

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

[]

The Legislature's Planning Committee met at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, December 16, 2016, in Room 1003 of the State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebraska, for the purpose of conducting a public hearing. Senators present: Tanya Cook, Chairperson; Paul Schumacher, Vice Chairperson; Kathy Campbell; Mike Gloor; and Merv Riepe. Senators absent: Galen Hadley; Bob Krist; Heath Mello; and Ken Schilz.

SENATOR COOK: Good morning, everyone. Welcome. I'd like to call our meeting to order, the final...final, the last one certainly for Legislative...for 2016, and for many of the members of the Legislature's Planning Committee. I'm Senator Tanya Cook. We won't have minutes to approve because if you recall, last month we were out at Offutt Air Force Base and that was considered an executive committee meeting. And from what I understand, the information that was shared at those meetings was sent out to the members of this committee and to new members. We also invited people who were recently elected, just in case they wanted to come by and see what it's like. So with that being the case, we will go right into our first presentation, Mr. Deichert. Selected Characteristics for Nebraska Legislative Districts. I always like this one. Welcome.

JERRY DEICHERT: (Exhibits 1-4) Well, this one is going to be based on two reports that you have in front of you and I've got...I copied on the handout the highlights from those reports so you don't have to search through the reports and some of the things to look at. But just to refresh your memory, all of this information comes from the American Community Survey and these data were released December 8, so that's a week ago. So we really worked pretty hard to get these two reports done so we could have them ready for this meeting in December. And the other thing to remember on that is that this is based on a sample and they accumulate the information over five years so every year there's an average of about 48,000 people interviewed at the state, so that's about 1,000 legislative districts over five years. This information is based on about a sample of about 5,000 people in your district. So it's a good size sample. And like I said, we've got these two reports that we've got for this year. Just to refresh your memory, these are the tables that we have in the Quick Fact report where we have a handful of variables and we compare the U.S. and Nebraska for 2011-15 to 2008-12 and 2008-12 was the first year after redistricting that we had information for the current legislative districts so we can compare those

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

to. And we have the United States and Nebraska and then we have Nebraska compared to each legislative district and I just have District 13 in here for comparison purposes. And you can look at all of that on your own, but I think what I want to do is look at all of the districts together. And so this first one looks at...the chart looks at how has population changed since...over that time period. So it's kind of like the average population for each of those periods. Statewide the average legislative district increased 858 people or about 286 persons per year. The fastest growing legislative district was District 39. And you can see there were 11...or not 11, there were 15 that lost population and three are in Douglas County, one is in Lancaster County and 11 are in greater Nebraska. And District 8 was the fastest or largest declining in 13 and 47 and so what that means is if you look at the next page, since the equal population requirement for the state legislative districts is about...the largest and the smallest have to be within 10 percentage points of each other. And so I took the average plus or minus 5 percent, so if the average is 38,150 people, if we add 5 percent, we get 40,000-something, and if we take away 5 percent we get 36,000-something. And you can see by those dashed lines, these dashed lines here, you can see that there are already six that are above that threshold and there are five that are below. And you can see District 39 has 48,000 people and District 47 has 35,000 people. So there's a large difference now between the largest and the smallest legislative district in the state. And that's only going to widen as time goes on. I think with this year's new senators if they get elected two terms would be around for the redistricting...

SENATOR GLOOR: Interesting times.

JERRY DEICHERT: ...so it's going to be...there's going to be some...you know, 47 again is going to have to change.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Good luck to them. That's a most difficult process.

JERRY DEICHERT: And then the next slide looks at what's happened to median household income and this has all been...I changed everything so it's in the same dollars so it's in 2015 dollars. And you can see that there were 23 districts that had increasing incomes over that time period. The state was pretty much unchanged. You can see it lost \$44 dollars for the median. The U.S. was down, but there was 23 that grew: 4 were in Douglas; 3 were in Lancaster, but 16 of the

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

districts that had increasing household income was in greater Nebraska. And that's probably because that's still reflecting some of the big increase in farm income over the time period compared to the initial time period that we compare. The next one looks at poverty and for the most part there was a slight increase in poverty statewide of three-tenths of a percent over that time period. But there were...I can't remember, 26 districts that had a decrease in poverty and 23 that had an increase in poverty over that time period. So it's pretty much an equal number that increased and decreased. And you can see the largest two increases were those in southeastern Douglas County, District 5 and District 7, had the two largest increases in poverty. And then you can see where the decreases were. Again, a lot of those were in more rural Nebraska. The next one looks at unemployment change and Senator Gloor, it looks like District 35 had the largest increase in the unemployment over that time period and other than that, was mostly a decrease for very, very small increase in the unemployment rate. And you can see statewide and U.S. both had decreases in unemployment. And District 11 had the largest decrease in the unemployment rate.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Senator Chambers.

JERRY DEICHERT: The last slide that looks at the comparisons looks at median home value. And you can see nationally there was a decline in home value, but most of the districts in Nebraska had an increase in home values. Thirty-two out of the state's districts had an increase in the median home value. Four were in Lancaster, five in Douglas, one in Sarpy, and twenty-two again in greater Nebraska. So it looks like housing values are increasing for the state in contrast to what had happened nationally.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: So this wouldn't be better houses that people are living in, just same house, higher price.

JERRY DEICHERT: Yeah. And it's all self-identified. So it's on the question that they ask, what's the value of your house? And so it doesn't necessarily reflect assessed valuation, although some people may...

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Some people.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

JERRY DEICHERT: ...some people may go and look and see what their assessed valuation is. But...so typically what's found is that for people who have recently purchased their house, they have a pretty good understanding but if they've lived in a house for 20 or 30 years, they have a tendency to undervalue what their house is worth.

JOHN BARTLE: Jerry, you need to advance the slide.

JERRY DEICHERT: Oh, sorry. Thank you. And the next set of slides come from this report that we've had ever since we started the committee and that's the selected characteristics and there's a number of tables in there. And then this one instead of having information for individual...a page for each individual legislative district, we have a page of data and then each legislative district is...all legislative districts are on that table. And so the first one looks at population under 18 and you can see District 5 has 31 percent and District 6 has 18 percent. So there's a...even when thinking about children, there's a big difference among the legislative districts as far as the percentage of the population that are children. And you can see Nebraska at 25.9 is higher than the U.S. at 23.3 percent, so we have more children under 18. And there's a wide variation among the...between the highest and the lowest. And if you remember, District 5 also had the higher increase in unemployment and so there's things going on in that district...that's a lot of change going on in District 5. When you look at population 65 and older, we've got 21 percent down to 6.4 percent. And this 46 for those of you who weren't familiar, this is the area around UNL main campus and so this includes dormitory residence and the likes, so.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Senator Morfeld.

