

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

May 11, 2005

LB 425

small cities and villages in my district, because my understanding is, MIRF money goes for new development, such as building new sewer lines, new water lines. Is that correct?

SENATOR BOURNE: I think that the reason there's some confusion is my responsibility, Senator Fischer. I apologize. This would be \$2.4 million of new money, not to MIRF, but into state aid to municipalities. So it would not go into MIRF. I simply...the logic, in my mind, why I chose \$2.4 million, is that is the amount of money that MIRF would have been restored to if we had lived up to our agreement. So...but the \$2.4 million is not in MIRF. It will be in the aid to municipalities. So if you vote yes on this amendment, you are increasing state aid to municipalities, 523, or 532 municipalities or cities throughout the state. That's what you'll be doing. Not MIRF, but you're increasing state aid to cities.

SENATOR FISCHER: So when the money is given to these municipalities, if we pass this amendment, the restrictions that MIRF has on how the money can be used, such as building new water lines, those restrictions aren't there? These small communities that aren't expanding, that aren't putting in sewer and water, they can repair and maintain their current sewer and water lines.

SENATOR BOURNE: Yes, ma'am.

SENATOR FISCHER: Is that correct?

SENATOR BOURNE: Absolutely. That is absolutely a correct statement.

SENATOR FISCHER: Okay. Thank you very much, Senator Bourne. I'll return the rest of my time to the Chair. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Fischer. Senator Erdman.

SENATOR ERDMAN: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature. And just to clarify to Senator Pederson, I actually made that exact argument, that what Senator Stuthman asked us to do was to fulfill a statutory obligation. The