

STROMMEN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the George W. Norris Legislative Chamber for the thirtieth day of the One Hundred Ninth Legislative Second Session. Our chaplain for today is Senator Lippincott. Please rise.

LIPPINCOTT: Lord, our state and nation has slid so far from the reverence and humility we once walked before you. Now the words of Isaiah ring true for us. Woe to those who call evil good and good evil, who put darkness for light and light for darkness, who put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter. Woe to those who are wise in their own eyes and clever in their own sight. Instead, let us be as John the Baptist said: he must become greater, I must become less. Let each of us repent and our prayer be those of the writer of Hebrews, who said, therefore, since we are surrounded by such a great cloud of witnesses, let us throw off everything that hinders in this sin that so easily entangles, and let us run with perseverance, the race marked out for us. Let us fix our eyes on Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith, who, for the joy set before him, endured the cross, scorning its shame and set down at the right hand of the throne of God. For in the words of Daniel of the Old Testament, let us be true for us today. We do not make requests of you because we are righteous, but because of your great mercy. Father, may each of us repent and surrender to our Lord's calling in each of our lives and advance the kingdom of God, which is the reign and rule of the Lord Jesus Christ, within our hearts and soul, so your kingdom will come upon the earth, as it is in heaven. And as Zachariah records, not by might nor by power, but by my spirit, says the Lord Almighty. Please send your spirit to fill this place with your holy presence. In the holy name of the Lord Jesus Christ, we ask that we will bring glory to you today. Amen

STROMMEN: I recognize Senator Jacobson for the Pledge of Allegiance.

JACOBSON: Please join me in the Pledge of Allegiance. I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

STROMMEN: Thank you. I call to order the thirtieth day of the One Hundred Ninth Legislature, Second Session. Senators, please record your presence. Roll call. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: There's a quorum present, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

STROMMEN: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Are there any corrections for the Journal?

CLERK: I have no corrections this morning, sir.

STROMMEN: Thank you. Are there any messages, reports or announcements?

CLERK: There are, Mr. President. Notice from the Health and Human Services Committee, for the notice of committee hearings. Additionally, amendments to be printed from Senator Conrad to LB937; and motions and amendments to be printed from Senator Conrad to LB937. New LR, LR345 from Senator Wordekemper, LR346 from Senator Wordekemper, those will both be laid over. A report of registered lobbyists for February 19, 2026, will be printed and found in today's Journal. Additionally, agency reports electronically filed with the Legislature can be found on the Nebraska Legislature's website. That's all I have at this time, Mr. President.

STROMMEN: Thank you. Senator Lonowski, you are recognized for an announcement.

LONOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to announce that Adams Central, the, the school where I taught and the team that I coached, became state champions in Class B Women's this last Wednesday. And so, the girls that I coached 2 years ago are now juniors and seniors, and so I just wanted to give a shout out to Coach Boyer and the Adams Central Patriots. Thank you.

STROMMEN: Thank you. Speaker Arch, you are recognized for an announcement.

ARCH: Thank you, Mr. President. Shortly, you will be receiving a handout listing the 25 bills I've designated as my 2026 Speaker Priority Bills. Every year presents different challenges, and this was no exception. This year, many of the bills that would have been requested and selected as Speaker priority bills have advanced as worksheet order bills. Just yesterday, we advanced off of General File 5 of those bills I had planned to designate as Speaker priorities. Also, because of the number of good government bills we've already taken up, some of the requests for Speaker priority designations fell outside of what I would consider a typical Speaker priority. I did, however, come up with a list of 25 excellent Speaker priorities, of course. Let me read you the numbers, and you'll be receiving a sheet of paper with the detail. LB727, LB758, LB764, LB781, LB787, LB819,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

LB826, LB835, LB852, LB866, LB888, LB904, LB905, LB914, LB955, LB985, LB986, LB1029, LB1048, LB1057, LB1086, LB1181, LB1205, LB1236, and LB1240. Thank you, Mr. President.

STROMMEN: Mr. Clerk, for additional items.

CLERK: Thank you, Mr. President. Additional item this morning, a list of 2026 Speaker priority bills will be found in today's Journal. That's all I have at this time.

ARCH: Mr. Clerk, we will move to Final Reading. Members should return to their seats in preparation for Final Reading. Mr. Clerk, the first bill is LB103.

CLERK: [Read LB103 on Final Reading]

ARCH: All provisions of law relative to procedure having been complied with, the question is, shall LB103 pass? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Voting aye: Senators Andersen, Arch, Armendariz, Ballard, Bosn, Bostar, Brandt, Clements, Clouse, DeBoer, DeKay, Dorn, Hallstrom, Hansen, Hardin, Holdcroft, Hughes, Ibach, Jacobson, Kauth, Lippincott, Lonowski, Meyer, Meyer, Moser, Murman, Prokop, Quick, Raybould, Riepe, Rountree, Sanders, Sorrentino, Storer, Storm, Strommen, von Gillern, Wordekemper. Voting no: Senators Cavanaugh, Cavanaugh, Conrad, Dungan, Fredrickson, Guereca, Hunt, Juarez. Not voting: Senators Dover, McKinney, and Spivey. Vote is 38 ayes, 8 nays, 3 excused not voting, Mr. President.

ARCH: LB103 passes. We will now proceed to LB202.

CLERK: [Read LB202 on Final Reading]

ARCH: All provisions of law relative to procedure having been complied with, the question is, shall LB202 pass? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: Voting aye: Senators Andersen, Arch, Armendariz, Ballard, Bosn, Bostar, Brandt, John Cavanaugh, Clements, Clouse, Conrad, DeBoer, DeKay, Dorn, Dungan, Fredrickson, Guereca, Hallstrom, Hansen, Hardin, Holdcroft, Hughes, Hunt, Ibach, Jacobson, Juarez, Kauth, Lippincott, Lonowski, Meyer, Meyer, Moser, Murman, Prokop, Quick, Raybould, Riepe, Rountree, Sanders, Sorrentino, Storer, Storm, Strommen, von Gillern, Wordekemper. Voting no: Senator Machaela Cavanaugh. Not voting:

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

Senators Dover, McKinney, and Spivey. The vote is 45 ayes, 1 nay, 3 excused not voting, Mr. President.

ARCH: LB202 passes. We will now proceed to LB320, and the first vote is to dispense with the at-large reading. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 45 ayes, 0 nays to dispense with the at-large reading, Mr. President.

ARCH: The at-large reading is dispensed with. Mr. Clerk, please read the title.

CLERK: [Read title of LB320]

ARCH: All provisions of law relative to procedure having been complied with, the question is, shall LB320 pass? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: Voting aye: Senators Andersen, Arch, Armendariz, Ballard, Bosn, Bostar, Brandt, Cavanaugh, Cavanaugh, Clements, Clouse, Conrad, DeBoer, DeKay, Dorn, Dover, Dungan, Fredrickson, Guereca, Hallstrom, Hansen, Hardin, Holdcroft, Hughes, Hunt, Ibach, Jacobson, Juarez, Kauth, Lippincott, Lonowski, Meyer, Meyer, Moser, Murman, Prokop, Quick, Raybould, Riepe, Sanders, Sorrentino, Storer, Storm, Strommen, von Gillern, Wordekemper. Voting no: Senator Rountree. Not voting: Senator McKinney and Spivey. Vote is 46 ayes, 1 nay, 2 excused not voting, Mr. President.

ARCH: LB320 passes. We will now proceed to LB397, and the first vote is to dispense with the at-large reading. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 44 ayes, 1 nay to dispense with the at-large reading, Mr. President.

ARCH: The at-large reading is dispensed with. Mr. Clerk, please read the title.

CLERK: [Read title of LB397]

ARCH: All provisions of law relative to procedure having been complied with, the question is, shall LB397 pass? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 20, 2026

Rough Draft

CLERK: Voting aye: Senators Andersen, Arch, Armendariz, Ballard, Bosn, Bostar, Brandt, Clements, Clouse, DeKay, Dorn, Dover, Hallstrom, Hansen, Hardin, Holdcroft, Hughes, Ibach, Jacobson, Kauth, Lippincott, Lonowski, Meyer, Meyer, Moser, Murman, Raybould, Riepe, Sanders, Sorrentino, Storer, Storm, Strommen, von Gillern, Wordekemper. Voting no: Senators Cavanaugh, Cavanaugh, Conrad, DeBoer, Dungan, Fredrickson, Guereca, Hunt, Juarez, Prokop, Quick, Rountree, and Spivey. Not voting: Senator McKinney. Vote is 35 ayes, 13 nays, 1 excused not voting, Mr. President.

ARCH: LB397 passes. We will now proceed to LB441.

CLERK: [Read LB441 on Final Reading]

ARCH: All provisions of law relative to procedure having been complied with, the question is, shall LB441 pass? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: Voting aye: Senators Andersen, Arch, Armendariz, Ballard, Bosn, Bostar, Brandt, Cavanaugh, Cavanaugh, Clements, Clouse, Conrad, DeBoer, DeKay, Dorn, Dover, Dungan, Fredrickson, Guereca, Hallstrom, Hansen, Hardin, Holdcroft, Hughes, Hunt, Ibach, Jacobson, Juarez, Kauth, Lippincott, Meyer, Meyer, Moser, Murman, Prokop, Quick, Raybould, Riepe, Rountree, Sanders, Sorrentino, Spivey, Storer, Storm, Strommen, von Gillern, Wordekemper. Voting no: Senator Lonowski. Not voting: Senator McKinney. Vote is 47 ayes, 1 nay, 1 excused not voting, Mr. President.

ARCH: LB441 passes. We will now proceed to LB663, and the first vote is to dispense with the at-large reading. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 44 ayes, 2 nays to dispense with the at-large reading, Mr. President.

ARCH: The at-large reading is dispensed with. Mr. Clerk, please read the title.

CLERK: [Read title of LB663]

ARCH: All provisions of law relative to procedure having been complied with, the question is, shall LB663 pass? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 20, 2026

Rough Draft

CLERK: Voting aye: Senators Andersen, Arch, Armendariz, Ballard, Bosn, Bostar, Brandt, John Cavanaugh, Clouse, DeBoer, Dorn, Dover, Dungan, Fredrickson, Guereca, Hallstrom, Hansen, Hardin, Holdcroft, Hughes, Hunt, Ibach, Jacobson, Kauth, Lippincott, Lonowski, Meyer, Meyer, Moser, Murman, Prokop, Quick, Raybould, Riepe, Rountree, Sanders, Sorrentino, Spivey, Storer, Storm, Strommen, von Gillern, Wordekemper. Voting no: Senators Machaela Cavanaugh, Clements, Conrad, DeKay, Juarez. Not voting: Senator McKinney. Vote is 43 ayes, 5 nays, 1 excused not voting, Mr. President.

ARCH: LB663 passes. We will now proceed to LB717, and the first vote is to dispense with the at-large reading. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 45 ayes, 1 nay to dispense with the at-large reading, Mr. President.

ARCH: The at-large reading is dispensed with. Mr. Clerk, please read the title.

CLERK: [Read title of LB717]

ARCH: All provisions of law relative to procedure having been complied with, the question is, shall LB717 pass with the emergency clause attached? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: Voting aye: Senators Andersen, Arch, Armendariz, Ballard, Bosn, Bostar, Brandt, Cavanaugh, Cavanaugh, Clements, Clouse, Conrad, DeBoer, DeKay, Dorn, Dover, Dungan, Fredrickson, Guereca, Hallstrom, Hansen, Hardin, Holdcroft, Hughes, Hunt, Ibach, Jacobson, Juarez, Kauth, Lippincott, Lonowski, Meyer, Meyer, Moser, Murman, Prokop, Quick, Raybould, Riepe, Rountree, Sanders, Sorrentino, Spivey, Storer, Storm, Strommen, von Gillern, Wordekemper. Voting no: none. Not voting: Senator McKinney. Vote is 48 ayes, 0 nays, 1 excused not voting, Mr. President.

ARCH: LB717 passes with the emergency clause attached. We will now proceed to LB718, and the first vote is to dispense with the at-large reading. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 46 ayes, 0 nays to dispense with the at-large reading, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

ARCH: The at-large reading is dispensed with. Mr. Clerk, please read the title.