JERRY DEICHERT: Yeah, Senator Morfeld. And you can see Nebraska and the U.S. have exactly the same percentage, 14.1 percent, 65 and older. And most of the highest percentages are in the more rural districts. If we look at the minority population or the population of color as a percentage of the state's total population, there are currently two that are majority of the population or population of color, and that's District 11 and 7. And District 5 is growing rapidly and so I would expect the next time we do this, they will also be over 50 percent. But District 13 is fairly stable at that 40 percent and I wouldn't expect that to increase in the relatively near future. And then you can see it goes from 75 percent down to 3.2 percent. If we look at the

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

foreign-born population, again District 7 and 5 in southeastern Douglas County, District 7 almost 27 percent are foreign born and that goes all the way down to 41, which is less than 1 percent foreign born. I think one of the things that we found and pointed out a number of times is that when we look at the average for Nebraska it really doesn't reflect individual legislative districts very well. I mean, there's just such variation among districts. High school graduation, you can see there's...this one has relatively little variation from 98 percent until we get down to again Districts 5 and 7, which have 64.5 and 70 percent that are high school graduates. Nebraska is a little bit higher than the U.S. But when we get to college graduates, you can see that United States is slightly higher than Nebraska and there's large discrepancies between the percentage of college graduates from almost 60 percent in District 4 down to a little under 12 percent in District 11. And you may have seen the article in the World-Herald that we did...research we did, last week that looked at what they call it, the brain drain.

SENATOR COOK: Yes.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Right.

JERRY DEICHERT: And that Nebraska has been losing college graduates, a substantial...one of the higher percentage than most other states of the college graduates.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: And we're not bringing them in either.

JERRY DEICHERT: We're bringing some in, but we're losing more than we're bringing in. So on a net basis, we're losing. This just looks at the actual poverty rate for that time period, not looking at the change. And you can see the highest is almost 40 percent of the population of District 11 down to 3.6 percent in District 39. And the U.S. is slightly higher than Nebraska as far as the poverty rate for population over that...in that five-year average. So you might see some annual numbers that are different but this is again for that five-year period so we can get enough information to compare the legislative districts.

SENATOR COOK: Senator Schumacher, do you have a question?

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Now poverty rate is basically the household income in respect to the household population. Am I right in thinking that?

JERRY DEICHERT: It looks at the total household income...for the total family income I should say. So if there's two unrelated people living together, it doesn't combine the incomes, it looks at those individuals. But it's the total family income and it compares it to a threshold. And so a two-person family will have a different poverty level than a three-person family.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: And so a household could shift from poverty to not or from not poverty to poverty by the addition of a child.

JERRY DEICHERT: Yes, or if you had two unmarried folks living together, both below poverty, if they got married, they both would be above poverty, depending upon their income. Now, that's...and so the Census Bureau is looking at new ways of measuring poverty to take into account costs such as healthcare and childcare and adjust for value of our housing costs and also adjusting for noncash payments received. And so there's a measure of poverty that they use to do that. And when that happens, Nebraska's poverty rate goes down a little bit and...but nationally, and nationally it goes...I can't remember, Senator, I think it goes down a little bit too nationally when you take into that account. But some states take into account cost of living, you'll see California's poverty rate goes higher and Nebraska's goes down because of differential for cost of living. But I think that new report that was just released today will go into that in greater detail.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Yeah.

JERRY DEICHERT: And for children under 18, you can see again another wide variation from 55 percent in District 11 down to 2.4 percent in District 25 and Nebraska is a little bit less...is less than the U.S., but 17 percent of the children under 18 are below poverty. And we also have under five in that report too. Median household income. again wide variation in the state. Districts 4 and 39 are...and 31 are all \$95,000 to \$96,000 and District 11 is \$25,000 and District 7 is \$33,000 as far as median household income. So you can see, on average Nebraska is just slightly less than the U.S.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR COOK: Senator Schumacher.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Is the median the best tool that we have for detecting it as far as what household income is? Is there a better way of looking at it? I would guess that in these numbers you don't have a normal distribution.

JERRY DEICHERT: No.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: And that we have some very high numbers and maybe some very low numbers, but the high numbers are really high compared to the mean.

SENATOR GLOOR: But if that's true, the median is a better way to look at it than the statistical mean because you're counting actual....

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: But is there any better way to portray the distribution of income on like a...well, a Gaussian distribution...a curve, so we see if it's skewed, if it's...there's a long tail on one side or the other, a peak.

JERRY DEICHERT: Yeah, I don't know if there is necessarily a better way, but there are other ways and sometimes they will look at what's the cutoff to be in the top 10 percent, or what's the...you know, because this is the 50 percentile, you know that's the median. So you can look at well, what's the cutoff for the top 25 percent; what's the cutoff for the top 10 percent; what's the cutoff for the bottom 25 percent. So you could look at those percentiles which would give you another way of looking to see how...you know, if the median is close but one area has much higher 75th percentile, then you know that they don't have...they have a...it's more clustered around that middle and so you can...so some of those things might be good. The other thing that we include in the report for the state totals is what's called the Gini coefficient which measures the degree of inequality. It shows how much dispersion there is within that to kind of see how big that tail is out at the end. And they have that information too for the legislative districts, but, you know, it comes out like a number like .476 and it really has no meaning unless you are one of those policy wonks that digs into those numbers and so for the vast population it doesn't really tell you anything.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Is there mean and standard deviation numbers for this, or...?

JERRY DEICHERT: There are means. I do not recall that they published that deviation but I assume we could...yeah, we could get at those, yes.

SENATOR GLOOR: A simple run we used to do sometimes from a marketing standpoint was look at all those in the mean, median, mode, midpoint, take a look at all four and see if there was any major discrepancy in there that might merit taking a harder look at the numbers. But if I recall, mode is the most commonly occurring number. So you say, well, within 5 percentage points, what's the mode appearing. Sometimes that at least tells you, yeah, there's something not right here.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Well, one of the reasons I'm kind of asking these questions is, we just did that incentive program stuff and the figures was, well, this industry or whatever, this is the average. Well, you get the impression if you were to see a distribution of that, you would see fairly low and then some really nice piece. And the average of it looks like it's going great guns in some respects, but...and if you look at it, say, well, it's going great guns for a few people.

JERRY DEICHERT: Yeah, if I remember correctly, the average household income in Nebraska is around \$75,000, even though the median is about \$55,000, the average is in the seventies and so that's because of those ones on the upper end.

SENATOR COOK: Warren Buffett is skewing it maybe.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: What district does Warren Buffett live in?

SENATOR COOK: (District) 8.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Thank you.

