

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Executive Board March 18, 2025

HANSEN: OK. Good afternoon and welcome to the Executive Board. My name is Senator Ben Hansen. I represent the 16th Legislative District in Washington, Burt, Cuming, and part of Stanton Counties, and I serve as chair of the Executive Board. I would like to invite the members of the committee to introduce themselves, starting on my right with Senator Clements.

CLEMENTS: Rob Clements, District 2.

McKINNEY: Terrell McKinney, District 11.

DORN: Myron Dorn, District 30.

JACOBSON: Mike Jacobson, District 42.

HANSEN: Also assisting the committee is our legal counsel, Benson Wallace, our committee clerk, Natalie Schunk, and our committee pages Joel and Kym. A few notes about our policy and procedures. Please turn off or silence your cell phones. We'll be hearing one resolution today, which is listed on the wall outside the hearing room. OK. On the table near the door to the hearing room, you'll find green testifiers sheets. If you're planning to testify today, please fill one out and hand it to the page when you come up and testify. This will help us keep an accurate record of the hearing. If you are not testifying at the microphone, but want to go on record as having a position on a bill being heard today, there are yellow sign-in sheets at the entrance where you may leave your name and other pertinent information. Also I would note, if you are not testifying, but have an online position comment to submit, the Legislature's policy is that all comments for the record must be received by the committee by 8 a.m. the day of the hearing. Any handouts submitted by testifiers will also be included as part of the record as exhibits. We'd ask if we do have any handouts that you please bring 12 copies and give them to the page. We'll be using a light system for testifying. When you do come up to testify, please begin by stating your name clearly into the microphone and please spell both your first and last name. The hearing will begin with each introducer giving an opening statement, and then we'll hear from those in support, those in opposition, and those in the neutral capacity. On a side note, the reading of testimony that is not your own is not allowed unless previously approved. And we do have a strict no-prop policy in this committee. So with that, we will begin today's hearing with LR40 and welcome Senator Brandt.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Executive Board March 18, 2025

BRANDT: Good afternoon, Chairman Hansen and members of the Executive Board. My name is Tom Brandt, T-o-m B-r-a-n-d-t. I represent District 32: Fillmore, Thayer, Jefferson, Saline, and southwestern Lancaster Counties. I am here today to introduce LR40. LR40 is a resolution requesting the city of Lincoln and the Capitol Environs Commission work together to place stop signs at the dangerous intersection on the west side of the Capitol. I'm sure all of you senators are aware there are two crosswalks there, and that there have been multiple close calls between vehicles and pedestrians at this intersection. I have personally witnessed people in the crosswalk nearly getting hit because traffic is not paying attention to the crosswalk. Plus, the parking on both sides of the street really block a driver's ability to see someone entering the crosswalk. These crosswalks are heavily utilized every day, obviously at a greater rate when we're in session. I believe the best solution to this problem is to place stop signs and remove parking spots at the south crosswalk going to Lincoln Mall. Those of you that have been around a while will remember when 14th Street used to be a one-way the whole way with a yield sign at the intersection. This was replaced with a stop sign at the intersection. When 14th Street changed to being a two-way street, the stop signs were removed. Before one of our constituents, one of our senators, one of our staff, or a school child visiting the Capitol, and, yes, even before a lobbyist gets hit and run over at these intersections, we should ask and do all we can to make the area surrounding our workplace safe. Additionally, the intersection of 16th and H on the southwest corner of the Capitol grounds is an accident waiting to happen. I would ask that some safety measures be looked at here also. I would be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

HANSEN: All right. Thank you. Are there any questions from the committee? Seeing none, will you stay to close?

BRANDT: Yes.

HANSEN: All right. So with that, we'll take our first testifier in support of LR40. Welcome.

