 75 percent, and in 4 States, it is less than 50 percent. A comparison of the regular and farm registration fees for this vehicle in each State is shown in figure 9.

In Nebraska, the regular registration fee for the 12,500-pound stake truck is \$60.00, but a farmer can register the same truck for \$4.00. In Kentucky, a flat fee of \$4.50 is applicable to farm trucks of 22,000 pounds or less, but a 22,000-pound vehicle in private use requires a registration fee of \$134.00. The importance of these figures is underscored by the fact that in 1951 more than 54 percent of Nebraska's trucks, and in Kentucky, over 39 percent, were registered at reduced farm rates. Similar situations exist in other States, but in most the reductions are not as great. In New Hampshire, for example, a farm truck of less than 16,000 pounds may be registered at a flat fee of \$25.00, but since this is greater than the regular fee of \$21.15 for a pickup truck having a gross weight of 4,700 pounds, the farm rate is of no advantage to owners of the pickup. Consequently,

only 5.2 percent of the total truck registrations in New Hampshire are in the farm classification.

In 1951, the farm truck registrations were more than half of all truck registrations in 5 States, and exceeded 30 percent in 13 States. It should not be forgotten, however, that the special reduced rates for registration of farm trucks are in part compensated for by the fact that farm trucks probably average fewer miles per year than other trucks. Thus the reductions are not as great on a cents-per-mile basis as it might appear from the comparisons in tables 5 and 6 and in figures 7 and 8.

Carrier Taxes

In the consideration of motor-carrier service, the gross receipts taxes and other levies that are imposed on general business, and not limited to motor carriers, have been eliminated. Fees for authority to operate, and other fees paid only at the time a carrier begins to haul goods for hire, have also been excluded.

Care should be taken in comparing the carrier taxes of the several States. Many of the States have special registration classes for vehicles used in contract (for-hire) service. The fees in the special registration classes, in most cases, are substantially greater than the registration fees for

vehicles in private (not-for-hire) service. The difference, while technically classed as part of the registration fee, is in reality a special carrier fee. There is, of course, the compensating factor that vehicles in carrier service usually can be expected to operate a considerably greater mileage than those in private use, thus reducing the per-mile cost of their registration fees.

The majority of trucks are used for the ordinary private service of carrying goods owned or sold by the vehicle owner, and for which there is no direct transportation charge. Even these trucks, however, are subject to mileage or other carrier taxes under some conditions, and the variations in the tax structures of the States made it necessary in a few instances to make arbitrary decisions on the inclusion or exclusion of these special levies.

The general policy followed was to include only the taxes that have to be paid on almost all of the vehicles in a given group. For example, the laws of some States are so written that practically all vehicles of more than 1½ tons (manufacturer's rated capacity) have to pay certain mileage or compensatory taxes, whether in private or contract operation. In the same States many vehicles of 1½-ton capacity or less are not subject to the tax. In such a case the tax has been shown only for the heavier vehicles. It should be remembered that the purpose of the study is to present a comparison of tax rates and burdens on certain typical vehicles rather than to include all taxes on all vehicles. Undoubtedly many of the larger trucks traveling in interstate commerce are subject to greater taxes than are reported in this study, and are also subject to additional restrictions and regulations. The larger units apparently have certain offsetting economic advantages, however, or they would not be in use.

Mileage Taxes

The classification and treatment of mileage taxes is something of a problem. Historically, road-user taxes have been classed by most authorities into three major groups. The first and most important of these consists of fuel taxes and miscellaneous fees incidental to fuel taxation. The second major group of taxes, usually termed motor-vehicle revenues, consists of motor-vehicle registration fees and a group of additional fees, some of which are not paid annually, that include title fees, drivers' licenses, and other revenues of relatively minor importance. The third group of road-user revenues, motor-carrier taxes, consists of special taxes on for-hire carriers.

These three groups have in the past afforded adequate classification of road-user revenues, although there are borderline instances in which there was considerable question as to proper classification. Most common among these, of course, is the annual registration fee in States that levy higher plate fees on for-hire carriers. Should

Table 8.—Road-user and personal-property taxes on a single-unit, three-axle dump truck, 40,000 pounds gross vehicle weight (No. 6)

