

February 21, 1996 LB 1205

that there has been an expansion of budget with no restraint by the Legislature's Appropriations Committee, possible 2.6 million to administer the agency. They have their own office building. As far as trust, that isn't a problem I have. They, and I don't want to use all your time, or I'll put...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: It's all right. Go ahead.

SENATOR BROMM: ...my light on and give you some. The...it's a little broader than that. It is...it is not that they aren't capable. They are capable, they are the ones that are most capable of putting together the best plan because they know all the intricacies of when their leases end and how much land is centered in each locality. They could make the best judgment on how and when the land could be sold to maximize the return better than I could as with the knowledge that I have, and if we, if the Education Committee and the Legislature doesn't like their report, we certainly would have the opportunity to get an independent analysis of that report as well, and I certainly would consider that. But I hope that...that explains ..and they have, by the constitution, a fiduciary duty to administer this project, so I don't think we should usurp their fiduciary duties by giving that to somebody else, without giving them a chance.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Senator Bromm, when I read starting in line 7 of the committee amendment, the plan shall comply with the fiduciary duties of the board, but...the "but" is disjunctive. It puts what follows perhaps in opposition to what went before. It's directing the board to comply with their fiduciary duties but, and this is the way I read this language; if, in complying with your fiduciary duties, you conclude that this sale should not occur, you are not at liberty to state that. No matter how you perceive your fiduciary duties, you shall put together a plan calling for the sale of these lands by a certain date. So how are you, on the one hand, going to require them to comport with their fiduciary duties, and I think they must, I don't think the Legislature can even annul that. This other language is superfluous, if it's contradictory to what their fiduciary duty requires them to do. So now here is the question. If, as they interpret their fiduciary duty, they cannot come up with a plan that comports with those duties that will call for a sale of 95 percent of all the educational lands by January 1, 2012, what is to happen then, if that should be their conclusion?