

February 7, 1986 LB 172, 548

CLERK: 33 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of Senator Chambers' amendment, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The Chambers amendment is adopted. Do you wish to return it back?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I move that LB 548 be returned.

SPEAKER NICHOL: You've heard the motion. All in favor say aye. The bill is advanced. Do you have anything else on the bill?

CLERK: No.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Okay, we'll move on then to LB 172 with the emergency clause attached.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Vickers would move to return 172 to Select File for a specific amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Vickers, please.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President and members, LB 172 adopts the philosophy that says that if the valuation of the...assessed valuation of...in a political subdivision is increased that the levy levied by that political subdivision, unless it is levied for an increase in the budget, should be automatically lowered the percentage of the increase in valuation. The amendment that I offer to you, and you should have a copy of it laying on your desk, adopts that same philosophy, only on the other side of the coin that says that if the valuations decrease pursuant to the sections of the law that control the valuation that we passed last year, that if the valuation is decreased then the same thing takes place, that the levy would then raise to keep the political subdivision at the status quo. Now it is applied irrespective of a statutory limitation on that levy limit. But it is not appl...does not apply and obviously we couldn't apply it to constitutional levy limits. I want to make that clear because the county levy limits are constitutional. Now we had a discussion yesterday about that very issue, about what happens when valuations are plummeting, how do we continue to operate some of the political subdivisions that have a statutory