

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

February 4, 2003 LB 126

over time, that would come to the attention of the Appropriations Committee, wouldn't it?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Well, sure, in the long run. Sure.

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: Wouldn't the cash balance grow?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Absolutely.

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: And so that would come to the attention of the Appropriations Committee.

SENATOR CUDABACK: You're correct.

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: Now, does the Legislature reserve the option, then, later on, to be flexible with these fees? They can lower them at any time?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Yes. The board can lower them also. Because they do not have to charge this. Did I stress that? I'll stress it now again. The board, they do not have to go up here. But I'm afraid...I don't know how they're going to not go up there. In the year 2007 they're going to only have a 300...like Senator Dwite Pedersen says, you know, the money is just not there. Unless you want to cut back on inspectors. Now, if this body wants to cut back, hey, I'm pretty tight myself. You know, I don't...so if that's what you want, you want to jeopardize our...I don't...it's not my...this is your bill. It's not Jim Cudaback's bill.

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: Well, thank you, Senator Cudaback. I agree with you, Senator Cudaback, that there is a demonstrated need for an increase in these fee schedules. There's no question about it. And there seems to be a lot of concern in the body about the "excessivity" of these fees. But I think that I trust the Appropriations Committee. I'm now learning their logistics, the way they work. And I know that the cash balances in these fees will be closely monitored. And given Senator Jones' comments with regard to a sunset on the fees, that's another strengthening to my position that no type of sunset would be needed in this type of arrangement, as well. So I want