

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Langford. I appreciate that information, and I think at this point I am just going to hold back and see how the discussion goes, for the most part, and then I have got my light on again and I will make some general comments about how I see this whole procedure going on. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Discussion on the amendment, Senator Langford, your light is on, followed by Senator Warner.

SENATOR LANGFORD: Well, actually, I think I have, in answering the questions, I think I have given most of the information. The problem is when you are studying this much material in that short a time it takes a lot of people to do it, and since they have to have an inventory ready, this really, by June, this really means that they have to do the work twice. They are trying to find out the age of all of the material that they have which requires the lab technicians, and they are trying to photograph everything so that they have an accurate account. Then they have to go back to the previous material that they have, which they...the inventory that they took when they got the material in the first place. So it does take a lot of time and effort, and since it has to be done so quickly, they need more money to hire more people to do the work. And if anyone else has any questions, I would be happy to answer them for them. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Warner, followed by Senator Bernard-Stevens and Baack.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, and members of the Legislature, as I understand, the discussion is relative to the level of funding for this program which Senator Langford has explained the basis for the additional request. The only...one thing I should have also added that these funds are in a separate program limited to the expenditures necessary to comply with LB 340. Any funds that are not needed in that relationship lapse back to the General Fund. So it is not a case of providing money that might otherwise be used for something, some other purpose. Certainly there can be some discussion on pending lawsuits but that really probably is not a matter of the appropriation. It may be a basic policy issue but I am not sure that is related to the appropriation for the passage of LB 340. And, finally, I would say that, obviously, a way to create an even more unnecessarily complex problem would to underfund the