

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would rise to oppose the amendment to strike the entire provisions which is anticipated for a number of...there were a number of things included in that amendment which apparently are being stricken. The principal one was it limited to one trip and the argument that you had to get it out of the field. My assumption indicates the beets, and that seems to be what we are arguing, if the beets are piled in the field, I would assume that from the field to storage is the one trip. And there is no problem. The problem, as I see it, is that it opens it up all over the place if this amendment is dropped. There is no way that you could argue that there is an emergency involved with other grain from storage to market. That just doesn't happen so that you need overweight trucks. It only pertains to the heavy trucks, the big trucks, tandem axles as it is now written. A factor that is used for overloads is the ratio of...or a factor of about 1.9 on the damage factor. For 3,400 pound you go to 15 percent. That same factor goes up about 3.3 or 3.4, which is at least a 50 percent increase, and the factor that if 10 percent of the trucks statewide are not significant, but it will be very significant on the limited roads that are used. You strike the amendment also it will result in elimination of the provision that the permit restrictions would be carried with the permit, so that if a vehicle was stopped it could be checked. If it was driving on roads that it was not supposed to be, the arresting officer would have to try and find out whether that vehicle was on a road that it was permitted to be on. I see no reason why that should be stricken at all. I would hope you would reject to try and strike all of those provisions because you are going to, in that process, destroy any effective effort to really tell whether or not a vehicle is going where it had a permit to go. Number two, there is no argument that can be made of an emergency from storage to market. Frankly, I would anticipate that the beet issue, as long as the stockpile is in the field, is still in essence hauling from the field to market, and is covered by the one time trip, one trip that the law now provides. So I would hope that you would reject this amendment. Any way you cut it, roads are built to carry a certain load, and whenever you increase those loads in excess of what they are designed for, it is going to have an effect that is deleterious upon the life of that road, and it ought to be eliminated. You should not go the route of increasing the cost of roads that we already have, which everyone knows is high, by increasing