CLERK: [Read title of LB718]

ARCH: All provisions of law relative to procedure having been complied with, the question is, shall LB718 pass? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: Voting aye: Senators Andersen, Arch, Armendariz, Ballard, Bosn, Bostar, Brandt, Cavanaugh, Cavanaugh, Clements, Clouse, Conrad, DeBoer, DeKay, Dorn, Dover, Dungan, Fredrickson, Guereca, Hallstrom, Hansen, Hardin, Holdcroft, Hughes, Hunt, Ibach, Jacobson, Juarez, Kauth, Lippincott, Lonowski, Meyer, Meyer, Moser, Murman, Prokop, Quick, Raybould, Riepe, Rountree, Sanders, Sorrentino, Spivey, Storer, Storm, Strommen, von Gillern, Wordekemper. Voting no: none. Not voting: Senator McKinney. Vote is 48 ayes, 1 nay-- 0 nays, 1 excused not voting, Mr. President.

ARCH: LB 718 passes. We will now proceed to LB719, and the first vote is to dispense with the at-large reading. All those in favor, vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 45 ayes, 1 nay to dispense with the at-large reading, Mr. President.

ARCH: The at-large reading is dispensed with. Mr. Clerk, please read the title.

CLERK: [Read title of LB719]

ARCH: All provisions of law relative to procedure having been complied with, the question is, shall LB719 pass with the emergency clause attached? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: Voting aye: Senator Andersen, Arch, Armendariz, Ballard, Bosn, Bo-- Bostar, Brandt, Cavanaugh, Cavanaugh, Clements, Clouse, Conrad, DeBoer, DeKay, Dorn, Dover, Dungan, Fredrickson, Guereca, Hallstrom, Hansen, Hardin, Holdcroft, Hughes, Hunt, Ibach, Jacobson, Juarez, Kauth, Lippincott, Lonowski, Meyer, Meyer, Moser, Murman, Prokop, Quick, Raybould, Riepe, Rountree, Sanders, Sorrentino, Spivey, Storer, Storm, Strommen, von Gillern, Wordekemper. Voting no: none. Not voting: Senator McKinney. Vote is 48 ayes, 0 nays, 1 excused not voting, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 20, 2026

Rough Draft

ARCH: LB719 passes with the emergency clause attached. We will now move to LB794, and the first vote is to dispense with the at-large reading. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 45 ayes, 1 nay to dispense with the at-large reading, Mr. President.

ARCH: The at-large reading is dispensed with. Mr. Clerk, please read the title.

CLERK: [Read title of LB794]

ARCH: All provisions of law relative to procedure have been complied with, the question is, shall LB794 pass? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: Voting aye: Senators Andersen, Arch, Armendariz, Ballard, Bosn, Bostar, Brandt, Cavanaugh, Cavanaugh, Clements, Clouse, Conrad, DeBoer, DeKay, Dorn, Dover, Dungan, Fredrickson, Guereca, Hallstrom, Hansen, Hardin, Holdcroft, Hughes, Hunt, Ibach, Jacobson, Juarez, Kauth, Lippincott, Lonowski, Meyer, Meyer, Moser, Murman, Prokop, Quick, Raybould, Riepe, Rountree, Sanders, Sorrentino, Spivey, Storer, Storm, Strommen, von Gillern, Wordekemper. Voting no: none. Not voting: Senator McKinney. Vote is 48 ayes, 0 nays, 1 excused not voting, Mr. President.

ARCH: LB794 passes. We will now proceed to LB821, and the first vote is to dispense with the at-large reading. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 45 ayes, 1 nay to dispense with the at-large reading, Mr. President.

ARCH: The at-large reading is dispensed with. Mr. Clerk, please read the title.

CLERK: [Read title of LB821]

ARCH: All provisions of law relative to procedure having been complied with, the question is, shall LB821 pass? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: Voting aye: Senators Andersen, Arch, Armendariz, Ballard, Bosn, Bostar, Brandt, Cavanaugh, Cavanaugh, Clements, Clouse, Conrad,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

DeBoer, DeKay, Dorn, Dover, Dungan, Fredrickson, Guereca, Hallstrom, Hansen, Hardin, Holdcroft, Hughes, Hunt, Ibach, Jacobson, Juarez, Kauth, Lippincott, Lonowski, Meyer, Meyer, Moser, Murman, Prokop, Quick, Raybould, Riepe, Rountree. Sanders, Sorrentino, Spivey, Storer, Storm, Strommen, von Gillern, Wordekemper. Voting no: none. Not voting: Senator McKinney. Vote is 48 ayes, 0 nays, 1 excused not voting, Mr. President.

ARCH: LB821 passes. While the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and do hereby sign LB103, LB202, LB320, LB397, LB441, LB663, LB717e, LB718, LB719e, LB794, and LB821. Mr. Clerk, for items.

CLERK: Thank you, Mr. President. Your Committee on General Affairs, chaired by Senator Holdcroft, reports LB1235 to General File, with committee amendments. Additionally, amendment to be printed from Senator Jacobson to LB837; and notice that the Health and Human Services Committee will have an executive session now, in room 2022, Health and Human Services now, in room 2022. That's all I have at this time.

ARCH: Mr. Clerk, please proceed to the next item on the agenda.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB720. There are no E&R amendments. Senator Kauth, I have FA349 with a note that you'd withdraw.

ARCH: So ordered.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Senator.

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB720 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor, say aye. Opposed, nay. It advances. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB745. Senator Kauth, I have FA374 with a note that you'd withdraw.

ARCH: So ordered.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Senator.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB745 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: Colleagues you've heard the motion all those in favor, say aye. Opposed, nay. It does advance. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB940. There are no E&R amendments. Senator Kauth, I have FA5-- excuse me. Senator Murman, I have FA568 with a note that you'd withdraw.

ARCH: So ordered.

CLERK: Senator Kauth, I have FA566 with a note that you would withdraw. In that case, Mr. President, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would move to amend with AM2053.

ARCH: Senator Cavanaugh, you are recognized to open on AM2053.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Actually, since my school meals bill was prioritized yesterday by Senator Hunt, I am going to withdraw this amendment. Thank you.

ARCH: So ordered.

CLERK: Senator, I have nothing further on the bill.

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB940 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: Members you've heard the motion. All those in favor, say aye. Opposed, nay. It does advance. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB1022. There are no E&R amendments. Senator Kauth, I have FA670--

ARCH: So ordered.

CLERK: Senator Kauth, FA678.

ARCH: Senator Kauth, you are recognized to open on FA678.

KAUTH: Withdraw.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

ARCH: So ordered.

CLERK: In that case, Senator, I have nothing further on the bill.

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB1022 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: This is a debatable motion. Senator Conrad, you are recognized to speak.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. Good to see everybody here after a significant snowstorm that caused some travel delays, but nevertheless is quite beautiful, in my opinion. Anyway, I didn't have a chance to give Senator Murman a heads up, as we were constrained on Final Reading this morning, but I do have a few points that I want to make sure to lift up in this regard. So one of the good things, of course, about our process is we have the public hearing process and then 3 rounds of debate. If you go back and you look at the committee statement on LB1022, the measure pending before us, you can see that there was very little engagement from the public at the committee level, and so it wasn't an, an issue that generated widespread concern or questions, at least at that juncture. And then, of course, as we have the opportunity to advance and debate bills, those, those, those deliberations are covered by the press, and are discussed on social media and in coffee shops and kitchen tables. And it's been very interesting to me that since the initial debate on General File, there's really been a considerable amount of discussion about whether or not this human relations course for substitute teachers is beneficial or not, and whether or not it should be eliminated or reformed or continued. And it's been very interesting to me that I've received a lot of feedback from Nebraskans who have all different kinds of backgrounds-- retired doctors, engineers, farmers, psychologists, et cetera, who wanted to step forward, either in retirement or a break in their career trajectory otherwise to serve as a substitute teacher. And they talked about how, of course, they met the minimum qualifications in regard to schooling, but then had to work through this course to assist them with human relations and classroom management. And quite a few Nebraskans have indicated that that training and curriculum was actually very beneficial to helping them have a successful experience as a substitute teacher. So I just want to, to lift up some of the, the shifts, in terms of public engagement on this topic from the committee level, and then through

General File and where we find ourselves today. So I, I do think that we need to pay attention to that. I think it is very important and helpful feedback. We know that under the existing structure there is a way for temporary certification before the course is completed. We know there is a mechanism under the current format for alternative coursework to be counted so that the course itself is not redundant or duplicative for individuals that already possess that training and skill set. But for those that don't, there is a lot of information being provided from the public that they do find this helpful. And I know that we talked a lot on General File that Senator Storm actually has a really good kind of companion or competing proposal to address the same issue, which does bring cost and potential barrier to addressing our substitute teacher shortage with it that was-- I believe his measure was constituent-derived. And in essence, the competing or alternative solution that Senator Storm puts forward, which I think is probably a better solution, would be to direct the Department of Education to have a uniform course, and to provide that in a more accessible way to maintain the curriculum and the training but remove the barriers, rather than the straight elimination as proposed in Senator Murman's LB1022. I'm just about out of time and I need to ask him a few questions so I'm going to punch in again.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Conrad. Senator Conrad, you're next in the queue.

CONRAD: Thank you, Madam President. And I see Senator Murman is involved in discussions with the fellow Education Committee members. I'm not sure if I can grab his attention or not. But Madam Chair, if you would see if Senator Murman would be kind enough to yield to some questions.

DeBOER: Senator Murman, will you yield?

MURMAN: Yes.

CONRAD: Thank you, Senator. I'm sorry to disrupt your conversation with another member, but I, I did just want to ask a couple of points in regards to this measure. And the first one is, we talked a little bit about this in executive session, when we were looking at your bill and comparing that to Senator Storm's proposal. Why exactly did you think that Senator Storm's proposal wasn't a viable alternative or solution, and prefer, prefer your, your proposal?

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

MURMAN: Well, the purpose of removing this requirement was to eliminate all barriers, to, to get substitute teachers mainly back into the classroom as soon as possible. And any other courses that would take extra time and, and money would pre-- present somewhat of a, of a barrier to get back in-- to get into the class room to substitute teach.

CONRAD: OK, and you didn't think that his measure, which sought to reduce cost and streamline the process, would accomplish the same, in terms of barriers or accessibility?

MURMAN: I'm not saying his course wouldn't be beneficial, but to get back into the classroom as quickly as possible, it would present a barrier.

CONRAD: OK. All right. Well, maybe we can take that up on Final Reading, or find another pathway to maybe marry together those, those issues or, or have a better path forward. And Senator Murman, I'm just going to ask you very candidly, because this has definitely been part of the conversation. Your track record is crystal clear. You are a self-described opponent of, quote unquote, DEI efforts or CRT efforts, and have introduced legislation and spoken voraciously about anything that would address racial justice or diversity or equity or an inclusion that wasn't a significant part of our debate at the [MALFUNCTION]. Is that why you're bringing this measure forward?

MURMAN: No. I am actually a proponent of justice, and, and I'm all about diversity, also. So just, just portions of those things you talked about that I don't agree with, actually.

CONRAD: OK. So do you think, Senator, it would be beneficial for substitute teachers, who maybe don't have that training because they worked as an engineer, or in ag, or as a dentist before we put them in the classroom, to give them some sort of information or tool or training about classroom management or working with diverse populations of kids, whether that's kids with disabilities or kids of color, or kids with neurodivergence. Can you help me kind of work through that, so that we can have a good experience for both the kids and the sub?

MURMAN: Well, there's a lot of things we could do, you know, to, to put extra requirements or classes that would be beneficial in some way, to teaching. But at this point, we need subs into the classroom as quickly as possible, so I am not in favor of putting any further

requirements or barriers up to getting those subs and teachers into the classroom just as soon as possible. We have a, a huge shortage of teachers. It's improving a little bit-- and substitutes. But I, I just think we need to keep those extra barriers or any kind of requirements out just to get the subs and teachers into the classrooms just as soon as we can.

CONRAD: OK. Just to follow up on that point, Senator, and thank you so much for your dialogue. Then do you think we should move-- remove all of the requirements that we presently have in the books for substitute teachers or just human relations?

MURMAN: What requirements are you referring to?

CONRAD: Well, there's a host of requirements to become a substitute teacher-- background check, requisite amount of college education-- I can't remember the other ones right off the top of my head. Those are the, the primary ones.

MURMAN: Yeah, me either. I can't remember what requirements you'd be referring to--

DeBOER: Time, Senator.

MURMAN: --but those you talked about are, are good.

DeBOER: Senator Conrad, you're recognized.

CONRAD: Thank you, Madam President. And if Senator Murman would just continue the discussion, if he'd be so kind.

DeBOER: Senator Murman, will you yield?

MURMAN: Yes.