| State | Private operation | | | | | Rank of State | |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Registration fee | Property tax | Other taxes and fees | Gasoline tax | Total | Total fees and taxes | Total, excluding property tax |
| | | | | | | | |
| New England: | | | | | | | |
| Maine..... | \$300.00 | \$140.88 | | \$450.00 | \$890.88 | 11 | 15 |
| New Hampshire..... | 240.00 | 101.43 | | 375.00 | 716.43 | 30 | 31 |
| Vermont..... | 420.00 | | | 375.00 | 795.00 | 18 | 11 |
| Massachusetts..... | 120.00 | 225.40 | | 375.00 | 720.40 | 29 | 44 |
| Rhode Island..... | 127.00 | 265.00 | | 300.00 | 692.00 | 34 | 46 |
| Connecticut..... | 200.00 | 257.86 | | 300.00 | 757.86 | 25 | 42 |
| Middle Atlantic: | | | | | | | |
| New York..... | 200.00 | | \$187.50 | 300.00 | 687.50 | 35 | 23 |
| New Jersey..... | 240.00 | | 1.00 | 225.00 | 466.00 | 46 | 45 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 250.00 | | | 375.00 | 625.00 | 41 | 28 |
| Delaware..... | 155.00 | | | 375.00 | 530.00 | 45 | 35 |
| Maryland..... | 200.00 | 50.00 | | 375.00 | 625.00 | 40 | 33 |
| District of Columbia..... | 150.00 | 132.00 | | 375.00 | 657.00 | 39 | 39 |
| West Virginia..... | 242.00 | 281.75 | | 375.00 | 898.75 | 10 | 30 |
| Southeastern: | | | | | | | |
| Virginia..... | 180.00 | 150.48 | | 450.00 | 780.48 | 20 | 27 |
| North Carolina..... | 320.00 | 165.67 | | 525.00 | 1,010.67 | 6 | 7 |
| South Carolina..... | 351.00 | 209.00 | | 525.00 | 1,085.00 | 4 | 4 |
| Georgia..... | 50.00 | 206.24 | | 450.00 | 706.24 | 33 | 43 |
| Florida..... | 189.00 | | .25 | 525.00 | 714.25 | 32 | 21 |
| Kentucky..... | 350.00 | 227.09 | .75 | 525.00 | 1,102.84 | 3 | 5 |
| Tennessee..... | 275.00 | | .50 | 525.00 | 800.50 | 17 | 10 |
| Alabama..... | 50.00 | 101.84 | .50 | 450.00 | 602.34 | 43 | 40 |
| Mississippi..... | | | | | | | |
| East Central: | | | | | | | |
| Ohio..... | 492.25 | | | 300.00 | 792.25 | 19 | 12 |
| Indiana..... | 200.00 | 471.95 | .25 | 300.00 | 972.20 | 8 | 41 |
| Illinois..... | 640.00 | 56.25 | | 375.00 | 1,071.25 | 5 | 2 |
| Michigan..... | 378.00 | | | 337.50 | 715.50 | 31 | 20 |
| Wisconsin..... | 460.00 | | | 300.00 | 760.00 | 24 | 14 |
| Minnesota..... | 350.00 | | | 375.00 | 725.00 | 28 | 19 |
| Iowa..... | 465.00 | | | 300.00 | 765.00 | 22 | 13 |
| Missouri..... | 300.00 | 48.12 | | 225.00 | 573.12 | 44 | 37 |
| Southwestern: | | | | | | | |
| Arkansas..... | 200.00 | 40.18 | | 487.50 | 727.68 | 26 | 22 |
| Louisiana..... | 200.00 | | | 525.00 | 725.00 | 27 | 18 |
| Oklahoma..... | 395.00 | | .50 | 487.50 | 883.00 | 12 | 3 |
| Texas..... | 360.00 | 103.17 | | 300.00 | 763.17 | 23 | 26 |
| West Central: | | | | | | | |
| North Dakota..... | 400.00 | | 100.00 | 375.00 | 875.00 | 13 | 6 |
| South Dakota..... | 412.50 | | 465.00 | 375.00 | 1,252.50 | 1 | 1 |
| Nebraska..... | 220.00 | 353.46 | | 375.00 | 948.46 | 9 | 32 |
| Kansas..... | 250.00 | 140.00 | 100.00 | 375.00 | 865.00 | 14 | 17 |
| Mountain: | | | | | | | |
| Montana..... | 300.00 | 230.84 | | 450.00 | 980.84 | 7 | 16 |
| Idaho..... | | | 394.20 | 450.00 | 844.20 | 16 | 8 |
| Wyoming..... | 150.00 | 135.24 | | 450.00 | 660.24 | 38 | 38 |
| Colorado..... | 75.00 | 135.24 | 1.00 | 375.00 | 661.24 | 37 | 36 |
| New Mexico..... | 172.50 | | | 450.00 | 622.50 | 42 | 29 |
| Arizona..... | 188.50 | 202.80 | | 375.00 | 766.30 | 21 | 34 |
| Utah..... | 295.00 | 177.32 | | 375.00 | 847.32 | 15 | 24 |
| Nevada..... | 85.05 | 322.55 | 398.00 | 337.50 | 1,143.10 | 2 | 9 |
| Pacific: | | | | | | | |
| Washington..... | | | | | | | |
| Oregon..... | | | | | | | |
| California..... | 206.00 | | 126.00 | 337.50 | 669.50 | 36 | 25 |

Summary of Comparisons

The foregoing discussion concerns general subjects rather than specific vehicles, except for the remarks on farm rates. It is impractical to include in this report a full discussion of each of the tables and charts presented, but there are comparisons and items of special interest that do merit being called to attention in connection with each of the vehicles.

Vehicle No. 1, light-weight passenger car (table 4; fig. 12).—Registration fees for the light-weight passenger car range from \$3.00 to \$28.76, total road-user taxes from \$28.28 to \$66.70. Since this vehicle is assumed to use 576 gallons of gasoline a year, each cent of a State's gasoline tax rate amounts to a levy of \$5.76 during the course of a year, or 11 cents a week. The lowest gasoline tax rate costs the owner of the light passenger car 33 cents a week, the highest about 78 cents a week.

There are 15 States with property taxes alone that exceed the total road-user taxes paid in the lowest State. (The property taxes shown on these vehicles are for the State capitals, however, and undoubtedly exceed the averages for the States in most cases.)

There are 25 States in which the total road-user taxes on this light automobile amount to less than \$40 a year, or 80 cents a week. In 11 of the States, road-user taxes amount to between \$40 and \$50, and in 10 States they are between \$50 and \$60. In only two States do they exceed \$60.

Vehicle No. 2, medium-weight passenger car (table 4).—The medium- and light-weight passenger cars are representative of far more than half of all vehicles on the highways. Although the taxation of automobiles probably receives less attention than the taxation of heavier commercial units, automobiles, because of their vast numbers, contribute substantially more in road-user taxes.

There are not great differences between the road-user taxes on light automobiles and those of medium weight. The registration fees for this vehicle range from \$3.00 to \$37.26. The \$37.26 fee applies in Oklahoma and this registration fee combined with a 6.5-cent gasoline tax makes the total road-user taxes \$84.82, the highest for this vehicle in any State. However, there is no property tax on motor vehicles in Oklahoma and if property taxes are included for States in which they are imposed, Oklahoma ranks 18th in total fees and taxes. Nebraska, on the other hand, with a \$5.00 registration fee and a 5-cent gasoline tax, obtains a total of \$41.20 in road-user taxes on the medium-weight sedan, and ranks 40th among the States. If the property tax of \$74.51 is added, however, the total becomes \$115.71, the highest in any State.

