

TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH SYNTHESIS

Minnesota Department of Transportation
Office of Transportation System Management
Research Services & Library
651-366-3780
www.mndot.gov/research

TRS 1807

August 2018

Permit Fee Policies for Oversize/Overweight Vehicles

Prepared by CTC & Associates LLC

Since the early 1990s, the state of Minnesota has been considering a move toward a unified permitting process (UPP) for oversize/overweight (OSOW) vehicles. The multiphase UPP project now underway will, over the long term, establish the framework for a statewide “one-stop shop” permitting system. This streamlined permitting process is expected to increase efficiencies in permit application and issuance practices, and reduce agency costs and the staff time needed to process OSOW permits.

MnDOT is seeking information about the practices of other state transportation agencies in setting, collecting and distributing permit fees for heavy commercial and OSOW vehicles. This information will be used to support Minnesota’s ongoing effort to establish an OSOW UPP. To gather this information, selected state departments of transportation and other state agencies were surveyed about their OSOW permit fee structures; the statutory basis, purpose and allocation of permit fees; the state’s level of engagement with local agencies; and special policies associated with the movement of OSOW loads. This Transportation Research Synthesis presents the findings of that survey along with statutory references and other resources provided by survey respondents.



Technical Advisory Panel

Rich Sanders, Technical Liaison
Polk County, Minnesota

Laura Roads, Technical Liaison
MnDOT Office of Freight and Commercial
Vehicle Operations (OFCVO)

Christine Kline, Principal Investigator
CTC & Associates LLC

Patrick Casey, Principal Investigator
CTC & Associates LLC

Clark Moe, Project Manager
MnDOT Office of Maintenance

Tim Andersen, Panelist
MnDOT Office of Materials and Road
Research

Ted Coulianos, Panelist
MnDOT OFCVO

Kent Exner, Panelist
City of Hutchinson, Minnesota

Lowell Flaten, Panelist
MnDOT District 8

Rick Johnson, Panelist
Tiller Corporation

Renaë Kuehl, Panelist
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.

Lenny Laures, Panelist
Minnesota Association of Townships

Mike Marti, Panelist
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.

Shelly Meyer, Panelist
MnDOT OFCVO

Captain Jon Olsen, Panelist
Minnesota Department of Public Safety

Ruth Simpson, Panelist
Minnesota Association of Townships

Joel Uring, Panelist
MnDOT State Aid

Brad Wentz, Panelist
North Dakota State University

James Wilde, Panelist
Minnesota State University, Mankato/
Texas State University

The purpose of this Transportation Research Synthesis (TRS) is to serve as a synthesis of pertinent completed research to be used for further study and evaluation by MnDOT. This TRS does not represent the conclusions of either the authors or MnDOT.

Permit Fee Policies for Oversize/Overweight Vehicles

Introduction

MnDOT is seeking information about the practices of other state transportation agencies in setting, collecting and distributing permit fees for heavy commercial and oversize/overweight (OSOW) vehicles. This information will be used to support Minnesota's ongoing effort to establish an OSOW unified permitting process (UPP). The multiphase project underway to develop a UPP began with an exploration of the feasibility of creating an accessible and automated system for unified permitting within and across jurisdictions (including local and state government agencies). In the UPP project's final phases, development and testing of a proof of concept will be followed by implementation of unified permitting statewide.

This Transportation Research Synthesis presents findings from a survey of selected state departments of transportation (DOTs) and other state agencies expected to have experience with OSOW permitting. The survey sought information about each agency's OSOW permit fee structure; the statutory basis, purpose and allocation of permit fees; the state's level of engagement with local agencies; and special policies associated with the movement of OSOW loads. Statutory references, research reports and other resources provided by survey respondents supplement survey findings.

Summary of Findings

Survey of Practice

An online survey was distributed to 24 states; 20 states, including Minnesota, responded to the survey. Current MnDOT practices are reflected throughout this report to allow for comparison with other agencies' practices.

Below are highlights of survey results in eight topic areas:

- Fee implementation.
- Statutory authority or other basis for fees.
- Fee purpose.
- Fee components.
- Fee distribution.
- Engagement with local agencies.
- Policies for special load types.
- Other related resources.

Fee Implementation

The implementation date of respondents' OSOW permit fee structures varied widely, with some describing fairly recent changes to at least some permit fees, while others reported on fee structures of long standing. Some fee structures date back to the late 1950s (Maryland), while other respondents reported a recent review of fee schedules (March 2016 for Iowa DOT). Other states add new fees to fee structures of relatively long standing (new permit types added in 2018 supplement a Texas fee structure in existence for more than 20 years). Several respondents noted that fees are updated to reflect changes in state law.

Statutory Authority or Other Basis for Fees

All but two respondents provided information about the statutory authority for their states' fees (respondents from Colorado and South Dakota described transportation commission oversight that is also based on state statute). See page 7 for the statutes, regulations and other guidance respondents cited as the basis for their states' OSOW fees.

Other Factors Influencing Permit Fee Structure

Three respondents reported on factors other than statutory requirements that have influenced the establishment of OSOW permit fees. Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and Missouri DOT examined the fee structures of fellow members of Mid America Association of Transportation Officials. North Dakota Highway Patrol contacted surrounding states and members of Western Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials to inquire about current fee structures. Missouri DOT also reviewed surveys conducted by the Specialized Carriers and Rigging Association.

Research studies informed establishment of OSOW permit fees in four states (Indiana, Montana, Ohio and Virginia). These respondents cited the relevant research, and some offered additional perspective on how the research impacted agency practices:

- In Indiana, state and national pavement research informed establishment of the state's OW divisible load permit fees.
- Ohio DOT conducted a study of the impacts of OW loads for the state Legislature in connection with the agency's request for a 2009 fee increase.
- In Virginia, the state's current statutory fee structure was the outcome of a 2011 stakeholder study that recommended fee increases and tiered them by weight to better reflect pavement, bridge and structural damage caused by OW vehicles.

Also cited in this section of the report are studies completed by Illinois and Wisconsin DOTs that consider aligning OSOW permit fees with agency costs.

Fee Purpose

Respondents described the purpose of their states' OSOW permit fees by selecting all that applied from among four general purposes:

- To recover the cost of the administrative effort to issue the permit.
- To recover the cost of highway maintenance and other activities associated with addressing OSOW load impacts.
- To better understand how the road network is being used.
- To follow the fee structure set by statute.

Almost three-quarters of respondents assess fees to recover the cost of highway maintenance associated with OSOW loads. Respondents were least likely to assess OSOW fees to better understand how the road network is being used.

Fee Components

Respondents were asked to describe the following components of their OSOW permit fees, if applicable:

- Flat fee.
- Base fee.
- Mileage fee.
- Overweight fee.
- Overdimension fee.
- Load type fee.
- Engineering fee.
- Traffic review fee.
- Escort fee.
- Law enforcement fee.
- Other fees.

Tables that begin on page 18 address each OSOW fee component individually. When practical, common practices are identified and categorized. The tables reflect some overlap between fee components and respondents' differing views on how to classify fees.

Some respondents reported on other fees that were not specifically addressed in survey questions:

- Administrative or service fee: \$3.33 (Florida); \$5 (Texas); \$10 (North Dakota, South Carolina).
- Credit card processing fee: \$5 (South Carolina).
- Permit amendment fee: \$2 (Missouri).
- Transfer fee: \$10 (Virginia).
- Sliding-scale county selection fee: \$175 to \$1,000 (Texas).

Fee Distribution

Respondents described the types of funds or accounts to which OSOW permit fees are directed after collection, identifying few restrictions on the use of the funds collected. Most respondents reported distribution of OSOW permit fees to a state highway fund. In a few cases, permit fee revenues are directed to different funds based on permit type.

Engagement With Local Agencies

More than three-quarters of respondents reported no engagement with local agencies in connection with the setting or collection of OSOW permit fees, or indicated that each local agency is responsible for setting its own fees.

Four respondents described consistent statewide practices or provided details on how the state engages with local agencies:

- **Colorado.** Local agencies have statutory limitations that must be observed when creating a size and weight enforcement plan and fee structure. The DOT works closely with local agencies through its OSOW permit advisory committee to achieve statewide consistency.
- **Georgia.** The state has authority to issue permits and route loads on all roads in the state.
- **Maryland.** The state collects funds and disperses them as appropriate; other agencies have access to relevant data and reporting via the state's online permitting system, Maryland One.
- **Virginia.** Any locality that wishes to issue OSOW permits is required by law to enter into a memorandum of understanding with Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) that allows DMV to issue permits on behalf of the locality and that stipulates the conditions the locality must meet in order to also issue permits.

While MnDOT does not currently engage with local agencies to determine or collect OSOW fees, the agency recently completed a review of local agency fees and practices using primarily online resources.

Policies for Special Load Types

Four states have established special policies for the steel industry (Indiana and Kentucky), wind towers (Wisconsin) and workover service rigs (North Dakota):

Indiana. The Indiana General Assembly created a regulation and fees for “extra heavy duty” highways to address the travel need for OW vehicles servicing the steel industry, mainly in the northwestern part of the state. The special weight permits are available for travel on these routes for vehicles up to 134,000 lbs gross vehicle weight.

Kentucky. A law passed in 2016 “in order to promote economic development and retain jobs” within the state provides for a \$250 annual overdimensional permit for transporting steel products to a Kentucky riverport. The permit is “limited to movements of steel products within the state of not more than seven (7) road miles from the manufacturing facility.”

Wisconsin. Route mitigation efforts were made to accommodate wind tower movement through the state on two major wind tower routes.

North Dakota. The state has a separate OSOW policy and fee structure for workover service rigs (vehicles with coils of cable and other equipment that are used to perform maintenance or make repairs on oil or gas wells). A single-trip permit is required when traveling on the state highway system; the permit fee is \$100.

Other Related Resources

Statutory references and citations for research reports and other publications are included throughout this report in the relevant topic areas. In this section of the report, which begins on page 32, additional resources are presented, including agency websites that provide information about regulations, fees and current practices. Manuals, handouts and other agency publications describe OSOW permit fees and practices.

Next Steps

Going forward, MnDOT might consider:

- Following up with respondents to learn more about agency policies for recovering costs associated with OSOW-related maintenance.
- Examining whether other states specify permit fees in a state statute or establish fees through a separate policy.
- Conducting an extensive literature search to gather information about state practices for establishing OSOW permit fees when fees are not set by state statute.
- Identifying other states' practices for providing exemptions to OSOW permit fees for specific load types or vehicles.
- Gathering information about engagement strategies among townships, local agencies and the state when establishing, collecting and distributing OSOW permit fees.

