

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

Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee  
January 17, 2018

---

[LB786 LB825 LB827]

The Committee on Government, Military and Veterans Affairs met at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, January 17, 2018, in Room 1507 of the State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebraska, for the purpose of conducting a public hearing on LB786, LB827, and LB825. Senators present: John Murante, Chairperson; Tom Brewer, Vice Chairperson; Carol Blood; Tom Briese; Mike Hilgers; John Lowe; Theresa Thibodeau; and Justin Wayne. Senators absent: None.

SENATOR MURANTE: (Recorder malfunction)...John Murante, I'm the State Senator for District 49, which includes Gretna and western Sarpy County. And I'm the Chairman of this committee. We are here today for the purposes of conducting public hearings on three pieces of legislation. We'll be taking those bills up in the order on which they appear on the agenda outside of this room. If you would wish to testify on any of the matters before the Government Committee today we ask that you fill out one of these green sheets that are located on either side of the room and submit them to our committee clerk before you begin testifying. If you do testify, we ask that you begin by stating and spelling your name for the record. Our order of proceedings is that the introducers will be afforded an opportunity to make additional remarks, we will then listen to all of the proponents of the legislation, followed by the opponents, then the neutral testifiers, and then we will give the introducer an opportunity to close. We ask that you listen very carefully and try not to be repetitive. We do use the light system in the Government Committee. Today, we will be having four-minute testimony. When the yellow light comes on, you have one minute remaining to testify and we ask that you begin concluding your remarks. When the red light comes on, your time has expired and we will open the committee up for any questions they may have of you. At this time, I would like to encourage everyone to turn off or silence any cell phones or other electronic devices. Really anything that makes noise. If you have a prepared statement, an exhibit, or anything you would like distributed to the committee, we ask that you provide 12 copies to our pages and they will distribute it to the members. If you don't have 12 copies, that's fine. Just give what you have to the pages and they will make the necessary copies for you. If you are here and wish to state your support or opposition for any of the matters before us, but you do not wish to testify, we ask that you sign in on our sign-in sheet. Again, that's located on either side of the room. With that said, I will introduce our committee staff. To my immediate right is Andrew La Grone, who is the Government Committee's legal counsel. To our far left is Katie Quintero, who is our substitute committee clerk while Sherry Shaffer is healing up. So thank you, Katie, for being here. Sherry will be back soon. And now we'll do some self-introduction for the members. We'll start on the far right. Senator Lowe, you want to tell folks who you are?

SENATOR LOWE: You already did.

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

Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee  
January 17, 2018

---

SENATOR MURANTE: Senator Lowe, where are you from, Senator Lowe?

SENATOR LOWE: Senator John Lowe, District 37.

SENATOR BRIESE: Tom Briese, District 41.

SENATOR HILGERS: Mike Hilgers, District 21: northwest Lincoln and Lancaster County.

SENATOR BREWER: Tom Brewer, District 43.

SENATOR WAYNE: Justin Wayne, the "Mighty 13": north Omaha, northeast Douglas County.

SENATOR THIBODEAU: Theresa Thibodeau, District 6 in northwest Omaha, Douglas County.

SENATOR BLOOD: Senator Carol Blood, western Bellevue, and southeastern Papillion.

SENATOR MURANTE: I don't think so. And I would also advise everyone Senator Brewer is the Vice Chair of the committee. With that said, we have dispensed with our formalities. And welcome, Senator Vargas, back to your committee on Government, Military and Veterans Affairs.

SENATOR VARGAS: Good afternoon, everyone, and members of the committee. Thank you very much, Chairperson Murante. My name is Tony Vargas, T-o-n-y V-a-r-g-a-s, and I represent District 7 in downtown and south Omaha in the Nebraska Legislature. My testimony today will be incredibly brief, but I will be of course happy to answer any questions committee members may have. LB786 is a very straightforward bill. It updates outdated language in 14 sections of Chapter 23 of the Revised Statutes, which deals with county government and officers of the county. There are no policy changes or impacts, the changes merely reflect modernized language. With that, I would be happy to answer any questions. [LB786]

SENATOR MURANTE: All right. Thank you, Senator Vargas. Are there any questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony. [LB786]

SENATOR VARGAS: Thank you very much. [LB786]

SENATOR MURANTE: Appreciate it. All right, are there any proponents wishing to testify on LB786? Welcome. [LB786]