SENATOR COOK: (District) 8 and (District) 9, right. He's on the south side of Dodge, 9.



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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR RIEPE: The one-time designated blighted area.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: It was District 9, seriously.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: That rascal Omaha has really got some problems with blight.

SENATOR COOK: They really do.

JERRY DEICHERT: And then the other one we have here is labor force participation rate and that's taking the entire population 16 and older, whether they're retired or students or whatever as the base, and then the percentage that are looking for work or working, that's the labor force participation and you can see Nebraska is 70 percent. U.S. is a little over...a little under 64 percent, so you can see that Nebraska has a much higher labor force participation rate and some of the legislative districts, it's over 80 percent. And I think one of the things that we notice in Nebraska when the employers are trying to come to Nebraska is that everybody who wants to work is working and not only that, we have a lot more people who are...may have been retired or out of the labor force in other states that are still working.

SENATOR COOK: Do we ever overlay participation of the labor force with the poverty numbers, district by district, because it...on first...at first blush it says to me that people are in the labor force and they still get to be poor on one of the other pages.

JERRY DEICHERT: One of the things we could do, we haven't...we do have that information. We do have for people who are...what are the poverty rates for people who are working year-round, full time. That would be something that would be of interest?

SENATOR COOK: Okay, yes. To me, yes, and perhaps as the Intergenerational Poverty Committee...to continue, that might be good information to have, I think.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Yeah, it would be, although I would guess that we picked up some...and in some of the presentations that most of the people in generational poverty are employed, because our concentration wasn't on situational poverty, our concentration was the

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

generation to generation to generation. So when we put the report together with much help from Jerry, that's the group that we looked at. But by and large, they're employed. It may not be full-time, but they're not making enough to get them out of it.

SENATOR COOK: Yes, Senator Schumacher.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: You know, we talk about intergenerational poverty. In working with that issue is there any value to knowing about intergenerational wealth, the mirror image and how that works?

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Could be.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: I mean, it strikes me is that... that's a...when we're talking about this income disparity and the compounding effect of it getting worse rather than better, how intergenerational wealth works. Seems to have a role somewhere in that.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: In relation to generational poverty?

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Yeah, and this spread, the problem with the middle class not getting any traction. How do we do intergenerational wealth? Is it transferred by education? Is it transferred by trust? If your grandparents are wealthy, are you apt to be wealthy or do you have to blow it off, blow it away? I mean, how does the transfer of wealth work?

SENATOR CAMPBELL: We can tell you from...I mean, one of the interesting things about the generational poverty report that you look at is the fact that education is a help to it, but it isn't always the step out of it. In other words, people who are born into poverty could stay there their entire life, that it has such a detrimental effect on their whole life. Education can help to get you maybe out of it, but it isn't the sole thing that gets you out of it. Remember that, Jerry, our discussion with that? And that is in the report and we really can't tell you why. And all the research materials can't really tell you why that's such a determinant, but the research would tell you it is.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

JERRY DEICHERT: And Senator Schumacher, we've been...since I think sometime this summer, we've been looking to try to find good wealth measures at a small area and just...it is really, really hard to find those. That there's things that are collected at the national level and maybe you can get down to a state level, but getting much good information for wealth is really difficult to do.

SENATOR GLOOR: I remember a number that ran in that stalwart of research papers, USA TODAY, but it was, you know, 15 years ago or something and it showed the county with the largest percentage of millionaires and it was some Sandhills county, where what they were measuring was...

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Yeah, Arthur.

SENATOR GLOOR: Yeah, was it Arthur? They were measuring...what they were measuring obviously took into consideration the land owned by families.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Both of them?

SENATOR GLOOR: Both of them, yeah. But...and that would be the issue. You know, there just was a small enough population with enough landowners in that population group. And I laughed and I thought, people are going to be scrambling for Madison, Nebraska, trying to figure out where this county is. So that is an example of some of the problems of trying to identify what really is wealth.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: What do you...what are...what hypothesis have you got, Paul?

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: You know, I'm struggling with this idea of what is clearly a trend outstate with the land holdings getting larger, fewer farmers, fewer people to populate the schools, we're getting all that problem. And how is that wealth being transferred? Is it being transferred to folks out of state? Are they retaining it once it's transferred?

SENATOR COOK: Stocks.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: All that, I mean, wealth is a big issue and in the legal community the transfer of wealth, at least agricultural wealth, is a big, big thing. And, you know, how are we transferring wealth? And once transferred, should we be worried about it or once it gets to the grandkids it's all subdivided and blown anyway, so who cares?

SENATOR COOK: Yes, Senator Campbell.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: I wonder if it's possible through the Revenue Department--and it would depend on how accurate, I suppose, the county records are--but you could look at the inheritance tax in the county because if it's a wife, it's zero, but if you're out of state and you're paying more, there might be some worth to having...

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: You don't pay more if you're out of state.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Oh, yeah, on a county inheritance tax?

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: You pay more...a child pays the same, grandchildren, all 1 percent and nieces and nephews. But if you happen to have girlfriends and boyfriends, then you really get zapped.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: But do you think that's how they're transferring that wealth, though?

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Well, they're transferring it basically through trust or through the estate mechanism. But that can show up, if they're honest, on the inheritance tax forms, right? And maybe those things should be computerized and audited more, because right now there's just kind of a sloppy process.

SENATOR COOK: Senator Riepe.

SENATOR RIEPE: Thank you, Senator. Wasn't Ted Turner one of the, if not the largest landholders in Nebraska?

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Somebody said the Mormon Church had a lot of land, too.

SENATOR COOK: Yes, and the Mormon Church, the Church of Latter-day Saints.

SENATOR RIEPE: The Mormon Church has huge landholdings around Orlando, but I didn't...I just recall Ted Turner was a major landholder.

SENATOR COOK: Yes, Dr. Bartle.

JOHN BARTLE: If I may, Senator Cook. The Nebraska Community Foundation has looked at this issue of the transfer of wealth over time in the state and Jeff Yost, their executive director, might be a good person to talk to about that because I know they've looked at this over a number of years.

SENATOR COOK: Thank you.

