

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

March 16, 2004 LB 916

deleted because I have different language, but it says: The Appropriations Committee of the Legislature shall review the report in its analysis of executive programs in order to verify that the revenue generated from fees was used solely to offset appropriate and reasonable costs associated with carrying out the act and to determine whether the fee structure (sic) is adequate to meet up to 20 percent of program costs. Well, the Legislature, in its review process, unless it's a year in which we are suffering some severe financial problems, doesn't, as a matter of course, have statutory changes that would facilitate or allow the changing of a fee that's statutorily set. So this suggestion that the Appropriations Committee look at it would seem to have little effect or little potency since the Appropriations Committee wouldn't be normally in a position where it would be able to do anything about it, even if it discovered that it didn't meet up to 20 percent of program costs. So, rather than this ineffectual methodology, what I'm suggesting is that the department shall annually review and adjust the fee structure, give them the power with regard to the fee structure, to ensure that fees are adequate to meet at least a certain percent of the program costs, looking at the program costs in the previous fiscal year. So that process would take place automatically every year and would ensure that the fees stayed up to a particularly...a particular identified percent of the program costs. Now, in this amendment, I'm suggesting that that percent be 30 percent and not 20 percent, and the reason that I do that is that I...is because my fundamental philosophy in this area is that fees should pay all of the costs, and the fundamental philosophy of this body historically, except in certain selected areas, has been that regulatory programs specific to a particular industry should be funded pretty much by that industry that's being regulated. Furthermore...so the 30 percent, obviously, represents, from my perspective, an enormous compromise to begin with from the 100 percent figure. Furthermore, back when the livestock waste program began in 1998, the agreement coming out of the Natural Resources Committee was that it would be 50 percent funded by fees. Subsequent to that particular point in time, it turned out that the department's estimate of the fees that would be forthcoming was very much overestimated, and that what has actually happened fairly rapidly after that, but more so each year, is that the