

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

January 26, 2006 LB 366

SENATOR STUHR: Yes, there will be a change, but of course that will need to come from the county budgets.

SENATOR RAIKES: Right. So the fiscal note...that would be a local fiscal impact.

SENATOR STUHR: Yes, that's correct.

SENATOR RAIKES: Another...now you mentioned a couple of reasons for doing this. One of them, I think, is that there have...the auditors have shown that there have been errors in adding people or accepting people for retirement benefits. Apparently, if you don't do it right away and you wait a year, then there's a tendency to forget that, oh, one year is up so this person needs to be allowed to contribute. Is that roughly what happens?

SENATOR STUHR: Yes, that's true, Senator Raikes. The state employees, roughly, we have over 14,000 state employees, and so you can imagine how difficult that is when there are different time lines when people are hired and then they have to wait 12 months and then they're expected to pick up exactly in that 12 months, start that retirement. So the other three plans all have immediate participation and we always work towards trying to have as much uniformity in the five plans as possible. So this was one area that would certainly help if we had immediate...

PRESIDENT SHEEHY: One minute.

SENATOR STUHR: ...participation.

SENATOR RAIKES: Well, that's the other thing I wanted to question you a little bit about. You mentioned the second main reason was comparability between the plans. And if I look at the second page of your handout, where you've got school, State Patrol, judges, state, and county, as near as I can tell, State Patrol is far and away the highest in, on line 3 there, amounts to be contributed. That's more than twice as high as what state is, even after this change. So do we look forward to several more changes in order to make this comparable, or is that more