

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

March 22, 1999 LB 142

probably the wrong way. I don't see a whole lot of NRD people out here twisting our arms, so to speak, on this issue. And so I...I do support Senator Beutler's views that they probably need funding, but this is probably the wrong way to do it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Cudaback. Seeing no further lights, Senator Beutler, you're recognized to close on your motion to suspend the germaneness rule.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Lieutenant Governor, first of all, I thank the body for listening to a second alternative kind of solution to the problem and...and obviously there are things to think about that complicate that particular solution, so...but at least we've gotten out on the table what another possible solution might be. I keep hearing that we should put this off for a year and decide these questions later, but I've been around long enough to know that financial situations can change and, unless there's some good reason for putting things off for another year, you put in jeopardy those things that you put off. Whereas, it seems to me that the thing we should do, if we've all decided and everybody says, yes, the NRDs are important; yes, we need to figure out how to get the money back to them, we should get the money back to them now. If the Revenue Committee wants to massage, as they indicated, or to make small adjustments, they can do that. But the NRDs ought to have an opportunity to be a part of the solution this year just as they are being shut out of the money this year. Now, one can argue that the NRDs don't need the money, and I will try to document that better for you. I would argue quite strongly that they do need the money; that their responsibilities are increasing and, again, I will...I will seek to document that for you. But you can point to the NRD levies and say, yes, there are some NRDs that don't need the money, but there are quite a few that are up at the very top end of their levy schedules, over 3.5, up around 4, and one who already is at the top of the levy limit, 4.5. What you did not see passed out to you is where the cities are, for example, or where the counties are in terms of their levy limits. Do they need the money? If you look at those charts, you'll see that there are an awful lot of cities and an awful lot of counties who don't need the money any more than the NRDs need the money. Lancaster County doesn't need the money, for