

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

Executive Board Committee  
February 07, 2012

---

[LB761 LB1059 LR373CA LR377CA]

The Executive Board of the Legislative Council met at 12:00 noon on Tuesday, February 7, 2012, in Room 2102 of the State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebraska, for the purpose of conducting a public hearing on LR373CA, LB1059, LR377CA, and LB761. Senators present: John Wightman, Chairperson; John Nelson, Vice Chairperson; Deb Fischer; Mike Flood; Russ Karpisek; Steve Lathrop; and Rich Pahls. Senators absent: Mark Christensen, Chris Langemeier, and Lavon Heidemann.

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Welcome to the Executive Board Committee hearing. My name is John Wightman. I'm from Lexington, Nebraska, represent District 36. I will be serving as Chair of the committee. The committee will take up the bills and constitutional amendments in the order posted...well, no, not in the order posted. Senator Lautenbaugh is going to be late and so we'll take Senator Avery first. Our hearing today is your public part of the legislative process. It's your opportunity to express your position on the proposed legislation before us today. To better facilitate today's proceeding, I ask you abide by the following procedures. Please turn off cell phones or silence them. The order of testimony will be first the introducer, then the proponents, the opponents, those wanting to testify in a neutral position, and then the closing. A testifier should sign in, hand your sign-in sheets to the committee page when you come up to testify. Please spell your name for the record before you testify, be concise. Written materials may be distributed to committee members as exhibits only while testimony is being offered; hand it to the page for distribution to the committee and staff. We have Justin here today who will assist you. We'll need 13 copies of anything you wish distributed. If you have written testimony but do not have 13 copies, please raise your hand or signal the page, Justin, shortly so that he can make copies for you. If you do not wish to testify but would like your position to be part of the record, you can sign the form found at the testifier's table the testifier sign-in sheet. So I will start around the table again, to the far...we're not going to say right today, to (laugh)...we were going to say port and starboard, but since I can't remember which is which,...

SENATOR NELSON: Starboard is on your right.

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: ...at any rate, over to this corner would be Senator Christensen, who is from Imperial, Nebraska, and he will not be with us today. Next to him is...I'm trying to see who's next,...

JANICE SATRA: Heidemann.

JESSICA SHELURN: Senator Heidemann.

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: ...Senator Heidemann, who is also ill today. Next to him will be...I'll let them, self-introductions.

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

Executive Board Committee  
February 07, 2012

---

SENATOR FLOOD: Mike Flood from Norfolk, District 19.

SENATOR KARPISEK: Russ Karpisek from Wilber, District 32.

SENATOR NELSON: John Nelson from Omaha, District 6.

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: To my immediate right is Janice Satra, who is our committee counsel. To my immediate left is Jessica Shelburn, who is the clerk of the committee. And starting with Senator Lathrop, self-introductions.

SENATOR LATHROP: Steve Lathrop, District 12.

SENATOR FISCHER: Deb Fischer, District 43.

SENATOR PAHLS: Rich Pahls, District 31.

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: And Senator Langemeier, who would be seated here, is also not going to be present today, so... Now we have changed the order, unless you've...

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: I'm fine. Go ahead.

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Okay. We have changed the order and agenda items number 2 and 3 will be first, and we're going to join those together, which we don't usually do, but they are kind of companion amendments. So Senator Avery.

SENATOR AVERY: (Exhibits 1-2) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Bill Avery, B-i-l-l A-v-e-r-y. I represent District 28 here in south-central Lincoln. Thank you for allowing me to bring this bill. Really, I'm here to propose a new concept that will deal with a long-festering problem. That problem is, of course, low, inadequate pay for state senators. We have a situation here that encourages candidates to run for office if they don't need the money. The concept that I am proposing to you would set up a new mechanism for dealing with fair and reasonable compensation for senators and for constitutional officers. Before I get to the specifics of the proposal, let me say that I understand that the time may not be right, which by the way it never is. I also understand that you have another proposal before you to change the length of term limits, which I support. Putting both that and this bill or Senator Lautenbaugh's bill on the ballot at the same time may not be a very strategic move. I recognize all of that. Your job, of course, is to decide whether the time is right for one or for both. It's not an easy decision but I do want you to consider what I have to offer. Let's start by pointing out that there has been a changed landscape in this state for the legislative branch of government. Term limits have ended whatever existence there may have been of career professional politicians in the Legislature. Since we have only one Chamber, our citizen