CONRAD: My question, Senator, I just wanted to drill down on that, is if-- I, I do agree, we have a teacher shortage and we have a sub shortage. And we have made strides together to figure out how to address both of those issues, which ensure that we have qualified people on the front lines of our classroom to help kids be successful in their educational endeavor. But my, my question is, if we want to remove barriers for substitute teachers in this regard, why are you only looking at human relations? I'm not suggesting that we should change background checks or perhaps the educational requirement, but I'm just trying to, to understand why you zeroed in just on this and

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

why, for example, the temporary certification or alternative coursework path to being a substitute would not be sufficient. If Senator Murman wanted to respond to that.

MURMAN: So your question again was-- why I, I chose this particular course.

CONRAD: Yes.

MURMAN: Well, the, the two other things you mentioned, background checks and a college degree, I think are very important. And I'm not saying this is totally unimportant, but I, I think it's just an extra barrier that at this time, especially, we don't need because, like I said, we need to get teachers in the classroom just as soon as possible and as easily as possible. You know, there's a lot of things we could require, but this is just one that I think is actually an extra barrier for someone to get into the classroom where they're needed.

CONRAD: OK. Very good. Thank you so much for your time and discussion, Senator Murman. I'm going to see if perhaps we can't put our heads together, if this advances today, and put together maybe an amendment to pull it back from Final, to harmonize or incorporate some aspects of Senator Storm's solution or proposal on the same topic, which I think might provide a better pathway forward. So, just wanted to be candid about that, and appreciate your time. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Conrad. Seeing no one else in the queue, the question before the body is the advancement to E&R Engrossing of LB1022. All those in favor, say aye. All those in favor, say aye. Record vote has been requested. Mr. Clerk. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. There's been a request to place the house under call. The question is, shall the house go under call? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays to place the house under call.

DeBOER: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. Those unexcused senators outside the Chamber, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel, please leave the floor. The house under call. Senator Fredrickson, Senator Meyer, Senator Hardin, Senator Quick, Senator Andersen,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

Senator Storm, Senator Bostar, Senator Ballard, Senator Riepe, and Senator Hansen, the house is under call. Please return to the Chamber. All unexcused senators have now returned. Senator Murman, would you accept call-- call-in votes? There is a vote open. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator Ballard voting yes.

DeBOER: Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 3 nays to advance the bill, Madam President.

DeBOER: The bill is advanced. I raise the call. Mr. Clerk, for the next item.

CLERK: Madam President, Select File, LB748. There are no E&R amendments. Senator Kauth, I have FA377 with a note that you'd withdraw.

DeBOER: So ordered.

CLERK: In that case, Senator, I have nothing further on the bill.

DeBOER: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Madam President, I move that LB748 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

DeBOER: Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor, say aye. All those opposed, say nay. It is advanced.

CLERK: Madam President, Select File, LB924. There are, first of all, Senator, E&R amendments.

DeBOER: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Madam President, I move that the E&R amendments to LB924 be adopted.

DeBOER: Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor, say aye. All those opposed, say nay. The E&R amendments are adopted.

CLERK: Senator Kauth, I have FA583, with a note that you'd withdraw.

DeBOER: So ordered.

CLERK: In that case, Senator, I have nothing further on the bill.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

DeBOER: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Madam President, I move that LB924 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

DeBOER: Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor, say aye. All those opposed, say nay. The bill is advanced. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Madam President, Select File, LB956. There are no E&R amendments. Senator Kauth would move to amend with FA612.

DeBOER: Senator Kauth, you're welcome to open on your amendment.

KAUTH: Withdraw.

CLERK: In that case, Senator, I have nothing further on the bill.

DeBOER: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Madam President, I move that LB956 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

DeBOER: Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor, say aye. All those opposed, say nay. The bill is advanced. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB749. I have no E&R amendments. Senator Kauth, I have FA378, with a note that you'd withdraw.

DeBOER: So ordered.

CLERK: In that case, Senator, I have nothing further on the bill.

DeBOER: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: By the presence I move that LB749 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

DeBOER: Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor, say aye. All those opposed, say nay. It is advanced. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Madam President, Select File, LB771. First of all, there are E&R amendments, Senator.

DeBOER: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 20, 2026

Rough Draft

GUERECA: Madam President, I move that the E&R amendments to LB771 be adopted.

DeBOER: Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor, say aye. All those opposed, say nay. The E&R amendments are adopted.

CLERK: Senator Kauth, I have FA400, with a note that you'd withdraw.

DeBOER: So ordered.

CLERK: In that case, Senator Fredrickson would move to amend with FA1013.

M. CAVANAUGH: Senator Fredrickson, you are recognized to open on your floor amendment.

FREDRICKSON: Thank you, Madam President. Good morning, colleagues. Good morning, Nebraskans. This is a floor amendment. I don't know if folks remember this, but we had, had amended this bill last time on General File, so to put some protections in for the dynamic pricing for, for residents and for Nebraskans. We got some feedback from rideshares, specifically, specifically from Uber, that had wanted to do a little bit more clarification here. So this is a friendly floor amendment. I've spoken with Senator Ballard. What this amendment does is that it just kind of fine-tones it a bit more. So it says-- it adds to the bill: dynamic pricing shall not be permitted for seven days after any state of emergency declared by the Governor when such emergency impacts transportation of persons, supplies [SIC], goods or equipment. So in other words, this just ensures that the ban on dynamic pricing goes into effect when the emergency affects specifically, transportation. So if it's a state of emergency that does not impact transportation, dynamic pricing is still allowed. So I would ask for your green vote on FA1013. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Fredrickson. Senator Ballard, you're recognized.

BALLARD: Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of Senator Fredrickson's floor amendment. I just want to give, give him thanks for working with all the interested parties on making this workable for, for rideshare, and for Nebraskans, and for emergency response. So thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Ballard. Seeing no one else in the queue, Senator Fredrickson, you're recognized to close on your floor

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

amendment. Senator Fredrickson waives his closing. The question before the body is the adoption of FA1013. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 31 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of the amendment, Madam President.

DeBOER: The amendment is adopted.

CLERK: Senator, I have nothing further on the bill.

DeBOER: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Madam President, I move that LB771 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

DeBOER: Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor, say aye. All those opposed, say nay. The bill is advanced. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Madam President, Select File, LB743. There are no E&R amendments. Senator Kauth, I have FA372, with a note that you'd withdraw.

DeBOER: So ordered.

CLERK: In that case, Senator, I have nothing further on the bill.

DeBOER: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Madam President, I move that LB743 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

DeBOER: Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor, say aye. All those opposed, say nay. It is advanced. Mr. Clerk, for the next item.

CLERK: Madam President, if I could, some items for the record. Bill read this-- bills read this morning on Final Reading were presented to the Governor on February 20, 2026, at 9.58 a.m. consisted of the following LBs: LB103, LB202, LB320, LB397, LB441, LB663, LB717e, LB718, LB719e, LB794, and LB821. Your Committee on Banking, Commerce, and Insurance, chaired by Senator Jacobson, reports LB1138 to General File, with committee amendments; a proposed rule change from Senator Kauth to be printed in the Journal; notice of committee hearing from the Rules Committee; amendments to be printed from Senator Machaela Cavanaugh to LB455; Senator Brandt, amendment to be printed to LB815

and LB1010. That's all I have at this time. Madam President, as it concerns the agenda, General File, LB948, introduced by the Agriculture Committee. It's a bill for an act relating to agriculture; provides for the transfer of funds from and the termination of the Nebraska Poultry and Egg Development, Utilization, and Marketing Fund; changes the Nebraska Commercial Fertilizer and Soil Conditioner Act to the Nebraska Commercial Fertilizer and Beneficial Substances Act; defines and redefines terms; provides for the use of beneficial substances, changes and provides provisions of the Nebraska Commercial Fertilizer and Beneficial Substance Act relating to registration of products, package labeling, fees, enforcement, prohibitions, and preemption of local law; changes the Fertilizers and Soil Conditioners Administrative Fund to the Fertilizers and Beneficial Substances Administrative Fund and changes provisions relating to such fund; eliminates references to the soil conditioners; eliminates provisions relating to certain agricultural associations or societies, certain qualifying organizations, the Nebraska Dairymen's Association, the State Horticultural Society, the Nebraska Livestock Feeders and Breeders Association, the Nebraska Home Economics Association of Organized Agriculture, the Western Nebraska Organized Agricultural Association, the Nebraska Poultry Improvement Association, and certain appropriation authorizations; eliminates the Nebraska Poultry and Egg Resources Act; eliminates obsolete provisions; harmonize provisions; and repeals the original section; and outright repeals several sections of Chapter 2. The bill was read for the first time on January 9 of this year and referred to the Agriculture Committee. That committee placed the bill on General File, with committee amendments, Madam President.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator DeKay, as chair of the Agriculture Committee, you are recognized to open on the committee bill.

DeKAY: Thank you, Madam President. LB948, as introduced, amends the Nebraska Commercial Fertilizer and Soil Conditioners Act to include modernized regulatory language on beneficial substances. LB948 would rename the Nebraska Fertilizer and Soils Conditioners Act as the Fertilizer and Beneficial Substances Act. Much of the bulk of the bill is a result of harmonizing internal references within the act to this name change. The name change reflects that the act and its label-- labeling, and quality regulations are extended to encompass beneficial substances rather than more narrow terms or oil conditioners. Beneficial substances are defined by the Association of American Plant Food Control Officials, or AAPFCO, as any substance or compound,

excluding plant nutrients or pesticides, are scientifically shown to benefit plants, soil, and growing media. This includes bio-stimulants, which are rapidly developing as an agronomic tool beyond traditional fertilizers and soil amendments. Bio-stimulants are substance or microorganism-- microorganisms applied to seeds, plants, the soil, or growth media-- act to support a plant's natural processes by improving nutrient availability, efficiency of nutrient uptake, stress tolerance, that contribute to healthy growth, development, quality, and yield. The change in LB948 is consistent with the nationwide movement to update state fertilizer and soil conditioner labeling content and efficiency verification laws to encompass new types of beneficial substances, to ensure such, such products are honestly, accurately labeled to promote uniformity in regulation and facilitate further innovation. In March 2024, the AAPFCO published guidance for states to incorporate beneficial substances into state fertilizer laws. With LB948, Nebraska would join a number of states who have already done so and many others who are considering similar legislation. Apart from this substantive purpose, LB948 changes some fees under the act. The bill adds a new registration fee of \$50 per product to cover the department's cost of reviewing product labels and increases the minimum tonnage inspection fee from \$5 to \$10, and increases an annual license fee to distribute fertilizers and beneficial substances from \$15 to \$25. The bill also associated the cash funds so the fund can also be used for other plant health programs administered by the department. Also included in LB948 is the repeal of the Nebraska Poultry and Egg Resources Act and the transfer of funds from the associate-- Associated Poultry and Egg Development Cash Fund to the Nebraska Agricultural Products Marketing Cash Fund. This proposed change came about when the Nebraska poultry industry expressed interest in joining the North Central Poultry Association, a larger regional association. Lastly, this bill would also outright repeal obsolete statutes relating to the Nebraska Dairyman's Association, State Horticulture Society, Nebraska Livestock Feeders and Breeders Association, Nebraska Home Economics Association, Organized Agriculture, Western Nebraska Organized Agriculture Association, and the Nebraska Potato Council. These specific agriculture organizations are no longer functioning groups and have found representation through other associations and organizations. Current law, first enacted in 1969, authorizes appropriations to underwrite costs of the University of Nebraska and its extension service to support the mission of these organizations. The Fiscal Office was unable to identify any appropriations to the Department of Agriculture or the University for this purpose in recent memory, and

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

the statutes have fallen into disuse. I'll end there and move to the committee amendment.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator DeKay. As the Clerk indicated, there is an amendment from the Agriculture Committee. Senator DeKay, you're recognized to open.