Vehicle No. 3, pickup truck (table 5; fig. 13).—The registration fees for the pickup truck in private use are slightly higher than those on passenger cars in most States. However, large numbers of pickup trucks

limit enforcement), would undoubtedly increase the registration revenues of some States. Practices are understood to vary considerably in this respect. It is necessary, therefore, that any careful comparison of road-user taxes be accompanied by a close examination of practices and interpretations in the application of existing statutes. The data presented in this study make no allowances for such differences.

The payment of motor-fuel taxes is another item that merits close examination. Practically all persons familiar with highway finance agree that some of the gasoline used on the highways escapes taxation (by means of refunded taxes), and that the amounts vary greatly between States. There is no way of knowing how much revenue escapes through excessive refund claims, but it is probable that the total is considerable.

For example, the stipulation in this study for the light-weight automobile is 9,500 miles of annual travel at 16.5 miles per gallon, with total gasoline consumption of

576 gallons for the year. Yet the average for all vehicles in one State was less than 500 taxed gallons in both 1950 and 1951. Traffic counts and other information indicate that the residents operate their vehicles about as much as residents of other States. In view of the amazing "fuel economy" of their vehicles, it appears that taxation of ownership, as distinguished from taxation of use, is a surer source of revenue under such conditions. (The State legislature apparently made this deduction some time ago, and imposed registration fees of \$25.00 and \$35.00 on light and medium-weight passenger cars, respectively, and eliminated reductions for farm trucks.)

Another subject for scrutiny is the collection of diesel-fuel taxes. There are numerous ways of avoiding or evading the tax on diesel fuel, and the State authorities charged with collecting it are in practically unanimous agreement that a considerable amount escapes taxation or is uncollectible. These authorities feel, however, that the situation is improving.

are registered at reduced farm rates. The lowest registration fee on any vehicle covered in the study, \$2.50, applies to pickup trucks in Georgia regardless of whether they are in farm or private service. The highest registration fee on the pickup truck, \$34.80, was found in Ohio. It is probable that pickup trucks outnumber other trucks in many States. Consequently, although the total taxes on each pickup are relatively small compared to taxes on heavier vehicles, the large number of pickups makes this an extremely important category from a revenue standpoint.

Vehicle No. 4, stake truck, 12,500 pounds gross vehicle weight (table 6; fig. 14).— Vehicles in the 12,500-pound group are subject to registration fees that in some States break away rather sharply from the fees charged on automobiles and pickup trucks, although this is not true in all cases. The stake truck may be registered in Wyoming for \$15.00, in Colorado for \$17.50, and in Virginia for \$19.50. In Vermont and Wisconsin, however, the fees are \$118.75 and \$110.00, respectively, for registration in private service. The farm rates, as discussed elsewhere, offer vehicles substantial reductions in many States, including Vermont and Wisconsin.

In contrast to the heavier trucks, there are large numbers of vehicles registered in the approximate weight range represented by this 12,500-pound unit (the group commonly classed as "1½-ton").

Vehicle No. 5, van truck, 19,000 pounds gross vehicle weight (table 7; fig. 15).— The lowest registration fee on the 19,000-pound van truck, \$25.00, is found in Colorado, and the highest, \$199.50, is found in Vermont. Although this van can be registered in South Dakota for \$100.00 (slightly below the average of \$104.65 for all States) the inclusion of the mileage tax of \$185.00 in South Dakota makes a total of \$400.35 in road-user taxes, the highest found in any State on this vehicle.

Vehicle No. 6, 40,000-pound dump truck (table 8; fig. 16).—The 40,000-pound dump truck, with perhaps minor adjustments of axle spacing, would be permitted to operate in all States except Mississippi and Washington. (Its axle spacing and loading are representative of concrete transit-mix and other special equipment.) The lowest registration fees on this vehicle are \$50.00 in Alabama and Georgia and \$75.00 in Colorado. These are the only States that still register trucks on the basis of manufacturer's rated capacity. The highest fee, \$640.00, is found in Illinois, and the average for all States is \$295.20. Although the Illinois registration fee is higher than that of any other State on this vehicle, the total road-user taxes on it would be greater in South Dakota, where the mileage tax applies.

Vehicle No. 7, 40,000-pound combination (table 10; fig. 17).—The 40,000-pound combination is typical of the largest group of combinations, and is found in substantial numbers even where much heavier vehicles

Table 9.—Road-user and personal-property taxes on the tractor and the semitrailer of a three-axle combination, 40,000 pounds gross vehicle weight (No. 7), in private operation