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

Executive Board Committee  
February 07, 2012

---

legislators are not gaming the system by switching political...or switching legislative bodies to circumvent term limits, as happens in bicameral systems in order to prolong their political careers. Another observation is that a two-term senator in this state will make \$96,000 in an eight-year period. So it is clear that we are here not to make money but to do a job, to serve the citizens of this state to the best of our abilities. I think you would agree with me that we have two types of senators. Many are young adults with young families, laying the groundwork, under sometimes great financial burden, for perhaps a future in public policy in this state; and another group of senators who are independently employed, retired, or have a professional flexibility that allows them to take leave from their jobs for a considerable amount of time. Not many people have that kind of flexibility and not everybody can be independently employed and, of course, if you look at the age of the members of the body, it's pretty clear that many of us are retired. So the question is, do we want to have a Legislature where really only those who don't need the money can afford to serve? And I think the answer to that is, no, we do not want that. The situations that I've described are sometimes difficult, requiring great sacrifice. It's tough on families. Some of the members have to maximize limited time, personal resources, long driving hours, renting condos, meeting with constituents instead of coaching Little League. And you know the sacrifices I'm talking about because you make them every day. Of the 50 state legislatures, Nebraska is at or near the bottom in any straight-up base pay. Does that matter? I'd suggest to you that it does. The academic literature on political corruption has long found that low pay for public officeholders is very strongly related to higher levels of corruption. So it certainly does matter. Now I'm not suggesting that it matters here in that same way. There are some pretty extreme examples though. Alabama, which pays its legislators \$10 a day, recently had a state senator found guilty of accepting \$3,000 a month in casino bribes. New Mexico, which doesn't pay their senators anything, had a case where a state senator was found guilty of conspiracy and mail fraud in the amount of \$4.4 million. Now that's pretty...those are extreme cases. What is my point? I'm suggesting not that we have corruption. I don't think we do. I think we have a very clean system. But I am suggesting that excessively low pay can have a corrosive effect on the political process and it can have an effect by undermining perhaps commitment to hard work and dedication to good policymaking. It might lead to a lax attitude toward ethics and, well, you know, this may not be wrong but...or it may not be illegal but it may not be exactly right, maybe I shouldn't do this, but, hey, I'm not getting paid anything anyway so what difference does it make? And I would like to see that this Legislature do everything we can to make sure the process is completely sound and completely above board. We can always find economic and political excuses to avoid this topic, but if not today then when? I think it's been 25 years since a successful effort was waged to get a pay raise for state senators. I think now is the time and I think it is our duty to leave this office better than we found it. Many of us will be termed out and I would like to see us leave behind an institution that is stronger than when we arrived. So I am proposing something for you to consider. I am proposing the creation of an independent, unbiased, compensation commission whose duties would be to research and review legislative

