

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

March 22, 2005      LB 739

put on to cut the rates, cut the rates. And I believe the Department of Labor had concerns at that time, and they hired economist Ernie Goss, Ernie Goss--about said the wrong word there--but from Creighton University, and he did a study and that's the number he came up with. And with the lack of any better ideas, that's the number we're using. Now, there's been many that have indicated they felt .85 was too high. But currently we spend about \$121 million a year on unemployment insurance and if it were up to .85 right now we would, I believe, have somewhere in the area of \$220 million in the fund. So, as you understand government, any time you have any fund that there appears to be an excess of money, somebody tries to take it or give it back or do something somehow. So...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time, Senator.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Beutler, you may continue. This will be your last time, Senator.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cunningham, extending the discussion just a little, this array system, to the extent that it's sophisticated to the extent of including a yield factor, as we have now here presented to us in your bill, does that kind of yield factor system exist in a number of other states now, to your knowledge?

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: I believe it exists in a couple states. I'm not certain on the number, but it isn't a widely used tool.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. So most of these states probably that are showing high trust fund ratios right now, they may have those ratios, but they don't necessarily have an array system.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Right. Our system will bring the fund up or down, as you stated earlier, but it will always try to level it out to the .85. And it will be something that's in place so the politics is taken out of it, and there's assurance that the funds are going to be there to pay the benefits when they're needed.