LB 219 provides that the vesting percentage will be a hundred percent after only five years of plan participation and this provision will result in a decrease of forfeitures transferred from the future service fund to the prior service fund. Now we are adding more employees, we are lowering the age, and we have reduced the hundred percent vesting to immediately after the five year period instead of adding the two percent per month which we are presently doing. And according to the fiscal impact, that amounts to $386,985 and that estimate is based on the assumption that the number of people terminating in calendar years '84 and '85 will be the same as in the calendar year '82 and the dollar amount of their forfeitures will remain the same. I believe that since we are making other changes in our retirement system that it would be foolish to make this change also which is going to have the greatest fiscal impact on our retirement system. And when we asked Roxann Brennfoerder of Bankers Life who is concerned with the employees' pension fund what the reason was for shortening this vesting period, Roxann believed that it was because state employees thought the vesting period was too long. Well, I think that there should be a little incentive past that five year period when they begin vesting, that the two percent a month is an incentive to keep that state employee and to bring them along the way we have been doing in the past instead of making another big radical change and I urge your support to bring this back for this amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President, I would oppose Senator Pirsch's change and correct some of the information that she provided. The numbers on the fiscal impact and the fiscal note are different than those as the bill is before you because of committee amendments that were adopted and changes. The original cost was estimated on the basis of years of service with the state as opposed to years of participation in the state employee retirement plan. The estimate that we have from our actuary with the change that we made which is years of participation is that the impact of this to the state is $75,000 in lost general fund revenue and it is lost in the sense that right now there are forfeitures, people who leave the state, the money is lapsed and becomes income back to the state. So Senator Pirsch, I think the impact of this section is less than say the adding the employees between age 25 and 30 so this is not the most significant section with regards to this bill as far as fiscal impact. With regards to rationale as far as the change on the vesting, the Retirement Committee has tried over the past few years to get a certain uniformity of treatment of employees, and in one of those areas is at what point when you leave you