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

Executive Board Committee  
February 07, 2012

---

and constitutional officer salaries, look at trends in other states, consider cost-of-living adjustments, analyze other policy-based professions to determine if Nebraska's legislators and constitutional officers are in line with other states, with our own state agencies, and with the private sector. This legislation has been influenced by the state of Alaska, which has a State Officers Compensation Commission set up in 2008. It's been very successful there, and if you are interested in looking at that we can get you a copy of their law. We currently have 71 state employees earning more than the Governor. And by the way, the Alaska Compensation Commission also considered intangible costs of public service: loss of privacy, exposure to public criticism, relocation, disruption to family and career, possible financial loss, possible divestiture of assets to avoid conflicts of interests. These are costs as well. In order to achieve what I am proposing, we'd have to take up a companion bill to LB1059 and that is LR377CA. It is an amendment to the constitution that would strike language in Article IV (sic), Section 7(4) in the constitution that sets legislative salaries at \$1,000 a month, travel expenses and per diems. The amendment also includes language in Article IV (sic), Section 19, to direct a compensation commission to establish salaries, travel expenses and benefits for constitutional officers, Governors, Lieutenant Governors, Treasurers, etcetera. I am going to give you a proposed amendment. Do you have a page? And I am also going to pass out some information here from the Legislative Research Council (sic) on our history of salaries and compensation. This amendment that I am passing around came about because of some ambiguities in the wording of benefits. The intent of the proposed legislation is to allow for benefits to be a part of compensation. State benefit provisions currently are locked in statute and the Legislature, of course, would need to authorize any participation over and above what is already in law. I don't think that for us the language was clear but for the Bill Drafters it was not, so that amendment should clear that up. LB1059 creates the commission I've been talking about to review salaries, travel expenses, per diems, and then they would make a recommendation to the Legislature. The Legislature would take this up in an up or down vote, no amendment. And this seems to work in Alaska; I think it might be useful here. One of the ways that I came about this idea was my experience in research on free trade, fast-track authority, base realignment, and closure. These are very difficult issues at the federal level. Congress has recognized their almost paralysis when they get to these issues when they reach the floor, so they have developed procedures for getting these things done in an expeditious manner by denying themselves the right to amend these bills. When they come out of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission, the recommendations have to be voted up or down in a deadline-driven vote, no amendments; the same thing with free trade agreements. It seems to me that might work here. The compensation committee would be comprised of two members...two from each legislative caucus with four-year staggered terms. Each legislative caucus would approve two members of the commission in two separate political affiliations. You'd have a balance of party participation. The full Legislature would approve, or if they did not approve these members it would go back to the caucuses for another round of selection. Candidates for the participation on this commission would have to file with Accountability and

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

Executive Board Committee  
February 07, 2012

---

Disclosure financial reports. The commission would select a chairperson and a vice chairperson. The chair would not have voting rights because if the chair had voting rights it would throw off the bipartisan balance on the commission. Of course, the commission would abide by open meetings and open records laws that we currently have. And commission members later found to violate sections of the act would be removed by action of the Legislature. They would receive no compensation, only travel and actual expenses. Eligibility would be restricted to Nebraska residents. They have to be registered voters who have not changed their party affiliation in one...at least in the previous year. They cannot have been a lobbyist in the past year, cannot be an elected public officeholder or party officeholder, not be a relative of an officeholder or a constitutional officer, cannot be a UNL or a University of Nebraska employee. I included this because the university is such a huge player in the appropriations process in this Legislature and I thought that might be a good idea. No campaigning for office, no participating or contributing to campaigns; no campaigning or holding of office for the Legislature or constitutional office for two years following service on the commission. That essentially is an outline of what I am proposing and I would be happy to take any questions. [LB1059 LR377CA]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Thank you, Senator Avery. Do we have any questions? Thank you. [LB1059 LR377CA]

SENATOR AVERY: You are welcome. I'm going to stick around for a little while. [LB1059 LR377CA]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Do we have proponents, in favor of? And you can speak on both issues, LR377CA and LB1059. [LB1059 LR377CA]

ADAM MORFELD: Good afternoon. My name is Adam Morfeld. I'm executive director of Nebraskans for Civic Reform. On my...the spelling of my name is A-d-a-m M-o-r-f-e-l-d. Nebraskans for Civic Reform is an organization dedicated to making our civic institutions more accessible and making civic...strengthening K-12 civic education. We are coming out in support of both of these proposed changes. The board talked about this at length. Our primary concern is that the lack of compensation really narrows the field of candidates and choices for voters to be able to choose from a representative population of candidates that are representative of the population. So in general, that's our position. The way in which we go about doing this, I think there's many different ways. I think Senator Avery's proposal, while many have felt as though Senator Avery's proposal was a bit more...made more sense being in our constitution, that putting a hard and fast number in the constitution was just not the best way of going about it because it's very hard to change the constitution, obviously. So the commission route we thought would be probably the better route if we were to go about it. However, I don't know if the voters would really like that, and that was something that was also discussed at length as well. However, that being said, we are in support of both proposals. And I'd be happy

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

Executive Board Committee  
February 07, 2012

---

to answer any questions that you may have. [LB1059 LR377CA]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Thank you. Any questions? Seeing none,... [LB1059 LR377CA]

ADAM MORFELD: Thank you. [LB1059 LR377CA]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: ...are there other proponents? Are there any opponents to either one, the constitutional amendment or LB1059? Is there anyone wanting to testify in a neutral capacity? [LB1059 LR377CA]