Detailed Findings

Survey of Practice

An online survey was distributed to selected state departments of transportation (DOTs) and other state agencies expected to have experience with oversize/overweight (OSOW) permitting. These states were:

- Alabama.
- Colorado.
- Florida.
- Georgia.
- Illinois.
- Indiana.
- Iowa.
- Kansas.
- Kentucky.
- Maryland.
- Michigan.
- Missouri.
- Montana.
- New York.
- North Carolina.
- North Dakota.
- Ohio.
- South Carolina.
- South Dakota.
- Texas.
- Utah.
- Virginia.
- Wisconsin.

Survey questions sought details of each agency's OSOW permit fee structure, the purpose and allocation of permit fees, the level of engagement state agencies have established with local agencies also assessing OSOW permit fees, and special policies associated with the movement of OSOW loads. [Appendix A](#) provides the full text of the survey questions. [Appendix B](#) lists the contact information for survey respondents.

The survey received responses from agencies in 19 states:

- Colorado.
- Florida.
- Georgia.
- Indiana.
- Iowa.
- Kansas.
- Kentucky.
- Maryland.
- Michigan.
- Missouri.
- Montana.
- New York.
- North Dakota.
- Ohio.
- South Carolina.
- South Dakota.
- Texas.
- Virginia.
- Wisconsin.

A MnDOT representative also completed the survey. Current MnDOT practices are reflected throughout this report to allow for comparison with other agencies' practices.

Below is a discussion of survey results in eight topic areas:

- Fee implementation.
- Statutory authority or other basis for fees.
- Fee purpose.
- Fee components.
- Fee distribution.
- Engagement with local agencies.
- Policies for special load types.
- Other related resources.

Fee Implementation

The implementation date of respondents' OSOW permit fee structures varied widely, with some describing fairly recent changes to at least some permit fees, while others reported on fee structures of long standing. The table below summarizes survey responses.

Implementation of Respondents' OSOW Fee Structures

| Permit Fee Practice | State | Implementation Date/Time Period |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---|
| Fairly recent fee changes | Indiana | New fees were established on January 1, 2014, for OW divisible load permits (metal commodities, agricultural commodities, logs, wood chips, bark and sawdust). |
| | Iowa | March 2016 |
| | Kansas | 2009 |
| | Kentucky | Some fee changes went into effect in 2017. |
| | Michigan | October 1, 1998 (amended effective May 14, 2018) |
| | Missouri | 2009 |
| | New York | Mid-2000s |
| | Ohio | Implemented in stages beginning in 2009; fully implemented in 2010. |
| | South Carolina | July 1, 2012 |
| | Texas | Some fees were implemented more than 20 years ago, while others were implemented with new permit types on January 1, 2018. Fees for each permit type are determined at the time of permit creation in state statute. ¹ |
| | Virginia | January 1, 2013 |
| | Wisconsin | Statutory changes in 2005 and 2007. |
| Long-standing fee structure | Colorado | The current fee structure was implemented in 1989; new permits have been added to state statute since then. |
| | Florida | The state's fee structure precedes the respondent's tenure at Florida DOT, which began in the 1990s. There have been no fee increases since that time. |
| | Georgia | Updates to the fee structure are noted beginning in 1999 and most recently in 2002. |
| | Maryland | 1957 |
| | Minnesota | Permit fees had a minor adjustment in 1982; the respondent noted that those fee amounts "seem to still be in place today." |
| | North Dakota | Most permit fees were established in the late 1990s. Newer permit fees are established in conjunction with new state law. |
| | South Dakota | 2000 |
| Unknown implementation date | Indiana | The implementation date for most permits is unknown, other than prior to 2015, due to lack of records and recodification of state statute. |
| | Montana | The respondent is unaware of the implementation date but estimates it to be more than 10 years ago. |

¹ The Texas respondent noted that the state "do[es] not have a specific fee structure. Each permit type—we have more than 30—has its own fee. Some permit fees are a set fee while others involve a sliding scale."

Statutory Authority or Other Basis for Fees

Respondents were asked to describe the statutory authority that is the basis for their state's OSOW permit fee structure. All but two respondents provided information about the statutory authority for their fees; two agencies described transportation commission oversight.

Transportation Commission Oversight

The Colorado and South Dakota respondents reported on transportation commission oversight provided for in state law.

Colorado. Statutory authority is given to the DOT and approved by the state's Transportation Commission. (See below for the relevant Transportation Commission regulation.)

§2 CCR 601-4, Rules Pertaining to Transport Permits for the Movement of Extra-Legal Vehicles or Loads, Code of Colorado Regulations, April 2017.

<https://www.sos.state.co.us/CCR/GenerateRulePdf.do?ruleVersionId=7541&fileName=2 CCR 601-4>

South Dakota. State law gives the South Dakota Transportation Commission authority to set permit fees, unless otherwise specified in state law.

Statutes and Administrative Codes or Rules

Most respondents provided a specific statutory reference when asked to describe the statutory authority that is the basis for their state's OSOW permit fee structure.

Florida. Chapter 316.550 of Florida Statutes defines the minimum and maximum fees; Florida Administrative Code 14-26 defines the fee structure.

Florida Statute Chapter 316.550, Operations Not in Conformity With Law; Special Permits, Chapter 316, State Uniform Traffic Control, Title 23, Motor Vehicles, 2018 Florida Statutes, 2018.

http://www.leg.state.fl.us/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=0300-0399/0316/Sections/0316.550.html

Chapter 14-26, Safety Regulations and Permit Fees for Overweight and Overdimensional Vehicles, Florida Administrative Code, 2010.

<https://www.flrules.org/gateway/ChapterHome.asp?Chapter=14-26> (for links to individual rules within the chapter)

Georgia. On its website, the Georgia Department of Public Safety summarizes the laws that govern the movement of goods and materials; see <http://gamccd.net/OSPermit/Laws.aspx>.

Chapter 672-2, Permits for Vehicles or Loads of Excess Weight or Dimension, Chapter 672, State Department of Transportation, Georgia Code, March 2014.

<http://rules.sos.state.ga.us/gac/672-2?urlRedirected=yes&data=admin&lookingfor=672-2>

Information about the issuance of permits is available at this site, including restrictions, conditions and the permit application procedure.

Indiana. The statutes below govern OSOW permits and fees in Indiana:

- Indiana Code (IC) 9-20 addresses issues related to vehicle size and weight regulations.

- IC 9-20-1-5 gives Indiana DOT the authority to adopt rules for the fee structure for overweight permits, overweight divisible loads and special weight permits (a type of permit used only on extra heavy duty highways in northern Indiana).
- Oversize-only permit fees are defined by IC 9-20-6-13.
- Tractor-mobile home rig oversize permit fees are defined by IC 9-20-14-2 and IC 9-20-15-1.
- Permit fees for special weight permits are partially defined by IC 9-20-5-7 (annual registration fee) and also in rule at 105 Indiana Administrative Code (IAC) 10-2 (trip permit fee).
- Permit fees for overweight divisible loads are in rule at 105 IAC 10-3.
- Definitions related to vehicle size and weight regulations are given in IC 9-13-2, Chapter 2.

Article 20, Size and Weight Regulation, Title 9, Motor Vehicles, Indiana Code, 2017.

<http://iga.in.gov/legislative/laws/2017/ic/titles/009#9-20>

Title 105, Oversize and/or Overweight Vehicular Permits for Highways, Indiana Department of Transportation, Article 10, Indiana Administrative Code, latest update May 9, 2018.

<http://www.in.gov/legislative/iac/T01050/A00100.PDF?>

IC 9-13-2, Chapter 2: Definitions, Title 9, Motor Vehicles, Indiana Code, 2017.

<http://iga.in.gov/legislative/laws/2017/ic/titles/009#9-13>

Iowa

Chapter 321E.14, Fees for Permits, Chapter 321E, Vehicles of Excessive Size and Weight, Iowa Code, January 2014.

<https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/2014/321E.pdf>

Chapter 321E.14 of the Iowa Code details the fees for various permits, including annual, single-trip and multitrip permits.

Kansas. Chapter 8 of Kansas Annotated Statutes addresses size, weight and load restrictions of vehicles. Chapter 8-1911 specifies permits and fees; Chapter 8-1919 provides for special permits for certain vehicle combinations (annual overweight divisible load permit for a truck-tractor semitrailer combination vehicle or a truck-tractor semitrailer, trailer combination vehicle with a gross vehicle weight of more than 85,500 pounds but not more than 90,000 pounds transporting divisible loads on six or more axles).

Chapter 8, Automobiles and Other Vehicles, Kansas Statutes Annotated, 2017.

http://www.ksrevisor.org/statutes/ksa_ch8.html

Chapter 8-1911, Permits for Oversize or Overweight Vehicles; Fees, Chapter 8, Automobiles and Other Vehicles, Kansas Statutes Annotated, 2014.

http://www.ksrevisor.org/statutes/chapters/ch08/008_019_0011.html

Chapter 8-1919, Issuance of Special Permits for Certain Vehicle Combinations; Fees; Conditions, Chapter 8, Automobiles and Other Vehicles, Kansas Statutes Annotated, July 2017.

http://www.ksrevisor.org/statutes/chapters/ch08/008_019_0019.html

Kentucky

Chapter 189.270, Special Permits to Exceed Limits, Chapter 189, Traffic Regulations—Vehicle Equipment and Storage, Kentucky Revised Statutes, April 2012.

<http://www.lrc.ky.gov/statutes/statute.aspx?id=40065>

Chapter 189.270 of the Kentucky Revised Statutes provides condition and fee information for issuing permits to vehicles or equipment that exceed weight or dimension limits.

Related Resource:

Kentucky Revised Statutes, Overweight/Over-Dimensional Laws and Regulations, Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, 2018.

<https://drive.ky.gov/motor-carriers/Pages/OWOD-Laws-and-Regulations.aspx#kentucky-revised-statutes>

This webpage provides links to Kentucky Revised Statutes that are relevant to OSOW laws and regulations.

Maryland

Chapter 24-112, Permits for Excess Size and Weight, Title 24, Vehicle Laws—Size, Weight and Load; Highway Preservation, Subtitle 1, Size, Weight and Load, Maryland Code, 2017.

<https://law.justia.com/codes/maryland/2017/transportation/title-24/subtitle-1/section-24-112/>

Chapter 24-112 of the Maryland Code provides permit fees and other information for OSOW vehicles.

Michigan. Section 257.725 (amended) provides condition and fee information for issuing permits to vehicles or equipment that exceed size, weight or load limits. Act 300 of 1949 of the Michigan Vehicle Code addresses all matters related to motor vehicle size, weight and load, including Section 257.725 (Amended), Special Permit for Certain Vehicles and Loads Required; Fees; Violation as Civil Infraction; Annual Permit for Movement of Construction Equipment; “Jurisdictional Authority” Defined.

§257.725 (Amended), Special Permit for Certain Vehicles and Loads Required; Fees; Violation as Civil Infraction; Annual Permit for Movement of Construction Equipment; “Jurisdictional Authority” Defined, Act 300 of 1949, Size, Weight and Load, Chapter 257, Motor Vehicles, Michigan Vehicle Code, May 2018.

