

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

Executive Board Committee
January 22, 2018

[LB744]

The Executive Board of the Legislative Council met at 12:00 p.m. on Monday, January 22, 2018, in Room 2102 of the State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebraska, for the purpose of conducting a public hearing on LB744. Senators present: Dan Watermeier, Chairperson; Kate Bolz; Sue Crawford; Dan Hughes; John McCollister; and Jim Scheer. Senators absent: John Kuehn, Vice Chairperson; Ernie Chambers; Tyson Larson; and John Stinner.

SENATOR WATERMEIER: We will go ahead and get started. Welcome to the Executive Board committee hearing. I am Dan Watermeier from Syracuse, represent the 1st Legislative District, southeast Nebraska, and I serve Chair of the Executive Board. Our hearing today is your public part of the legislative process and your opportunity to express your position on the proposed legislation before us today. The committee members may come and go during the hearing. We get called away for various reasons. It is not an indication we are not interested in the bill being heard in this committee. It is just part of the process. To better facilitate today's proceedings, I ask that you abide by some following procedures. Please silence or turn off your cell phones. The order of testimony would be the introducer, the proponents, the opponents, neutral, and then closing by the introducer. If you are testifying, please make sure you fill out a green sheet that the page can give you if you need and they are located outside the entrance room or the pages can get them. When you come up to testify, please hand the green paper to...the handouts to the pages and we will pass them out. We would ask that you bring 12 of these copies with you. Please state and spell your name for the record at the start of the testimony. Each testifier will have five minutes to speak and typically I'll ask to see who is all here today in order to speak so we might adjust that time a little bit. You'll have one minute when the yellow light comes on; and when the red light comes on, please close it up. If you will not be testifying but want to go on record as having a position on the bill being heard today, there is a white sheet in the entrance that you can leave with your name on it as well. Written materials may be distributed to the committee. Once again, I ask that you have 12 copies of that for the committee. If you have written testimony but do not have 12 copies, please raise your hand now so the page can have your copies made to you. To my immediate right is legal counsel, Janice Satra. To my left is committee clerk, Laura Olson. And one other thing I'll mention, too, as far as testimony, we kind of decided as a group that we'll have testimony be obligated to be in my office, I think we decided 5:00 the day before. Most committees are going to do that. So for those watching on TV, we're going to have the committee...if you're going to submit something for testimony, I want it here at 5:00 the day before so we can process that that next morning and have it ready to go into the record. So with that, I'll introduce the committee members, starting my far left, Speaker Scheer.

SENATOR SCHEER: Jim Scheer, District 19.

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

Executive Board Committee
January 22, 2018

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: John McCollister, District 20.

SENATOR BOLZ: Senator Kate Bolz, District 29.

SENATOR HUGHES: Dan Hughes, District 44, ten counties in southwest Nebraska.

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Good afternoon. Sue Crawford, District 45, eastern Sarpy County.

SENATOR WATERMEIER: And our page today is Heather. Where are you from, Heather?

HEATHER BENTLEY: Miller.

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Miller, very good. Welcome. So with that, we'll open up the testimony on LB744 which is my bill so I'm going to ask Senator Hughes to come up and Chair the hearing.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Watermeier. On the agenda, LB744 is up. Senator Watermeier. [LB744]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: All right. Thank you, Chairman Hughes. Members of the Executive Board, for the record my name is Dan Watermeier, spelled W-a-t-e-r-m-e-i-e-r. I'm here today to introduce LB744 which deals with the legislative election contests and qualifications challenges. I had also introduced a companion rule change to Rule 10 which deals with the same subject matter. Between the rule change and this bill, my intent is to address areas of concern the special committee discovered and also that noted to be cleaned up in the event of a future challenge. As you all are well aware, last year the Executive Board created a special committee to consider an elections challenge to the qualifications of Senator Chambers. As the special committee worked through the process, we identified instances where there was no precedent. We sometimes had to, as they would say, fly by the seat of our pants or blaze a new trail. Once the final report was adopted, I asked staff to work on a needed rule and statutory changes that addressed both procedural and legal issues and issues that we ran into that we believe need to be resolved. LB744 creates a separate act, the Legislative Qualifications and Election Contests Act, which would apply only to members of the Legislature. Election contest provisions for other elected officials would remain in Chapter 32. The bill would codify certain legal provisions that are currently in Rule 10 and also add new language that would provide guidance and clarity for future legislative qualifications or elections challenges. For example, LB744 clarifies that only an unsuccessful candidate whose name appears on the ballot for that district can file. While we didn't have to deal specifically with this question, it came up during our discussions and it is a