FRANK DALEY: Chairman Wightman and members of the Executive Board, my name is Frank Daley, D-a-l-e-y. I serve as the executive director of the Nebraska Accountability and Disclosure Commission. I'm here in a neutral capacity as to LB1059 for the sole purpose of recommending that you delete four words from the bill if you decide to advance it. On page 5, line 15... [LB1059 LR377CA]

SENATOR LATHROP: Which one, Frank? [LB1059 LR377CA]

FRANK DALEY: This is LB1059. On page 5, line 15 there's a sentence which begins, "Prior to legislative approval, each member of the commission shall file a statement of financial interests and conflict of interest with the Nebraska Accountability and Disclosure Commission." I'm recommending that if this moves forward that the words "and conflict of interest" be deleted. By law, you file a conflict of interest statement if you're faced with, as a public official or public employee, with something, an action or decision, which could result in a financial benefit or detriment. LB1059 provides for that in Section 13. And so typically a potential official would not file one of these statements in advance of actually becoming a public official. So that is the only recommendation I'd make and thanks for the opportunity to testify. [LB1059 LR377CA]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Daley. Anybody have any questions? Thank you again. [LB1059 LR377CA]

FRANK DALEY: Thank you. [LB1059 LR377CA]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Any other...I guess any other person wanting to testify in a neutral capacity? If not, we'll close the...oh, Senator Avery, did you wish to close? (See also Exhibit 3) [LB1059 LR377CA]

SENATOR AVERY: No. [LB1059 LR377CA]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: With that, we'll close the hearing on LR377CA and LB1059. We'll take number 1 on the agenda, LR373CA. Senator Lautenbaugh. [LB1059

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

Executive Board Committee  
February 07, 2012

---

LR377CA LR373CA]

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I'll be brief in that I think the nature of the problem was very ably stated by Senator Avery. Our pay is currently, in my opinion and I think in the opinion of many of us, too low. I don't know how to explain that any more clearly than that. And I think we are limiting the number of people and the type of people who can serve here as a result. My amendment very simply would be on the ballot this fall and would increase the pay to \$32,000 a year. I've been asked many times what is the magic of that number. There is none. For adjusting for inflation from the last time we received an increase would put us, if memory serves, around \$22,000 to \$24,000 a year and I'm going to leave what that number should be to the wisdom of this committee if you decide to advance this. I don't come here and say I have the answers. I do take a different approach than Senator Avery does to arriving at a pay increase, I would say a more traditional approach. But again, there's never a good time and it's long overdue. I'd be happy to take any questions you might have. [LR373CA]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. Senator Pahls. [LR373CA]

SENATOR PAHLS: Thank you, Chairman. Senator Lautenbaugh, I just...I understand the need for an increase and, of course, it would not affect me since I'm one of those retired people, and I wasn't here for the other discussion on the other bills we've heard with a similar background of this type of legislation. Right now, I just counted roughly and there are like ten attorneys on...in the Legislature right now. Are we looking for more attorneys? Are we looking for...do you see where I'm...? I mean apparently the salary must not be unbelievably terrible. [LR373CA]

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Well, honestly, you've touched on something there. I think the public thinks that we're all attorneys instead of just ten of us. And I think people are surprised when I say, no, there's only nine or ten of us. That is one of the limited groups of people who can, with some difficulty or varying amounts of difficulty, serve here. I believe with the salary being as low as it is, it's limited to people like myself and Senator Lathrop, who can in some ways juggle our practices around to try to accommodate the demands of the Legislature, or again, the very wealthy or the retired. And I think that just leaves out a tremendous swath of the public and precludes them from serving. It is not easy. Being an attorney doesn't make it easy to be here. It makes it conceivable, same with being retired or wealthy. With the numbers as low as they are, the salary as low as it is, I don't think increasing it is going to result in more attorneys. I think it will result in more other kinds of people, nonattorneys, nonwealthy, nonretirees perhaps looking at it and seeing it as something that they could possibly undertake. [LR373CA]

SENATOR PAHLS: And I can understand, I can understand why...for some of the called the younger people into their profession this could be difficult, but I need to be on record

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

Executive Board Committee  
February 07, 2012

---

that I am impressed with the number of people that we have in this body who are not what I call financially at the top end of their line. So somewhere along the line something is working, because as I look across, especially the ones who have been in within the last several years, I'm impressed with their ability. And you're saying their ability is there but we need to pay them more. [LR373CA]

