

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

April 20, 1999

LB 637

all these ideas maybe can be brought all together within the shrinking confines of federal requirements and legislative or state prerogatives. I would...I would think we could do something along these lines: first of all, basically retain the structure of the bill as we have amended it to date, perhaps with additional refining amendments, especially the one that Senator Chambers suggested earlier. But, part one, retain basically the bill so that you're proceeding on some basis that's acceptable to the federal government. The second step would be to cut back the A bill so that the funding in the first of two years was only enough funding to do some additional planning and enough money to seek a waiver in the sophisticated way a waiver must be sought, if it's going to be taken seriously as a serious request by the federal government. So, by delaying an A bill, you will be making no decision to proceed with a full flush system, at least for one year, while the process of seeking a waiver goes forward. So a third part of the amendment would be then in fact to put into the bill a direction to DHS to seek the waiver, at the same time proceeding along the other track. If the waiver comes through then, fine, we don't have to do anything. If the waiver doesn't come through, we are still working slowly towards meeting the federal requirement. So then the next part of the amendment I would think would be to require from DHH that they send over to us, by January 1st of the year 2000 or thereabouts, a preliminary plan. Let the Legislature and everybody in the Legislature look at the preliminary plan, see how we're doing, are we on course? And then require a final plan, maybe by January of the year 2001, and give ourselves a second session to reject the whole process, if we should choose to do so, after we've seen the final details of the plan that's being proposed. So I think there are ways of putting this all together, if on the one hand some people are willing to give and admit that we're going to lose the money if we don't proceed, and then proceed in such a way that we can draw back at, at least, a couple of different stages. So, something along this line has to be what evolves. Certainly, merely seeking a waiver and rejecting all else cannot be the solution. We might as well have no bill at all. And obviously the Legislature is not enamored of the current proposition for a solution as it is. So perhaps buying some time, if that in the end is the purpose of the Bohlke amendment, and to get it over to Select File where we can have a flushed out discussion on an amendment that has had