

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

April 8, 2004 LB 32

mandates. So the choice is yours. Do as you will. I'm taking the path of least resistance. It's not the bill I wanted it to be, but I do believe it will give the cities and the NRDs the chance to set up some programs and to spend some money. They're already doing that, but I think this will make it easier for them to do so. With that, I give my...that concludes my opening remarks.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Schrock. Now for discussion on FA1445. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, I've always taken a consistent position on these matters, and that is that the people who cause the problem generally should pay for it. Most of the communities in this country have resolved this problem by having storm water fees that are geared and structured so as to be a fair representation of what is...of the percentage of the problem that's caused by a particular piece of property, and then assessing that piece of property accordingly. All of that has been thrown out. And there's nothing that Senator Schrock is offering to do that has anything to do, or would allow any kind of a storm water fee. All we do is violate three important principles. One, we're causing more property taxes in the urban areas. Because if they can't do it with storm water fee, eventually they'll do it with property taxes. So you're forcing the local communities to increase property taxes. And Senator Schrock would propose lifting the budget lid so they can do that. But I don't want to do that. Secondly, in addition to violating that principle, you're ignoring local control. What's more local than how a city deals with its storm water? It's like sewers. It's like water. It's a local matter. And yet, on this one occasion, we want to listen to the lobby. They come in here and say, no, it can't be a local matter; it can't be a local matter because we don't like it. And thirdly, it violates the principle that I first talked about of having the users pay. This is what I've argued for in water matters, as you well know, in wastewater matters. I argue it in situations where the fees are being applied to rural folks, and I think I should be consistent and argue for it when it involves fees being applied to urban folks. And as far as I'm concerned, this bill is a waste, at this point. And the