[http://www.legislature.mi.gov/\(S\(f1i5mbgbwkysd02ndfdizbks\)\)/documents/mcl/pdf/mcl-257-725-amended.pdf](http://www.legislature.mi.gov/(S(f1i5mbgbwkysd02ndfdizbks))/documents/mcl/pdf/mcl-257-725-amended.pdf)

Act 300 of 1949, Size, Weight and Load, Chapter 257, Motor Vehicles, Michigan Vehicle Code, May 2018.

[http://www.legislature.mi.gov/\(S\(ibhsqd3qinlxbjiixcwo5mcp\)\)/mileg.aspx?page=getObject&objectName=mcl-300-1949-VI-SIZE-WEIGHT-AND-LOAD](http://www.legislature.mi.gov/(S(ibhsqd3qinlxbjiixcwo5mcp))/mileg.aspx?page=getObject&objectName=mcl-300-1949-VI-SIZE-WEIGHT-AND-LOAD)

Minnesota

§169.86, Special Permit to Exceed Height, Width or Load; Fees, 2017 Minnesota Statutes, latest update 2016.

<https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/?id=169.86>

From Section 169.86(d):

The state as to state trunk highways, a statutory or home rule charter city as to streets in the city, or a town as to roads in the town, may issue permits authorizing the transportation of combinations of vehicles exceeding the limitations in section 169.81, subdivisions 2a and 3, over highways, streets, or roads within its boundaries. Combinations of vehicles authorized by this paragraph may be restricted as to the use of state trunk highways by the commissioner, to the use of streets by the city road authority,

and to the use of roads by the town road authority. Nothing in this paragraph or section 169.81, subdivisions 2a and 3, alters or changes the authority vested in local authorities under section 169.04.

Subdivision 5, Fees; Proceeds Deposited; Appropriation, §169.86, Special Permit to Exceed Height, Width or Load; Fees, 2017 Minnesota Statutes, latest update 2016.

<https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/?id=169.86#stat.169.86.5>

This subdivision of Section 169.86 provides fee information for permits along with guidance for appropriating funds to the trunk highway fund in the state treasury.

Missouri

§7 CSR 10-25.020, Oversize/Overweight Permits, Chapter 25, Motor Carrier Operations, Title 7, Department of Transportation, Missouri Code of State Regulations, June 2017.

<https://www.sos.mo.gov/cmsimages/adrules/csr/current/7csr/7c10-25.pdf>

See page 4 of the document (page 3 of the PDF) for the section applicable to OSOW permits.

Montana

§61-10-124, Special Permits—Fees, Part 1, Standards, Permits, and Fees, Chapter 10, Size—Weight—Load, Title 61, Motor Vehicles, Montana Code Annotated 2017, latest update 2011.

http://leg.mt.gov/bills/mca/title_0610/chapter_0100/part_0010/section_0240/0610-0100-0010-0240.html

Section 61-10-124 of the Montana Code provides for special permits for OSOW vehicles.

§61-10-125, Other Fees, Part 1, Standards, Permits, and Fees, Chapter 10, Size—Weight—Load, Title 61, Motor Vehicles Montana Code Annotated 2017, latest update 2005.

http://leg.mt.gov/bills/mca/title_0610/chapter_0100/part_0010/section_0250/0610-0100-0010-0250.html

Fee information based on load and axle limit is provided in Section 61-10-125 of the Montana Code.

§61-10-130, Custom Combiner's Special Permit—Fee—Collection—Distribution—Not Transferable, Part 1, Standards, Permits, and Fees, Chapter 10, Size—Weight—Load, Title 61, Motor Vehicles, Montana Code Annotated 2017, latest update 2001.

http://leg.mt.gov/bills/mca/title_0610/chapter_0100/part_0010/section_0300/0610-0100-0010-0300.html

Section 61-10-130 provides permitting information for Montana residents and nonresidents engaged in the business of custom combining.

New York

Part 154, Special Hauling Permits, Subchapter C, Highway Use and Maintenance, Chapter IV, Highways, Title 17, Department of Transportation, New York Codes, Rules and Regulations, current through March 10, 2018.

<https://govt.westlaw.com/nycrr/Browse/Home/NewYork/NewYorkCodesRulesandRegulations?guid=Ic10a7840b1c711dd9fb3cdc96a8a111e&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=sc.Default>

This site provides access to Subpart 154-1, Nondivisible Load Permits; Subpart 154-2, Divisible Load Overweight Permits; and Subpart 154-3, Nondivisible Load Status Determinations.

Types of Divisible Load Overweight Permits and Fees, PERM 69, Central Permit Office, New York State Department of Transportation, December 2015.

<https://www.dot.ny.gov/nypermits/repository/Perm%2069%20Permit%20Types%2012-15.pdf>

This two-page document summarizes the agency's divisible OSOW permits and fees. Divisible loads are described as any vehicle or combination of vehicles transporting cargo of legal dimensions that can be separated into units of legal weight without affecting the physical integrity of the load. Examples of divisible

loads include aggregate (sand, top soil, gravel, stone); logs; scrap metal; fuel; milk; and trash/refuse/garbage.

Information Concerning Special Hauling Permits, PERM 30, Central Permit Office, New York State Department of Transportation, November 2011.

<https://www.dot.ny.gov/nypermits/repository/PERM30.pdf>

A special hauling permit is required for a nondivisible load, which is described as follows:

A non-divisible load means any load or vehicle exceeding applicable length or weight limits which, if separated into smaller loads or vehicles, would:

- a) Destroy the value of the load or vehicle, i.e., make it unusable for its intended purpose (i.e., manufactured/modular home, transformer, bulldozer, or a self-contained, self-propelled construction vehicle such as a crane, well-drilling rig, backhoe, pay loader, etc.); or
- b) Require more than 8 work-hours to dismantle using appropriate equipment. The applicant has the burden of proof as to the number of work-hours required to dismantle the load; or
- c) Compromise the intended use of the vehicle, i.e., make it unable to perform the function for which it was intended.

A special hauling permit is generally issued for the transportation of a single piece or item. However, multiple items such as wood trusses, precast concrete pipe or manholes, construction equipment, etc., are allowable as long the addition items do not cause an overweight condition or cause an additional over dimension condition. A permit will not be issued for any load which can be reduced to legal weight or dimensions.

North Dakota

Chapter 39-12, Size, Width and Height Restrictions, North Dakota Century Code, undated.

<http://www.legis.nd.gov/cencode/t39c12.pdf>

Chapter 39-12-02 addresses special permitting for OSOW vehicles, including a fee schedule.

Article 38-06, Movement of Oversize and/or Overweight Vehicles and Loads, Title 38, Highway Patrol, North Dakota Administrative Code, effective January 2016.

<http://www.legis.nd.gov/information/acdata/html/38-06.html>

Sections within this article of the North Dakota Administrative Code address permitting regulations, fees and restrictions.

Chapter 38-06-03, Permit Fees, Article 38-06, Movement of Oversize and/or Overweight Vehicles and Loads, Title 38, Highway Patrol, North Dakota Administrative Code, effective January 2016.

<http://www.legis.nd.gov/information/acdata/pdf/38-06-03.pdf>

This chapter provides permit fee information along with guidance for appropriating funds.

Ohio. Ohio Revised Code 4513.34 allows for the DOT to issue permits for a fee. Ohio Administrative Code 5501:2-1-10 specifies the rules and fees.

§4513.34, Written Permits for Oversized Vehicles, Chapter 4513, Traffic Laws—Equipment; Loads, Title 45, XLV Motor Vehicles—Aeronautics—Watercraft, Ohio Revised Code, last amended September 2013.

<http://codes.ohio.gov/orc/4513.34v1>

§5501:2-1-10 Schedule of Fees and Payment Procedure, Chapter 5501:2-1 Movement of Overweight and Overdimension Vehicles, Title 5501:2 Division of Highways, Ohio Administrative Code, effective January 2014.

<http://codes.ohio.gov/oac/5501:2-1-10>

Texas

Chapter 623, Permits for Oversize or Overweight Vehicles, Subtitle E, Vehicle Size and Weight, Title 7, Vehicles and Traffic, Texas Transportation Code, effective January 1, 2018.

<http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/TN/htm/TN.623.htm>

This chapter provides comprehensive information about permitting OSOW vehicles.

Virginia

Article 18, Permits for Excessive Size and Weight, Title 46.2, Motor Vehicles, Chapter 10, Motor Vehicle and Equipment Safety, Code of Virginia, 2018.

<https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacodefull/title46.2/chapter10/article18/>

General provisions and fee information for a range of OSOW permits are detailed in this article.

Wisconsin

§348.25, General Provisions Relating to Permits for Vehicles and Loads of Excessive Size and Weight, Subchapter IV, Permits, Chapter 348, Vehicles—Size, Weight and Load, Wisconsin Statutes 2015-2016, 2018.

<https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/348/IV/25>

Information about single-trip, annual, consecutive month or multitrip permits and weight limitations are provided in this section.

§348.26, Single Trip Permits, Subchapter IV, Permits, Chapter 348, Vehicles—Size, Weight and Load, Wisconsin Statutes 2015-2016, 2018.

<https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/348/IV/26>

General provisions and procedures are defined in this section.

Other Factors Influencing Permit Fee Structure

For some respondents, factors other than statutory requirements have influenced the establishment of OSOW permit fees. Three respondents compared their state practices with other states:

- Kentucky Transportation Cabinet examined the fee structures of fellow members of Mid America Association of Transportation Officials (MAASTO).
- Missouri DOT reviewed MAASTO member fees and surveys conducted by the Specialized Carriers and Rigging Association (see <http://www.scranet.org/>) and other unspecified groups.
- North Dakota Highway Patrol contacted surrounding states and members of Western Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (WASHTO) to inquire about current fee structures.

Respondents from four states—Indiana, Montana, Ohio and Virginia—reported that research studies informed establishment of OSOW permit fees. The following sections cite the referenced research and, if provided by the respondent, offer additional perspective on how the research impacted agency practices. Also cited below are studies completed by Illinois and Wisconsin DOTs that consider aligning OSOW permit fees with agency costs.

Illinois

Development of Overweight Vehicle Permit Fee Structure in Illinois, Imad Al-Qadi, Yanfeng Ouyang, Hao Wang, Hadi Meidani, Osman Erman Gungor, Antoine Petit, Jingnan Zhao and Junjie Qiu, Illinois Department of Transportation, February 2017.

<https://apps.ict.illinois.edu/projects/getfile.asp?id=5261>

From the abstract: Although the State of Illinois uses a relatively comprehensive permit system, many of its parts have not been revised for more than 30 years. Therefore, the objective of this study was to revise the current

permit system by evaluating up-to-date impacts of overweight vehicles. In this study, impacts of overweight (OW) vehicles were evaluated in three aspects (bridge, pavement, and traffic safety) and individual fees were developed for each. The most recent databases on infrastructure condition and state-of-the-art prediction/classification algorithms were employed to produce the realistic and up-to-date assessment of OW vehicles' impact. Finally, a combined permit fee was recommended as a function of miles to be traveled, as well as axle and weight information, by aggregating the calculated individual fees.

