

Sections 3 and 4 of the proposed amendment by Senator Bromm have to be read together in order to make any sense at all out of what we are attempting to do. And Senator Chambers' context can fit within an explanation, and I've spoken with him briefly, and I think he has the same explanation, in that we have really three different circumstances that are being addressed; those circumstances where we have an agency that wants to charge a fee greater than allowed by state law. In other words, we actually do have a fee specified in state law, but for a new kind of access, electronic access, they want to charge more. That is, I believe is dealt with in Section 3. We also have those specific circumstances in which a statutory fee is allowed by law, and it is my understanding that neither Section 3 nor Section 4 is to have any application to those circumstances. In other words, where there is a specific statutory fee for something, that is not affected. There is also, I think, a broad range of transactions, contracts, events, whatever you want to call them, for which there is currently no fees specified in state law, and those seem to be beginning to be dealt with in Section 4, although I think when we finish work on Senator Chambers amendment, we will come to an amendment that I have filed to this amendment, which specifies that some of those transactions for which there is no current statutory authority, no current statutory fee base, we just don't care about receiving reports. For example, if somebody wants photocopies or some other de minimis transaction, we don't care. Why should they have to report that to us? It does not make any sense to me. But I think within the context of those three different kinds of transactions, those where arguably or potentially an agency wants to charge more than a specific statutory fee, fine, deal with those in Section 3. In Section 4, begin to deal with those where there is no fee specified, and for those situations where a fee is already specified in statute, leave that alone. If Senator Chambers' amendment can be read in that context, I think it makes sense and should be adopted. I believe that's what his intention is. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Senator Brashear.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Madam President, members of the Legislature, I rise to the amendment to the amendment by Senator Chambers, and I will be specific about that later. I also rise with a certain degree of frustration. I am not certain that LB 1375