DeKAY: Thank you. The committee amendment, AM976, is a white copy amendment that replaces the original sections of the-- and becomes the bill. The committee amendment retains the provisions of LB948 without change and adds the provisions of LB947. The provisions of LB947 added to the bill update fees of the Plant Protection and Plant Pest Act, update fees in the Pesticide Act, amends the department's duties relating to publishing and distributing the Weeds and Great Plains book-- of the Great Plains, and eliminate transfer of funds in associated cash fund and allow for the transfer of remaining funds in our Potato Development Cash Fund, which terminates July 1, 2026, to the Plant Protection and Plant Pest Cash Fund. Licensure of nursery stock distributors under the Plant Pest and Plant Protection Act and related inspection and certification services by the Department of Agriculture are intended to prevent, detect, and mitigate the introduction and spread of plant diseases that are detrimental to agriculture and the environment. The program also facilitates the ability of Nebraska's horticulture industry to enter products into interstate commerce, as our program is recognized as limiting the risks that plant, plant pests from Nebraska could introduce plant pests in those states where Nebraska products are sold. The fee changes in the Plant Protection and Plant Pest Act contained in the amendment will allow the program to continue operations and offset program reliance on General Funds. The department's activities under the Plant Pests and Plant Protection Act are funded by a combination of general and cash funds. The act's cash reserve is nearing the point of being exhausted, and without these changes, this program would need General Fund offset of roughly \$139,000 in the next fiscal year, and the shortfall would continue to grow in the coming fiscal years. Proposed changes to the pesticide registration fees contained in the bill are to prevent the Noxious Weed Cash Fund and Pesticide Administrative Cash Fund from experiencing revenue shortfalls. The bill therefore increases the pesticide product registration fee from the current \$160 to \$200, and increases the statutory cap for this fee to \$240. The zero increase in the fee would be allocated by increasing the portion of the fee to the noxious weed program, from \$30 to \$50, and a portion allocated to the Pesticide Act implement-- implementation from \$25 to \$45. These proposed fee changes keep the

program operating without a revenue shortfall and subsequent reliance on additional general funds. The provisions of LB947 in this amendment eliminates the mandatory duty of the Department of Agriculture's responsibility to publish hard copy-- copies of the Weeds of the Great Plains books. 75% of the proceeds from the sale of each book are currently placed in a Weed Book Case Fund, which accumulates over time to pay for publication of future editions of the book. The other 25% currently goes to the Noxious Weed Cash Fund. The changes would allow the department to distribute remaining books freely and dispose of the number of books that have become damaged while in storage.

Additionally, the amendment directs the transfer of any remaining balance in the Weed Book Cash Fund, which is roughly \$30,000, to the Weed Book Cash Fund to the Noxious Weed Cash Fund. Lastly, this bill would allow for the transfer of funds from Nebraska Potato Development Cash Fund to the Plant Protection and Plant Pest Cash Fund. With the passage of LB346 last year, the Nebraska Potato Development Act and associated cash fund are set to terminate on July 1, 2026. When LB346 passed, there was no language in the bill that keep these funds within the department. The transfer of the plant pest, plant pest program, we believe, will continue to benefit the potato industry participants who paid into the fund, since this money will help the plant pest program to continue nematode surveys that benefit the potato industry. It is uncertain the amount that it will be available for transfer, but all obligations of the fund would have been satisfied before the fund expires. LB946, as introduced, contained the emergency clause so that instruction to the transfer of funds from the Potato Development Cash Fund was in place before the funds expired, which would cause any balance remaining to default to General Fund. I will have an amendment to the committee amendment shortly, to allow the bill to be enacted with the emergency clause, to clarify, affecting the operational dates of different parts of the bill, as combined under the amendment. Both LB947 and LB948 were heard before the Agriculture Committee on January 27. The committee voted to add the provisions of LB947 with the adoption of this amendment 8-0, and a vote to advance the bill amended on as a 7-1 vote. Thank you.

DeBOER: Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator DeKay, I have AM2101, with a note that you'd withdraw.

DeBOER: So ordered.

CLERK: In that case, Madam President, Senator DeKay would move to amend with AM2169.

DeBOER: Senator DeKay, you're welcome to open on AM2169.

DeKAY: Thank you. AM2169 modifies the committee amendment to provide for operative and implementation dates for various provisions of the two bills combined under the committee amendment. As I mentioned previously, LB947, which is attached to LB948 by the committee amendment, contained the emergency clause, and this is carried over to the committee amendment. The e clause is necessary to accommodate the transfer of any funds remaining in the Potato Development Cash Fund to the Plant Pesticide and Plant Protection Cash Fund when the Potato Development Fund expires on July 1. Without the instruction to transfer the funds being in effect before July 1, any funds remaining would default to the General Fund. Additionally, because of a severe depletion of the Plant Pests and Plant Protection Cash Fund, LB948 as amended contains an authority to expend funds from the Fertilizer and Soils Condition Fund [SIC] for other plant health program administered by the department, which will help keep the plant pest and plant protection program solvent until the new fee schedule under the act in this bill can shore up that program's cash flow, without having to steal general funds from other programs. However, the e clause would apply to all provisions of the bill which would become effective the day after the Governor's signature. While there are provisions in-- of LB948 that we would like to become effective right away, there are other changes that we will want to not become effective until later. My amendment to the committee amendment would allow the changes to the Fertilizer and Beneficial Substance Act to become effective with the e-clause. However, the amendment revises sections of the bill that would bring beneficial substances within the regulatory provisions of the act to delay the start of the industry compliance until the first of the year. This will enable the department ample time to prepare and notify the industry, for the industry to prepare to meet its registration requirements. These changes avoid beneficial substances from being technically sold in violation, by not being registered at the time the Governor signs the bill. The underlying bill also repeals all sections of the Poultry and Egg Checkoff Program This amendment will discontinue those sections of the act that authorize the collection of check-off assessments immediately, but allow those sections that authorize expenditures of the check-offs assessments already collected to be expended until the first of the year. All the remaining provisions of the bill, as amended by the committee amendment, do not cause disruptions by going into effect with the emergency clause under this amendment. They, too, would become

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

effective with the Governor's signature. I would move to adopt AM2069 and the committee amendment as amended, and advance LB948. Thank you.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator DeKay. Senator Andersen, you're recognized.

ANDERSEN: Thank you, Madam President. Senator DeKay, would you yield to a couple questions?

DeBOER: Senator DeKay, will you yield?

DeKAY: Yes.

ANDERSEN: All too often, we consider bills, and there's fee changes and everything else. Happens all the time. The, the challenge I have with it is I don't want to increase the administrative costs to the, to the citizens, the residents, the fee changes and all that stuff, but trying to put it in context, right? So for example, on here, when you're talking about the, the minimum inspection-- tonnage inspection fee goes from \$5 to \$10. Right? Now I may think, well, \$5 to \$10, that's not very much, but it's actually 100% change, right, the increase in the fee. So it depends on, you know, when that initial fee was, what the change is. Personally, I'm an advocate for building in clauses that say that they should increase by the rate of inflation every year. That way, it takes away the question of, you know, yeah, it's 100% increase, but it's been 20 years. So with that in mind, could you provide a little context for the, the fee increases?

DeKAY: Well, the fee increases, time-- you know, over the course of time, inflation takes place. The cost of updating the labeling and stuff on some of these fees have to-- you know, they are under-- they've got to be looked at by people, and, and that takes time, and that's-- time is money, sometimes. So, these increases are very small increases. 100% on-- from \$5 to \$10 a year. Yeah, it's 100%, but it's \$5 over the course of the entire program, so.

ANDERSEN: Yeah. I think that all depends on where you sit financially and otherwise, whether 5 bucks is a lot or not. Again, I'd be in favor of doing something that is by the rate of inflation at an annual increase-- probably would be more representative of what people realize, in the increased cost of goods and services. Well, thank you. I appreciate it.

DeKAY: Thank you.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senators DeKay and Andersen. Senator Strommen, you're recognized.

STROMMEN: Thank you Madam President. Hey, I just wanted to get up again. Yesterday, I got up and spoke on a similar, similar topic, regarding fee increases The-- while again, I agree with 90% of what's in this bill, I'll just reiterate what I said yesterday, which is what we are seeing and we have seen a 49% increase in cash fund appropriations over the last 4 years Again, if you go to page 57 of the budget book, you'll see that we've gone from \$4 billion to \$6 billion, which is substantial. While the focus is typically on general funds, cash fund spending via fees and fee increases are essentially a tax increase at a time where cost of living is the number one issue on the top of everyone's mind. So, we really, really need to be thoughtful and mindful when it comes to these fee increases, as they have a significant effect on businesses, [INAUDIBLE], cost of goods sold, which get passed on and hurt everyone's bottom lines. So when we start looking at these, I think we just have to really be mindful of what we're doing here. So thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Strommen. Mr. Clerk, for an announcement.

CLERK: Thank you, Madam President. The Education Committee will have an executive session now, in room 2102. Education Committee, now, room 2102, executive session. That's all I have at this time.

DeBOER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Storm, you're recognized.

STORM: Thank you. Yeah, I'm, I'm on the Ag Committee. I'm the one vote that voted against this bill. I'm going to echo what Senator Andersen and Strommen have said. You know, the fee increase is a tax increase. And I know people might disagree with that, but the number one issue for Nebraskans is the cost of living. And we sit here, and, and as you watch throughout this session, it's a fee increase here and here and here and here, and \$5, \$10, \$100, \$200, and it's money going into the cash funds. So we lower our general funds, we increase our cash funds. Those funds will eventually be swept. So it, it is not a-- the overall amount of money we're taking from Nebraskans is, is going up, in my opinion. So that's why I voted the way I did. There'll be another bill up today, which I'm probably going to speak out, as well. It's another fee increase bill. So, thank you.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Storm. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Madam President. Would Senator DeKay yield to a question?

DeBOER: Senator DeKay, will you yield?

DeKAY: Yes

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Senator DeKay. Just listening to our colleagues talking about fee increases --and I've been a bit of a stickler on cash funds and fees, and sweeping them and moving them to the General Funds. But I was listening to your opening, and I just want to clarify for my own mind, is this a self-sustaining fund, so basically, do we need to increase the fees to continue running the program appropriately?

DeKAY: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: So it's not because we're going to move the money into General Funds to fund something else?

DeKAY: No.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. Thank you. I appreciate that. I, I introduced a bill that was in Government, I think actually this week, about reassessing fees regular-- on an annual basis, that all of our state agencies should reassess the fees. Because sometimes, they're carrying a large balance in the cash funds and that's why we're taking the money out and putting it in the General Funds, when I think that we should be assessing, maybe we need to lower those fees. But then, as this bill does, it is assessing that there are some fees that aren't high enough to maintain the programs that the cash fund is funding. And so, there are going to be times where we have to increase the fees, and this seems to be one of those instances. My hope for the future of the Legislature is that we will, moving forward, have this annual assessment of fees and cash funds, and maybe have, like we have a claims bill every year, we'll have a fees bill every year. Because so many of these fees are in statute, and that could result in fees being lowered or increased, depending on the need and the inflation, cost of living, and all of those different things. So thank you, Senator DeKay, and I look forward to moving this forward. Thank you.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh and Senator DeKay. Seeing no one else in the queue, Senator DeKay, you are recognized to close on AM2169.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

DeKAY: Thank you. I would just like to reiterate that if these fees are not adjusted, the program would need a General Fund increase of \$139,000. This makes these-- these fee increases make these programs self-sustaining, and does not put any more tax burden on our property taxpayers, so thank you.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator DeKay. Colleagues, the question before the body is the adoption of AM2169. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. There's been a request to place the house under call. The question is, shall the house go under call? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 21 ayes, 0 nays to place the house under call.

DeBOER: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. Those unexcused senators outside the Chamber, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel, please leave the floor. The house under call. Senator Hallstrom, Senator Spivey, Senator Rountree, Senator Fredrickson, Senator Glen Meyer, Senator Hardin, Senator Quick, Senator Andersen, Senator Jacobson, Senator Ballard, Senator Riepe, Senator Hansen, the house is under call. Please return to the Chamber. Senator Spivey, please return to the Chamber. The house is under call. All unexcused senators are now in the Chamber. There was a vote open. Senator DeKay, would you accept call-in votes?

CLERK: Senator Fredrickson voting yes. Senator Brandt voting yes. Senator Hughes voting yes. Senator Hansen voting yes. Senator Hardin voting yes. Senator Lonowski voting yes.

DeBOER: Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 2 nays on adoption of the amendment, Madam President.

DeBOER: The amendment is adopted. Seeing no one else in the queue, Senator DeKay, you are recognized to close on the Agricultural's Committee amendment. Senator DeKay waives closing. The question before the body is the adoption of AM1976 to LB948. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 34 ayes, 1 nay on adoption of the committee amendment, Madam President.

DeBOER: Committee amendment is adopted. Seeing no one else in the queue, Senator DeKay, you're recognized to close on the bill. Senator

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

DeKay waives his closing. The question before the body is the advancement of LB948. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 36 ayes, 1 nay on advancement of the bill, Madam President.

DeBOER: The bill is advanced. Mr. Clerk, for the next bill. I raise the call.