Indiana

State and national pavement research informed the state's OW divisible load permits and the following fees:

- Single-trip permit: \$20 plus per-mile fee for vehicles with equivalent single axle load (ESAL) greater than 2.4.
- Annual permit: \$20 fee for vehicles with ESAL of 2.4 or less.

Related Resource:

A Synthesis of Overweight Truck Permitting, Muhammad K. Bilal, Muhammad Irfan, Anwaar Ahmed, Samuel Labi and Kumares C. Sinha, Indiana Department of Transportation, September 2010.

<https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2608&context=jtrp>

From the abstract: This study was carried out primarily to document the state of practice of truck weight permitting in Indiana vis-à-vis those of its neighboring states. This was done on the basis of the fee amounts, fee structure, and the ease of the permit acquisition process for the permit applicant. The study determined that while the upper thresholds (dimensions and weights) for legal trucking operations are generally the same across states, those for extra-legal operations vary considerably. Also, findings from published literature, agency websites, and phone interviews showed that there is great variability in overweight and oversize truck permitting criteria across the states. Furthermore, it was seen that no state has adopted explicitly the weight-distance concept for its overweight trucks. However, in the states of Indiana, Ohio and Illinois, the fee structures for overweight vehicles include weight levels and extents of travel, and thus operate in a manner similar to a weight-distance fee.

From the perspective of overweight and oversize thresholds and associated permit fees, it was observed that a number of states such as Indiana appear to be generally more favorable to trucking because they have relatively higher upper thresholds for defining an overweight truck and/or relatively lower fees for overweight trucking operations. However, as demonstrated in the [E]xcel spreadsheet case studies that accompany this report, the differences in fees incurred by truckers across the states are significantly influenced by a variety of factors including the trip circumstances, permitting criteria, and trip frequency and distance.

This report also documents the streams of revenue from the permits issued for extra-legal trucking operations over the recent past: approximately \$12 million annually. On the subject of revenue neutrality, the study reports that highway agencies that had switched from a single-trip permit system to an annual flat fee permit system report that they benefited from cost savings due to reduced monitoring efforts of truck trips but had lost significant revenue overall. Using data from a national study, the report quantifies the extent to which each additional payload increases pavement deterioration. The data also suggests that having more axles on a truck reduces pavement deterioration and consequently, damage repair cost, but could decrease the revenue to be derived from overweight permitting. In conclusion, the study recommended the conduction of a cost allocation study to update these load-damage relationships as well as the overweight permit fee structures, to reflect current conditions in Indiana.

Montana

An Evaluation of Montana’s State Truck Activities Reporting System (Addendum), Montana Department of Transportation, 2005.

https://westerntransportationinstitute.org/research_projects/an-evaluation-of-montanas-state-truck-activities-reporting-system-addendum/

This project sought to “refine and improve the way that data from Montana’s State Truck Activities Reporting System (STARS) is processed to make it a more effective tool for planning weight enforcement activities by the Montana Department of Transportation (MDT).” *From the abstract of the May 2005 report available at https://westerntransportationinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/4W0285_STARS_First_Addendum.pdf:*

Since its deployment and activation five years ago, STARS has provided valuable information to MDT on commercial vehicle activity on the state’s highways. Using this system, data on vehicle weight and configuration is continuously being collected around the state using sensors embedded in the roads. This data is processed to assist MDT with a variety of functions such as vehicle weight enforcement, road design, and transportation planning. This addendum to the STARS evaluation will address issues that MDT has determined will make STARS even more effective in its weight enforcement role. These issues include: 1) refining the data collection methods to identify permitted overweight vehicles; 2) determining how infrastructure damage attributed to overweight vehicles can be quantified to account for changes in traffic volume; 3) investigating how level of enforcement effort can be factored into the STARS database; and 4) exploring how STARS-based data on overweight vehicle activity can become a part of the federal weight enforcement plan and certification process.

Ohio

Ohio DOT conducted a study of the impacts of overweight loads for the state Legislature in connection with the agency’s request for a 2009 fee increase.

Related Resources:

Impacts of Permitted Trucking on Ohio’s Transportation System and Economy, Ohio Department of Transportation, January 2009.

<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/Legislative/Documents/ImpactsofPermittedTrucking-Web.pdf>

From the executive summary: None of the adjoining states regulate permitted vehicles the same. Some states only allow loads up to 100,000 pounds, the transport of only one steel coil, or the transport in a limited area up to 35 or 50 miles. Other than Michigan, it can be argued that Ohio has the most liberal or accommodating permitting practices. Given the flexibility in Ohio permitting it is remarkable that Ohio’s permits are the least costly among its neighboring states. And so it can be safely concluded that our permit fees do not put Ohio businesses at a competitive disadvantage. On the contrary, they have a competitive advantage.

Note: The presentations below summarize the results described in more detail in the research report cited above.

“The Impact of Overweight Trucks on Ohio’s Highways and Bridges,” Ted Strickland and Jolene Molitoris, Ohio Department of Transportation, 2009 Ohio Conference on Freight, September 2009.

http://tmacog.org/OCF_09/Presentations/Impact_Overweight_Trucks.pdf

“Overweight Vehicle Permitting Report,” Ted Strickland and James G. Beasley, Ohio Department of Transportation, undated.

<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/Legislative/Documents/OverweightVehiclePermittingPresentationWeb.pdf>

Virginia

The state’s current statutory fee structure was the outcome of a 2011 stakeholder study (see *Related Resources* below) that recommended fee increases and tiered them by weight to better reflect the pavement, bridge and structural damage caused by OW vehicles. That damage had previously been quantified in research sponsored by Virginia DOT, which the stakeholder study took into consideration.

Related Resources:

Permit Equity Study: An Equitable Approach to Setting Permit Fees for Overweight Motor Vehicles, Transportation Committee of the House of Delegates, Commonwealth of Virginia, December 2011.

<https://rga.lis.virginia.gov/Published/2011/RD387/PDF>

From the executive summary:

This document reports the results of the study undertaken in 2011 in response to the enactment of Delegate Joe May’s House Bill 2022, which called upon the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to:

develop a uniform system of permitting for overweight and oversize vehicles and a comprehensive, tiered schedule of fees for overweight vehicles, taking into consideration the Virginia Department of Transportation’s research on the cost impact of damage to Virginia’s highways from overweight vehicles, the administrative feasibility of such fee structure, and the impact of such fee structure on the Commonwealth’s economic competitiveness.

See pages 5 and 6 of the report (pages 9 and 10 of the PDF) for recommended fee schedules for multitrip and single-trip hauling permits. More detailed tables appear on pages 48 and 49 of the report (pages 52 and 53 of the PDF).

Note: A second report included in the Permit Equity Study that begins on page 145 of the PDF is described below.

Overweight and Oversized Hauling Permit Practices, Virginia Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment and Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles, August 2011.

See page 145 of the PDF at <https://rga.lis.virginia.gov/Published/2011/RD387/PDF>

This report summarizes a survey of 20 states that sought to “gauge the cost structure, administration practices and permitting practices of peer states with respect to OW/OS vehicles.” Fifteen agencies responded to the survey. The full text of survey responses is provided in Appendix A of the report, which begins on page 155 of the PDF.

Wisconsin

Aligning Oversize/Overweight Permit Fees With Agency Costs: Critical Issues, Teresa Adams, Ernie Perry, Andrew Schwartz, Bob Gollnik, Myungook Kang, Jason Bittner and Steve Wagner, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, August 2013.

<http://wisconsin.dot.gov/documents2/research/WisDOT-CFIRE-project-0092-10-21-final-report.pdf>

From the abstract: This project provides an elementary analysis of issues and a proposed framework for the state to evaluate cost recovery options due to OSOW operations. The authors provide a review of current permitting practices, provide a sampling of fee structures, and outline preliminary trends for OSOW demand in

the foreseeable future. The basis for the project is the Midwest States, but the findings incorporate national trends and data as appropriate.

The research team surveyed state DOTs for information on permit fee structures and the respective distribution and allocation of permit revenue. The research team did not attempt to determine roadway, infrastructure, and other impacts of OSOW loads, but rather document studies that attempt to monetize these values and provide observations. A methodology is proposed to generate said costs, but the validation of such methodology was outside the scope of this study. Finally the project report details other considerations, including truck-to-rail diversion potential if permit fees are increased. A series of best practices is provided to help guide the operations of a permitting process.

The research team concludes that permit fees likely cannot recover the costs of issuance, however, in many agencies the permit fee is not designed to be a cost recovery mechanism. This is magnified in the multitrip permitting processes available in most states. The authors do not make a specific recommendation for agencies with respect to permit fee determination. The research team does recommend additional and site specific research to determine the impact and associated cost of pavement damage due to single trip, oversize and overweight movements

Fee Purpose

Respondents described the purpose of their states’ OSOW permit fees by selecting all that applied from among four general purposes:

- To recover the cost of the administrative effort to issue the permit.
- To recover the cost of highway maintenance and other activities associated with addressing OSOW load impacts.
- To better understand how the road network is being used.
- To follow the fee structure set by statute.

(Respondents from Iowa and Kentucky did not select from among the possible purposes presented in the survey, instead noting that OSOW permit fees are deposited in each state’s road fund.)

Almost three-quarters of respondents assess fees to recover the cost of highway maintenance associated with OSOW loads. The table below summarizes survey responses.

| OSOW Permit Fee Purpose | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| State | To Recover the Cost of the Administrative Effort to Issue the Permit | To Recover the Cost of Highway Maintenance Associated With Addressing OSOW Load Impacts | To Better Understand How the Road Network is Being Used | To Follow the Fee Structure Set by Statute |
| Colorado | | | | X |
| Florida | | X | | |
| Georgia | X | X | X | X |

| OSOW Permit Fee Purpose | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| State | To Recover the Cost of the Administrative Effort to Issue the Permit | To Recover the Cost of Highway Maintenance Associated With Addressing OSOW Load Impacts | To Better Understand How the Road Network is Being Used | To Follow the Fee Structure Set by Statute |
| Indiana | X | X | | X |
| Kansas | | | X | X |
| Maryland | X | X | | X |
| Michigan | X | | | X |
| Minnesota | X | X | X | X |
| Missouri | | X | | |
| Montana | | X ¹ | | |
| New York | | X | | |
| North Dakota | X | X | | X |
| Ohio | X | X | | |
| South Carolina | X | X | | |
| South Dakota | X | X | | X |
| Texas | | X | | X |
| Virginia | X | X | | X |
| Wisconsin | X | | | X |
| Total Responses | 11 | 14 | 3 | 12 |

1 The respondent noted that, in theory, an OW fee is assessed to assist with funding maintenance costs. He contrasted that assumption with the state's \$10 fee for some OW vehicles, noting that the fee is focused less on recouping maintenance costs than on placing conditions on the travel of the load.

