

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

March 14, 2006      LB 1061

SENATOR BOURNE:      I appreciate that. I intend to support your amendment.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Thank you.

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

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, this particular aspect of things was not particularly easy for Senator Pederson or the Governor or anybody involved, and it did involve the Environmental Trust again, and as you know, those of you who have been here awhile, there's been a continual desire from time to time, when people...when different agencies have quasi-environmental needs, to look to the Environmental Trust, and to not only look to the Environmental Trust, but to go outside the trust process and simply create a new statute that arbitrarily transfers money from the trust, a process that was really never, never envisioned by the people who voted the trust into place. So I think that the solution that's been reached this time around is a, while it may be an unhappy short-term solution, is...hopefully will turn out to be a happy long-term solution, because if you are in agreement with both Senator Pederson's view of things and my view of things, we will, later in the session, attempt to introduce language into a constitutional amendment that will, in the future, avoid these kinds of transfers. I wanted to say one thing in particular. Some of you have heard from persons or groups who've benefited from the trust grant process just this last cycle, who may have been upset by the fact that they were cut out of all of the work they had done, by virtue of the interjection of the university and the Department of Environmental Trust grant applications, which, as many of you know, were somewhat elevated in a second review of grant priorities. We put that transfer date back in time, so that nobody who would have gotten funds this grant cycle but for the two big items that we're funding here, they will still get their grants. So everybody who had a right to a grant under the normal process, as it played out the first time around, will receive their expectations. So you shouldn't have anybody complaining that they were cut out of a grant because of this intervention into the process. And hopefully, again,