

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

March 7, 2006

LB 248

category of local funds, it came from three different sources: from the wheel tax, from a general fund, and from impact fees. Now if instead of putting in general funds--they put general funds in, in the amount of \$5.6 million--if they had put the sales tax motor vehicles' money in, it would have been \$5 million. It would have been less than what they're putting in, in general funds, right now. So they are putting in the equivalent and more of that amount of money, and I guess, you know, if you want to make them reshuffle their funds and funnel money different ways, perhaps it's no big deal. But it's just an intrusion on local control, and the facility of doing things in what seems to them the most expedient manner. It's not that they're using these funds for other purposes. So please know that when you're considering the question. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Further discussion? Senator Baker.

SENATOR BAKER: Thank you, Senator Cudaback and members, and I think the debate is...the discussion is a good one here, and I do thank Senator Redfield, and we're making some progress here. We're taking \$9 million away, and now we're just reshuffling funds, which I...that's what we're doing. We're not taking any money away from any city, village, or otherwise. We are, as Senator Beutler said, reshuffling funds and want to make sure that people do realize that we expect sales tax on vehicles, which typically Nebraska has been a users based fees on...to fund roads, which certainly cars, obviously, are running down, up and down the roads. We want to make sure that that continues. Senator Mines has filed an amendment, I see on the screen here, that I think probably I can support. I'm going to ask people to vote against Senator Bourne's amendment. I'm getting a little ahead of myself. I know there was some concern about cities having pledged these funds for retirement of bonds, and I can understand their concern there. If they've pledged them for bonds and so on, I can support that. Senator Mines' amendment, I believe, does alleviate that concern that they would have, saying that simply anything adopted prior to the operative date of this act, if the provision adopted by registered voters required the use of sales and use tax revenue for a specified purpose, which apparently, in some cases it has.