

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

March 10, 2005      LB 217

now.

SENATOR BEUTLER: All NRDs would be taken back into the bill and could avail themselves of the benefit of the bills, except the one in...one...the...any NRD with a city of the metropolitan class in it.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Well, that would be just the Papio NRD.

SENATOR BEUTLER: That's right.

SENATOR JANSSEN: So you would exclude the Papio NRD. What...and what was your reasoning for that? Because they are so large and have such a great financial base that they're able to do whatever they want to? Is that correct?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Their assessed valuation in their area is many times the valuation of any other NRL, so they are relatively well-off and probably don't need the benefits of this bill. One could argue that both ways, perhaps, but members of the committee didn't want NRDs and, as far as I could ascertain, it related to...the objection really didn't relate to all NRDs.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Right. I'll use a little hypothetical situation here. Say the city of, oh, let's see, the city of Scribner, Nebraska, which I believe is in the Lower Elkhorn NRD, they needed a dike project. Could they joint together on that, on that project somehow or another? Would that be a possibility?

SENATOR BEUTLER: They could certainly join together with other entities under the interlocal agreement situation that currently exists in law, but they wouldn't have the benefit of this particular bill, of joining together to issue bonds that didn't require an election. And you may not particularly like that situation, but yesterday nobody was defending leaving all the NRDs out, you know? I didn't get very many votes for that. But it does seem to be agreeable to bringing most of them back in, and I would like to do that, Senator.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Okay. Thank you very much, Senator Beutler.