

January 9, 1989

LB 58, 84, 98, 102, 140, 141, 241-266

CLERK: Mr. President, new bills. (Read titles for the first time to LBs 241-266. See pages 112-18 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, in addition to those items, the Rules Committee would like to announce that Senator Carson Rogers has been selected as Vice-Chair of the committee.

Mr. President, Revenue Committee will be or are...is conducting a meeting underneath the south balcony.

Mr. President, the Judiciary Committee will conduct an Executive Session upon recess on the south side of the Chamber; Judiciary upon recess. And Transportation will meet in the lounge upon recess...or, Senator...I'm sorry, Senator Lamb, do you want that this afternoon, Senator? I'm sorry, Transportation upon adjournment this afternoon in the Senators' Lounge; Transportation this afternoon.

Mr. President, Government Committee has selected Senator Bernard-Stevens as Vice-Chair.

Mr. President, Senator Conway would like to add his name to LB 140 as co-introducer; Senator Beck to LB 102 and to LB 141; Senators Smith and Hartnett to LB 58; Senator Hartnett to LB 98; Senator Rod Johnson to LB 84.

Mr. President, the last note is a Reference Committee meeting at two-thirty this afternoon in Room 2102; Reference Committee at two-thirty in Room 2102. That's all that I have.

PRESIDENT: Senator Emil Beyer, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BEYER: Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege. I hope that the senators have noticed that we have a familiar face back in the Legislature and that's our Page Supervisor, Kitty Kearns. We're glad to have her back and we've missed her and we wish her good health from now on. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, would you please listen as your Speaker speaks.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. President, and members, just a reminder to committee chairs, committee clerks, if you plan to have a hearing next week, I believe the first day would be the

a trooper's salary, I'm sure of that, but for the benefit of the doubt and a 5 percent increase in salary and 20 years would make his retirement for 20 years, starting in...if you took a '92 salary at a 5 percent increase of salary, it would be \$426,900 that annuity would be worth in 20 years. So, if you take, in '95, a 5 percent increase makes that annuity worth 494,000 and three-fourths of that would be 370,000. But let's go down to a sergeant, that's where most of them would be, the same basis, 20 years at a 5 percent increase makes that annuity 592,000, or three-fourths of that is almost 440,000. Twenty-five years, and I would expect life expectancy to be somewhere around age 75, 70, 75, that then makes that at...the troopers' annuity at 740,000, and then the spouse at 555,000. My amendment would simply bring that back to 50 percent, if married less than four years. I think it's fair. I think a good share of them are drawing social security. One of the comments was, we like to quit so we can draw social security, and not all of them are, and I realize that. Also, I can speak to it later, but in doing my homework I noticed LB 252 that was held in Retirement Committee, that bill called for COLAs in the next few years. That bill calls for a COLA, and that bill also calls for additional benefits, as I said it was being held there, to bring up the retirement for the \$1,000 a month for all of the pre-retired. The cost of that bill related to accelerated retirement, 25 years with no age limits was 4.6 million for that provision. The joint and survivorship benefit, from 50 to 100 percent is 2.7, and the increase up to 1,000 for the...I call it the old, old retirees, 1.1, and the cost of living increases for that bill was 3.8 or a \$12.2 million bill. So that tells you what is coming down the pipeline, folks. I have no problem with being fair, and I have no problem with something that is reasonable. But I just simply...I just think that we're asking for too much. If you check with the fiscal office, they will tell you that there is no bill, no retirement bill that compares with the original proposal. And I will be supporting Senator Schellpeper's, which does change part of mine. But what mine would do is simply just stricken the four-year provision.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Discussion of the Nelson amendment? Senator Haberman, followed by Senator Wesely.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President, members of the body, Senator Nelson, so that I understand your amendment, your amendment says that unless a patrolman has been married to his surviving spouse four years, they don't participate in the retirement. Is that

plan under this original bill would have made them a superior early retirement benefit and caused others to want to follow. So I really don't want to say anything bad about the State Patrol. I want to say something good about the good work that they do, and the bill minus this provision that Senator Schellpeper would strike would still be an excellent step up for the Patrol and more reasonably fit into the principles of our retirement plan and also fit in with the other plans that we have. Getting back to Senator Nelson, I voted against the Nelson amendment because I understand that that provision, a four-year wait on marriage before you can get the benefits, is unusual. Other plans don't have it and so it is not fair that the Patrol would have to wait while others don't for that kind of benefit, and that is what I look for, conformity, fairness, equity, and if you have it, it is kind of hard to argue against. So I would support the Schellpeper amendment. It will save a great deal of cost, and I think be the fair thing to do.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Nelson, followed by Senators Pirsch and Elmer.

SENATOR NELSON: As I say, I am much more comfortable with this proposal the way the Schellpeper amendment. I still, I guess I almost have to faint at the amount of the annuity, but if the body is comfortable with that, I guess...I do have to question Senator Schellpeper, and I know where he got it.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Schellpeper, please.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Yes, Senator Nelson.

SENATOR NELSON: Senator Schellpeper, and I had a lobbyist tell me this a few minutes ago, but he says if the actuaries say something I like to hear, fine. If they say something I don't like to hear, then I don't like to quote it. My experience on the teachers' retirement and the same thing here that actuarially when any plan is not set up actuarially and is increased like this, then you become an unfunded liability, which is the case there. This may be actuarially with \$8 million there now, but with increased benefits, as I read to you from LB 252, that is probably only going to last for a couple of years, so do you have any comment on that? I know you were told actuarially that I don't need an A bill now, but, again, eventually with increased benefits, a half a percent, it has to be, and the survivors' benefits, there has to be