

February 6, 1981

LB 14, 51

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is the advancement of LB 14. All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Record.

CLERK: 30 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the motion to advance the bill.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is carried. The bill is advanced. Now we move to LB 51.

CLERK: Mr. President, LB 51 is offered by Senator Rumery. (Read title). The bill was read on January 8 of this year. It was referred to the Public Works Committee. The bill was advanced to General File. There are committee amendments pending, Mr. President, by the Public Works Committee.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Beutler, the committee amendments.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I don't want to take Senator Rumery's speech away from him but I think I am going to have to explain the bill just a little bit so that you can understand the committee amendments. Basically, we have in effect in the state a system of state incentive payments to counties for the purpose of encouraging the employment of qualified county highway superintendents, and those incentive payments are set out specifically in the statute in dollar amounts and it varies in accordance with the size of the county. Senator Rumery's bill did two things, one, it sought to increase those dollar amounts since they have not been changed for some time. The specific date eludes me right now. I am sure Senator Rumery will advise you of that. And the second thing that the bill sought to do was to discourage through an incentive mechanism the employment of consultants for purposes of doing the job basically of the county highway superintendent. Okay, the committee amendments then did two things. First of all, it struck out the provision that would have made hiring consultants less of a preference, and the second thing that we did was to reduce the increase in the incentives from 300 percent which was what was proposed to 50 percent. So those are the...that would be the effect of the committee amendments, to reduce the incentives below that which was originally proposed and to strike the provision that would have discouraged the hiring of consultants. Thank you.