Fee Components

Respondents described the following components of their OSOW permit fees, if applicable:

- Flat fee.
- Base fee.
- Mileage fee.
- Overweight fee.
- Overdimension fee.
- Load type fee.
- Engineering fee.
- Traffic review fee.
- Escort fee.
- Law enforcement fee.
- Other fees.

Two respondents expanded on their descriptions of individual fee components with additional perspective on their states' practices for assessing OSOW permit fees:

Indiana. Indiana Department of Revenue is charged by state law with administering the OSOW permitting program. Indiana DOT is responsible for interpreting state and federal laws and rules and developing rules and policies for permitting. For vehicles that are both oversize and overweight, the greater of the two

permitting fees applies. Oversize-only permit fees are mostly prescribed by state statute; overweight permit fees are for the most part not set by statute. The agency is planning a rulemaking exercise in 2018 to address this discrepancy.

Maryland. The state maintains a multijurisdictional system that issues permits for the state and the city of Baltimore, and collects fees on behalf of Maryland Transportation Authority (MDTA). Maryland State Highway Administration is the only agency other than the city of Baltimore that issues OSOW permits in Maryland. Maryland One, the agency’s online OSOW permitting system (see <https://marylandone.gotpermits.com/>), is considered a “one-stop shop” that has handled all billing and OSOW-related matters for the state since May 2016.

The tables below address each OSOW fee component individually. When practical, common practices are identified and categorized. The tables reflect some overlap between fee components and respondents’ differing views on how to classify fees.

| Flat Fee | |
|-----------------|---|
| State | Fee Description |
| Colorado | The agency assesses a flat fee for every type of permit; fees range from \$30 to \$3,000. Some permits assess a flat fee and an additional fee based on the number of axles or vehicles. See Attachment A for details. |
| Georgia | All permit fees are flat fees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single trip (not to exceed 16' high, 100' long and 150,000 lbs): \$30. • Single trip superload (not weighing more than 180,000 lbs): \$125. • Single trip superload plus (exceeding 180,000 lbs): \$500. • Six-month (tobacco or unginned cotton): \$25. • Multitrip (not greater than 16' wide, 16' high and not weighing more than 150,000 lbs): \$100. • Annual: \$150. • Annual plus: \$500. |
| Indiana | Special weight: \$25 annual registration fee plus \$42.50 per-trip fee. (Applies only for operation on extra heavy duty highways established by Indiana Code.) Sealed oceangoing container: \$800 annual permit for each permitted truck. OW divisible load: \$20 annual permit if vehicle ESALs less than or equal to 2.4. |
| Iowa | Single trip (one way): \$35. Annual OS: \$50. Annual OSOW: \$400. |
| Kansas | Single trip: \$20. Large structure: \$30. Superload: \$50. Annual: \$150. Annual agricultural: \$200. Five-year hay: \$25. |
| Kentucky | Single-trip and annual permits. |

| Flat Fee | |
|-----------------------|--|
| State | Fee Description |
| Maryland | \$25 when traveling on MDTA roads. |
| Minnesota | Nondivisible annual OS: \$120. Divisible 6-axle: \$300. Divisible 7-axle: \$500. Nondivisible OW (90,000 to 155,000 lbs): \$200 to \$900. |
| Missouri | Single-trip OS: \$15. Single-trip OS in excess of 16' wide, 16' high or 150' long: \$15 plus \$250 movement feasibility fee. Multitrip OS: \$25 (farm implements only). Single-trip OW permits up to and including 160,000 lbs gross vehicle weight (GVW): \$15 plus \$20 per each 10,000 lbs in excess of legal GVW. 30-day blanket: \$300. |
| Montana | Single trip: \$10. Single trip (triples): \$20. Annual: \$75. Annual (nondivisible loads): \$125. Annual (triples): \$200. |
| New York | Special hauling permit (trip permit) could be OS and/or OW: \$40. Annual special hauling permits: Fee varies with permit type. Divisible load: Fee varies with permit type. |
| North Dakota | All permits under 150,000 lbs GVW with the exception of special mobile equipment: \$20. Special mobile equipment under 150,000 lbs GVW: \$25. |
| Ohio | Flat fees are based on the type of permit. |
| South Carolina | Single trip: \$30. Multitrip (annual): \$100. House moving license (annual): \$100. |
| South Dakota | Single trip: \$25. Annual: \$60 (certain permits). |
| Texas | Twenty-three permit types that include flat permit fees ranging from \$10 to \$6,000. |

| Base Fee | |
|-----------------|---|
| State | Fee Description |
| Indiana | OW (nondivisible loads): \$20. |
| Maryland | State fee: \$30 plus \$5 per ton. Baltimore city fee: \$60 plus \$5 per ton. |

| Base Fee | |
|---------------------|---|
| State | Fee Description |
| Minnesota | Single trip: \$15 plus fee for miles traveled per axle group OW. Job permit: \$36 plus fee for number of moves and miles traveled per axle group OW. Building move: \$15 plus fee for miles traveled per axle group OW. |
| Missouri | See other fee categories, including overweight and load type fees. |
| Ohio | Administrative fee: \$10. <i>Note:</i> The agency is requesting an increase to \$20 in 2018. |
| South Dakota | \$25. |
| Texas | Six permit types have a base fee that ranges from \$60 to \$270. |
| Virginia | Single trip: \$20. Superload single trip: \$30. Blanket (one year): \$100. Blanket (two years): \$200. Superload blanket (one year or less): \$100. <i>Note:</i> Blanket permits are issued for multiple moves over a specified period of time. |
| Wisconsin | Single trip (length only): \$15. Overwidth or overheight: \$20. Overwidth and overheight: \$25 plus \$10 per 10,000 lbs over legal weight. Multitrip (annual) miscellaneous equipment (length only): \$60. Width and/or height and/or length: \$90. |

| Mileage Fee | |
|------------------|--|
| State | Fee Description |
| Florida | Trip (10 days): Per-mile fee assessed for range of weights (95,000 lbs to over 199,000 lbs). |
| Indiana | OW permits, in addition to base fee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GVW 80,000 to 108,000 lbs: \$0.35 per mile. • GVW 108,000 to 150,000 lbs: \$0.65 per mile. • GVW more than 150,000 lbs: \$1 per mile. • OW divisible load with ESAL > 2.4: \$0.07 per mile and per ESAL in excess of 2.4. |
| Minnesota | Single trip, building moves and job permits (when OW on axle groups). |
| Missouri | For superloads only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moves of 0 to 50 miles: \$425. • Moves of 51 to 200 miles: \$625. • Moves over 200 miles: \$925. |
| Montana | Mileage fees for single-trip permits are based on the excess in axle or axle group weight. Fees range from \$3.50 (5,000 excess lbs) to \$70 (100,000 excess lbs). |

| Mileage Fee | |
|----------------|--|
| State | Fee Description |
| North Dakota | \$0.05 per ton over 200,000 lbs GVW for every mile traveled. (The agency's computer system determines this fee to one-tenth of a mile.) |
| Ohio | \$0.04 per ton over 120,000 lbs GVW per mile traveled. |
| South Carolina | Additional megaload impact fee for loads over 500,000 lbs on entire GVW: \$0.05 per 1,000 lbs per mile. |
| Texas | Three permit types have a mileage-based fee. Fees vary, with a minimum fee of \$31. |
| Virginia | Single trip: \$0.30 per mile if OW or the vehicle configuration cannot be licensed in Virginia. Mobile homes and manufactured housing pay a flat fee of \$1 in lieu of the \$0.30 per-mile fee. Superload: \$0.30 per mile if OW or the vehicle configuration cannot be licensed in Virginia. Blanket (multiple moves over a specified period of time): \$40 annual mileage fee. |

| Overweight Fee | |
|----------------|--|
| State | Description |
| Florida | Multitrip (12 months): Fees ranging from \$240 to \$500 are assessed for weights ranging from 95,000 lbs to over 199,000 lbs. Route-specific (three months): Fees ranging from \$60 to \$250 are assessed for weights ranging from 95,000 lbs to over 199,000 lbs. |
| Indiana | \$10 executive fee for all vehicles with GVW greater than 120,000 lbs. |
| Maryland | See also base fee. |
| Michigan | Single trip: \$50. Annual: \$100. Construction equipment: \$264 (special single-trip permit type). |
| Minnesota | Fees for nondivisible annual permit types: single-trip, building move and job permits. |
| Missouri | Single-trip OW permits in excess of 160,000 lbs GVW: \$15 fee plus \$20 per each 10,000 lbs in excess of legal GVW. |
| Montana | Single-trip permit fees for loads OW on bridges but with legal axle weights (nondivisible loads): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moves up to and including 100 miles: \$10. Moves of 101 to 199 miles: \$30. Moves of 200 miles and over: \$50. Term permit fees of \$200 to \$4,000 are assessed for weights ranging from 5,000 lbs to 40,000 lbs in excess axle weight. (Term permit fees can be prorated on a quarterly basis and paid quarterly, semiannually or annually. If paid other than annually, an additional fee of \$10 is assessed each time a fee is paid.) |

| Overweight Fee | |
|-----------------------|---|
| State | Description |
| North Dakota | Fees increase by \$10 for every 10,000 lbs, up to 190,001 lbs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 150,001 to 160,000 lbs: \$30. • 160,001 to 170,000 lbs: \$40. • 170,001 to 180,000 lbs: \$50. • 180,001 to 190,000 lbs: \$60. • 190,001 lbs and greater: \$70. |
| Ohio | \$135, which includes the base administrative fee. |
| South Carolina | Superload impact fee for all loads over 130,000 lbs: \$3 per 1,000 lbs. |
| South Dakota | \$0.02 per ton per mile once weight exceeds certain axle weights. |
| Texas | Sliding scale highway maintenance fee that applies to four permit types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80,001 to 120,000 lbs: \$150. • 120,001 to 160,000 lbs: \$225. • 160,001 to 200,000 lbs: \$300. • 200,001 pounds and greater: \$375. |
| Virginia | General blanket (one or two years): \$360 per year (damage fee) added to base fee if OW. |
| Wisconsin | Single trip: \$10 per 10,000 lbs. Multitrip (annual) for miscellaneous equipment: \$100 per 10,000 lbs. |

| Overdimension Fee | |
|--------------------------|---|
| State | Description |
| Florida | An additional overdimension flat fee is added to the OW flat fee for annual permits exceeding 12' wide, 13'6" inches high and/or 85' long: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trip (10 days): Fees range from \$5 to \$25. • Multitrip (12 months): Fees range from \$20 to \$500. • Route-specific multitrip (three months): Fees range from \$5 to \$250. |
| Indiana | No base fee is applied to permits for vehicles that are oversized only. Up to 95' long, 12'4" wide and/or 13'6" high: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single trip: \$20. • Quarterly: \$100. • Annual: \$405. 95' to 110' long, 12'4" to 16' wide and/or 13'7" to 15' high: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single trip: \$30. • Quarterly: \$100. • Annual: \$405. More than 110' long, 16' wide and/or 15' high: |

