

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

March 3, 2004

LB 962

going to sit here or stand here and say that I understand every nuance of the water bill. I don't. But when I hear somebody like Senator Beutler, who I consider, along with Senator Schrock and other members of the body, an expert in this area, say that the \$4.7 million won't even begin to cover it, that tends to get my attention. And then there's an amendment coming up that allows the NRDs to assess an additional 1 cent per \$100 of value on property, and I voted no on that bill coming out of the Revenue Committee, but it did have enough votes to come out. That's an additional \$9.8 million. Now, that is not in the bill. That's in an amendment that's coming. So \$4.7 million General Fund money, and we hear from Senator Beutler that's not going to be enough, plus, if the other amendment is going to be adopted, that's an additional \$9.8 million. So we're looking at about \$15 million, \$14 million per year for this bill when we're running a three hundred and some million dollar deficit. So when I hear Senator Mines speak up about his concern with the General Fund situation here, I don't believe his concerns are unwarranted, and I appreciate him bringing that to our attention, because this is a huge expenditure at a time when we're running record deficits. And if Senator Beutler would like the remainder of my time, I'd be happy to yield it to him.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Bourne, thank you. I appreciated Senator Vrtiska's remarks. I mean, I'm not sure which way he's going ultimately on how financing works out, but it...I think it's interesting and informative to point out that he is in an area where all the farmers...none of the farmers down in Richardson County, with maybe one or two rare exceptions, use irrigation. So they have good years and bad years, depending on the flooding in the Nemaha area and on the rain that comes or doesn't come. But you know, when we load this on to General Funds, for example, it's the farmers in Senator Vrtiska's area who are paying for the farmers who are getting irrigation, and the farmers who are getting irrigation year in and year out are going to have better crops than the farmers who are paying for the regulation of that irrigation. Does that make sense? If the irrigators can't pass on the costs with their stabilized production, how do those who don't have stabilized production,