

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

April 2, 2004

LB 1091

you said, but you get...say somebody gets some money the first year. The second year that need shows up in the TEEOSA aid, General Funds. Would that be right?

SENATOR RAIKES: That is the way we spelled it out in the amendment, and if I could repeat Senator Brashear's money is fungible, to the extent you're taking money out of the General Fund and not taking out of lottery money, the lottery money then goes to the General Fund. But the other issue you raise I think is maybe more important. You know, what if you...what if this program would turn out to be a real hit, if you will, and there were a lot of schools that took advantage? So that maybe, yes, we've got...we've got some certainty in that first year we're only going to spend a million dollars, but maybe on the average, because of that, we're only paying one-fourth or, in the extreme 10 percent of the total money that's obligated, so in the second year then you're going to have a significantly higher obligation. The point is, though, do you want to put schools in a position where, well, you know, we told you this is the amount of money we'd...that you would be entitled to and, na, we've changed our mind, that really you're only going to get a fourth of that?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: I know, but the state is in the same situation. Well, we have time to warn them next year if we have...I mean, so I'm just...I think that ought to either be studied or looked at. I'll let it go. I mean, I'm not going to...I think what we need to do. But we did take this money out a few years ago when we were under dire straits, and I'm assuming things are going to get better, but we can't obviously afford an \$18 million hit, and I don't...I think that's the other side. But I just said between now and next year I think there ought to be something in to...and that's why it's hard to do right here on the floor.

SENATOR RAIKES: Well, and to just respond quickly, I think that's why it's important that the specifications in here be for a significant reorganization; that, in fact, there's going to be some real progress made. And I would just tell you that one of the things that is left out of here is unification. These need to be mergers. Unifications are not a part of this.