

March 6, 1996

LB 901

roads to...

SENATOR ROBINSON: To 60, I believe it...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...60 miles.

SENATOR ROBINSON: Sixty, yeah.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Just so I understand.

SENATOR ROBINSON: That's correct, that's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Robinson, the reason I'm going to disagree with your amendment is that a problem could be created if we fragment the highways in this manner by having a posted limit of one amount here, then without warning it changes to something else. I know it's not your intent, so don't think what I'm saying I'm attributing to you as a motive because yours is safety and I believe it. But it could very easily turn into a speed trap where law enforcement people of the county would know that people are driving on a road where the limit is posted at 60. Senator Robinson correctly points out that they usually give you four to five miles, so they might be actually moving at a rate, regular traffic I mean, at 64 miles an hour. So then they cross this line and the limit is 55 and they got everybody who comes across that line and it becomes a speed trap type situation. So I am going to oppose Senator Robinson's amendment mainly for the reason that I gave. I'm not in favor of fragmenting the highway system in this manner.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Kristensen.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Madam President and members of the Legislature. It's sometimes difficult to stand up and speak against an amendment that would perhaps keep a speed limit lower and perhaps save some lives, but I'm going to do that for Senator Chambers certainly began pointing out what I think's wrong with this policy. First of all, Senator Robinson, I do not have any objection to that road being at a lower speed. In fact, the facts, as you give them, probably would indicate that that road would be a good candidate to be lower. However, the policy here is if we begin to take section by section of highway through this state you will have a bill from every senator here