

March 29, 1982

LB 603

and it is higher than 5 percent because we also have the dynamics of LB 111 from last year working into this. Is that right? You are getting a double shot. You are giving them 5 plus 5, but we also have the dynamics of the formula change of LB 111 working. Is that correct?

SENATOR CULLAN: Well, Senator Dworak, those figures which you set out are 5 percent above their current salary which is the \$41,000, so I don't believe...I think...as I...what we were supposed to prepare...what this table is supposed to present is a 5 percent increase each year.

SENATOR DWORAK: Okay, the second...then just one other question. If we don't adopt your amendment and then we are strictly on the dynamics of LB 111 from last year, correct, what kind of an increase will they have then if we do not adopt your amendment?

SENATOR CULLAN: If we do not adopt my amendment and we go with the recommendation of the...

SENATOR DWORAK: Committee.

SENATOR CULLAN:Judiciary Committee, it is \$55,000 but then they reduced the percentages from 85 percent to 77½ percent, I believe, is the percentage so that there would actually be over the course of a period of time a very slight increase for the District Court judges, substantial increase for the Supreme Court judges and a slight increase for the county judges as well.

SENATOR DWORAK: Slight increase?

SENATOR CULLAN: As I understand it would be a very slight over the...(interruption).

SENATOR DWORAK: Can you tell me the total dollar impact if we do not adopt your amendment but just go with the Judiciary Committee recommendation?

SENATOR CULLAN: As I understand it the fiscal impact would be almost the same for the Judiciary Committee's approach and this approach.

SENATOR DWORAK: But it would be a different distribution whereby the Supreme Court would be getting the bulk of the increase with the District judges getting considerably less.

SENATOR CULLAN: That is correct.

9608