

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

March 28, 2003      LB 524

electronic access to many parts of state government, we established a process of setting those fees through the State Records Board. This is a statutory board chaired by the Secretary of State which reviews what we do charge for the public to access records in our various departments, and periodically that board, based on cost standards, the statutes require that they look at access to records by the public and not charge them more than our cost of making those records available. They review the fees and make recommendations on whether they should be lowered, raised, or changed, and then it's...after their recommendation, that comes to the Legislature for ratification or approval, and if we don't approve it those fees can't go into effect. And we must approve them within 18 months of when the Records Board makes their recommendations. One of the reasons I chose to offer it at this point is that if we do not offer these fee changes and approve them this session, the time will run out from the time that the Records Board made the recommendations. These suggestions actually lower the fees in some cases. It sets a fee of 45 cents per page for corporate and UCC filings, and that is a lowering of the existing charge that the Secretary of State makes. They've determined that we actually can offer that convenience at a lower fee. It eliminates a 75-cent fee that they now charge on line for corporation searches, like if you are searching for a corporate name, a corporate registered agent. It eliminates that fee altogether, which again is a lowering of the fee, which really is an unusual thing for us to do, especially in a year like this. Secondly it...or thirdly, it sets the fees for downloading entire databases of corporate and UCC records. It sets up a \$300 weekly subscription for that, a \$1,000 twice a month subscription fee, or an \$800 monthly subscription. Those are batch services and they are used primarily by large, out-of-state concerns, like Dun and Bradstreet would request those kinds of records, and that is the recommendation. The Secretary of State has recommended this, as well as the State Records Board. The Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee held a hearing Wednesday, I think, March 5. There were no opponents to the suggested changes. The bill was advanced without opposition and that's the reason I would like to return the bill, is to offer that amendment. And if there are questions, I'll try to answer them. Thank you,