

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

March 19, 2004 LB 1091

SENATOR RAIKES: I'm not...I'm not real sure. I would assume similarly to the way they were evaluated on the education.

SENATOR BOURNE: But is there a staff associated with the Environmental Trust Fund now?

SENATOR RAIKES: I'm pretty sure there is. I don't know just how many people.

SENATOR BOURNE: I think there is as well, and I seem to remember last year that the individual that ran that gave themselves a raise, a fairly significant raise, and are you aware of that?

SENATOR RAIKES: I'm not, Senator, so...

SENATOR BOURNE: And I hate to...I don't like...I talked about this a couple years ago, but the head of the Environmental Trust makes some \$70,000 or \$80,000 a year, and there's other paid staff members there. I just am...I'm having a real problem here. The voters put into place, when they did the lottery, they said, okay, some of the money goes to the education component, some goes to the environmental component, little bit goes to the Gamblers Anonymous component, or I don't think that's the right name, but the Gamblers' Assistance, whatever it is. Well, we have consistently taken the money from the Education Innovation Fund and, on a very limited basis, we have taken the money from the Environmental Trust, and I'm struggling with that. You know, on an ongoing basis we're taking \$4 million a year, and I don't see any parity whatsoever.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR BOURNE: What's good for the goose is good for the gander. Both of these components, both the education component and the environmental component, do good things, but I think that there is an inequity here. And, yes, we do have some money from TEEOSA. We have a lot of money going into education in the state, but we don't have money going to fund the kinds of things that the Education Innovation Fund does. You can also make the same argument, well, we're not spending as much money in the