

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

March 9, 2005

LB 102, 217

tax. And again, this mechanism doesn't allow, or doesn't encourage, public involvement. It is a joint agreement between two entities to fund a \$5 million project. And it's not slipping it through in the dead of night but, in fact, it doesn't encourage people to become engaged and to approve of that bonding process. So I didn't feel...or, I don't feel that it's appropriate that that process be tied in and somehow enabled for the purposes of LB 102. And that's it. I have no more, Mr. President. Thank you very much.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Thank you, Senator Mines. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Janssen, members of the Legislature, first of all, LB 102 is not my bill. The bill in the Natural Resources Committee is a committee bill, I believe. That's all right. I just wanted to be clear on that. But I am in favor of resolving the storm water sewer problem that's been laid upon us by the federal government. I'm interested in resolving that for the city of Lincoln, along with Omaha and all of the first class cities. So it would be fair to say I take a big interest in LB 102, even if it's not, per se, my bill. Having said that, though, let me explain that at least in our county, the city of Lincoln and the county of Lancaster and the NRD, the Lower Platte South NRD, work very nicely together on a whole array of projects. Involves things in the city, like city parks, the water on city parks. It involves things just outside the city boundaries that are more in the jurisdiction of the NRD. In dealing with storm water, for example, it's anticipated that there would be some kind of joint program with the NRD and/or the county and the city of Lincoln. So it's very much in the interest of my constituents to be able to use a bill like this. And their immediate problem is storm water, and their immediate partner is the NRD. And for some reason, because maybe one NRD is in disfavor someplace, or because there's some relationship in terms of descriptive material, although not in fact, with some other bill that's disliked, in the Natural Resources Committee, having to do with a fee system, I don't think those are very good reasons for the committee amendment excluding those things. If you look at the type of things that are being allowed--public buildings or related improvements to real estate, parking facilities, recreation facilities--I mean, if we