

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature  
Transcriber's Office

Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee  
February 25, 2009

---

[LB81 LB242 LB425]

The Committee on Nebraska Retirement Systems met at 12:10 p.m. on Wednesday, February 25, 2009, in Room 2004 of the State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebraska, for the purpose of conducting a public hearing on LB81, LB425, and LB242. Senators present: Dave Pankonin, Chairperson; Jeremy Nordquist, Vice Chairperson; Lavon Heidemann; Russ Karpisek; and Heath Mello. Senators absent: LeRoy Louden. []

SENATOR PANKONIN: Welcome everyone to the Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee and our hearing today. If you have a cell phone, you know the rules around here. That's turn them off or turn them down so we don't have that distraction. We have a committee member that's going to introduce a bill, our Vice Chairman, Senator Nordquist, but I'll let the other committee members introduce themselves. Senator Louden is at another event this noonhour. Senator Heidemann, go ahead. []

SENATOR HEIDEMANN: Senator Lavon Heidemann from southeast Nebraska, District 1. []

SENATOR MELLO: Heath Mello, District 5, south Omaha and Bellevue. []

KATE ALLEN: Kate Allen, legal counsel for the Retirement Committee. []

SENATOR PANKONIN: I'm Dave Pankonin, District 2. []

SENATOR KARPISEK: Russ Karpisek, District 32. []

DENISE LEONARD: I'm Denise Leonard, and I'm the committee clerk. []

SENATOR PANKONIN: I'd also like to introduce our page, Mike Hartquist from Omaha. He does good work for us. The agenda has been posted. We'll take the bills in the order that they're on the schedule which would be LB81 that Senator Nordquist is going to introduce, then LB425 which I have, and then LB242 which is Senator Karpisek's bill. Senator Nordquist, welcome. []

SENATOR NORDQUIST: Thank you, Chairman Pankonin, members of the committee. My name is Jeremy Nordquist, N-o-r-d-q-u-i-s-t. I represent District 7 in Omaha, here today to open on LB81. LB81 makes a change to the State Patrol contribution rates. Currently, the employees in the State Patrol System contribute 13 percent of their pay and the employer, the department, pays 15 percent, for a total of 28 percent. The last actuarial study that came out as of June 30, which came out this fall, showed an actuarial...an unfunded liability in the actuarial study. This bill is an agreement that the Governor's Office and the State Patrol worked out to address that shortfall. This, according to the fiscal note, will generate about another \$550,000 in contributions to the

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature  
Transcriber's Office

Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee  
February 25, 2009

---

plan, making significant headway on that unfunded liability in reducing the General Fund expenditure for the state. I want to thank the State Patrol for being good partners in this. I know we're going to come...you know, this probably is not the first one of these bills we're going to see. I know there's another one out. But over the next couple of years, we're going to have serious challenges in our plans, and I appreciate that they're willing to be a good partner and come to the table and have a discussion on what we need to do to keep these plans solvent long term. So with that, I thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. [LB81]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Thank you, Senator Nordquist. Just a quick question on my behalf about what we're doing here. It looks to me like the employees are stepping up their contribution; state stays the same at the present time. [LB81]

SENATOR NORDQUIST: Yeah. Yeah, sorry, I didn't...I guess I didn't go into enough detail on that. The current rates, the employees contribute 13 percent, employer 15, for a total of 28. This would make it 15 for the employee and 15 for the employer, a total of 30 percent which is probably, if you think about it, pretty similar to what we have for like our teachers where they contribute 7...I can't remember 7-something, and then the school districts match 101. So it's a pretty even partnership, and that's what this would be as well. [LB81]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Okay, thank you. Any other questions for Senator Nordquist? Seeing none, any other proponent testimony on LB81? [LB81]

SENATOR NORDQUIST: Yeah, thank you. [LB81]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Seeing none, any opponent testimony on LB81? Neutral testimony? [LB81]

