

April 11, 1974

their judgment that they were not serving the best interests of the trust by following this formula. They therefore developed a separate and independent formula for renting the land and that formula was essentially that the lands would be rented at what they would go for on the open market if they were owned by anybody. They would then call this new thing, this new formula, appraised rental value which is completely and distinctly separate from what is in the statutes of Nebraska. What the bill does and one of the biggest elements of the bill, the one that probably hasn't been discussed much, is that the bill makes a practice that they are following now conform to the law by writing the law to say the land shall be rented for appraised rental value. Now, I have stated here, and I believe it sincerely, that if we do not conform the law to what is being done, then either we will have to go back and follow the law exactly which is renting it for 4% of market value or we will have lawsuit having a determination of this and I think, in my opinion, the lawsuit will say you will have to follow what the law is, 4% of market value. In this case, it would severely reduce the rentals and it would go back, I would guess, about what it was renting for when they were supposedly following this formula. This amount was about \$3 million dollars. The amount that the rental will bring in along with bonuses this year, as I understand, is somewhere between \$8 and \$9 million. One of the main things then, Senator Carpenter, in explanation of the bill, is that it sets up rental of the lands at whatever the market will bear. Now, there have been complaints by tenants and I have taken a lot of them to the board myself, that the rentals that the board has set have been too high. I know the board in specific cases has reviewed some of their rentals and has lowered them. However, as a practical matter, all the land that has been available to be rented has been rented and there has been keen competition and what is known as bonus bidding for the opportunity to get these lands. Which leads one to believe they are definitely not too high in most cases. In select cases, they may well be and those individuals who have complained should file them with the board and have a re-evaluation of their particular rent. Another element of the bill is that the bill adapts certain businesslike practices in the handling of funds and the leasing of the lands, granting the board to have certain advertising rates the same as other sub-divisions of government in the newspapers. Granting the board the right to charge interest on delinquent rental payments, granting the board a procedure to take back lands when they are in default in rent and granting the board a procedure for taking back lands if a tenant wants to yield his rent. The bill also then has what is apparently the most controversial portion of the bill which is the maintenance of the land that are in existence to their best use. And this year out of those funds would come about \$650,000 for this purpose. Now, on the floor of the Legislature the other day, I stated that Senator Whitney and I had a sincere disagreement on the constitutionality and I urged him to check with the Attorney General. Senator Stull did check with the Attorney General and as he has told you, the Attorney General rendered a verbal opinion that the bill as written is most constitutional definitely. Senator Whitney just got up and read you a portion of an opinion from 1967 which takes not into consideration changes in the law made since then and does not take the whole essence of the opinion. The Legislature has the authority to classify what shall be included in the cost of administering the land....the administrative expenses. And that is all we are doing with this bill and with this money and this particular portion of the bill. Finally, the bill has one other