

HUGHES: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the George W. Norris Legislative Chamber for the fifty-second day of the One Hundred Seventh Legislature, Second Session. Our chaplain for today is Pastor Charles Tschetter from Omaha, in Senator Arch's district. Please rise.

PASTOR CHARLES TSCHETTER: It's a privilege for me to pray with you today and for you. Let's pray together. Father, thank you so much for the men and women in this Chamber. We thank you for the work they do for our state here in the Legislature. Watch over and care for them. I ask that your hand of protection would be upon them and upon their families as well. These aren't easy days to serve as leaders in our state, and so I pray that you would help them to lead with courage as they do what is right. In the midst of what is often no doubt hard and a critical world, even toward them personally, we encourage them to do good work for us, and we pray that you would enable them to do that. As they demonstrate a humble spirit before you and one another, may you give them success because you are a just god. To the degree that they're capable, we pray that you would help them to execute justice for all. Give them understanding and insight into the complex and difficult issues they seek to work together to solve. Father, we know that the men and women who serve as our leaders affect the conditions in-- in our lives, and they have a great impact on our families, our churches, our places of work, and our cities. And so we pray for wisdom for them. Help them to govern wisely for the good of all the people of our state. Help them to lead and govern with integrity, and may their integrity guide them and keep them on the right track. And, Father, I ask that as you accomplish your good work in their lives, that your purposes might be worked out through them. Encourage and strengthen them today. Guide them so that we might all live peacefully and quiet lives in all godliness and holiness. And we ask these things in the powerful name of Jesus. Amen.

HUGHES: Thank you, Reverend Tschetter. I recognize Senator Gragert for the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

HUGHES: Thank you. I call to order the fifty-second day of the One Hundred Seventh Legislature, Second Session. Senators, please record your presence. Roll call. Mr. Clerk, please record.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

CLERK: I have a quorum present, Mr. President.

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

CLERK: There's one, Mr. President. On page 1006, line 28, strike "FA166" and insert "FA164." That's all that I have.

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

CLERK: New A bill, LB777A by Senator Brewer; it appropriates funds to implement LB777. Agency reports received are on file on the legislative website, and the lobby report, as required by state law. That's all that I have, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Speaker Hilgers, for the end-of-the-week announcement.

HILGERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. As we head into a four-day weekend, I wanted to give you an update what to expect next week, which is our last full week before we adjourn sine die. Big picture, from a scheduling perspective, you should expect Tuesday and Wednesday to be similar to what we had this week; in other words, late nights that go at least past 8:00, you should be prepared for that. And then on Friday, Friday, my intent and my hope is to be done similar to a day like today. It's the last day of the week, we won't have lunch, get done at 3:00. However, next Friday, as you know, it's our last day for General File debate, and so be prepared at least to go past 3:00. Depending on what we get done between now and then, we may need to go back past 3:00 in order to accommodate all of General File. We will, of course, also start at 9:00 in the morning and continue with our 10:00-- I'm sorry, one-hour recess at lunch. In terms of the actual budget-- bills we're doing next week, at the beginning of the week, we will continue with LB873 and LB920. We'll finish those debates. In addition, I have worked with Senator Matt Hansen and Senator Wayne in terms of scheduling the veto-- motion to override the Governor's veto on LB1073. That will come up on Tuesday. In addition, on Tuesday, Senator Erdman's LR264CA will come up, on Tuesday. On Wednesday, we will have LB933, Senator Albrecht's abortion bill. And then Thursday and Friday, we're just going to work to get as much as we can, both on General, but also Select. We can't forget about Select because we have to keep that moving in order to be able to get things ready for Final Reading. For today's agenda, two notes. One is you see that there is-- LB1014, the ARPA bill, is on today's agenda. I just want to note that is a motion to return to Select File,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

one amendment, and that is if Senator Wayne's compromise amendment on LB1024's North-- North Omaha Recovery Act. If that gets adopted, then we will go to LB1014 because ARPA will need to be-- will need to conform with the language in LB1024. If it doesn't get adopted, then we will not do that. But we're not actually going to pa-- we're not going to do LB1014, the ARPA bill, on Final Reading today. In addition, we do have a lot of Select File on the back end of today's agenda. My hope and intent is to get through all of that primarily to help out our staff in the Revisor's Office. As that Select File gets backed up, it puts more and more of a burden on them. And in particular, with late nights, they can go till 1:00 or 2:00 or later in the morning. And so I-- my hope is that we can get through all of today's agenda. Other than that, if you have any questions, please let me know and I hope everyone enjoys a long four-day weekend. It's certainly well earned. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Speaker Hilgers. We will now proceed to the first item on the agenda, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, LB1068 by Senator Stinner; it's a bill for an act relating to the Behavioral Health Workforce Act; states intent; provides for additional residencies and training experiences for certain behavioral health providers. Introduced on January 18 of this year, referred to Health and Human Services, advanced to General File. I have no committee amendments. I do have an amendment to the bill, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Stinner, you're welcome to open on LB1068.

STINNER: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Legislature, I feel like I'm trapped in the movie Groundhog Day. Before I start, this is my personal priority bill. I want to read because I think this is important to distinguish the BHECN's relationship with the University of Nebraska. I know it shows up as a University of Nebraska bill, but BHECN is financially administered by UNM-- UNMC, but it is governed by the executive committee made up of members from Creighton University, behavioral-- behavioral health regions, UNMC, private foundations that fund behavioral health services across the state. BHECN also has a statewide advisory board of behavioral health providers, DHHS, hospitals, N-- NDE, and Legislature. Jen Day serves on that advisory committee. We-- the university wants to make it abundantly clear that they have consistently stated that they are a pass-through organization. BHECN was created by statute. UNMC was to be the pass-- pass-through organization and administer the funds, so I just wanted

to make that distinguishing point before I start. LB1068 updates Section 71-830, which was enacted by the Legislature in 2009, effectively establishing the Behavioral Health Education Center of Nebraska, or BHECN. The bill will allow BHECN to appropriately fulfill statewide behavioral health service needs, workforce education, and professional training through already established practices and program. The changes proposed in LB1068 reflect the need to provide programming for the entire behavioral health workforce in the state of Nebraska. Presently BHECN is in three regions. There are six regions. They're in Omaha, they're in Kearney and, and Chadron. This bill expands them for the rest of the state. I've been working to improve access to behavioral and mental health services in rural Nebraska since I came to the Legislature. With over 95 percent of the Nebraska counties classified as behavioral health professional shortage areas by the Federal Health-- Federal Health Resource and Service Administration and the Department of Health and Human Services, there are access issues everywhere in the state. We are facing severe behavioral and mental health workforce shortages, which negatively impact access to appropriate behavioral health services. The COVID-19 pandemic only made matters worse. The Legislature must now work to address immediate needs and implement long-term strategies to alleviate education, training, recruitment, retention challenges in the behavioral health field. We also want to provide 24-7 access to telehealth in the behavioral health services. Given the fact that we have a potentially one-time opportunity to make a lasting and meaningful impact, I brought together a large group of stakeholders over the interim. Actually, it was Korby Gilbertson that approached me on the idea of, you know, expanding and creating a statewide web and communication services, so this was a group we actually put together. No associations were invited. These were all individuals. We wanted to make sure that we understood what was actually happening on the ground and try to prioritize an action plan. Our group concluded that the state should focus on addressing diverse needs across the state and provide funding in a way that will positively impact the entire state and not create winners and losers based on geography or resources. In short, we don't need to recreate the wheel or waste funds by creating new programs, but instead use the current programs that have proven-- have proven track record and existing relationships. A crucial priority to address these issues is to build a workforce pipeline, expand quality education, professional training opportunities, and efforts to ensure Nebraskans are able to access behavioral health services in a timely fashion, regardless of where they're located. I propose a three-bill package to bring meaningful change to both the behavioral health workforce and access to behavioral healthcare

services across the state. Two of these bills, LB1066 and LB1067, were referenced to the Appropriations Committee to address funding from two sources: a short-term infusion from the ARPA funds and a long-term commitment of General Funds to allow an existing program to meet its original objectives and evolve with the changing needs of our state. After reviewing the operational needs of BHECN and weighing those against our many budget obligations, it was determined that we could come up to a reasonable General Funds baseline funding of \$5 million for BHECN, which currently they have \$2.4 (million). What we're trying to do is add \$2.6 million to that baseline funding. BHECN does get funding from, from other types of sources, certainly from philanthropy but also from grants, so I think that they can carry on with this type of baseline funding. LB1068 represents an opportunity to ensure long-term success of the established recruitment, education, training and service programs carried out by BHECN. Since its creation in 2009, BHECN has made a big difference with their programs, resulting in a 33 percent increase in behavioral health providers across the state. BHECN now has over ten years of experience working with behavioral health stakeholders, educational institutions, students, and profession-- professionals across the state. Their programs make the center well-positioned to help address our current workforce shortages and meet the behavioral health needs of Nebraskans now and into the future. As envisioned by our predecessors in 2009, BHECN has focused on numerous programming and service areas, including: psychiatric residency and psychology internship training experiences that serve rural Nebraska and other un-- un-- underserved areas; training of behavioral health professions in the telehealth techniques and other innovative means of care delivery in order to increase access to behavioral health services for all Nebraskans; analyze the geographic and demographic availability of Nebraska's behavioral health professionals, including psychiatrists, social workers, community rehabilitation workers, psychologists, substance abuse counselors, licensed mental health practitioners, behavioral analysts, peer support providers, primary care physicians, nurses, nurse practitioners, pharmacists and physician assistants and then prioritize the need for additional professionals by type and location; establish learning collaborative partnerships with other higher educational institutions in the state, hospital, law enforcement, community-based agencies, and consumers and their families in order to develop evidence-based, recovery-focused, interdisciplinary curricula and training. Another priority of BHECN when it was established was to develop six interdisciplinary behavioral health training sites across the state, which would allow professionals to receive the training they need closer to home. This is especially important in rural areas

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

of the state. During our discussions this interim, we found that providing access to education and training in each of the six behavioral health regions would be beneficial, and this would allow BHECN to reach that goal while working within our existing behavioral healthcare framework. With LB1068, I also recognize the evolution of the behavioral healthcare service providers and have included language to broaden the residency, the internships, and the practicum programs to include physician assistants, psychiatric nurse practitioners, and mental health therapists. Finally, in order to ensure that Nebraskans can receive behavioral healthcare services no matter where they live, the bill clarifies that BHECN to-- work to educate behavioral health providers and facilities to integrate behavioral healthcare services into primary care practices and other licensed health facilities. I do want to thank-- this bill came out 7-0 out of the committee. I want to thank the committee for their patience. There was lots of testifiers, lots of interest in behavioral health. Behavioral health and mental health is-- is a discussion we've had here a lot within, within this body. Certainly, yesterday, it was one of the-- or two of the options were--

HUGHES: One minute.

STINNER: --excuse me-- was centered around behavioral health and building a system statewide to get in front of the problems associated with, with crime. And if you understood that what we're trying to do is really kind of do a statewide network, certainly building on telehealth, certainly building on education, certainly building on strategies as it relates to workforce, workforce then means that we have better access in rural areas, so that's kind of connecting the dots of what we're trying to get done in this bill. With that, I would ask for your green vote on LB1068. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Stinner. Colleagues, before proceeding, Senator Dorn would like to recognize Dr. Josue Gutierrez of Crete, who is serving as the family physician of the day today on behalf of the Nebraska Academy of Family Physicians. Dr. Gutierrez, if you would please rise to be welcomed by your Nebraska Legislature. Mr. Clerk, for an amendment.

CLERK: Senator Blood would move to amend, AM2564.

HUGHES: Senator Blood, you're recognized to open on AM2564.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. Fellow senators, friends all, I would first like to report that this is indeed a friendly amendment that has

the blessing of Senator Stinner. And because this pertains to a particular district here in Nebraska, I would like you to know that Senator Bostelman has also gave me his blessing. It's loud over there today. So I'm sure you're already familiar with what happened in Mead, but as a refresher, AltEn's ethanol plant that has been using seed treated with insecticides and pesticides off label to produce biofuel. Now this is a really good time to say, and I hope everybody is listening, that our other ethanol plants are exceptional and Mead was an outlier. They bragged that they took in 98 percent of the nation's excess coated seed. It gave AltEn free supplies, but left Nebraskans with a waste product too ridden with pesticides to even feed animals. In Mead, AltEn created giant piles of waste, known as wet cake, that comes from the leftovers of the company turning pesticide-coated seed corn into ethanol. The wet cake toxins then leached into the ground, blew into the air, and spilled out of containment berms and burst pipes. The AltEn facility housed enough wet cake-- I hope everybody's listening on this sentence-- to cover a football field 150 feet deep and it's been freely exposed to the volatile weather conditions in Nebraska for nearly ten years. The University of Nebraska has been undertaking extensive research in Mead, and if you look at your handouts, there's a very good one-page description of what they're doing and the surrounding areas, which is really important, of the ethanol plant for two years, assessing and evaluating the environmental and human health effects of the toxic chemicals contained in the dry residue and wastewater produced and stored at the AltEn ethanol production plant in Mead. This amendment would appropriate only \$1 million to the university to continue this research for approximately one year, as their funding runs out in June. And as you will note, in the handout that I gave, originally we had hoped to try and fund for ten years, so we'd have like really good research, at approximately \$7 million, but that's just not going to happen in this budget cycle, and I can respect that, but moving forward for a year is better than not moving forward at all. The results of the environmental study would inform the people of Saunders County and affected Nebraskans as to how to protect and potentially clean up their environment. This project will also inform citizens of their health risks, if any, from the contamination. This evaluation of environmental and health-- human health status began in April 2021, and most of the work is anticipated to be completed by December 2025. So the project is divided into four main approaches. In one-- in one, samples of air/dust, water, which means surface water, groundwater, and domestic water, and soil are and will be sampled to determine whether the water, soil, wildlife, and people living near the AltEn plant are near fields where wet cake or wastewater was field-applied

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

are being exposed to hazardous levels of insecticides and/or fungicides. In the second, adults living near the AltEn plant or near fields where wet cake or wastewater was field-applied will be asked to complete a survey of perceived adverse health effects and to provide blood and urine samples for analysis of the compounds, as they've already been doing, by the way. The survey has been approved and a pilot version has been tested. Starting this January, the survey was rolled out to people in the affected areas of Saunders County. In the third arm, insects, specifically pollinators, vegetation, and wildlife will be sampled from contaminants from the plant and their effects. And lastly, a medical registry has been established to track potential long-term health effects caused by exposure to contaminants from the Alt-En plant. Enrollment in the registry is offered to people living in Saunders County. They plan to monitor the long-term health effects quarterly and the registry for 10 years. These four arms of the study will be connected so they can determine off-site migration of the possible toxic contaminants, especially in the water from the AltEn plant, and whether exposure to these contaminants may have adverse effects on people and animals' health. In addition, hospital records with no personal identifiers will be examined to determine whether there's an increased incidence of particular health issues in the affected areas in the past three to four years. Friends, it's imperative that the university's research continues. We know that there was some mishandling of what happened at AltEn, and I'm not here to point fingers, but I do want to say that it's our duty to protect those possibly poisoned, our Nebraska's animals, our citizens, our insects, and our very important agricultural assets by funding this research. And so I would ask that you have compassion for those who live in Saunders County, and I would ask that you support the science because it's all about the science, friends; it's all about the research. And something that I want to say before I close is that you may not know that the doctors that participated in this research donated their time, donated their time. Nobody paid them. There was no funding that was given to them. They were granted funds to cover the expenses but not their cost for the hours that they donated, and they did this because they feel that this is the worst environmental crisis in recent history here in Nebraska. So with that said, because I'm not going to stand here and preach about AltEn, because this is Senator Stinner's time in the limelight, I would ask that you please support AM2564 with your green vote and, of course, Senator Stinner's underlying bill, LB1068.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Blood. Debate is now open on AM2564. Senator Jacobson, you're recognized.

JACOBSON: Thank you, Mr. President. I got in the queue before the amendment was introduced, and so I would tell you that I'm-- I'm still contemplating how I would-- how I will vote on the amendment. I understand the issue. Probably the troubling thing for me is the fact that this million dollars may just be a start, and I'm going to have a hard time getting behind something that we're going to start funding and then potentially be feeling the need to continue to fund at a million dollars a year. My bigger concern is the needs for healthcare training, healthcare workers, getting more people in the western part of the state and, and getting them trained. What we're finding with the University of Nebraska at Kearney, it's a great asset for all of us that live west. Although Kearney is very much central Nebraska, it's our university when it comes to what we're accessing out west. The things they have done over the last several years have been phenomenal. They have great leadership. They've been able to hold tuition costs down. They've continued to develop great students. I've been able to hire a number of those. One of the things we find is that when you go to a university, whether it be in Lincoln, whether it be in Omaha, at the Med Center or UNO or you go to UNK, you go there as a student and you tend to stay there if there are jobs available. It's a great incubator for us in terms of hiring people, but more importantly, it's helping solve this healthcare problem that we have and behavioral health problem, which is-- which is in crisis proportion. So I'm very much in favor of supporting the, the underlying bill, LB1068, because I believe that LB1068 will make a real difference. I'm one who always gets concerned about General Fund expenditures that could be ongoing. This truly is an investment in our future. If we can't solve the healthcare worker crisis, we're going to continue to have problems staffing our nursing homes. I've got a nursing home that closed in my district, in Mullen, and that nursing home may not-- home may not open again, and that's tragic. And as we continue to have more and more people age up to the point they need this care, we don't have workers available to staff it. I also sit on the board of the Great Plains Health in North Platte, and I can tell you that we're short of nursing staff there. We've got one floor, the top floor of the hospital, that we're not able to fully utilize because we can't hire enough nurses to be able to staff it. There is a critical shortage and I get it. We've got shortages in all professions across the country. But training people in our general area, they're tending to graduate and they're tending to stay there and accept jobs that are open there, so I truly applaud the efforts of Senator Stinner to bring this bill. I think the university has done a great job of developing these people, especially the Kearney campus. And so I'm very interested in seeing LB1068 move forward. I think it will help

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

fill a critical void that we have in the state. With that, I'll yield the rest of my time back to the Chair. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Jacobson. Senator Bostelman, you're recognized.

BOSTELMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I'm going to stand in support of AM2564. Senator Blood, as we talk about, UNMC has done some research out there, some study work out there. The local community is very concerned about what-- if-- if there are any, what may be happening in that community or has happened healthwise with those. I think this is an opportunity for them to continue that for another year and/or apply for some funds, use this to help apply for some other grants, some other funds that are out there, to continue that process. It is an important thing for my district, and especially for the Mead community. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh-- or Senator Bostelman. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I would ask if Senator Blood would yield to a question.

HUGHES: Senator Blood, will you yield?

BLOOD: I am happy to yield.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Senator Blood. Do you know what-- so the amendment is a white-copy amendment, correct?

BLOOD: Um-hum.

M. CAVANAUGH: And I just am-- I'm a learner. I like to follow things along. Could you-- do you know what section on the white-copy amendment is your portion of it?

BLOOD: I do if I grab my computer.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. Sorry, I should have given you a heads-up. I just was going through it myself, and I'd just like to know what parts are what parts.

BLOOD: So if you scroll down--

M. CAVANAUGH: Um-hum. Is it Section 3? I just got to that part.

BLOOD: Give me a page here.

M. CAVANAUGH: Page 5-- 4, line 21.

BLOOD: It is indeed. "The University of Nebraska shall conduct an assessment of the environmental and human health effects--" is the first sentence.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK, great. And so I recall last year when you had some of us come to Mead to meet with the people, the community.

BLOOD: Yeah, that was memorable.

M. CAVANAUGH: It was, it was certainly-- my senses will never forget it. There was some researchers there from UNMC. Is this part of that research that that woman was doing?

BLOOD: That, that is indeed part of that research group. And as I said earlier, too, I'd remind everybody that those researchers donated their time. We didn't fund that research. They got a grant, and the researchers took no money, to make sure that this got implemented and started.

M. CAVANAUGH: So this has already been started.

BLOOD: It has been started and their funding that they have ends in June.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK, so this would be us helping to continue the funding for at least one more year.

BLOOD: It would, indeed.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK, great. Thank you, Senator Blood. I really appreciate it.

BLOOD: My pleasure.

M. CAVANAUGH: And I appreciate you bringing this amendment. I have more to say about the bill itself, but I'm going to let us go to a vote. I'm going to get out of the way for voting on the amendment, and then I'll get back when we're on the underlying bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of AM2564 and LB1068, and I wanted to rise in support of this. I appreciate all

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

of the work that Senator Blood has done on this issue. You know, she just talked about-- I know everybody was listening. I know everybody's paid attention to what was happening at-- in Mead at the AltEn plant and the sort of slow-evolving catastrophe of the contamination as a result of the using the treated seed for ethanol. And so I think this is, like she said in her opening, this is not about placing blame, though there's surely blame-- blame to be placed, enough to go around. This is about looking at what are the long-term effects of this, making sure that we are having the resources to actually do the studies, track the, the medical issues, because with these sorts of things, with contamination, especially with chemicals, toxins that we aren't-- don't fully have a grasp of how-- what the harm is that they're going to cause to people, it's important that we are testing the groundwater, testing the soil, and tracking individuals for years to come because we don't know. And these type of incidences have happened all over the country. It's happened that we have, you know, cancer clusters, not saying that's the-- necessarily what's going to happen here, but you have these things and then they have to go back years and years to find out what is the origin of that. And so right now, we have a point source or originating point that we can keep track of and make sure and get all the data so that we understand what are the potential, I guess, clusters of symptoms, ailments that may arise out of this. And then we can make that connection and make sure that we understand it. So this is really an important thing that we should be doing. I appreciate-- Senator Blood has been tenacious on this issue. She has kept this issue alive for the people of Mead and for the people of Saunders County and for people of Nebraska to make sure that we do not look away before we have done the work of mitigating the harm that was caused by this. So this is really necessary; this is a good idea; this is what we should be doing on AM2564. And LB1068, I appreciate Senator Stinner's work on, on this and I think this likewise is a very important thing that we should be doing going into the future. So with that, I would yield the remainder of my time and I would support-- I'd encourage everybody to support both AM2564 and LB1068. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Albrecht, you're recognized.

ALBRECHT: Thank you, President. In reading through the amendment, I would like to just ask a few questions of Senator Blood if that would be all right.

HUGHES: Senator Blood, will you yield?

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

BLOOD: Yes, I'll yield.

ALBRECHT: OK, so there's a couple different parts of this amendment that I have questions on. I do appreciate the attention that you've put into the Mead area because my grandchildren do attend that school. And if, if the people in the area were to get their blood and urine checked, it-- would it be at the expense of the university and the program? Is that right?

BLOOD: That is-- the funding is only for the mechanisms that are involved, so drawing blood, testing the blood, drawing-- not drawing urine, collecting urine, testing the urine. None of the funds that we're asking for goes to the physicians. It goes to the work that is being done.

ALBRECHT: OK, so did-- was there a hearing on this bill, on the Mead?

BLOOD: There-- there was a hearing in front of Appropriations.

ALBRECHT: OK.

BLOOD: And Appropriations was unable to fund it. And after speaking to several members of Appropriations, it was suggested that this would be the best avenue, and we reduced the amend-- the ask to only \$1 million. It's loud in here today, isn't it, Senator Albrecht?

ALBRECHT: Yes, it's very loud. But then I have-- in other sections of this bill, were these count-- was-- were the behavioral health workforce internships a part of your request or someone else's?

BLOOD: That is Senator Stinner's bill.

ALBRECHT: OK.

BLOOD: And the reason that this is alongside Senator Stinner's bill is that we're asking-- or, I should say, directing the University of Nebraska to conduct something in particular or to do something in particular, so the germaneness is the fact that we are requesting a specific duty be done.

ALBRECHT: OK, so then-- OK, I appreciate your information. So I'd like to ask Senator Stinner just a quick question about the other part of the amendment.

HUGHES: Senator Stinner, will you yield?

STINNER: Yes, I will.

ALBRECHT: OK, the same questions: Did someone come to you asking for-- to provide more physician assistance and psych-- psychiatric nurse practitioners? Did somebody come forward and ask for that?

STINNER: Yes. Actually, that was all part of that action group that I put together, and because healthcare, and especially mental and behavioral healthcare, has expanded into those areas and now they are fulfilling certain parts of the behavioral health and mental health equation, so that's why we expanded it to include additional-- additional professional people. That helps be more comprehensive, I guess, in, in the approach across the state.

ALBRECHT: OK, so it actually-- on page 3, line 28, it only adds for public school districts. Is that where these ten people are going to be headed, toward their school districts? And if so, why wouldn't the school districts pay for this instead of us?

STINNER: Actually, we added the public school districts because we actually had a-- a superintendent, superintendent of Scottsbluff, they got career academies. So what we're trying to do is to provide educational component for a curriculum for a CNA. CNA is certified nurse-- nursing assistant, which is a two-year degree, so they can use dual credit. They could career path-- pathway to that. This just gives them the opportunity to do some work, to do some survey work to track if that program is successful and--

HUGHES: One minute.

STINNER: --to help public schools to, to, to foster this type of activity.

ALBRECHT: And, and I do appreciate the rural side of it because, you know, that's what we can use. But knowing that there's such a shortage, I-- I'm trying to connect the dots that we probably will be asking for more practitioners in that particular area, so I appreciate the, the answers. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Albrecht and Senator Stinner. Senator Erdman, you're recognized.

