

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

February 9, 2001 LB 166

additional needs in that area or if any of it would be directed in that area any way other than highway construction, but we are...we are limiting our options if we adopt this amendment. We are tying the hands of the Department of Roads. It was pointed out to me in one of the contacts I had, Senator Baker, I apologize for that but I just had a contact just in the last several minutes and I went and talked to Senator Wehrbein as well because I know he's concerned about...about the fiscal situation, but it was...it was pointed out to me that some of the additional costs of implementing .08 will fall upon DMV because there will be additional hearings, there will be additional proceedings if additional prosecutions or arrests are made, and so that's why I went and talked to Senator Wehrbein right away when I couldn't spot Senator Baker to see if he had any concerns about that. And DMV is pretty much a cash-funded agency so it very well might be that the additional fees they receive from reinstatement of licenses and that sort of thing will offset the additional hearing costs and things that they will have. But I guess I wish that we would have a little more time maybe to think about this rather than...than proceeding with these questions in mind. And I...I don't think Senator Baker has a bad idea at all, but I just want to be sure that we understand fully the implications of adopting that amendment and the options that we are taking away from the Department of Roads should they choose to use them. So I offer that information or discussion, Senator Baker, which I would like to have had with you prior to telling you on the mike, but that's the way sometimes things happen here. So thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Wehrbein, on the Baker amendment to LB 166.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Thank you, Mr. President, members. Actually, my comments are much along the line of Senator Bromm, even though we didn't discuss that part of it in great detail. The grant funds, from your fiscal note, says the grant funds may be used for highway construction and/or highway safety projects, and with Senator Baker's amendment it's strictly (inaudible) confines it to use of the highway road construction and takes away the option, the way it would appear, of highway safety projects. I, too, don't have a great difference of opinion as