JERRY DEICHERT: Then unemployment rate again considering that this is that, again, that 2011-15 period, you can see Nebraska was 4.7 percent, but again not a wide variation. And that kind of reflects the labor force participation rate, too, between District 11 and down to District 10. But you can see most of the state was...at that time was under 4 percent as far as the districts. And there were several that had fairly high rates, and there were four that had higher rates than the U.S. Then the other one that was of interest a few years ago was the percentage of children under six where if they've got one parent, that parent is in the labor force, or if they have two, both of them are in the labor force, and you can see that. Also it varies a lot from 85 percent almost down to 57 percent, 60 percent. So you have...I think one of those...I think Senator Harms was interested in this because he was interested in what happens to children under three for early childhood education and how this might have an impact on one of the indicators of some of the need in some of those areas by high percentage of folks where their kids are in...where both parents are working or one parent is working. This is something that we've noticed happening in the state is that the percent of homeowners has been declining. If we look at value...when you...for the state totals, we'll see that that's been happening, that the number of homeowners has been declining or the percentage of homeowners has been declining. And you can see Nebraska

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

is...about two-thirds of the state's population own their home or are purchasing their home. A little bit higher than the U.S., but again another large variation between legislated districts from 84 percent down to 37.5 percent. And District 46 again is around UNL, so I mean that's understandable why that would be the case. But District 7 in southeast Douglas County is 40 percent or 41 percent. Median home value: I show that Nebraska was increasing compared to the U.S. and still the U.S. has a higher median value and Nebraska is \$133,000. Again, we see larger variations from \$240,000 to \$67,000 and I think one of the discussions that we had had in an earlier...when we were talking about ag land valuation. Well, if you look at some of these rural legislative districts with lower median housing values that there's not a lot of...there's not a large tax base there when you have relatively low housing values.

SENATOR GLOOR: Exactly.

JERRY DEICHERT: And so you think about the difference in tax base for some area where the median housing value is...and then again, this is another one of those that somebody had asked to see for early childhood. And this looks at the percentage of children three and four years old and enrolled in school. And without...they could be either public or private and it's, again, wide variations. Nebraska is a little bit less than the U.S. and we go from 65 percent down to 21 percent.

SENATOR COOK: Senator Schumacher.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Now, enrolled in school, I mean, they're three or four, they're not in a K-12 system. What is the school then? Is it a preschool, a private daycare school? What is school?

JERRY DEICHERT: Let's see, I think I meant...we have the definitions of how the question was asked and...it says--and this is on page 38 of the report--it says, the question included instructions to include only nursery or preschool, kindergarten, elementary school, home school, and school leading to high school diploma or a college degree, because it asks of everybody. And so it gives specific instructions on what to do to fill out school enrollment. So we do have...that's

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

a good point that we do have the definitions of a lot of these in the report. I forgot to mention that.

SENATOR COOK: Senator Campbell.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Thank you. Just to comment, yesterday the folks from the Department of Education came over and gave me the last report that I'll hear anyway, on where we are in Step Up to Quality and we put the rating system in. Probably that was before Senator Riepe's time, but we put that in for centers that made a million or \$500,000 or \$250,000 in childcare subsidies. What is interesting is that we have had a great number of people voluntarily get into that system of stepping up the quality, and the highest step is...steps are four and five. And all of the people in four and five are those numbers and they're small at this point. There's five in each. They're home centers and one is in Omaha and one is in Plattsmouth that are at the top. And we all worried so much on the floor of the Legislature that the home centers would be left out of this and they have just embraced this (inaudible) quality.

SENATOR COOK: That's good news.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: It really is a great success story for the home people. And some of the center...one center in particular that we thought was warehousing kids said, I think I'll go out of business, because they didn't want to meet the quality for the children they had. So, I mean it was really neat to hear that the home provider is doing just fine, thank you.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: And this is for kids who are under five?

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Uh-huh. It would probably be the population that would be in that...

JERRY DEICHERT: This three to four years?

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Yeah, but it was very interesting. Sometimes what we worry about doesn't happen, thankfully.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR COOK: Yes. Thank goodness.

JERRY DEICHERT: Well, I've got two more slides on here and this looks at what's happened to health insurance. And looks at the percentage of the population that's uninsured. And you can see that Nebraska is...and this is '11 through '15, so it's again, over that time period. Nebraska was 10.3 percent. The United States was 13 percent and it was a high of 27.3 percent in District 7 to a low of 3.2 percent in District 25.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: And that's my district.

JERRY DEICHERT: And if you remember, District 7 has a high percentage of foreign-born population. And the last one looks at the percentage of the population that receives...and this is of the total population, not just those that have insurance, that has Medicaid or some means-tested public coverage. And again, you see Nebraska is 13 percent; U.S. is 18.5 percent, so Nebraska is quite a bit less than that and you can see how that varies by legislative district. And we also have the "uninsurance" in there for children and for the 18- to 64-year-olds, too, so it's in that main report. We just don't have that in the...kind of the summary charts. Then the next one I had here I think...I wasn't able to make it to the last meeting. And so John said that there was some question about when we looked...showed the income tax collection by farmers and ranchers that there was some question about what do we see with sales tax for sales. And so, I looked at net taxable nonmotor vehicle sales primarily because those are the sales that go into the state's General Fund. And the vehicle sales go into a cash fund. And so, the first chart looks at...the Department of Revenue has these collected and probably are in their own reports from 1999 through 2015. Don't have 2016 yet, so we can guess where that would happen. But I broke the state into...first of all, I broke it into two parts, Douglas, Sarpy and Lancaster which is this blue part, and then the balance of the state which is the red. And you can see that in 2015, 62.2 percent of the sales...of those sales within Nebraska were from these three counties, and 37.8 percent were from the rest of the state. And on average over those last five years, Douglas, Sarpy and Lancaster Counties average about 61 percent and the balance of state average is about 39 percent of the...that taxable sales. And if you're interested, the percent of population that these three counties have is 54.4 percent. So 62.2 percent of the sales and 54.4 percent of the population. And then, obviously, we know what the difference is. Now, one of the things that



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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

when I was looking at this I was noticing that there's huge variation in the counties in this group. And so, I looked at it and I decided that we know that crops are doing different than livestock and so I broke the counties into three groups. Crop counties were...at least 60 percent of cash farm marketings come from crops. Livestock, or at least 60 percent come from livestock or livestock products. And then mixed, where neither one has over 60 percent. And then I also broke those into rural and metropolitan. So if they're in a metropolitan area like Seward or Washington Counties, or if they're micropolitan, meaning they have a town of 10,000, so that would include Columbus. And I also...Grand Island is also in the metropolitan. So broke it into those groups and so if we just look at that, I've got this map and you can see that the blue are the what I call predominantly livestock counties, and Scotts Bluff, Lincoln, and Dawson County also have a town of over 10,000, so I've got those...looking at those separately. And the green is mixed livestock and crop. And the orange or whatever color that is, is predominantly crops. And then I've got Douglas, Sarpy and Lancaster out here separately. So those are the county groupings that I used. So sometimes I just look at crops, mixed, and livestock and sometimes I look at the different components.