CLERK: Madam President, General File, LB1237, introduced by the Executive Board. It's a bill for an act relating to the State Capitol; it amends Section 28-101, 81-1108.15; prohibits bringing weapons or prohibited substance into the State Capitol as prescribed; defines terms; provides a penalty; provides a duty to the Nebraska State Patrol; harmonizes provisions; repeals the original-- [MALFUNCTION] --was read for the first time on January 21 of this year and referred to the Executive Board. That committee placed the bill on General File, with committee amendments.

DeBOER: Senator Hansen, as chair of the Executive Board, you're recognized to open on LB1237.

HANSEN: Thank you, Madam President and members of the Legislature. Good morning. LB1237 is an Executive Board priority bill and the result of extensive consultations between the leadership of the legislative, executive and judicial branches, in collaboration with the Nebraska State Patrol. The goal is to implement appropriate security measures that ensure all Nebraskans can safely enjoy the State Capitol and fully participate in the governmental functions that take place here. LB1237 prohibits individuals from knowingly entering or attempting to enter the State Capitol while in possession of a weapon or prohibited substance. The bill defines weapon to include firearms, knives, brass knuckles, pepper spray, tasers, and stun guns. Prohibited substances would be things like explosives or incendiary devices. Violations would be classified as a Class III misdemeanor. Additionally, LB1237 clarifies that the Nebraska State Patrol is responsible for security at the State Capitol. It requires the Patrol, after consulting with the Executive Board, the Governor, the Chief Justice, and the State Capitol Administrator, to implement procedures by January 1, 2027, to detect and prevent weapons and prohibited substances from being brought into the building. The Executive Board held a hearing on LB1237 on February 2. We heard testimony from proponents, including representatives from the public and advocacy groups, who emphasized the need for enhanced safety in their Capitol.

Opponents, primarily from gun rights organizations and individuals, expressed concerns about restrictions on Second Amendment rights. After careful consideration, the Executive Board advanced the bill to General File on a unanimous 9-0 vote. AM2028, which adds a fourth exception to, to allow individuals holding a current and valid permit under the Concealed Carry Permit Act to carry a concealed handgun into the Capitol. This change directly addresses feedback from the hearing to balance security needs with the rights of responsible permit owners. The amendment also makes conforming changes to Section 28-1202.01, the statute governing concealed carry in Nebraska, to include the State Capitol among the locations where concealed handguns are generally prohibited, subject to the exceptions outlined in this bill. Regarding the fiscal impact, starting in fiscal year '26-27, the Nebraska State Patrol has outlined 2 options for security procedures. Option 1, with 2 public entry points, is estimated at about \$1.4 million in fiscal year '26-27, increasing to \$1.5 (million) annually, thereafter. Option 2, with one public entry point, which would, from my understanding, be the west entrance, reduces costs by about 39% to \$870,000, in fiscal year '26-27, and \$945,000 annually, thereafter. These figures include additional staffing, equipment, and operations, all from General Funds. The Department of Administrative Services estimates \$50,000 in General Funds for electrical conduit as proposed entrances, with potential additional indeterminate costs if ADA upgrades are needed for the east or west entrances. Through conversations with Senator Clements and the Appropriations Committee, there is currently enough money within the budget of the Legislative Council to pay for these initial outlays, like metal detectors and electric-- electricity conduits, in order to put the bill into practice. The ongoing costs will require an increase in General Funds to the State Patrol budget to pay for the additional troopers to operate the entry points. This was further discussed and confirmed at our agency request hearing this last Wednesday. LB1237 is a commonsense measure to protect everyone who works in, in our-- in or visits our State Capitol-- legislators, staff, visitors, and the public-- while respecting the rights of individuals. I urge you to adopt AM 2028 and advance LB1237 to Select File. Thank you, Madam President. And again, colleagues, I'll do the best to answer the questions that I can. And I am working with some other colleagues for a potential amendment on Select File, as well, to narrow or strike the list of some of the prohibited weapons, because we, we, we have been listening to some of public and other, and other people about the types of weapons that are prohibited, but some of ones such as maybe tasers and brass knuckles and pepper spray would-- we're considering

striking those out so they are allowed in here, because those are non-lethal devices. So that's one of the amendments we're considering bringing on Select File. So thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Hansen. As the Clerk noted, there are committee amendments. As chair of the committee, you are recognized to open on the committee amendments

HANSEN: Thank you, Madam President. Yeah. The committee amendment is, is, again, laying out what I mentioned before. And with what we heard in testimony at the hearing and also being in communication with the firearm associations, we have decided-- and I have been in communication with the State Patrol and they, from my understanding, don't seem to have a problem with this, allowing those individuals who do have the carry conceal permit, the one that the State Patrol actually issues, to be able to carry in the Capitol. And so, then, we're giving the State Patrol a little bit of leeway to de-- to decide how they're going to move those individuals through. Either they kind of go around the metal detectors, such as staff would, as long as they show their license-- which they're already registered with the State Patrol, so they know, or take that out and go through the metal detectors a different way. So I think the State Patrol would be best to make those decisions about how to expeditiously move people through, so they're not kind of backing up. So we want to make sure that we get people in and out-- into the Capitol as fast as we possibly can, so we don't hold people up. So, thank you.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Madam President. Would Senator Hansen yield to a question?

DeBOER: Senator Hansen, will you yield?

HANSEN: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. So what weapons would remain prohibited if you struck the ones that you just mentioned? What are we left with?

HANSEN: Yeah. So right now, I think if we just concentrate on-- I, I would assume deadly weapons. That would be firearms and knives. And then, again, I think that's maybe part of the amendment we're looking at, is maybe being more specific about which knives, we're talking about ones-- I think, legally-- maybe Senator Conrad will, will

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

correct me here. There is a legal term for a deadly weapon that's a knife, like longer than 3 1/2 inches or 4 1/2 inches. That might be something we have to specify in the statute. So somebody with a pocket knife, a small pocket knife, isn't going to-- they have to go back to their car and take it back in there.

M. CAVANAUGH: So-- but you're going to still allow guns in the Capitol?

HANSEN: Yes. Those individuals who have the carry conceal license that the State Patrol issues-- they took the class-- would be allowed to carry in the Capitol.

M. CAVANAUGH: But not--

HANSEN: Same as we're allowing for law enforcement who come in here.

M. CAVANAUGH: But not open carry?

HANSEN: No.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. So how will we, as the people that work in this building, know who has been cleared to carry a gun?

HANSEN: The State Patrol would determine that.

M. CAVANAUGH: But will they inform us?

HANSEN: I would assume not.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK.

HANSEN: We're relying on the State Patrol, you know, to-- and if they don't have the carry conceal license and they carry in the Capitol, the metal detector would then determine who that is, and they would have to return their firearm.

M. CAVANAUGH: And so, if somebody comes in the Capitol and they are cleared to carry the firearm or they have one of the other weapons that is exempted, and then they're going to the Supreme Court, then they will still have to--

HANSEN: Because-- yeah, because we are allowing those with the carry conceal license to still carry in here, the, the Supreme Court would still probably-- they would still have their metal detectors. Because

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

I'm assuming their policy is going to stay the same, where they don't allow any firearms within the, within the Supreme Court.

M. CAVANAUGH: And then, when we have committee hearings, where we have-- what is it, the annotated committee hearing, where now there is a metal detector currently outside, are they still-- are we now going to allow people with concealed carry permits to take that weapon into the committee hearing?

HANSEN: That would probably be a discussion with the Exec-- that would be a policy change, so that would be a decision by the Executive Board to determine, like--

M. CAVANAUGH: What's the current, what's the current policy?

HANSEN: The current policy right now is with an annotated hearing, the chair has the discretion to have a metal detector so those people cannot carry a firearm or a weapon into the hearing room.

M. CAVANAUGH: So this wouldn't-- these exemptions in this bill wouldn't supersede that at this time.

HANSEN: At this time, probably not.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK.

HANSEN: We, we would have to revisit that policy and determine what's the most appropriate for an annotated hearing. Do we give the chair the discretion to determine what they want to do?

M. CAVANAUGH: Was that-- was there any discussion in committee about how this would impact that annotated hearing process that we currently have?

HANSEN: I don't think so, because there's the assumption then, then we wouldn't have to have that with annotated hearings anymore, because that, that detection is happening at the entrance now.

M. CAVANAUGH: But with the annotated hearing, they're not allowed to have the weapon in the hearing room.

HANSEN: Currently, yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: This would now change that and allow them to have the weapon in the hearing room.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

HANSEN: Yep. Those individuals who are cleared by State Patrol who have the carry conceal license, yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. Thank you. Thanks for answering my questions.

HANSEN: Yep.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh and Senator Hansen. Senator Brandt, you're recognized.

BRANDT: Thank you, Madam President. Would Senator Hansen answer a question, please?

DeBOER: Senator Hansen, will you yield?

HANSEN: Yes.

BRANDT: Senator Hansen, I'm kind of curious. You've done a lot of research on this. Your committee's done a lot of research on this. We've talked about this for years. How does Nebraska compare to some of the other states? Are we in the middle of the pack, or we're wide open, what do some of the other neighboring states do?

HANSEN: Yeah. Actually, I was just looking at that information now. I had that-- because there's multiple states that have metal detection, and a lot of them vary by the state, right? We're kind of modeling ours after what Texas, Kentucky, Kansas does, where they allow those individuals who have a carry-- you know, some kind of carry conceal license, to be able to still carry in the Capitol, but still detect those people who are unqualified, I guess, according to the carry conceal license, to not be able carry in the Capitol.

BRANDT: So is Nebraska currently the only state that has no metal detection in its Capitol?

HANSEN: I think there's maybe three or four other ones that don't have one, but yeah. We're on the sh-- the very, very short list of Capitols that don't have any kind of detection for deadly weapons when somebody walks into the Capitol.

LONOWSKI: And I guess my last question, you did mention because we are not ADA accessible except on the north end, if you use the west and the east entrance, it would have to include funds to make those ADA accessible. Is that correct?

HANSEN: That is correct. And currently, I believe, even in the statute, it would allow those individuals to use the north entrance, based-- or this is-- maybe it's not in the statute, but the State Patrol's indicated to me that they would allow people that-- the north-- to use the north entrance who need ADA capability, and they would, they would bring them in, as needed, until we get the ADA set up on the east or the west entrance.

BRANDT: All right. Thank you for that information.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Brandt. Senator Conrad, you're recognized.

CONRAD: Thank you, Madam President. Good morning, colleagues. I understand the goal that the Executive Board is trying to advance to improve accessibility, particularly in regards to ADA issues and compliance. That's a good goal. I understand the goal that they're trying to advance to ensure a safe work environment and a safe overall Capitol environs for all of our visitors and citizens and staff and elected officials, who have reason to visit this beautiful building, engage in the process or as part of their public service. I appreciate and understand those good goals. However, I'm just generally opposed to this measure, both as introduced and as amended. And I, I really-- I don't know how else to say it, other than I think it's half-baked at best. I've never seen a fiscal note like this, that is a fiscal note with alternative proposals, none of which are clear in, in terms of which direction we're headed, are probably grossly understated, based upon the experience of a decades-long building administrator, Bob Ripley, who came be-- forward-- came forward at the committee level, to talk about any sort of changes to the Capitol, and the historic and structural issues that go along with that, and how cost-cutting actually can create a pretty significant amount of headaches and heartaches for historic preservation and for the taxpayers ultimately. There's a significant lack of specificity in regards to the definitions and the timeline. This measure contains additional and new criminal penalties, which has been a "reoccurrent" theme in this Legislature as of ra-- as of late. And I think it will create really, a chilling and kind of chaotic environment, as people seek to petition their government for change, or to visit here or to conduct their business here. A couple of additional points that I want to lift up. Political violence is wrong. It's always wrong. And we have to speak out voraciously, regardless of who the target of that political violence may be. And there has been a rise in political violence as the temperature has arisen in our political and public discourse in recent years. And we've seen abhorrent acts, like an attempted

assassination attempt of the President in a public forum. We have seen gun violence be wrought upon members of Congress in a variety of different public forums. We've seen, of course, a hostile and violent takeover and insurrection of our nation's Capitol on January 6, to prevent the facilitation of a peaceful election. We have seen state lawmakers gunned down in their homes recently, in other states, and we've seen high profile political figures assassinated in large public gatherings. So a couple of points. Number one, I think it's critical that we address the root causes of political violence and how our actions and words either help to reduce or foment that broader issue. Additionally, many members of the Executive Board and otherwise who are pushing this forward say, well, we got to do something, we gotta do something because those state senators in another state were shot. Yes, that is horrific. They were shot in their homes. They weren't shot when they were doing their business in the Capitol. Same for the other recent, high-profile elements of political violence that I mentioned, with the exception of January 6, of course, in our nation's Capitol. I am going to run out of time here, but plan to spend the rest of the morning on this measure. I'm very opposed to this for fiscal policy, practical, and legal considerations, and I want to achieve the goals that the Executive Committee has set forward for--

DeBOER: Time, Senator.

