

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

March 31, 2003 LB 626

language, when we pass the new budget bill, will be repealed. And so even intent language will be gone. Following that, I introduced an interim study resolution that was jointly done by the Government, Appropriations, Business, and the Health Committees, with the chairs or each of those committees working on it. And I think we did some very good things. There is a copy that we have available of the results of that interim study, LR 399. And that's available. And Christy Abraham is here with the Government Committee and is under the north balcony and could probably address questions if people had any on some of those issues. At the same time, the Program Evaluation Committee also saw this as a concern. And they put together their own study. And Andre Mick and Martha Carter worked on that, and they're over here, along with Kate Allen, my staff, who put in even more time on this issue. So we have the Program Evaluation study. We have been studying, we have been putting data together, for a number of years, and it continues to go forward. Just at the end of last year, December 20, Governor Johanns did a revised Executive Order. And that Executive Order is essentially what LB 626 is based upon. That is a part of what I think we need to get done today. And my goals in doing the bill and in putting time into this is to be able to identify if we're saving money, whether we're saving money, knowing how much money is being spent. We're talking, folks, \$1 billion a year. And we don't even always have good information on where and how that money is being spent. That's why the World-Herald talks about the need to get something done. That's why this time has gone into it. Now more than ever we need good fiscal accountability and responsibility. And right now we don't have a database set up yet, although the NIS system, when that's complete, should help in that area. LB 626 does pretty much mirror the Governor's Executive Order, with some minor changes. Now, I say minor. They may not be minor to everyone. One is, materiel division preapproval is required for contracts over \$50,000, and that's in Section 4, and for all sole-source contracts, in Section 5; whereas in the Executive Order it asks for prereviews. And that was one of the issues that the LR 399 task force said they wanted preapproval rather than prereview, which is why that change was made. It reduces the agencies that are exempt from the procedures outlined in the bill, versus the Executive Order. That was a second component