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

Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee  
January 17, 2018

---

DAN ESCH: (Exhibit 1) Hello, good afternoon. My name is Dan Esch, first name is spelled D-a-n, last name is spelled E-s-c-h. I'm the Douglas County Clerk. I have, of course I only brought 11 copies, not 12, however, it's just a letter I had emailed to all the committee members. It's the same letter, except this is just addressed to Chairman Murante. But it was essentially the exact same letter that I e-mailed to all of you this morning. I guess I really don't have much more to add to what Senator Vargas has already stated. It's just...I've been the county clerk since November of 2015, and just some statutes that have caught my attention over the past two years that I felt needed to be modernized. Like he said, it doesn't take away any duties for anybody, it doesn't add any duties to an office. It's just some of these statutes haven't been touched since the 1940s. So it's just making them more appropriate. So I would be happy to answer any questions you guys might have. [LB786]

SENATOR MURANTE: All right. Thank you very much for your testimony. Are there any questions? Seeing none, thanks for coming down today. [LB786]

DAN ESCH: Thank you. [LB786]

SENATOR MURANTE: Appreciate it. All right, any additional proponents to LB786? Is there any opposition testimony to LB786? Is there any neutral testimony? Seeing none, Senator Vargas, you are recognized to close. Senator Vargas waives closing, and that concludes our public hearing on LB786. Thank you, Senator Vargas. Next up is Senator Lowe...actually Senator Brewer. So Senator Lowe is...LB827. Welcome. [LB786]

SENATOR LOWE: Thank you, Chairman Murante. My name is John Lowe, J-o-h-n L-o-w-e, and I represent the 37th District, which is Kearney and the surrounding area. Today, I'm introducing LB827. This bill was brought to me from the Department of Veterans Affairs to help clean up language that was not updated last year when an oversight of our veterans homes was moved from DHHS to Veterans Affairs under LB340. LB827 deals with the claims to money and personal property in the hands of the department, and what can be done if nothing is filed to assert a claim for the money or personal property. This bill simply adds the Department of Veterans Affairs to those statutes. I can attempt to answer any questions you may have on LB827, but there are individuals from the department here that might do a better job to answer those questions. [LB827]

SENATOR MURANTE: All right. Thank you, Senator Lowe. Are there any questions? Seeing none, thank you for your opening. Director Hilgert, welcome back. [LB827]

JOHN HILGERT: It's good to be back. Good afternoon, Chairman Murante, members of the Government, Military, and Veterans Affairs Committee. My name is John Hilgert, J-o-h-n H-i-l-

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

Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee  
January 17, 2018

---

g-e-r-t. I'm the Director of the Nebraska Department of Veterans Affairs. I'm here today to testify in support of LB827. I would also like to thank Senator Lowe for introducing this bill on behalf of Nebraska's veterans. This is a very brief bill. Some of this information was offered by Senator Lowe in his testimony, so I'll keep my comments brief. LB827 adds the Department of Veterans Affairs alongside references to the Department of Health and Human Services in sections in statute concerning the disposition of property of members of the veterans homes. The exemption of certain personnel from the department from the state personnel system, and to harmonize provisions accordingly. These changes were required as the result of the successful passage of LB340, which you may remember from last year, which merged DHHS division of veterans homes into the Nebraska Department of Veterans Affairs. Thank you again to this committee and to Senator Murante for his support of LB340 last year. We do not anticipate LB827 to have any fiscal impact on our operations, and would ask and encourage your support of this bill. This concludes my testimony. [LB827]

SENATOR MURANTE: All right. Thank you very much for your testimony. Are there any questions? Seeing none, thanks for coming down. [LB827]

JOHN HILGERT: Thank you, sir. [LB827]

SENATOR MURANTE: Appreciate it. Is there additional testimony in favor of LB827? Is there any opposition to LB827? Any neutral testimony? Seeing none, Senator Lowe waives closing. And that concludes our hearing on LB827. Now we will proceed to Senator Brewer's bill, LB825. Senator Brewer, welcome. [LB827]

SENATOR BREWER: (Exhibit 1) Thank you. Senator Murante and members of the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee, my name is Senator Tom Brewer, that is spelled T-o-m B-r-e-w-e-r, and I represent the 43rd Legislative District. I have introduced LB825 at the request of the Nebraska Auditor of Public Accounts, Charlie Janssen, I have also brought an amendment that would put back the language stricken on page 2(5). This was a suggestion from the Bill Drafters, and has caused a lot of questions and generated some concerns about the bill. I am told by the Auditor's Office that the language could be stricken, but it doesn't really affect the bill in any way. We are in no way trying to eliminate the sinking funds. I will let someone who is near death from the Auditor's Office explain the bill in greater detail. Remember, this is just a matching language--levy limits to lid limits. That concludes my introduction. If you have any questions, I will be glad to answer them. But I will be followed by a representative from the Auditor's Office who can address those. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: All right. Thank you, Senator Brewer. Senator Blood. [LB825]