| State | Tractor-truck | | | | | Semitrailer | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|----------|------------------|--------------|----------------------|---------|
| | Registration fee | Property tax | Other taxes and fees | Gasoline tax | Total | Registration fee | Property tax | Other taxes and fees | Total |
| New England: | | | | | | | | | |
| Maine..... | \$300.00 | \$76.28 | | \$480.00 | \$856.28 | \$5.00 | \$75.00 | | \$80.00 |
| New Hampshire..... | 240.00 | 94.52 | | 400.00 | 734.52 | | | | |
| Vermont..... | 420.00 | | | 400.00 | 820.00 | 15.00 | | | 15.00 |
| Massachusetts..... | 120.00 | 122.04 | | 400.00 | 642.04 | 2.00 | 88.00 | | 90.00 |
| Rhode Island..... | 127.00 | 144.00 | | 320.00 | 591.00 | 2.00 | 103.00 | | 105.00 |
| Connecticut..... | 200.00 | 240.29 | | 320.00 | 760.29 | | | | |
| Middle Atlantic: | | | | | | | | | |
| New York..... | 88.25 | | \$370.00 | 320.00 | 778.25 | 90.00 | | | 90.00 |
| New Jersey..... | 110.00 | | 1.00 | 320.00 | 351.00 | 90.00 | | \$1.00 | 91.00 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 120.00 | | | 400.00 | 520.00 | 75.00 | | | 75.00 |
| Delaware..... | 83.00 | | | 400.00 | 483.00 | 87.00 | | | 87.00 |
| Maryland..... | 35.00 | 30.00 | | 400.00 | 465.00 | 100.00 | 15.00 | | 115.00 |
| District of Columbia..... | 65.00 | 75.50 | | 400.00 | 540.50 | 50.00 | 70.40 | | 120.40 |
| West Virginia..... | 227.00 | 152.55 | | 400.00 | 779.55 | 15.00 | 110.00 | | 125.00 |
| Southeastern: | | | | | | | | | |
| Virginia..... | 30.00 | 82.28 | | 480.00 | 592.28 | 150.00 | 59.40 | | 209.40 |
| North Carolina..... | 160.00 | 72.28 | | 560.00 | 792.28 | 160.00 | 68.60 | | 228.60 |
| South Carolina..... | 66.00 | 100.00 | | 560.00 | 726.00 | 96.00 | 77.00 | | 173.00 |
| Georgia..... | 20.00 | 52.16 | | 480.00 | 552.16 | 100.00 | 80.52 | | 180.52 |
| Florida..... | 88.00 | | 25 | 560.00 | 648.25 | 109.50 | | 25 | 109.75 |
| Kentucky..... | 350.00 | 122.96 | 75 | 560.00 | 1,033.71 | | 88.66 | | 88.66 |
| Tennessee..... | 275.00 | | 50 | 560.00 | 835.50 | | | | |
| Alabama..... | 50.00 | 50.25 | 50 | 480.00 | 580.75 | 25.00 | 40.20 | 50 | 65.70 |
| Mississippi..... | 271.00 | 61.86 | | 560.00 | 892.86 | 11.00 | 45.75 | | 56.75 |
| East Central: | | | | | | | | | |
| Ohio..... | 177.20 | | | 320.00 | 497.20 | 135.20 | | | 135.20 |
| Indiana..... | 190.00 | 204.75 | 25 | 320.00 | 715.00 | 25.00 | 166.57 | | 191.57 |
| Illinois..... | 640.00 | 78.75 | | 400.00 | 1,118.75 | | | | |
| Michigan..... | 154.00 | | | 360.00 | 514.00 | 127.75 | | | 127.75 |
| Wisconsin..... | 60.00 | | | 320.00 | 380.00 | 167.50 | | | 167.50 |
| Minnesota..... | 350.00 | | | 400.00 | 750.00 | 10.00 | | | 10.00 |
| Iowa..... | 435.00 | | | 320.00 | 755.00 | 60.00 | | | 60.00 |
| Missouri..... | 300.00 | 32.08 | | 240.00 | 572.08 | 7.00 | 16.04 | | 23.04 |
| Southwestern: | | | | | | | | | |
| Arkansas..... | 200.00 | 34.56 | | 520.00 | 754.56 | 5.00 | 29.40 | | 34.40 |
| Louisiana..... | 140.00 | | | 560.00 | 700.00 | 120.00 | | | 120.00 |
| Oklahoma..... | 65.00 | | 50 | 520.00 | 585.50 | 295.00 | | 50 | 295.50 |
| Texas..... | 154.00 | 56.00 | | 320.00 | 530.00 | 117.00 | 45.46 | | 162.46 |
| West Central: | | | | | | | | | |
| North Dakota..... | 400.00 | | 100.00 | 400.00 | 900.00 | | | | |
| South Dakota..... | 162.50 | | 215.00 | 400.00 | 777.50 | 60.00 | | 185.00 | 245.00 |
| Nebraska..... | 240.00 | 160.76 | | 400.00 | 800.76 | 1.00 | 111.36 | | 112.36 |
| Kansas..... | 30.00 | 83.00 | 200.00 | 400.00 | 713.00 | 100.00 | 55.00 | | 155.00 |
| Mountain: | | | | | | | | | |
| Montana..... | 60.00 | 124.82 | | 480.00 | 664.82 | 32.50 | 90.03 | | 122.53 |
| Idaho..... | 65.00 | | | 480.00 | 545.00 | 54.00 | | | 54.00 |
| Wyoming..... | 50.00 | 73.22 | | 400.00 | 523.22 | 40.00 | 52.80 | | 92.80 |
| Colorado..... | 25.00 | 73.22 | 1.00 | 480.00 | 579.22 | 20.00 | 52.80 | | 72.80 |
| New Mexico..... | 88.50 | | | 480.00 | 568.50 | 74.00 | | | 74.00 |
| Arizona..... | 69.50 | 109.80 | | 400.00 | 579.30 | 50.95 | 79.20 | | 130.15 |
| Utah..... | 70.00 | 91.76 | | 400.00 | 561.76 | 90.00 | 81.84 | | 171.84 |
| Nevada..... | 39.60 | 174.64 | 156.40 | 360.00 | 730.64 | 32.85 | 125.93 | 133.15 | 291.93 |
| Pacific: | | | | | | | | | |
| Washington..... | 105.00 | | 46.25 | 520.00 | 671.25 | 55.00 | | 39.50 | 94.50 |
| Oregon..... | | | | | | | | | |
| California..... | 66.00 | | 71.00 | 360.00 | 497.00 | 81.00 | | 52.00 | 133.00 |

are permitted. It is legal in all States. The average road-user tax payment on it in private operation is \$677.50. The lowest registration fee on this combination, \$45.00, is found in Colorado; the highest, \$640.00, in Illinois. The average registration fee is \$255.83, somewhat lower than on the three-axle single-unit truck (No. 6) of the same gross weight.

As an interesting sidelight, table 9 shows for this combination, in private operation, the taxes levied on the tractor-truck and on the semitrailer as individual units. The ratio of the taxes on the component units varies widely among the States: in Minnesota, for example, the \$10.00 tax on the semitrailer is little more than 1 percent of the \$750.00 levied on the tractor, while in Oklahoma the \$295.50 for the semitrailer is 50 percent of the \$585.50 for the power unit.

Vehicle No. 8, 50,000-pound gasoline-powered combination (table 11; fig. 18).— The 50,000-pound combination is legal in all States except Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Tennessee, and can be operated in those States with reduced loads. The average

registration fee for this combination is \$341.17 when in private service, but in contract service the average registration fee is \$586.70. The highest annual total of road-user taxes in private service is \$1,637.50, but in contract service the highest total of road-user taxes is \$2,555.25.