SENATOR COOK: Senator Schumacher.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: I notice Platte shows up as dark blue, livestock, when probably if one were to ask, it probably is mostly irrigated corn and beans. But the anomaly there is there's a number of large, large pork operations. And so it isn't many people that are involved in it at all even though probably by value it may turn it blue, but Platte is basically a corn and bean county.

JERRY DEICHERT: Right and you can say the same thing with Cuming where you've got large feedlots, cattle feedlots. So when you're looking at acreage and numbers of people involved...but when you're looking at the amount of income that comes in from that, it's...or it's the sales that are greater (inaudible) it's different. And so like I said, it's kind of an arbitrary way to look at things but I thought well, that might be a good way to start to see if there are differences? So then this looks at...by type of agriculture. Again, for those three main groups, you can see the mixed counties--and obviously you can see that that includes a lot of the most populous counties--and there was a little blip, downturn during the recession, and then it peaked off in 2014 and it dropped. You can see the livestock counties, again a little bit of dip, increase and it's

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

leveled off and dropped. And crop counties are the similar pattern as livestock as far as that, but it looks like there's a little bit bigger drop in this time period. But I've got those percentages on the next slide. And so if we look at it, we've got the blue is the percentage change from one year to the next for crop counties. The red is mixed counties, and the green is livestock, and the purple is Lancaster, Douglas and Sarpy. So let's just go back to the most recent year. You can see that crop counties that had primarily crops were...had the largest decline in sales. The mixed had the next. Livestock in Douglas and Sarpy Counties and Lancaster County had an increase in that taxable sales. And you can trace each one of those through to see that during the peak commodity prices there was a large increase in counties that were predominately crop. And in livestock kind of was a little bit of...a little bit less, but it was also an increase. And in the mixed counties you didn't see so much. So I think that's an interesting way to look at it because you can see that those vary quite a bit, especially in these last few years depending upon the type of commodity. If we break and just look at what happened in the rural counties, those are those livestock, crop, and mixed with rural counties. Now I've got this adjusted value in here because there was a county in northeast county of Nebraska--I can't remember what it was--that one year had \$35 million in sales; the next year had \$135 million in sales; and then it had \$37 million in sales. So I figured there either was something that went on or whatever reason, that hundred million...and that's why that threw this way up. And then if I take that out, you can see what this adjustment looks like. It's a little bit more realistic. But you can see the last few years those counties that don't have a major population center or are not part of the metropolitan area, had a fairly large decline in sales regardless of whether they were mixed, crop, or livestock. And you can see the crop and livestock, that size county really tracked very similar. If we look at those that are the metro or the micro counties--so we're throwing in...now we're looking at Platte County and Hall County and Scotts Bluff County--you can see that for the most part the mixed counties were growing and had a slight decline. The livestock counties fairly flat in the last few years. And crop counties really haven't had much of a change since 1999, just a very slow increase. But those counties are much different than the rural counties that are associated with them. Somebody in the World-Herald is doing a story on this and was wondering...said that they'd talked to people in Columbus and Norfolk that said their businesses aren't having any problems, and why is there an issue? Well, it's because those types of counties really haven't had the same impact as those smaller rural counties. And this looks at all of those again. So the green are the crop counties entirely, the purple are those mixed counties, and these are the livestock

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

counties. The dark colors are the bars for the most rural and the light color are the metro counties. And you can see whether it's a crop, whether it's mixed, or whether it's livestock. Those counties that are what I call rural have the most volatility and have really been hit hardest in this last...well, with the commodity prices going down. So you can see that the crop counties had a big loss. The mixed and the livestock, but if they had a larger or a trade center, there was an increase, a slight decline, and a slight increase.

SENATOR COOK: Yes, Senator Schumacher.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: When you...the zero percent is based upon what, this time frame?

JERRY DEICHERT: It's between...you read that down at the bottom. So that zero percent is between 2007-08 or '08-09. So, yes, it's an annual percent change from 2007, 2008, so about...oh, this is about 1 percent here and this is about .5 percent here growth.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: You know the thing that gets me thinking a little bit is the 2007 and '08 period is the beginning of the anomalous economic event of the Great Recession coupled with this alignment of the stars on ag commodity prices. And that if this were to go back to 2000, what we would see is these reflect a more normal situation with this blip in here. It looks to me like the ag economy is going back to normal rather than going into depression.

JERRY DEICHERT: Yeah, I did go back that far and I did include it, because it just got overwhelming. You know, it's just...and so I was debating whether or not to go back. But you're right, it does look...it's just kind of whiffle-waffling around like that and with a little bit higher, a little bit lower. But you see this is where you get...you've got the recession and then you've got the big run up in commodity prices.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: And I guess where I think that then they have some relevance is, if we're saying, oh, we're in a temporary fluky recession, let's spend our Cash Reserve, we don't have to worry about adjusting tax rates or anything. But if we are in a return to normalcy after a unusual blip, then we'd be far more conservative in how we spend reserves and how we bet that we're going to have a surge of revenue in the near future.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR COOK: Senator Campbell.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: So then it might be valuable to some extent maybe to look at collapsing some of these categories but looking at it longer, to go to your point.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: I mean, that's just the hypothesis. We're in a very normal agricultural situation now after a very unnormal thing triggered by a lot of things. And the other thing that I wonder how--I don't suppose you can sort it out--if you look at taxable sales, a lot of the taxable sales occurring for Platte County residents, for example, are because they're going to Omaha on the weekends. They're going to Costco and they're going to Sam's Club and that's...it isn't that the folks in Omaha and Lancaster County and in between are spending that much more. There's one big boost in retail sales by people within driving distance going to a center to buy their stuff.

JERRY DEICHERT: Yeah, it's point of purchase, not point of residence.

SENATOR GLOOR: And, you know, coming up with the right formula here to consider all the different variables involved in crop prices, is an example. So what's going to happen in terms of foreign policy and what does that mean in terms of trade with Asia or trade with Russia, or how about ethanol subsidies? And there are...those all could have a huge impact on crop prices one way or the other and it's a huge unknown. It might be great, might be misery.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Might be great again.

SENATOR COOK: Senator Campbell.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: You know, one thing that...to keep in mind also was, when we were freshman senators and came in is when we really had the big, the start of that. And so we cut the budget and then we had special session and cut the budget and we used Cash Reserves, about half of what we had, to do that. And then we went into year two and we went, it's not better, it's worse if we remember. And the only thing that saved us was the...our own money that came from the feds. Otherwise we would have depleted every resource we had in the rainy day fund and we

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

still would have been short. And then we would have gone into the third year with absolutely nothing. So keep in mind that it's never a one-year blip on the budget.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: And to Senator Gloor's point, you know, if you believe the idea that there's going to be trillion plus dollars spent on infrastructure, that will make the...if that happens, that will make the other stimulus stuff just look...pale in comparison. So how does that impact us then?

