

to save two minutes for you. I am going to be very quick. You know one of the arguments here is there is not very many people that use them so, therefore, we ought to legalize the use of studded snow tires no matter what the cost. Now that is the issue, the cost. Let me say that if ten percent of the people in America decided the sky was going to fall tomorrow, that is not the criteria for us to change and say we can adjourn, forget it, because the sky is going to fall tomorrow, just because ten percent of the people believe that. The bottom line truth is that there has been no proof that studded snow tires provide any safety except on glare ice and then the negatives far outweigh the positives. The negatives far outweigh the positives. On the safety issue alone, it is not correct. But let's talk about cost. Why should ninety percent of the people of this state pay for the use of studded snow tires by ten percent of the people even though they don't do any good? The answer is they shouldn't. The cost are \$22 million in terms of damage and the damage is done if ten percent use it, or if fourteen percent use it, or if five percent use it because it tears the covering off the roads. In Omaha alone, in Omaha alone, the estimated costs are \$10 million a year, \$8 million a year. Now, frankly, what we have to look at in this issue, and I think it is very simple, we have to look at with declining federal dollars for highways, with declining dollars for street and bond issues, with declining tax bases, can we afford the luxury of studded snow tires, especially now that we have front wheel drive, we have better tires, et cetera? The answer is clearly no. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, let me try just to analyze for you for a minute what came before the Public Works Committee. Basically we had three questions. Do the studded tires tear up the highways? Is there a net safety effect, if you have studded tires? And if the answer to both of those questions is yes, then you have to figure out whether the safety benefits outweigh the economic costs, and that basically is the question. Now what are the costs? The fiscal note which I passed around to you from the Department of Roads indicates the cost may well be \$35 million, and I don't think that they are just trying to be scary with that figure. I think that is accurate in terms of the hundreds of thousands of dollars per square mile that it takes to resurface roads. They indicated that on the kind of travel that could be expected, that the forty year life of an interstate highway could be reduced to as low as twenty years. It is important to note that there are no studies to my knowledge