KORBY GILBERTSON: Good afternoon, Chairman Pankonin, members of the committee. For the record, my name is Korby Gilbertson. That's spelled K-o-r-b-y G-i-l-b-e-r-t-s-o-n, appearing today as a registered lobbyist on behalf of the State Troopers Association of Nebraska, appearing neutrally because of, as you can imagine, there are always members who question why they should be increasing their contribution rates when the employer side is not. But as Senator Nordquist talked about in his opening, we have had a longstanding good relationship with the administration and with the Legislature insofar as this retirement plan. I've been working on it now for over 15 years, and this is kind of eat, sleep, and drink it, it seems. But it's something that we deal with every year, and I know that there have been times in the past where people have said, why don't you do this, and then we won't have to worry about it for a few years? Well, that never seems to work. The current contribution rates were instituted in 2007. Last year we did not do any contribution rates because, as all of you know, the market seemed to be doing pretty good, and we were all hoping that we

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature  
Transcriber's Office

Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee  
February 25, 2009

---

would continue those double-digit increases, but that didn't happen. So we sat down and met with the administration and came to an agreement that we would step up to the same amount that the administration does, and then from here on out, we will go up and down together. We feel that that is a fair agreement. As you all know, the troopers do not participate in Social Security, so then when you look at the contribution rates, this is very comparable to the amount that you would be putting into retirement plans for other employees when you add in the contribution rate for Social Security and the retirement contribution. So with that, I'd be happy to try to answer any questions. [LB81]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Thank you. Are there any questions? Seeing none, thank you. [LB81]

KORBY GILBERTSON: Thank you. [LB81]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Senator Nordquist, do you want to close? Okay, that completes the hearing on LB81. [LB81]

SENATOR NORDQUIST: All right, we will open the hearing on LB425. Chairman Pankonin. []

SENATOR PANKONIN: Good afternoon. Vice Chair Nordquist and members of the Retirement Committee, my name is Dave Pankonin, D-a-v-e P-a-n-k-o-n-i-n, representing Legislative District 2, and I'm here to introduce LB425. LB425 was introduced as a placeholder bill in the event a contribution adjustment is necessary to the State Patrol Retirement System. It would raise State Patrol member contribution rates to an unspecified amount, beginning July 1, 2009. As Senator Nordquist has explained and Ms. Gilbertson, this is kind of the follow-up to LB81, in that over this next couple of years, if we have to change rates, this is the bill that will allow us to do it, and that's the only intent. Thank you. [LB425]

SENATOR NORDQUIST: Thank you, Senator Pankonin. Any questions from the committee? Seeing none, we will entertain proponent testimony. Any proponent testimony? Seeing none. Any opponent testimony? Seeing none. Any neutral testimony? Seeing none, Senator Pankonin will waive his closing. That will conclude the hearing on LB425. [LB425]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Thank you, Senator Nordquist. Our next bill is LB242. Senator Karpisek. []

SENATOR KARPISEK: Thank you, Senator Pankonin, members of the Retirement Committee. For the record, my name is Russ Karpisek, R-u-s-s K-a-r-p-i-s-e-k. I'm here today to introduce LB242 that would increase the mandatory retirement age for State Patrol officers from 60 to 65. We have also put an E clause on the bill, because we have

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature  
Transcriber's Office

Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee  
February 25, 2009

---

troopers that are going to have to retire before they can get their maximum benefit of retirement, which is the whole reason behind this bill, and I have at least one person behind me to tell his story. But right now, everyone in the patrol has to retire at age 60. I don't feel that that is right. The law was established in the 1940s. This many years later, I feel that people can perform at a higher level than they did at that time. We know Social Security has surely raised its ages in that amount of time and will continue to do so. The biggest issue that I have is anyone right now that would start with the State Patrol over the age of 35 could never get enough years in to get their full benefits as a state trooper. I feel that that takes out a lot of people that right now may be county sheriffs, deputies, city police. Anyone that we could get in that are proven to be good police officers, there's no incentive for them to get in. I shouldn't say no incentive, but they'll never be able to get to 100 percent of their retirement. The retirement plan is a good plan. We know that. We have...the gentleman behind me works with...DARE. The DARE Program is a very good program. I'm sure we all know about it. As far as I know, he's one of the only ones that we have, troopers working with DARE. At the end of this...September of this year, he will have to retire. There will be no one left to do the DARE Program unless they appoint someone else. I don't know that they're going to; I don't know they're not going to. The issue is, Trooper Trantham will not have enough years in to get his full retirement. I will say he worked for the State Patrol for awhile. He quit, cashed in his benefits, and then started again. That has been an issue that has been brought up over and over on this issue. Had he known that he was going to come back, I'm sure he wouldn't have quit in the first place. So that is one scenario. I think that we have at least 30 officers, troopers, that fall into this category that they cannot get enough years in to get full benefits. I don't think that that's fair. The last two years, I had a bill that would allow them to at least buy out some retirement, much the same as the teachers. We never got any traction on that. We had an interim hearing on this issue. It sounded to me during that hearing that maybe the best idea was to raise the age, that we could actually save some money in the retirement system which would seem to make sense. If people can stay on longer, there wouldn't be as many years between their retirement and their demise. The DROP program has also been brought up in this whole conversation. I fully support the DROP plan. I think it is working. I think that we could still do both. The DROP plan is if...when a trooper reaches full retirement, they can stop putting money into the retirement and taking that money and investing it somewhere else. I don't know that this would affect that so much. Once you have your years in, you could do the DROP. Now you could argue, well, we'll have them staying on until they're 65 still doing DROP. If they can perform their job, I guess so what? The other issue that I have is just our surrounding states: Colorado has no mandatory retirement age; Iowa, you must retire before your 66th birthday; Kansas, no mandatory; Minnesota and Missouri are mandatory at age 60, but they both have...Missouri has some purchase of service, Minnesota does a little offshoot where time in the military could be counted toward their retirement; South Dakota and Wyoming, no mandatory age; and all of those do have some...except Iowa, no purchase of service. All the others do have some purchase of service. So I guess my thought is, I'd rather increase the

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature  
Transcriber's Office

Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee  
February 25, 2009

---

age; 65 I'm not dead set on. If we can do something. If we could talk about buying service out, however we could do it to...there's only a limited number of these people right now. We could even sunset it to say, grandfathered, whoever is in the system now. Once they're done, that's it. But it still comes back to the issue of not being really able to hire experienced police officers. Maybe the State Patrol doesn't want to do that. Maybe they want to train their own. I don't know and I don't want to make that decision for them. I have nothing but great respect for the State Patrol, and I think they're doing a fine job. Those are the issues why I've brought this bill again. Trooper Trantham will give us more detail, but if there's any questions, I'd be glad to try. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Thank you, Senator. Any questions for Senator Karpisek? Seeing none, we'll have...other proponent testimony. Come forward, please. Welcome. [LB242]

WAYNE TRANTHAM: Thank you. My name is Wayne Trantham, T-r-a-n-t-h-a-m, and I'm here in favor of LB242. And I don't represent anybody else except maybe some of the other troops that might benefit, too, if this would pass and become law. If I can just read this, would that be okay? [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Sure. [LB242]

WAYNE TRANTHAM: (Exhibit 5) Thank you, Senators, for allowing me to speak at this hearing today. I'm here to show my support of LB242 which provides for increasing the mandatory retirement age for troopers from age 60 to 65. Several officers may stand to benefit from this proposed legislation. See attached list I came up with. I'm sure there are more which I'm not aware. As previously stated, I'm Wayne Trantham, a Nebraska state trooper, who has 22 years, credible service years with the Nebraska State Patrol Retirement System. I reside in Beatrice in District 30 and am one of Senator Wallman's constituents. For the past 12 years, I have served as a Drug Abuse Resistance Education, DARE, instructor, having taught almost 5,000 fifth or sixth grade students in at least 11 counties in southeast Nebraska. The main goals of DARE is to teach our youth to make healthy and wise decisions while avoiding and resisting drugs and violence. In the fall of 2007, upon reaching the age of 58, I contacted several state senators, mainly those on the then Retirement Systems Committee, urging them to propose and support legislation that would allow troopers to work past age 60 if they can still perform their assigned duties. I referred to the state statute 81-2025, which was enacted in the 1940s during World War II which mandates retirement at age 60 for any officer who participates in the Nebraska State Patrol Retirement System. This law was written nearly three generations ago, when longevity and health concerns often were real issues for those nearing this age. But today, our society is living much longer and is much healthier as well. This age 60 law, I feel, unfairly discriminates and allows no consideration for good health, job performance, or assignment of duties. I pointed out in my correspondence with the senators that any officer over the age of 35, who joins the

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature  
Transcriber's Office

Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee  
February 25, 2009

---

Patrol Retirement System, will never be allowed to reach the maximum benefit level of 25 years of credible service. Last November 2008, Senator Karpisek, who had kept in contact with me, urged my appearance at the legislative hearing concerning his LR310. This resolution called for an interim study to examine this age 60 mandatory retirement law, and the lack of purchase provisions in the patrol's retirement system. Briefly stated, my three main points, hopefully, for your support of this current legislative bill, LB242, are, one, comparability, just like Senator Karpisek pointed out earlier in the hearing, comparability with surrounding states. This is done every two years when the State Troopers Association of Nebraska and the state get together for wage discussions. At the November 17 hearing on LR310, Senator Karpisek presented the results of a study of surrounding states regarding mandatory retirement age and purchase of service provisions. That study is attached to my comments. I'm not going to read all those. Of these seven states, four have no mandatory retirement age. Iowa has a 66 law. Missouri, Minnesota are the only ones that have an age 60 law. But all seven states have some sort of purchase of service provision, but Nebraska has none. It's very obvious that Nebraska is lagging way behind in these two comparability issues with area states. Second of all, there's a double standard that currently exists. There is a category of troopers who are not affected by the current age 60 law. A few years ago, individuals working for the Department of Roads as carrier enforcement officers, they were mandated by the Legislature to be reassigned to the State Patrol. Several of those officers chose not to enroll in the Patrol Retirement System but kept their existing plan for retirement. It was not feasible for them financially, as they were not allowed to convert their Department of Roads retirement plan funds over into the State Patrol Retirement System. Thus, some did not want to start all over again, because of the age factor being in their late thirties or into their forties or even beyond. So this group will not face any mandatory retirement age. There will be no age 60 for them to retire yet healthy, competent officers participating in the Patrol Retirement System will be forced out at age 60. Many of these former Department of Roads employees have been in contact with me in recent months, and are urging that some sort of a purchase of service/conversion of service provision be enacted so that they may convert or buy some of their Department of Roads retirement benefits toward credible service with the Nebraska State Patrol Retirement System. Many in that group who did enroll in the Patrol Retirement System, upon switching from the Department of Roads, could stand to benefit if LB242 becomes law so they may be able to work a while longer past age 60. The third factor or reason I would urge you to support LB242 is that some day a lawsuit is going to happen; it's inevitable. This is related to provisions in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's laws regarding age discrimination. But, Senators, my main concern is this: I'm going to urge you to support LB242, and it's not because it's financial for me. I enjoy my job. I believe I still have the zeal, energy, and ability to perform my assigned duties. To me, this is a career and ministry to the Nebraska youths. Each year I or another trooper go past age 60 would be one less year of drawing out any monetary benefits, and I still would be contributing, I believe it's supposed to go to 15 percent unless it changes with these last LBs we just heard about,

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature  
Transcriber's Office

Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee  
February 25, 2009

---

but it's scheduled, I think, to go to 15 percent for troopers annually of my yearly salary into the retirement system. Many troopers will not want to go past or beyond 60, because they can make more money by adding a second job's income to their retirement benefits upon reaching age 60. So, Senators, I urge you to support LB242 and advance it out of your committee, send it through various steps to allow the whole Legislature to vote on the issue. Please leave the emergency provision intact, so it may take effect on July 1, 2009. For me to benefit from LB242, it must become law before September 10 of this year when I reach age 60. Thank you. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Thank you. Thank you for your testimony. Any questions? I've got one, sir... [LB242]

WAYNE TRANTHAM: Yes. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: ...I'm just familiar...I come from Cass County,... [LB242]

WAYNE TRANTHAM: Yes. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: ...and we've always had county sheriffs do the DARE Program and... [LB242]

WAYNE TRANTHAM: Yes. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: ...as my kids grew up. In your area, you said there's 11 counties that you serve? [LB242]

WAYNE TRANTHAM: I go about...well, there's...we have 15 counties in my district. But Cass County is one, and Seward County, they have deputies that teach DARE and... [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Okay, so you supervise those folks in those counties where the...? [LB242]

WAYNE TRANTHAM: No, I don't supervise them. It's the state DARE Program. The State Patrol actually helps train those people in Grand Island. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Okay. [LB242]