CONRAD: --accessibility and safety, but it's not contained in this legislation.

DeBOER: Time, Senator. Senator Spivey, you're recognized.

SPIVEY: Thank you, Madam President. Good morning, colleagues and Nebraskans that are joining us. I hope everyone has been safe with the unexpected snow that hit. I feel like going from 70 degrees to negative 7 and 6 inches was a, a big swing, and so, hopefully, folks are safe at home or at work as they are watching and engaging with us this morning. I wanted to stand up and just provide just some insight as I was thinking about this. Some of my colleagues that are part of the Executive Board asked for my feedback as they were working to develop what is in front of us today, which I appreciated that, and don't know where I stand on the current underlying bill and the AM, but again, just wanted to offer some thoughts and context as I think about this. I do think safety is important. I am an Omaha senator. And so, when I go to other local political subdivisions' homes-- think City Hall in Omaha-- they do have a strict no-weapon policy. And so, you cannot bring in tasers, knives, any type of what I guess is

considered and what we're defining as the, the legal weapons and what's contained in LB1237. And you also, for example, can't bring in anything that has like a sharp metal edge. I was going into the-- a city hall with someone and they had a hair pick that was made with metal and had points, and they could not bring it in because it could be used to still stab someone, even if it was not considered an actual knife in the, the same way, with a blade, and so they had to, you know, put it outside, or leave it, or throw it away. And so, I have been in other spaces engaging with government officials-- elected, appointed-- doing different types of business, and that is just the expectation, and, and you, and you adhere to it. I think, coming here, I can appreciate the openness of the people's home, that we are saying we want folks to come in. I do think in the political environment that we are in, I have been concerned about safety and what does that actually mean. After there was a lot of noise in the media about the posters being taken down here in the Capitol, there was an incident where there was a person dressed in fatigue clothing knocking at a senator's door-- actually, "bamming" on their door. The office was closed, and they were demanding to get let in. They were screaming in the hallway. And I, as well as my staff, felt very unsafe. I didn't know who this person was. There was not a clear path that I could leave from my office to go get the State Patrol. We did call, but again, we have to recognize that in this day and time, whether political violence has taken place in an actual Capitol or government building or in-- out in community, that there is more heightened sensitivity in, in incidences that we are made aware of, for whatever reason. And so I do think I would like to see, and when I was talking to my colleagues that were on the-- that are on the Exec Board around this, that I would to see some stronger security measures. The folks that come here are performing an act of service. We make sacrifices every day to represent our communities, to engage in trying to make Nebraska better. We have staff here that come because they want to add value to the political process and on what we develop from a policy standpoint, and folks want to go back home. Folks want to go back home to their families. Folks want to feel like they're in an environment where their, their physical safety is prioritized. And I do worry with the exceptions that are in the amendment and then still allowing for folks that have the permit to carry inside the Capitol doesn't really actualize, I think, the underlying intention of this bill. You know, there-- there's lots of conversations around accessibility to firearms, specifically, and that we do not have enough regulation around that. And so, if that is going to be the measure of who can come in still with a firearm, that doesn't provide a sense of safety

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

to me, again, for the original intent of what I think the Executive Board is really working to address. So I see my light is on. I know my time is running out, but just wanted to kind of offer those thoughts that I was sitting with as I worked with members of the Exec Board when they were sourcing feedback from their colleagues. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Spivey. Senator Clouse, you're recognized.

CLOUSE: Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this bill. I do have a lot of concerns and questions, and I think everyone has, and I think this needs to be well thought out and deliberate as to what we're doing. And it-- it's important that we provide the security that we need in this facility. We have a lot of visitors in this commun-- in this building, third graders, fourth graders, a lot of kids running around. And I think it's important that we have a secure, safe environment. So this is a work in progress, and I, I hope we keep moving forward with it, because I think it is an important issue. Senator Hansen-- I'd ask, ask Senator Hansen to answer a question.

DeBOER: Senator Hansen, will you yield?

HANSEN: Yes.

CLOUSE: OK. Thank you, Senator Hansen. I was looking at when we have the definition of weapons and it has pepper spray, and that's when it kind of jumped out at me. You know, my wife and a lot of the ladies have pepper spray in their purses. Is-- when it says to get approval from the Nebraska State Patrol, is that if they come in they have to have-- they just show it to them, or what does that look like, or do we even know yet? Have we gotten that far?

HANSEN: Yeah. It's a good question. I addressed that in my opening. That is actually--

CLOUSE: I, I missed that. I'm sorry.

HANSEN: Yep. That's one of the things we're going to be-- I, I am about 98% positive the amendment on Select File is going to end up striking the pepper spray part.

CLOUSE: OK.

HANSEN: And so that would be an allowable item to have in here. I might try to push for almost all nonlethal devices that people could

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 20, 2026

Rough Draft

still carry in here, like brass knuckles, taser, stun gun. It's the more deadly weapons that I'm concerned about, which is the kni-- the firearms and the knives.

CLOUSE: OK. Thank you. And I, and I apologize for missing the opening. We had a lot of, a lot of things we're working on here this morning, and I apologize for missing that. So anyway, I would just support continue moving forward with this bill and amendment and, and doing what we need to do to make this facility, this building, the "people's house," as safe as we can. So, thank you.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Clouse. Senator Andersen, you're recognized.

ANDERSEN: Thank you, Madam President. And I rise in support of LB1237 and AM2028. I thank Senator Hansen and the Executive Board for the work they've done. The political environment has become much more hazardous and sometimes violent, so addressing it proactively, I think, is a smart thing to do. I appreciate the amendment because, foundationally, we do have the Second Amendment rights. Right? You do have the right to bear arms, and you should. I think that the provision within the amendment is right on, to allow for somebody that has a concealed carry permit to self-identify with the State Patrol and then be allowed to carry. The person that you want in the place is a person with a CCW. That means they understand, they've had training in how to handle a weapon, they know how to shoot a weapon. They, they understand the laws, and they, they typically have-- they have to have a background check done, so you know that they're not-- don't have a criminal background. So I think checking in with the State Patrol, and notifying them that you are carrying and that you have a CCW and have the permit, I think is the, the right thing to do. I would also say that if you look at, at many of the, you know, unfortunate mass shootings that we see, a lot of them are at schools and churches. And why is that? Typically, that's because those are the places that ban, ban guns. They ban weapons. So the easiest place to go shoot up is a place where you're not allowed to carry a weapon. And bottom line is the best way to stop a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun. So I thank Senator Hansen for the, the bill, and the Executive Board, for the work they've done, and I rise in support of the bill and, and the amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Andersen. Senator Hansen, you're recognized.

HANSEN: Thank you, Madam President. I want to kind of may-- try to address some of the concerns that Senator Conrad had. She mentioned the fiscal note. And the fiscal note does have different options in there because it would be a determination of the Executive Board on whether to do one entry point or two entry points. I think, in my opinion-- again, it would, it would be up to the Executive Board to make this decision, just because of the cost, I think, and the implementation of this, to make sure it's done correctly. I would recommend maybe doing one entrance first, which would probably be the west entrance, which has already, two doors on there, and this is what the State Patrol has indicated to me, as well, that that would be the easiest one to do. Get that up and running, start it, get the policy and procedures in place, and then open it up to possibly two entrances, which would then be the east entrance. And then, who knows, maybe even down the road, if things work out well, you can open it up to the south entrance, if that's doable, as well. So that would be my, that would be my opinion, but again, it is up to the Executive Board to determine that. She mentioned the penalty part. Yes, it is a Class III misdemeanor, I believe, if somebody knowingly carries a firearm in here. That is something I'm willing to work with her on, too. And if that's something we need to kind of either get rid of or look at tweaking a little bit, I'm willing to discuss that with her and see if there's something we can move forward with that, as well. I think we just mirrored this bill after maybe what, what other State Capitols have done, and so that's why you put some of this stuff in here. But like Senator Clouse said, it is a little bit of a work in progress, like is-- it should be. We want to make sure that we're being-- you know, making good decisions with what we're trying to implement here, because this does determine how the people do come in-- into the Capitol, and so we want to make sure that we-- make sure we do it the right way. And he also mentioned, Senator Clouse did, that we are responsible for everybody in this building, for the most part. And we require fourth graders to come in here. We have our staff. We have visitors. So we want to make sure that we can do everything that we can, but without restricting these people's rights, or their ability to come in here and, you know, counsel their state senator or others-- to hold them up too much at all. So I think we found that good balancing act here between allowing gun-- the responsible gun owners to carry in here, you know, based on the carry and conceal license, you know, making the appropriate changes to the building-- in the State Capitol, so we can get people in and out quickly, so I, I think we, we found a good balancing act. And again, I think an amendment on Select File would be appropriate, which we're going to address some of

these other things that I mentioned already. But I'm willing to work with all the state senators here and see how we can make this the best bill possible, not just for our safety, but for the people of Nebraska, as well. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator Conrad, you're recognized.

CONRAD: Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate Senator Hansen's and other senators, other leaders in this body's willingness to have dialogue on this and to continue to work on this. I do have concerns about the creation of a new criminal penalty. And I also, I guess, was a bit surprised, in reading the committee amendment, about how there seems to-- there purports to be some sort of prior approval process that the Nebraska State Patrol can provide to individuals that essentially would be a permission slip or exception to an otherwise existing criminal law, and I'm just-- I'm not aware of any other aspect of law that works that way. And I don't understand how the grant of immunity or whatever it purports to be, from citation or prosecution, perhaps, is decided, is bestowed, is communicated, if there's criteria, I just-- that, that, that seems incongruent to how criminal law works, just generally, and so that's something we, we definitely need to hash out more. As this overall measure was first starting to be discussed in the interim period and then through present day, there's also been a lot of rumblings, primarily off the record, about whether or not there would be [MALFUNCTION] a fast-pass system for senators and staff and potentially even lobbyists. And I just want to be crystal clear. I understand that people have to come here to do their business. I'm not dunking on lobbyists. Their work is protected by the First Amendment. But I do just want to lift up that I will voraciously fight any sort of two-tiered system that gives special treatment to senators, staff, and lobbyists, and treats the citizenry in a disparage-- a dis-- dis-- disparate manner. I, I think the, the optics of that are terrible. I think that is an absolutely awful policy. So I don't know if there's been more discussion about this, if that's flushed out, or at least kind of generally raised, in regards to the fiscal note, in terms of which doors are going to be open or not, and how the accessibility will work or not. Again, those are issues that we need to, to flush out. I do just want to also note that we do have armed guards in the Chamber as we conduct our work. We do have armed guards in most committee hearings, so it's not like we're starting from scratch. We definitely need to figure out how to get a tighter, better definition on any controlled substances or the weapons. There's lack of clarity, in terms of incendiary device. Does that include a lighter, or matches, or a firework? Is it meant to

include just things like bombs? I don't-- I'm not 100% sure what the Executive Committee's contemplation is in that regard, if it's any sort of fire starter or combustible device. When it comes to the, the knives themselves, Senator Hansen and others are exactly right. This has been a confusing point of contention in courthouse security and in Nebraska case law, trying to discern exactly what the appropriate definition is in that regard. And, of course, we all have kitchenware in our offices, where we're cutting carrots or apples or whatever, because we frequently are, are eating lunch here quick, in between debate and committee hearings, and there's no clarity in terms of how that, perhaps, is addressed. There's existing criminal penalties in regards to criminal mischief, and vandalism, and trespass, et cetera, which are not, again, being contextualized in the court-- course of this measure. And I, I just have a, a ton of questions about how this works for, if say, for example, a senator or a staff member is carrying a weapon into the building-- or let's say a senator. Are they allowed to do that? How does the constitutional provision of legislative immunity apply in regards to this? Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Time, Senator. Thank you, Senator Conrad. Senator Jacobson, you're recognized.

