

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

May 5, 2005

LB 425

money going to each city. Is that correct?

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Yeah. MIRF funding is funding the use of which is limited. And of course, the cities don't like that too well anymore, and...but if you look at the handout that I presented, the funding is constant for the cities. The cities are not being deprived of any money, and it's a bookkeeping entry on '05-06 and '06-07 to take it away, take away \$2,480,000 for both those years and then to put it back. So it zeros it out. But then if you look at the bottom line, it's a constant \$3 million that goes for MIRF. So we're not cutting MIRF. I mean, it's there.

SENATOR KREMER: Yeah, I understand. But I was wondering, what is the advantage to not just leave it the way it was, where it just went in their General Fund, they could use it for infrastructure or whatever they wanted, rather than putting it back into MIRF and restricting how that can be spent, and cutting them in another area? What is the advantage of what we're doing rather than just leaving it the way it was?

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Well, it is left where it is right now, in that the MIRF funding...

SENATOR KREMER: The dollars, but not the way they're spent.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: No. There's a statute that provides that we have to fund MIRF.

SENATOR KREMER: Okay. Okay.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: And that limits what we can do, and it's in there in what we have done by this.

SENATOR KREMER: So that...because of statute, that's why you have to reimburse...

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Yes. Yes, Senator Thompson essentially was trying to do away with that statute and cut it off, but it was decided not to do it that way, and so we have continued along in the projection as the statute provides until 2008-09 to