JUSTIN BRADY: Chairman Hansen and members of the committee, my name is Justin Brady, J-u-s-t-i-n B-r-a-d-y. I'm appearing before you today representing myself. And I don't know whether I'm supposed to register or not after looking at former Senator Linehan registering for herself, I don't know whether I should or not, but I'll look into that after this. But, no, I want to talk to you about this stop sign on the west side of the Capitol. And as Senator Brandt talked about, I've worked in this building coming from across the street as a business

owner for 26 years, I've watched that intersection. I've watched the cars go flying through it as Senator Brandt made reference to. At the very beginning, there was a yield sign. And that's when the street also was only a one-way from Lincoln Mall to K Street. And then eventually there was a stop sign. We referred to it as the Galen Hadley's memorial stop sign because when he was Speaker, he worked with the city and the Capitol Environs Commission to get a stop sign there. After he left being the Speaker, then the city looked at changing the flow of traffic to making it a two-way. And in that process also removed the stop sign that was previously there. And so with working with Senator Brandt, we would like to see the stop sign go back before someone gets hit. I mean, I watch it, I probably walked back and forth that intersection hundreds of times a year over the last 26 years. I also have an office that overlooks that intersection, and I can watch the cars that accelerate and the people that are out there in the crosswalk. And I know they've looked at different options. You know, whether they do remove parking, which is obviously a premium around the Capitol, I wouldn't advocate necessarily for removing much parking. They've talked about doing these bump outs, which would be, in essence, move the curb farther out, which I think if you look back at Capitol Environs and the city have talked about what a pain those are for with snow removal. I don't think we need to look to that expensive of a solution. I mean, a stop sign seems to be-- worked for many years, and I think we ought to look at putting it back. I did have a letter handed out, signed by 30-plus business owners, employees that all work in the area, that also make that same cross, maybe not daily, but at least on a regular basis. And so with that, Senator, I support this and ask if you have any questions.

HANSEN: All right. Thank you. Any questions from the committee?
Senator Jacobson.

JACOBSON: Will we be required to name that the Senator Brandt memorial stop sign or is that part of the deal?

JUSTIN BRADY: That's up for discussion, Senator.

JACOBSON: All right. Thank you.

ARCH: It's a different LR.

HANSEN: I got a question. So I know you're talking about your firsthand experience. Have you seen, like, other members of the public in danger sometimes or-- of getting hit?

JUSTIN BRADY: I have, yes, multiple times seeing people, you know, whether they're coming to the Capitol or not, it's still an intersection that a lot of citizens of Nebraska utilize. I'll give you an example, Senator. In all honesty, yesterday as I was walking out of the Capitol, there was a gentleman walking in and he literally turned to me and he was just-- I mean, he was in shorts and a golf shirt. Maybe he was coming to the Capitol, maybe not. But he literally turned to me, we met in the intersection. He goes, boy, they don't stop here, do they? And I said, they used to, but they don't. Yeah. And so-- but, yes, it's-- I mean it's, it is something that people see on a regular basis.

HANSEN: Any other questions from the committee? Seeing none, thank you very much.

JUSTIN BRADY: Thank you.

HANSEN: Take the next testifier in support.

KENT ROGERT: Good afternoon, Chairman Hansen, members of the Executive Board. My name is Kent Rogert, K-e-n-t R-o-g-e-r-t, and I'm here also representing myself in support of LR40. I want to thank Senator Brandt for putting this forward. February 22, 2010, Senator Rogert was walking across K Street at 13th and got smoked by a car from behind. Your assistant clerk was hit in that intersection also shortly before I did, and another employee of a lobby firm here in town was hit a year after that in that intersection. That intersection looks today drastically different than it did in terms of lighting and signs. You can't turn left, they're the red arrows now instead of stop signs. So I guess today I want to talk about reactionary versus proactionary. And I think that the city did a really good job of fixing that intersection and to trying to address pedestrians getting hit. I think we can do that before people get hit with this intersection. Like Mr. Brady, my office is right across the street and with, with the crosswalks that were put in more recently, apparently we don't teach drivers what crosswalks mean anymore. I can stand right in the middle street in that crosswalk and just watch cars drive right by me as fast as they can. They see that light on 13th Street green and they accelerate to try to get through it. And they aren't paying attention to anybody that's on the side, so. I know the city is here to talk about it, and we would support any discussion they would like to go through to maybe make that a much safer intersection, so. Answer any questions if I can.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Executive Board March 18, 2025

HANSEN: Thank you. Are there any questions from the committee? Seeing none,--

KENT ROBERT: Thanks.

HANSEN: --thank you very much. Take the next testifier in support. Welcome.

