

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

January 26, 2004 LB 139, 662

SENATOR JOHNSON: ...as well as discussions with you.

SENATOR MINES: Well, thank you. As I mentioned up front, I'm in support in concept. The fiscal note is a concern. And I look forward to more information down the road. I yield the rest of my time to the Chair.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Mines. Senator Beutler. And this will be your third time, Senator.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback. Senator Mines, let me throw out a couple of things that might respond, in part at least, to the questions you're raising. First of all, with respect to the numbers, the fiscal cost that's been recited to you by Senator Johnson, that's absolutely correct, according to all staff information, everything that we've seen. You may be confusing it in your mind with LB 662, which was my bill to cover all felonies, which did have a higher fiscal note on it. Secondly, I want to reiterate what I was saying earlier, that it's not my personal belief at this point in time that any General Funds need be used for this purpose, that the State Patrol has a cash fund, it's called the federal forfeiture...well, it's called the Public Safety Cash Fund. But what it is, is all that money that comes from the federal government that is our share of the federal forfeitures that occur in drug cases. And this year it's \$1 million. It's far, far more than the State Patrol ever expected. It's expected to be a very high number next year, and it will continue to be a fairly high number, although not in the vicinity of those, hopefully. But it's our intent...we only recently discovered that that...that the criteria for that cash fund seems to...would seem to allow the use of DNA enhancement testing. And so the next step is to go to the State Patrol and see if they have any problem with using that federal money for this purpose. And we're not expecting that they will, since the vast majority of this \$1 million is a windfall they weren't expecting anyway. So it's not like we're going to be taking away some basic needs that they've identified to the Legislature at any particular point in time. But I would also mention, with regard to General Funds, even if you had to go that way, the State Patrol is one of the agencies that's been cut little or nothing in all four of the sequences of cutting that we've gone