Figure 10 (p. 143) compares, for this combination and for the 40,000-pound combination, the tax costs in cents per mile of private and contract operation.

Vehicle No. 9, 50,000-pound diesel-powered combination (table 12; fig. 19).— The 50,000-pound diesel-powered combination, empty, is somewhat heavier than the 50,000-pound gasoline combination and thus carries a correspondingly smaller payload when at full capacity. (It is also a somewhat more expensive combination than the one with gasoline power and is subject to greater property taxes in many States.) Offset against this, however, is its substantial saving in total fuel cost, including tax. The diesel combination is assumed to save one-third in fuel gallonage. The saving in fuel is highly desirable from almost any standpoint, but the resulting reductions in




Figure 10.—Comparison of State road-user taxes (personal-property taxes not included), in cents per mile for private use and contract operation, for a 40,000-pound three-axle tractor-semitrailer (No. 7) and a 50,000-pound gasoline-powered four-axle tractor-semitrailer (No. 8) (right).






Figure 11.—Comparison of State road-user taxes (personal-property taxes not included) in cents per mile for private use and contract operation, for a 64,000-pound diesel-powered five-axle tractor-semitrailer (No. 10) (left) and a 72,000-pound diesel-powered six-axle combination, truck and full trailer (No. 11) (right).

LIGHT-WEIGHT PASSENGER CAR (No. 1)




Figure 12.—State road-user and personal-property taxes on a light-weight passenger car (No. 1), ranked according to total taxes (left) and road-user taxes (right).

PICKUP TRUCK (No. 3)





Figure 13.—State road-user and personal-property taxes on a pickup truck (No. 3) in private use, ranked according to total taxes (left) and road-user taxes (right).

12,500-POUND STAKE TRUCK (No. 4)





Fig. 14.—State road-user and personal-property taxes on a 12,500-pound stake truck (No. 4) in private use, ranked according to total taxes (left) and road-user taxes (right).

19,000-POUND VAN TRUCK (No. 5)





Figure 15.—State road-user and personal-property taxes on a 19,000-pound van truck (No. 5) in private use, ranked according to total taxes (left) and road-user taxes (right).

40,000-POUND TANDEM-AXLE DUMP TRUCK (No. 6)




Figure 16.—State road-user and personal-property taxes on a 40,000-pound tandem-axle dump truck (No. 6) in private use, ranked according to total taxes (left) and road-user taxes (right).

40,000-POUND THREE-AXLE TRACTOR-SEMITRAILER (No. 7)





Figure 17.—State road-user and personal-property taxes on a 40,000-pound three-axle tractor-semitrailer combination (No. 7) in private use, ranked according to total taxes (left) and road-user taxes (right).

50,000-POUND GASOLINE-POWERED FOUR-AXLE TRACTOR-SEMITRAILER (No. 8)




Figure 18.—State road-user and personal-property taxes on a 50,000-pound gasoline-powered four-axle tractor-semitrailer combination (No. 8) in private use, ranked according to total taxes (left) and road-user taxes (right).

50,000-POUND DIESEL-POWERED FOUR-AXLE TRACTOR-SEMITRAILER (No. 9)




Figure 19.—State road-user and personal-property taxes on a 50,000-pound diesel-powered four-axle tractor-semitrailer combination (No. 9) in private use, ranked according to total taxes (left) and road-user taxes (right).

64,000-POUND DIESEL-POWERED FIVE-AXLE TRACTOR-SEMITRAILER (No. 10)




Figure 20.—State road-user and personal-property taxes on a 64,000 pound diesel-powered five-axle tractor-semitrailer combination (No. 10) in private use, ranked according to total taxes (left) and road-user taxes (right).

72,000-POUND DIESEL-POWERED SIX-AXLE TRUCK AND FULL TRAILER (No. 11)





Figure 21.—State road-user and personal-property taxes on a 72,000-pound diesel-powered six-axle truck and full trailer combination (No. 11) in private use, ranked according to total taxes (left) and road-user taxes (right).



Plotting Aggregate Gradation Specifications for Bituminous Concrete

By JOHN B. DALHOUSE, Highway Engineer
North Carolina District Office
Bureau of Public Roads

Aggregate gradation specifications for bituminous concrete generally specify either the total percentages passing each sieve of a series or the percentages passing one sieve and retained on the next. Ready comparison of two dissimilar types has been considered impossible, largely because no practical means of plotting the second type for visual inspection has heretofore been developed.

In this article there is described a simple method for plotting the requirements of percentage passing and retained specifications, thereby permitting visualization of the nature of a specified gradation and comparison of it with the plotting of a total percentage passing gradation.

ALL SPECIFICATIONS for bituminous concrete set forth the gradation of materials to be used in the mix. Mineral aggregate gradation requirements in the various current specifications are of two general types. One specifies the total percentages passing each individual sieve in a given series, and the other specifies the percentages passing one sieve and retained on the next smaller sieve. Because of the dissimilarity between the two types, it has in the past generally been considered impossible to compare them by any ready means. An additional complication is the use of varying series of sieves in different specifications.

Some experienced engineers are able to determine, by reading of the specifications, just what kind of a mix will result from the requirements. To a great many engineers, however, the easiest means of visualizing the nature of a specified aggregate gradation is to plot it as a graph, preferably on semilogarithmic cross-section paper. A convenient form of aggregate chart is commonly used, with a percentage scale on the vertical axis and the sieve sizes in logarithmic scale on the horizontal axis.

The plotting is an easy operation for the percentage passing specifications, but has not heretofore been feasible by any simple method for specification requirements on a percentage passing and retained basis. The purpose of this report is to describe a method whereby this latter type of specification can be plotted.

Demonstration of Method

To demonstrate the method, the passing and retained aggregate gradation specification shown in table 1 is used in this report. It is to be understood that this is not considered as a typical or recommended gradation, but merely as a working example. Derivation of the plotting points is shown in table 2, and the curves drawn therefrom appear in figures 1 and 2.