JERRY DEICHERT: Senator Schumacher, one thing we could do like on these where we have this long period, we could run a trend line so you could see, you know, how many, where you're above and where you're below the trend and see how that would go, carry out if that trend line was consistent. And so does that bounce back up or does that continue to vary?

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: And the other thing on some of the statistical stuff, if there's correlation coefficients and things like...is there a correlation that you can reduce the numbers to shed some light on this? And I guess that's where I was...when I poked a little bit of the median idea, those are pretty elementary statistics and sometimes you can learn a lot more by some of these other tools that are out there that most of us probably don't understand and if we ever did, have forgotten.

SENATOR GLOOR: Well, and then the special sauce on all that is...armed with all that, then can you convince policymakers that it's real stuff and ought to be paid attention to or does static from the outside overwhelm it? We seem to be in a less data driven decision-making mode in this country right now, so.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Is the Planning Committee like Las Vegas--what happens in Planning Committee stays in Planning Committee?

SENATOR COOK: Any more questions? All right. Thank you. Senator Gloor.

SENATOR GLOOR: Are we going to...this is to that point. This is important to share I think with the legislative body, so how does that get done? I mean, is this something that can

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

transition? Can this be...I think this is important. And if nothing else, people are always curious about how their district compares to other districts, so I think it would be looked at. The issue for me is how do you get this information to the body in January with all the things that are hitting the new senators in particular and make sure it doesn't get lost in that clutter and static of information overwhelm.

SENATOR COOK: In years past, we've had an opportunity early. Are you going to do that again? There's a plan in January to...

JERRY DEICHERT: In years past, we've done some policy briefs and just a little bit description of the data. And so we were...as we were driving up here, John and I thought that maybe if I put these tables and wrote something up on it and also did the income tax from farmers and ranchers and maybe that might be something you think that would be good to present at that January meeting as well as one or two of these...of the briefs that we've done earlier. And so if there were a couple of the briefs that...I mean, that you thought would be good to present along with this, then we could do that.

SENATOR COOK: There are lists...there's a list of the policy briefs in your binder on the agenda so that you can...we can have a conversation about what makes....what we think that people coming in might be most interested in. Obviously, ag land property tax values are going to be a...continue to be a hot topic. In terms of the opportunity to really...for them to come in with a clearer understanding of the impact in urban, rural, and in-between. Yes, Senator Schumacher.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: The problem of how you...I mean, this is all great and nifty stuff, and it's actually six years of great and nifty stuff now--you guys were on it all the time I was on it, too--and is a transferring--and you can do a little presentation and it's in one ear and out the other and there's somebody maybe mentions it on the floor. But the statute creating the Planning Committee talks in terms of proposed legislation. Theoretically, the Planning Committee I think is authorized to propose legislation. What if it had a couple of priorities? And what if, instead of just listening to the data, we had a mission or--I'll be out of here before this ever could gel together--but you had a mission, Senator Riepe, of coming up with a bill or two and giving it priority and taking it to the body and saying, this is what we've learned and this is what we're

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

taking care of and it transcends over several committees' stuff? And so this is what we put together as a result of sitting in that room once a month and a lot of work from UNO. And this is...we're going to call it to your attention this way.

SENATOR COOK: Senator Campbell.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: You know, just as a small point--and I suppose it's so much on my mind because of yesterday--but we sat here for a great period of time and listened to Senator Harms's interest in children in poverty. If you remember, that's some of the data that we asked for, and it did translate. In other words, we finally said, okay, let's do a major two-year study. And now you have the results of that study. And all of this really came from...and Senator Mello was very clear yesterday in talking to the press that this came because of the discussion in this committee, that it would not have bubbled up. And so maybe we're not doing a good enough job saying, these are the things that have bubbled up from this committee. But I like your idea, Paul, because that would be great. Some of the issues that are in that report this committee could certainly give a priority to.

SENATOR GLOOR: And it might be unrealistic to have this committee develop a bill because it's really not staffed. I mean, it's staffed by whoever...

SENATOR COOK: Through grace right now.

SENATOR GLOOR: Yeah. It certainly might be very realistic that we have a priority or two that we can assign to a bill that's developed by somebody else. I mean, there's certainly no shortage of bills. You know that way...and it may be seen as less onerous by those who (inaudible) planning process if what the committee does is it has a priority it can drop on a bill that's out there because it's such a good fit with what we've seen through our planning process.

SENATOR COOK: Senator Riepe.

SENATOR RIEPE: I like the idea, particularly if we'd keep it down one or two so that whatever we would do would be of significance and not just a scattering of just more bills.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: We'd never get more than two anyway.

SENATOR COOK: Right. Somewhat like the process within the Performance Audit Committee (inaudible) identified priorities. The tools that we have for two whole weeks for some of us around the table is that we can identify, maybe based on the priorities we've set for 2016 policy briefs, and we can still have something drafted. Any of us still has that opportunity while they're still in the building. It's just identifying which one is going back to what is going to be a priority. We also have the resource that we've added this year of being able to remember to call upon the Legislative Research folks to say, hey, here's the section of the law, here's what the law says now, and based on what we've learned in our Planning Committee, some language for an amendment to existing law versus brand new, spanking section of law.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: For us to have a priority, we'd have to have a rule change. So if that isn't a dumb idea for us to have a priority or two, should maybe we kind of come to a recommendation that the rule be changed to allow so that we can take that to the Rules Committee?

SENATOR COOK: I like that idea. When I spoke of a priority, I thought about the priorities that we just identified as a group, but a formalized priority we would have to go through a rules change. And since I won't be here, I think it's a great idea.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: It may gives us some traction in the Rules Committee if we say, this is what the Planning Committee recommended.

SENATOR COOK: Right. And more conversation and more familiarity about the role of the committee, especially as more and more people come on. Interestingly, just as you said earlier, Senator Campbell, the concerns or the fears, if you will, when the Planning Committee was formed, was that it would take power away from the chairs of the committee to set priorities. Although as someone who cares about the Legislature as a thing and thinks that it's role is to prioritize in the aggregate across the state, I think it is a great idea for us to propose a rule. Yes, Senator Riepe.



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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR RIEPE: Are we looking for that in the form of a motion that we (inaudible)?

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: If we think we can be able to do that, I think it would give some impetus to it to say, you know, that, hey, this is...this would be something that the outgoing Planning Committee recommended. We're talking about recommending a rule change to allow two priorities.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: I think it's a good idea. I would move that we put forward a recommendation that the Planning Committee receive two priority designations.

SENATOR RIEPE: That it may or...

SENATOR COOK: Thank you, Senator Campbell. Pardon?

