

SENATOR HALL: ...that to use those roads. So I don't think it is a fair comparison or analogy, if you will, but I will be happy to negotiate the purchase of my house with you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Hall, let me ask you this, then. Do you think the argument pertains to this discussion that people have offered in terms to how much damage a vehicle does to the road, and based on that, the fee ought to be paid?

SENATOR HALL: Clearly I think there is an argument that could be made.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then why don't we base it on the weight of the, and I am not being facetious now, on the weight of the vehicle, rather than the year.

SENATOR HALL: And that is what I did do. One of the amendments that is in the committee amendment, as it relates to at least recreational vehicles, Senator Chambers, rather than go with a flat fee, did spread that out on a weight basis.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do you consider in that amendment the amount of miles the vehicle is driven?

SENATOR HALL: No, that is not included.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So then one that sits in the driveway most of the year would pay as much as one that is used on the highway constantly?

SENATOR HALL: Correct, just as the personal property tax system currently does.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So then, again, there is no correlation between what is charged and the basis for making the charge?

SENATOR HALL: That is correct, that is correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, so how would that be more rational than the present system, which you've described as being...

SENATOR HALL: Weight base?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...illogical and irrational. Not just the weight base, the current system.