ERDMAN: Thank you, Mr. President, and good morning out there. I was-- had another meeting this morning, so I wasn't here for the opening, but I brought this up. I has-- I guess I hadn't reviewed the amendment. I guess I'm on the same page that Senator Albrecht is. I'm

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

having a real difficult time making the connection how this is germane to Senator Stinner's bill. Senator Stinner is training people to do mental healthcare, and this is asking the university to conduct an assessment of environmental health issues from an ethanol plant. Now that's a stretch. That is a real big stretch. I cannot connect those two, so I was wondering if Senator Stinner would yield to a question.

HUGHES: Senator Stinner, will you yield?

STINNER: Yes, I will.

ERDMAN: Senator Stinner, in Appropriations we had this bill about assessing the environmental health issues or the cleanup, or whatever it might have been, on the ethanol plant. Did that bill get enough priority votes or enough people who wanted to talk about that that we had a discussion about it in the Executive Session?

STINNER: I don't believe in the original form, it did

ERDMAN: OK. And in the original form, was it \$10 million?

STINNER: I-- it was something like that. I can't remember the exact number. It was much, much larger than this number.

ERDMAN: OK, so this, this amendment is asking for \$1 million. Is that correct?

STINNER: Yes.

ERDMAN: OK. So are they taking \$1 million out of your \$10 million ask?

STINNER: This, this-- and actually we-- I think Senator Wishart worked with Senator Blood to carve out some of her ARPA money, so this will not be General Funds money.

ERDMAN: OK. All right. So do you consider this a friendly amendment?

STINNER: I have considered it a friendly amendment. Yes.

ERDMAN: Do you think that my comments about being germane are justified or am I off base?

STINNER: You know, I've never been really good at the rules, so I kind of stick to my numbers.

ERDMAN: OK.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

STINNER: So I'm not sure. I-- I think there's a whole lot of other folks that are smarter about that than I am.

ERDMAN: Yeah, I understand that. But I just-- OK, thank you. I appreciate that. You know, so we're going to put this in here and we're on day 50-- 55th day, right? Fifty-two, 52nd day, so we have perhaps eight days, unless I do a sine die before that, and so we're trying to figure out any way we can to get bills to the floor. I think this is inappropriate. I think this is inappropriate that we attach this bill and we will say it is germane because it's all going to the university. So perhaps we should just give all of our money to the university and avoid all these discussions, because, you know, they return about a gazillion dollars for every dollar we give them in economic advantage. So we just give them all our money and then we won't have any budget problems, because they're going to make so much more that we'll just have a free-for-all like we did this year. I'm tired of giving the university money. OK? And I've had several emails in the recent past asking about, what does all this money we give the university do for us in western Nebraska? I don't know how to answer that. Maybe "not much" is the answer. But I am not in favor of this amendment.

HUGHES: One minute.

ERDMAN: Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Erdman. Senator Blood, you're recognized.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. Fellow senators, friends all, again, I hope everybody is actually listening to this debate and hasn't made their minds up already. Especially for those that aren't enthused, Senator Erdman, I'm talking to you, with the university. I know that, Senator Erdman, and you say this all the time and I respect this, that-- that you're tired of giving the university money. But you know what I'm tired of? I'm tired of Nebraskans being collateral damage to big business. I'm tired of us not hearing the voices of these potential victims and pretending that if maybe we ignore the problem long enough, it's going to go away. I am sick and tired of that. And, Senator, this isn't germane because the university has their name in the bill; it's germane because we are directing the university in both the amendment and the underlying bill to do something. And we searched through all the bills to find one that was germane, and this one is germane. And I want to say, because I do appreciate the kind words and I have been very vocal when it comes to Mead, but this is Senator Bostelman's district, and he has, as well, so let's make sure that--

that we give him praise, as well, because we both are concerned about what's going to happen po-- potentially in Mead. But here's the other thing. We don't want to give money to the university, but, boy, when this research team donated their time, when this research team found a grant to fund it to make sure that people weren't going to die, we didn't call them up and say, thank you for being creative, thank you for finding a way to protect Nebraskans. But, boy, when we try to extend that research, science that we have to have to protect the public, we're up in arms. We're up in arms for funding one more year of a ten-year study. How do you put a value on human life? How do you put a value on human life? Because that's ultimately what we're talking about if we're not willing to move this amendment through. So we can-- can stand on the mike and say all the fancy words we want to, and we know how people are good at taking one side or the other and we can basically take the exact same sentence and make it sound like we're pro or con, because we're savvy at that, and good on us. But let's be real for a minute. Right? The effects of the pesticides used by AltEn on humans, animals and insects, although it varies greatly, we know that there's similarity when it comes to the devastation that it caused to critical functioning systems, developmental-- and we just talked about that, Senator Albrecht and I, or neurological effects of these pesticides on humans can include malformations of the developing heart and brain of children, autism spectrum disorder, and a cluster of symptoms, including memory loss and tremors, and there has been research that points to organ damage, reproduction issues, pro-life people, respiratory issues, and cancer. Continuing this research in Mead is critical for the future of the citizens who reside there. We want people to stay in Mead and Nebraska, folks. We want people to be well because people have the right to feel safe and be well, and it is critical to protecting the watershed surrounding this area, Lincoln senators. Though results from the project are preliminary, it implicates contamination in the water and land that spread several miles downstream from the ethanol plant. There's also concerns about how the source of Lincoln's high-quality water from a river aquifer will be affected. This isn't a small project. It's a big project, a big project--

HUGHES: One minute.

BLOOD: --that people took upon themselves and put their blood, sweat and hearts into it, and they did that because they don't want Nebraskans to be collateral damage. And to say that you're sick and tired of giving university money, I-- I respect that, but, jeez, have a heart. Have a heart. We're talking about Nebraskans, taxpayers, by the way, who deserve better. Thank you, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Blood. Senator Walz, you're recognized.

WALZ: Thank you, Mr. President. I am in support of AM2564. I attended the town hall in Mead last summer. I took the time to attend it and listen to the victims' stories. I learned a lot about what happened. I learned a lot about the effects of the pesticides and what was being done to remedy-- or, I guess I should say, what was not being done to remedy the situation. This really is an important issue, and I think if it was happening in your community, you may have a different view on things. It's important issue. It's important to the lives of Nebraskans. It's important that we take the time and listen to this issue and do things that protect the people that we serve. With that, I'll yield my time to Senator Blood.

HUGHES: Senator Blood, 4:10.

BLOOD: Thank you, Senator Walz, and thank you for talking about the town hall because I think that, for those of us that were able to attend, I think it left a really lasting memory of why we have to continue to be diligent and try and fight for those folks. And again, it's not about finger pointing. It's about protecting Nebraskans so they're not collateral damage. And so when I see people oppose things like this, I-- I wonder why. Because you don't like the university? You don't think that they deserve funding? Because you think if we ignore the problem, maybe it'll go away? I mean, I know it hasn't brought a great light onto Mead, but Mead had nothing to do with it. They're the victims. And if I wanted to move into Mead, Nebraska, I'd want to know that I was protected because I had researchers who had valid information to share with me to show me that if I'm of childbearing years I'm not going to not be able to have a child because I was exposed to this, or that if I have a child I don't have to worry about that child getting brain tumors as a result of these toxins. I'm a little puzzled, and I have to tell you that the bills I've brought forward have been a fight the whole way and I, I don't know why, because it's not about pointing fingers. With that, I would ask that Senator McCollister yield for a question.

McCOLLISTER: Yes, I will.

HUGHES: Senator McCollister, will you yield?

McCOLLISTER: Yes, I will.

BLOOD: Senator McCollister, we've heard three of the senators already talk about the town hall. You were at that town hall. What do you

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

remember most about the town hall as far as the people that spoke to us?

McCOLLISTER: The earnestness of the people that spoke and--

BLOOD: And-- and do you remember the concerns that they shared with us and you?

McCOLLISTER: Well, I certainly do.

BLOOD: Can you share with that, please?

McCOLLISTER: Well, they felt it was the obligation of the state to deal with this issue and that the state hadn't successfully done that. So I-- I understand the issue they, they wanted us to understand.

BLOOD: That's fair. Thank you very much, Senator McCollister. I could start calling on all the Senators that-- that participated. But the one thing I was going to tell you is that they're always going to remember the smell, because the smell was like a cross between a rotten egg and a dead animal and you can smell it in your sinuses for like days after you visit, so imagine living there. And now that's gotten better because they put like a pile of concrete over the poisonous mass, so the smell has gotten better. But we know, too, that now apparently one of the bladders, one of the well containments, apparently is leaking. You can find that information on the NDEE public site. And so if it's leaking, friends, where does that go? Does it magically disappear with fairy dust, or does it go into the ground, into the air, into our waterways? It's a mess. It's a mess that went on for ten years.

HUGHES: One minute.

BLOOD: We don't need to point fingers, but what we do need is to put on our big-boy pants, our big-girl pants, and help those who need help. They are Nebraskans. They are taxpayers. Some of them are our future workforce. And frankly, we need to make sure that we do our due diligence and we don't allow them to get sick or ally them-- allow them to die. Nebraskans aren't collateral damage to mistakes. They should never be collateral damage. So I'm-- you know, I want to make sure that we don't drag this out too long. Senator Stinner's bill is important to him. My amendment is really important. I really ask that you folks consider voting green on both and we can get onto the many, many bills that we have in front of us. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Blood. Senator Arch, you're recognized.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

ARCH: Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to ask Senator Stinner some questions if he would yield.

HUGHES: Senator Stinner, will you yield?

STINNER: Yes, I will.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Stinner. I'm lost. [LAUGH] So I-- I want to-- I want to make some statements and I-- I want you to confirm or say, no, that's not-- that's not correct. So LB1068 came to the Health and Human Services Committee and it was a BHECN bill, and it was-- originally it was an ARPA request. And so we discussed the merit of-- merits of BHECN, and the-- my understanding was really the nut of the BHECN bill, the LB1068, was the expansion to the entire state. Right now, they're-- they're limited to certain areas of the state. Is-- is that correct, Senator Stinner?

STINNER: Yes, we're-- they are not in the northeast, southeast, or southwest behavioral areas, so this would expand into all six behavioral health areas.

ARCH: So we discussed-- we discussed the merit of-- of BHECN. We discussed the issues surrounding the-- this-- this issue that we have with-- with behavioral health staff and-- and professionals in all areas of our state. And we decided, based upon that, that we would move that bill out of committee based on the merits of the expansion of BHECN to the rest of the state. So we did that and-- and at the time there was a request for ARPA. That request was-- was going to be handled over in Appropriations, not-- not in-- not in our bills-- I mean not in our committee. And so this was one of those bills where it was-- it was in both committees and we needed to discuss the merits of it, which we did. OK. So LB1068 moved, and-- and you, I know, had some-- had-- had some discussions as to how this would be funded. So where does it sit now? So-- and I'm just talking about LB1068, not-- not Senator Blood's amendment, but just LB1068. Where does it sit now for the funding of BHECN?

STINNER: The funding of BHECN will be a baseline funding to increase their \$2.4 million existing funding and General Funds to \$5 million, or the \$2.6 (million). And you and I had a discussion. I actually took the administrative cost out of the ARPA bill because it only was three years. And when I talked to the folks at BHECN, they said, you know, that's not a stable situation for us, we'd like to have a more permanent situation. They originally had a \$10 million request. You and I talked. We've removed that \$10 million, but I came back with we

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

need baseline funding for BHECN to get this done that-- and then obviously there's other funding sources called grants, federal grants, and local ph-- or statewide philanthropy can fill in the rest. But the-- the ARPA funds over a three-year period will-- will certainly energize or provide the resources to really institute the telehealth, to start the regions up, the hard cost associated with start-up. And obviously internships, as well, over a three-year period of time will be energized and then they can take a look and-- and probably drop some of those numbers back or else go for grants to--

ARCH: Good.

STINNER: --continue the program, but no more state funding.

ARCH: One of the-- one of the-- one of the testimonies that I recall from that came from your area and-- and it was-- it was the-- I-- I don't remember the name of the, of the, of the consortium, but it was a-- it was a group that was-- that was bringing postdocs, once they get their Ph.D., bringing postdocs into the area and then funding them through an internship and, and their postdoc to-- and then with the desire, of course, to help them get established in the area and then to start their practice there and been pretty effective. And I understand from residencies and fellows in-- in-- in physicians, in medicine, that there's a cost associated with that, and that cost is difficult. Now, of course, in medicine, you get that through Medicare and you can pass those costs on, but when it comes to psychology and behavioral health, that funding--

HUGHES: One minute.

ARCH: --finding that internship dollar is difficult. So I understand that the bill moved out of-- the bill moved out of HHS and, and you worked out the-- you worked out the financial arrangements on that. Now, if-- if AM2564 does not pass, what happens to LB1068 and, and that underlying BHECN bill? Because AM2564 seems to incorporate all of the BHECN bill in that, what happens to LB1068?

STINNER: I would think that the LB1068 would survive in its current form.

ARCH: And it would then be funded out of General Funds, as you've me-- as you've mentioned there, for the expansion of BHECN across the state.

STINNER: Yes.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

ARCH: The-- the-- the-- the AM2564-- I may run out of time here, but the AM2564, that has a-- is that a one-time expenditure of a million dollars or is that an ongoing commitment?

STINNER: That was the in-- that was definitely the intent. Let me ex-- let me--

HUGHES: Time, Senators.

ARCH: I'll put my light on. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Arch and Senator Stinner. Senator Friesen, you're recognized.

FRIESEN: Thank you, Mr. President. Would Senator Stinner yield to questions?

HUGHES: Senator Stinner, will you yield?

STINNER: Yes, I will.

FRIESEN: Senator Stinner, we've-- we've talked a lot about prison population and the mental health issues and trying to stem the flow of people in that pipeline, and I have mentioned before we have a lack of mental health facilities. How does this fit into that bigger picture of providing more mental health services in rural Nebraska? More beds? I think there are two different components here. This is one of them. Explain a little bit, because I'm really interested in the rural mental health issue--

STINNER: Yep.

FRIESEN: --and-- and getting more beds out there, more practitioners.

STINNER: Actually, I am, as well, and that's what really brought this initiative forward to spread it across the state as a web and maybe have some spokes in-- or a hub-and-spoke type of analysis, if you will, in those regions. But we're expanding from Omaha, Kearney, Chadron to northeast Nebraska-- now there isn't a location yet-- southeast Nebraska and southwest Nebraska, so it will encompass and be comprehensive across the state. And as you're well aware, and one of the-- the numbers that I-- I've really kind of centered on is when we compare Nebraska providers as it relates to psychiatrists and psychologists. When I look at rural Nebraska, per 100,000, we got three psychol-- psychiatrists. Urban Nebraska has 11.8; 8 point-- psychologists, 8.7 versus 27 in urban. Obviously, they congregate near

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

urban areas. What we have to do is incent them in some fashion to go to rural Nebraska. Now in the-- the-- in the residency programs, many of them have-- I can't tell you all of them have this, but many of them have a component that they have to serve a certain amount of time in rural Nebraska. So that would kind of introduce them to rural Nebraska. Certainly, from my psychologist's side of things, they have two internships right now. BHECN actually funds-- funded two years of-- of internships. Out of the four people that they have rotated through, one actually is contemplating staying, so that's a-- that's a major win for my area. That, I think, really kind of shows you how I hope this works. It'll have to be monitored.

FRIESEN: So how much-- how much time is those-- is the internship or the practicum? What-- they're going out there for their-- to-- to-- kind of like a-- the-- I don't know what you call it, a--

STINNER: I-- I have--

FRIESEN: Is it like--

STINNER: --I stru-- I struggle with the-- with vernacular for that, too, as well.

FRIESEN: Is it like a three-month-- is it a three-month stay out there or is-- or should it be longer? I mean--

STINNER: It depend--

FRIESEN: --so a lot of companies, you know, they-- they'll pay for someone's education, but they expect a two-year stay or something like that. Are we-- is this too short a time frame to get them acclimated into the community so that they do tend to want to stay in rural Nebraska?

STINNER: I-- I would say the success rate will be around that 20-25 percent, but that's only on certain professions. Now there is a whole host of other professions that you can do home grown. CNA would be one of those that you can actually reach into that high school, get them dual credit, which is available now, and get them a CNA certificate as they come out of high school for \$17.50 an hour, full benefits. It's a great way to start a nursing career. Those are homegrown-type of jobs. You can also, in many cases, leverage off of different regions and their expertise. We're looking right now to do kind of a hub situation. We have a nursing school there. We're going to try to do some additional stuff with the iWall and we've got Chadron State

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

participating with their social worker program. WNCC, obviously, is the catalyst with the high school and the Regional West--

HUGHES: One minute.

STINNER: --trying to bring all of those disciplines together to build a workforce that we need in western Nebraska, and hopefully it spans out--

FRIESEN: OK. I mean, my--

STINNER: --throughout the Panhandle.

FRIESEN: --my only concern reading through it is that they weren't required to stay out there long enough, maybe, but other than that, I-- I support the program. I support the idea of it. And then down the road, I think there's another bill that helps to provide some mental health beds and-- and facilities rather than just people.

STINNER: Yes.

FRIESEN: So I think the two kind of work hand-in-hand.

STINNER: Yes, they do.

FRIESEN: Thank you, Senator Stinner. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Friesen and Senator Stinner. Senator Erdman, you're recognized.

ERDMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. It seems it's normal that when people do not agree, they raise their voice, and Senator Blood got her cheerleader voice up there. I'm not opposed to what she's trying to do. OK? It may very well be needed. But the question is, is it germane? And in my opinion, it is not germane, and I want to challenge the germaneness of this amendment to that bill.

HUGHES: Senator Blood, you have the opportunity to respond if you'd like.

BLOOD: I'm going to respond with the same response I was given when we researched this, which is that if you look at the document, we are giving directives to the University of Nebraska in Senator Stinner's bill; and if you look at the amendment, we are also giving a directive to the University of Nebraska. We're not going outside of that ask by giving them additional directives. We're doing an ask with guidance,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

as is Senator Stinner's bill. Who said my name? There's really no more response than that. I-- and I have to say, friends, I always think it's interesting-- and I try not to do this because I try not to point out that I'm a woman, because, you know, maybe you won't notice, but how come every time a woman raises her voice, it becomes like something we have to talk about on the mike? But when you guys do it, hey, he's using his football voice and, hey, he means business. When a woman raises her voice, how come we get berated for it? I-- I just-- really bugs the heck out of me, so I just gotta get that on record. And, you know, Senator Erdman is my friend. I respect his opinion. I do not agree with what he had to say about it not being germane. We did a lot of research to make sure that we were indeed germane, and to rule otherwise would be ignoring the fact that it comes down to something really basic, which is they're both asks. They're both asked to the same entity. They're both asks that describe what the want and need is, and it is appropriate and it is germane.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Flood-- or Senator Blood and Senator Erdman. Germane amendments relate only to details of the specific subject of the bill and must be in a natural and logical sequence to the subject matter of the original proposal. Therefore, I rule LB-- or AM2564 is not germane to the bill. Senator Blood, you're welcome to open on your challenge to overrule the Chair. Members, everyone can speak one time and Senator Blood can close. Senator Blood, you are recognized.

BLOOD: I don't know if I need to say thank you since you just overruled us, but thank you. Fellow senators, friends all, we searched bill after bill after bill. We wanted to make sure that whatever we did was germane. Now you can talk about single subject, but part of that single subject, based on past experience and based on things that have happened on this floor-- and by the way, we have had so many bills that truly weren't germane that got funding because we have this big pot of money that nobody blinked twice at. And I gotta say I'm a little concerned because we, friends, have a bill for an exploratory committee stuck in Executive Committee right now and, to find a polite way to say this, our Chair is on that committee and refusing to vote it out. So I do question this option to say that it was not germane, I don't question his intent, but I do question his bias. And I respect Senator Hughes, but I don't agree with Senator Hughes. We know, for those of us that have been here six years or longer, that germaneness can be about the ask. It's about the ask and the entity, and that is what my amendment does. And I want to be really cautious because I certainly would never want to sink Senator Stinner's bill. And I want to say Senator Stinner, unlike a lot of the people I've worked with,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

is a man of his word. Whenever I ask him for help, he either says he can or he can't, and he's always kind and he's always informative, so I just want to get that on record. We are at a point now where if this does not go through, if we decide, ah, it's not germane so I can use that as my excuse to not help Mead, OK, but remember this is our last chance to help Mead. There's no other bills coming through. There's no other funding that's going to happen. And so I'm going to make sure that we share the vote and that people understand that I did my very best to do whatever I could to move this forward because I-- friends, I don't know what else to do. Based on what we learned when we had training our first year, germaneness isn't just about the statute that it goes into, because that is part of germaneness. Germaneness is also about action. The action is the same as the action in LB1068. Now I know we've got some lawyers that I think are in the queue, that will know much more about it than I will. So I'm going to sit down for now. I only get to talk once, I think. Is that true? Or do I get to talk for a closing as well on this? I can't remember.

HUGHES: You're able to close.

BLOOD: All right. Thank you, Mr. President. With that, I'm going to make sure that we move this along in respect to Senator Stinner.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Blood. Debate is now open on the motion to overrule the Chair. Senator Arch, you're recognized. Senator Arch waives his opportunity. Senator Ben Hansen. Ben Hansen waives. Senator Matt Hansen.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President, and good morning, colleagues. Colleagues, I'm going to talk broadly about germaneness to kind of lay out where we're at and the motion of a rule in the Chair. And I know there's some other people behind me who hope to speak to the specific germaneness of this amendment. I will say that I am going to vote for the amendment and I'm going to vote for the motion to overrule the Chair, but I'll leave the policy discussions to others behind me. So, colleagues, as you know, germaneness is a provision in our rules that obviously has not come up much, and germaneness is really an issue about whether or not totally unrelated subjects preventing basically totally unrelated subjects from rolling into a bill. And the primary purpose, as I understand it, kind of throughout the course of legislative bodies and germaneness, is partially a public transparency portion in the sense of a bill being changed into an entirely different subject matter in a way that the public cannot follow, cannot comprehend, and cannot expect. And I think here we have a very clear amendment with a very clear proposal being attached to a bill,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

and it's tied to the funding of a-- of a similar organization. And I will say broadly again, germaneness, just like the filibuster rule, just like what is full and fair debate, just like what is-- when is appropriate time to call the question, is something the body ultimately gets to decide, and that's what we ultimately get to decide here with the overruling of the Chair. And we can trend in different directions in terms of how strict or how-- how strict we want to apply this rule or how kind of generous we want to apply this rule. And that's something kind of, I'll say, regardless of how this ultimate vote and overruling the Chair comes out, I hope that we'll keep that in mind and try and be consistent. One of my always perpetual fears is with some of these rarely applied rules, is that they'll be used kind of-- used and have different standards applied to them in the future. So if we want to take a very strict ruling or a very strict perspective on germaneness, I hope we appreciate that and recognize that same standard. And I hope you keep that in mind when you're voting that if you say, no, I support a very strict germaneness standard, recognizing that that can then instead be used maybe on an issue you support. I think through my eight years, we've been pretty generous on germaneness rather than, you know, sometimes the rule is as simple as, you know, sometimes you could go as strict as, you know, is it the same section, is it the same chapter in statute, you know, and there's other times where you can look broadly of like what are we trying to accomplish, what are we trying to accomplish, does this fit in the overall goal of, in this instance, say, public health and-- public health and what role does our university provide in public health? And so we can see opportunities like that where that could obviously be a very broad category, but we see this from time to time where we have other bills, you know, criminal justice, appropriations, taxes. You know, if we want to be really strict on a bill and say, no, it absolutely has to be the exact same-- the exact same-- it has to be on absolutely the exact same topic, you know, factor that in the mind in other amendments that you've supported. You know, would you consider a sales tax amendment germane on a property tax bill? Would you consider a mental health amendment germane on a bill dealing with maybe infectious disease? And if you start going, no, no, no, those are all different topics, like I appreciate that and I can respect that position, but also I bring those up because, recognize, that's probably not how we as a body have voted, and probably not how we as a body have-- have gone forward over the past few years. We've generally been generous in allowing senators--

HUGHES: One minute.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

M. HANSEN: --thank you-- senators to attach bills, especially coming from the same committee and kind of dealing broadly with the same topic. You know, I think about some of the issues we've had on, for example, economic development. You know, sometimes we've even been broad enough to combine bills from different committees and different avenues and different approaches, even just in the same concept of economic development. You know, I believe we've combined, you know, job training with workforce housing when-- under the guise of, you know, we need to provide opportunity, we need to provide growth for the state. When you think about it, the actual text of those two bills are pretty distinct programs in di-- pretty distinct areas of statute. Colleagues, I've always supported a pretty generous germaneness rule. I think that incorporates Senator Blood's amendment in this case. So I would encourage you to support the overruling of the Chair and ultimately support Senator Blood's amendment. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator Erdman, you're recognized.

ERDMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate Senator Matt Hansen's discourse on if it's similar, and I understand getting in front of the university snowball going down the hill is a difficult place to be. So you, Mr. President, read the rule. I appreciate that, but I'm going to read it again because I don't think people understand what you said. Germane amendments relate only to the details of the specific subject of the bill. Senator Stinner's bill is with mental health training. Senator Blood's amendment is with environmental issues. Those are-- those are the same, right? No, they're not. And it also must be neutral and logical sequence to the subject matter of the original proposal. OK, so this is germane, right? We're going to talk about environmental issues and Senator Stinner is talking about mental health. Those are exactly the same-- not a chance, not a chance. We have rules and we are to follow those rules. Just because the money goes to the university, both of these, the amendment and the bill, does not make it germane, not at all. As I said earlier, I'm not opposed to what Senator Blood is trying to do, but it's not germane. So I encourage you that have a vote today to do what I do sometimes and press the red button. It works. Press the red button because they can stand up and say all they want about it is germane because it-- well, it all goes to the university. Read the rule. And you don't have to have a law degree to understand the rule. Even a farmer can understand the rule. Specific subject of the bill must be the same. These two subjects are not the same, therefore, it is not germane, plain and simple, no other way to say it. But if you're an avid supporter of the University of Nebraska, your vote's going to be green to overrule the Chair. You don't care about the rules. You care about

the university. So vote red, sustain the opinion of the Chair. He made the right decision. This is not a germane amendment. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Erdman. Colleagues, Senator Linehan would like to introduce 85 fourth graders from Fire Ridge Elementary in Elkhorn. They are seated in the north balcony. If they would please rise to be welcomed by your Nebraska Legislature. Thank you for coming today. Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I'm glad to follow Senator Erdman. Senator Erdman, I-- I do have a law degree, but I did stay at a Holiday Inn last night, so-- I think that's how that joke goes. So the rule, you can read the rule and you can read the part about relates only to specific subject, but the very last line: a nongermane amendment includes one that relates to a substantially different subject. My reading of this amendment is-- well, it came out of the same committee. It has to do with appropriating money to the university. It has to do with the same section of the law. So it-- even if your-- your argument is that they are not the exact same subject, although the standard is not exact same, it is substantially different subject, and so they can be different, but they need to be substantially different to be nongermane. So this is-- it-- it checks basically every box in relevance, relating to the details, specifics, natural and logical. This is the natural and logical place for this amendment. This is going to the same institution, same entity. It has similar actions that it's calling on that institution to undertake. It comes out of the same committee. It has the same-- it applies the same section of law. It is-- it meets the standards of the-- the letter of the law, the letter of the rule of germaneness. And as Senator Matt Hansen talked about, if you want to go down the path of narrowly defining it so much, that will be a real problem going forward. So I respectfully disagree with the Chair on this. I will vote green to overrule the Chair. And again, I will continue to vote green on AM2564 and LB1068. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of AM2564. I oppose the germaneness question and I support overruling the Chair. I'm not entirely clear as to why this is happening this morning, because Senator Blood went to the introducer and talked about what she wanted to do. She worked with Senator Bostelman, who is very intricately involved in this, and this is like the epitome of a bipartisan, working-across-the-aisles amendment to get something done

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

for the people of Mead and also for the people of Nebraska. And I don't see anything about this that is not germane, and I don't think that a case has been made for why this is not germane. And so I would encourage, colleagues, that you all vote to overrule the Chair because this is-- this just feels personal, and I hope that it's not, but that's how it's-- it feels right now. And Senator Blood and Senator Bostelman have both worked very hard for the people of Mead, Nebraska, and I don't know why we would be taking this out on them, but I hope that you overrule the Chair so that we can move forward. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Bostelman, you're recognized.

BOSTELMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. I do support AM2564 and LB1068. I will be voting to overrule the Chair. I appreciate Senator Blood for bringing this amendment because the people of Mead deserve to have their concerns considered by this body. That AltEn issue is real, and it has been of great concern to the individuals who live and work in Mead, indeed, perhaps affecting the mental and behavioral health of some residents. I have worked hard with the people of Mead and NDE and others to address the here and now of what happened at the AltEn plant and I, again, appreciate Senator Blood trying to address the concerns of future impact that the residents of Mead have. The opportunity we have here now is to continue to study and look at what's going on in the Mead area, what has gone on to the Mead area, and the concerns of the residents there. I think this is an important opportunity that we have to provide some funding to help them through the next year, help them to move forward on-- to continue to address the concerns of the people in Mead. I work with them and I talk with them and I-- and I meet with the people in Mead and I-- I'm in the community, and there is a part of this that I think will be with them for a long time and how that's going to affect them and their behavioral health side of-- of what the bill has in it, I think, is very important for us to recognize and agree with. So with that, I will be voting to overrule the Chair and I do support AM2564 and LB1063. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Bostelman. Senator Albrecht, you're recognized.

ALBRECHT: Thank you, President. This one is a tough one, because I do appreciate the work that Senator Blood has put into this. But we're also winding down our session and we're always looking for places to put things. I did receive from Al Davis, former Senator Al Davis, that there was \$250,000 a donor had put in to help with the testing of

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

residents in and around the Mead area. I think that's a good start. I don't know. I did ask Senator Blood how-- in taking blood tests and urine samples, what would they do with it? I mean, you would find out that, hey, in fact, maybe there is something going on there, but-- but what-- what else would be there for that? But I know we give a lot of money to the university, and I can't imagine that that can't be an ask of them, you know, with the funding that we have given them for a lot of different research. I don't know that it actually has to be in a bill. But-- but the germaneness is important to me because, quite frankly, we probably should have brought that up during the budgetary items that we were going through and spending hours upon hours talking about something that was truly not germane to the topic. But I'm going to have to stay with the Chair on this one and hope that there are others that will come forward or the university themselves. But even if they did, not so sure what the folks are going to be able to get out of it besides knowing that, hey, there's a problem, because I know the company seems to be struggling to just get rid of all the waste. So I'm conflicted on this, appreciate the work that's been going on behind the scenes with Senator Bostelman and Senator Blood, but at this point I'm just going to have to stay with the Chair on the germaneness. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Albrecht. Senator Day, you're recognized.

DAY: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of LB1068, AM2564, and I will be voting green to overrule the Chair. In response to what Senator Albrecht had just mentioned about the \$250,000 that has already been established, as Senator Blood stated in her opening, that \$250,000 is for research that is already being done and that runs out in June, which is why she is requesting the money to continue on beyond June. And you know, I think we-- we deal with, you know, hundreds of issues on the floor of the Legislature, and we have a handful of those issues that are literally emergency-imminent issues, and this is one of them, so I hope that we can all agree that we need to-- to-- to vote green on overruling the Chair in terms of the germaneness and help Senator Blood and Senator Bostelman address the issues in Mead. I agree with Senator Erdman in terms of we have rules and we should follow them. This amendment is not out of order. It's about an action directing the university to do something and a request, which is exactly what LB1068 does, and you can have multiple topics that are germane based on these similarities. I echo some of the sentiments of a few other senators in terms of setting the precedent that we're going to create this very narrow definition of what is germane, and I think that's a problem. It's-- you know, we-- we had a-- we had a good day yesterday where we all ended up coming

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

together to vote on a-- on a huge tax relief package, and I think it's unfortunate that this is how we are starting our last day of the week, one of the few. What do we have, eight days left in the session? And I would agree with Senator Cavanaugh that it feels a little bit personal, and I don't know that I'm naïve enough to know that that's not the case with this. So I will be voting green on the motion to overrule the Chair, and I hope that you will all do that as well. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Day. Senator Pansing Brooks, you're recognized.

PANSING BROOKS: Thank you, Mr. President. I stand to also support the motion to overrule the Chair. I want-- I'm coming at it from a different perspective. I-- I'm concerned because I want-- I want to-- I want you to understand, from a legal perspective, there's a good chance that the state is going to have some liability here on the Mead, on the Mead case. I want to relate to what happened in Flint, Michigan, the Flint water-- Flint water settlement and implications of the Michigan Supreme Court's reaffirmation of the-- of the tort claims, and with that case, residents of Flint, Michigan, are going to receive compensation soon for the poisoning of their drinking water. In August-- this was 2020-- the state of Michigan settled claims against it and Michigan officials-- these are claims against the state-- including former Governor Rick Snyder for \$600 million. And I'll say to you, the fact that we have done nothing as a state is one issue. But now we are even, in my opinion, more liable because this issue has come before the Legislature, and to choose to do nothing in this case, in my opinion, is going to make us more liable. So if we want to go forward and act like this hasn't happened, act like that there are no legal ramifications on this, that's fine if that's what you choose to do. But you are putting the risk of the state of Nebraska-- the state of Nebraska at risk for liability, you are ignoring the concerns of the people of Mead, which we heard about a lot in our committee, and I think that-- that we're going to be walking down a bad path and that at some point they're going to be looking back at this day and saying the state of Nebraska had an opportunity to act, to do something, and if you vote against this you're choosing to do nothing to help the people in Mead. I really do think it's-- it's an issue. It went on to say in the case this-- the Michigan Supreme Court ruled that the plaintiffs had adequately pled claims of inverse condemnation and for violations of the bodily-- of the right to bodily integrity, a due process. You're thinking of state violation, state tort claims. It's a due process violation under Michigan's constitution to overcome the defendant's motions for summary

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

disposition because, of course, everybody's thinking, oh, you can't sue the state. Well, you can for certain things and for certain violations, so a-- a choice here to do nothing is a choice that is putting our state at risk. And with the giant tax package that we passed yesterday, you have to be real-- willing to recognize that hundreds of millions of dollars could be fined against our state and we're going to have to deal with that. And that's what's happened-- what happened in Michigan. And if you want to bank on the fact that the Supreme Court's not going to do that and that we can go ahead and not deal with this issue in our state, where people are sick, where we-- where we have people that are injured from this claim, and if we want to go ahead and bury our heads in the sand, that's fine. But the issue is now that this has come before the body, and the Supreme Court will look at the fact that this has come before us--

HUGHES: One minute.

PANSING BROOKS: --and we chose to do nothing. Choosing to do nothing does not help us alleviate any claims against us. Choosing to do nothing and hiding our heads in the sand is avoiding the issue completely and become-- we become more negligent by the fact that we chose to do nothing in a case where we should be doing something and could have liability. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Pansing Brooks. Senator Vargas, you're recognized.

VARGAS: Thank you very much, President. And, colleagues, I'll keep this brief. I just wanted to chime in, you know, for two reasons. One, I do believe this is germane, and I think that usually the guidelines that we operate with is, you know, whether or not it's-- it's related and whether or not it's in the same lines of statute or whether it's in the same sections. But the reason for me is, you know, we need to make sure that we are responding to the healthcare needs and using data and research. And one of the things that I do know from the hearing on this was that the reason why we need to do screenings is because we-- if we do not screen the blood and urine, we can't actually make sure we could look at the markers that are within this to see if there is potential contamination. If we are able to do that, then individuals can work with their own physicians and can be more proactive about whether or not there actually is a serious illness down the road. You know, that-- that's just part of-- this is just-- seems very prag-- pragmatic and reasonable. And-- and I do su-- I don't normally do this, but I do support overruling the Chair in this capacity because I do think it's germane and-- and more importantly, I

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

think it's something we need to do. So I urge your vote to support the AM2564 and to overrule the Chair. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Vargas. Seeing no one else in the queue, Senator Blood, you're recognized to close on your motion to overrule the Chair.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. Fellow senators, friends all, this override is important. We have rules that are meant to be followed, but they are also meant to be interpreted by this body in a way that is fair and honest and balanced. When we looked through our bills, and it was hours and hours of searching through bills, we were able to find germaneness in this combination. We were able to get the bill's support-- the bill's sponsor's support. We've been able to get enthusiastic support for the amendment. Those are all the things that we have to do in order to have an amendment go forward that we believe is germane. Now I'm going to take it outside of the business side of it, and I'm going to say this again, friends. If you're on the fence at all, lean yes, because if this is over-- if this is overruled and this doesn't go any further, then there is no funding to continue the research. You heard Senator Albrecht say that a donor gave \$250,000. That's for the research that started in January because the state did not fund the research. And so the babies, the moms, our seniors, those people that are the most vulnerable in Mead, are not going to have the benefit of the information that this research would have provided to them so they can be proactive and get the help that they deserve and they need, because, friends, they are Nebraskans and they are taxpayers. And if you are one of those senators that say, I'm going to say that it's not germane because, gosh darn it, I don't want the university to have any more money. That's not what this is about. This-- this money doesn't go to the university. This money goes to a research team, which, by the way, also has folks from Creighton on the team who, again, donated their time, donated their time. How often do we hear that when we give money to people? They gave their time because this is an environmental crisis. We're not playing pretend here, folks. It's an environmental crisis. If you haven't been attent-- paying attention, the canary in the coal mine was the bees. The bees died. Look downstream six miles from the plant, and a family who'd been in there farm-- at their farm for generations now has something called a dead pond from the runoff from that plant. Want to talk about property rights, friends? You have the right to enjoy your property, to breathe clean air, to drink clean water, to eat the food that you grow in the ground. But apparently, in Nebraska, you don't really have that right if there's big money involved where people are worried about getting in trouble for something that they did. Anybody

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

that's worked on me with this knows that-- that this was not extra work that I wanted or needed. You know, for the people that are close to me here in the body, that I've had a year, a really challenging year. I almost lost a loved one--

HUGHES: One minute.

BLOOD: --at the very start of the session. But you know what I didn't stop doing? I didn't stop helping the people of Mead. And now I'm asking you to take a step forward. This is not the first time we've overruled a Chair, friends, not the first time. If you're not sure whether it's germane or not, let's overrule the Chair and just help the people in Mead. Do it because you want to do the right thing. I'm not saying that you shouldn't be aware that this may or may not be germane, but I think we've heard arguments on both sides, but more for the fact that it should be overridden than against the fact. You've heard Senator Bostelman. He is in support of this. Ultimately, you're going to decide who you want to help and who you don't want to help when you vote on whether this is going-- we're going to overrule the Chair or not, friends.

HUGHES: Time, Senator. Members, this motion will require 22 votes to be adopted. The question is the adoption of the motion to overrule the Chair.

BLOOD: Call of the house.

HUGHES: All those-- there's been a request to place a house under call, the question is, shall the house go under call. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 27 ayes, 6 nays to place the house under call.

HUGHES: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. Those unexcused senators outside the Chamber please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel, please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, Senator McKinney, Senator Lathrop, Senator Friesen, the house is under call. Senator Blood, we can't seem to locate Senator Cavanaugh. Do you want to proceed or wait? All members are now present. Colleagues, this motion will require 23 votes to be adopted. The question is the adoption of the motion to overrule the Chair. There's been a request for a roll call vote in reverse order. Mr. Clerk.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

CLERK: Senator Wishart voting yes. Senator Williams voting no. Senator Wayne voting yes. Senator Walz voting yes. Senator Vargas voting yes. Senator Stinner voting yes. Senator Slama voting no. Senator Sanders not voting. Senator Pansing Brooks voting yes. Senator Pahls. Senator Murman voting no. Senator Moser voting no. Senator Morfeld voting yes. Senator McKinney voting yes. Senator McDonnell voting yes. Senator McCollister voting yes. Senator Lowe voting no. Senator Linehan voting no. Senator Lindstrom. Senator Lathrop voting yes. Senator Kolterman voting yes. Senator Jacobson voting no. Senator Hunt. Senator Hughes voting no. Senator Hilkemann voting yes. Senator Hilgers voting no. Senator Matt Hansen voting yes. Senator Ben Hansen voting no. Senator Halloran voting no. Senator Gragert voting yes. Senator Geist. Senator Friesen voting no. Senator Flood voting no. Senator Erdman voting no. Senator Dorn voting yes. Senator DeBoer voting yes. Senator Day voting yes. Senator Clements voting no. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator John Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Briese voting no. Senator Brewer voting no. Senator Brandt voting yes. Senator Bostelman voting yes. Senator Bostar voting yes. Senator Blood voting yes. Senator Arch voting no. Senator Albrecht voting no. Senator Aguilar not voting. 24 ayes, 19 nays.

HUGHES: The vote to overrule the Chair is adopted. Returning to debate on AM2564, I raise the call. Senator Linehan, you're recognized.

LINEHAN: [RECORDER MALFUNCTION] you. So I'm-- Senator Blood, could you yield for a question, please? And I'm sorry I didn't give you a heads-up.

HUGHES: Senator Blood, will you yield?

BLOOD: Yes, I'm happy to yield.

LINEHAN: So on your amendment, is this a million dollars for evermore, every year?

BLOOD: Nope, one time only.

LINEHAN: One time only. And it goes to-- but it goes to the University of Nebraska?

BLOOD: It goes to the University of Nebraska to give to the research group to fund the research.

LINEHAN: So if we can't-- it's my understanding, because I've heard this all the time, the Jim Exon v. the University of Nebraska [SIC] Supreme Court decision. How is it that we can give them money and tell

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

them how to spend it in certain cases, but we can't tell them how to spend it in other cases?

BLOOD: I think that would be a question for one of the attorneys in here. That would not be a question I feel qualified to answer. All I know is that, upon our research, we discovered multiple examples where indeed this type of language was used, so it's consistent with things that have been done in the past.

LINEHAN: I agree. I do think it's consistent with things that have been done in the past, but I don't think-- I think maybe just nobody's ever challenged it from this side of the question.

BLOOD: Fair enough.

LINEHAN: We have several attorneys in here, so I'm going to just pick one random who's not only attorney, but he's also been here, one of the members who's been here the longest. So it should have been a little enough of a heads up that they won't be completely shocked. Thank you, Senator Blood. Senator Flood, would you yield for a question?

HUGHES: Senator Flood, will you yield?

FLOOD: Yes.

LINEHAN: Senator Flood, so you're aware, because I'm sure you've been here eight years now, going on ten years, that frequently when we're dealing with the University of Nebraska there's a question about whether we can tell them what to do because of Exon versus-- I'm not sure. I think it was--

FLOOD: Board of Regents.

LINEHAN: Board of Regents, yes. And what was that decision?

FLOOD: Well, I think the decision was from the mid-1970s, and it basically said that as a separate constitutional-- that the-- the officers of the Board of Regents were constitutional officers and they had their own authority to make decisions on how the university was run and that the Legislature couldn't tell a separate constitutional government political subdivision how to run or operate itself, although I think that's been debated over the years.

LINEHAN: I agree. I've always questioned-- I've questioned that because it seems to me that if you have the power of the purse, which

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

we clearly have, there's some question-- thank you, Senator Flood-- there's some question. So I think the way it's been interpreted-- this is my-- and somebody can respond to the-- the way it's interpreted, if we're asking the university to do something they don't want to do, we follow that case. But if we're asking-- if we're asking them to do something they want to do, then it's fine to tell them. So I think there's a disconnect there somewhere. I-- I am not going to support Senator Blood's amendment. It's not because it's not a good cause. It's because we've had general-- we've done the general budget, which is a significant amount of money, and we've got the ARPA budget coming back, which is a billion dollars, and we did taxes yesterday. Thank you. Great. But I'm-- right now, I'm thinking, how much money is left for any of the other A bills, any of them? And now we've got an amendment that's spend a million dollars. So I-- I just-- I would like some clarity on where we stand as far as bills we've already passed on Select. And I support Senator Stinner's LB1068, and I understand it's ongoing inside of General Funds. But it's clear, if you look at ARPA and you look at the budget, General Fund budget--

HUGHES: One minute.

LINEHAN: --and this amendment, that Senator Stinner has spent a huge amount of time trying to figure out how to move us forward on mental health. It goes across the state. We all know it's an issue. We all know we need to do more. And it seems to me that he's looked in every pocket for a way to move us forward, which I appreciate very much. So I am supporting LB1068, but I'm not going to be for the amendment on AM2564. Thank you.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Linehan. Members, Senator Dorn would like to introduce 36 fourth graders and their 8 adults and teachers with them from Freeman Elementary in Adams, and it also includes Deighton Dorn, Senator Dorn's granddaughter. They are seated in the north balcony. Would you please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Returning to debate, Senator Ben Hansen, you are recognized.

B. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. I first want to start off by saying I appreciate Senator Stinner's approach to rural behavioral healthcare, and one of the things that we heard kind of consistence-- consistent-- consistently, with his bill and others, is the-- the idea of internships. We had many healthcare professionals and other kinds of professionals that came in front of HHS saying one of the-- the biggest positive they saw or one of the biggest reasons of why they saw people actually staying in the state of Nebraska, healthcare

professionals, was internships. A lot of people who did internships in the state of Nebraska, in their opinion, many of them ended up staying here in Nebraska. And so I know he has approached that and this bill, and I'm appreciative of that. I did have a couple. So I'm in favor of LB1068. I still don't know for sure where I'm at with the amendment, and so I had a couple questions for Senator Blood if she'd be willing to yield, please.

WILLIAMS: Senator Blood, would you yield?

BLOOD: Yes, I-- yes, I will yield.

B. HANSEN: Thank you. These questions are-- kind of come-- I'm trying to figure out the appropriateness of the amendment and funding it. You mentioned that-- I just had a couple questions about the research team currently that is doing it-- not paid, and they're doing it out of their own pocket.

BLOOD: Um-hum.

B. HANSEN: What does that mean? So I know they're all typically employed by a university and some employed by Creighton. Are they doing this like on the weekends or with vacation time, or are they doing it during their hours they're typically working at the university?

BLOOD: You know, that's not a question I can answer. I'm not their supervisor. I can just tell you that after a year and a half of working with the watchdog group that's been trying to help Mead that we discovered that the researchers and the scientists that were participating in the research were doing this on their own time. And I know that they do work nights and weekends, but I don't know if that's only nights and weekends. And I certainly don't want to pretend I know. And they do that because that's when most people that live in Mead are available to do this type of testing.

B. HANSEN: OK. And I asked that question, I'm not trying to delegitimize their work or doing like that, it's just that we're trying to give a million dollars to help them because with the feeling that they're not getting paid or they're doing this other free time. That's one of the reasons why I asked that question. Do you know by chance, is this a research because I don't think there's a lot of cleanup going on by, by this, this team, it's more about research. Are they receiving any federal funds currently?

BLOOD: For this research?

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

B. HANSEN: Yes.

BLOOD: No. The only money they've received, as we've said several times on the mike today, is that \$250,000 that Senator Albrecht brought up and that I said about in my introduction, introduction that they have been doing it on a shoestring budget and they have started it and they are moving it forward and they are making it public information.

B. HANSEN: OK, I'm not coming out of hostility, so these are more clarifying questions. So in case I missed that in your opening, I apologize. Also more with the company-- and this is just because I am unfamiliar with it and so I apologize. The company that did this, that, you know, I don't know for sure which-- the name of the company, the ethanol plant. Are they in bankruptcy currently or are they dissolved?

BLOOD: So I'm glad you actually asked that questions. These ne'er do wells did file bankruptcy, but then in the dark of night, and Senator Bostelman and I just talked about that, started selling off equipment to try and generate income for themselves. And then they also, before they claimed bankruptcy, sold off the cattle part of their business. And that's why the seed companies are now suing because they're trying to get the court to stop that sale. So there's been a lot of stuff that's been meant to screw over the citizens of Mead and the state of Nebraska, Senator.

B. HANSEN: OK, thank you. Do they have a parent company by chance, do you know?

BLOOD: There is a parent company that I believe is based in, I want to say Missouri.

B. HANSEN: OK. Has, do you know, has there been any kind of lawsuits against the parent company? Because I know sometimes it's hard to kind of pierce the corporate veil and--

WILLIAMS: One minute.

B. HANSEN: --kind of go after another company because of liability issues. But have-- you know, has there been any kind of suits been under the parent company to help with the cleanup?

BLOOD: You know, I know about the state's lawsuit and I haven't seen any motion-- movement on that since March. That's pretty much my knowledge.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

B. HANSEN: OK, thank you. And one more question, final question. Is there any insurance because I'm kind of curious because typically, even if a company goes bankrupt, there has to be some kind of insurance policy to help with kind of, to kind of mitigate an incident such as this. Do you know if there's any insurances funding any of this kind of stuff?

BLOOD: I think that would be a question for our Attorney General who's in charge of that.

B. HANSEN: OK?. All right. Thank you for your questions.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Ben Hansen and Senator Blood. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Blood, you are recognized to close on AM2564.

BLOOD: You know, it's, it's always been really hard for me to separate my heart from the policy. You guys know that about me. I mean, you saw that when I had the hearing aid bill my freshman year and it brought me to tears that we got it passed. When I do policy, I'm very pragmatic about it. I like to solve problems. And so when we stand and we start talking about things and go off into the weeds that really don't pertain to the problem, I always find that really curious because that's not how my brain works and that's certainly not how my heart works. This is what I know, friends. We've had five different types of bills and resolutions to help Mead. And we really haven't had a lot of success. And it's not because it's not important, but it's because some people truly believe that it's a done deal and it's OK and we don't have to be worried about it anymore. I can tell you right now that there is national media doing a follow-up story this week in Mead Nebraska, and they're doing a follow-up story in Mead-- on Mead, Nebraska because it's beyond everybody's expectations, beyond-- people can't believe in other parts of the country that we let this go on for 10 years. But mostly, people can't believe that we haven't taken legislative action to help these people. And I agree, and gosh darn it, I hate that the media has to come in and keep bringing light to this because we're not moving it forward. I want to read something to you that was sent to me by one of the researchers, those particularly vulnerable are pregnant women or those intending to become pregnant. After all, this exposure over time, obstetricians need to know if the reproducing female has been exposed because their fetuses are at higher risk for a particular set of abnormalities. Insecticides are neural toxins, friends. Let's not make this about somebody is at fault. I don't care who's at fault. I don't want to point fingers. Let's make it about the people of Mead. Senator Bostelman told you, in

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

his district, it's about the people of Mead. We don't care whose fault it is. We don't want to point fingers. And by the way, I'm going to say this one more time, this has zero to do with our beloved ethanol industry in Nebraska. These were naysayers. These were bad actors. Bad actors that knew what they were doing and continue to do it because they just wanted to make a profit. And then when they got called to it, when they were asked to be responsible, they decided to go behind curtains, start selling stuff off because it's a bunch of rich people who don't want to lose money. We can do better here in Nebraska and we have the power right now, and it's a little teeny thing. You gave away tens of millions of dollars for a lake. You gave away tens of millions of dollars for research on a canal where there is a ton of questions, and again, water is important and I don't not support it, but put this in perspective. What are you going to tell me when you vote, is the value of someone's life? It's not a million dollars, friends--

WILLIAMS: One minute.

