

bill, will achieve it.

The Department of Transportation has made a preliminary study of the comparative efficiency of fixed versus portable scale locations, based upon the actual results obtained from the three fixed stations (each with two enforcement units) and the thirteen portable stations operated during the last half of 1975. The study indicates that the portable locations are more efficient than the fixed ones. For example:

(1) In terms of arrests per vehicle checked, at the fixed stations, 132,114 vehicles were checked, resulting in 3,501 arrests, or one arrest for each 37.7 vehicles checked. At the portable stations, 24,758 vehicles were checked, resulting in 5,295 arrests, or one arrest for each 4.67 vehicles checked. Thus, in terms of vehicles checked, the portable stations produced eight times as many arrests as the fixed ones.

(2) In terms of arrests per vehicle weighed, similar results occurred. At the fixed locations, 61% of the vehicles checked were weighed, but of the 80,361 vehicles weighed, there were only 930 arrests for overweight, or just over one percent of the vehicles weighed. At the portable locations, only 17% of the vehicles checked were weighed, yet of the 4,210 vehicles weighed, there were 1,927 arrests for overweight, or 45%.

(3) In terms of cost efficiency, approximately one-half of the \$1.3 million budget for the Truck Weight Enforcement Division was expended for the three fixed locations, the other half going for the thirteen portable units. Considering that each of the three fixed stations has two enforcement units, the State gets more than twice the coverage (and significantly more arrests) per dollar with portable units than with fixed ones.

I have also received information from the State Police Truck Weight Enforcement Division indicating that these figures do not tell the whole story, and that maximum efficiency would be achieved by the placement of additional fixed stations on certain Interstate and other heavily travelled highways.

These conflicting indications point up the need to give further consideration to where our investment in truck weight enforcement ought to be. This need was also recognized by the Senate Committee on Budget and Taxation and the House Committee on Appropriations as evidenced by the Report of the Joint Chairmen issued on April 12, 1976. That Report recommended that the whole program of truck weight enforcement be considered for evaluation prior to the 1977 session of the General Assembly, "with the objective of evaluating its effectiveness and