The percentages of material passing and retained are given in table 1 as ranges, in the usual manner. These figures are, of course, minimum and maximum amounts. The first step in the procedure is to calculate from table 1 the cumulative percentages of material passing each sieve, using first the minimum limits throughout and second, the maximum limits starting with the smallest size sieve in the sieve series in each case. These cumulative series are entered respectively in columns 1 and 2 of table 2. For example, working upward from the bottom of table 1, the *minimum* cumulative amount passing the No. 200 sieve is 2 percent, that passing the No. 80 sieve is 2 + 7 = 9 percent, and so on (see column 1 of table 2). The *maximum* cumulative amount passing the No. 200 sieve is 8 percent, that passing the No. 80 sieve is 8 + 12 = 20 percent, and so on (see column 2 of table 2).

The minimum cumulative percentage passing values thus calculated are plotted in figure 1 as curve 1; the maximum values as curve 2. As indicated in table 2, column

Table 1.—Assumed aggregate gradation requirements

| Sieve size | | Percentage of material |
|--------------|--------------|------------------------|
| Passing | Retained on | |
| | 1 inch..... | 0 |
| 1 inch..... | ½ inch..... | 25-45 |
| ½ inch..... | No. 4..... | 10-25 |
| No. 4..... | No. 8..... | 6-15 |
| No. 8..... | No. 16..... | 6-9 |
| No. 16..... | No. 40..... | 8-13 |
| No. 40..... | No. 80..... | 7-13 |
| No. 80..... | No. 200..... | 7-12 |
| No. 200..... | | 2-8 |

2, certain of the calculated percentages may be greater than 100 percent and are disregarded in the plotting since they are fictional values. The two curves define the limits of the intended grading band in the fine sizes but they do not define them in the coarse sizes.

The second step in the procedure is to calculate from table 1 the cumulative percentages of material retained on each sieve, using first the minimum limits throughout and second, the maximum limits, starting with the maximum size sieve in the sieve series in each case. Enter these figures in columns 1R and 2R of table 2. Thus, working downward from the top of table 1, the *minimum* cumulative amount retained on the 1-inch sieve is 0, that retained on the ½-inch sieve is 25 percent, that retained on the No. 4 sieve is 25 + 10 = 35 percent, and so on (see column 1R of table 2). The *maximum* cumulative amount retained on the 1-inch sieve is 0, that retained on the

Table 2.—Cumulative percentages of aggregate gradation, and derived specification on a percentage passing basis

| Sieve size | Cumulative percentage passing, by simple addition | | Cumulative percentage retained | | Cumulative percentage passing, by subtraction | | Derived specification on a percentage passing basis ¹ |
|--------------|---|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|---|-------------------|--|
| | Minimum (1) | Maximum (2) | Minimum (1R) | Maximum (2R) | Maximum (3) | Minimum (4) | |
| 1 inch..... | 71 | ² 140 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| ½ inch..... | 46 | 95 | 25 | 45 | 75 | 55 | 55-75 |
| No. 4..... | 36 | 70 | 35 | 70 | 65 | 30 | 36-65 |
| No. 8..... | 30 | 55 | 41 | 85 | 59 | 15 | 30-55 |
| No. 16..... | 24 | 46 | 47 | 94 | 53 | 6 | 24-46 |
| No. 40..... | 16 | 33 | 55 | ² 107 | 45 | ² - 7 | 16-33 |
| No. 80..... | 9 | 20 | 62 | ² 120 | 38 | ² - 20 | 9-20 |
| No. 200..... | 2 | 8 | 69 | ² 132 | 31 | ² - 32 | 2-8 |

¹ The greater of the two minimum values, columns 1 and 4, and the lesser of the two maximum values, columns 2 and 3.
² Fictional values.




Figure 1.—Limiting curves of grading.

1/2-inch sieve is 45 percent, that retained on the No. 4 sieve is 45 + 25 = 70 percent, and so on (see column 2R of table 2).

In any grading analysis, when the percentage retained on any particular sieve is known, the percentage passing the same sieve can be determined simply by subtracting the percentage retained from 100. Thus, in table 2, columns 3 and 4 are derived from columns 1R and 2R. The values exceeding 100 percent in column 2R are fictional and, therefore, the negative values in column 4 are also fictional and are disregarded in plotting.

The maximum cumulative percentage passing values thus calculated (column 3, table 2) are plotted in figure 1 as curve 3; the minimum values (column 4, table 2) as curve 4. These two curves define the limits of the intended grading band in the coarse sizes but they do not define them in the fine sizes.

The third step is to select the lower values of curves 2 and 3 and connect these values by a solid line, as illustrated in figure 2. Similarly, the higher values of curves 1 and 4 are selected and connected by a solid line. These curves define the limits of the intended grading band.

As indicated in column 5 of table 2, an equivalent gradation on a percentage passing basis may be derived from the values computed in columns 1, 2, 3, and 4. The lowest maximum values (columns 2 and 3) and the highest minimum values (columns 1 and 4) are used. When plotted on an aggregate chart, these percentage passing values enclose an area identical in shape and size with that representing the passing and retained specification from which they are derived.

The grading band, so drawn, will enclose all possible gradings that fall within the limits of the passing and retained grading

specification in table 1, and the derived percentage passing grading, in column 5 of table 2.

Control for each Sieve

The two specifications are not identical in their control, however, because of another factor. That is the requirement in the passing and retained specification, table 1, that for each fraction defined, there is a definite control of the amount of that which passes any particular sieve which must be retained on the next smaller sieve in the named series. This has the effect of

placing maximum and minimum limits on the slope of each segment of any specific grading curve that might be drawn within the borders of the grading band. These maximum and minimum slopes vary as the specific grading curve passes from zone to zone but they are definitely fixed, as follows:

1. Minimum slopes are fixed by curve 1 and 3 which are parallel to each other throughout (see fig. 2). Therefore, each of the solid lines in the envelope curve that represents a segment of either curve 1 or 3 establishes the minimum slope, under the passing and retained specification, for the zone in which it occurs.

