

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

February 3, 2004 LB 32

SENATOR SCHROCK: Yes.

SENATOR BOURNE: Okay.

SENATOR SCHROCK: But the funds have to be exclusively for storm water.

SENATOR BOURNE: Sure, I understand that. And again, this is outside of the budget, the 3 percent increase per year?

SENATOR SCHROCK: That is correct.

SENATOR BOURNE: Okay. Let me ask you another question, if you would. On page 3 of the bill (sic--amendment), it talks about the revenue bonds. And it says: "Such revenue bonds shall not be a general liability on such city but shall be secured only by the proceeds of the tax levy." Isn't that the definition of a revenue bond, that it's only...I mean, why would there be language in here that says that it's not a general liability to the city?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Senator Bourne, I can't answer that right now.

SENATOR BOURNE: Okay.

SENATOR SCHROCK: We'll try and get back to you.

SENATOR BOURNE: Let me ask one last question, Senator Schrock, and then, in...on line 10 it talks about, a city described in Section 2 may enter into a contract with any corporation organized under or authorized by the laws of this state. That strikes me as allowing privatization of sewage and storm water treatment. Is that an accurate assessment of that paragraph?

SENATOR SCHROCK: I think that's correct. The city could deal with this in whatever manner they saw to be most efficient, I suppose would be the way to put it.

SENATOR BOURNE: Is that different than how we treat storm water runoff now? Do we allow cities to privatize such an event, or