WAYNE TRANTHAM: When I leave,...this is sad. Whenever I leave, and my sergeant and everybody, they have given nothing to indicate they're going to replace me in DARE, we're the agency that trains people, the lead agency, but yet we will not have one trooper teaching DARE. I think that's sad. [LB242]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature  
Transcriber's Office

Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee  
February 25, 2009

---

SENATOR PANKONIN: Okay, so your area may not have that service then, might not have that program... [LB242]

WAYNE TRANTHAM: Most of the county deputies, the sheriffs say that they lack the manpower. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: To do it. Okay. [LB242]

WAYNE TRANTHAM: They have no manpower. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: And that was kind of the intent of the question. Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you. [LB242]

WAYNE TRANTHAM: Thank you. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: We'll now have further proponent testimony on LB242. I don't see any, but I do want to mention that we did have four letters that the committee received in support of LB242, and we'll have those letters in the record. They're from Shawn Biltoft, sixth grade teacher at East Butler public school in Brainard; Nancy Jill Reinsch also with the East Butler School in Brainard; Mike Yates, a sixth grade teacher at Freeman Public Schools in Adams; and Mike Meyerle, the principal at the Diller-Odell schools. These were all letters that were in favor of LB242. (Exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 4) All right, opponent. Go ahead, Senator Heidemann. [LB242]

SENATOR HEIDEMANN: I just want to add that there are a lot of people that support you down in my district. You have a lot of schools in my district, and all these e-mails are in support. They won't be read into the record, but I do want to note that I have got a lot of correspondence on this. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Thank you, Senator Heidemann. Okay, we will now have opponent testimony regarding this bill, LB242. [LB242]

KORBY GILBERTSON: Good afternoon, Chairman Pankonin, members of the committee. My name is Korby Gilbertson, K-o-r-b-y G-i-l-b-e-r-t-s-o-n. I'm appearing today as a registered lobbyist on behalf of the State Troopers Association of Nebraska. The state troopers regrettably have to oppose this bill for a number of reasons. As I talked about in the previous bill I testified on, retirement issues are ever changing and something that we look at every year. And every time we have had changes in benefits or back to when they first got the COLA, we have had certain members who have not benefitted from those changes to the system. However, we cannot please everyone every time, and our core interest is making sure that this retirement system is sound. And that is why we have worked diligently with the administration and the Legislature to make sure that steps are taken to protect these funds. The retirement system is...the

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature  
Transcriber's Office

Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee  
February 25, 2009

---

first two reasons. We are concerned with any impact it would have on the retirement system. I know that Senator Karpisek in his opening said that there were statements made by the actuary that this might actually save money for the plan, because troopers would technically or probably die quickly (laugh) after they retire or, secondly, that there would be other cost savings because of what could happen. However, none of that has actually gone through an actuarial study and been shown for anything other than just a guesstimate during a hearing. Secondly, we do have concerns about the impact that this could have on the DROP program, which is obviously something that we're just starting, and we would hate to see anything happen to that, because we worked very hard for years to get that implemented. The third concern that the troopers have is that they are self-funded for health insurance. And any time you're going to add a group of people that are additionally five years older, you will have a group of people that have considerably more health concerns than you do with a younger population. That is a proven fact, and we are very concerned with that, what that could do to the health insurance that STAN funds. With that, I'd be happy to answer any questions. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Okay, thank you. Questions for Ms. Gilbertson? I've got a couple. [LB242]

KORBY GILBERTSON: Okay. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Just going back through your reasons, and I...on the self-funded health insurance issue, I think that could be a legitimate one. Although the trooper's point about lawsuits, how do you feel about that? I mean, don't you think there is potential since the retirement age...? [LB242]

KORBY GILBERTSON: No, I don't. I think there's been a longstanding exemption for law enforcement in age discrimination suits. I don't think that that's an accurate statement. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: So that...you don't think that's a factor. Okay, the first point that Senator Karpisek made about, if people do work longer in the system, I mean, it obviously narrows the gap no matter when we...our demise is. It obviously narrows that gap and may systemwide save money if people do want to do it, but you just... [LB242]

KORBY GILBERTSON: It's not been proven. That's our concern. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Okay. All right. Our counsel has handed me a question and, obviously, the...probably the issue here a little bit is because of the situation with the trooper involved, but about doing an actuarial study. Is there any interest in doing a study on this issue? [LB242]

