

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

March 31, 2004 LB 1090

Governor agreed with the raising of that revenue. It's not clear to me whether he is recommending that we do it only by a sales tax. He has certainly indicated that he would support a sales tax. I don't know if he would support other revenue raisers in that amount. But the point is the committee and the Governor were together in indicating that we needed a revenue raiser in the amount of at least \$112 million. That, even with those two large things happening, left a \$35 million gap to be dealt with next year. Prior to floor action, the Revenue Committee could not come to agreement, apparently, on any particular revenue source, or even on whether, I guess, to recommend a revenue solution. And so with that, one of the two holes, that the Appropriations Committee and the Governor had closed, opened back up again. We had a \$112 million, \$104 million, right in that area, gap with that, with that action. And then the second thing happened on the floor which recreated the second gap, and that was that the body as a whole rejected the \$100 million cut in state aid because we believed that property taxes would be exacerbated by this part of the solution. So we've come through this treacherous course where we had, basically, no big problems; then we had two big problems; then the two big problems were solved; then the two big problems were recreated again; and now we sit here in the worst of positions on Select File with probably no other possibility than this morning to make a judgment about whether we want to add revenues to this budget. This may be the critical moment of this session, this morning, because I'm not sure if there's room on the agenda anywhere for any other revenue raising measure if we do not act this morning, nine days left. Let me talk a little bit then about the electrical surcharge. What it would do, basically, is add on top of the sales tax that is already applicable to your electric utility bill, another 5 percent for a period of three years. That addition would begin...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...January 1 of 2005, and would continue for three years. It would raise approximately \$55 million a year for three years. It has a low-income exemption provision that would allow the Energy Board to make a decision with regard to