BLOOD: --but you have the opportunity now to tell Senator Bostelman's district that you don't want them to lose their babies and you don't want them to have sick children, and you don't want them to die from horrible cancers and brain tumors. And I am not exaggerating, friends, do the research. So you decide if it's more important to hate on the university or to hate that we're giving a measly million dollars out after we have given tens of millions of dollars out, to help this community, to help Nebraskans, to help taxpayers. And yes, Senator Erdman, I raised my voice, but it's still my indoor voice. Let's show compassion. Let's show that policymaking isn't just about numbers. Policymaking is about the people and good policy. And this is our opportunity to move both forward. Thank you, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Blood. Members, the question is the adoption of AM2564 to LB1068. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed-- there has been a request to place the house under call. The question is, shall the house go under call? All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 21 ayes, 4 nays to place the under call.

WILLIAMS: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. Those unexcused senators outside the Chamber please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel please leave the floor. The house is under call. Members, we are waiting for a few senators and while we are waiting, we have 10 high school students from Southwest High School, Danbury, Bartley,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

Wilsonville, Indianola, Lebanon and Marion sitting in the north balcony. Would you please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Senator Blood, all senators are here now, with the exception of Speaker Hilgers. Would you like to continue? Would you like to continue to wait or go ahead? Understood. Members, we do have a call of the house, so if you please return to your seats. Members, the question is the adoption of AM2564 to LB1068. There's been a request for a roll call vote in reverse order. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator Wishart voting yes. Senator Williams voting yes. Senator Wayne voting yes. Senator Walz voting yes. Senator Vargas voting yes. Senator Stinner voting yes. Senator Slama. Senator Sanders voting yes. Senator Pansing Brooks voting yes. Senator Pahls. Senator Murman not voting. Senator Moser voting yes. Senator Morfeld voting yes. Senator McKinney voting yes. Senator McDonnell voting yes. Senator McCollister voting yes. Senator Lowe not voting. Senator Linehan voting no. Senator Lindstrom. Senator Lathrop voting yes. Senator Kolterman voting yes. Senator Jacobson not voting. Senator Hunt voting yes. Senator Hughes voting no. Senator Hilkemann voting yes. Senator Hilgers. Senator Matt Hansen voting yes. Senator Ben Hansen not voting. Senator Halloran not voting. Senator Gragert voting yes. Senator Geist. Senator Friesen voting no. Senator Flood voting yes. Senator Erdman voting no. Senator Dorn voting yes. Senator DeBoer voting yes. Senator Day voting yes. Senator Clements voting no. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator John Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Briese. Senator Brewer voting yes. Senator Brandt voting yes. Senator Bostelman voting yes. Senator Bostar voting yes. Senator Blood voting yes. Senator Arch not voting. Senator Albrecht voting no. Senator Aguilar voting yes. 31 ayes, 6 nays on the amendment.

WILLIAMS: The amendment is adopted. Raise the call. Returning to debate on LB1068. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Stinner, you're recognized to close on the advancement of LB1068.

STINNER: Thank you, Mr. President, for the sake of speed, I'm just going to waive my closing. Thank you.

WILLIAMS: Thank you. Senator Stinner. Members, the question is the advancement of LB1068 to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all voted that wish? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 34 ayes, 4 nays, Mr. President, on the advancement of the bill.

WILLIAMS: LB1068 is advanced. Mr. Clerk, for items.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

CLERK: Mr. President, Transportation Committee, Chaired by Senator Friesen, reports LB761, LB913, LB914, LB1021, LB1145, LB1214, LB1234, LB1259, and LB1266 (also LB1022), all indefinitely postponed. I have amendments to be printed, Senator Wayne to LB917A, and Senator DeBoer to LB873. I also have two confirmation reports from the Transportation Committee. That's all that I have, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Returning to the agenda. Senator priority bills, LB1068A.

CLERK: LB1068A is a bill by Senator Stinner. It's a bill for an act relating to appropriations. It appropriates funds to implement LB1068. I do have an amendment from Senator Stinner, Mr. President, AM2683.

WILLIAMS: Senator Stinner, you are recognized to open on LB1068A.

STINNER: Thank you, Mr. President. I had to do quite a little bit of scrubbing on the A bill. Obviously, the original one was \$10 million, then the \$2.6 million, which brings it up to \$5 million mainline support for the Beacon efforts. I then had to change dates, so what we're trying to do is start this in '22-23, which will happen right after-- it'll start happening July 1st. So that's what the amendment's about. It's \$2.6 million, brings up baseline funding for the Beacon program to \$5 million. I would appreciate your green vote. Thank you.

WILLIAMS: Mr. Clerk, for the amendment.

CLERK: AM2683, Mr. President, is the amendment.

WILLIAMS: Senator Stinner, you are well-- recognized to open on your AM2683. Senator Stinner waives opening on that. Debate is now open. Senator Erdman, you are recognized.

ERDMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. And I appreciate that. Senator Stinner, will you yield to a question.

WILLIAMS: Senator Stinner, would you yield?

STINNER: Yes, I will.

ERDMAN: Senator Stinner, so how much are we appropriating each year?

STINNER: We are in-- starting July 1st of 2022, which is the next fiscal year, the Beacon allotment or appropriation will go from \$2.4 (million) to \$5 million.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

ERDMAN: OK. And then in 2023-24?

STINNER: Yes, it stays right at that level.

ERDMAN: Another \$5 million?

STINNER: It stays at the level that it's at. It does not raise itself, so.

ERDMAN: OK, so this will be an ongoing obligation.

STINNER: Yes, it will.

ERDMAN: OK. So this is not a one-time spend thing, right?

STINNER: That is correct, it's ongoing.

ERDMAN: Okay. Thank you.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Erdman and Senator Stinner. Seeing no one wishing to speak, Senator Stinner, you are recognized to close on AM2683. Senator Stinner waives closing. Members, the question is the adoption of AM2683. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all voted that wish to? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 30 ayes, 2 nays on the amendment.

WILLIAMS: The amendment is adopted. Moving to discussion. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Stinner, you are recognized to close on LB1068A. Senator Stinner waives closing. Members, the question is the advancement of LB1068A to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all voted that wish? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 29 ayes, 4 nays on the advancement of the A bill.

WILLIAMS: LB1068A advances. Next bill on the agenda, LB977.

CLERK: LB977, Senator Slama. Relates to appropriations. It appropriates federal funds to the Department of Economic Development. Introduced on January 11, referred to appropriations, advanced to General File. There are committee amendments.

WILLIAMS: Senator Slama, you are recognized to open on LB977.

SLAMA: Thank you, Mr. President and good morning, colleagues. I'm happy to present for your consideration, LB977, a bill that represents a strong investment in southeast Nebraska's second largest town, Falls

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

City, and their electrical infrastructure. Falls City, the second largest town in southeast Nebraska has almost everything going for it to make it the perfect site to grow Nebraska's economy, a ready site with access to rail, gas, fast broadband and a large workforce within commuting distance. In fact, Falls City has the largest population within a 100-mile radius of the city. The one thing we are missing is access to the electrical capacity needed to grow. I have been working with Falls City Economic Development and Growth Enterprise, or EDGE, who has proactively secured options on more than 1,000 acres of land situated next to both BNSF and Union Pacific Rail lines. The site is flanked by a natural gas pipeline and U.S. Highway 73. Unfortunately, this site continues to lose out on potential development prospects because of our inability to secure redundant and resilient access to power. Not only is there no excess power to offer a potential transformative project, but most concerning to me, the continuity of the electrical service we do have within the community is also challenged. Falls City has experienced numerous outages that affect the day-to-day lives of our citizens and businesses. In fact, the power went off during a recent Girls High School District basketball game. That was the day before the Appropriations Committee hearing on this bill. Without upgrades to our southeast Nebraska electrical infrastructure, there can be no growth. Falls City checks all the boxes for many potential game-changing projects or could even serve as a location for our state's first mega site. Except they need access to electricity and frustratingly, we don't have that, so we can't compete and we can't grow. As amended by the upcoming committee amendment, LB977 would use \$15 million from the Cash Reserve Fund and transfer the money to the Site and Building Development Fund for expanding electrical system capacities and enhancing redundancy and resilience. With economic arguments aside, it's greatly needed. As you'll hear, the amendment to LB977 also decreases the appropriation requests from \$29 million to \$15 million. It would also require Falls City to secure a minimum commitment totaling one-half of the total project cost. So the state money would be the last dollars in this project. The front end would be covered by Falls City OPPD. Once you get to over half of those costs, that's when that \$15 million would be mobilized for this project. Because of the location of Falls City as a gateway to Nebraska, this infusion of dollars to District 1 will not only transform a community, but it will transform our whole state. Thank you for your consideration, and I ask for your green vote on this bill. The Appropriations Committee advanced this bill unanimously, 8-0 recently, and I am also happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Slama. As the Clerk stated, there are amendments from the Appropriations Committee. Senator Stinner, you are recognized to open on the committee amendments.

STINNER: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Legislature, LB977, as amended by the committee, would amend 81-12,147 to expand eligibility of the Site and Building Development Fund to issue grants to cities of the second class for the above-mentioned purpose. Eligible grantees would need to secure a minimum commitment totaling one-half of the total cost of the project. The original request was to appropriate federal funds pursuant to the ARPA. However, this was deemed not likely to be eligible. There is a \$15,000 transfer from Cash Reserve Fund to the Building and Site Development Fund [SIC] conducted in 2021-22. As this transfer occurs in 2021-22, there's an emergency clause on LB977. The committee voted to advance this bill 9-0 with this amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Stinner. Debate is now open. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you are recognized.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I would ask if Senator Slama would yield to some questions.

WILLIAMS: Senator Slama, would you yield?

SLAMA: Absolutely.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Senator Slama. So I'm trying to catch up on some of the things here, and you did already answer some of my questions. So 50 percent of the costs will be paid for by the local entity, correct?

SLAMA: It would be a cost share between the local entities, yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. In the original bill, the green copy at the end, line 11, it says that, well, 10 and 11 says, "the department shall disburse the funds appropriated under this section to applicants until the appropriation is exhausted", which to me indicated that, and please let me know if this is an incorrect, that other, other towns could've applied for this money?

SLAMA: So I believe, Senator Cavanaugh, you're referencing the green copy of the bill.

M. CAVANAUGH: Yes.

SLAMA: This is a white copy amendment.

M. CAVANAUGH: I understand.

SLAMA: AM2310 and the language is slightly different. I'd ask you on the white copy amendment to look with me at page 3, line 21, so it's slightly different language. But yes, this is not-- you cannot specifically tailor appropriations for a specific community. So reasonably speaking, any city of the second class could qualify for this. But Falls City is in a very unique situation. It's the-- it's a city in our state that is in the extreme southeast corner. So unfortunately, it's on an electrical infrastructure island. So that's where the issues with redundancy and resiliency come in, but also where Falls City is uniquely positioned and in need of this investment.

M. CAVANAUGH: Sure. And yes, I understand that and thank you for that. My question was because I did see that that kind of change from the green copy to the white copy and I know other cities such as Ord or West Point could possibly also apply for this money. And so I'm just curious if there's been any conversations with those two communities and whether or not if they apply for them, will they also be eligible? Will this \$15 million possibly be spent over multiple communities, or is it only going to one community?

SLAMA: I don't represent those communities or the Public Power District, so I would not be at liberty to say.

M. CAVANAUGH: I just mean, does your bill allow for that?

SLAMA: It does not expressly say that you can't. That's the language on page 2, line 5, "grants to any city of the second class, which partners with public power utilities for purposes of expanding electrical system capacities and enhancing redundancy and resilience". And we do have public power representatives out on the other side of the glass today who can answer some of your questions on implementation to you.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. Well, I do worry that if I were to leave, then I would miss out on the vote. So, so I understand that Falls City is in a unique situation. But how did we land on from-- this was originally \$29 million from ARPA funds, and now it's \$15 million in cash funds.

SLAMA: That's a great question, Senator Cavanaugh, and it really speaks to the interesting aspects of this bill. It really is a uniquely responsibly-constructed economic development that the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

Appropriations Committee has done a wonderful job in working with me to craft. The original ask of \$29 million was from ARPA funds. There were questions as to whether or not this project would qualify. Twenty-nine million dollars was the overall cost of the estimated project, so to lower the request to \$15 million and to make the state dollars the last ones in, we actually ensured a majority of local buy-in to this project so that, that explains the change in why we switched from ARPA requests to the cash reserve and also cut--

WILLIAMS: One minute.

SLAMA: --their request in half. Thank you, Mr. President.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you for that, Senator Slama. I, I'm not trying to belabor the point. I just have a couple more questions. I'm going to just jump back in the queue and--

SLAMA: Happy to answer.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. I appreciate it. This is very helpful and I always like learning about other parts of the state. So Falls City is on the border with Kansas. So I assume this is opening up a new opportunity for Falls City to expand their situation because they have a limited opportunity to expand to help. Will this grant help them with that?

SLAMA: Expand economically? Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. So you talked about in your opening the 1,000 acres of land. And I think you said-- somebody was kind of talking to me. So I think you said BNSF and someone else, would you mind recapping--

SLAMA: Sure. Falls City, where it's located, is at the intersection of major BNSF and Union Pacific rail lines, which puts it at--

WILLIAMS: Time, Senator, but you are next in the queue. You may continue.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, if Senator Slama wouldn't mind continuing with what she was saying.

SLAMA: Sure, sure. Yeah. So Falls City is very uniquely positioned. It's at the intersection of major BNSF and Union Pacific rail lines, which puts it in a very unique position for economic development. And the core of this bill is about electrical infrastructure reliability. But what we've ran into in the last couple of decades in Falls City in

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

that area, is that not only is there not the redundancy in place, Falls City is kind of on an island. If you look at Falls City on a map, it is in the far southeast corner of the state. So redundancy resilience questions aside, it also puts Falls City, which is a town of over 4,000 people, in the position where it can't even seek out small economic development projects. I know I talked about the potential for a very large one, but even a small new employer coming in would push Falls City over its capacity, which creates a chicken and an egg problem. Because, OPPD as we've seen with Sarpy County will not do electrical system upgrades unless there's a set economic development project in place.

M. CAVANAUGH: I see.

SLAMA: However, when this happens with rural communities, it can take, it can take too much time to get that electrical infrastructure set up. So economic development projects are looking for sites that are ready to go now, not five years down the road. So the exciting part about LB977 is we're solving that chicken and the egg problem and getting that investment now so that both sides-- and during negotiations, it was wonderful to see both sides come around the table and come to a conclusion that this was the best route to go.

M. CAVANAUGH: All right, thank you. That's, that's wonderful. So the land that we're talking about, is that already owned by Falls City, or is that going to need an eminent domain or how is that going to work?

SLAMA: That's, there's options secured on the, on that site. There's no eminent domain questions there.

M. CAVANAUGH: Great. Thank you. OK. Sorry, I just, this is a new subject for me, so I'm interested in it. So OPPD will then help do economic development projects after this is done, or--

SLAMA: No, we're just upgrading the lines.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. All right. Thank you. I very much appreciate your time answering my questions. I think you answered all of them and I learned a little bit more about your district, so I appreciate that.

SLAMA: Thank you.

M. CAVANAUGH: I am concerned about the cash funds, mostly because of us moving a large amount of cash funds yesterday, but this does sound like a really important project for Senator Slama's district, so I am interested in moving it forward and maybe having further conversation

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

about if the cash funds are actually available. But thank you, Senator Slama. I appreciate your time.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh and Senator Slama. Senator Kolterman, you are recognized.

KOLTERMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I'd like to stand in support of LB977 and AM2310. We did hear this originally as an ARPA request. And while that ARPA request was coming in, I hadn't, because of my past work in economic development in my own community, and the idea that we're, we're trying to build a rail spur, our rail sites for Nebraska, they came to me. The economic development people from, from Falls City came and visited with me and asked for our help on this. They have a well-put-together plan and it, and it, and they've done a lot of research. The only thing missing in the entire plan was really the, the possibilities of getting more power to the area. And because of their unique situation where the community has their own power plant, it would cost them a lot of money to upgrade that to take care of any kind of growth in economic development. But because we're willing to partner with them, and again, as Senator Slama has indicated, we are the last entity in on this. If our willingness to work with them brought together OPPD as well as the community of Falls City, I think this is an opportunity for us to help a rural community grow and prosper. They're situated in such a nice position between the capital city here in Lincoln and Kansas City, and because of their proximity, they have an opportunity to really encourage businesses to come there and grow that area, just like we're trying to do in the western part of our state. So I think that we should move this forward. Again, we're the last people in if they do need the money. If we don't ever use it, it stays with us. So with that, I would encourage you to vote green on both the amendment as well as the original bill. Thank you.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Kolterman. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Stinner, you are recognized to close on the committee amendment. Senator Stinner waives closing. Members, the question is the adoption of AM2310 to LB977. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all voted that wish to vote? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 34 ayes, 0 nays on the adoption of committee amendments.

WILLIAMS: Committee amendments are adopted. Moving back to debate. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Slama, you are recognized to close on LB977. Senator Slama waives closing. Members, the question is the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

advancement of LB977 to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all voted that wish? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 34 ayes, 0 nays on the advancement of LB977.

WILLIAMS: LB977 advances. Moving back to the agenda, LB977A.

CLERK: LB977A appropriates funds to implement LB977.

WILLIAMS: Senator Slama, you're recognized to open on LB977A.

SLAMA: Thank you, Mr. President, I'll be brief. This is simply the appropriation for LB977. It's \$15 million cash reserve, last dollars in, very responsible investment by the state of Nebraska in a much needed infrastructure project. Thank you.

WILLIAMS: Thank you. Senator Slama. Debate is now open. Senator Wayne, you are recognized.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I'm not really speaking on the bill, I'm supporting the bill, but I just wanted to give everybody a heads up. I know at one o'clock we're going to debate LB1024. The, the negotiated amendment was just dropped, so hopefully it'll be available in the next five or 10 minutes. I just don't want people to think that we dropped it at the last minute and didn't give everybody a heads up. So that's at least an hour. It's not that long. It's only 10 pages or 15 pages, but five of them are current sections of law. So I just want to give everybody a heads up so we can have a fruitful debate at one o'clock. Thank you, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Slama, you're recognized to close on LB977A. Senator Slama waives closing. Members, the question is the advancement of LB977A to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 35 ayes, 0 nays on the advancement of the A bill.

WILLIAMS: LB977 advances. Next item on the agenda, LB792.

CLERK: LB792 was introduced by Senator Lowe. Relates to appropriations. It appropriates funds to the Department of Health and Human Services. There are Appropriations Committee amendments pending, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Lowe, you are recognized to open on LB792.

LOWE: Thank you very much, Mr. President. LB792 is now not a YRTC bill. LB792 will have an amendment on it that will make it a UNK bill. LB792 is a bill where it is important to pay attention to the white copy amendment that has been attached. AM2430 becomes the bill, and this amendment funds the University of Nebraska Medical Center Rural Health Complex, which will be on the University of Nebraska, Kearney campus. I want to thank Senator Stinner and the members of the Appropriations Committee for their support on this amendment. I want to thank Senator Hilkemann for introducing the bill that funds the creation of the Rural Health Complex for the drafting of this amendment, and I want to thank Senator Vargas for helping to find a vehicle in a priority bill to ensure we can fully fund this project. AM2430 is the product of years of work that included the Appropriations Committee, the Health and Human Services Committee, UNMC, UNK, and countless others. I urge my colleagues to vote green on this AM and the bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Lowe. As the Clerk stated, there are amendments from the Appropriations Committee. Senator Stinner as Chair of the committee, you are recognized to open on AM2430.

STINNER: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Legislature, the committee amendment strikes the original provision, provisions and becomes the bill. The amendment appropriates funds from the General Fund to the University of Nebraska for operating expenses of the Rural Health Complex. Funds appropriated are as follows; \$3 million for 2022-23, \$9 million for 2023-24 and \$15 million for 2024-25. Start-up costs and construction costs for this project are appropriated to the university in LB1014 from funds received from the state pursuant to the federal coronavirus recovery funds in the ARPA Act of 2021. The Committee voted to advance the bill 7-1 with that amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Stinner. Debate is now open. Senator Jacobson, you are recognized.

JACOBSON: Thank you, Mr. President. I'd just like to reiterate again my support for this bill and the AM. Again, I really appreciate the partnership that UNMC has with UNK, and at any time we can continue to bring these services out further west, I'm going to be in support. There's a critical need out there. I've seen what they're trying to get done at UNK. This is a great project. This will help all of us as

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

we move further west. And so anytime we can bring projects like this to further west outside of the Lincoln, Omaha metro area and do it cooperatively with UNMC who has been very cooperative with us. Support also with our hospital in North Platte. Great resource. This is how we get things done from a cooperative standpoint where we're leveraging what they're doing in Omaha and bringing that further west. So I applaud the effort, thank those who brought the bill and would urge everyone to vote yes on the amendment and the bill. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I'll yield my time.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Jacobson. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you are recognized.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I rise in support of LB792 and AM2430. Very much appreciate Senator Lowe bringing this bill, as I've talked previously, we really need to update those facilities and this is a great project. I do want to point out that I don't see a queue full of people rising up against the university on this one. Seems like we're picking winners and losers when we're opposing the university here today. And Senator Lowe hit the jackpot, I guess, just sparkling personality means that nobody's going to question what we're doing with the university. So I appreciate that because I think this is a great bill. I just am disappointed in what happened this morning and how it happened and why it happened, and I just wanted to state that for the record. So thank you, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Vargas, you are recognized.

VARGAS: Thank you. I'll keep this brief. I just want to thank Senator Lowe, Senator Hilkemann, and the Appropriations Committee. One of the reasons why this is important is we constantly talk about rural development and our next generation of health care professionals. They don't just spring up out of anywhere. We have to be intentional about what we do to educate them, to create pathways, to create pipelines and that happens with our university system. And that's coming from an urban senator making sure that we do this in rural Nebraska. And I think that's important for our state and we're trying to grow our state. I also think it's important when we're trying to keep people in different areas and make sure that we have opportunities to grow the population, population of our state. So I support this. Was happy to work on this with Senator Lowe and others, and I urge your green vote of AM2430 and the underlying bill, which will come, become the new bill. Thank you.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Vargas. Senator Erdman, you are recognized. Senator Erdman waives. Senator Hilkeman, you are recognized.

HILKEMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise in strong support of AM2430, the amendment and this, this bill. This rural health care complex is transformative for medicine in Nebraska. When I first considered running for the office and had my first meeting with, with, with Dr. Gold from UNMC, I said we need to work to get a medical school at the University of Nebraska at Kearney. I am so honored that I was able to bring this bill before-- which is-- which actually ARPA legislation, but this is, this we need to have to have that come to fruition. And so therefore, this is a very important bill for the University of Nebraska. It's very important bill for Nebraska as we look at going beyond. And so therefore, in strong support of these. Thank you very much.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Hilkemann. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you are recognized.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I would ask if Senator Erdman would yield to a question.

WILLIAMS: Senator Erdman, would you yield?

ERDMAN: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Senator Erdman. I appreciate the enthusiasm. I am looking at the committee statement and I see that you did not vote for this. And I was wondering if there were concerns you had with this bill as to why you wouldn't have voted for it.

ERDMAN: I had questions. Those questions were answered. They have now been taken care of.

M. CAVANAUGH: They've been taken care of in the amendment?

ERDMAN: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: Do you mind sharing what those concerns were?

ERDMAN: I do not want to share those with you.

M. CAVANAUGH: Oh, OK, well, thank you.

ERDMAN: Thank you.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

M. CAVANAUGH: All right. I just-- I saw this on the committee statement so I just wanted to make sure that everybody was on board because it again is going to the university. I know it's going to western part of the state, so maybe that's why everybody's OK with it. Although Mead is technically kind of a rural community, but anyhow. Thank you.

WILLIAMS: Members, Senator Lathrop would like to introduce 43 fourth-graders from Seymour Elementary in Ralston, along with six adults and teachers. They are seated in the north balcony. If you would please rise and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Returning to debate, seeing no one in the queue, Senator Stinner, you are recognized to close on the committee amendment. Senator Stinner waives closing. Members, the question is the adoption of AM2430 to LB792. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all voted that wish? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 32 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of committee amendments.

WILLIAMS: The amendment is adopted. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Lowe, you're recognized to close on LB792. Senator Lowe waives closing. Members, the question is the advancement of LB792 to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 33 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of committee amendments [SIC].

WILLIAMS: LB792 advances.

ARCH: Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next bill, LB927 by Senator Pahls. It's a bill for an act relating to Center Facility Financing Assistance Act; defines and redefines terms; it changes provisions relating to the use of state assistance. Introduced on January 10, referred to Revenue, advanced to General File. There are committee amendments pending.

ARCH: Senator Flood, you are recognized to open on LB927.

FLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. As you know, Senator Rich Pahls cannot be with us here today. And so after being in communication with him and in his office, we agreed that I would introduce the bill on his behalf on General File. This bill includes three major provisions. First, it provides an increase in the amount of state sales tax turnback available for renovations and expansions under the Convention Center Facility and Finance Assistance Act.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

Second, it includes nearby parking facilities as qualifying projects. Third, it would raise the cap on funds available from the turnback of state sales tax revenue available through the Convention Center Facility Financing Act from \$75 million to \$150 million. By the time the CHI Center in Omaha's debt service is paid off at this time projected to be 2027, the city of Omaha will have hit its cap of \$75 million. Increasing this cap allows Omaha to maintain and renovate the CHI Center, protecting Omaha's valuable investment, and the numbers speak for themselves. In 2021, meetings and events held at the Convention Center in Omaha and the arena infused \$83 million into Omaha's and the state's economy. It's important to note, too, that this number does not include concerts and community events. It represents half capacity of the U.S. Olympic swim trials and does not account for the annual Berkshire Hathaway shareholders meeting. All these events were impacted by COVID. These meetings and events at the Convention Center and arena have economic benefit to businesses beyond the immediate area. An out-of-town convention attendee to Omaha stays longer and spends more compared to a typical leisure traveler. Convention attendees spend 20 percent more at Omaha restaurants, 44 percent more at Omaha hotels. Businesses in Omaha depend on the CHI Center and the maintenance and construction of the state sales tax turnback helps facilitate. Senator Wayne and Senator McKinney might be pleased to hear that north and south Omaha also benefit from this turnback as well. By the time Omaha has paid off its debt service and hit the cap of \$75 million, \$7.5 million will have been transferred to the Community Betterment Turnback Fund to revitalize both north and south Omaha. I'm personally glad that rural communities benefit from LB927 as well, with \$37 million generated to the fund for economic development projects through the Civic and Community Center Financing Act, which assists communities statewide. In the committee amendment, Senator Linehan will discuss a provision that will help communities across the state like Ashland, Brownville, Norfolk, Scottsbluff, and others. Members, this is a good bill. It helps protect an important asset in the Omaha CHI Center. It benefits both urban and rural communities, and I urge you to give it a green vote. LB927 had no opponents at its hearing and was voted out of the committee with seven votes. AM2023 is attached. I ask for your support of LB927 and AM2023. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Flood. Mr. Clerk, for an amendment.

CLERK: Senator Linehan will move to amend the committee amendments.

ARCH: Senator Linehan, you're welcome to open on the amendment.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

LINEHAN: Thank you, Mr. President. AM2023 is a white cuppy amendment and becomes the bill. LB927 as amended was advanced to General File on a 7-0 vote from the Revenue Committee, with one member abstaining. Senator Flood has explained the original version of his bill and-- of Senator Pahls's bill-- was intended to do. The amendment does not change that. The amendment does two basic things. It adds the provisions of LB one, excuse me, LB818, which I introduced and it allows cities to partner with certified creative districts for one-time opportunity to obtain a grant. The second provision is something Senator Flood developed with the League of Municipalities. And if he's on the floor, I would defer to him to explain that grant program. LB818, which is amended into LB927, addresses some of the needs for the city of Ralston and its arena. It makes three specific changes. One, it allows parking facilities that are not connected to the arena to be included in the definition of an eligible sports arena facility. The arena is losing significant block of parking spaces that it leases, and this will help them accommodate the new parking spaces. The parking is required to be within 700 yards of the arena and must be specifically for its use. It strikes the existing law that requires the state turnback assistance to be paid within 20 years of the issuance of the first bond of the arena. This just gives Ralston a little more breathing room. Finally, it increases the total amount of assistance from \$50 million to \$100 million. I have a handout, which I will send around that gives you a summary of the situation with Ralston's arena. Remember, Ralston is a landlocked city that cannot expand outward to increase economic development. It must invest in the facilities it has, and this bill will go a long ways towards making that happen. So with that, I would appreciate your green vote on AM2023 and LB927. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Linehan. Mr. Clerk for an amendment.

CLERK: Mr. President, now I have a series of amendments to the committee amendments. Senator McKinney has AM2242 pending, but I have a note that he wishes to withdraw AM2242 and offer AM2632 as a substitute.

ARCH: Any objection? If-- if not, so ordered. Senator Bostar, I understand you will open on this amendment. You may proceed.

BOSTAR: Thank you, Mr. President. I agreed to open on Senator McKinney's amendment while he is engaged in negotiations with the Governor. So this amendment makes a few changes to the turnback provisions. One, it-- it doesn't change the permitted uses of the turnback funds, but it does sort of specify some of the allocations.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

So it would establish 55 percent of funds shall go to, one, showcase important historical aspects of such areas or areas within close geographic proximity of the area with a high concentration of poverty; two, assist with the reduction of street and gang violence in such areas. So those two would make up 55 percent of the allocation of funds. Forty-five percent of the allocation of funds would go to assist with small business and entrepreneurship growth in those areas. So it clearly delineates how those funds should be separated. The other, the real sort of substantial thing that this amendment does is it increases the turnback area from 600 yards to 1,200 yards. It effectively doubles it. And I think there's-- there's a good argument to be made for why we should make that increase. This would apply to the arenas in Lincoln and Omaha, and each of those arenas have geographic constraints that limit the area of development around them. So in Omaha, the arena is essentially bordered by the state of Iowa, which prevents a significant portion of what would be a 600-yard radius from being utilized for these turnback purposes. In Lincoln, the Lincoln Arena is bordered by a floodplain, so we can't develop essentially half of our area as well. So this would, I think, fix some of the limitations that our geography has placed on this and align the intent of the legislation with the realities that we face in our state. And just as a reminder, again, this is only a turnback on hotels. So I don't know exactly how many additional hotels this would bring in in the Omaha area, but I can tell you that in Lincoln, for example, this would bring in two additional hotels for turnback tax purposes. And with that, if anyone has any questions on this amendment, I would be happy to attempt to answer them on behalf of Senator McKinney, and I would encourage all of you to vote green on AM2632.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Bostar. Debate is now open. Senator Linehan, you are recognized.

LINEHAN: The week is catching up with me. So I believe right now I'm OK with Senator McKinney's AM2632. I didn't quite understand what was going on, but I will work with Senator McKinney between now and Select to see if we can have more clarity about what this actually means. So thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Linehan. Senator Wayne, you are recognized.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President. So the idea behind this is if we're going to expand a little bit on the feet, then we should also expand the collection back for the turnback tax for a grant program. So-- but I would invite and ask everybody to do is to vote green on this. I

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

recognize the Revenue for the last week and a half have been working on taxes and so the communication was there or attempted, but I think everybody was running around. So I think we're all in the same agreement, but we just want to get this to Select File so we can keep having these conversations and to fix whatever minor changes that need to be fixed. But the idea is if we're going to expand it to include additional areas such as parking-- parking garages, then the turnback tax, which we provide grants for throughout the community for different programs, including businesses, to help business generate business, that also should be raised to a higher threshold. So it's basically if we're going to expand, we should increase the turnback tax grants. It's a really simple idea, but again, I understand that a lot's been going on in the last couple of days, so I would ask for a green-- a green vote and move this forward. Thank you.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Senator Erdman, you are recognized.

ERDMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. I'm amazed by how much money we have to give to Omaha. Never satisfied. OK? We have too many convention centers now, but we've got to continue to bail out the ones that are failing because we overbuilt. So we're going to use turnback sales tax, which is very, very similar to TIF, very similar to TIF. We're gonna do that. How much money, what will be the number when Omaha will be satisfied and say, that's enough. Thank you. This is nuts. We just want to move this on to Select so we can continue the conversation about what? This is crazy. So we just want 55 percent. We want to do this. We want to build another hotel, and want to build another convention center when they're already overbuilt. I'm perplexed by this. I just-- I was in support of LB927 when it started. And we continue to amend it to make it even less attractive, if that's possible to me. But maybe I'm the only one in the room that thinks enough is enough. Maybe, maybe I'm the only one. At some point, the people who represent Omaha need to say, hey, thank you. Thank you. You thought of us. You voted to take care of us. We appreciate that. That may never happen. It may never happen. So maybe from these comments that I have made, you've concluded what my opinion is of this bill and these amendments. You're very observant if you have. Enough is enough. Thank you.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Erdman. Senator Friesen, you are recognized.

FRIESEN: Thank you, Mr. President. I, in committee, said I would support what Ralston wants to do with the parking lot or build a-- an elevated parking garage. But I want to spend a little time talking about the history of this and my time on the Revenue and how we've

over and over again tried to increase either the distance and the revenue that's collected in order to keep Ralston Arena alive. And I think at some point I'm-- I'm agreeing with Senator Erdman, enough is enough. This I see happening as we start to build these recreation centers around the state. We're going to build too many of them and they're not all going to make it. So what I am opposed to is extending the range out to a thousand yards. We've increased this previously and if I have not had time to read the amendment, but if we extend this range to all of the current turnback tax projects, I mean, and Lincoln here, we're going to increase that. The CHI Center, we're going to increase that distance and the amount of money that we're starting to talk about is getting to be to the point where I think sometime it has to end. You know, we I think as a body back in the day agreed to help them build a facility. Now they're still collecting the turnback tax and the facilities are starting to need remodeling. And they haven't turned enough profit or been invested enough yet to even start to pay for the maintenance on their facilities and keep them up. And so they keep wanting more distance and more money. And what Senator McKinney wants is a bigger portion of this. I get that. I have no problem with probably what he's after. But when you're looking at increasing this distance and increasing the revenue, that's where I have a problem. I asked the Ralston to give me some numbers on this, and they've historically collected 2 to \$3.7 million annually. They've collected \$23 million since 2013. And so I look at this and I'm-- I'm asking questions about, you know, how much did Ralston get in ARPA money? So they got \$643,000 in ARPA money. And should they have used that on their Ralston Arena that they own, that is in trouble? I don't know. They made choices of where they're going to spend their money. So I'm reluctant to increase this distance because it keeps taking away again from state revenue on our sales tax collections and turning it back to those cities. Now, if you want to-- if you want to give them more revenue, let's-- let's amend this to say that they're also going to keep the city's portion of the tax collected because right now they're just turning back the 5.5 percent that goes to the state. Let's put them-- put some skin in the game from them. Let's take the 1.5 or 2 percent that they're collecting. Let's put that in the fund and they can help pay for their own arenas, so to speak, instead of just the state. This is just the state's obligation that goes to fund these arenas. And so I will be opposing the amendment at least that increases the distance. That's where I have the problem. If we keep the distance the same, I said I would support the Ralston Arena and what they're trying to do. But I think longer term, when the WarHorse gambling casino gets built there, I don't see that people are going to want to attend the Ralston Arena. They're going to have trouble

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

attracting people there because I have a feeling the casino is going to have a facility that has these entertainment venues in it, and they're not going to want to travel very far away from the casino to entertain these events. And so I think longer term, the picture looks bleak--

ARCH: One minute.

FRIESEN: --I think, for the Ralston Arena. But that's again, I don't live there. I don't-- I can say that I've never attended anything at the Ralston Arena. But this is a long-term problem that's been festering for a long time. And, you know, they had some issues with they thought they were going to get different events there. And it turns out they built another arena in the city and things fell through. I feel bad for them. Things went wrong. But again, I don't see that that is a state problem now when we want to start increasing the distance and changing the dollars that we're going to be able to let them collect. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Friesen. Senator Brandt, you are recognized.

BRANDT: Thank you, Mr. President. Would Senator Bostar be available to answer a few questions?

ARCH: Senator Bostar, will you yield?

BOSTAR: Absolutely.

BRANDT: Senator Bostar, I know this isn't your bill, and maybe you don't-- don't have the knowledge of this. And I'll move on to Senator Wayne if you're unable to answer these. So I guess my first question is when we increase that radius, let's use Ralston as an example, and it crosses city boundaries so you go from Ralston into Bellevue or Papillion, La Vista or somewhere like that, do those municipalities have to turn that back-- tax back to that convention center?

BOSTAR: I don't think it crosses any boundaries. And, you know, I think it's worth also just, and I'm going to probably keep saying this, it's just hotels. You know, that's the only thing in this that the turnback tax applies to. So I don't think you're capturing anything on any other side of-- of a political boundary in a hotel where-- where this question would be applicable.

BRANDT: So if-- if you're an existing hotel that gets caught in the expanded turnback tax, a lot of these lodging taxes already go to the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

city or another entity. So can they redirect that existing lodging tax back to another political subdivision?

BOSTAR: So I think to some extent the lodging taxes are separate from the sales tax. And so this is applicable to the sales tax. Specifically, the state's portion of the sales tax would be turned back for the purposes outlined in the legislation.

BRANDT: So it would just be the state's portion, not the city portion.

BOSTAR: That's my understanding of what we're doing here.

BRANDT: All right. Thank you, Senator Bostar. Senator Wayne, would you be available for a question?

ARCH: Senator Wayne, will you yield?

WAYNE: Yes.

BRANDT: Senator Wayne, you're the ranking fiscal conservative on the General's [SIC] Affair Committee, are you not?

WAYNE: Yes, I am.

BRANDT: Yes. So if-- if we're going to build new parking garages for Ralston, would it not make sense that they just charge enough to park the car there to pay for the garage?

WAYNE: Well, first, this doesn't apply to Ralston. This only applies to Lincoln and Omaha, so the convention and Pershing.

BRANDT: All right.

WAYNE: To your point, though, your premise, yes, typically, you should charge enough to build your own.

BRANDT: OK. And then you heard my questions to Senator Bostar before. Do you-- do you feel that the answers that he gave are accurate?

WAYNE: Yes. The issue is, if you're talking about a lodging tax, I wasn't sure if you were talking about the occupational tax, which is the local tax that stays at the local. We are talking about sales tax. But when-- generally when you say lodging tax, it kind of includes it all. So I do believe his answer is right.

BRANDT: All right. Thank you, Senator Wayne.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Brandt, Senator Bostar, and Senator Wayne. Senator Wayne, you are recognized.

WAYNE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, now I want to remind people why you might think this just-- this is an Omaha-- well, first of all, I want to say thank you to Senator Erdman. People think Erdman, Senator Erdman is just a no and-- and has always voted no on-- on Omaha. He has not. We've had many conversations. But on behalf of Omaha, since you said nobody said thank you, I want to make sure I tell you, thank you. Me and him are both smiling tongue in cheek because we have a great relationship. But I do want to remind people that this act actually applies to the entire state. Now the convention centers are in Omaha and Lincoln. But there is a map and, Senator Erdman, you have many, many people who received grants underneath this because part of the state dollars goes to the Civic and Community Center Financing Act, which is part of the Civic Community, yeah, the Financing Act. They provide grants to anywhere in the state that does not have a convention center. So if you are a small community, you have applied and I can get you the map of from 2004 to 2021 that small municipalities across the state have received dollars from Omaha and Lincoln based off of this act because they also get a portion. And so that's what Senator McKinney is trying to say is that not only do these certain areas get here, but I hope you read the rest of the amendment. What the rest of the amendment does, which is why I hope we can keep this going, it adds more accountability. If you recall, last year, Senator McKinney brought a bill to add a lot more accountability and transparency to the grant process and even made himself a nonvoting member on the board so he can watch it more. And out of that conversation in board meetings, he introduced this second amendment, saying this is an opportunity to add more accountability. But I just want to remind everybody this is not just to Omaha and Lincoln only. That there is part of this Civic and Community Center Financing Act that provides for the rest of the state, municipalities, the rest of the state grants based off of these dollars. And every county except for Sheridan and Garden, oh, Grant, Hooker, Thomas, Arthur, and McPherson, the ones that all have less than 1,000, but every one of them across the state, and Newman [SIC] and Richardson, sorry, Senator Slama, I didn't see them on the right, every other state [SIC]. So that's 90-plus, 80-plus counties, a municipality in one of those counties received grants and dollars, which you would deem from Omaha and Lincoln. So we're all tied in this together is my point. We got to continue to work together and we will do that from General to Select. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Senator Flood, you are recognized.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

FLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. I have had a lot of experience with this, and as a member of the Revenue Committee, two quick comments. One is how did we get to where we're at? Back in 2000, essentially, the turn of the century, Omaha Mayor Hal Daub and the administration from Omaha was working to address convention center facility space. The Omaha Civic Auditorium had been kind of a weight on the city's leg. It wasn't working the way they needed it to from a tourism perspective and, "walla," here came a brand new convention center because the Legislature formed a compromise that said, as we turn back the state's portion of the sales tax, we're going to carve 30 percent of it out for rural communities to participate in the CCCFF. The CCCFF is the fund that pays back to rural communities for convention center, for public meeting space, and I'm handing out what has been the list of all of the projects that have funded-- have been funded in recent terms from the CCCFF. That's how I got into this. The city of Omaha came forward and said, here's where we're at. And by the way, you know, I live in Norfolk. It's hard to argue that the Pinnacle Bank Arena has not enriched the lives of people in the Lincoln and greater Nebraska area. Last Sunday, my neighbors made their way down to Lincoln to enjoy the sounds of Elton John, a cultural and entertainment opportunity that would otherwise not be available had a venue like that not been created. It happens all the time with the CHI Center, the Olympic Swim Trials exposing men and women of all ages to the fantastic sport of swimming. We all can benefit from shows. I know that for a fact there are a lot of shows at the Ralston Arena do the same thing. So the benefit, I think, has proven itself out over the last 22 years as to what these facilities have done to increase access to entertainment, the arts, business and trade shows, making things like the Berkshire Hathaway Convention happen when it's in person in Omaha. I got my vaccine shot for the COVID virus at the Pinnacle Bank Arena, where it was filled with nurses and doctors and technicians, police officers that were directing us in to get our vaccine shots. These are important public facilities that have more than paid back their public purpose. So the dollars that come out of this, the sales tax dollars, the state's portion is kept by the city to pay back the bonds. The city of Omaha comes in and says, we are seeing more traffic downtown. We have more lodging downtown. Think about what's happened since this was passed. You've got the TD Ameritrade baseball complex for the College World Series. Well, they have to address parking. They have to address facility upgrades. The-- in Lincoln, the city of Lincoln, says, yes, Pinnacle Bank Arena has been a huge driver and catalyst for the Haymarket area. We have more opportunities now than we had 10 years ago or 15 years ago when Vision 2015 embarked on this process, and Dick Campbell essentially went business to business to

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

business and house to house to house to encourage people to get into this project in Lincoln. And then Ralston comes to us, Ralston sitting on a spot of land where there's going to be a casino nearby and they're going to take up some of the parking that Ralston Arena currently counts on. And they said we, too, have these parking issues. Trust me, we vetted all of these things. We've asked them tons of questions.

ARCH: One minute.

FLOOD: We've put them up on the stand and we basically said, verify this and substantiate this. They met that burden and here we are. Senator McKinney's amendment only applies to Omaha and Lincoln. It expands it from 600 yards to 1,200 yards for the purpose of capturing those hotels. So if you're in Omaha, think about like the Holiday Inn Express that's on Cuming Street. Senator Pahls would be so proud that I'm identifying landmarks in the-- city of the metropolitan class. And think about what's happened downtown, the Kindler Hotel. I can tell you at the Cornhusker Hotel on Sunday night I saw all sorts of Elton John fans. The place was packed and it's because of the Pinnacle Bank Arena. So I would encourage you to vote for AM2632. The Revenue Committee has vetted this. We have talked about it ad nauseum inside the committee, and I know Senator Linehan has a long history with these facilities and I look forward to learning more--

ARCH: Time, Senator.

FLOOD: --about where she stands on this. Thank you.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Flood. Senator Linehan, you are recognized.

LINEHAN: Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, Senator Flood. So one statement was made just to be clear: Omaha, like every other institution, yes, they come and ask for money and ask for turnback and ask for-- yes, they do. That's what you do for constituents. I'm-- but to be clear, the Revenue Committee hardly passes everything on out of the Revenue Committee that anybody asks for, even if it's Omaha. So my recollection on this is we talked about the distance in committee, but because this came up this week, or maybe it was even in the last seven days, I would say, I did not pull the Revenue Committee together and look at this. So what I would like to propose here is that we go ahead and let AM2632 go forward, even though-- and I will work with the committee and Senator McKinney and others who are interested before we bring this back. And it won't take very long. I think we can come to some kind of solution. With that said, I would like to focus on my

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

part of the bill, and I feel a little bit bad because Senator Pahls is not here, but he is-- this is his priority, if I remember right. He was on-- he was here in the Legislature, and he served on the city council in Omaha. So of course, this is very near and dear to him, so I don't want to, like, discount how important the Civic-- the CHI Center is in Omaha. And I remember I was in a different place than Senator Flood when this all came to be. But it was a huge effort by the Omaha Chamber of Commerce and many people, John Gottschalk, who was publisher of the World-Herald at the time and Hal Daub, mayor. It was a miracle basically that that convention center got built. And it was a lot of private money, that had nothing to do with taxpayers' money that went into making that happen. So let's go to Ralston. I'm not going to hand this out because we're buried in paper and all tired. But Ralston came in when they-- on my bill that just dealt with Ralston. It's not just that they're doing the asking for a turnback tax. They have a whole plan, the Granary District. It's called the Hinge Project. The historic Granary Building is being revitalized as part of a larger commercial and residential development known as the Granary District. The Granary District created space for businesses and already has created 30 permanent jobs. They have-- they're redoing buildings that are already there. Again, they're landlocked and they, they built an arena thinking they had a client that they lost. So they have struggled forward and they, I think, have done an excellent job. Then they get hit with COVID. So yes, they-- it's not been an ideal situation. But now their parking is going to be overtaken by a casino. This just allows them money so they can build a parking garage so they can keep the arena open. They have hired a private management firm to take it over. And even though they had COVID, they stopped losing money. The deficit has been reduced by 33 percent. They are all in on this. It's-- what Ralston is, is a small town in the middle of great big Omaha. And anybody that's run for statewide office or who's been involved in a statewide campaign has been to the Fourth of July Ralston Parade. The Ralston Parade is like a basic part of Nebraska where everybody goes, you start off in Omaha neighborhood parades, then you go to Ralston.

ARCH: One minute.

LINEHAN: It's-- it's a little town that just keeps working really hard. So I would really appreciate your support on all three of these amendments and then, excuse me, two amendments. And I also want to thank Senator Matt Hansen for withdrawing his amendments this morning-- approve this, and I will talk to Senator Erdman and Senator Friesen and others who have concerns about this, and we will try and fix those before we bring it back on Select. Thank you, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Linehan. Senator Friesen, you are recognized.

FRIESEN: Thank you, Mr. President. I totally understand that 30 percent of this money does go out as grants to rural areas. Back in the day, it was restricted to what could be done in these-- in the-- in the grant process. And I know they were building up a lot of money at the time in those-- that fund. And so we started opening up to more and more different types of projects can be applied for in these grants that go out into rural Nebraska. I get that. And it's a lot of money. There are some great projects out there that have been funded by this or partially funded. But again, it is to the point, well, we-- we just keep increasing this distance. It's one way of doing things, but it also means that a community is having to raise taxes to fund the other half of this project or three-fourths of it or whatever it's funding. My point is, is that it's not just the hotels that it covers. When you increase this distance, every bit of sales tax within that yardage is turned back. It's not just hotels. That wording is not in here. I don't see it. And so this idea that you're just hitting certain areas, it is every dollar of state sales tax collected in the radius of that 1,250 yards or however it reads will get turned back to the state. At some point, we have to say enough is enough. There can be other programs. There can be other ways of doing this, but to just keep increasing that distance and in some cases, you have pretty significant retail outlets that would be covered by that increase in distance. Let's just say, for instance, that distance would suddenly touch a Cabela's or a Walmart. That suddenly turns into a huge, huge cash flow where we're talking a lot of dollars. And so I am not opposed to the original bill. I'm not opposed to the components of parts of it. But when we're starting to increase that distance, that's where I have a problem. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Friesen. Seeing no one left in the queue, Senator Bostar, you are welcome to close on AM2632.

BOSTAR: Thank you, Mr. President. So just to respond to a few things. You know, Senator Friesen talked about the distance including a Cabela's or Walmart, I think were cited. And just-- so just to clarify, with AM2632 extending that distance, it will-- it can only capture hotels. There's no other retail that will be impacted by this whatsoever. And I appreciate Senator Linehan's remarks about, you know, let's-- let's put this on now to go to Select and then the committee will all get together with the interested parties and we'll figure out if there's something we need to do to right-size this. So with that, I would appreciate your vote. And again, and just also just to-- there's a lot of things I think that are getting kind of mixed

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

together. This particular amendment only impacts Lincoln and Omaha, those arenas. This isn't-- this doesn't have an impact on-- on the Ralston, the Ralston Arena, and their sort of unique situation. They-- they operate-- the turnback tax for Ralston is a little bit different, and this sort of isn't-- isn't going to impact them. And finally, if you're on the fence and thinking about the distance increasing, again, as written, it goes from 600 to 1,200, but I want everyone to keep in mind that because of geographic limitations, we can only really take about half of that circle. So this, in a way, is a-- is an idea to address that, address those limitations. And as Senator Flood mentioned, you know, at the arena for the Elton John concert, you know, the Cornhusker Hotel was full of fans who were going to that concert. This would, this amendment would include the Cornhusker. Someone asked me which two hotels in Lincoln. It would include the Cornhusker and would include the Kindler, which are obviously hotels that derive a lot of traffic and a lot of business from their proximity to the arena. I think this makes a lot of sense. And I would hope that you would trust the Revenue Committee to examine this between now and Select and advance it at this point. Thank you very much.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Bostar. The question is, shall the amendment to the committee amendment to LB927 be adopted? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Have you all voted? Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 28 ayes, 0 nays on the amendment.

ARCH: The amendment is adopted.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Ben Hansen would move to amend, AM2505.

ARCH: Senator Ben Hansen, you are recognized to open.

B. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. AM2505 is essentially a cleanup bill of my postcard bill that I had last year. Been working closely with the counties and the cities and listening to some of the concerns and just kind of trying to make the, the process of that bill more efficient and effective. And that's what AM2505 essentially is. So we would amend LB1250 into LB927. LB1250 had a hearing on March 2 without opposition and was voted out of the Revenue Committee on March 8 with 8-0 support. Last year, I worked to pass the Property Tax Request Act that worked to put a check on government spending. Political subdivisions are now required to justify the reasons for increased taxes to the taxpayers where we have a postcard in the mail. Each

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

postcard will include an explanation of proposed property tax increases, along with the details of public meetings where Nebraskans have an opportunity to voice their opinions. Oftentimes, when legislation is passed, there is a need for cleanup language to clarify the logistics of the statute. And like I mentioned before, that is the purpose behind AM2505. I have been in communication with Nebraska's counties, cities, and school boards to figure out the specifics that would update the process of sending out the postcards and running the joint public hearings. In the statement on the postcard that informs taxpayers of revenue increase, AM2505 adds language that further explains how it would result in an overall increase in property taxes. The county assessor will then send the information required on the postcard to a printing service designated by the county board. The initial cost of the printing of the postcard will be paid for by the county's general fund, while the remaining cost that comes with everything involved in creating and sending the postcards will be charged proportionately to all the political subdivisions that are included in the joint public hearing. The costs will be divided based on the number of parcels in each participating political subdivision. And finally, AM2505 ensures that an enforcement process of the Property Tax Request Act, a political subdivision that has followed the guidelines, will not have its property tax request invalidated due to another political subdivision's failure to comply with the act. So with that, colleagues, I appreciate your time and ask for your support of AM2505. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Debate is now open on the bill, on the amendment. Senator Hunt, you are recognized.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. Would Senator Ben Hansen yield to some questions?

ARCH: Senator Hansen, will you yield?

B. HANSEN: Yes.

HUNT: Thank you. Sorry, I didn't give you a heads up. I was just listening to you talk and questions came to mind. I'm reading-- I'm pulling up this amendment. Does the-- is this an amendment to require subdivisions to send a mailing? Can you-- sorry, what does this do again?

B. HANSEN: Yeah, that was a previous bill. And so this is kind of clarifying some of the language on how the subdivisions will pay for the postcard. So instead of them all paying for it equally, because

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

some parts of subdivisions are bigger than others, they will divide it out proportionately.

HUNT: OK, thank you. That's all.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Linehan, you are recognized.

LINEHAN: I'm just saying this is a friendly amendment, and I appreciate your vote for it. Thank you.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Linehan. Senator Blood, you are recognized.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. Fellow senators, friends all, I'm not sure that I support the amendment. I do have several questions for Senator Hansen if he would yield, please, to several questions.

ARCH: Senator Hansen, will you yield?

B. HANSEN: Yes.

BLOOD: Senator Hansen, can you kind of walk me through? I remember the last "unfunmet" unfunded mandate that you did with the previous bill. What does this do that helps the previous unfunded mandate? How does it-- is it clarifying something?

B. HANSEN: It's more clarifying language. This doesn't change anything. There's no fiscal note attached to this. It's more-- and the counties and the cities and the school boards are the ones that kind of brought a lot of this to me to make it more effective for them. And so there's less confusion among the different political subdivisions. That was one of the primary concerns they had, and that's what we kind of included in this amendment.

BLOOD: And what was the confusion? That's-- because I'm confused because I don't understand what the confusion was with the prior bill.

B. HANSEN: Yeah, OK, so for instance, who's going to organize the hearing? We clarified that. That's the county clerk, right? So the county assessor will send the information required on the postcard to a printing service. So we're-- the county was trying to figure out one of the best ways we can kind of print these postcards in an effective and efficient manner. And so they had the county board can then designate a printing service for that. That will then be included for all the political subdivisions and then divided out and charged proportionately based on the number of parcels in each participating

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

political subdivision because the county itself might be bigger than they might send out more than a school board [INAUDIBLE].

BLOOD: So, Senator Hansen, so we gave them more clarification on implementation, yes or no?

B. HANSEN: Yes.

BLOOD: And then we made it clear who is stuck paying the amended unfunded mandate based on who it's being sent on behalf of. Is that correct?

B. HANSEN: If that's the language you want to use, yes.

BLOOD: Well, it-- it is an unfunded mandate, friend. So we just need to make sure that we keep talking about what unfunded mandates really are because it seemed to be some confusion on my bill the other day. So I appreciate your answers. Thank you, Senator Hansen, and thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Blood, Senator Hansen. Seeing no one left in the queue, Senator Hansen, you're welcome to close on your amendment. Senator Hansen waives close. The question is, shall AM2505 be adopted? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Have you all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 29 ayes, 0 nays on the amendment.

ARCH: The amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Matt Hansen would like to withdraw FA172. Mr. President, Senator Flood would move to amend, AM2677.

ARCH: Senator Flood, you are welcome to open on AM2677.

FLOOD: Mr. President and members, I intend to withdraw this amendment. We are going to address some of these issues on Select. Notably, we want to have a conversation about a bill that was introduced and passed last year, LB39, which created the Youth Facility Finance Act. And I think those conversations are better had with Senator Brett Lindstrom here. So we'll visit with him on Select and I would ask that this be withdrawn.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Flood.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

CLERK: I have nothing further pending to the committee amendments.

ARCH: Debate resumes on AM2023. Senator Matt Hansen, you are recognized.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President and colleagues. I'll be brief, be-- excuse me, be brief. Excuse me, end of the week is getting to me. I am going to be in support of the package in LB927 in this round. What I wanted to speak to is more procedural. I just have to say I'm appreciative that the body made the motion to overrule the Chair and have kind of a generous interpretation of germaneness. As we've kind of noted, we just had a turnback tax bill amended by an update to an unrelated act about postcard mailing for tax protest hearings I believe. If we were going to rule that the other way that germaneness wasn't established, I would seriously question germaneness of the last one. I had no desire to challenge that, especially after the body had the generous motion to overrule the Chair this morning. But that was the exact issue that I wanted to address in my floor speech when overruling the Chair is. If we wanted to have a strict standard in germaneness, we can and there could be lots of bills and lots of amendments impacted. As it stands, that was a good amendment and I had nothing to say on it, so I will continue to support this bill. Thank you.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Seeing no one left in the queue, Senator Linehan, you're welcome to close on AM2023. Senator Linehan waives close. The question before the body is the advancement of AM2023. Excuse me, the adoption of AM2023. All those in favor vote aye; opposed, nay. Has everyone voted? Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 27 ayes, 0 nays on the committee amendments.

ARCH: The amendment is adopted. Turning to the bill, LB927, Senator Flood, you are recognized to close.

FLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President, members. We appreciate the conversation on this bill. We have a plan on Select File to address a couple of issues. One is Senator McKinney's amendment that was adopted as it relates to the expansion from 600 to 1,200 yards, and he and I and others will be working with the Revenue Committee and its Chair to clarify that on Select File. We'll also have a conversation about the Youth Facilities Sports Finance Act. I don't think I'm properly referencing it, but it was formerly LB39 from last year. With that, on behalf of Senator Pahls and his district in Omaha, I invite you and encourage you to vote affirmatively on LB927. Thank you.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Flood. The question is the advancement of LB927 to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Has everyone voted? Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 31 ayes, 0 nays on the advancement of the bill.

ARCH: LB927 is adopted. Mr. Clerk for items.

CLERK: Very quickly. Enrollment and Review reports LB876, LB750A to Select File. Senator Clements offers LR426; Senator Stinner, LR427. Amendments to be printed: Senator Hilkemann to LB833 [SIC LB933]; Senator Morfeld, LB1045. That's all that I have, Mr. President.

ARCH: Mr. Clerk, we can move to the next item on the agenda.

CLERK: LB686, no amendments. It was considered. It's a bill by Senator Hughes. Changes the composition of the Executive Board of the Legislative Council. Senator Cavanaugh had pending a motion to bracket until March 30. Obviously, that date has expired. So that motion will be withdrawn. Senator Cavanaugh will now move to bracket until April, is it 6, Senator, is that the date? April 6, 2022.

ARCH: Senator Cavanaugh, you're welcome to open on your bracket motion.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President, colleagues. So this is the bill that changes the caucuses, and I know that there was a lot of consternation around this the last time we were on this, and I honestly didn't think we were going to get to it before one o'clock. And there's a lot of people that had concerns that I don't believe are here right now because of meetings that are happening outside of the Chamber. So this, for the people at home and people in the Chamber, this bill is our caucus bill and it decides who is in which caucus or which-- which legislative district is in which caucus. And because we did redistricting, it obviously seems pertinent to change that. And there was some concern over how we are aligning our caucuses with our congressional districts. And so I know that it's not a perfect system, but I also believed that people were going to talk about this further. And since I didn't see any amendments pending on here, it is my assumption, and anyone is welcome to tell me that I'm wrong, it is my assumption that there hasn't been any resolution to the concerns that were previously expressed. So that's why I put the bracket motion back up so that those conversations can happen before we move this forward. I know we need to move this forward; but once we resolve those concerns, I think this will move very quickly. So until then, I'm

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

going to keep the bracket motion up. So this morning has been certainly a different flavor for the most part than yesterday was, except for the germaneness issue. And so since I have a few minutes, I will just echo what Senator Matt Hansen said about germaneness. Colleagues, it is important to not play fast and loose here. We should be consistent in how we are using the rules. And I have felt a lack of consistency for a while, and it feels very much driven by who the rule is going to be impacting. So Senator Ben Hansen had a amendment and it was a fine amendment. There was no problem with the amendment, but it very arguably was not germane. But no one got up to talk about that, including myself, because why would I? It's fine. We can attach it. I don't want to have an argument over germaneness over a bill that's, you know, just going to move through. But then this morning, we had a germaneness argument and then it moved the bill and the amendment moved with 30-plus votes. It is very frustrating to be a woman in the Legislature. It is excruciatingly frustrating to be a Democratic woman in the Legislature. I am not going to speak for my other Democratic women. I feel penalized by this body every day for being a Democrat and a woman, every day. And it is-- once you see it, once you see it, you can't unsee it. And in conversations that I have with you, colleagues, you-- so many of you don't see it. But once you do, you can't go back. Once you see how we are treated, you will awaken to something and you will not feel good about it. I don't think any of the women in this body are treated particularly well. But I do think that the Republican women in this body get more support from-- than the Democratic women. Maybe that's because there's fewer Democratic men and more Republican men. I don't know. But I definitely see a difference. And a colleague this morning was talking about dilatory motions with me. And I, first of all, welcome somebody giving me a-- putting up a dilatory motion against me; but also, why would you do that against me and not somebody else? There are plenty of other opportunities. Why single me out? Because I talk more? And to Senator Moser's point last night, when I talk, when I take time, there is a reason for it. There is a purpose. You just don't know what it is because I haven't filled you in on what I'm doing. That doesn't mean it's for no reason whatsoever. So since I had the time, I thought I'd air a few grievances from the last 52 days. I see there are some people in the queue, so I will yield the remainder of my time. Thank you.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator. Senator McCollister, you are recognized.

McCOLLISTER: Ooh. Thank you, Mr. President. That was shocking. This came up before the Executive Board and it was a 5-4 vote so it was a close vote. I think we all know that the Executive Board is composed

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

of two people from every caucus and then the three officers: the Chair, Vice Chair, and the Speaker. And how the Executive Board is composed is based on the assignment of legislative districts to each caucus. Generally, not this time, generally, it follows congressional lines, but we didn't choose to do that this time. And that's, I think, an error. I don't think we're prepared to argue this point on General File. But I think this issue will come up and we'll need to debate it further because the-- the assignment of-- of legislative districts to each caucus, I think, was arbitrary and capricious. So we will deal with that on Select File. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator McCollister. Senator Hughes, you are recognized.

HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon, colleagues. I just want to reiterate that the only boundaries that we have to-- in assigning our caucuses, our, our state boundaries, and our legislative district boundaries. There's no other thing in statute that requires us to put those boundaries anywhere else. Those are the only two things: state boundaries and legislative district boundaries. The easiest way to make this change-- and I did not make it. I asked the Clerk's Office to do-- to draw the map and what they did is they took Senator Williams' district that got moved in the, the census redistricting, moved it from the third caucus to the second or first. I don't remember which one it was. So that-- it's simple. You know, we need to move on and we need to remember that after this next election, the body will be vastly different than it is now. So where those lines are drawn is not that big a deal, but we have to get this passed in order to make sure that the rules for the next Legislature can be implemented and can function. Get the caucuses together, choose your leadership, and go through those committee assignments. It's pure and simple. That's all it is. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Hughes. Senator Vargas, you are recognized.

VARGAS: Thank you very much. It's actually been a real pleasure sitting next to Senator Hughes here and I agree with him. I do think it's simple and I hope it can be simple that we make some changes to it. I don't disagree that this was done the way it is. It just-- we added a district because a district was added to the district. That makes complete sense. But then we look at the rest of the map and we have representation of another colleague of mine, Senator Arch, who I have a lot of respect for as well, but is-- no longer has any constituents within Nebraska's Second District. And it seems like a simple fix for us to just move him to the district in CD 1 so that he

can caucus there. Because if it were any other situation, I feel like that's just the most logical thing to do and then it would largely stay the same. There would be 16 senators in the Second District, like there have been 16 senators in the First, and then 17 in the Second and the Third. And yeah, so I, I hope this is something that we can, we can fix. I will give some deference to, to the chair of the committee if there's something we can work on between General and Select because I did make an amendment in committee. That amendment was not adopted. But we could do-- and I know Senator Wayne said this on the mike the other day-- we could just include Senator Bostelman, who does have a significant portion in our district, and then just have Bostelman represented in Second District because he is part of the Second District now, about half of his constituents are, and then have Senator Arch in the First District. And the only difference will be where they each caucus. I think it's a-- actually a reasonable request and it would align with what we usually do with our standards. And I don't think it conflicts with what we've done in the past because as much as we, we may disagree on this perspective, we all have had conversations about each caucus and what we do in those caucuses and who we represent and it is important to each of us to have that say in our caucuses. And I know for the Second District caucus, as it's going to change, which it likely will change beyond our time here, a-- decades into the future, it's going to look entirely different. And when it does, we just want to make sure those lines continue to update and reflect what we did in redistricting. I hope it's something that we can take care of between General and Select. I really do. And if we do it, this would make it, I think, a lot easier because I think the intent is to try to make this as easy as possible. So that's my hope here. I know there's other people who are going to talk on the mike here. I just-- it's not out of confusion. It's-- I don't see it as nefarious. I just see this as extremely pragmatic and reasonable to make a simple change in this effect and I hope the public understands that as well because at the end of the day, we do make decisions on who we elect and who we represent in our caucuses. And that is ultimately-- we do it every ten years and these changes are, are permanent, you know? And so I want to make sure they're updated and they reflect our constituencies as much as possible. Thank you.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Vargas. Per today's agenda for the body, we are moving to the 1:00 item. Mr. Speaker-- I mean, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: First of all, Mr. President, Senator Hansen, can I get you to offer E&R amendments, please? Thank you.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

ARCH: Senator Hansen for a motion.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. I'd move we adopt the E&R amendments to LB1024.

ARCH: All those in favor say aye. Opposed nay. Carries.

CLERK: Senator Wayne would move to amend, AM2687.

ARCH: Senator Wayne, you're welcome to open on your amendment.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President. And colleagues, first, I want to thank a lot of people. Initially when this was brought up, there were a lot of people who wanted to talk and figure out a way forward so I wanted to thank Senator Flood. For those who watched last time, you saw some back and forth, but I think that truly in this process, when you can go back and forth and nitpick every bill, it actually makes the bill better. And so I want to thank him for pointing out some things that I think were flaws in the bill that we corrected. I want to thank Senator Linehan, who has always been a support for me, and I really appreciate that and helped me navigate where and how I should move things. I want to thank Senator Wishart, who was helping me through the budget process and making sure that I and-- Senator McKinney and I knew what funds were available and where they were. I want to thank Senator McDonnell and Senator Vargas for their input on the south Omaha side of things and the minimum requirements that we put in there. And then lastly, I'm going to thank what I would call the broadband people who may or may not agree with where we're at today, but Senator Bostelman and Senator Friesen. I think we negotiated in good faith and came up with a solution to where we can use these dollars and we'll hear more conversations about that. So I want to talk technically about what the bill does and then we can talk about the impact it will have in not just north and south Omaha because this bill is no longer a north and south Omaha bill, although the Recovery Act applies in north and south Omaha. What you'll hear in this amendment is rural Nebraska qualified census tracts are now a part of this. Lincoln affordable housing and census tracts-- qualified census tracts are a part of this, that we have broadness to make sure that this bill reflects the entire state needs when it comes to some ARPA requirements, but also with the emphasis still on north Omaha. If you recall in LB1014, the initial appropriations for north and south Omaha and housing combined was around \$250 million. LB1024 obviously asks for a lot more than that. AM2687 clarifies the portions of ARPA dollars that will be spent and the amendment-- there is an amendment filed on LB1042 that will clarify what language needs to be removed to

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

make sure we don't appropriate twice. So I just want to remind everybody the initial needs assessment of north and south Omaha is about \$2 billion. In north Omaha in particular, it was little over \$1.5 billion and those were engineers and people who I would say study economics and housing who came up with those numbers. We started this ask with \$450 (million), looking at the overall Cash Reserves, General Fund reserves-- or General Fund dollars and ARPA dollars. AM26 [SIC, AM2687] reduces that amount to around \$250 million, which was the initial ARPA request-- the ARPA budget, which was incorporated into the ARPA committee, and then it also adds a cash transfer of this year. But it's put in a contingency fund, which we'll talk about here in a second. So if you look at the chart that was handed out, what you'll see is half of the money is spent this year. When I say spent, I mean appropriated and, and appropriated to certain projects. Those projects have had feasibility studies done, have had more planning done than probably most of the plans we ever budgeted for in this building for the last 20 years. They have been updated and those are the real numbers of support. But to add to Senator Friesen and others concerned about how much money we're spending all at once, we've incorporated a STAR WARS-like committee. And so the 135-year-- \$135 million will not actually be appropriated to specific things until I come back to you next year or Senator McKinney and ask this body to move them out of a contingency fund. This adds another layer of accountability that is not seen anywhere in the ARPA or budgeting process, except for two areas; the canal and the prison, which are both big asks that this body said we should have an accountability piece and a step piece to make sure those happens. So we included that. On the STAR WARS-like committee is the Chair-- is Urban Affairs Chair, four individuals from qualified census tracts in Omaha, and Appropriations Chair or designee and the Speaker. So we are going to bring back next-- recommendations for the \$135 million next year from a broad wide of support of different individuals who will study everything. But what AM26 [SIC, AM2687] also clarifies is money will be directly allocated to the business park around-- the north Omaha business park around the airport. Senator McKinney's bill around iHubs, I can tell you that has been a huge conversation in our community, everything from the University of Nebraska at Omaha, Creighton, and local nonprofits who are trying to join some consensus and some building around how do we make sure we are the entrepreneur, a mecca in the Midwest, and that we can support small businesses in a different way? And that's currently on Final Reading. We have crime prevention and we have a small portion going to a financial literacy program for food for those who are impacted-- individuals or impacted communities where they-- the success rate, the success rate has shown

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

that, one, they improve their financial ability almost 30 percent and they actually move out of poverty into a middle-class job so they get off of state aid and actually move forward. So we think in the next two to three years, we'll be able to present some data showing that-- how this program works. One of the other things is the production of Standing Bear. We heard this conversation on the floor, the impact in north Omaha, the impact in the state, and we will make sure that we're a part of that filming process. And many of those things will be conducted in north Omaha. As you know, he stayed in Senator McKinney's district and was housed there in prison for a significant period of time and the actual trial was done in Omaha, in downtown Omaha, which-- well, just outside of downtown, which also was a qualified census tract. The last thing is we are creating a new division for affordable housing, both in Omaha and Lincoln. It's not a division, but a new program where we are working with both private and public nonprofit and developers because we feel it's important to not only increase competition, but to turn these dollars quickly. And lastly, there's a lost revenue portion for Lancaster County Event Center, who lost roughly \$7 million. And those who haven't been to there, they had the high school rodeo, national rodeo, one of the events that got canceled that actually brought in just as much money last year as a Husker football game, and it was one of the best events that I ever went to. Last thing, on General File, we created a division called economic development division, a recovery division, but then I started looking on the internet and actually reading the divisions there. So one of the things you know I've-- since LB1107, I try to incorporate recovery with incentives and we created ERAs throughout LB1107 that are not just in north Omaha, but throughout the state. And so we wanted to take a holistic, coordinated plan view. So we created or merged-- maybe created the economic recovery and incentive division because when we look at the poorest areas of our state, regardless of north and south Omaha, we shouldn't just be looking to recover them. We should be trying to attract businesses through economic development and the incentives program we already have. So I thought it was important, after talking to people in our community, that we have a holistic approach not just in north and south Omaha, but through the rest of the state on how we do economic development. After long conversations with many people, there was a portion that Senator Flood brought up around the Capital Construction Project Fund. This is a separate fund that appropriations did not allocate any dollars for. If you'll recall, initially it was all going to Omaha. Then the first amendment had half of it going to qualified census tracts. But what you'll see now is we divided it pretty much evenly where Omaha actually takes the loss of around \$4 million. The total fund is around

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

\$200 (million)-- \$128 million. You'll look, Third District gets \$43 million, Second Districts get only \$40 (million), and the First Districts get \$43 (million). Now, what's interesting about this is the Second District, which is Douglas County and partly Sarpy County and Saunders, we're capped. We're capped at \$40 million. The other districts, it's a floor. So you actually can go above the \$43 million and let DED and those applications decide which one's better for your area to make sure that is done in the way fits your needs, not necessarily ours and our needs. So we are trying to be fair here and the last thing I'll say is there is a grant for \$3 million that has not been allocated. It's \$3.8 million and so in efforts of fairness, again, we just divided among the three congressional districts. Again, I don't think this is very complicated. I think what we're doing here is adding accountability. We are adding fairness. I will not lie and say when I came here, I wanted most of the money to go to north and south Omaha. But we heard Flood's comments. We heard Senator Wishart's comments. We heard Senator Friesen's comments and we went back to the drawing board and thought outside the box. And I think we've done our rounds with pretty much every senator in here to explain how this is going on. The key to this whole thing is next year, we have to appropriate to move those dollars. So there is an accountability piece outside of what we normally do in this body because part of it is-- it's kind of like a-- when you find-- like, the dog is on a horse track that actually catches the animal and they get shocked.

HUGHES: One minute.

WAYNE: This is the scariest thing I ever did because we get this type of money and this type of investment into north Omaha, if we fail, this body will never, ever give us a second chance. So the pressure now is not on getting the dollars because I think we can come to an agreement somewhere. But next year, you all are going to ask me where are we at? How are we moving? How far has it gone? How many people have we helped? And if I don't have that data for you, I don't expect you to appropriate me any more dollars. I don't expect my community to get another dime. That's what's different about what we're trying to do here is we are adding a layer of accountability so you know where your dollars are going, the state knows where their dollars are going, and it's not an ongoing program forever. We believe that if we make an impact right now, not only will the local community and local businesses step up, but also the city and Douglas County will step up and they already said they would. So this is an investment in which you--

HUGHES: Time, Senator.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

WAYNE: --would directly-- thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Those in the queue are Senators Wishart, Vargas, and Friesen and others. Debate is now open on AM2687. Senator Wishart, you're recognized.

WISHART: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I rise in strong support of AM2687 and the underlying bill. I actually-- I consider it a privilege that I was-- got to be one of the first people that had a conversation with Senator Wayne about this vision. It was when we were climbing Mount Kilimanjaro and we were way up in about-- very, very high altitude and talking about dreaming big, as you do when you're in thin air, about what could be done with ARPA dollars that would be transformative for his community, transformative. And the amount of pressure that he and Senator McKinney and Senator Vargas have toward supporting and fighting for their districts. So we got down off the mountain and he went right to work and I saw him working while we're still in Tanzania, starting to develop a plan for what we could do as a state to support a historically under-invested community. Because colleagues, this bill is also criminal justice reform. This bill is economic development for a historically underdeveloped community in terms of resources from the state. And I have to give a lot of credit to Senator Wayne because this was his and Senator McKinney's idea. They put in the work. We were all there for his presentation. From day one, they came and said, this is the vision we have for transforming and fighting for our community. And for him to have the respect of all of us and support of all of us in the needs that we have for our communities, he was willing to give and that's AM2687. He was willing to allow for a lot of us to share in these great ideas that he brought for his community when it comes to supporting qualified census tracts, when it comes to supporting capital improvements in a district, when it comes to supporting affordable housing because there are major needs in Lincoln and across the rest of the state. And it's because of Senator Wayne and Senator McKinney's vision and then Senator Vargas' leadership as well that we've gotten here today. This bill is a start to helping north and south Omaha and other areas that are under-resourced in our state in terms of economic development. And this amendment that I had the privilege and honor of working with Senator Wayne on is an amendment that we worked out with Senator Vargas and Senator McKinney and then got the OK from Chairman Stinner. And then got the OK from the Speaker and then went around and educated as many of you about what the vision is with this amendment for utilizing ARPA dollars to, to really help a significant portion of this state. So I encourage all of you to vote green on AM2687 and the underlying bill. Thank you.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Wishart. Senator Vargas, you're recognized.