SENATOR RIEPE: Under it may or may not (inaudible)?

SENATOR CAMPBELL: That would be fine.

SENATOR COOK: That they may. All right, versus a "shall."

SENATOR CAMPBELL: If it's a rule, it's a rule, it's got to be a "shall." They don't have to use it.

SENATOR RIEPE: Well, I'm just saying, it doesn't mandate that we have to come up with...

SENATOR COOK: Have to fill up with a total of two, but up to two.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: You shall have them, but if we use them or don't use them, that's a different story.

SENATOR GLOOR: Yeah. Sort of same with us. If you don't...if you decide you don't want to use your priority.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR COOK: I don't want to do this. Do I hear a second for that...Senator Campbell's...?

SENATOR GLOOR: Second.

SENATOR COOK: Senator Gloor second. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed, same sign. Thank you. It's a very good idea. Yes, Senator Campbell.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: I have one other suggestion for the continuing people and that is, I think it's great that we do the briefs at the beginning, you know, and give some. But, boy, I sure think that there are...one committee that comes to mind is Appropriations and that if the Appropriations Chair did a briefing for the Appropriations Committee with some of these selected "informations" in setting a budget. What's the trend line in Nebraska? What have we seen?

SENATOR GLOOR: Well, that's a great idea there.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: I think that sometimes we're so focused on what we want now that we don't look at what that trend line is and I think we ought to be presenting a policy brief, specifically, or policy orientation for the Appropriations Committee.

SENATOR COOK: All right. The Appropriations Chair is officially a member of the Planning Committee per the statute so that would be a good natural flow.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: I think that...and remind any chair that they could do a briefing for their committee on data that is relevant to it. I mean, that would be helpful to giving the Planning Committee a little bit more oomph.

SENATOR COOK: Yes, Senator Riepe.

SENATOR RIEPE: I don't know whether it's the appropriate time but I'm...I at least want to get it on record that I may a draft Senator Schumacher for the Chairmanship of the long-range Planning Committee and I'll be campaigning and picketing or whatever it is.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR COOK: You have that right, Senator Riepe.

SENATOR GLOOR: He would picket, you would campaign.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Yeah, that's exactly...I concur with that. I think that would be great.

SENATOR RIEPE: Anyway, I'm just trying to (inaudible) a little bit further because...

SENATOR CAMPBELL: I think it would be great.

SENATOR RIEPE: Thank you.

SENATOR COOK: Senator...I mean, Mr. Deichert.

JERRY DEICHERT: To answer your question, following up with Senator Campbell, what if we...and we've been talking about this, that the people that would probably have more use for these data are some of the staff members. And we've been talking about when there's a break in the session or something, maybe having a half-day program where we invite all the staff members and whether they're committee staff or senate staff to present the...say the policy briefs, the database, and show them how to use it and how to get access to it. Would that be something that would be kind of follow up what you would say to get that information out to the staff?

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Great idea.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Yeah, that's really excellent because we be gone, they may still be here.

JERRY DEICHERT: And I was just thinking, given what Elice did, I mean because we worked with her a little bit so I mean...and more and more staff, if they know what's out there I think that might be a...and so we could work with the committee to decide what a good day that would be in the upcoming session and then we can do that. And then this would be sponsored by the Planning Committee and...then, I had one other question. Then for the January meeting, then did

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

you want us to do something on putting together kind of a brief or something on this tax and the ag land preservation or something else or what would you want us to present end of January?

SENATOR COOK: I think the population...I think a way to engage anybody is to...for them to be able to talk about themselves. And especially when you're brand new, you're trying to find the hearing room, get your mind around a lot of your committee work, to be able to offer them these quick facts about each person's district so they can become familiar and be able to speak knowledgeably about what the trends are in each of their districts as they relate nationally or as they relate to Nebraska is a great way, I think, to engage people.

JERRY DEICHERT: And we will have copies of all of these available then so that they can pick them up at the time.

SENATOR GLOOR: So do we need a motion for any of those multiple recommendations, like briefing for Appropriations and, I mean, this presentation (inaudible)?

SENATOR COOK: All right. And the staff briefing, do we need motions for that? I don't think so. I think they're addressed. They're minutes action items versus a...

SENATOR CAMPBELL: I do want to follow up on what Jerry indicated so that those of you who take a look at the intergenerational poverty report--you will all get a printed copy, not the whole indices, but you'll get that--is that when we lost the legal counsel and I had assigned her to write this report, Elice Hubbert, who is the committee clerk, stepped in and authored this report. And this is not like any report I've seen in the years I've been here. I mean, it is an incredible report of what she did in the research and the writing of it. So I would encourage you to look at it because it is incredible. Her skills are not anywhere utilized there. I mean, she's just...got a lot of talent.

SENATOR COOK: That happens a lot in this building. We're lucky. Senator Schumacher.

SENATOR RIEPE: I want to admire her for stepping up.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Speaking from my own perspective, is I spend a lot of time on the road, but I suspect a lot of us spend a lot of time on the road. And sorting through the reports, reading summaries and stuff like that, you can't do that while you're driving if your reading it. I've often thought that some of this informational stuff, if it were on a...whatever it takes, whether it's a USB chip or CD-ROM, that instead of listening to '60s music on satellite radio, you could listen to that report, for example. The odds of it being listened to or what at least is translatable to audio being listened to and reviewed, go up tremendously.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Planning Committee podcast.

SENATOR COOK: Yes. The Planning Committee podcast.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: I don't think it's a bad idea.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: I mean, where is...is Fred here? Did Fred leave? I was hoping to hook NET into doing the audio.

SENATOR GLOOR: Put it in a bill.

SENATOR COOK: Perhaps there could be a field study opportunity for a student in CPACS to...because I think students can sort of do that right on their phone, boop, boop, iTunes and then it's done.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: All of these very important reports we kill so much time on, whether it's the material in here, whether it's the tax incentive reports, the biomedical engineering stuff. Put a nice, thick book, bound, good, there, it's on the dust shelf. But it wouldn't be if you could use your time in audio, to at least listen to when you're driving.

SENATOR RIEPE: Another good idea.

SENATOR COOK: Yes.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Yeah, I like it.

SENATOR COOK: It's leadership.

SENATOR RIEPE: So you would say making that available to staff, to anybody that wanted it.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: To duplicate that stuff is cheap. What does a CD-ROM disc cost? Thirty cents or something. Just don't put Skype on it.

SENATOR COOK: No, I don't think we're permitted to do that.

SENATOR RIEPE: Bad move.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Put Policy Research should be doing legislative podcasts for a lot of other issues than even what we're seeing here. I mean, you think that's a great possibly that people all across the state could listen to some of this. I think it's a great idea.