| Overdimension Fee | |
|-----------------------|--|
| State | Description |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single trip: \$40. • Quarterly: \$100. • Annual: \$405. |
| Maryland | See also base fee. |
| Michigan | Single trip: \$15. Annual: \$30. Construction equipment: \$264 (special single permit type). |
| Missouri | Single-trip routine permit: \$15. |
| Montana | Annual (95' long, 15' wide and 14'6" high): \$75. Annual (100' long; interstate only): \$125. Annual (120' long; nondivisible length): \$125. |
| North Dakota | \$20 base fee; no additional fees. |
| Ohio | \$65, which includes the base administrative fee. |
| South Carolina | Fees assessed for excess width: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excess width over 16': \$35. • Excess width over 18': \$40. • Excess width over 20': \$45. • Excess width over 22': \$50. |
| Wisconsin | See also base fee. |

| Load Type Fee | |
|------------------|--|
| State | Description |
| Indiana | Tractor-mobile home rig up to 12'4" wide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single trip: \$10. • Quarterly: \$250. • Annual: \$1,000. Tractor-mobile home rig 12'5" to 14'4" wide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single trip: \$18. • Quarterly: \$500. • Annual: \$2,000. |
| Kentucky | Annual based on width: \$250 to \$500. Metal commodity: \$1,250 annual; \$100 single trip. Farm annual: \$80 to \$150. Annual nondivisible steel (statewide; routes required): \$500. |
| Minnesota | Agricultural (farm) product, road construction materials, forest product, snowplow (based on blade size), double-decker bus and studded tire. |

| Load Type Fee | |
|-----------------------|---|
| State | Description |
| Missouri | See also flat fee. Annual blanket emergency OW (round trip): \$624 (fee will be prorated quarterly). Annual blanket OS (single commodity): \$128 (fee will be prorated quarterly). Annual blanket OS (multiple commodity): \$400 (fee will be prorated quarterly). Annual blanket OW well drillers or concrete pump truck permit: \$300 (fee will be prorated quarterly). Annual blanket milk hauler: \$500 (fee will be prorated quarterly). Project permit: \$125. Highway crossing: \$250. Noncommercial building movement (in excess of routine dimensions): \$265. |
| South Carolina | Superload application fee (nonrefundable): \$100. |
| Texas | The agency assesses fees that are specific to a load type but does not base its fees on the type of load. |
| Virginia | None, but blanket permits for certain types of freight cost more than others. |
| Wisconsin | Radioactive single trip (highway route control quantity): \$1,800. Sealed container single trip: \$30. Sealed container multitrip: \$300. |

| Engineering Fee | |
|-----------------|--|
| State | Description |
| Georgia | \$500 fee for in-house analysis on megaloads of more than 180,001 lbs. For loads greater than 300,000 lbs, the hauler is responsible for outside analysis using a vendor from a state-approved list. |
| Indiana | \$10 bridge analysis fee for every bridge crossed by vehicles with 200,000 lbs GVW and greater. \$25 design review fee. |
| Maryland | For MDTA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$250 flat fee for state permits. • \$8 per structure up to and including 200,000 lbs. • \$12 per structure if over 200,000 lbs. |
| Missouri | Single-trip commercial zone bridge analysis: \$265. Single-trip OW permits in excess of 160,000 lbs GVW are assessed the appropriate bridge and roadway analysis fee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moves of 0 to 50 miles: \$425. • Moves of 51 to 200 miles: \$625. • Moves over 200 miles: \$925. Identical permit applications with identical vehicle configurations will only be charged |

| Engineering Fee | |
|-----------------------|---|
| State | Description |
| | one bridge and roadway analysis fee if the original bridge study is less than 30 days old for loads in excess of 300,000 lbs, and if the original bridge study is less than 60 days old for loads weighing less than 300,000 lbs. An additional \$425 bridge study fee will be charged if the applicant modifies dimensions or weights on an application and a new bridge analysis is required after the original analysis has been completed. |
| North Dakota | \$25 (no longer assessing this fee in connection with the automated bridging system). |
| Ohio | Included in permit cost. |
| South Carolina | Superload engineering analysis over 130,000 lbs: \$100. Superload engineering analysis over 200,000 lbs: \$200. Superload engineering analysis over 300,000 lbs: \$350. |
| Texas | Vehicle supervision fee for loads in excess of 200,000 lbs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$500 if bridges on route. • \$10 if no bridges on route. |
| Virginia | Superload: \$4 per structure for non-Interstate routes plus \$4 per Interstate traveled. |
| Wisconsin | \$10 structural analysis fee. |

| Traffic Review Fee | |
|--------------------|---|
| State | Description |
| Ohio | The agency includes its traffic review fee in engineering fees. |
| Wisconsin | \$10 traffic review fee per region. |

| Escort Fee | | |
|---|--|---|
| Fee Practice | State | Description |
| Fees charged by the DOT | Ohio | Ohio DOT charges \$1 per mile if an Ohio DOT bridge monitor is required. |
| Fees charged and/or collected by law enforcement | Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, Wisconsin | <p><i>Indiana.</i> Indiana State Police charges an hourly rate plus mileage from the trooper's home for escorts. Police escorts are required for vehicles with GVW greater than 200,000 lbs and/or width greater than 17'.</p> <p><i>Maryland.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State fees: \$250 fee assessed by Maryland State Police for each officer for the first four hours; \$62.50 for each officer for each additional hour. • City fees: \$750 fee for three officers and one DOT |

| Escort Fee | | |
|--|----------------------------------|---|
| Fee Practice | State | Description |
| | | <p>escort (mandatory).</p> <p><i>Minnesota.</i> Minnesota State Patrol (MSP) assesses the carrier an hourly fee of \$89.28 (this fee is subject to change annually) for a licensed peace officer escort. Circumstances requiring this type of escort:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When dimensions of the load require an escort. • When the load encroaches over the centerline and/or blocks the opposing traffic or intersection. <p>MnDOT will impose the latter requirement when MSP notifies MnDOT of dangerous locations where a certified pilot car may be incapable of managing traffic control.</p> <p><i>North Dakota.</i> Fees include \$0.50 per mile and \$50 per hour per trooper.</p> |
| Fees charged and/or collected by private-sector escort companies or law enforcement | Colorado, New York, South Dakota | <p><i>Colorado.</i> Escort fees are charged by private-sector escort companies or the Colorado State Patrol. Colorado DOT maintains a pilot car escort certification program and pilot cars cannot legally operate in the state without the certification.</p> <p><i>New York.</i> The DOT does not manage escorts. Private-sector escort companies are responsible for assessing fees and for superload moves; New York State Police provides additional escorting and assesses a fee.</p> <p><i>South Dakota.</i> All escorts are managed and fees are assessed by the private sector.</p> |

| Law Enforcement Fee | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Fee Practice | State | Description |
| Specific fee | Iowa | Fees do not exceed \$250 per day per escort. |
| Unspecified fee assessed and collected by state law enforcement | Colorado, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin | <p><i>Missouri.</i> Missouri State Highway Patrol assesses a fee when escorting a superload.</p> <p><i>Ohio.</i> Fees assessed to carriers using Ohio State Police escorts are billed as an off-duty escort and are not reflected in Ohio DOT's OSOW permit fee.</p> |
| Unspecified fee | Georgia, South Carolina | <i>Georgia.</i> Fees are assessed on a case-by-case basis for superloads over 16' wide. |
| Addressed in escort fees | Indiana, Minnesota, North Dakota | N/A |

Other Fees

The table below summarizes the other fees respondents reported on that were not specifically addressed in survey questions.

| Other Fees | |
|----------------|--|
| State | Description |
| Florida | \$3.33 administrative fee for OW trip permits. \$5 transmission fee for 10-day trip permits. |
| Colorado | The agency assesses a trip surcharge that matches the cost of the permit. Funds collected through the surcharge are deposited into a fund that focuses on maintaining infrastructure. |
| Minnesota | Transaction fees/merchant fees are charged for online payment. The fees are assessed at the time of the transaction and passed on to the customer. |
| Missouri | \$2 permit amendment fee. |
| North Dakota | \$10 service fee on every routed permit. \$5 faxing fee, if applicable. |
| Ohio | If the agency is required to remove signs or signals, or if the load damages any infrastructure, the hauler is charged for the actual cost of the work or repair. |
| South Carolina | Unspecified amendment fee. \$5 credit card processing fee (convenience fee charged by the credit card authorizer). \$10 administrative fee for prorating active annual permits. \$10 administrative fee for road machinery permits. |
| Texas | One permit type includes a sliding-scale county selection fee ranging from \$175 to \$1,000 that is based on the number of counties in which the applicant elects to travel. Another permit type includes a \$5 administrative fee. |
| Virginia | \$10 fee to transfer a blanket permit between vehicles. |

Fee Distribution

Respondents described the types of funds or accounts to which OSOW permit fees are directed after collection, identifying few restrictions on the use of the funds collected. Most respondents reported distribution of OSOW permit fees to a state highway fund. In a few cases, permit fee revenues are directed to different funds based on permit type. The table below summarizes survey responses.

| Distribution of OSOW Permit Fees | | |
|----------------------------------|---------|--|
| Fund or Entity | State | Description of Fee Management or Distribution |
| Department treasurer | Georgia | Funds are used “to help defray the expenses of enforcing the limitations set forth in this article and may also be used for public road maintenance purposes in addition to any sums appropriated therefor to the department” (see §32-6-28, |

| Distribution of OSOW Permit Fees | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Fund or Entity | State | Description of Fee Management or Distribution |
| | | http://ga.elaws.us/law/section32-6-28). |
| General fund | New York, Ohio | <i>New York.</i> Fees are deposited in the general fund administered by the Office of the New York State Comptroller. |
| Road fund | Iowa, Kentucky, Missouri | N/A |
| State highway fund | Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota | <p><i>Indiana.</i> All permit fees collected are deposited in the state highway fund (SHF), which is used for construction and maintenance statewide. There are no restrictions on the use of permit fees beyond the restrictions applicable to the SHF.</p> <p><i>Michigan.</i> Permit fees are deposited in the state trunkline fund.</p> <p><i>Minnesota.</i> Unless otherwise specified, all fees for permits issued by the commissioner of transportation must be deposited in the state treasury and credited to the Trunk Highway Fund.</p> <p><i>Note:</i> Minnesota statutes provide that the first \$50,000 in each fiscal year must be deposited in the trunk highway fund for costs related to administering the permit program and inspecting and posting bridges (see §169.86 subd.5(i)(1), https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/?id=169.86#stat.169.86.5).</p> <p><i>Montana.</i> Permit fees are deposited into the Highway State Special Revenue Account. Funds are used for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payment of obligations incurred for construction, reconstruction, repair, operation and maintenance of public highways, streets, roads and bridges. • Payment of county, city and town obligations on streets, roads and bridges. • Enforcement of highway safety, driver education, tourist promotion and administrative collection costs. <p><i>North Dakota.</i> Permit fees are deposited into the highway fund to be used for roadway maintenance, with the exception of the service fee. Service fees remain under the control of the State Highway Patrol to pay for and maintain the permit system.</p> |
| State transportation fund | Florida, Maryland, Wisconsin | <p><i>Florida.</i> Permit fees are deposited into the state transportation trust fund.</p> <p><i>Wisconsin.</i> Permit fees are deposited into the transportation fund.</p> |
| Multiple allocations | Colorado, Texas, Virginia | <p><i>Colorado.</i> Permit fees are sent to the state’s general fund; the surcharge is sent to a fund that focuses on maintaining infrastructure.</p> <p><i>Texas.</i> Permit fee distributions vary by permit type. Primary recipients are the state highway fund, general revenue fund, Texas Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) fund, counties selected for travel (associated with five permit types) and municipalities selected for travel (associated with one permit type).</p> |

| Distribution of OSOW Permit Fees | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Fund or Entity | State | Description of Fee Management or Distribution |
| Multiple allocations | Colorado, Texas, Virginia | <i>Virginia.</i> Administrative and temporary registration fees are retained by DMV. All other fees are sent to Virginia DOT. Pavement damage and bridge assessment fees for permits issued to exempt vehicles are allocated between Virginia DOT and localities according to lane mileage within each jurisdiction. |