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Well, I think and a lot of people I know, I could have...you've all heard the examples and it's not for me to tell other people's stories, but, yes, there are some very young, very capable people here who may or may not come from wealth or have means in some way. I know many of them struggle. Many of them don't realize what's being asked of them and sometimes we do end up with situations where people are seeking employment and perhaps other undesirable impulses because it is very difficult as a young person, if you aren't a young person of means, to serve here. I don't consider myself either one, neither young nor of means anymore. But, yes, I would say that we have seen people step up. But I don't think it's anything we're doing through pay that is making people look at it and say, yeah, this works. I think term limits are bringing new faces here, which I'm fine with, but then the new faces in some instances are struggling or don't have a full appreciation for what is being asked. And again, I just think we need to make a nod to reality here and say, look, even keeping pace with inflation we're way behind. In my mind, that's just unconscionable. [LR373CA]

SENATOR PAHLS: Thank you. [LR373CA]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Thank you, Senator Pahls. Senator Nelson. [LR373CA]

SENATOR NELSON: Thank you, Senator Wightman. Thank you. You know you used the term "struggling" there. Would you agree that the younger legislators who come down here and do have to earn a living elsewhere above and beyond the \$12,000, that that unduly impacts the work that they do here in the senate? Because it's kind of a full-time job when you're down here and if you can't devote your full attention to it, probably you're not doing all that you can. Is that a fair statement? [LR373CA]

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: I don't want to cast aspersions on how anyone here chooses, and I know you're not saying that either, how anyone here chooses to engage in the process and who's here enough and who isn't enough. That's not what I'm saying. But there is certainly a pressure, when you've got bills to pay, to sometimes not be here for things because you have to go do something else. And I think we all...I mean last week I had to go try a very short case just because that's when it came up and, you know, I can't just say, look, I just won't try cases during the session. So, no, and I was not here that day, so it does happen. [LR373CA]

SENATOR NELSON: Would the \$32,000 level, would that alleviate that? Would that

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

Executive Board Committee  
February 07, 2012

---

permit, in your opinion, someone to not have to work outside at all while they're down here at the Legislature? [LR373CA]

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: I hesitate to say at all. I mean it would depend on a variety of factors of do you have a spouse who works, does that spouse happen to have health insurance fortunately, that kind of thing. It would help. I can't say we're going to eliminate the problem. I mean that would be overpromising and I don't want to do that. But I am saying that any amount of increase would be beneficial. [LR373CA]

SENATOR NELSON: Thank you. [LR373CA]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Thank you, Senator Nelson. Any other questions? Senator Lathrop. [LR373CA]

SENATOR LATHROP: Maybe just one. If we were to put out the bill to extend term limits, and I know you wouldn't probably support that, just from our own conversations, but do you think this would diminish the chances of something like that being approved by the voters? Other words, here they are asking for more time and more money. [LR373CA]

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: I have been very clear to the proponent of that proposal that I would have nothing to say about that whatsoever, so I really don't know what the effect of that would be. [LR373CA]

SENATOR LATHROP: Okay. Thanks. [LR373CA]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Thank you, Senator Lathrop. Any other questions? If not, thank you, Senator Lautenbaugh. [LR373CA]

SENATOR LAUTENBAUGH: Thank you. [LR373CA]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Do we have proponents? Proponents. [LR373CA]

RON SEDLACEK: Chairman Wightman and the members of the Executive Board, for the record my name is Ron Sedlacek, that's spelled S-e-d-l-a-c-e-k, and I'm here on behalf of the Nebraska Chamber of Commerce as well as been asked to enter testimony in support for the Nebraska Bankers Association and have signed in as such. The State Chamber board of directors met last week, reviewed the constitutional amendments, proposals, and want just to be on record in support of LR373CA. It's been about 24 years, I believe, since the last pay raise. We believe it should be on the ballot. We have been supportive of efforts in the past. We would support what this committee brings forth to the Legislature and hopefully ultimately to the people, and we will continue to support that effort in educating our membership as well as those who will

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

Executive Board Committee  
February 07, 2012

---

listen to us. That's all we have. [LR373CA]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Sedlacek. Does anyone else...does anyone have any questions? If not...Senator Pahls. [LR373CA]