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

Executive Board Committee
January 22, 2018

potential problem that needed to be addressed. Another example, the bill specifically provides that the petitioner has the burden of proof. If you recall, we had to have a special committee adopt an order affirming which party had the burden of proof. The answer would now be very clear in LB744 if it's passed. The rule change covers the process and procedures that the Legislature will follow in an election or qualifications challenge. For example, committee selection, discovery, and committee procedures are in the proposed rule. I would be happy to answer any questions, but I've asked the Clerk, Patrick O'Donnell, to come up behind me and answer some questions. With that, I would offer time if there is a specific question. But I know Patrick has done a lot of work on it. I really want to thank Janice and Patrick for this because I know it was kind of a long process. Senator Chambers had offered some suggestions before the process even started that we knew we had changes that needed to be made, and I think we've done the best job we can. Keep in mind that we have the LB in front of us today. The Rules Committee is still holding a proposed rule change. They have decided they wanted to see our LB on the floor. I'm not sure if that means passed but at least on the floor before we bring up the Rules Committee and offer that change for the rules. So any questions? [LB744]

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Watermeier. Are there any questions? Senator Crawford. [LB744]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Thank you. And thank you, Senator Watermeier. I think one of our key policy questions will be the providing for the recovery of attorney fees. And so I'm just pulling that out, maybe asking for you to reflect on your understanding of the rationale for how we have it worded now. But I just kind of pointed that out as an issue that we probably will want to make sure we're clear about. And that's on page 10 in the bill. And it's currently written that the committee may decide to...that the prevailing party should receive attorney fees and costs. So it's very much left to the discretion of the committee to decide if that's an appropriate thing to do or not. And so if you prevail, you may or may not get attorney fees in response (inaudible). [LB744]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Correct. [LB744]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: I just wondered if you had a reflection on that choice. [LB744]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: I mean two things. We clearly didn't have enough in the bond to cover our overall expenses that the body incurred, that the committee at least incurred. I think I like the way it's there and I think Patrick can maybe attend to it a little bit better than I. [LB744]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Sure. [LB744]

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

Executive Board Committee
January 22, 2018

SENATOR WATERMEIER: And maybe if you want me to, I can close up. But we just need to have a little bit more provision, but yet it can't be so burdensome that someone couldn't post a bond and proceed forward. So I mean, I think the adjustment we made is reasonable. [LB744]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Thank you. [LB744]

SENATOR HUGHES: Senator McCollister. [LB744]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: Thank you, Senator Hughes. How much did the Legislature ultimately spend on that challenge? [LB744]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: I'm going to defer to my legal counsel, but I'm going to say it was around \$30,000 or a little over. [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: 44. [LB744]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: \$44,000, excuse me. [LB744]

SENATOR HUGHES: Any additional questions? Senator Crawford, I'm sorry. [LB744]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Thank you, Senator Hughes, and thank you, Senator Watermeier. Just we can clarify this beyond, what was the \$44,000 including returning recovery fees? [LB744]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Recovery fees? [LB744]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Or was that including the funds that were paid to Senator Chambers... [LB744]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Yes. [LB744]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: ...for legal costs? [LB744]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Yes, it does. [LB744]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: So it was our costs plus those costs... [LB744]

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

Executive Board Committee
January 22, 2018

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Correct. [LB744]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: ...went into that amount. Okay, thank you. [LB744]

SENATOR HUGHES: Any additional questions? Seeing none, will you stay to close? [LB744]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: It depends on the testimony. Probably. [LB744]