JACOBSON: Thank you, Madam President. Well, I rise to really express that I am on the Exec Board. I was there for the hearing and the discussion. I've got mixed feelings about the bill. I, I think that it-- as Senator Hansen said, we need to thoroughly discuss this bill and express what our concerns are. I think the original iteration of the bill was, was strongly opposed by those who were licensed carry people. That pretty much dominated the testimony. I would tell you that the, the real concern here is the rising level of discourse in politics today, and when do they ramp this up to a level to where it could include deadly weapons? I was here in 2023, for the circus that went on during that, that, that two or three days. I sat where Senator Guereca sits today. And so from the north balcony, I was pummeled in the head at least three times, and I realize that Senator Guereca and I have shared the fact that we have a fairly easy target with our heads. But, but again, not deadly weapons, but people expressing their-- the, the discourse, and expressing their opposition by attacking in some sort of way. So the question really becomes how much is that going to get amped up, and do we want to be trailing or leading? My son had a home in-- along-- near Capitol Beach, a few years ago, and I remember there were several car accidents that occurred at the intersection where his house was at, and they were

really bad accidents. And they-- the neighbor kept turning it into the city and saying, you need to put stop signs here. And the city's position was, we need to wait for somebody to get killed here before we put up a stop sign. I thought, well, that's an interesting litmus test, that you have to-- somebody has to die in an accident before we take it seriously and put stop signs up, and that's kind of what I think is happening here. Well, I think we've demonstrated that the Capitol has an outstanding surveillance system. We have cameras out here to pretty much find-- if anybody does something inappropriate, we're going to catch it on cameras. Now, that doesn't help the person-- that doesn't help the person that got shot or stabbed, but it does help us identify who that person was after the fact. And so, there are a number of challenges that go with implementing something like this. I think many of them have been mentioned. The only ADA compliant area into the Capitol is on the north entrance. There's no parking really, to speak of, on the north side. So then, you look at, well, you go to the west side. And again, the Capital Commission is going to have to weigh in on what kind of modifications they want to do for ADA compliance. And then we have to also do the readers, and how do we equip that for electricity and so on, without defacing the Capitol. Those are all concerns. But the parking is on the south and the west sides-- or the south and east side. Now-- so that creates a problem, and, and how much do we want to cause it a problem for the public to go figure out which, which entrance to come into the Capitol building. So I understand the reason the bill was brought and the concern on the political discourse. At the same time, I'm also concerned that we want the Capitol to be accessible, and we can certainly badge in for senators and their staff and potential lobbyists. And there's risks that go with that as well. So you can get in, but we still have the general public. And then we also don't want to forget that there's a lot of fourth graders that come into this Capitol every year, and do we want to protect them against problems that may occur? And then, when you start doing the carve-out for those who have carry permits-- so certain people are going to be carrying and others are not. How much of a problem is that? So this needs some debate. I-- I'm, I'm indifferent at this point, as to how I'm going to vote. I'd probably vote to move it to Select and see what we end up with for amendments at that time, but a lot of issues to think about. With that, thank you, Madam President, for the time.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Jacobson. Senator Dungan, you're recognized.

DUNGAN: Thank you, Madam President. Good morning, colleagues. I appreciate some of the conversation we've had here today. I rise, still, I guess, ambivalent about the AM and the LB, or torn, I guess you could say, about how I'm going to vote on this. I've been listening to the debate today to better understand some of the issues that are going on here, and I think that both sides have raised really good points. At the heart of this, I think you're sort of balancing safety with transparency and openness. And one of the things that I've always loved about the Nebraska State Capitol is that it's so open. The fact that there are people before us who fought tooth and nail to keep this Capitol open and available to the public, I think is worth noting and trying to uphold. I love that high school students can just walk in, bring a book, go up to the 14th floor, sit in the Rotunda up there and read, or I've seen people walking around, taking pictures, just spending time here. And I think the openness of the Capitol is part of the thing that makes it so special, and I love that the "people's house" has that openness and availability. At the same time, I understand that with today's society, there's a lot of fear that exists, and there's a lot of threats of physical violence that have happened. And so, you know, when I talk to staff, in particular, who deal with a lot of members of the public, who sometimes aren't the happiest with us or the things that we do, there's a fear that exists. And, you know, I don't know if it's entirely fair for staff to have to bear the brunt of that anger and frustration that oftentimes is directed at us, but the staff are the ones who are dealing with those folks. And I think that ensuring there's a level of safety and a level of security that those individuals, I think, feel when dealing with other people, who may be upset or, or threatening, is important. At the end of the day, though, I think a lot of what's been discussed already, with regards to this provision or these-- this part of the bill being maybe a little bit half-baked, I think is prob-- probably true. I think there's enough questions of the interplay between carry concealed and the requirement of a permit and who can or cannot have a firearm in the Capitol, balancing open carry with concealed carry and Second Amendment rights, there-- there's just a lot of question marks that we have there. In addition to that, you know, the creation of the Class III misdemeanor that's been discussed already by Senator Hansen, I think, gives some pause, just by virtue of the fact that we continue to have these penalties and the idea that exercising a, a right in the Capitol could lead to a crime, I think, is potentially problematic. So there's just a lot of interplay between those things here. So I'm gonna continue listening to this debate. I just wanted to get up and note that I do think there are valid arguments on both sides of this

particular issue, but I do that rushing something through is going to be potentially more problematic than turning back around and trying to stop things after the fact when you've implemented a bill that has problems and holes. So with that, I will continue to listen to the debate, but I do encourage people to engage in this conversation and, and listen to what people are talking about back and forth, because I think that It's an important issue, and we want to make sure that the "people's house" remains open, but also obviously a place that people feel safe in. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Dungan. Senator Dorn, you are recognized.

DORN: Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. I wanted to get up on the mic and talk a little bit about this-- on the exec board, but how this bill came about, and Senator Hansen for introducing it, and I wanted also to make this comment. Seven years ago, when I came up here, I was-- this type of bill, I was opposed to, or whatever. I didn't think we needed it. I think most people, and maybe it's been said on the mic, most people know what's going on in the country, the United States, and what we all have in front of us-- issues in front of us. And now, very supportive of this bill, and working through it, and getting, I call it the things in place that we need to get in place, but that there will be some growing pains. And later on, there will be some things that are going to have to be adjusted. I see Senator Hansen's talking to somebody else, but I wanted to ask him a question, if I could, Madam President. Senator Hansen.

DeBOER: Senator Hansen, will you yield?

HANSEN: Sure.

DORN: Thank you. Thank you, Senator Hansen. The part of the amendment and the concealed carry, and may-- and maybe you've talked about it some, but if you could reiterate that more. Right now, if somebody just-- if the thing was in place and somebody just showed up and had a concealed carry, and they say, hey, you said I could come in, that may not occur. It-- you're having a lot of discussion chat.

HANSEN: Yeah. I think with this bill, we're putting the guardrails in place about what we think is best policy, but also don't want to hamstring the State Patrol and security too much and micromanage that process, where we kind of hinder people from being able to get in or slow the process down. So we're going to be working closely with the State Patrol, to say, OK, what's the best way we can get people with a

carry conceal license in the building quickly, you know, and making sure we're respecting their rights, and also the people who don't have one, you know, so we're-- it's-- we're kind of leaning a little bit on the State Patrol about how best to move people through here.

DORN: Well, thank you. Thank you very much, because I know we did have discussion in Approp-- in Exec Board, about the fact that what if somebody just shows up and they have a concealed carry? They have the-- that card, or whatever, will they be allowed to go in, or do they need to-- one of the discussions we had, do they need to, I call it let the security here or the State Patrol here ahead of time know that Wednesday, I will be there, and those types of things?

HANSEN: Yeah, and I think it's a good question. So how I see this working out and what the State Patrol has communicated to me-- and again, they can correct me afterwards if I'm wrong. But already, the people who have the carry conceal license, who've taken the class, they have the, the-- you know, the State Patrol-issued badge, they are already a part of a registry, to some extent. They already have-- they already know who's here. So even if you've never-- at least is the way I would see it, is even if you've ever been in the Capitol before, you have a carry conceal license that's issued by the State Patrol that's current, you should be able to get into the Capitol with your carry conceal, as long as the State Patrol verifies that license.

DORN: Yeah. But just don't show up without it and then expect to get in.

HANSEN: Yes.

DORN: Because there will be need-- there will need to be some verification that's part of the discussion or whatever. So yes, very supportive of this bill, very supportive of the amendment to it. I think the time has come for the people of the state of Nebraska and particularly, the State Capitol, to have some different security measures than what we're used to, so thank you. I'll yield my time.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Dorn. Senator Hunt, you're recognized.

HUNT: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, colleagues. Good morning, Nebraskans. At this time, I'm rising in opposition of LB1237, to put up the metal detectors, to prevent the guns in the building, all of this type of stuff. And I think, I think some people are kind of surprised to hear me share that point of view, but I can, I can

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

elucidate that a little bit more. My whole thing in here-- I don't know. I, I understand the reason for the bill. I understand the rationale for it. I don't think that it's quite thought through. I-- I'm eager to see what version we have on Select File. But what activates and motivates me in here is that I'm not afraid of Nebraskans. I'm not afraid of Nebraskans with guns. I'm not afraid of trans-Nebraskans. I'm not afraid of Nebrasans and the way that they vote at the ballot box. I'm not afraid of homeless Nebraskans. I'm not afraid of immigrants, regardless of their legal status. I'm not afraid of people in the balcony who want to throw tampons at me, and I'm not afraid of guns. I'm not afraid of people who come in here with guns. You know, we talk about the gun hearings that we've had over the years. In 2020, we had the bill that was introduced by Senator McCollister, to require gun dealers to give a pamphlet about suicide prevention to people who purchase firearms. And I think that there was also a bill during that hearing to require background checks at gun shows. And that bill brought out hundreds-- and that's not an exaggeration-- hundreds of gun owners to the Capitol to testify in opposition to those bills. I don't think we've seen anything like it since, even with some of the most hot button, you know, controversial things that we've debated here. And at that hearing, there was at least one overflow room for opponents to the bill, and the overflow room was right next to my office at the time. It was one of the "bowling alley" offices on the first floor, as we call it. And to go in and out of my office, I had to go through a horde of, you know, these opponents to the bill, many of them armed, many of them, frankly-- I mean, I'm not stupid, many of them frankly acting pretty intimidating toward me. I was a proponent of those bills. And a lot of the guys-- and they were all men in the hallway, holding their long guns, holding their AR-15s in the Capitol-- were quite intimidating to me. They were teasing me. They were doing this type of thing to me where they're, you know, acting domineering. And I was asked by State Patrol at the time, just because of the proximity of my office, if I wanted an escort at that time. And I said "no" to them. And to these men who were lunging at me and intimidating me in my office in 2020, around that hearing, I said, "what are you gonna do, shoot me? Shoot me. You won't, because you're a coward." I would never have my children embarrassed that their mother can't walk around without a gun. That's the difference between me and those people. I'm not afraid of Nebraskans with guns. I'm not afraid of Nebraskans at all. And I think that the work that the State Patrol has done in this building throughout the history of the Legislature, throughout the history of the Capitol, has been very good to protect us from threats from the

outside, to investigate threats that are made against us, to protect our staff. And you know, I understand that this is in everybody's view. And I also understand that I'm coming from a place of choice here because, as an elected official, I'm one of the people who chose to be in the arena. You know, you run for office, you file, you go through all the work, knowing that something like this can happen to you. You see what happens, you know, to, to Melissa Hortman, the, the Speaker of the House in Minnesota, who was gunned down in her home. Other instances around the country of political violence that we have seen, which is all wrong, which is all inexcusable, but in the Capitol, I trust the State Patrol to keep us safe here. I'm not afraid of Nebraskans with guns, and I think that the remedy for this problem of political violence is to lower the political temperature, to stop the provocative crap, not to increase the paranoia, especially in a way that I believe will be enforced very unequally by passing LB1237. I think that if we're serious about addressing the problem of political violence, we need to look within. We need to look at ourselves. We need look at what we are doing as elected officials--

DeBOER: Time, Senator.

HUNT: --to raise the level of violence and address that here and now. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Conrad, you're recognized.