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Good afternoon. Chairperson Hansen and members of the Executive Board, I'm Elizabeth Elliott, E-i-l-z-a-b-e-t-h E-l-l-i-o-t-t, Director of Lincoln Transportation and Utilities. And I'm here to testify regarding LR40. I appreciate the Legislature's attention to pedestrian safety, which is a priority we all share. Our goal is to ensure that a safe and effective transportation system that balances all modes of traffic while also accounting for human behavior. LR40, as you heard today, calls for stop signs to be installed for northbound and southbound traffic at the intersection of 14th and Lincoln Mall. While we all want to improve pedestrian safety, it is important to implement solutions that are effective and do not create unintended risks. Federal guidelines establish clear standards for when stop signs are warranted, and this intersection does not meet that criteria. Those standards exist to ensure stop signs function as intended and are not disregarded by drivers. When a stop sign was previously located here, it was frequently ignored. In fact, the only accident or crash that we've had at this location in the last 25 years was when that stop sign was in place. Because what happens when the stop sign can't be seen, it creates a false sense of safety and security for the pedestrians, such as all of you, who are assuming the vehicles are going to come to a stop. If a pedestrian steps into a crosswalk expecting the drivers are going to comply with that stop sign and a driver disregards it, the risk of a serious crash increases. Additionally, yes, there have been mid-block pedestrian crashes in this area. Those incidents, though, would not have been prevented by a stop sign at this intersection. There has been a documented crash at the intersection itself, however, that was determined to be an alcohol related. Based on the data and the proven strategies, rather, rather than a well-intended but ineffective solution, we are proposing something different. We are not dismissing the concerns that are being raised. In fact, our team did develop a plan over a year ago that was presented to the Capitol Environs Commission. Unfortunately, in addition to my staff there presenting the design and supporting it, there was Capitol staff there that testified against it. There were no lobbyists or state senators there to testify in support of it and so the Capitol Environs Board, at that time, denied our request to install improvements. The plan that we

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Executive Board March 18, 2025

have now is a win-win plan where we would-- we have to balance, as was mentioned earlier, parking with safety needs. We know parking is at a premium. One of the louder complaints I hear are lack of parking. So the win-win solution that we can do are by creating bump outs. That way it preserves the parking, but it pushes the stop sign out farther so the operators of the vehicles can see it while maintaining safe expectations for the pedestrians there. That is the design we are proposed to bring forward again to the Capitol Environs Commission on March 28. It would be extremely beneficial to have legislative support in doing so this time around. But a comprehensive, well-designed approach will do far more to improve pedestrian safety that we're all concerned about than simply placing a stop sign in the ground, which will likely not be effective. So I appreciate your time today, I'm happy to answer any questions that you have, and I appreciate the opportunity.

HANSEN: Thank you. We'll see if there's any questions from the committee. Speaker Arch.

ARCH: Thank you. I'm glad you have a plan. I-- you know, I-- as I was thinking about this, my mind went to the possibility of, of installing the light system. And I don't mean a stop light,--

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Right.

ARCH: --but one that indicates somebody is in the crosswalk. Why, why do you not consider that?

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Absolutely. So with other traffic measures, such as an RRFB, which is a rapid rectangular flashing beacon, that I think you might be referencing, the, the sight line issues are the same. It is still set back. Yes, they're LED and, yes, they're bright. They're not as effective during the day as they are at night. And, and so we still have those issues, we would also still be looking at removing some additional parking stalls, again to enhance the sight lines to that sign without the bump outs. And the other aspect that we had, some in our community where they do live near an RRFB or work near it, they consider them unsightly. So I anticipate that we would get raised concerns from the Capitol Environs Commission, as well as those who are living here in the area. If that light goes off at 10:00, 11:00 at night, it is going to be intrusive into the windows around the area. So for those two reasons, we don't think that will be the most effective measures at this location.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Executive Board March 18, 2025

ARCH: Your proposal of a bump out, I'm, I'm assuming that is a bump out from the curve, right, where, where actually it-- it's-- it, it puts the pedestrian further out into the street before being exposed to traffic?

