

January 19, 1996 LB 750

Landis and his staff have put into working on this issue as well as other members of the community who are extremely concerned about this, and also the time spent by the utilities themselves. I will go along in support of this amendment, however, I still think that we should have strict liability and that is not a part of this. So this is a weakening, as I view it, of the actual bill of the actual proposed legislation in 750 in that regard, from my perspective. I do understand that dose limits does mean that if there is exposure and if that exposure is there, then that amount and that limit would trigger the liability and do appreciate that. However, for the security of the people who, particularly those people who are closest to I-80 and those people closest to the rail lines, I prefer to have strict liability as a part of the legislation. And that is not here. I will be looking further, since this amendment has just been before us in its final form this morning, and would like to spend more time in consulting with other concerned parties about this at this time and will be doing that between now and Select File and will reserve my final support or lack of support or amendments...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR PREISTER: ...between now and Select File. But at this time, it would appear to me that it is probably in our best interest to adopt Senator Landis's amendment and then with further scrutiny make some determinations between now and Select File and make those decisions at that time. To my knowledge, and Senator Landis can speak more to it because he has been more involved in the actual negotiation of the process, but to my understanding, there is limited or no opposition to this amendment, although there is still certainly concern about the actual bill. With that, I will conclude and thank the body for its attention.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Preister. Senator Vitiska.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body, I'm also a cosponsor of this bill. I cosponsored this bill basically because my district has a number of railroads running through it, principally the Burlington Railroad that carries a great deal of traffic. We've had about five train wrecks in my particular area in the last, at least four train wrecks, in the last five years. And I've seen the devastation