

Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, let me read to you from the committee hearing. Mr. Lamberty has been quoted several times. The statement said flatly I do oppose the idea that we need overweight for hauling from storage to market. All you've talked about are beets. Senator Nichol pointed out that in the future probably the farmer is going to haul his beets to the processing plant, which is exempt under the bill as it was. What you now have opened up is for all commercial farm trucks, everybody, and I assume that Senator Beyer's amendment was stricken with mine. I'm not sure if it was or it wasn't. It said amend the Warner amendment, as I heard it read. It doesn't. Oh, okay. Then it limits to 75 miles, 70, but it is all trucks with tandem axles to haul any farm product, including grain, from storage where there is no emergency on the roads. Now it does create additional damage, at least 50 percent more damage based upon the Bell curves that I've been supplied. The department did not say that they supported the second trip. I would take the position that even the bill, as it was prior to the adoption of this last amendment, did permit, probably would have permitted at least the beet issue in that one alone. But you are dealing with a whole much broader picture than that. Everybody understands that heavier vehicles cause more damage. Relatively speaking single axle, even with 25 percent overload, which is the chart I had, was a damage of 5, a like overload of 25 percent, for a tandem axle, was a factor of 4.7. So what you've done, by excluding the single axles earlier, is you allow the overweight with the biggest vehicles there are and where the most damage can be, the most relative damage. And you haven't changed that. Obviously if we could all run overloaded why it reduces our cost. That is simple. It costs so much a mile to haul, and that is exactly what you are going to have happen. There never has been an overweight permission that wasn't utilized to its maximum. And you'll see this spread much wider than it is. It is one of those insidious kinds of costs that we put on the taxpayers repeatedly, making exemptions which, in the long term, increases their cost to government. And we do it because it is supposed to be for a good cause. But the bad cause is that you are increasing the costs for everyone, and you really aren't saving that much. You really aren't saving that much. I would hope that you would indefinitely postpone the bill. It was a bad one. It wasn't a good bill