

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

February 1, 2006 LB 876

conversion, and I do it in a timely manner, and if this "substantive" language remains in the law, and the director decides there is no substantive reason, there is no substantive objection being made, there's no substance to it, where can I go if I am not satisfied that that determination by the director was objective and fair?

SENATOR MINES: Well, Senator Chambers, the director decides whether or not there are hearings. He is the last step in the food chain.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So it could really be a very substantive objection, but there still is no place to go once that decision has been made by the director to deny a hearing?

SENATOR MINES: Well, administratively, that's true. Certainly, if one believes strongly enough in their objection, they could contact the Governor or someone in the Legislature and hope that a hearing could be brought forward. But that's the determination of the director.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And if those steps that you're mentioning were embarked upon, they would entail an expenditure of time, effort. And if a person went to the Governor or a legislator, a third-party interest is going to have to inform himself or herself of what the issues are, to decide whether or not to try to prevail on the director to conduct a hearing, or make a determination themselves that there should be no hearing. But in any case, time and effort and the involvement of a third party will be required. Would you agree?

SENATOR MINES: That's correct. And one might have to determine if the argument is substantive enough to make a difference.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So it might be better to just remove "substantive," let the objection be made, conduct a hearing, and be done with it. I don't see anything that says the hearing must last a long time or just go on and on and on, is there?

SENATOR MINES: No, there is not, Senator.