Engagement With Local Agencies

More than three-quarters of respondents reported no engagement with local agencies in connection with the setting or collection of OSOW permit fees, or indicated that each local agency is responsible for setting its own fees. Four respondents described consistent statewide practices or provided details of how the state engages with local agencies. The table below summarizes survey responses.

| Engagement With Local Agencies | | |
|--|--|---|
| Practice | State | Description |
| Consistent practices across the state | Colorado, Georgia | <i>Colorado.</i> Local agencies have statutory limitations that must be observed when creating a size and weight enforcement plan and fee structure. The DOT works closely with local agencies through its OSOW permit advisory committee to achieve statewide consistency. <i>Georgia.</i> The state has authority to issue permits and route loads on all roads in the state. |
| State agency engages with local entities | Maryland, Virginia | <i>Maryland.</i> The state collects funds and disperses them as appropriate; other agencies have access to relevant data and reporting via the state’s online permitting system. (See page 18 for information about Maryland One, the state’s online permitting system.) <i>Virginia.</i> Any locality that wishes to issue OSOW permits is required by law to enter into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with Virginia DMV that allows DMV to issue permits on behalf of the locality and that stipulates the conditions the locality must meet in order to also issue permits through its own offices. Under the MOU, the locality must provide DMV with all information required to issue permits on its behalf, including fees (see §46.2-1139(A1), https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title46.2/chapter10/section46.2-1139/). |
| No state engagement with local entities | Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, South Carolina, Texas, Wisconsin | <i>Iowa.</i> The state refers local entities to the state code. <i>Michigan.</i> State and local entities are “statutorily separated,” and there is no engagement regarding OSOW permit fees. <i>Minnesota.</i> The agency recently completed a review of local agency fees and practices using primarily online resources but does not actively engage with local agencies. |

| Engagement With Local Agencies | | |
|--|--|--|
| Practice | State | Description |
| No state engagement with local entities | Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, South Carolina, Texas, Wisconsin | <i>Missouri.</i> Kansas City and St. Louis issue city street permits. While the state DOT provides that information to carriers, it does not interact with the local agencies. |
| Local agencies set own fees | New York, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota | <i>New York.</i> By statute local agencies cannot charge more than \$10 for an OSOW permit; some local agencies assess fees that are added on to the OSOW permit fee. <i>Ohio.</i> Ohio law allows local agencies to set their own fees. <i>South Dakota.</i> Local agencies set their own fees. |

Policies for Special Load Types

Respondents were asked about special policies that were established to address the frequent movement of certain types of OSOW loads in certain areas (for example, areas where wind turbines are manufactured or installed, or near oil fields). Four states have established special policies for the steel industry (Indiana and Kentucky), wind towers (Wisconsin) and workover service rigs (North Dakota). The following describes these policies and provides links to relevant publications.

Steel Industry

Indiana

The Indiana General Assembly created a regulation and fees for “extra heavy duty” highways to address the travel need for OW vehicles servicing the steel industry, mainly in the northwestern part of the state. The special weight permits are available for travel on these routes for vehicles up to 134,000 lbs GVW. The original intent was for these permits to apply to the Michigan Train truck configuration, but any legal-sized vehicle operator may apply for them.

From § 9-20-5-7, Special weight permits; extra heavy duty highways; fee; additional permit fee:

- (b) The fee for an annual registration under subsection (a) is twenty-five dollars (\$25). The fee imposed under this section must be deposited in the motor carrier regulation fund established under [IC 8-2.1-23](#).
- (c) The department of state revenue may impose an additional permit fee in an amount that may not exceed one dollar (\$1) on each trip permitted for a vehicle registered under subsection (a). This additional fee is for the use and maintenance of an automated vehicle identifier. The fee imposed under this section must be deposited in the motor carrier regulation fund established under [IC 8-2.1-23](#).

Related Resource:

§9-20-5, Chapter 5. Heavy Duty Highways and Extra Heavy Duty Highways, Indiana Code, 2017.
<https://iga.in.gov/legislative/laws/2017/ic/titles/009#9-20-5>

Kentucky

A law passed in 2016 “in order to promote economic development and retain jobs” within the state provides for a \$250 annual oversized permit for transporting steel products to a Kentucky riverport. The permit is “limited to movements of steel products within the state of not more than seven (7) road miles from the manufacturing facility.”

Related Resource:

§189.2716, Annual Oversized Permit for Transporting Steel Products to a Kentucky Riverport—Width and Mileage Limitations, Kentucky Revised Statutes, effective July 15, 2016.
<http://www.lrc.ky.gov/Statutes/statute.aspx?id=45068>

Wind Towers

Wisconsin

Route mitigation efforts were made to accommodate wind tower movement through the state of Wisconsin on two major wind tower routes. Wisconsin DOT’s guidance is excerpted below (see *Related Resource* for this publication):

[C]urrently [wind tower] sections are built and shipped out of Manitowoc, WI. The typical maximum load dimensions for these loads are 15'-8" High, 205' Long, and 15'-1" Wide. The dimensions of these loads have required extensive coordination and research to identify and maintain available corridors. See the OSOW maps for routes designated as Wind Tower corridors.

<http://dot.wi.gov/osowmaps>

On projects located on these corridors, a minimum 16' travel lane shall be maintained in each direction. Due to the length of these vehicles, route the “Wind Tower Base” vehicle through the work zone using Autoturn to confirm off tracking will not impact the work zone.

If unable to maintain a 16' clear width, coordinate with adjacent regions and freight section in Bureau of Highway Maintenance to ensure viable routes exist.

Document these accommodations in the Traffic Management Plan.

Related Resource:

Chapter 11, Design, Section 50, Traffic Control, Facilities Development Manual, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, June 2017.

<http://wisconsin.gov/rdwy/fdm/fd-11-50.pdf>

See page 15 of the PDF for 5.12.2, Wind Tower Corridor Considerations.

Workover Service Rigs

North Dakota

The state has a separate OSOW policy and fee structure for workover service rigs (vehicles with coils of cable and other equipment that are used to perform maintenance or make repairs on oil or gas wells). A single-trip permit is required when traveling on the state highway system; the permit fee is \$100.

Related Resource:

Permit Policy for Movement of Oversize and Overweight Workover Service Rigs, Motor Carrier Division, North Dakota Highway Patrol, Ref: 9-6 Annex G, January 2016.

<https://www.nd.gov/ndhp/sites/www/files/documents/Permits/9-6-g%20handout.pdf>

Other Practices

Other respondents described OSOW-related practices that are not policy-based:

- Colorado DOT has not established special policies by industry. Requirements and restrictions are permit-specific and may include night movement only or additional escorts. The agency requires all loads over 16 feet to travel with a height pole escort in front, and all loads over 16 feet 6 inches must travel with an International Municipal Signal Association (IMSA) Level II-certified contractor through all intersections with overhead light signals.
- Michigan DOT has no formal policy; however, carriers propose acceptable routes that the agency reviews and preapproves for superload-size components. The preapproved routes become the basis for approval of future permits for those components.
- South Dakota state policies are based on the size of the commodity, not the commodity type.

Other Related Resources

The resources below provide additional information about respondents' permit fee policies and practices. Agency websites provide information about regulations, fees and current practices; manuals, handouts and other publications describe OSOW permit fees.

Colorado

Permit Cost, Colorado Department of Transportation, February 2016.

See [Attachment A](#).

This internal document provides a list of OSOW flat fees for a range of permit types, including additional fees assessed per axle or vehicle.

Florida

Over-Weight Over-Dimension Permits, Structure Operations, Office of Maintenance, Florida Department of Transportation, 2018.

<http://www.fdot.gov/maintenance/OWODPermits.shtm>

This website provides access to Florida DOT's Permit Application System (PAS), where users can self-issue trip permits for OSOW vehicles. Additional links at the site direct users to regulations and fees, weight restriction charts and instructions for divisible load permits.

Georgia

Laws, Oversize Permit, Georgia Department of Public Safety, undated.

<http://gamccd.net/OSPermit/Laws.aspx>

Links to Georgia laws governing the movement of goods and materials can be accessed on this page along with information about legal size and weight limitations for vehicles.

Indiana

Oversize/Overweight Vehicle Permitting Handbook, Motor Carrier Services Division, Indiana Department of Revenue, February 2014.

<https://www.in.gov/dor/files/osowhandbook.pdf>

A discussion of OSOW permits begins on page 10 of the handbook.

General Provisions of an Oversize/Overweight Vehicle Permit, Indiana Department of Revenue, September 2017.

<https://www.in.gov/dor/files/m204.pdf>

OSOW permitting general provisions are summarized in this one-page handout.

Special Provisions for Vehicle Permitting, Motor Carrier Services, Indiana Department of Revenue, July 2011.

<https://www.in.gov/dor/files/m204s.pdf>

OSOW permitting special provisions are summarized in this one-page handout.

Indiana Extra Heavy Duty Highways, Indiana Department of Transportation, undated.

<http://www.in.gov/indot/files/Hvydty.pdf>

Route restrictions are illustrated in these maps of the extra heavy duty highways in northwest and northeast Indiana.

Maryland

Maryland Oversize/Overweight Hauling Permit Manual, Maryland State Highway Administration, April 2008.

http://www.roads.maryland.gov/oost/MD_Hauling_permit_manual.pdf

This manual provides the information needed to complete applications to obtain OSOW hauling permits when traveling through Maryland. Permit fees are listed on page 46 of the manual.

