

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

February 13, 2002 LE 185

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Time.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Thank you.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Brashear.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, just to review briefly and then we'll go on to some other issues, I stand by what I submitted to you yesterday. We tend to vary here. Sometimes we're doing...we're always doing this for safety and I accept that, I know that to be the good faith argument, but sometimes it's because of hazardous materials. Well, you really don't need to worry about that. Throughout the history of railroading, it's been well established in the case law how dangerous a moving locomotive is, period. We're dealing with huge, huge vehicles. We're dealing with vehicles that can't alter their course and they can't stop on a dime and a lot of other things. So this isn't just about hazardous materials. This is about trains, locomotives and trains, and a moving locomotive has some inherent power if it comes into collision with something if it's empty, if it's carrying cream cheese, to do some very significant damage. So safety with regard to railroading is important but let's leave it there, because what I was talking about was equal protection of the law as guaranteed by the constitution, and there being a rational demonstrable, provable basis for differentiating between Class I and other railroads. And while I appreciate and understand the generalization, that short haul and short line and non-Class I railroads are...don't involve the same kind of movements, we've got to be...we've got to focus on the facts because that's our job. You've got regional carriers that can travel 328 miles in this state. That is not an incidental movement. You've got local carriers that can go 505 miles. That's not an incidental movement. And you've got switching and terminal carriers that have 15 miles of trackage. So my point yesterday, and I'm glad that I could amuse my good friend Senator Engel back here in whatever corner this is, (laugh) you noticed we've localized this debate, but in any event, I was trying to point out that under this bill a regional or non-Class I carrier could have a longer train, a heavier train moving faster with one crew person than a Class I with a shorter train, a lighter train, and a