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: It does, and I apologize, I meant to print out a copy and give you all a, a visual of that so I can provide that to you later so you have a visual of what that looks like. It does. So it would actually-- so if you look at where the stairs are on, on the west side, it would bump out basically the width of a car. So you are now on the what would be the westernmost edge of a car parked along that sight line. So one impact of this is it would eliminate the ability, especially for State Patrol, that's typically who I see occasionally parked there to park in that area, because if you park there, you'd be in the traffic lane. So this does push it out basically a car length. So it creates a shorter walking distance for pedestrians, which is proven to be safer. And then it also puts that stop sign out on the other side or equal with the edge of the vehicle, which means vehicle operators are going to be able to see that better.

ARCH: So it's a bump out with a stop sign?

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Yes, it would be a bump out with a stop sign both for northbound and southbound. So eastbound would not have a stop sign, but north and south would.

ARCH: Only one of the crosswalks? There's two out there.

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: It would be both. So one would be on the north side one, one would be on the south side one. Yes. Yep.

ARCH: Got it.

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: There would be two.

ARCH: Thank you.

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: I apologize, I will get you a visual so you can see this. It is hard to imagine.

HANSEN: Senator Bostar.

BOSTAR: Thank you, Chair Hansen. Good to see you.

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Good to see you. Thank you.

BOSTAR: So 2 years ago, I sent a letter to the city requesting a stop sign--

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Yes.

BOSTAR: --be placed at this intersection. And my understanding is that it was-- as you said, it was considered by the Capitol Environs Commission, the city opposed it to the Capitol Environs Commission, Capitol Environs Commission were not opposed to putting the stop sign. The city wants to do a bump out which the Capitol Environs Commission doesn't want to do. So how, how do we ensure that something happens and not a continuation of nothing? Again, that was years ago. So I think, you know, my primary fear is the city has something that they would like, Capitol Environs Commission doesn't like it, Capitol Environs Commission is totally fine with putting a stop sign, but the city goes and says, no, you shouldn't. Walk us through what happens next.

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Yes. So there were a couple different proposals provided to the Capitol Environs. One was more of a temporary measure. There were some candlesticks proposed, that type of thing. That definitely esthetically is not the best way to go. The other side of that is there are certain design standards with that you must comply with the Capitol Environs, and there were some questions that I think we could have provided better clarification on was that we would continue to comply. So, as you can see, walking down Lincoln Mall, there are brick pavers at each of the corners outside of the walkway, but on the corners, kind of highlighting. The, the plan would include maintaining all of those brick pavers and creating-- keeping that esthetics appeal. The crosswalks, right now, one of the issues with Capitol Environs' design standards is they are parallel, perpendicular, and, and the design standards are essentially all roads shall point to the stairs of the Capitol. So the concept we had modified slightly is to make sure that the pedestrian crosswalks are at an angle leading to the stairs of the Capitol. So I think those concerns are more in line with the Capitol Environs Commission. I would say one of the things the Commission relied heavily upon was Capitol staff saying, essentially, this isn't a big deal. It's not going to go anywhere. And so that was part of it. So I think having this very vocal support for it will be helpful. But I think any additional support to the Capitol Environs from all of you would be helpful as well.

BOSTAR: But I, I think just to clarify, I'm not-- are you asking for support for the bump out specifically, or are you saying just more

support, vocal support among the Legislature for action period of any kind is where the value is?

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: I'm asking for support for an effective and safe improvement. A stop sign is not effective and will not create the safety that we are all looking for. So I'm looking for support for that effective design which does include bump outs.

BOSTAR: Thank you.

HANSEN: What about speed bumps? Are those--

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Right. So my understanding of, of the concern and our concern is the pedestrian safety, speed bump, speed humps, speed tables, whatever we want to call them, those are more to reduce speeds in areas it does not often-- does not require drivers to stop. And so if the goal-- our goal being pedestrian safety, that would not be an effective means of protecting pedestrians.

HANSEN: OK. Senator Jacobson.

JACOBSON: You mentioned candlesticks, and I'm assuming you don't mean real candlesticks. So--

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: I apologize.

JACOBSON: --could you explain for us what the candlestick design is?