CONRAD: Thank you, Madam President. Again, good morning, colleagues. And I-- I'm glad that Senator Jacobson and Senator Hunt mentioned our experience in 2023, because it was a very highly pitched moment in our work and in our public life, and there were literally thousands of Nebraskans that peacefully engaged with their government and sat in hallways for hours, waiting for a few minutes to testify on the record. There were protests, there were rallies, there was considerable noise and en-- and engagement at every juncture along the way, but there-- even at that most highly pitched moment, there, there actually wasn't any violence. And I know that perhaps Senator Jacobson was traumatized by tampons or pads being in his vicinity. But again, are we going to ban those from the Capitol? I mean, that, of course, is not contemplated in this measure, but I say that not to be facetious, but to reground what, what are we actually talking about here? The other thing that I think is important to note is like, so if we're going to allow for an exception with a concealed carry permit, even though we abolished that requirement a few years ago, to facilitate Second, Second Amendment rights, how are those still

provided or updated. I understand they're there on a voluntary basis. How will those be checked? If somebody-- do they have to be a valid permit? Can they be an expired permit? If somebody doesn't meet the requisite permit requirement contemplated in the amendment, then what happens? Do they have to leave the Capitol? Do they have to dispose of their weapon? Are there-- is there safe storage available at that point? None of these things are, are kind of fleshed out. And again, Senator Hansen and others noted that we already have a separate set of security system in place, in regards to the judicial branch, and then the Governor, of course, has his own security detail, but I don't understand how this proposal works within that context. So if somebody enters the Capitol with a weapon, but they have a concealed carry permit according to the amendment, then are they allowed to access the Governor's space or the Supreme Court's space, or there's a separate set of rules, dependent upon where you're at, which, I think, again, could be very chaotic and confusing, and is not fleshed out, in terms of the measure or the amendments. I think it's unclear exactly how the purported exception is supposed to play out. And Senator Cavanaugh tried to ask, perhaps, some questions to learn more about this. So if somebody who has a concealed carry permit, even though we don't require those, for people to have concealed carries anymore, do they actually have to conceal it? Can they have an open carry, in that regard? Does it apply to all kinds of weapons or just handguns? Again, these are just some basic, serious questions that I was thinking when I had a chance to review the committee hearing last night, and look at the measure and the amendment today. But again, I understand the goals of the legislation, but none, none of these things are fleshed out at all, in the least, in terms of-- really vague definitions, a lack of clarity in terms of cost and implementation. There seems to be a pretty grant-- broad grant of authority to some future Legislature or some other branches of government or some unelected bureaucrats in the Capital Commission to somehow sort this all out after we pass this, this authorization in LB1237, and I, I just don't think that's good practice. We need to be clear and we need to legislate with specificity so that members actually know what they're voting on, so that we don't unlawfully delegate these authorities to other branches, or to other state agencies, so that the public knows what we're talking about in terms of what is prohibited, why, how the process works.

DeBOER: Time, Senator.

CONRAD: Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Conrad. Senator Quick, you're recognized.

QUICK: Thank you, Madam President. And good morning, colleagues. To be honest, I've been out working on some other bills, so I've missed some of the debate on, on the-- both the, both the amendment and the bill itself, and I do know some of the general aspects about it. So I-- you know, I understand what, what we're looking at and what we are trying to do here, so I'll still be listening to debate and trying to figure that out. But I thought I'd talk about some of my past experience. You know, this time, the first two years, I've really-- most people who have contacted our office or been in the Capitol have been really respectful of, of, of, of our opinions or our decisions to vote or-- oppose or support a bill. I can tell you the, the first four years, I did have two instances in my office, and one-- one wasn't actually in the office. It was on a phone call, and I had someone actually threaten me. So I didn't take it that seriously, but when I got to the office the next day, I talked to my staff, and they felt like this is something that you should report to the State Patrol. So I did that, and they said that they would look into it, and they did a great job. I mean, they went-- they contacted local law enforcement back in Hall County and kind of did some research on the individual and I think he'd had some, some-- maybe some mental health, health issues over the years, and also maybe some interactions with law enforcement in, in Hall County. So they reassured me that they would kind of keep an eye on it. They didn't feel like it was to the level that they would have to do anything, to go out and actually speak with him or to, to maybe file a, a complaint or anything on him. And then, the other individual was someone who came into the office and actually was very abusive to my staff. And it was over a vote that I took on a bill. And I did go out. I-- and my staff came with me, because he says, I'm not letting you go out there and talk to this guy by yourself. But I says, it-- I-- it'll be OK. I, I know him. It'll be just fine. And so, I went out and I talked to him, and I explained my position, and we talked about it. And the one thing I did tell him is, is that, you know, you can talk to me in any way you please, but I would ask you that you be respectful of my staff. They're, they're working for me, and they're working for my constituents. This individual was not a constituent, but he-- and I understand his passion. You know, people are passionate about different bills, and they-- and I respect that passion. You know, and-- you know, I'll have meetings with people in Grand Island on different issues. They'll want me to support a bill, or they'll want me to oppose a bill, and I'll meet with them, and then I can express my, my opinions on, on how I feel about it or what I'm seeing

with the-- with this piece of legislation. And I just try to be honest, as honest as I can, with anybody that I'm meeting with, and I think I gain that respect from them. Even if we don't agree in the end, if we respectfully agree to disagree, they respect the-- my-- the, the-- my decision to actually meet with them and sit down and listen to their concerns. So I think a lot of that, you know, dealing with people who are really passionate about things, comes down to how we interact with them as well, so, you know, making sure that we're being respectful of, of their opinion. I know there's-- there are times when people just-- maybe just aren't going to be that understanding, and then it's maybe time to disengage and know how to maybe just walk away, and not have any other conversations at that point. But I can tell you, the, the biggest thing for me is making sure that my staff, that they're respected and that, that-- you know, for me, you know, you gotta have thick skin if you're going to be down here in the Legislature, because you're never going to please everyone. I even had that-- I learned that as a union leader. I could never please all my union members. So there were, there were individuals that would, that would call me all the time that would be upset. I can remember one, one evening, one of our union members was going to quit, and he was all upset about something that he didn't think-- he felt like we weren't representing him correctly. I talked to him for about two hours on the phone. And by the time we were done, he was-- I said, you need to get involved. You need to be part of the process. You know, come and be in the meetings with us. So, you know, sometimes it's about having that voice at the table, too, and making sure that you're heard, and so I understand all of that. So with that, thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Quick. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Madam President. Would Senator Hansen yield to a question?

DeBOER: Senator Hansen, will you yield?

HANSEN: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. I was reading over the, the amendment, and it sparked another question for me. So I was looking at the part that says-- under the exemptions of Section 3. And it says, if the person has-- who has prior approval from the Nebraska State Patrol, and we talked about this, my question is, does the State Patrol have the

latitude to decide whether or not to approve somebody, or do they have to approve them automatically if they have a concealed carry?

HANSEN: Which section is that, just so I'm reading it right?

M. CAVANAUGH: Sorry. It's line 18 on page 1. Of the--

HANSEN: I'm assuming that is prior approval as in the form of a carry conceal license, because that's a state-issued-- State Patrol-issued license. That would be the prior approval, but I will check with legal counsel to make sure and get back to you about that.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. I mean, I know if you have a, a, a license, you've gone through a process, et cetera. My, my question would be if there was any concern about maybe a relationship that they had with somebody working in the building, would they have the latitude to say you actually can't even though you have concealed carry? Are they-- do you believe-- is it your understanding that they'll have the latitude to make that judgment call?

HANSEN: I think that's a good question, but--

M. CAVANAUGH: You want to ask--

HANSEN: For me to answer it, answer it right, correctly-- I want to make sure I answer it the right way.

M. CAVANAUGH: I got it. Thank you. OK. I'll come back to you on it. So that-- yeah. I have, I have questions about the process here and I appreciate that I'm not as well-versed on everything that's in the amendment, so I will come back to this my next time on the microphone. Would-- Senator Conrad, you want some time? I-- I'll give my remaining time to Senator Conrad.

DeBOER: Senator Conrad, you're yielded 2 minutes, 57 seconds.

CONRAD: Oh, very good. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. So I want to also respond to an issue that's been part of the debate, thus far, this morning, and that I have been thinking a lot about, just in general. I am a civil rights attorney. I am a civil libertarian at heart, and I'm skeptical of big government, and government overreach, and mass surveillance. And one thing that really troubled me about some issues that have been happening this session-- and I'm glad my friend, Senator Jacobson, talked about the extensive surveillance that we have in the Capitol, which, again, should

contextualize this debate, but it also is something that bothers me, in terms of the political weaponization of security. And there were concerns about some displays in our Capitol and whether or not they should have been posted or shouldn't have been posted, but the reason that came to fruition is because all of a sudden, internal Capitol security footage showed up on the Governor's campaign account Twitter feed. What the heck is that protocol? Has anybody looked into that at the Executive Board level? The political weaponization of Capitol security has happened, and would be extended and strengthened perhaps throughout this measure. That's a serious problem, friends. And it's not academic. It's real. We saw it. We've talked about it this year. So how exactly is this massive surveillance going to work for trans-Nebraskans, or Nebraskans who are for robust Second Amendment rights, Nebraskans who are for a strong state of Israel, Nebraskans who are pushing for Palestinian rights? Where does the camera get turned? How does it get focused? Who's evaluating that? Those are careful and dangerous questions, because you're starting to tip into viewpoint discrimination and political weaponization. And we have to have those hard conversations when you put measures like this before us, and there's not just hy-- law school hypotheticals hanging out there. There's real-life examples that have impacted this body and its members.

DeBOER: Time, Senator.

CONRAD: Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh and Senator Conrad. Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Madam President. I yield my time to Senator Conrad.

DeBOER: Senator Conrad, you're yielded 4 minutes, 56 seconds.

CONRAD: Thank you, Madam President. And thank you to, to Senator John Cavanaugh for the additional time. When it comes to political weaponization, I want to continue again to lift some real life, very recent examples that were on full display in this Capitol, the "people's house," this year. For the first time in our body's history, as far as anybody knows, definitely the first time that I've ever seen anything like this in my two-plus decades working either in or around this body and this process, you'll remember when measures that were presented this year that touch upon issues of equality and

discrimination and gender issues were brought forward, for the first time, there were, there were metal detectors erected outside of committee hearings where those issues were being heard, where Nebraskans of goodwill on all sides of those issues came forward to share their perspectives about whether or not they thought that was a good or a "proublic"-- a problematic policy that had been proposed in the Legislature. And that is exactly their right and what we should be encouraging-- more civic engagement, more robust dialogue, more voices in the process. And it left really, such a bad taste in my mouth when I was walking through the halls of this august Capitol. And on these critical issues, there had been a decision-- which, again, is subjective-- at the behest of the committee chair, not applied uniformly, that somehow, issues involving trans Nebraskans were uniquely dangerous and we had to erect metal security-- metal detectors and security before those hearing rooms, and it caused long lines, and it was extra work for the Capitol Security. I think it definitely had a chilling effect for many citizens who came to share their perspective on those topics, and again, it goes to show another example of political weaponization under the guise of security. And, of course, the tensions that we see in regards to liberty and security, to freedom and safety, have always been hard to reconcile. But in a free society, we need to think carefully about infringements upon public participation and individual rights and liberties. And again, I understand the goal present in this legislation. There is no quarrel or disagreement about ensuring that we have better access for Nebraskans with disabilities to engage their government. But those still need to be fleshed out with additional clarity to ensure that we understand what the process is and what the cost is, and that we get it right. The other issues regarding safety have a long way to go, from a policy, legal, practical, and fiscal perspective, and we can and we should learn from the experiences of our sister states. But we have to err on the side of embracing all Nebraskans, encouraging all Nebraskans to peacefully petition their government for change, to share their perspective, to not be turned away when they come to share those perspectives. And I have questions about how this will play out. Where exactly is the stop point? Will Nebraskans be out in the rain and the cold while they're waiting to move through these new procedures and protocols? Will they be inside? What does that mean for ingress and egress in the entrances and the hallways other-- otherwise? You can also look to experiences that we do have at the Supreme Court, at the county courthouse level, where we can get a better understanding about how--

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2026
Rough Draft

DeBOER: Time, Senator.

CONRAD: --to strike the right-- thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Conrad. Mr. Clerk, for items.

CLERK: Thank you, Madam President. Items for the record. Your Committee on Transportation, chaired by Senator Moser, reports LB1099 to General File. Additionally, your Committee on Revenue, chaired by Senator von Gillern, reports LB852, LB1109 to General File, LB1109 having committee amendments. Amendments to be printed from Senator Wordekemper to LB400; Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, LB455; series of motions to LB634, from Senator DeBoer; series of motions and amendments from Senator Conrad to LB1050; amendment to be printed from Senator Guereca to LB970. Name adds: Senator Storm added to LB938; Senator Andersen, LB1029. And a priority motion, Senator Ibach would move to adjourn the body until Monday, February 23, at 10:00 a.m.

DeBOER: Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor of adjournment, say aye. All those opposed, say nay. We are adjourned.