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

Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee  
January 17, 2018

---

SENATOR BLOOD: Thank you, Senator Murante. Don't worry, it's not a hard one. Have you had...has anybody from any of the area municipalities reached out to you on this bill in reference to... [LB825]

SENATOR BREWER: The sinking funds or any other issues with it? [LB825]

SENATOR BLOOD: No, the bill as a whole. Because it... [LB825]

SENATOR BREWER: No, they have not. [LB825]

SENATOR BLOOD: Okay. That was the only question I had. [LB825]

SENATOR BREWER: Good. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: Thank you, Senator Brewer. [LB825]

SENATOR BLOOD: And we discussed that. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: All right, seeing no additional questions, thank you for your testimony. [LB825]

SENATOR BREWER: Thank you, sir. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: Proceeding to proponent testimony. Senator Karpisek, welcome back to the Government Committee. I hear you're not feeling well. I hope it's not too bad. [LB825]

RUSS KARPISEK: Thank you, Senator Murante. I don't feel very well, but I probably don't look very well either. So that's normal. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: That's normal, Senator Karpisek. [LB825]

RUSS KARPISEK: For the record, my name is Russ Karpisek, R-u-s-s K-a-r-p-i-s-e-k. I am the legislative liaison for the Nebraska Auditor of Public Accounts, Charlie Janssen. I would like to thank Senator Brewer and his staff for working with us on this bill, especially since the last couple days I've been under the weather. As Senator Brewer said, the stricken language on page 2 was suggested by the Bill Drafters, and we would like an amendment to put that stricken

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

Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee  
January 17, 2018

---

language back in because it really doesn't affect the bill one way or another. Again, there is no intent to get rid of sinking funds. We really believe that this is a cleanup bill. I just ran into someone from the League, and I apologize, I'm not feeling good and pretty cranky. We're not trying to do anything...we think it's a cleanup bill. And if there are problems, we'll have time that we would be glad to sit down with them and try to work it out. And again, we sure aren't trying to change anything. We've had people come in and ask why there's two different definitions of "public indebtedness." We feel that this makes it all one definition, and it goes to the Statute 10-134 that talks about a "Bond shall mean any bonds, notes, interim certificates, evidences of bond ownership, bond anticipation notes, warrants, or other evidence of indebtedness." So again, we feel that that just cleans up and codifies the way that our office has been doing it now. I did ask Deann Haeffner and Mary Avery to come back cleanup for me if I have not said it the right way, because this does get a little further into the grass I guess of bookkeeping than I am up to. The proposed amendment on page 5...I shouldn't say amendment, the language change, is making it clear that a vote by the people to exceed the allowable growth percentage would only apply to one year. I don't know if most of you remember recently we've talked about the Lincoln City Council did a 1 percent budget authority vote. This is like that, but it isn't exactly the same, but different. This would be is if the people voted for that override or the 1 percent extra of budget authority and we're saying that it would only apply to one year, to try to make that clear. Especially in these times of two-year budgets, we want to make sure that it's only one year. And the last one, the days of publication, passed last year. And this statute was overlooked, saying when a municipality or anyone, a subdivision, does a budget and they have to put in the paper, publish when the budget will be heard. It's now four days, and we count the day of the publication and not the day of the hearing. Again, that statute was just missed. That's about it. I'll be glad to try to answer your questions. Thank you for your time. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: Thank you, Senator Karpisek. Are there any questions? Seeing none, thank you very much for your testimony. [LB825]

RUSS KARPISEK: Thank you. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: Much appreciate it. Is there additional proponent testimony to LB825? Is there opposition testimony to LB825? [LB825]

LYNN REX: (Exhibit 2) Senator Murante, members of the committee, my name is Lynn Rex, L-y-n-n R-e-x, representing the League of Nebraska Municipalities. And we're here respectfully opposing this measure. And I apologize to Senator Brewer's staff because this morning when I spoke to Tony I told him, I said, we're kind of trying to drain the swamp here. Everything is like drinking water out of a fire hose. So we're trying to catch up and get information as fast as we can from our members and to our members. But we did...and I also had a brief conversation with

