

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

March 1, 2006 LB 853

discussion? Senator Chambers, on the Erdman amendment. Senator Chambers, are you on the floor?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'd like to ask Senator Erdman one or two questions.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Erdman, would you yield.

SENATOR ERDMAN: I would.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Erdman, you used the word "may" throughout, so is this one of those issues which the highway...the roads department would have something to say as to whether or not such a sign would be placed?

SENATOR ERDMAN: The language, as I understand it, Senator Chambers, would allow the flexibility, because there are two different options that they would have. They may place them; they're not required to place them there, and that's why the language is permissive.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But what I'm getting at, the Department of Roads would have input on the placement of these signs?

SENATOR ERDMAN: There...let me, if I may,...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Sure.

SENATOR ERDMAN: ...back up. There's currently a process in which a county can petition the Department of Roads in order to locate a sign in this fashion. This bill would not require them to go through that process, because that process follows federal law that actually won't be fully implemented till 2012. This simply would allow them to take advantage of this opportunity sooner, and then come in compliance with that at the appropriate time, so they would still be in part of this process. It wouldn't bypass them completely, but it would simply allow the counties to make that determination and to work with them in that area and have this authority, which they currently don't have.