

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

March 8, 2000

LB 628

that I would like some further discussion on as to what is intended. An opportunity for the requester to prioritize the request. What...what were people thinking there? I mean, if a particular office has a list of requests that have come in, in chronological order, in a time sequence, what's envisioned by a particular requester being able to prioritize the request? I would yield some of my time to Senator Brashear to respond.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Senator, Senator Beutler, I'm going to talk about something I would know best. If...if we are talking, for instance, a multithousand page piece of litigation, and the request is for a copy of every pleading, and an order has just been entered, and I get a response back that says this will take ten days in order to produce this for you, I might go in and say I'm delighted to wait ten days for all of it, except the final or the order that was entered the day before yesterday, will you give me that one now. And that changes...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: ...the priority, so that I'm asking for the last first, and I'll wait for the first last.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, that makes perfect sense. So the language is intended solely to deal with that...with a portion of the request. It's not intended to deal with one request versus a completely separate request that they may have gotten.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: No, it's meant to allow for a...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: ...discourse and a dialogue that cooperatively results in the person getting what they need when they need it.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Makes perfect sense. Thank you, Senator. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Chambers, on the committee amendments.