

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

March 10, 2005 LB 217

think that's fairly substantial. And the public still has the chance to remonstrance against this by petition, and I want that to be as easy as possible. And with the amendment we just passed, it's not all the registered voters; it's all the voters that voted...the same number of voters that voted in the last general election for Governor, so I think there's protection built in for the public. But I can appreciate your concerns.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Okay. Thank you. I will be doing some more examination between now and Select to see what this is relative to, because if we could...if this could be done on a large scale annually, up to \$5 million, there could be significant bonding done by a fairly small group of people, if people weren't paying attention. And I just want to determine the impact. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. (Visitors introduced.) On with discussion of the Beutler amendment. Senator Stuthman.

SENATOR STUTHMAN: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body. The thing that I have a concern about is, you know, taking one out, leaving a bunch in. I don't agree with that totally because I think it's either all or none. The issue that I have is, you know, that I think, you know, the bonding authority, the fact that, you know, if it's a project that needs to be done, goes to a vote of the people, I think that's the right way to do. I don't...I'm not in favor of allowing them to have bonding authority without a vote of the people. I totally disagree with that part of it. I think the NRDs, you know, have sufficient funds. They can get sufficient funds. If valuations stayed the same and were constant all the time, then I would see that there would possibly be a need. But, most generally, valuations go up anywhere from 4 to 8 to 10 percent, plus added valuations, which would be new homes or anything like that, and they can get a certain mill for that, and that's set by a statute, what they can get, and they can go up to that no matter if they spent the money or not. So they do have the authority, you know, to get a lot of money. So I'm not...I'm in favor of LB 217. I am in favor of the concept of it, but I am really thinking hard about the amendment that we're discussing right now. And, with that, I'll give the balance of my time to the