

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

March 22, 1999 LB 142

the Missouri River, near Omaha. The quality of that water is directly impacted by the amount of runoff from agriculture chemicals and other contaminants that get into that water through a variety of nonpoint sources of pollution. What Senator Beutler is attempting to do is use funds that come from an area that helps to create the problem, use those funds to help mitigate the problem, to give that money back to the NRDs in an attempt for them to do the job that is a part of their mandate to do. Originally the concern was for the fertilizer tax. That legislation was there to extend what was going to be a sunset on that fertilizer tax. That money would have gone directly to the NRDs to deal exactly with what we're trying to do to provide resources, financial resources, to the NRDs. When the Revenue Committee chose to kill that legislation, there goes that attempt to replace some of the funding that was taken away when the voters made a choice in how those property tax funds for motor vehicles were going to be allocated. In talking to a number of folks about the vote that they cast, after the fact they didn't realize what they had actually voted on. Many folks did not realize that the NRDs were going to be impacted and have that money taken away from them. They cast their vote thinking that it was appropriate in the way that it was worded on the ballot, but not fully appreciating or comprehending the consequences. That, in and of itself, is not so unusual. Frequently, a full education of something that's on the ballot just doesn't have the resources or the backing to get accomplished. In this case I think there were many people across the state who didn't fully comprehend...

SENATOR CROSBY: One minute.

SENATOR PREISTER: ...the consequences of that vote. So we ended up in a situation where monies were being cut, and cut from the NRDs because of that ballot issue and because of the way the vote turned out. In addition to that, because of the vote in the Revenue Committee, we're going to be losing additional revenue to the NRDs through the repeal of the fertilizer tax. And that seems such a fair way of dealing with the problem, to me. When you put the assessment on the fertilizer which causes the problem, you've got the potential solution, or the mitigation of the problem coming from the source that's causing the problem. It's done locally, it's done