2. Maximum slopes are fixed by curve 2 and 4 which also are parallel to each other throughout, including the fictional segments not shown. Therefore, each of the solid lines in the envelope curve that represent a segment of either curve 2 or 4 establishes the maximum slope for its zone.

3. In the transition zone B, no segment of curves 1 or 4 was used as a part of the envelope curve. Likewise in zone C, no segment of curves 2 or 3 was used as a part of the envelope curve. In these zones proper control may be obtained by using the dashed segment of curve 1 to set the minimum permissible slope in zone B and the dashed segment of curve 4 to set the maximum permissible slope in that zone. Similarly, the dashed segments of curves 3 and 2 establish the minimum and maximum slopes respectively in zone C. It might appear that this is not necessary and that it would be more practical to utilize the solid lines connecting Y with Z and V with X for the slope control, but this is not correct as may be seen by a close examination of the specification requirements.

It is evident, from the preceding dis-




Figure 2.—Grading band (enclosed area between solid lines).

ussion, that the number of different grading curves that could be drawn within the boundaries of a grading band, such as the one illustrated in figure 2, is greatly reduced by the slope limitations that are imposed in each zone by the passing and retained type of specification. There is, of course, no such reduction in the case of the ordinary type of percentage passing specification. As a result, unless some slope limitation is included in the grading requirements of the percentage passing type, a great many more grading curves of this type can be included in the grading band under discussion than will meet the requirements of the passing and retained specification on which this grading band is based.

The heavy dot-dash line within the grading band limits of figure 3 represents an individual grading or job-formula curve that conforms to both the fractional limits and slope limits of the illustrative passing and retained grading of table 1. Actually, this curve is also fairly representative of job formulas that are generally developed under the percentage passing type of specification. Any curve within the grading band, such as the one illustrated in figure 3, will meet the requirements of the passing and retained specification provided the slopes within the grading zones are within the minimum and maximum slopes indicated by the dotted lines.

Skip Grading

The simple requirement that the job-formula curves must fall within the grading limits of the percentage passing specification in column 5 of table 2, or the grading band defined by the solid lines of figures 2 and 3, would permit another type of job formula characterized by one or more "skips" in the grading curve—that




Figure 3.—Example of a grading that will pass both types of specification.

is, one in which, in one or more zones of the curve, all material passing a certain sieve will also pass the next smaller sieve. Such a job-formula curve is shown by the heavy dot-dash line in figure 4. It indicates a skip grading in that all of the material that passes the No. 4 sieve also passes the No. 8. Some engineers permit skip gradings to be used on the ground that they have certain definite advantages. Many others, however, do not permit their use. In such cases, in order to provide for the exclusion of skip gradings, it may be necessary to have controls other than the simple grading band

limits for the percentage passing specification. Skip gradings are automatically eliminated by most specifications of the passing and retained type. They are readily prevented in percentage passing specifications by requiring that there be a certain minimum amount of material between any two consecutive sieve sizes.

For example, assume that the percentage passing specification in column 5 of table 2 had an additional requirement that the fraction retained between any two consecutive sieves shall not be less than 4 percent of the total. Then any curve within the grading band in figure 4 would represent a gradation meeting the specifications provided the slopes within the grading zones are greater than this minimum 4 percent shown by the dotted lines.

Other Controls

As noted, a skip grading, represented by a zero slope illustrated in zone C in figure 4, is considered by many engineers to be an undesirable extreme. This is debatable, but there is no doubt as to the undesirability of the opposite extreme of excess material in one size which would be reflected by a very steep slope in one or more of the zones. With the grading band limits as wide as those in figure 4, it would be possible to have as much as 39 percent of the aggregate between two sieves (zone B). The latter extreme can be partially avoided by reducing the percentage range in the specifications for all or some of the sieves. However, actual experience with the passing type of specification indicates that the extreme conditions discussed above do not generally constitute a serious problem.

Some passing and retained specifications with relatively wide controlling limits have




Figure 4.—Illustration of a skip grading.

an additional requirement such as, for instance, that the total retained on the No. 10 sieve shall be 45-65 percent (equivalent to percentage passing of 35-55 percent). This type of control may be desirable, particularly on the No. 8 or No. 10 sieve, but it is misleading to set the envelope limits to appear to give a wider range.

In other cases, slopes are drastically limited by such means as setting very narrow ranges on certain sieves, as illustrated in zone D of figure 3, where the total variation allowed for the fraction between the No. 8 and No. 16 sieves (table 1) is from 6 to 9 percent or only 3 percentage points. Another type of drastic slope limitation that generally reduces the flexibility of a specification is the requirement of a disproportionately large fraction between any two sieves. Such devices generally fail to serve any useful purpose and make specifications appear to be quite open and flexible when actually they are very difficult and expensive to meet.

It is evident that percentage passing specifications and percentage passing and re-

tained specifications may have identical grading-band limits. Resulting mixtures obtained by either will generally be approximately the same, although many gradations meeting the former will not meet the latter. Regardless of the differences to be considered in analyzing the two systems, the method of plotting described here gives a reasonable comparison of requirements under the two systems. It also permits comparison of the gradations with ideal gradation curves.

The percentage passing specification is perhaps more easily understood and is more readily compared with the ideal gradation curves. It is also more convenient in predetermining graphically the gradation resulting from the combination of two separate aggregates (fine and coarse) and in checking the combined gradation against the controlling limits of the specifications.¹

¹ *Principles of Highway Construction as Applied to Airports, Flight Strips, and Other Landing Areas for Aircraft*. Public Roads Administration, 1943, pp. 184-186.

Difficulty is sometimes encountered in comparing bituminous concrete specifications because of the fact that some specifications give aggregate gradation requirements with separate indication of the amount of asphalt to be added, while other specifications include the asphalt with the aggregate in the gradation requirements. The latter method makes it difficult to predetermine that a particular aggregate, when mixed with the asphalt, will produce a mix complying with the specification.

The result desired in all cases is a bituminous concrete that will adequately serve under the anticipated traffic loads. Variations to fit the characteristics of local aggregates, the volume and weight of traffic to be accommodated, economic factors, and other influences undoubtedly are responsible for the wide range of controlling limits observed in different specifications. However, it would appear logical to prepare specifications under a uniform system in order that the experience of different engineers might be interchanged and a common meeting ground for discussion could be developed.

