

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

April 1, 2004

LB 1090

money. It was using bonds to pay short-term responsibilities, and I thought it was too much. The scaled-down version I think starts to be sensible. What it says is, the bonds are for a one-time kind of expenditure. Now it's not a hard asset. And that's normally what you do with bonds, you normally buy a road or a bridge or a school. But a \$150,000 judgment against us for a nuclear waste plant is such a one-time expenditure. It meets the basic criteria for what you fund by bonding, and that is those one-time exceptional costs that you can't do in the normal course of budgeting. And unlike a bridge, it doesn't have a hard asset effect. But it is not the short-term money that was originally the idea. So we're talking about, I think, a significant idea here. And let me throw in a wrinkle, because I think it makes the bonding idea a little more interesting. We used to have a 5.5 percent sales tax for cars, and we spent the money and sent the money to the motor vehicle...into the infrastructure, into the road funds. We reduced that about a year ago to 5 cents, and we kept a half cent in the General Fund. Remember? Going to come to an end. When that half cent goes from the General Fund to the motor vehicle fund, it's a transfer of about \$14 million a year. If you treated that \$14 million a year as debt service, it would underscore about \$200 million of debt over 30 years. That would mean \$160 million of debt for the nuclear waste, and it would be three years of the...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...General Fund money that you would be foregoing. And in three years' time, you would grow out of that problem, hopefully, for the General Fund. In other words, you could take the half cent which is in the General Fund now, put it back into the road fund where it was. That would be \$14 million back into the road fund, and that \$14 million could be the debt service on bonds sufficient to do the nuclear waste dump lawsuit. It's money that's currently in the General Fund and is not in the road fund. Now it is scheduled to go back, but it's not there yet. It's 14 million bucks in the General Fund, and we could use that for this idea. Seems to me it's scaled down and it's appropriate. Senator Beutler gave us an idea. It was the electric surcharge. There's a problem with