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Yes, I apologize. So if you've ever seen the, what look like plastic tubes that are stuck in a ground, sometimes they're used to mark off bike lanes or something like that. They're plastic, they can be hit, they fall over and they crack. That is what we call a candlestick. And those are meant to be temporary or just a visual indication to, like, delineate a bike lane. This was one where it was-- there was some concern that maybe a bump out wouldn't be as effective either. And so to try it with a temporary measure before it was permanent and this, this would not, we would just go right with the permanent. Just looking at the history of vehicle data and the crashes and things like that, I think just moving to the permanent is the way to go to increase safety.

JACOBSON: Well, as a follow up to this, that is-- has to be a very unique intersection. OK? I mean, volume of pedestrian traffic through there seemingly is contributing to some of this. And the fact that you've got pretty good speed coming, I might add, anybody that tries to leave the senator parking lot and exit onto 16th Street, I've got a

large vehicle, and I have a heck of a time seeing ongoing traffic that's literally racing down 16th Street and worry about making a left-hand turn and who's going to rear end me or trying to drive across and hoping there's not a car coming down the raceway. But that's another story for another time. But because of the uniqueness of that, I mean, why can't you put a stop sign in the middle of the street?

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: A couple different reasons. Putting stop signs in the middle of the street are a little more challenging. One, they get hit more often by vehicles passing, not paying attention. They tend to swerve in the other lane to not hit them.

JACOBSON: Really thick pipe filled with concrete, that'll stop that.

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Then we're looking at legal liability on the city when that crash happens. But that, ultimately, they do get hit more often. Snowplows coming down, tomorrow as we see the snow plows, more likely than not to get hit by those as well. So long-term purposes. It also is somewhat misguided, like, where would you put those? Could you put them each in the stop block, the crosswalk, which then impedes pedestrians having to walk around them, which then gets them out of the crosswalk area? Do you put them in the middle of the street on that and is it just one single pole and who's looking at that? So there's some additional confusion in creation because typically drivers are like water, they're going to go at the least, the, the least impact route. They're just going to go where it's easy. And people follow habits. Flashing yellow arrows. That's the one that's a struggle for everybody, right, because that's abnormal. It's not-- we're not used to our habits. Here, stop signs are to the right. You look for your stop signs. You're not looking in the middle of the road. And so those are more likely to be run because drivers are not looking at them, because they're not expecting it to be in the middle of the road. So we see higher crashes in that area.

HANSEN: I'm going to ask one more question real quick.

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Yes.

HANSEN: When it-- and maybe it's-- I don't know if it's your general philosophy to at least try a method that would at least help to some extent and be a lot cheaper and see how that goes first, such as a stop sign with a red light on top. And then if we're still seeing problems down the road, then we can take more aggressive, more

expensive measures. Is that, is that kind of an approach that you would typically ever take or--

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: We could. The approach on that to put just a stop sign would require removal of several parking stalls. So then we get the additional complaints and concerns that parking is at a premium and now we are taking away probably more than a half a dozen parking stalls. And so--

HANSEN: With the bump out, you wouldn't have-- you, you would still have the parking stalls?

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Right, because we would be able to jet out in front, we would be able to maintain all of the parking stalls there. So long term, based on our experience on similar issues in other parts of town, yes, it's more expensive to do it this way, but there, there are a number of domino effects and complaints that will come taking a shortcut and doing it the cheap way where we're not actually being as effective as we could be.

HANSEN: Would you take the complaints or would we?

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Unfortunately, I would.

HANSEN: OK. Just want to make sure I've cleared that up before doing anything.

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: But I can send them your way. But, no, I would.

HANSEN: Senator Clements, did you have a question?

CLEMENTS: Yes. What is the cost difference between bump outs and just a stop sign?

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: I knew that was going to come up. So, yes, at first blush, it's going to sound expensive. But keep in mind this is more concrete and brick pavers are very expensive. So to install the concept that we are proposing, it is \$70,000 to do so. To do an RRFB because we do have to run power and conduit to it, we're looking at around another probably \$20,000 to add that. So because we would just be doing a stop sign with the bump outs with the brick pavers, we would be looking at \$70,000, give or take. But that's the cost estimate right now.

CLEMENTS: All right. You say the Board is going to meet March 28.

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Yes.