HIGHWAY STATISTICS, 1951

Available about April 4 will be the Bureau's *Highway Statistics, 1951*, the seventh of the bulletin series presenting annual statistical and analytical tables of general interest on the subjects of motor fuel, motor vehicles, highway-user taxation, financing of highways, and highway mileage. *High-*

way Statistics, 1951, will be sold by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at 60 cents a copy. The full series of the annual bulletin are available from the Superintendent of Documents, as indicated on the inside back cover of PUBLIC ROADS.

A complete list of the publications of the Bureau of Public Roads, classified according to subject and including the more important articles in PUBLIC ROADS, may be obtained upon request addressed to Bureau of Public Roads, Washington 25, D. C.

PUBLICATIONS of the Bureau of Public Roads

The following publications are sold by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Orders should be sent direct to the Superintendent of Documents. Prepayment is required.

ANNUAL REPORTS

Work of the Public Roads Administration:

1941, 15 cents. 1946, 20 cents. 1948, 20 cents.
1942, 10 cents. 1947, 20 cents. 1949, 25 cents.

Public Roads Administration Annual Reports:

1943; 1944; 1945. (Free from Bureau of Public Roads)

Annual Reports of the Bureau of Public Roads:

1950, 25 cents. 1951, 35 cents. 1952, 25 cents.

HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 462

- Part 1.—Nonuniformity of State Motor-Vehicle Traffic Laws. 15 cents.
Part 2.—Skilled Investigation at the Scene of the Accident Needed to Develop Causes. 10 cents.
Part 3.—Inadequacy of State Motor-Vehicle Accident Reporting. 10 cents.
Part 4.—Official Inspection of Vehicles. 10 cents.
Part 5.—Case Histories of Fatal Highway Accidents. 10 cents.
Part 6.—The Accident-Prone Driver. 10 cents.

UNIFORM VEHICLE CODE

- Act I.—Uniform Motor-Vehicle Administration, Registration, Certificate of Title, and Antitheft Act. 15 cents.
Act II.—Uniform Motor-Vehicle Operators' and Chauffeurs' License Act. 15 cents. (revised 1952)
Act III.—Uniform Motor-Vehicle Civil Liability Act. 10 cents.
Act IV.—Uniform Motor-Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act. 15 cents. (revised 1952)
Act V.—Uniform Act Regulating Traffic on Highways. 20 cents. (revised 1952)
Model Traffic Ordinance. 15 cents.

MAPS

- State Transportation Map series (available for 39 States). Uniform sheets 26 by 36 inches, scale 1 inch equals 4 miles. Shows in colors Federal-aid and State highways with surface types, principal connecting roads, railroads, airports, waterways, National and State forests, parks, and other reservations. Prices and number of sheets for each State vary—see Superintendent of Documents price list 53.
United States System of Numbered Highways together with the Federal-Aid Highway System (also shows in color National forests, parks, and other reservations). 5 by 7 feet (in 2 sheets), scale 1 inch equals 37 miles. \$1.25.
United States System of Numbered Highways. 28 by 42 inches, scale 1 inch equals 78 miles. 20 cents.

MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS

- Bibliography of Highway Planning Reports. 30 cents.
Construction of Private Driveways (No. 272MP). 10 cents.
Economic and Statistical Analysis of Highway Construction Expenditures. 15 cents.
Electrical Equipment on Movable Bridges (No. 265T). 40 cents.
Factual Discussion of Motortruck Operation, Regulation, and Taxation. 30 cents.
Federal Legislation and Regulations Relating to Highway Construction. 40 cents.
Financing of Highways by Counties and Local Rural Governments, 1931-41. 45 cents.
Guides to Traffic Safety. 10 cents.
Highway Accidents. 10 cents.
Highway Bond Calculations. 10 cents.
Highway Bridge Location (No. 1486D). 15 cents.
Highway Capacity Manual. 65 cents.
Highway Needs of the National Defense (House Document No. 249). 50 cents.
Highway Practice in the United States of America. 75 cents.
Highway Statistics (annual):
1945, 35 cents. 1948, 65 cents. 1951, 60 cents.
1946, 50 cents. 1949, 55 cents.
1947, 45 cents. 1950, 60 cents.
Highway Statistics, Summary to 1945. 40 cents.
Highways in the United States (*nontechnical*). 15 cents.
Highways of History. 25 cents.
Identification of Rock Types. 10 cents.
Interregional Highways (House Document No. 379). 75 cents.
Legal Aspects of Controlling Highway Access. 15 cents.
Local Rural Road Problem. 20 cents.
Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways. 75 cents.
Mathematical Theory of Vibration in Suspension Bridges. \$1.25.
Principles of Highway Construction as Applied to Airports, Flight Strips, and Other Landing Areas for Aircraft. \$1.75.
Public Control of Highway Access and Roadside Development. 35 cents.
Public Land Acquisition for Highway Purposes. 10 cents.
Roadside Improvement (No. 191MP). 10 cents.
Selected Bibliography on Highway Finance. 55 cents.
Specifications for Construction of Roads and Bridges in National Forests and National Parks (FP-41). \$1.50.
Taxation of Motor Vehicles in 1932. 35 cents.
Tire Wear and Tire Failures on Various Road Surfaces. 10 cents.
Transition Curves for Highways. \$1.25.

Single copies of the following publications are available to highway engineers and administrators for official use, and may be obtained by those so qualified upon request addressed to the Bureau of Public Roads. They are not sold by the Superintendent of Documents.

- Bibliography on Automobile Parking in the United States.
Bibliography on Highway Lighting.
Bibliography on Highway Safety.
Bibliography on Land Acquisition for Public Roads.
Bibliography on Roadside Control.
Express Highways in the United States: a Bibliography.
Indexes to PUBLIC ROADS, volumes 17-19, and 23.
Title Sheets for PUBLIC ROADS, volumes 24, 25, and 26.