SENATOR HUGHES: Okay. With that, we'll open the LB744 up to proponents. Welcome, Mr. Clerk. [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: (Exhibits 1, 2, 3) Thank you, Senator. Mr. Chairman, members, my name is Patrick O'Donnell, P-a-t-r-i-c-k, Clerk of the Nebraska Legislature, here testifying in support of LB744. I am passing out to each of you a summary, if you will, of LB744 and I'll walk through that as I...through my testimony. I'm also providing to you a copy of the new proposed Rule 10 that was submitted to the Rules Committee during their deliberations as well as a summation of the draft. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me...I want to thank a couple of people before I begin my comments and in particular Amara Meyer, who is in the room with us today. She was instrumental in terms of the work that went into both the work of your committee last session as well as the work this interim to come up with what is now LB744. So I publicly want to thank her for all of her efforts. Let me begin by saying this. I think this is my experience. I suspect it was maybe some of yours as well. There were...this was the first time we've had an election or a qualifications challenge proceeding. Okay? Never had one before. The election contest materials were essentially adopted statutorily back in the 1960s. That's all the material that you found in Chapter 32, Article 11. Rule 10, which was essentially the provisions that govern the qualifications challenge that you had before you, were adopted as part of Rule 10 back in 1994. There was never an effort to coordinate, harmonize, if you will, the statutory provisions with the rule. I think that led to some of the dilemmas, stresses, conflicts that you had as you worked your way through the election contest. I think it's fair to say that there was little symmetry between the election contest provisions of the 1960s and Rule 10 that was ultimately adopted in 1994. LB744 in my view of it attempts to provide some symmetry and harmony between the rules and the statutory provisions. As we went into the work this summer, our intent was not necessarily to change law but to provide clarity and consistency in any action whereby an individual could challenge the certificate of election through an election contest proceeding or qualifications challenge. We did propose some substantive law changes, and I will talk about those as I walk through the bill. First and foremost, I want you to know that we are recommending in LB744 that election contest for legislative seats or qualifications challenges for legislative seats be separated out and incorporated into its own article. Okay? Chapter 50 of the Nebraska statutes deals with the Legislature and its operations. We're recommending that we

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

Executive Board Committee
January 22, 2018

take the election contest provisions and qualifications challenges and incorporate those into a new article within Chapter 50. That way all the legislative stuff is one place and all election contest for other offices are in Chapter 32. I will also characterize to you generally that we...I look at Rule 10, the new proposed Rule 10 as a process-driven rule. In other words, Senator Watermeier talked a little bit about it deals with the appointment of committee; it establishes time frames for certain discovery-related items. It talks about the committee's deliberations and the report that ultimately comes to the floor. Whereas, LB744 deals with those substantive provisions that I think are better placed in law than in rule. An example of that is, as I mentioned to you a moment ago, nowhere in current state law in statute will you find any provisions that deal with qualifications challenges. The state constitution talks about your ability to judge the qualifications of your colleagues, but you will find no substantive provisions in state law. They're only found in Rule 10. So we're attempting to address that with the proposed rule. As I said, Rule 10 deals with the how-to piece; LB744 deals with the substantive provisions as to how you proceed. I might tell you that as we began our work on this I'd asked Amara to spend a significant amount of time looking at what other states were doing. Okay? We looked at, gosh, she's literally reviewed almost every state's provisions as it relates to election contests and qualifications challenges. As you would expect, it's a mixed bag. LB744 represents in large part what our current law is; but as I said, there were some substantive changes that I will be recommending to you. And I'll identify those as we walk through the bill. The other general parameter that I guess I want to call to your attention is that as we were working with LB744 and Rule 10 expediency became an issue. Okay? As you know, when you started last year's session, we had already at that point Mr. Sciara had filed his election or his qualifications challenge. I had spent considerable amount of time in November and December talking to various members about what I thought the process could look like, should look like. And I don't remember exactly when the committee made its decision and when the floor took action on the report that you provided them, but it was several months. Okay? What we've tried to do is accelerate that time frame, especially as it relates to qualifications challenges so that deadlines are imposed, decision points are imposed that allow for determination to be made sometime between mid to late February generally. Okay? I think that's fair to all parties concerned to the challenge as well as the member who you have temporarily conditionally seated. The longer it goes on I think it's unfair to them. Okay. Let me quickly walk through the provisions of LB744. In the summary, forgive my informality with the summary, but these were my working notes and then it occurred to me that this might be useful to you so they tend to be my thoughts on paper as opposed to a formal memo. Understand that in the bill we have provisions that are applicable to both election contests and qualification challenges. We did more statutorily than rule. The rule draft is dramatically scaled down from what is Rule 10 today because we felt it was better to incorporate a number of provisions into state statute. Sections 1-7 of the bill essentially really aren't something you need to spend a lot of time looking at. What we've done is take out those provisions that related to legislative elections and remove them from existing law and incorporated them into what hopefully will become this new article in Chapter 50. So Sections 1-7 really are striking