CLEMENTS: Which Board is that?

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: That is the Capitol Environs Commission that is meeting March 28. So we've submit-- I have it-- the Lancaster-- Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Department I've given that so it's on the agenda and ready to go for March 28.

CLEMENTS: OK. Thank you.

DORN: No, he asked my question. [INAUDIBLE]

HANSEN: Any other questions? Senator Bostar.

BOSTAR: Thank you, Chair Hansen. Ms. Elliott, thank you again. Are you-- I must-- I missed something. Are you testifying in the support, proponent capacity?

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: I am testifying in the proponent capacity because, like all of you, we do have a priority of pedestrian safety. So as we were last year when we brought it to the Capitol Environs Commission, we continue to be supportive of this and are willing to invest that additional funding to do it right.

BOSTAR: Thank you.

HANSEN: I feel like I'm back in city council in Blair because we installed stop signs all the time. This is great. OK, seeing no other questions, thank you very much for coming.

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT: Thank you.

HANSEN: Very informative. Thank you. Anybody else wishing to testify in support of LR40? Seeing none, anybody wishing to testify in opposition? Seeing none, anybody wishing to testify in neutral capacity? Seeing none, we'll welcome back up Senator Brandt to close on LR40. And we did have no online comments for the record.

BRANDT: Well, I'd like to thank Liz Elliott for coming here to testify. I think she cleared up a lot of things for the Legislature and the committee, because there's a lot of foot traffic that goes across that every day. We have a lot of meetings, receptions, apartments, just a whole raft of traffic. And it appears to me, and, and maybe Senator Bostar could enlighten me, but the problem is the city and the Capitol Environs cannot agree on a plan, but they need to

come up with a solution. Some of the things you've mentioned here, you know, if you put an axle-ripping speed bump there, they're going to stop. You know, if you bolted a big enough stop sign there with a flashing light in the middle of the street, they're going to see that. I would say if we do the bump out, and I talk to Capitol Environs, if we just did it on the west side, not on the Capitol side, but the west side, I think would be effective. OK? And the reason is along the Capitol side, a lot of people pull up next to this curb to pick people up. We've been picked up in buses. Think of the stuff that we do. But at in the morning and in the evening, a lot of employees here get picked up on the west side of the Capitol because it's a lot safer street to get picked up on than on the north side or the east side. So-- and if anything Capitol Environs somebody may want to expand that. You can solve the traffic problem, it's parallel on the east side of the street, simply take that cruiser spot off and move it back a little bit. The bigger problem is on the west side of the street, because the cars are parked at an angle. And I think the bump out would work there or you'd have to eliminate, like, two or three spots in front of the NSEA building and then you could see around the ends of those cars. Another thing we could do, and I don't know if this is legal, drop the speed limit to 15 miles an hour and then put some speed enforcement over there. The, the problem that I see is exactly what I think Senator Rogert expressed. When that light turns green and they're down there in front of their office building, people gun it because they want to make that green light, because they're too impatient to wait 30 seconds for the light to change again. And I can't tell you-- yeah, we're, we're kind of doing this lighthearted, but it kind of isn't. When you watch people approach that intersection, there's cars coming, I stop. I don't have enough trust that they actually see me because they're either on their phone, they're not paying attention. It's, it's really sped up this morning. I saw a car crawl. And it isn't just pedestrians, cars have this problem at that intersection, too. I saw a small car crawl out there because they can't see to their right who's coming, and just slowly poke themselves out there before they can turn left. Buses are almost the same way. A lot of the buses stop over there. Just some of the things that we're pointing out. So-- and I wholeheartedly agree, there's going to be a horrific accident down here on 16th and H. Take away those last three parking spots on the south end. Get-- you know, you're going to-- give up these parking spots in those areas and someday maybe the state paves where we've got our geothermal wells. We've got a whole block over here that we could put parking in if, if we want to someday. So that's everything I've got. I don't know if anybody's got any questions.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Executive Board March 18, 2025

HANSEN: Any questions from the committee?

BRANDT: Thank you.

HANSEN: Yep. Thank you very much.

BRANDT: Yep.

HANSEN: All right, well, that'll conclude our hearing on LR40 and our hearings for today.