VARGAS: Thank you very much. I'll be brief and I want to thank Senator Wayne and Senator McKinney and everybody else that was mentioned in working on this. And actually, I want to thank the Appropriations Committee because for those that don't understand the process, you know, we went through a very iterative process for evaluating a lot of ARPA bills and the committee took action to make sure we were setting aside funds that enabled us to do a lot of this. And that wasn't done alone and I just appreciate the committee working with us on that because it makes what is happening right now not only possible, but also transformational for what Senator Wayne and Senator McKinney's vision is. And I do appreciate him also working with the Senator McDonnell and I on the south side component. Because what you're going to see in this is there's a minimum amount for south Omaha and a minimum amount for north Omaha, which I think is equitable, which is one of the things that Senator Wayne has said on the mike several times. Most of the qualified census tracts in Omaha's metropolitan class exist in the north side of Omaha. So there's a reason why we should have a minimum amount that is more going to north Omaha by far. But knowing that there is a minimum amount that also goes to the south side where we have the second and third-most qualified census tracts also provides an opportunity for economic development for the east side recovery. There's nothing that I can say that is going to do justice to what has already been said other than people have been on the mike talking about the east side and we hold our heads up high and we care very deeply about our districts. We fight like crazy to make sure that we are providing better economic opportunity. The reason why I care about housing is I have substandard housing in my community. The reason why I care about trying to provide economic growth is because I see businesses that are helping each other during a pandemic and they helped each other, but we weren't investing in them. I have people that are working 40 hours or more a week that are still living in poverty and the way to change this is by creating economic opportunity, investing in communities, investing in economic development, in jobs, in centers where people work and want to live and not lose people. Even though we have some differences in terms of what the needs are, I can say this for at least south Omaha, I have people that leave because there's not economic housing opportunities. There's not as many jobs or the jobs are not keeping up and don't have enough wages. Projects like Senator McKinney's iHub, the housing development opportunities that exist in this language can change a lot of things and not just for my district. It is a big deal and I appreciate all those that have worked to try to figure out a way for a

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

pathway forward on this. Because at the end of the day, there are parts of Omaha that are economically thriving, but if you've ever walked or driven through any of our communities on the East Side, you will continue to see opportunity and inequities. And so that's just the-- what I wanted to say because at the end of the day, I'm appreciative of what the Appropriations Committee has done. I'm appreciative of the leadership of Senator Wayne and Senator McKinney on this.

HUGHES: One minute.

VARGAS: But I appreciate the body moving this forward so that we can actually have a pathway forward and also, we can end on a high note for the session and say that we have done things for the entire state through federal ARPA dollars, but we've also done something for the hardest-hit communities from COVID-19 and actually invested in them. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Vargas. Senator Friesen, you are recognized.

FRIESEN: Thank you, Mr. President. So me and Senator Wayne, we did have discussions on the \$128 million that is in the capital construction projects that was meant to be for broadband. So there's a-- there were a lot of rumors flying around at first and we did see that pot of money a long time ago. We were always told the Governor was going to put that into the Broadband Bridge Program, but nobody really came and talked to us. When Senator Wayne approached me, we had the discussion about how much money is going to come into the infrastructure funding package and the sizable amount of money that was. And at the time, if, if that money was available, we did make this agreement to kind of distribute it out and he could use some of it in his north Omaha construction projects up there and the rest was going to be put out there for broadband. But the way the original bill was written, it was a little bit, I'd say, not really clear as to how this can be used and so he did adopt some language that we asked him to put in there that clarified that the money that is used for broadband does have to follow the Broadband Bridge Program rules. So last night, the Governor's Office contacted me and did say that the Governor's Office had a plan for the \$128 million and that-- and they have already filed that plan with the federal government and those plans were in place and he was going to run that money, money through the Broadband Bridge Program. So in the end, I did-- I have talked to Senator Wayne since then. I have said that as Chair of the Transportation and Telecommunications Committee, I did need to make

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

sure that this money tried to go to broadband. I'm open to that discussion yet. I think we reached a fair compromise, but I want to keep my options open here as to what happens with this money and I want to make sure that the reason these dollars are important to what I would say is rural Nebraska-- and I'm talking about the sparse areas of the state-- is that this money here, if we use it for broadband, does not require the matching component. So when you get out into the Sandhills or the really sparse portions of the state where even a 75/25 match will not get fiber put out to the home, this is where those dollars could be used. And I know those areas are extremely expensive to get to, but the way this is worded now-- and, and again, some of the more populated areas and some of the congressional districts are easy to cover compared to areas of the Third District. So I'm open to talking with Senator Wayne more about how the distribution might be made and I do support what he's trying to do. I am disappointed that the city of Omaha doesn't take more interest in helping north Omaha because I think they had a lot of funds that they could have done something with, Douglas County could have done that with. They chose not to and that was their choice and I will call them out on that. If they don't feel it's important, it's hard for me to talk to my constituents and say it should be important to them because I think here is where the city of Omaha and Douglas County has failed to try and help north Omaha and what he's trying to achieve. With that, I'm open to more discussion on this, but again, I want to say that Senator Wayne has worked with me. He has adopted language that I've asked for, but we'll, we'll discuss that further as we move through this process and, and some of the other issues that we're going to talk about. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Friesen. Senator McKinney, you're recognized.

McKINNEY: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of LB1024 and AM2687. LB1024 for me is what has-- what is needed from this body for north and south Omaha and also other areas of the state. And yesterday, we had a robust conversation about what do we do about criminal justice reform and things like that. And another component to improving the community is just making sure people have opportunity. There's so many individuals that you talk to that have gotten involved with the criminal justice system that will tell you, I just needed an opportunity. I didn't know where to go. I fell in the wrong crowd because I didn't have opportunity. And what we're attempting to do here is infuse opportunity into our districts so a good number of our people aren't disproportionately represented in our criminal justice system. That's something that is-- always and has been at the top of

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

my list when I came down here is to find a way to get resources to provide more opportunity so another kid in north Omaha doesn't have to grow up like I did. That's why this is important for us. And that's why over the interim, me and Senator Wayne, we met with just about whoever wanted to meet with us that had a pen and a plan to try to figure this all out because it was, it was that important. It was night-- late nights, long days, heated discussions and things like that because we felt it was, it was important. It was some meetings we maybe didn't want to go to, but we went, we went to those meetings because we understood that we couldn't just put a plan together and not talk to people within our community because a lot of times plans are put together, no one talks to our community and then there's a bunch of outrage. And we wanted to do-- and we wanted to avoid that. But this is important because I think-- it's important not just for us, but I think it's important for the rest of the state because I truly believe if we improve north and south Omaha and other areas across the state that have high areas of poverty, then we fully achieve the good life that we tout as our state's motto. That's why LB1024 is important is for us to fulfill what we say we believe in, is ensuring a good life for all Nebraskans. It's hopefully decreasing the amount of people that even get justice involved in the first place because they're not growing up in poverty. They're not going to sleep without food. They have proper housing. Their parents can work at a job and make a livable wage so they can be at home at night and make sure homework is done and their kids aren't in the streets. That's why LB1024 is important because we're attempting to alleviate a lot of societal problems that has persisted within our communities for my lifetime and before, pretty much. So I hope that you all can see the value in this, not just for us because we came up with the plan and, and, and introduced a bill. I hope you see the value for the state. How great would it be to have all across the nation, the state of Nebraska has invested in these type of communities and we're seeing a good return on investment? That's, that's-- that could be a model for the rest of the nation that they can look at Nebraska and say, look, Nebraska is a great place. I want to go move to Nebraska because Nebraska values investing in those that haven't had a lot--

HUGHES: One minute.

McKINNEY: --in their lives. That's something to think about. I think this is not just a bill to make, you know, north and south Omaha look good. I think it's-- this is a bill that can have positive impact for the whole state as a whole. And since General, Senator Wayne has worked tirelessly to try to include whoever needed to be included so others wouldn't feel left out within our plan. And I think that's

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

commendable and I think that's why I believe you all should vote green on LB1024 and AM2687. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator McKinney. Senator Kolterman, you're recognized.

KOLTERMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of LB1024 and AM2687. I was wondering if Senator Wayne would answer a couple of questions for me. As he's walking over here, I'd like to just comment a little bit about this process that we've been through. I'm willing to let Senator Wayne and Senator Friesen work out their-- the, the challenges that they face, whether or not this goes into broadband or whether it goes into the coronavirus Capital Projects Fund. I think that's yet to be determined and I think that they're very capable of working that out with the Governor. Senator Wayne, would you yield to a question?

WAYNE: Yes.

HUGHES: Senator Wayne, will you yield?

WAYNE: Yes.

KOLTERMAN: As we've worked on the ARPA funds and the shovel readies inside the ARPA funds for \$100 million-- and you and I have talked quite extensively about some of the projects that are in the shovel ready and maybe some of them wouldn't qualify. So are you thinking that this \$126 million that you have for the Capital Projects Fund could alleviate or take some of that off of the shovel-ready program?

WAYNE: So currently, the way it's written, yes. So there's three things that-- this is not a fund strictly for broadband. It's for broad-- one use is broadband. The other one is laptops and connectivity so, like, cell phones. Pretty sure we don't want to spend money there. The second one is a multipurpose facility. And so what I did see in shovel ready was a lot, a lot of multipurpose community facilities such as in Kearney's health complex and those kind of things. So the only requirements are they have to be educational, health related, and multipurpose. So yeah, it's the only thing-- so yes.

KOLTERMAN: I, I-- that's just the clarity I wanted. The last thing I-- thank you, Senator Wayne. The last thing I want to comment about is over the last eight years that I've been in this body, I look around the room-- I'm, I'm not the oldest guy in here. I think that honor goes to somebody in the back row, but I'm one of the oldest in the body and

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

I grew up in a community that was 100 percent white. There was no people of color in my community, maybe one family that was of the black community. I've learned a lot from the, from the people that have come and talked to us. I learned from Ernie Chambers. I've learned a lot from Terrell McKinney and Justin Wayne, Tony Vargas. They've taught us what it's like to grow up in a different environment than I've grown up in and I really applaud the fact that they're looking at ways to eliminate the criminal aspects of our, of our society by creating jobs. And so when they came with this grandiose idea that we're going to use a lot of the ARPA funds or a lot of the cash funds to help develop north Omaha and give people in those areas, in those census tracts an opportunity to grow and have the same opportunities that I experienced as a young man growing up in Seward, Nebraska, I thought, what a, what a great way to help this state grow and prosper. And now they come back and say, well, we can't use it all so we're willing to put some of it back into the, into the First, Second, and Third Congressional Districts as well. This is an example of cooperation that if we can work together in this body, we can accomplish a lot. So I would like to compliment those, those three individuals that I mentioned along with as you start to look at what's coming next year, 12 of us are going to be gone.

HUGHES: One minute.

KOLTERMAN: I think that you look at the future of this body and there's a lot of promise. We have a lot of young people that are willing to step up into leadership roles. And I look forward to seeing what happens in the, in the future of our state, but I think with this type of thinking, we're on the right track. So, so thank you, Senator McKinney, Senator Vargas, and Senator Wayne for being bold and helping us learn about what goes on in your communities.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Kolterman. Senator Jacobson, you're recognized.

JACOBSON: Thank you, Mr. President. I'm a little torn on this issue because I really applaud what Senator Wayne is trying to get done in north Omaha. He and I have had numerous discussions that frankly, the north side of North Platte isn't a whole lot different than north Omaha from the standpoint that we deal with poverty issues, we deal with issues of drugs and alcohol problems, homelessness. So I can identify with a lot of those concerns and, and I want to support what they're trying to get done. I'm also concerned, however, about broadband and wanted to share with you that if you think about my district in particular, I'm, I'm dealing with towns like Mullen,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

Theford, Tryon, Stapleton, Elsie, and Madrid. And if you can imagine when you get up into the Sandhills, those four counties north of Lincoln County, you're in the middle of the Sandhills. Now why do people live up there? Because it's a wonderful place to live. If you've never been to the Sandhills, let me just imagine for a minute that you're up there. I remember being up there several years ago when I was at the Dismal River Club and it was a dark night and you had no moon, no stars. You walk out of the clubhouse and you literally can't see the hand in front of your face. That's how dark it is, OK? Imagine that. Where else are you going to have that as you go across Nebraska? It's an incredible area up there, but the downside is it's remote. Imagine the Sandhills where you have neighbors that are miles and miles away and then how do you connect them? How do you connect them with cellular-- cell phones? How do you connect them with broadband? That's a challenge. When you talk about expensive, it's incredibly expensive. So that's one of the things that we want to continue to focus on. And when you get down into Perkins County and you get into Lincoln County and a good part of Logan County where you're, you're farming and it's not just Sandhills, you're, you're looking at crop ground, then you'll need to look at current agriculture practices and precision agriculture and the kind of broadband needs that we have to be able to make that equipment run and operate and collect the data. It's incredibly important to modern agriculture for that to happen. So I want to make sure that we've got the right funding for broadband. It's critically important and it's very, very expensive to get into those areas where they're hard to reach. It's a little bit like when you look at Amazon, they're really good at getting the major cities, but it's that last mile that's difficult. You got the same issue with broadband. So I'm going to follow Curt Friesen's lead-- Senator Friesen's lead on this, but I'm hoping that he and Senator Wayne can work something out so that we can get a compromise there to where we can get the right outcome. I realize that there's federal dollars coming also for broadband. I don't know how much that can be spent in the short run and that's why I'm inclined to support the amendment and the bill in this case. But I want to make sure everyone understands how critically important broadband is to our-- to my district and all of western Nebraska and I want to continue to keep that in front and center when we start thinking about those issues. I'll yield the rest of my time, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Jacobson. Speaker Hilgers, you're recognized.

HILGERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon, colleagues, I rise in support of AM2687 and LB1024. I probably won't dive too much into

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

the merits on this one because I'm sure it's been articulated already by Senator Wayne, Senator Wishart, and others on the floor and you can read it for yourself. I just want to take a step back, though, and just say I think this is such a great example about what it is that we need to sort of be an antidote to the political culture that we see around the country. I, like you, probably have seen or received a number of emails from constituents or other people around the state of Nebraska who say, golly, can you not-- this is, this is a terrible time. Can you all not just get along? Can you not work together? Can you all just, you know, at least move off of the position that you've got? Can you not try to come up with creative solutions? Can you not try to come up with some long-term planning? And the truth is, a lot of that reputation and the work that we do around the country is well deserved, but it is not in this case. It is not in this case. People talk about short-term thinking. This is not short-term thinking. This is long-term thinking, multi-year, thoughtful, strategic thinking. People talk about why is everything zero-sum? I win, you lose. This is not that. When we came a couple of weeks ago and had General File debate of LB1024, I suggested on the mike that I'd be comfortable with \$200 million in the Cash Fund. That was a position I think that Senator Wayne was comfortable with, but a whole lot of people were not comfortable with that. Senator Stinner, I don't think, was comfortable taking \$200 million out of the Cash Fund. Senator Wishart was not comfortable with that. I'm willing to bet many of you were not comfortable with that. Now, in a zero-sum, I win, you lose context, what we would have been here on Select File is exactly that. We'd have an amendment. We'd say, hey, can we get 25? Can we just get a bare majority? That is not what Senator Wayne did. There's not \$200 million request from the Cash Fund. He went through and got creative and worked to find a path that would be comfortable with the people who originally opposed it. People talk about that we have no creativity. We don't think for ourselves. We just take whatever talking points are given to us from a party or some others or whatever else. That is not this. That is not this. If you look at the sheet in front of you that Senator Wayne passed around, he has gotten incredibly creative to find a number and a path that will make a difference for his community. A lot of times we're very micro, we're very tactical, we're very-- we just look at the, the little problem or the little thing in front of us. This is not that. This is strategic. It's big picture. It's transformative. A lot of times, we get into our little, our little corners and say, well, we're going to just work as a tribe. We're just going to work with our fellow urban senators, our fellow rural senators. We're just going to work with one party or one ideology. That-- this is not that. Senator Wayne worked with rural senators. He

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

worked with urban senators. He worked from-- with senators from Lincoln like myself. He worked with people of both parties. He put together a committee, the only flaw of which is we haven't come up with some kind of acronym like STAR WARS, that puts senators at the table working together to try to further a strategic plan for part of our state. And it's one that I think embraces an attitude of abundance and one that embraces an approach of win, win, win, which I think is-- when we are at our best, that is what we're doing and I think it's something that uniquely happens in this body. So this is one of those moments. We have long days. We have long weeks. We have difficult times when tempers get short and we fight one another and then we get out of the fight and then we got constituents and other people saying that we can't get anything done.

HUGHES: One minute.

HILGERS: Thank you, Mr. President. We've gotten a lot done this session. We're going to get a lot more done this session and LB1024 as amended is one of those things I think we'll look back on with a lot of pride, not just for the transformative impact that it's going to have on north Omaha and south Omaha, but the way by which we work together to get it done and get it across the finish line. Now I have every confidence that Senator Wayne and Senator Friesen are going to figure something out. I'm not exactly apprised of all the issues there, but if there's two people I know who can work together and reach a common solution, it's those two senators. And I look forward to supporting this on Select and I look forward to supporting it on Final Reading. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Speaker Hilgers. Senator Friesen, you're recognized.

FRIESEN: Thank you, Mr. President. So we are having ongoing discussions and again, I will-- I fully appreciate what Senator Wayne is trying to do and I will work with him to get something done here. We're having a little trouble now with the rest of the distribution. It's not really what Senator Wayne wants. It's what's all else built into the bottom part of the-- what we're doing here and that's the other \$80 million-some that we're talking about. So again, I'll go back to say-- I, I mentioned this earlier. You saw Douglas County and the city of Omaha had tremendous amount of ARPA money or CARES Act money. A lot of dollars went into those communities. Same with Lancaster County and Lincoln here and they chose not to help the Lancaster Event Center and now we're supposed to. And when we talk about money that's allocated to broadband and now you're going to take

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

that into a-- to help bail out these event centers-- and I get that. They needed some help, but their own city, their own county totally ignored them. They could have helped them and they chose not to. And so we're going to work out an agreement here, but yeah, I'm finding out now that more communities out there want to build community centers instead of building broadband out into rural areas. That's not what this money was meant for and that's where I'm going to kind of draw the line because we have a tremendous amount of need in rural areas that are not going to get broadband for years. Now, am I willing to help Senator Wayne and the north Omaha project? Yes. I think he is finally trying to do something. I'm going to say myself that I don't think money is always going to be the cure, but I'm going to give him the chance to prove it. And he has done at least more than I asked into pushing some of this money out into next year when this body can work with him again or some other entity and help appropriate more of the money and see once-- if it's doing what it's supposed to do. And so, yes, he has done more to help what my issues were with whole ARPA distribution than anybody else in this body. We've all just want to spend it right away. He at least is saying, look, let's push some of this out into next year and if I don't prove what I'm doing is right, you don't have to give me any more money. He's at least laying it on the line and saying, look, you give me this money this year, I'll prove to you it's working. I'll come back next year and I want more. I appreciate that. He at least admitted that just dumping a bunch of money into north Omaha wasn't going to fix this problem this year and I think he has acted very responsibly. What I'm having the problem with now is if, if we give \$40 million to Senator Wayne and Senator Vargas for the north Omaha, south Omaha, wherever it goes there, I want to know that the other \$80 million ends up in broadband. And that's not the way we're looking at things now. There's other people trying to get little pieces of this and that's where I'm having a little disagreement. And I know the Governor has a disagreement with all of it because he is the one that told me he wanted it all to go to the broadband and he has a plan in place. So I agree we are the appropriators. I want to work with people. I want to work with Senator Wayne especially because I think he is approaching it at least in a very responsible manner compared to some of the other things that we're doing in the state. So we will continue to talk and I will be willing to send this on if we reach some sort of agreement. We will fix it later. I trust him to do that. He has given me his word. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Friesen. Senator Wayne, you're recognized

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

WAYNE: So colleagues, there's a couple confusion about the congressional districts. So the-- in the, in the handout, what you see labeled differently-- so at the, at the top of the handout is all, all ARPA dollars, all kind of revenue coming in and, and, and what we're going to itemize. But the-- what we're kind of talking about it as the tourism grants in the Capital Project Funds. Those are not tied to census tracts at all. So when there's \$43 million as a floor going to the First Congressional District, that is any place in the congressional district that does three things: either broadband infrastructure or connectivity devices-- so that's libraries or schools who maybe need more computers, who maybe need more laptops, etcetera. That's anywhere in the congressional district. And then the other part, the last one is multipurpose facilities. Now, the key on the multipurpose facilities, it has to be workforce related. So they have to do some kind of workforce programming, they have to do some kind of education programming and the key is they have to do some kind of health monitoring, health monitoring. So they have to do physicals. They have to do some kind of health monitoring key. So that is not tied to a census tract at all. That is any congressional district is going to be broken up by \$40 (million) going to Congressional District 2, \$43 (million) and above and \$43 (million) and above going to CD 1 and CD 3. So the floor is where I'm trying to split those two evenly, but I recognize there may be more need in CD 2-- I mean CD 1 or CD 3 so you apply and DED will figure out, based off of priorities of economics and everything else that follows the federal guidelines, where they go. So theoretically, CD 1 could get only \$43 (million), C-- or CD 2 could actually-- or CD 3 could get \$80 (million) and CD 1 only gets \$20 (million) or vice-- well, it can't be because I got a floor of \$43 (million). So I put a safeguard in. You're going to get at least \$43 (million). My point is, is that we're trying to equally divide everything out to make sure it works for everybody. I just wanted to make sure everybody is clear. It is not related to census tracts. It is not related to, to qualified census tracts. This applies to the entire congressional district, small, big, or rural, municipalities, counties. It applies everywhere, it's just based off of congressional districts. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Seeing no one else in the queue, colleagues, the question before us is the adoption of AM2687. All those-- Senator Wayne, you're, you're welcome to close.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President, I will be brief. So the process going forward is the next bill is LB1014 and we're going to take out the appropriation, appropriation language in LB1014 because you can't-- you don't want them in two different areas. Why it's important that

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

the appropriation language be in this bill is because of the legislative history. I want to make sure DED-- that we have a coordinated plan going into north and south Omaha, that if there's any question by the agency of where we think we should do something, that there is a clear history on this bill and the hearing of what the two members who introduced this plan were really thinking. So if you put it in the Appropriations bill and they start looking through the legislative history and see what they were talking about, they'll look at LB1025 maybe, but they're really focused on LB1014. So we wanted to make sure as we move forward in this plan, there is a clear, concise legislative history of where everything is kept, the needs analysis are kept. Everything's there so this body in the future can go back and hold us accountable, that it's just not some one-liner in appropriation, that this was a bill with a history, with a targeted plan that we will be held accountable going forward. And so I would ask for your green vote on this. This isn't just a big step for north Omaha. This is a huge step for the state, not only the million-dollar-- billion-dollar impact, but what it says to generations of people who may have felt that they were left out, may have felt that the capitalistic society we believe live in doesn't work for them. This actually will provide them with hope and give them an opportunity to compete in this society with the resources that is needed to be successful. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Colleagues, the question before us is the adoption of AM2687. All those in favor of vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Have you all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 42 ayes-- excuse me, 43 ayes, 0 nays on the adoption of Senator Wayne's amendment.

HUGHES: AM2687 is adopted.

CLERK: I have nothing further on that bill, Senator McKinney.

HUGHES: Senator McKinney for a motion. Colleagues, Senator Wayne has dropped an additional amendment. It will take us a few minutes to get it into the system, but Senator Wayne, you're certainly welcome to open on your floor amendment.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President. This is actually a very simple amendment. What it does is if you look on page-- anyway, it says that nonprofit organizations and political subdivision can apply-- are the only two entities that can apply for the capital construction grants. Talking to Senator Friesen and others, there are actual companies who

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

build broadband out in western Nebraska and so I didn't want to leave them out. So now the language just says public or private entities to cover both the nonprofit-- I guess there are some co-ops that do some broadband, some-- in some areas so I just wanted to not leave anybody out by saying political subdivision or a nonprofit. I wanted to make sure that the private industry could actually participate and apply for communities. So it was a correction that we were trying to negotiate. We moved a little faster. But I wanted to make sure that correction got in because it was-- is critical to some of the small-town areas who have private companies who build out their infrastructure. So with that, I would ask for a vote on the green, but you probably want to read it so I'll just yield the rest of my time.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Senator McCollister would like to announce the following guests: attending the Legislature today we have 38 fourth graders from Rockbrook Elementary in Omaha. If they would please rise to be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Thank you for coming. Returning to debate on FA195. Senator Friesen, you're recognized.

FRIESEN: Thank you, Mr. President. As we're waiting for the amendment to either come down on the machines or, or changes to be made, I just want to again kind of be clear of what we're looking at doing here and the idea that all along, we've always been talking about how rural economic development depends upon getting broadband out into rural areas and how important that was. And now suddenly we're cannibalizing some of those funds in order to build community centers in different cities. And this-- we just got done talking about the, the turnback tax. This is that 30 percent. That's where you're supposed to go for community centers. That's where small communities out there go for those funds. They don't need to come here and take this money. We just got done talking about that and that fund is where you go and a community can apply and it's part of the turnback sales tax and that's where you can get the money to build these community centers that you want. That is the path forward. And now to take and say, you know, suddenly that rural broadband in the really hard-to-serve areas doesn't matter anymore? Rural economic development, we've got it cured, it's fixed? That's not true. And as long as I'm-- you know, we say that there's a priority put on this. I, I still want to see the majority of that money go to rural broadband. And I was OK working with Senator Wayne until I find out there's 14 other side agreements and promises made to take the rest of the money. Now I have a problem. I appreciate what Senator Wayne and Senator McKinney are trying to do. I, I support it wholly. But now, all of the sudden, you find out about all the side agreements that have been done and now I'm not so sure.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

And so I'm going to be sitting and waiting and watching, but I want to say how important-- again, how some of these areas are going to be hard to get to. Even where you have a 75/25 match, there's areas of the state that are not going to see broadband for a decade. It's not going to happen. And yet we keep saying how important it is to get it out there and we'll get it eventually, but I don't see this kind of money coming to do that again in those hard-to-reach areas where you can say that there's absolutely no match required. We're just going to build it. We'll hook things up with-- it might be wireless. It might be cell towers that are hooked up to those backbones. I don't know what was in the plan, but this is funds that really for the first time have no match requirements. That's what I was concerned about. And so I, I looked at that. I talked to Senator Wayne. I thought, OK, you know, if you want to take part of it, I'm OK with that. You're putting it towards a cause that I appreciate. You're actually taking money, moving it into the out-years where you're going to have to prove performance before you get the rest of it. I think that's great. But now when you've divvied up the rest of the money to go to other purposes, that's when I'm going to start having a little pushback. And it's not because of Senator Wayne. Me and him have always been able to work and get along and we will this time too. It's not going to stop this bill. But as we continue to move forward and everybody is doing this jockeying for money and our, our just apparent will to spend every last penny, Senator Wayne's the only one that has set it out there and said, let's do it two years from now. Let's do it a year from now. Let's look at it again.

