

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

May 11, 2005

LB 425

coming back in 2005. So my city, and I'm sure many of your cities, are sitting there with a hole in their budget because they were counting on this money coming back and it didn't. There was some confusion, and I'm not saying that anybody deliberately didn't put this money back or deliberately went back on an agreement, but there were a number of us in the body that thought we had an agreement and voted for a particular amendment that satisfied Lincoln's bond obligation, with the...again, with the promise or commitment that the money would come back in 2005. So I'm not advocating that that money come back and stay for four years, as was advocated in the previous Mines amendment. I'm simply saying, let's...let's give this money that would have gone into MIRF for one year, let's put it in the state aid to municipalities to help these cities that budgeted based on their thought that the money would come back, the MIRF money. Let me just go back a little bit. Senator Thompson had a bill, and it was LB 440, and the purpose of LB 440 was to eliminate the funding of MIRF, the Municipal Infrastructure Redevelopment Fund, and that comes from cigarette tax revenue, by the way. That would provide an annual cost savings of \$3 million to the General Fund. And that funding source, the MIRF fund, was set to expire anyway in 2009. So Senator Thompson's bill, LB 440, eliminated MIRF. Senator Beutler, on the floor at the end of the session in 2003, he filed an amendment, and that amendment basically changed the allocation so that...it was AM1661, and Senator Thompson, her comments on the floor: So as essentially if you vote for AM1661, you're doing two things. You're saying they're going to take care of the Lincoln problem, and that is that the city of Lincoln obligated that MIRF, that income stream, to bonds, but we're also going to reverse the Appropriations Committee recommendation to sunset MIRF totally. And LB 440 was the Appropriations Committee's recommendation. So if you adopt that, you're reversing the Appropriations Committee's recommendation so that the money would have come back in 2005. So again, what I'm trying to do is I'm not trying to restore the entire fund. I'm simply saying that there are a number of cities in our state that budgeted based on the belief that the MIRF money was going to come back now, and so what we are doing is we are doing a one-time inflow of money to state aid to municipalities to help these cities, who thought the MIRF money