

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 12, 2002 LB 687

SENATOR BRUNING: Yeah, I guess I don't know yet, Senator. There's a lot of uncertainty still in the budget process. I mean, nobody has really seen how things are going to work out. We'll know a lot more in a week or two, and my hope is this bill will move to Select and then the body can make the decision whether they want to spend that money. It's very significant in a very difficult year. But my argument is this is the cost of doing business. If we want to keep our employees, this is what we've got to do.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now the employees that have been here a longer period of time will not benefit from this bill as much as newer or younger employees. Is that true?

SENATOR BRUNING: No, that's not true. They'll benefit and they'll also benefit from LB 75 we passed last year, with the \$400,000 appropriation.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, but those...the two are not interrelated. If the vesting occurs sooner under this bill than is the case now, is there going to be required a higher contribution by the employee to be matched by a higher contribution from the state?

SENATOR BRUNING: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And those employees will be on the payroll for a longer period of time. They'll contribute more and the state will contribute more during the time that they are still employed. Is that accurate?

SENATOR BRUNING: The state will contribute more and those employees who are employed longer will also benefit from the annuity factor of their years of service will affect their final benefits.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If...if a current employee would remain employed for two years, would the benefit that employee receives...well, no, it couldn't be as great as what the one who has been here longer would receive, could it?