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

Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee  
January 17, 2018

---

Andrew, your committee counsel, this morning as well. I'm handing out a letter from the city of Lincoln. The League is not here today representing the city of Lincoln, the city of Lincoln is neutral on the bill. But they outline an issue that I think is...and also provide an answer here for this. I want to start by saying, and I'm going to read from this in a moment, but let me just suggest this: I don't think that, from talking to Senator Karpisek, or from talking to Deann Haeffner from the State Auditor's Office, that they intend to make a change in the way that this is interpreted, but we think it makes a major change. I don't think there's anybody that the League has worked with over the years more competent than Deann Haeffner and Mary Avery, just outstanding people that work for the Auditor's Office. And we have a disagreement on the interpretation of what current law is. I will accept some responsibility, because I was at the table negotiating these issues on sinking funds when this happened. So let me just walk you through the only issue we have with this bill, which deals with the issue of sinking funds. I think the other changes are clearly technical, we don't think that this one is. We think that other municipal officials across the state have made that clear too, and I don't speak for any other political subdivision. But I think...actually, this may be a good time just to...I'm going to briefly read from this, which is as follows. Again, not representing Lincoln, but just indicating that they have articulated in writing what basically my testimony is going to be. The first paragraph, this "bill would remove language allowing for municipalities to utilize an exemption for the replacement of tangible personal property to a qualified sinking fund". This is our major issue. Going down to the third paragraph, "This exemption allows for municipalities to collect restricted funds such as property tax, sales tax, motor vehicle fees to replace vehicles such as police cruisers and fire engines on a regular basis." Next paragraph, "Removing this exemption encourages municipalities to bond for equipment." The last line of that, same paragraph, "Encouraging bonding would add 20 percent to 40 percent to the costs for the truck depending on the term of the bond." Lincoln and Omaha probably don't use sinking funds, so I'm not here basically saying that this is a big issue for them. It is for other cities across the state. So let me just indicate to you, first, we appreciate restoring the language which is the definition. This is on page 2, lines 23-29, the definition of "sinking fund." The reason why that definition is there is because of the language that was negotiated by the League and many others on page 6. If you would be kind enough to look at page 6, lines 14, 16-17. "The limitations in Section 13-519" which means this is the lid on restricted funds, and just as a very quick reminder: municipalities and other political subdivisions, except for schools, and I'm not here to talk about the school issues...and by the way, Senator Brewer, we don't think in any way you're intending to do something harmful to municipalities, we just think the result is that. So, in any event, the lid on restricted funds is 2.5 percent over the prior year, plus growth over 2.5 percent, plus 1 percent on a supermajority vote. So that being said, what is outside of the lid on restricted funds? That's what this section addresses in 13-520. "The limitations in Section 13-519 shall not apply to (1)"--which is not being changed--"restricted funds budgeted for capital improvements". And then this is the language, "(2) restricted funds expended"--and I want you to kind of think of that word expended--"from a qualified sinking fund for acquisition or replacement of tangible personal

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

Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee  
January 17, 2018

---

property with a useful life of five years or more." So in talking to the Auditor's Office this morning, they said, well, this doesn't do anything because expended...the only folks that have a lid on expenditures would be the schools. The schools do have an expenditure lid, and I cannot, in any way, shape, or form, address their lid, what it does or what it doesn't do. You have a former member of a school board that can do that for you, I'm not the person to address that. What I can say, is that when I was at the table and we were negotiating this so that there would clearly be an exemption from the lid on restricted funds for sinking funds for personal property with a useful life of more than five years, that we use the word "expended" because we're saying taking it out of that fund. But again, I understand what the Auditor's Office is saying. I know former Senator Karpisek made a comment to me in the hallway basically saying, we're not intending to make any changes. Then leave it in. Because this is the language that allows municipalities to basically have this exempted from the lid on restricted funds. I know my time is up, but I'll just close with one statement, if I may. The Auditor's Office said, look, there's not even a line on the form that they have that addresses this. So they wanted to know how could anybody be taking it. We put some calls out, we haven't heard back from everybody, but what I can say is this: that the form should comport with the law, not the law comporting with the forms. And so, if in fact the intent is to make no changes in this, that's what Tony from your office said, that's what the Auditor's Office has said, and we respect them, we hope that they will leave the language in on this. Because I think it's going to create a major, major issue. With that, I'm happy to respond to any questions that you might have. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: All right. Thank you very much for your testimony. Are there any questions? Seeing none. [LB825]

LYNN REX: Thank you very much for your consideration. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: Thank you. All right, is there additional opposition testimony? Welcome. [LB825]