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

Executive Board Committee
January 22, 2018

legislative provisions in Chapter 32 and moving them over to Chapter 50. Sections 8, 9, 10 and 11 essentially create the act, the Legislative Qualifications and Election Contests Act, provide definitions. Section 12 deals with the issue of standing and here's a substantive point of law that you need to be aware of. Currently under state law, only a losing candidate can challenge a member in terms of election contest. The rule was built to say the same thing. You will find a split of authority in jurisdictions out there in terms of who is allowed to file an action. We chose to maintain it as it exists in Nebraska today so that is only a losing candidate would be allowed to file. And I would suggest to you it would be a losing candidate that appeared on the general election ballot as opposed to a losing candidate on the primary election ballot. The other thing I guess if Senator Chambers was here I would point out to him that this would also not allow for a write-in candidate to challenge your holding of that seat. Okay? Only the individual whose name appeared on the general election ballot. Moving on, Section 13 makes it clear that the new Legislature decides as opposed to the old Legislature. I had multiple discussions in November and December as to whether it was the preceding Legislature should decide or the new Legislature. It's always been my feeling that because the challenge entails seating of a member for the new Legislature that it's the new Legislature that should decide. Section 14 is consistent with current state law. It provides for the conditional seating. You may recall we conditionally seated Senator Chambers on opening day because he held the certificate of election. We have not changed that. Section 15 clarifies the burden of proof and the evidentiary standard. Currently state law is silent as to what the evidentiary standard is. You may recall in your deliberations with Judge Connolly the issue of whether the standard should be preponderance of the evidence or the alternative standard being clear and convincing. Preponderance is basically 51-49 scenario in terms of what you accept and believe is factually what happened. Clear and convincing is a higher standard. We are recommending to you the standard of clear and convincing, but that's a policy decision that you all will need to talk about a little bit. And I will say to you that again look...when we did our research in terms of what other jurisdictions were doing, I think it would be fair to say that a significant number of states use the clear and convincing standard. Section 16 deals with the notion of business day deadline so that if one of our deadlines falls on a holiday or a Saturday or Sunday it's the deadline would move to the next business day. That's consistent with state law as it relates to all kinds of things. Section 17 assures the service of process between the parties. In other words, each party is entitled to have provided copies of documents that are being submitted to the committee. There were times I think during the Chambers-Sciara contest that, you know, there was...I won't say it was unclear, but the timing of servicing of documents became problematic, especially for the parties. Section 18 deals with the 40-day filing period. You may recall the current law says that a challenger must file his or her election contest or qualifications challenge 40 days after the general election is over. That is existing state law as it relates to election contests. That's also existing law in Rule 10. We chose not to change that timing, that filing time frame. Section 19 deals with the issue of multiple filings. You may recall Mr. Sciara filed two petitions within that 40-day window. There was a question as to whether he had met all the requirements necessary for him to have standing before

