

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

March 13, 2003 LB 209

see a problem with changing this. I understand the four stipulations have to be met before that revocation can be stayed, but I don't think its unreasonable. I'm with Senator Bromm. You know, if the applicant is likely to prevail, fine. And these other three, I don't see that they're a tremendous burden, but...and the bottom line, of course, is that if it's not granted, this stay of revocation, it's simply...it's going to allow the court process to proceed on a district court level, in this case initially. All it's going to do is just...and they're not going to be able to drive while the court proceeding proceeds. So I want to point out how many times this was used last year when, on our interim hearing, it was LR 353 I think, a question was brought up: How many times has ALR been used in the past year? In 2002, there were 9,231 revocations were processed with the ALR program. I had no idea there were that many, and that's where, with that kind of a number, it came back to be not only an issue dealing with ALRs but...and a cost issue to the state of Nebraska also, which is what precipitated the interim study. And it was well attended; a lot of good testimony and, hence, the bill came out of that legislative study. So I got to point out to the body this is not something that's used occasionally. It's used less...in 2002, the calendar, 9,231 revocations. This is a widely used process. I don't think these particular requirements, where we are...eliminate...eliminating this automatic suspension, are any problem at all. Some of the other things this bill does, and I'm repeating what Senator Bromm said in his opening, it does make this a much moreworkable process and allows the hearings to be held by a telephone or videoconference call. It thereby frees up time of the arresting officer and so on. It obviously moves the responsibility from the county attorneys to handle the hearing back to the Attorney General's Office. It just simply cleans up a whole lot of the process and gets it out of the county attorneys' jurisdiction, as I believe it should be. The...obviously, the other big issue is it does eliminate the judicial bypass. So I don't know what else to add that Senator Bromm hasn't covered. I hope people realize though that this is being used more and more--over 9,000 revocations last year. I have no idea what it will be next year. But dealing with Senator Chambers' specific concerns, I don't think that those are particularly hard to meet, those four stipulations. I know