TERRY JESSEN: Thank you. Good afternoon, Chairman and committee. My name is Terry Jessen, T-e-r-r-y J-e-s-s-e-n. I am testifying as opposition to LB825, and I do that with a little bit of hesitancy. Senator Brewer, I don't mean to be stepping on your toes, and there's only one word in here that I am objecting to. The rest of the bill I'm in favor of, but I think I had to consider myself as opposition because I'm opposed to the one word. That one word is the proposed change from five days notice to four days notice. I tend to feel that the agencies that I have been observing they squeeze that down, they don't give the public any more notice than they're required to. And I think it's the wrong message to consider changing it to four-days notice. Really, that's my opinion very simply. I've testified at a lot of budget hearings starting in 2016, local budget hearings. And to stretch...or squeeze that time I think is the wrong message. I think

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

Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee  
January 17, 2018

---

taxpayers...there's a reason for the publication, it's to give taxpayers some notice of when the hearing is, some notice as to the dollar amounts involved. And to squeeze that number down is the wrong message. That's all I have. If there's any questions, I'd be happy to answer. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: All right. Thank you very much for your testimony. Are there any questions? [LB825]

TERRY JESSEN: Thank you. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: Seeing none, thank you for coming down. Is there additional opposition testimony to LB825? Is there any neutral testimony on LB825? Welcome. [LB825]

DEANN HAEFFNER: Hello, Chairman and senators. My name is Deann Haeffner, D-e-a-n-n, Haeffner, H-a-e-f-f-n-e-r, and I'm with the State Auditor's Office, and I oversee the budget forms, which is where this LB kind of originated and come from. It started off as we truly believe this was a cleanup bill or is a cleanup bill. And I just want to kind of follow up with some questions maybe that come up, and I guess try and answer any questions that you guys may have about it. Regarding the four days, last year there was an LB that passed that basically set out in statute specifically what the count was for the number of days, so that everybody was very clear on whether you got to count the publication day and the hearing day. So the point of that LB last year was to clean that up. We did not catch that there was another statute out there that identified the five days, and that's the one that's in the LB825. The point at this point was just to basically fold that into the rest of the statutes that were updated last year, because it got left out. There wasn't any intention of leaving it out last year, but it did get behind because it was in a different chapter of the statutes. Regarding the sinking funds, there has been a lot of calls to our office also. We actually had no intention of causing that kind of an uproar about sinking funds. And I think as Lynn stated, I think there's an interpretation difference between our office and the League. The forms, as they currently are projected and have, for at least the last 10 years, do not have a place to take an exemption for expended funds out of a sinking fund as a lid exemption. Right or wrong, that's the way we have interpreted it for at least 10 years. That I guess goes back to you, as to senators to tell us. If we're interpreting that wrong, please let us know. If you leave it the way it is, I think it will raise some questions between us and the League as to whether or not we're interpreting it right, they're interpreting it right. So I guess I would encourage you to set the record straight as to how you would like it interpreted. Expended money from a sinking fund raises question as how do we put that on the form? I mean, the form is to eliminate or to limit how much an entity generates from property taxes. If you say, well, yeah, we want them to have an exemption for expending money from sinking funds, I'm not quite sure how I put that on a form that's talking about generating revenue. So I think that raises some questions as to revenues are on one side of the sheet and expenditures are on the other, so how do I make that

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

Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee  
January 17, 2018

---

jump as an exemption when I'm talking about raising the taxes as far as the budget on the lid? So I guess I will answer any questions you might have. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: All right, thank you very much. Senator Brewer, this is your...well, I'll let you answer quick. Go ahead. [LB825]

SENATOR BREWER: Actually, all I was going to say is since obviously I close on this bill I would have had to say something like you just said. [LB825]

DEANN HAEFFNER: Okay. [LB825]

SENATOR BREWER: And I didn't have that knowledge, so thank you. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: All right, any additional questions? Senator Hilgers. [LB825]

SENATOR HILGERS: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your testimony. Just so I'm clear, is there any...is the reason it's not on the form, and maybe the answer is you don't know, but is the reason it's not on the form is because you just...there's some uncertainty about how to apply the statute? Or is there some interpretation of the statute that leads the office to believe that it doesn't need to be on the form at all? [LB825]