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

Executive Board Committee
January 22, 2018

the committee. Section 19 attempts to address that and make clear what would be allowed. Section 20 is the bond requirement. This is...Senator Crawford alluded to this in her comment to Senator Watermeier. Current law says the bond requirement is \$5,000. I'm recommending to you to increase that amount to \$10,000 based on the experience that you had in terms of cost and attorney fees associated with the Chambers-Sciara election contest. There may be those that feel we shouldn't do that and that's fine, but I wanted you to at least think about that. This is one of those, again, substantive conversations I think you need to have in your Executive Session. We also included in that provision the ability to raise the bond. I think it says the Clerk shall, but I would do it under your direction, of course, and the committee's direction. But I want you to be aware that that may be problematic because once we've established the bond and then we go to raise it, does...and the party and Mr. Sciara, as you may recall, had some difficulty coming up with the bond money. I don't know how...what that outcome would be so I just want you to think about that again as you deliberate. Section 21 allows for a response by a respondent. You may recall that Senator Chambers initially didn't respond to Mr. Sciara's petition. I think we're now...we don't make it mandatory, but we encourage it. And frankly, one of the reasons I wanted that provision in there if for some reason you thought the proposed filing and the contest or qualifications challenge was without merit, you can make a decision based on the petition of the petitioner and response by the respondent. Okay? Section 22 deals with attorney fees. Again, this is a substantive proposition that you're going to have to discuss. We spent...Senator, you noted at \$44,000-plus in terms of government public funds and paying attorney fees and the costs that were associated with the election contest. Mr. Sciara had filed a bond amount of \$5,000. But the question really is should the losing party pay? Should the state be responsible for that? Whether you leave it flexible. So as you make that judgment or the new committee would make that judgment, again, conversations you need to have. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that will conclude my remarks. I want to...I'm not going to...if you like, I can talk about Rule 10 although that's not before you today. I mean, we did...Rules Committee did have a brief conversation in January when they met. I'm glad that Senator Hilgers is here today. He can...because he and I have had a couple of short conversations about Rule 10. The Rules Committee agreed, and I think appropriately so, that defer action on Rule 10 to see what the reaction to LB744 might be and whether the body would think it's a good idea. So, Mr. Chairman, with that, I'll conclude my remarks and be happy to answer any questions of the committee. [LB744]

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Are there questions? Senator McCollister. [LB744]

SENATOR MCCOLLISTER: Yeah. Thank you, Senator Hughes. Regarding recovery attorney fees, Section 22, is there any limitation where the petitioner could obtain his or her funds to satisfy that requirement? What I'm thinking of is could that...could a petitioner use campaign funds or obtain the money from a contributor? [LB744]

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

Executive Board Committee
January 22, 2018

PATRICK O'DONNELL: You know, Senator, and I don't know this for a fact, but I think Mr. Sciara actually, to meet his initial bond obligation, there were some fund-raising activities that occurred. Okay? I don't think...I'm not aware of limitations as to how the petitioner might raise that bond money. My obligation under the current state law is to set a bond within a few days after the petition is filed. That amount is now currently \$5,000. I will tell you that Mr. Sciara stopped in the office within that time frame and asked whether I would take a personal check. I said, no, sir. I need something more secure than that. He ended up submitting a cashier's check. Oftentimes it's a bond or at least it has been in cases past. But where that money comes from, you know, I've never asked that question nor do I think there would necessarily be a limitation on the petitioner as to where that money would come from. His obligation...his or her obligation in the petitioning capacity is to post the bond in the amount that we set. [LB744]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: I don't think the NADC would prohibit a payment of that kind, do you think? [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: From campaign funds? [LB744]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: Yeah or... [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: You know, I hesitate...I tend to agree with you but I've not looked at that. I would, given the latitude that you have with the use of campaign funds, I suspect that very well may be true, Senator. [LB744]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: Thank you. [LB744]

SENATOR HUGHES: Additional questions? Senator McCollister. [LB744]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: Yeah. Is Senator Hilgers going to testify as well? [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: You'd have to ask him. I don't know. [LB744]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: Okay. At the hearing that the Rules Committee held, we talked about the membership of the committee. [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: You did. [LB744]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: And I think the original draft of this bill indicated seven... [LB744]