KORBY GILBERTSON: If Mr. Trantham would like to pay for one, he's more than

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature  
Transcriber's Office

Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee  
February 25, 2009

---

welcome to, but the State Troopers Association will not pay for one. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Okay, so the Troopers Association will not pay for that study. [LB242]

KORBY GILBERTSON: No. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: All right. Thank you. Any other questions? Seeing none, ... [LB242]

KORBY GILBERTSON: Thank you. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: ...any other opponent testimony on LB242? Any neutral testifiers on LB242? Senator Karpisek, you can close. [LB242]

SENATOR KARPISEK: Thank you, Senator Pankonin. I do support the DROP program, and I'm pretty sure that I carried that bill. However, (laugh) that's a couple of years ago; I can't remember that far back. I know I supported it, and it is probably a concern. And Ms. Gilbertson and I have talked quite a bit on this, and I do not want to do anything that would jeopardize that. However, I think that there is a way that we could work that out that we would make sure not to jeopardize the DROP program. This is a limited number of people. Again, if we were to put a grandfather on it, 30 people, they're not going to work that much longer, I wouldn't suspect. Even if they worked another five years, would it make a difference on health insurance plans? Possibly, a little. I guess I'm a little bit disappointed in the troopers organization that they don't necessarily look out for their own in that regard. Gee, what's it going to do to me? What's it going to cost me on my insurance rather than...you know, they might someday be in that situation on a different subject. And that does kind of concern me, because again, I have great respect for that organization, and it kind of flies in the face, I think, of what they're all about. Irregardless of a lawsuit or not, I just don't think it's quite right that we make people retire at 60. Things aren't the way they were in the forties. It's a limited number of people, passionate people. They still have to make sure that they can do the job, that they're in shape. We're not talking about maybe your stereotypical, what you think of as an old policeman that sits behind a desk. We're not talking about those people. If they can't keep up, then cut them loose, and I think they'd be more than happy to. Again, it's a very narrow...we could make it a very narrow group. Some things could happen. I don't think it's the end of the world. Trooper Trantham will still get some retirement irregardless. Again, as he said, his main concern is he wants to keep working. He likes his job. We know that he does a good job and, in fact, I'm very happy to say he's going to be teaching my sixth-grader at Wilber-Clatonia this spring in DARE, and I'm very excited for that, and I really have to thank him for that. I think it'll save money in the long run with...take all that into consideration. I'm scared what will happen to the DROP program. We don't have DROP in our county. We didn't have it at the city. We did for a

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature  
Transcriber's Office

Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee  
February 25, 2009

---

while. We didn't have the manpower. So that's the long and short of it. I think that we...I would love to look into it more. Although Mr. Schaefer didn't give us any facts, I think he knows his job pretty well, and he did say that he thought it may save some money. So, with that, I would take any questions that you have. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Any other questions for Senator Karpisek? I've got one quick one. I know you've tried to work on this bill, but you just haven't had much success then with your visits with association and not getting any headway. [LB242]

SENATOR KARPISEK: No, and really, to tell you the truth, I thought the last bill that I had for the buyout, although that didn't really make Trooper Trantham that happy, because he just...he wants to keep his job. But at least, a buyout, we have it with the teachers. When I brought that up in the interim study, oh, my God, if we did that it would cost...I don't remember what...something like \$300,000 to do that study (laugh) or something like that. I probably made a bad noise on that (laughter). The teachers have that sort of...option out. They can buy out. Irregardless of how this works out, it might be something to look at. If someone gets deathly ill, can they buy out to enjoy their last year or two? It's something to think about. I would like to see it raised...the age raised. Again, 65 I'm not dead set on, but 62 or 63 I could maybe negotiate down to. So I have not gotten any headway. As you heard Ms. Gilbertson say, they're not willing to do a \$3,000 study. I don't know what else to try. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Okay. Thank you. [LB242]

SENATOR KARPISEK: Thank you. [LB242]

SENATOR PANKONIN: Okay, we're done with our hearing, and we're done with our...all of our hearings this morning, so thank you. [LB242]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature  
Transcriber's Office

Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee  
February 25, 2009

---

Disposition of Bills:

LB81 - Indefinitely postponed.  
LB425 - Indefinitely postponed.  
LB242 - Held in committee.

---

Chairperson

---

Committee Clerk