

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

March 30, 2004      LB 888

to give information to the State Energy Office and the State Energy Office feeds information back, but bottom line, if the local people don't buy off on the Energy Office's opinion, they will do what they want insofar as it is legitimate under the terms "economically justified." So I wanted to explore with you just a little bit what "economically justified" means, especially in light of the fact that you took some language out of the green copy that had the tendency to explain to a certain extent what "economically justified" means.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Time.

SENATOR BEUTLER: For example,...

SENATOR HARTNETT: Beutler, Senator Beutler, your light is next so you may continue.

SENATOR BEUTLER: For example, in your discussion with Senator Synowiecki, we talked about blighted areas and Senator Synowiecki was indicating that we have to be reasonable in terms of what are...what we would require in truly blighted areas, albeit the definition in the statute would include cornfields as well as blighted lots. But in that balancing, the...if you look at the intent of the system long term, you wouldn't want necessarily to exempt out blighted areas simply because the initial cost of renovation was somewhat higher, in the sense that those areas will be filled with perhaps low-income people and their monthly cost in utility bills, if we don't take advantage of long-term utility savings, as I think these standards are intended to do, will simply mean that low-income people will be paying higher bills than necessary, month in and month out, albeit they got some kind of smaller break on the front end with a lower cost building. So if you're just going to look at the front-end cost, you might say this or that is not economically justified. But if you're going to look, as the green copy suggested, at not just the front-end cost but the long-term costs, then what might be economically justified in one instance would not be in another. So the first question I want to ask you, and I assume this is the case, that when you're looking at the words "economically justified" on line 24, page 9, and that exemption provision, you're thinking of