

March 13, 1980

LB 361

this Highway Trust Fund for gasohol, for railroad crossings, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. I don't think the answer is to continue the erosion. I think the answer is to draw the line and go the other direction and, of course, Senator Landis' bill does not do that. It is a perpetuation of the evils that resulted in the trouble and problems we have today. I think it is a step in the wrong direction and would urge you very carefully to look at this and vote down this particular amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I would rise to oppose Senator Landis' amendment but not on the context...of only one concept and that is the concept of utilizing highway user fees for something other than the construction and maintenance of the state highway system. Now it is true, as Senator Landis has indicated, there has been over the years some slight modification. Primarily it has been parking. Historically I think we would all agree that railroad crossings are directly related to highway or highway safety, at least, and when the parking was added in about '71, there was some logic to the fact that you needed parking allied perhaps to the use of motor vehicles but I think that the principle that we have had for years reserving highway user revenues for road construction is the one that should be paramount and the one that should be retained. I also have some concern with the amendment as proposed. It comes off of the top of the Allocation Fund and, as such, whatever is appropriated in the way of highway user revenue is proportionately taken away from the three governmental subdivisions we are talking about but I don't think it ought to be done at that level, in any event, if it was to be done, but I think it is the -wrong public policy to begin to deplete them all. Now as far as the bus transportation, it has general fund support. The appropriation level recommended I think, as indicated again by Senator Landis, from the committee was \$1,971,000 of general fund money and that is a little short of what... the full request and I would think that the more appropriate way to address the issue if an adjustment is to be made is to reconsider the legislation currently in law of prorating only the urban areas, that the prorating would be across the board but it is the kind of function I think that mass transit systems ought to be...it is the kind of function that ought to be funded out of general fund rather than highway user revenues. So I would hope that the body would not support the amendment as proposed.

8366