

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

March 12, 2003 LB 619

same thing. We're transferring money from a Department of Ag Cash Fund in lieu of additional General Funds. But now there's no suggestion that we transfer from any other ag fund, any other department of agricultural fund to make up for those funds, nor is there suggestion that we just outright raise the fees so that the Cash Fund contribution is reasonable. And we're doing this at the very worst time for the state altogether because we need General Funds. Not only is it fair that they should pay for it, but we badly need the General Funds in other areas, and I might say in other agricultural areas, in rural areas. It goes across the board. So if you would adopt the set of fees that are in Senator Schrock's bill, you basically bring the funding, the Cash Fund funding of this particular program, back up to the 30 percent level, which is still way below 50 percent, and way below the 100 percent that we apply as a rule to a great number of other programs that we fund. Most of these kinds of things we require entirely cash funding. The actual fees involved in this case include the initial inspection fee. There are different sized facilities, four different size facilities. The second largest class facility, a class II facility, that initial inspection fee would increase to \$200, and for the largest fees, for the largest facilities, the inspection fee would increase to \$1,000. And then it increases the application fee, the permit application fee, for all classes by a certain amount of money. And then it goes on to establish what should have been established a number of years ago but is now simply being considered, but would be established with this amendment, an operating fee. An annual operating fee for the small facilities, class I or class II, would only be \$100; for III and IV it would be \$300. And the payment of those fees would not be annually in every case, but as the facilities got smaller the fees wouldn't have to be paid but every fifth year. For the smallest ones, for example, it eventually goes up to \$300, but it's only paid every fifth year. So there's a staggered system of payment. So that's basically what the amendment does and what the bill does. There is no substantial reason, in my opinion, to delay doing this any longer,...

PRESIDENT HEINEMAN: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...and I don't think we should be changing