WILLIAMS: One minute.

FRIESEN: He's at least laying it on the line then he's going to have to prove that he's doing what he said he was going to do and he's getting it done. None of the rest of this does. So when we talk that we're this conservative body and we're a high-tax state, it's a bunch of baloney. Thank you, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Friesen. Senator Clements, you are recognized.

CLEMENTS: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this amendment. I see that it's going to allow private entities to help with building broadband in my county, in my area. And we've had a wireless internet company probably 20 years now, and we helped them get started. And they also worked with the villages around where-- if they would put a radio transmitter on the top of the water tower and a radio on top of the co-op elevator, they'd give the co-op free

internet, give the village free internet, and then they would also-- the idea was they could beam it out into the rural areas where the old DSL internet speed was getting too slow, but fiber wasn't economical. And they can beam it out there as long as they have line of sight. But there are people that are down in low spots and I'm thinking that the private company that runs this wireless internet might need to put a tower somewhere where there's not a water tower or a grain elevator. And it's probably not real economically feasible if it's only going to be for six or seven people and this would be something I think they could take advantage of to help fill out the coverage areas of the internet out in the rural areas. So I thank Senator Wayne for thinking of that and support FA195. Thank you, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you. Senator Clements. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Wayne, you're recognized to close on-- whoops, excuse me. Senator Bostelman, you're recognized.

BOSTELMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Looks like we need to talk just a little bit more time on this before we get to vote on this floor amendment. The concern the talk about-- the discussion we're talking about is funds for broadband and how that should be distributed or not distributed across the state of Nebraska. As most of you know, I put on the mike quite often and talk about the lack of broadband at my house close to here. But as you move further away from this side of the state, it gets even more critical and more difficult to find the funding to, to have folks, have companies willing to put in broadband, especially fiber, in rural areas. And with the funding that we're talking about right now, this \$126 (million), \$128 million the broadband piece in that, is without any matching. So that's a game changer. That's a game changer to getting out to a, to a farmstead, to a, to a ranch, to, you know, some, some small-- smaller groups of, of homes that are built in an area. Now this is-- this, this makes it where we can actually get broadband to them. We can get fiber to them. And as we continue to work on that, it's, it's an opportunity to bring economic development. It's an opportunity to bring businesses where someone can work from home, which what we've seen over the last year through COVID and stuff was the opportunity for more people to work from home. Whether it's a Nebraska company or maybe it's a company from another state, you can work from home. It also provides opportunity-- greater reach for telehealth, education, those type of things. Things are pretty desperately needed for the state to reach out to our smaller communities, to those isolated areas. We have to have that broadband in those areas and make it-- have funding available so, so companies will want to go out and build it because right now they're not. And we saw that happen on the initial thing on,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

on the bridge act when it went out was, there's a lot of communities, a lot of areas, counties that could have been built up, but were not and cost is part of that. And what this would-- these funds that we're talking about, that they're debating about over there, trying to get an agreement on over there, would provide those funds into those areas that would be critical that allow those companies now to build where they wouldn't before. That's why this is so important for us to move this ahead on what they're trying to work out over there, an agreement on over there to emphasize broadband in areas where we really need it and to provide those funds accordingly. And right now, what you're looking at, it-- they're-- have it divided by congressional district, which is \$43 million to the First Congressional District. Second Congressional District will be \$40 million, and then the Third Congressional District could be \$43 million, which is \$126 million total. Part of the discussion is, is when you go to the Third Congressional District, the need is even greater. The distances between homes, between communities is even greater than it is in the First or Second Congressional Districts. Where I'm at, I think-- you know, eventually we'll be able to do more with the new bridge program with a new-- some things that we-- they're making changes at the PSC on the rules and regs on this, on the applications. And I think it's going to make it to where we can get things built out to individual homes out across the country, connecting those people to where they need to be connected. With that, I think that we're close perhaps to finding an agreement over there, but I think it's really important for rural Nebraska to continue--

WILLIAMS: One minute.

BOSTELMAN: --on to look to how we can support rural Nebraska, how we can support small-town Nebraska, our small villages, our small communities and those people who work there in those areas and work remotely. And again, when COVID hit and our schools were closed, what was important? Broadband to reach our kids, to reach the students in order to get the material out to them and, and give them their homework and keep them on track with our coursework. Also, what we hear is-- from our health department is as telehealth is so important. Those things are things that are key and important to what we need in rural Nebraska.

WILLIAMS: Time, Senator. Thank you, Senator Bostelman. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Wayne, you are recognized to close on FA195.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President. First, you know, where is one person-- I thought-- I mean, I thanked a lot of people and I want to

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

really appreciate them, but I thank Speaker Hilgers for putting us in a bind yesterday. So who I'm really going to thank is Bill Drafting. We were going to have this on Tuesday and then we had to rewrite the bill and the process of rewriting the bill multiple times yesterday. And so Bill Drafting, I know you had a lot of tax bills, you had a lot of everything going on with amendments and you found time to put this up so we can get it up today. It's really-- really thankful and really important that you guys did that so I really do appreciate it. And on behalf of north Omaha, we appreciate it. I-- you know, we're still talking and what we're talking about now is semantics of where. And from my standpoint, Congressional District 1 and 3 have floors so the application that they're going to put in can compete and figure out what's best for their districts and work with DED to do that. I just tried to make it fair for everybody. And I think people know me in this body, have known me long enough that last year, we passed the inland port bill that did nothing for Omaha. I have continued to work with micro-TIF, I'm sponsoring that. That does nothing for Omaha. It's about everybody working together. And as I started this on General File, I can't do this alone. It takes everybody in here. Senator McKinney and I can't do this and we want to be held accountable next year. We want to be able to make changes over the next two years that I'm here because outside of Omaha, you guys do present us with really good ideas because the struggles from rural and urban are the same. So I look forward to working with you all in the next two years to make east Omaha better and this is the first step in that collaboration. Thank you, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you. Senator Wayne. Members, the question is the adoption of FA195. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 38 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of Senator Wayne's amendment.

WILLIAMS: The amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1024 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Senators, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed-- whoops. I'm sorry, Senator Friesen, I missed your light. You are recognized.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

FRIESEN: Thank you, Mr. President. Again, I will continue to work with Senator Wayne. We still have some other disagreements to work out as far as a override and what might happen. We don't know what the pushback is going to be on this yet. I will continue to work with Senator Wayne. I wanted everybody to know that and I know there's a lot of support for this amendment and for this bill. But when it comes down to it, as Chair of Transportation and Telecommunications, I feel it's my responsibility to look out for the broadband money and I'm doing that. I appreciated what Senator Wayne was doing so much and how he took all the ARPA money, anything else that was available, and he put it on the line for next year. He's willing to work with his body to do it right. I will continue to work with him and we'll see once we can get something worked out between Final Reading and now. And so with that, I, I do support the idea of this bill. There's just a few details yet that I'd like to discuss with some other members, but still am in support of what Senator Wayne and Senator McKinney are trying to do for north Omaha. Thank you, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Friesen. Now, members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1024 is advanced. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, we're now proceeding to LB1014, as I understand it. Mr. President, Senator Wayne would move to return LB1014 to Select File for a specific amendment. Senator, I have AM2652 in front of me.

WILLIAMS: Senator Wayne, you are recognized to open on your motion.

WAYNE: Well, this is awkward. I got M&Ms in my mouth. Colleagues, thank you. What this amendment does is it removes the appropriation language for the ARPA funds that we just moved to Final Reading. Probably we don't want to double, but two, again, I think what I explained earlier about the accountability piece and the legislative history, we are trying to-- from a-- what I'll say a legal standpoint, but I'm not meaning, like, a-- suing anybody or anything, but just from a historical standpoint, if there's any questions about the need, there's any questions about what the ideas were, we want it all stacked into one bill that you can go back and trace it all the way through the committee. So all this does is remove the ARPA appropriations from the ARPA bill. It's already in LB1024 that we just advanced so it makes it, one, not a double appropriation. So if you vote no, I, I won't mind. I just want you to say-- if you want to give me double the money, that's-- my community won't mind. But that's why we're doing it is we're just trying to, from a historical standpoint, keep a accurate count of what we're doing and what we're going to be

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

held accountable for in LB1024. So this is-- this removes that language and keeps everything in LB1024. Thank you, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Members, our first vote is on the motion to return to Select File. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 35 ayes, 0 nays on the motion to return, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: The bill is returned to Select File. Senator Wayne, would you like to use another opportunity to open? He waives his opening. Debate is now open. Senator Friesen, you are recognized.

FRIESEN: Thank you, Mr. President. Would Senator Wayne yield to some questions?

WILLIAMS: Senator Wayne, would you yield?

WAYNE: Yes, yes.

FRIESEN: Thank you, Senator Wayne. In this amendment that I'm seeing here, AM2652, it does some transfers and it changes some programs for community and rural development and are you moving, like, \$20 million from the rural--

WAYNE: Oh.

FRIESEN: --housing to--

WAYNE: Yes, so what had happened in the original appropriations-- original LB1040 [SIC, LB1014] was there was allocations for rural workforce housing and urban workforce housing in the original bill. So because we moved some of that to Omaha, we had to, we had to correct those dollar amounts. We're not actually moving anything from rural. We're just reallocating how it's positioned because some of it was for the qualified census tracts. If you remember, it was \$50 million across. So we put \$10 million in and we had to make the numbers all work out, but it's all the same total number, which was the \$250 (million).

FRIESEN: OK, you're not really impacting what rural workforce housing was getting--

WAYNE: No.

FRIESEN: --in the bigger picture?

WAYNE: No.

FRIESEN: OK. I just wanted to clarify that because some of the numbers look to me like there was going to be \$20 million less in the rural workforce housing, so.

WAYNE: No. So if you'll recall, Senator Dorn brought a refugee bill and so that was tied up with the urban middle-income housing and rural so we had, we had to separate out Omaha and Lincoln from all of that.

FRIESEN: OK. Thank you, Senator Wayne. So I'm going to-- we've talked a lot here about the, the urban, what gets money, what don't get money, where is the money all going? And I just want to point out, you know, there's, there's a lot of communities out in rural Nebraska of 10,000 or less that basically are getting nothing out of most of this. They're getting some-- there are some communities getting rural workforce housing. But again, of, of all the projects that are being done and all the billions being spent, there's a lot of communities been left out. There's small communities out there that are not going to get any of these grants. They're not going to get any of this workforce housing and I just want to point it out. We have small restaurants and small businesses that closed out there because they didn't receive very much in ARPA funding. And I know that was all based on population, but those small businesses out there will never be back. Those people end up moving out of those rural communities and we see that decline in population again from rural Nebraska because we really didn't target the businesses that were damaged. Senator Wishart did a small amount of that to try and get to those small businesses and, and get some grants out there to-- because of the damage that was done to those small mom-and-pop operations, the small businesses that were in every little community that are no longer there. And so I just want everybody to remember that when we're talking about these huge sums of dollars and what we're going to be doing everywhere. And what we're doing is making more of the larger urban populations more attractive and so we can take the people in these small rural communities where we still count on them as the number one business of agriculture in the state-- we still count on them to be there, but we are slowly but surely depopulating them and moving them to more urban areas because of all the amenities, again, that we're, we're helping to build there. We're going to attract more and more of our rural residents to those larger urban population centers.

WILLIAMS: One minute.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

FRIESEN: And we'll see more of a depopulation again in rural Nebraska. Thank you, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you. Senator Friesen. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Wayne, you're recognized to close. Senator Wayne waives closing. Members, the question is the adoption of AM2652. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 41 ayes, 0 nays on the amendment.

WILLIAMS: The amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator McKinney, Mr. President, for--

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1014 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1014 is advanced. Any items, Mr. Clerk?

CLERK: I have nothing at this time, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: OK. Members, we'll return to Select File appropriations bill, LB698A.

CLERK: LB698A, Mr. President. No amendments. Senator Cavanaugh-- Machaela Cavanaugh had pending M0197.

WILLIAMS: Senator Cavanaugh, you're recognized to open on your motion.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I have amendments filed on most of the things that are remaining on the agenda today. However, because I had filed them previously for a different reason, I am going to be withdrawing all of them so that we can move forward, get these to-- on Select File moved to, to E&R. So there is a method to my madness, Senator Moser. It's just that I don't tell everyone about it all of the time. So with that, I will withdraw this amendment and all others. Thank you.

WILLIAMS: Withdrawn.

CLERK: I have nothing further on LB698A, Senator McKinney.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB698A to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB698A is advanced. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: LB741A, no E&Rs. Senator DeBoer would move to amend, AM2650.

WILLIAMS: Senator DeBoer, you're recognized to open on your amendment.

DeBOER: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, Fiscal Office told me that they inadvertently transposed a number of what the project was from 354 to 345 or the other way around. I can't remember. This is to correct that error. It was not able to be done in E&R. Thank you.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator DeBoer. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator DeBoer, you're recognized to close on your amendment. Senator DeBoer waives closing. Members, the question is the adoption of AM2650 to LB741A. All those in favor of vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Has everyone voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 33 ayes, 0 nays on the adoption of Senator DeBoer's amendment.

WILLIAMS: The amendment is adopted.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB741A to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB741A is advanced. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: LB750A, Senator. I have no amendments to the bill.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB750A to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB750A is advanced. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: LB752A, Senator. I have no amendments to the bill.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB752A to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB752A is advanced. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator, LB804A. I have no amendments to the bill.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB804A to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB804A is advanced. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: LB848A, Senator. I have no amendments to the bill.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB848A to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB848A is advanced. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator, LB1037A. I have no amendments to the bill.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1037A to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1037A is advanced. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, I have LB1241A. I have E&Rs. I do have an amendment from Senator Lathrop.

WILLIAMS: Senator Lathrop. Is anyone prepared to handle this amendment from Senator Lathrop?

PANSING BROOKS: Senator Lathrop is in a meeting at this point, so as Vice Chair, I'm standing to just say that this is an amendment to appropriate \$5 million from the General Fund in fiscal year 2022-23

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

and then \$5 million from the General Fund in '23-24 to the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice for Program 199 to aid in carrying out the provisions of LB1241. So the total expenditure for permanent and temporary salaries and per diems from funds appropriated in this section shall not exceed \$42,263 for fiscal year 2022 or '23 or \$42,263 for 2023-24. So I-- this came before the Judiciary Committee and it is to help support the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. It's, it's obviously-- we have had consistent and, and, and repetitive requests from the commission to, to require-- and I'm sorry I'm not completely prepared on this because we didn't know he'd be gone-- but anyway, to request for funds for the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement. So I hope you will vote for this amendment and move forward with Senator Lathrop's bill, LB1241. Thank you and I think others are going to speak to this who are prioritizing this bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Pansing Brooks. Debate is now open. Senator Clements, you are recognized.

CLEMENTS: Thank you, Mr. President. LB1241 also included my LB1270, which is the law enforcement retention in hiring bonus act [SIC]. The \$5 million is going to give \$750 to an officer if they stay or \$1,500, depending on which department it is, if they stay one year and \$2,500 if they stay on the force three years. It's \$3,000 if they stay for five years and that's-- it takes \$5 million. It's a law enforcement hiring and retention payment over the next five years. And so evidently, it needed some slight adjustment in the amendment to LB1241. And I thank you, Mr. President. I ask for your green vote.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Clements. Senator DeBoer, you are recognized.

DeBOER: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, this is a white-copy amendment of the A bill that will make the amount \$5 million even. That was part of the changes that we made in the bill the last time to Senator Clements' portion. This is an excellent bill and we should all vote for it. Thank you, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator DeBoer. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Pansing Brooks, you're recognized to close on the amendment. Pansing Brooks waives closing. Members, the question is the adoption of AM2639. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all voted that wish? Record, Mr. Clerk.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

CLERK: 34 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of Senator Lathrop's amendment.

WILLIAMS: The amendment is adopted. Moving to discussion. Senator Clements, you are recognized. Senator Clements waives his opportunity. No one in the queue. Nothing else on the bill. Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1241A to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1241A is advanced. Moving on to Select File consent file, LB91.

CLERK: Senator McKinney, I have Enrollment and Review amendments, first of all.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to adopt the E&R amendments to LB91.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion to adopt the E&R amendments. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. The amendments are adopted.

CLERK: Senator Machaela Cavanaugh had a motion that I understand she wishes to withdraw.

WILLIAMS: Withdrawn.

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

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB91 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB91 is advanced. LB59.

CLERK: Senator, no E&Rs. I have a Cavanaugh motion that she wishes to withdraw.

WILLIAMS: Withdrawn. Senator--

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

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB59 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB59 is advanced. LB75.

CLERK: I have E&R amendments, first of all, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to adopt the E&R amendments to LB75.

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

CLERK: I have FA88 that Senator Cavanaugh wishes to withdraw.

WILLIAMS: Withdrawn.

CLERK: I have nothing further on that bill, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB75 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB75 is advanced. LB705.

CLERK: I have E&R amendments, first of all, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to adopt the E&R amendments to LB705.

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

CLERK: I have a motion to bracket from Senator Cavanaugh that I understand she wishes to withdraw.

WILLIAMS: Withdrawn.

CLERK: I have nothing further pending on LB705, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB705 to E&R for engrossing.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB705 is advanced. LB1148.

CLERK: I have E&Rs first of all, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to adopt the E&R amendments to LB1148.

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

CLERK: I have a motion to bracket Senator Cavanaugh, she wishes to withdraw.

WILLIAMS: Withdrawn.

CLERK: I have nothing further pending on LB1148, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1148 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1148 is advanced. LB971.

CLERK: I have E&Rs, Senator, is LB971.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to adopt the E&R amendments to LB971.

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

CLERK: Senator Cavanaugh offers FA91. I understand she wants to withdraw.

WILLIAMS: Withdrawn.

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

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB971 to E&R for engrossing.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB971 is advanced. LB691.

CLERK: LB691, Senator, no E&Rs. Senator Cavanaugh, FA92. A note to withdraw, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Withdrawn.

CLERK: I have nothing further pending on LB691, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB691 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB691 is advanced. LB1178.

CLERK: No E&Rs. Senator Cavanaugh, FA93 to be withdrawn.

WILLIAMS: Withdrawn.

CLERK: Senator McKinney, I have nothing further pending to LB1178.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1178 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1178 is advanced. LB697.

CLERK: No E&Rs, Mr. President, to LB697. Senator Cavanaugh, FA94 to be withdrawn.

WILLIAMS: Withdrawn.

CLERK: Senator McKinney, I have nothing further on that bill.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB697 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say nay. LB697 is advanced. LB697A.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

CLERK: I have E&R amendments to LB697A, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to adopt the E&R amendments to LB697A.

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

CLERK: Nothing further on that bill.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB697A to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB697A is advanced. LB824.

CLERK: I have E&R amendments, first of all, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to adopt the E&R amendments to LB824.

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

CLERK: Senator Cavanaugh has FA95. I have a note to withdraw.

WILLIAMS: Withdrawn.

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

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB824 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB824 is advanced. LB795.

CLERK: No E&Rs. Senator Cavanaugh, FA96, a note to withdraw.

WILLIAMS: Withdrawn.

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

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB795 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB795 is advanced. LB1147.

CLERK: I have E&Rs, first of all, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to adopt the E&R amendments to LB1147.

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

CLERK: Senator Cavanaugh, FA97, a note to withdraw.

WILLIAMS: Withdrawn.

CLERK: I have nothing further pending on LB1147.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1147 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you have heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1147 is advanced. LB807.

CLERK: No E&Rs. Senator Cavanaugh, FA98, a note to withdraw, Mr. President.

WILLIAMS: Withdrawn.

CLERK: I have nothing further on that bill, Senator McKinney.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB807 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB807 is advanced. LB779.

CLERK: I have no amendments to LB779, Senator.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB779 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB779 is advanced. LB808.

CLERK: I have no amendments to LB808, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB808 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB808 is advanced. LB1092.

CLERK: Senator, I have no amendments to LB1092.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1092 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1092 is advanced. LB1204.

CLERK: LB1204, Senator, I have no amendments to the bill.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1204 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1204 is advanced. LB1184.

CLERK: I have no amendments to LB1184, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1184 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1184 is advanced. LB1165.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

CLERK: LB1165, Senator. I have no amendments to the bill.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1165 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1165 is advanced.

HILGERS: While the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and do hereby sign the following LRs: LR350, LR352, LR353, LR356, LR357, and LB358.

WILLIAMS: Members, we're passing over LB29 for the moment. We'll go to LB855.

CLERK: I have no amendments to LB855, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB855 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB855 is advanced. LB905.

CLERK: I have E&Rs to LB905, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to adopt the E&R amendments to LB905.

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

CLERK: I have nothing further on LB905.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB905 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB905 is advanced. LB1082.

CLERK: I have E&Rs to LB1082, Senator.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to adopt the E&R amendments to LB1082.

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

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

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1082 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1082 is advanced. LB1137.

CLERK: I have E&Rs, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to adopt the E&R amendments to LB1137.

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

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

WILLIAMS: Thank you. Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1137 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1137 is advanced. LB742.

CLERK: LB742, I have no amendments to the bill, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB742 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB742 is advanced. LB983.

CLERK: I have no amendments to LB983.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB983 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB983 is advanced. LB908.

CLERK: I have no amendments to LB908, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB908 to E&R engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say nay. LB908 is advanced. LB856.

CLERK: I have no amendments to LB856.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB856 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB856 is advanced. LB1007.

CLERK: LB1007, Senator. I have no amendments to the bill.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1007 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1007 is advanced. LB829.

CLERK: LB829, I have no amendments to the bill.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB829 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB829 is advanced. LB851.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

CLERK: LB851, I have no amendments to the bill.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB851 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB851 is advanced. LB1124.

CLERK: LB1124, I have no amendments to the bill.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1124 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1124 is advanced. LB1057.

CLERK: LB1057, I have Enrollment and Review amendments, first of all.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to adopt the E&R amendments to LB1057.

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

CLERK: I have nothing further on that bill.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

McKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB1057 to E&R for engrossing.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB1057 is advanced. Returning to LB29.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Wayne would move to amend, AM2390.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President. I'll be really quick.

WILLIAMS: Excuse me. Senator Wayne, you're recognized to open on your amendment.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

WAYNE: Sorry. Sorry, Mr. Speaker-- Mr. President. Thank you. I'll be real quick. This just added an emergency clause and it's a small Revisor change. The emergency clause just makes sure if we pass the bill, we can actually celebrate Juneteenth this year. Thank you.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Debate is now open. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Wayne, you are recognized to close. Senator Wayne waives-- excuse me. Senator Clements, you are recognized.

CLEMENTS: Thank you, Mr. President. Would Senator Wayne yield to a question?

WILLIAMS: Senator Wayne, would you yield?

WAYNE: Yes.

CLEMENTS: I see you're adding the words National Independence Day. Could you explain why that's--

WAYNE: Yeah, that's part of the Revisor change because in Senator Williams' bill, they call that language. So we're trying to be consistent from federal and through all the bills that we put in. So that's the catch of the Revisors.

CLEMENTS: So that's the title that's used and-- at the federal level?

WAYNE: Correct and also used in Senator Williams-- the banking update.

CLEMENTS: OK, very good. Thank you.

WAYNE: Thank you.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Clements. Seeing no one else in the queue, Senator Wayne waives closing. Members, the question is the adoption of AM2390. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 35 ayes, 0 nays on the adoption of the amendment.

WILLIAMS: AM2390 is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: I have nothing further on that bill, Senator McKinney.

WILLIAMS: Senator McKinney for a motion.

MCKINNEY: Mr. President, I move to advance LB29 to E&R for engrossing.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 31, 2022

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB29 is advanced. I recognize Senator Gragert for a motion or for an announcement, excuse me.

GRAGERT: Thank you, Mr. President. Just real quickly, we have a plan for a helicopter ride and a mission brief out at the Army airfield. If-- all those that have signed up, I appreciate if we could just make our way out there. If for some reason you-- at last minute, you can't make it, just give me a text so we're not waiting on you and we'll get started with the flight as soon as we get out there. Thank you.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Gragert. Mr. Clerk for items.

CLERK: Amendments to be printed to LB843, Senator Brewer; Senator Matt Hansen, LB1045; (Senator DeBoer, LB1045). Senator Vargas, add his name to LB741 and to LB1069. Senator Stinner would move to adjourn the body until Tuesday, April 5 at 9:00 a.m.

WILLIAMS: Members, you've heard the motion to adjourn until next Tuesday at 9:00 a.m. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. We are adjourned.