Michigan

MDOT Permit Gateway, Michigan Department of Transportation, 2018.

http://www.michigan.gov/mdot/0,4616,7-151-9625_56949---,00.html

This website provides access to the agency's online permit ordering system. Also available at this site are links to general rules and guidelines, permits, restrictions and conditions, and maps.

Related Resource:

MiTRIP—Overweight or Oversize Permits, MDOT Permit Gateway, Michigan Department of Transportation, 2018.

https://www.michigan.gov/mdot/0,4616,7-151-9625_56949-253714--,00.html

At this site, users can order OSOW single-trip and extended permits through Michigan DOT's online Michigan Transport Routing and Internet Permitting System (MiTRIP).

Minnesota

MnDOT Permit Types and Fees, Office of Commercial Vehicle Operations, Minnesota Department of Transportation, April 2018.

<http://www.dot.state.mn.us/cvo/oversize/pdf/permittypesfees.pdf>

This four-page document summarizes available permit types issued by Minnesota DOT along with vehicle specifications and permit fees.

Missouri

Motor Carrier Services, Motor Carrier Services Program, Missouri Department of Transportation, 2013.

<http://www.modot.org/mcs/index.htm>

This site provides links to information, credentials and permits for motor carriers.

Related Resource:

OSOW Permit Regulations, Motor Carrier Services Program, Missouri Department of Transportation, July 2017.

<http://www.modot.org/mcs/documents/OSOWRegBook2017.pdf>

From the purpose:

This rule provides a uniform system for issuing special permits to regulate vehicles used on the state highways which when loaded exceed the limitations on length, width, height and weight established in Chapter 304, RSMo [Revised Statutes of Missouri].

Fee information begins on page 8 of the report (page 14 of the PDF).

New York

Permits, New York State Department of Transportation, undated.

<https://www.dot.ny.gov/permits>

This site offers access to permitting guidance, including permits for special hauling and divisible loads.

North Dakota

North Dakota Road Restrictions: Ton Mile Fee Schedule, Motor Carrier Operations, North Dakota Highway Patrol, January 2006.

https://www.nd.gov/ndhp/sites/www/files/documents/Permits/Ton_Mile_Fee_Schedule_-_Full_Size.pdf

This schedule presents fee information based on GVW.

Ohio

Permit Information, Special Hauling Permits Section, Office of Maintenance Operations, Division of Operations, Ohio Department of Transportation, undated.

<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/Operations/Maintenance/Permits/Pages/PermitInformation.aspx>

This webpage provides access to types of permits, fee information and other useful resources.

South Carolina

Oversize/Overweight Permits, South Carolina Department of Transportation, 2018.

<http://www.scdot.org/business/permits-osow.aspx>

Links to various permitting resources are available on this webpage, including the OSOW fee schedule and online permit application system.

Texas

Oversize/Overweight Permits, Motor Carriers Program, Texas Department of Motor Vehicles, 2018.

<http://www.txdmv.gov/motor-carriers/oversize-overweight-permits>

This webpage provides access to the TxPROS online permitting system and other resources, including size and weight limits.

Virginia

Virginia's Size, Weight and Equipment Requirements for Trucks, Trailers and Towed Vehicles, Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles, 2017.

<https://www.dmv.virginia.gov/webdoc/pdf/dmv109.pdf>

From the introduction: The material in this booklet has been condensed from the Motor Vehicle Code of Virginia and explains the size, weight and equipment requirements for trucks, trailers and towed vehicles.

When is a Hauling Permit Required?, Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles, undated.

https://www.dmv.virginia.gov/apps/vahps/vahps_home.aspx

The Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles public website provides information about OSOW permits, including price lists for state and local permits.

Wisconsin

Oversize-Overweight Permits, Bureau of Highway Maintenance, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, undated.

<http://wisconsin.gov/Pages/dmv/com-drv-vehs/mtr-car-trkr/osowgeneral.aspx>

General information about the permitting process is provided on this webpage.

Oversize-Overweight Forms and Applications, Bureau of Highway Maintenance, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, undated.

<http://wisconsin.gov/Pages/dmv/com-drv-vehs/mtr-car-trkr/osow-forms-apps.aspx>

Permit applications and information for single- and multitrip permits are available at this site.

Oversize/Overweight Single Trip Permit Information, OS/OW Permit Unit, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, July 2005.

<http://wisconsin.gov/Documents/formdocs/mv2600.pdf>

Details about the single-trip permit are provided in this one-page handout, including insurance requirements, charges and a fee schedule.

Multiple Trip Permit Information for Nondivisible Oversize/Overweight Vehicles/Loads, OS/OW Permit Unit, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, August 2011.

<http://wisconsin.gov/Documents/formdocs/mv2614.pdf>

Instructions for acquiring a multiple-trip permit are provided in this one-page handout.

Sealed Load in International Trade @ 90,000 lbs, CS Permit Condition Sheet, Oversize/Overweight Permits, Bureau of Highway Maintenance, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, October 2017.

<http://wisconsin.gov/Documents/dmv/shared/type-cs.pdf>

This two-page fact sheet summarizes the requirements for obtaining a single-trip permit to transport a sealed load, including size and weight limitations, insurance and vehicle registration requirements, and fee information.

Garbage, Refuse and Recyclable Scrap, AG Permit Condition Sheet, Oversize/Overweight Permits, Bureau of Highway Maintenance, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, May 2018.

<http://wisconsindot.gov/Documents/dmv/shared/type-ag.pdf>

This two-page fact sheet summarizes the permit requirements to transport divisible loads of garbage, refuse and recyclable scrap.

Appendix A

Permit Fee Policies for Oversize/Overweight Vehicles: Survey Questions

The following survey was distributed to selected state departments of transportation and other state agencies expected to have experience with oversize/overweight (OSOW) permit fee policies.

Fee Structure

1. When was your state's current OSOW fee structure implemented?
2. Please describe the statutory authority that is the basis for your state's OSOW permit fee structure.
3. Other than statutory guidance, has any research or other information informed development of your state's OSOW permit fee structure?
4. Please provide details below for all components that apply to your state's calculation of OSOW permit fees.
 - Flat fee.
 - Base fee.
 - Mileage fee.
 - Overweight fee.
 - Overdimension fee.
 - Load type fee.
 - Engineering fee.
 - Traffic review fee.
 - Escort fee.
 - Law enforcement fee.
 - Other fees (please describe).
5. Does your state assess supplemental fees in addition to the OSOW permit fee?

Fee Purpose and Allocation

6. Please describe the purpose of your state's OSOW permit fee by selecting all that apply.
 - To recover the cost of the administrative effort to issue the permit.
 - To recover the cost of highway maintenance and other activities associated with addressing OSOW load impacts.
 - To better understand how the road network is being used.
 - To follow the fee structure set by statute.
7. Please describe the distribution of OSOW permit fees after collection. For example, to what types of funds or accounts are the permit fees directed, and are there any restrictions on use of the permit fees collected?

Engagement With Local Agencies

8. Please describe how your state engages with local agencies assessing OSOW permit fees.
9. Does your state have access to the details of the OSOW permit fees charged by local agencies in your state?

Administrative Issues and Wrap-Up

10. Has your state established policies to address the frequent movement of certain types of OSOW loads in certain areas (for example, areas where wind turbines are manufactured or installed, or near oil fields)?
11. If available, please provide links to documents or web resources related to your state's OSOW permit fees. Send any files not available online to chris.kline@ctcandassociates.com.
12. Please use this space to provide any comments or additional information about your answers above.

Appendix B

Permit Fee Policies for Oversize/Overweight Vehicles: Contact Information

Below is the contact information for the individuals responding to the survey or providing supplemental information for this report.

Colorado

Craig Hurst
Manager, Commercial Vehicle Operations
Colorado Department of Transportation
303-757-9712, Craig.Hurst@state.co.us

Florida

Ronnie Martin
Permit Administrator
Florida Department of Transportation
850-410-5639, Veronica.Martin@dot.state.fl.us

Georgia

Michael Spurlock
Administrator, Oversize Permit Unit
Georgia Department of Public Safety
404-624-7258, MSpurlock@gsp.net

Indiana

Kristin Brier
Freight Manager, Multimodal Planning and Programs
Indiana Department of Transportation
317-232-2040, KBrier@indot.in.gov

Iowa

Phou Baccam
Administrator, Oversize/Overweight Permits
Iowa Department of Transportation
515-237-3270, Phoumine.Baccam@iowadot.us

Kansas

John Culbertson
Bridge Evaluation Engineer, Bureau of Structures and
Geotechnical Services
Kansas Department of Transportation
785-296-3347, John.Culbertson@ks.gov

Kentucky

Samuel Drake
Supervisor, Division of Motor Carriers
Kentucky Transportation Cabinet
502-564-1257, Samuel.Drake@ky.gov

Maryland

Tina Sanders
Technical Support Manager, Motor Carrier Division
Maryland State Highway Administration
443-618-7108, TSanders@sha.state.md.us

Michigan

Scott Greene
Section Manager, Development Services Division
Michigan Department of Transportation
517-373-7682, GreeneS2@michigan.gov

Minnesota

Shelly Meyer
Oversize/Overweight Permits Supervisor
Minnesota Department of Transportation
651-366-3689, Shelly.Meyer@state.mn.us

Missouri

Debra Bradshaw
Supervisor, Oversize/Overweight Permits
Missouri Department of Transportation
573-751-7410, Debra.Bradshaw@modot.mo.gov

Montana

Duane Williams
Administrator, Motor Carrier Services
Montana Department of Transportation
406-444-7312, DuWilliams@mt.gov

New York

Michael Mathioudakis
Director, Central Permits Bureau
New York State Department of Transportation
518-457-9800, Michael.Mathioudakis@dot.ny.gov

North Dakota

Jackie Darr
Supervisor, Permit Office
North Dakota Highway Patrol
701-328-4341, JDarr@nd.gov

Ohio

Mike Moreland
Manager, Special Hauling Permits
Ohio Department of Transportation
614-351-5530, Mike.Moreland2@dot.ohio.gov

South Carolina

Mechelle Mabry
Director, Oversize/Overweight Permits
South Carolina Department of Transportation
803-737-2184, MabryMV@scdot.org

South Dakota

Captain John Broers
Motor Carrier Services
South Dakota Highway Patrol
605-773-4578, John.Broers@state.sd.us

Texas

Kristy Schultz
Special Projects Coordinator, Motor Carrier Division
Texas Department of Motor Vehicles
512-465-1388, Kristy.Schultz@txdmv.gov

Virginia

Patrick Harrison
Director, Motor Carrier Services
Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles
804-249-5115, Patrick.Harrison@dmv.virginia.gov

Wisconsin

Gary Ishmael
Permit Supervisor, Bureau of Highway Maintenance
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
608-261-2574, Gary.Ishmael@dot.wi.gov