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

Executive Board Committee
January 22, 2018

PATRICK O'DONNELL: It did. [LB744]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: ...which is the number we had for the last hearing. [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: Right, right. [LB744]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: Was that...I couldn't find it in the text anywhere. [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: It's...I did not change it. So today since it's seven, well, you sit on the Rules Committee, right? [LB744]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: No, I don't. [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: No, you don't. Well, I can assure you that when they meet, I would reference your concern in that regard. I mean, it would be easy to change that to up to a nine-member...I don't know if you want to get much larger than nine. [LB744]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: No. I just want to not make the selection process more difficult. [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: Yeah and give the Legislature and the Exec Board the flexibility to decide what the appropriate size of the committee should be. So I actually think that's a good idea. [LB744]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: Is it more advisable to change it here in this bill (inaudible)? [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: Well, the rule is not before you today. That's only in the rule. Okay? [LB744]

SENATOR SCHEER: It's a rule. [LB744]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: I see. I understand. [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: So you won't deal with that today. When it comes out...if it comes out of the Rules Committee, as I say, I'll be talking to Senator Hilgers. And I might indicate while

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

Executive Board Committee
January 22, 2018

he's in the room, too, there are...you remember I've passed documents on to you two or three times in the last few months. There are some minor modifications to what Rule 10 looks like today as opposed to the first version you saw, just some general clean-up things, nothing really substantive. But I didn't change that, Senator, because the more you change things then people aren't sure what they currently have in front of them. But I can assure you that there will be a conversation about that... [LB744]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: Thank you. [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: ...when the Rules Committee convenes. [LB744]

SENATOR HUGHES: Okay. Additional questions? Senator Bolz. [LB744]

SENATOR BOLZ: I just have a question about I guess in my...it's Section 18(2)(a) on page 8. I'm not as familiar with election law and I'm just wondering if you could explain kind of the logic behind why the petition should contain the names of the voters whose votes are contested and then how that is...how we can do that while still protecting voting rights. [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: That provision is existing law. Okay? I think...I don't know why that's there. But I think in the nature of an election contest proceeding you're typically challenging the votes that were cast or problematic votes. And I think what that section would envision is an indication of what the nature of the problem was. As I remember, I can tell you the Byars-Korslund election contest there were some...I don't want to call them provisional ballots because that was preprovisional ballot I think, but there were ballots that the State Board of Canvassers ultimately chose to count that when the Legislature took a look at it decided they shouldn't have. So the committee actually at that point in time went against what the State Board of Canvassers had recommended. The committee ended up losing that vote on the floor. Okay? Because in that instance we had conditionally seated Senator Byars who had the certificate of election. So I don't want to get into all that war story, Senator. I think it's simply an attempt to give the Legislature...put them on notice as well as the respondent member who will be seated as to what the petitioner is alleging where the improprieties were or what was considered as part of the discussion that the petitioner is considering to be problematic. I know that's not a direct answer to your question. Part of it is I don't necessarily have an answer to why that provision is there. [LB744]

SENATOR BOLZ: Sure. And maybe I'll just comment for committee discussion later. I don't know the point at which these processes become part of our public record. [LB744]

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

Executive Board Committee
January 22, 2018

PATRICK O'DONNELL: Um-hum. [LB744]

SENATOR BOLZ: And I just want to make sure the people's voting rights are protected as we work through this process. [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: Voting...the voters themselves you're... [LB744]

SENATOR BOLZ: Correct. [LB744]

PATRICK O'DONNELL: Okay. [LB744]

SENATOR HUGHES: Additional questions? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. O'Donnell. Are there additional proponents to LB744? Additional proponents? Seeing none, are there any opponents to LB744? Seeing none, is there anyone who wishes to offer neutral testimony on LB744? Seeing none, Senator Watermeier, you are welcome to close. [LB744]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Thank you. Thank you, Chairman Hughes. I just forgot to thank Amara as well and we appreciate that. Last summer on the interim she spent an extensive amount of time and she really knows what she's doing and I just really want to appreciate that so thank you, Amara. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. [LB744]

SENATOR HUGHES: Any questions? Seeing none, that will close our hearing on LB744. [LB744]