

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

January 18, 2006    LB 548

to see if you shake your head yes or no. But this bill was originally Senator Jensen's bill. Is that correct? And you may recall that I believe it was on Select File that we amended it, and we amended into it some material that OPPD wanted very badly that defined and described a new procedure of theirs for approving bonds related to certain types of improvements. And in the process of doing that, we gutted the material that Senator Jensen had in the bill altogether. Is that correct, Senator Jensen?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Jensen?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. We had had some discussion on that bill previously, and Senator Chambers had had some involvement and had a couple of amendments adopted, but all of that was removed from the bill when this body approved, last session, the OPPD amendment. Then after that there was some further discussion and some points raised by Senator Chambers and others, with respect to the new material in the bill, which was the OPPD process. Subsequently, then, the bill was pulled from the agenda, so now it's back before us. It has already attached to it the OPPD amendment. There is now a new Schrock amendment. For purposes of clarity, it wipes out the OPPD amendment, but it really doesn't. It restores everything but a portion that it adds that has to do, basically, with judicial review. The main sticking point last time around, and the folks from OPPD have been very good about working with people over the summer and fall to work it out, but the main sticking point was that there was absolutely no judicial review when their board made a decision that rates were okay, that there was no problem with them being discriminatory, and so that lack of a process of judicial review was the main sticking point. And with this amendment, they are agreeable to a judicial review process. It's a very short window of time, ten days, in which somebody who's aggrieved by the fact that these rates may not be set in a fair and nondiscriminatory manner, that they can raise the issue to the court. There's an expedited kind of process described for the courts looking at this material, all done in a bit of an unusual fashion, but understandable in the sense that they're looking to get to the bond market fast on these types of issues. And so, in order to be sure that there's not too great a time