SENATOR PAHLS: Thank you, Chairman, I do, and this is more or less for information, just to point out something. I think about three years ago there was a bill that I was...had on the floor and Senator Chambers was giving me sort of a tough time about it. It dealt with viatical insurance. And I pointed out to him that as long as he had been a state senator, an outside company from Pennsylvania was paying a lobbyist more money to stop this one bill than what he had made his entire time in the Legislature, one bill, one bill. They were paying the lobbyist to stop this bill, and they did not, by chance. And that's the point I was trying to drive home to this senator. Thank you. [LR373CA]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Thank you, Senator Pahls. Any other questions? Thank you. Other proponents? Seeing none, any opponents? Seeing none, anyone wishing to testify in a neutral capacity? If not, Senator Lautenbaugh, do you desire to close? Senator Lautenbaugh waives closing. That will close the hearing on LR373CA. We'll open the hearing on LB761. Senator Heidemann is not here. I understand that his aide will introduce this. [LR373CA LB761]

KIM DAVIS: (Exhibit 4) Senator Wightman and members of the Executive Board, I'm Kim Davis filling in for Senator Heidemann, who's sick today. I'm here today to introduce LB761. LB761 amends LB264 which was passed last year. The law stated that any gift, bequest, or devise of real property, structure, or improvement proposed to be made available to any state agency, board, or commission had to go through a review process and, if in excess of \$10,000, had to be approved by the Governor and the Legislature prior to acceptance. LB264 added any acquisition of real property, structure or improvement that is acquired with the proceeds of a donation, gift, bequest, devise, or grant from an individual, organization, a corporation, a foundation or a similar entity, or from a nonfederal governmental agency to the review and approval process. LB761 would limit the expanded review and approval process passed in LB264 to any acquisition of real property or structure that is acquired with the proceeds of a donation, gift, bequest, devise, or grant to those in which the combined proceeds exceed \$250,000. I'll give an example. Prior to LB264, a gift of real property in excess of \$10,000 required legislative approval prior to acceptance, but if the same property was acquired using a cash gift no legislative approval was needed. LB264 closed a loophole and prevented an end run around legislative approval by gifting cash and requiring the money to be used for the same purpose as if they gifted the land, structure, or improvement itself. Senator Heidemann also felt it was important to keep the Legislature informed of such donations and gifts that the agencies were receiving. However, as experienced during the last interim, LB264 required the review and approval of cash gifts that were not very significant in terms of dollars, creating more work for the various

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

Executive Board Committee  
February 07, 2012

---

agencies, DAS, and the Executive Board. It also was found to delay the use of donations, which can be frustrating to a donor. Therefore, LB761 limits the expanded review and approval process to those situations in which the combined donations exceed \$250,000. In summary, the expanded review and approval process would still close the loophole that existed for major cash gifts but would not unnecessarily delay the process for smaller cash gifts. We've worked with the Fiscal Office and your legal counsel on this bill and it has been reviewed by DAS and the Game and Parks Commission. And I have an amendment to LB761 which is technical in nature and offered for clarification purposes. [LB761]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Thank you. [LB761]

KIM DAVIS: Uh-huh. [LB761]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Does anyone have any questions? Thank you. [LB761]

KIM DAVIS: Uh-huh. [LB761]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Are there any proponents of...any other proponents of LB761? [LB761]

PATRICK COLE: Senators, I'm Patrick Cole, C-o-l-e, Budget and Fiscal Division administrator with the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission. We just wanted to go on record in support of this bill and appreciate the work that Senator Heidemann's office and the fiscal analyst put in, in reaching what I think is a reasonable compromise to the situation, as you are aware, because we've been here three or four times last session trying to implement the previous bill. We do receive a lot of important donations from people that want to contribute to the cause of Game and Parks Commission. Some of those are relatively small and it does create a lot of additional work for this committee as well as our agency and the Executive Board. So we just wanted to come out in support of this bill. [LB761]

SENATOR WIGHTMAN: Thank you. Any questions? Seeing none, are there any other proponents of LB761? Are there any...is there anyone wanting to testify in opposition to LB761? Anyone wanting to testify in a neutral capacity on LB761? If not, we'll close the hearing on LB761. We'll be adjourned. (See also Exhibit 5) [LB761]