

districts have had no problem negotiating with the bond people and most school districts in this state have an election, vote of the people, before they build buildings and issue bonds. It was mentioned that there might be a problem with stage development. Well, what is meant by stage development is very nebulous. It can mean a number of things. If you are talking about a series of projects, then maybe there would be more than one vote, and in that case maybe there should be more than one vote. If you are talking about one project completed in several stages, then you would simply have the vote on the entire project at the beginning and it would not be necessary to vote on every stage. For example, a few years ago the school district of Millard issued several millions of dollars worth of bonds. The vote was on all the bonds at one point in time and then the bonds were actually issued in three different sequences at later points in time as they did their development by stages. So there is no problem in that regard. With regard to the argument that it has been on the ballot already on the constitutional amendment, I really don't see how that is relevant at all. The people voted to have the Legislature decide how tax increment financing would be implemented, and that is what we are in the process of doing right now, is deciding how it can be implemented, and I am suggesting to you that it should be implemented with this amendment. I haven't had a chance to do all the necessary research on this particular question, but I would suggest to you that you think closely about whether tax increment financing as it is presently constituted, whether it could not undermine vote of the people requirements that are now existing in law. There are a great number of public projects which presently under the statutes require vote of the people. It is a check on the local government officials expending money for capital improvements. We have seen fit traditionally to have that check in a whole number of areas. Now we can do tax increment financing and with the Cornhusker project, for example, we are going to have a civic center, a convention center, to be owned by the city. And I haven't checked into this, but I don't know if the city could build that civic center without a vote of the people, unless they had tax increment financing. I ask you to think about your communities. Are there buildings that are going to be built now without a vote of the people with public funds through tax increment financing? It doesn't take much creativity with the broad scope of blighted area. It doesn't take much creativity to figure out how to combine public and private improvements. Another thing I might point out to you that, for example, in Lincoln it would be the City Council that