DEANN HAEFFNER: Well, it leads us to believe it doesn't need to be on the form, because the lid restricts how much a political subdivision can raise in taxes from one year to the next. And that's the 2.5 percent, with some other items on top of that. And then it says, well, you can also raise taxes with the exemption of capital improvements, interlocal agreements. So you're talking about raising taxes, how much you can increase taxes from one year to the next, that's the current lid. And then there's this language about how much you spend. Well, there's nothing else in the whole lid about how much you spend, because where did that money come from in the first place? It came from the taxes. So the lid is to restrict how much is generated in taxes, how do you jump to the other side of the spreadsheet and say, oh, well now we're going to talk about how much you spend? [LB825]

SENATOR HILGERS: Well, with the other limitations in 13-520 talk about restricted funds like (2) (sic--1), it's "restricted funds budgeted", or in "(3) restricted funds pledged". Or in the...I guess, the restricted funds used. [LB825]

DEANN HAEFFNER: Right. [LB825]

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

Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee  
January 17, 2018

---

SENATOR HILGERS: I mean, I guess that those are all sort of the same concept. I mean, they're different words, but they're all sort of the same concept. [LB825]

DEANN HAEFFNER: Right. I guess to an accountant budgeting is a lot different than spending. Because you set the budget, and that's what you maybe intend to spend, but that's not what you really spend. Or that's...I guess, maybe that's technical as accounting, but if I set a budget for \$10,000 I may spend \$9,000. I don't have to spend the \$10,000. So to me, it's two distinct definitions of budget versus spending. And so if you budget to spend for capital improvements, that's the budget and you're generating the taxes to be able to spend that. But when you say you actually spent money out of sinking fund, the money was already in the sinking fund, so you're not generating new money, you're spending money you already had. [LB825]

SENATOR HILGERS: Yeah, I guess, I mean, I see your point. At the same time, how do you respond to Ms. Rex's contention, which I think is a sound one, which is how do you...I mean, the forms...we should figure out a way to conform the form or whatever it is to the law that we have. How would you respond to that? [LB825]

DEANN HAEFFNER: And I guess that is my response back to you: please direct us. If you want it to be budgeted, I can make the form easy. I can just add a row and say "budgeted." But I don't think I'm in the position of making the policy, I'm just trying to make the forms fit the policy. And right now I see the policy saying if you spent money out of the money you already had over here in the sinking fund that was some kind of an exemption, but the lid is talking about how much you're generating in taxes to put. [LB825]

SENATOR HILGERS: So if that's...instead of striking that whole...if I'm following your logic, just to finish this line of questioning off. If you were to change it from expended to budgeted, would that also address your concern? [LB825]

DEANN HAEFFNER: I think that's a big change in policy. In an accounting terminology word, that's a change. [LB825]

SENATOR HILGERS: But if it's a change from your perspective, that would make it easy for you to do the job that you're trying to do? Is that what I'm hearing you say? [LB825]

DEANN HAEFFNER: Yeah. [LB825]

SENATOR HILGERS: Yeah, okay. [LB825]

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

Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee  
January 17, 2018

---

DEANN HAEFFNER: I mean, because right now we consider that paragraph 2 definition to be obsolete, or not to be anything. [LB825]

SENATOR HILGERS: I understand. Thank you very much. [LB825]

DEANN HAEFFNER: Okay. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: All right, thank you. Any additional questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony. [LB825]

DEANN HAEFFNER: Thanks. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: Is there additional neutral testimony on LB825? Seeing none, Senator Brewer. [LB825]

SENATOR BREWER: Well, I would have waived closing, but since we had opposition I felt like I probably better come and take the hot seat. Again, the issue is the levy limits versus the lid limits. And so some of what we talked about here wasn't part of what we discussed when we were looking at the bill originally. So the last conversation that Senator Hilgers had, I mean, that's a valid point. But that might have to be part of the amendment so that the language is correct. Questions? [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: All right, any concluding questions? Senator Blood. [LB825]

SENATOR BLOOD: Senator Brewer, will you then be willing to meet with the League of Municipalities and hash this out and bring forward an amendment? [LB825]

SENATOR BREWER: Yes. I wish we would have had the meeting before, but yes, I'm open to that. We'll figure out what right looks like and be good to go. [LB825]

SENATOR BLOOD: Thank you. [LB825]

SENATOR MURANTE: Thank you. Seeing no additional questions, thank you. [LB825]

SENATOR BREWER: Thank you. [LB825]

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

Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee  
January 17, 2018

---

SENATOR MURANTE: (Exhibit 2) We do have a letter from the city of Lincoln, which Lynn pretty much read in. And that will close our hearing on LB825. We'll have a brief Executive Session to talk about some stuff. [LB825]