SENATOR COOK: I wonder if Legislative Research has an eye toward moving in an audible direction, which we could build this into that existing plan.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: I've done some of it with just text-to-audio converters but then a graph gets in your way and it isn't phrased right and all of a sudden you don't know what you're talking about. But a lot of the local chambers of commerce--and I think one in Columbus is one of them--have a much different perception of what's happening in rural Nebraska and what's happening with growth and growth potential and are making decisions to build schools with 50 percent more capacity. And if this stuff is showing us anything, that's really not a good place for the resources. But it's very hard to communicate that perception of, wait, you might not want to...you know, this is probably where you're going to end up in 2050. So if you're planning for the next 30 years, this is a better bet than guessing you're going to grow your community by 50 percent, because you build a bigger school they will come.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Well, if nothing else, a lot of these reports have an executive summary because, you know, (inaudible) listening. Podcasts aren't always very long either; some of them are longer. But even to get people interested in a topic or to understand and say, this is the link to it and there's where you go to get the full report.

SENATOR RIEPE: Kind of a tease.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: It would be enough to advertise some of this.

SENATOR COOK: And that's what podcasts typically do. They refer...one of my favorite podcasts refers you to big history books on the topic of the podcast to which you can go after your hour listening experience beyond the Internet, real live books, paper on them...that are on paper, so.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Well, we can sit at home in our retirement, Senator Gloor, and we can listen to the podcast of Senator Paul Schumacher.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: There we go. Now, there's a source of revenue.

SENATOR GLOOR: I was hoping to be a Disney character in the next (inaudible), the voice of a Disney character.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: But when you read it, you speed it up or slow it down to get those different voices. (Inaudible).

SENATOR COOK: So our action item is to...maybe our action item is to check with Legislative Research to see if they're going in an audibles direction. And if that's the case, we've already got the partnership to identify and go with the idea of an executive summary.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Or maybe some broadcast students at the university.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

JERRY DEICHERT: I was going to say, would you like us to check that out to see if we come up with a kind of a proposal, a possible plan of action, too?

SENATOR COOK: Yes, please. Yes. Thank you.

JOHN BARTLE: There is a hiring freeze, I'll note.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: We're looking for slave labor.

SENATOR COOK: For students? Yes, we're looking for student, field...three credit hours perhaps (inaudible).

SENATOR CAMPBELL: But it's worth a discussion with the Legislative Research Office, because even if they took some of the material that we're seeing here and used the staff that they've got there to do some of these, it's worth a trial I think.

SENATOR RIEPE: Do they have a broadcast program? Is that a subset of journalism?

JOHN BARTLE: KVNO is UNO's broadcast program.

JERRY DEICHERT: They do put on a Consider This program every week. One of the things that we could do is, if that's going to be done when we put some of these together we could put together kind of like a two-minute bullet point or something to that effect. So we wouldn't be doing the work, but we would be helping to put together an executive summary so that that could be taken then and whatever.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Or even when they're written--not much prose in some of this--but written with the mind that this...you don't stick a graph in the...if you can say it in words, say it in words and in graph.

SENATOR GLOOR: As figure 14 shows...none of that. Figure 14 does show that...



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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR COOK: So it's already digitized from a couple of meetings ago. We've got it up on these reports. We can double click and they're already on legislative...

JERRY DEICHERT: These current ones are not.

SENATOR COOK: But the ones a couple of months ago.

JERRY DEICHERT: The last year's are still up on the Web site so you can click on and get the report. But these we are...so if we just...I think the copy's still warm, so we will get that up then. At the beginning of the year we'll have those up, too.

SENATOR COOK: All right. Thank you.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: All of the information you've given here and provided for our task force was just incredible. I mean, it just...it's a data-driven look at the issue rather than just anecdotal what we think is happening. It made a lot of difference, Jerry. Thank you for all your work.

JERRY DEICHERT: Well, thank you.

SENATOR COOK: It's a real opportunity, thank you. And a reminder for those of you at our in-person audience, there's a sign-up sheet if you would like to get hard copies of these or copies of this e-mailed to your own attention, because members will get them but if you would like one there is a sign-up sheet. Senator Gloor, you looked like you were going to ask a question.

SENATOR GLOOR: Nope. I was pondering something, but it doesn't lend itself to a comment.

SENATOR COOK: Okay. All right. Senator Schumacher.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Well, just--and I don't know how this ties into anything--but we are facing the reality of the pressures for tax reduction and the reality isn't that you can do tax shifts but not tax reduction unless you do a budgetary reduction. And that's pretty hard to come

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

by. And so my operating presumption is that there are trends out there--be it the retirement trend, be it the trend of people getting older--baby boomers expecting to have a more expensive form of healthcare and a whole bunch of them that aren't going to be too anxious to become inputs for the mortuary industry. So to be able to authoritatively say, look, the odds are that the cost of government is going to go up and up faster than x-rate--whatever x-rate is--whether that's the traditional rate of tax increase or revenue increase or whatever, so that people aren't under the impression that they should bet on the cost of government going down when they get into these tax-cutting modes...not tax cutting, revenue-cutting modes. I mean, that's I think the fundamental thing we're going to be facing, and you'll face it a lot longer than I will is, are we going to look at decreased costs of government so we can begin to program in tax cuts or formulas that are delayed in interacting because this is a fluky bad year coming up, but we can lock in something to take us ten years in the future in tax reduction? Or is that just not the real world? I'm looking for some authoritative (inaudible) to say the best bet is the cost of government is going to go up than the cost of current revenue stream...or than the current revenue streams go up? I think that's the case, but that's only my guess.

SENATOR COOK: And you will get someone to perceive that there's a whole bunch of spending that can go bye-bye. So that's the other part of the educational opportunity for policymakers and the public at large. Even my friends...

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: We've had about 15 years to look for that pot of gold.

SENATOR COOK: Yes. Even my friends in the service groups that I go to, there's an idea that there's a big...we're spending, spending, spending on things that we shouldn't be. So there's that. But we do have some more business, members of the Planning Committee, here under IV. I would entertain a motion to formally accept 2016 policy briefs as Planning Committee documents.

SENATOR GLOOR: So moved.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Second.

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

Legislature's Planning Committee  
December 16, 2016

---

SENATOR COOK: Senator Gloor makes a motion, Senator Campbell, second. All in favor? Thank you. And some committees, I don't think they've convened, although informally certainly, indirectly the Intergenerational Poverty Committee did. And so I don't think we have any reports there. Any comments? Any more questions or discussion? In that case, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

SENATOR RIEPE: So moved.

SENATOR COOK: Senator Riepe.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Second.

SENATOR COOK: Senator Campbell seconds. All in favor? Thank you very much.