

and we kept that again as a part of role and missions. However, we did amend the bill to allow a metro technical community college to offer a general studies program at their North Omaha Campus, and that is consistent with what we are allowing the other six...or the other five areas to do. So that is in the bill. Now in addition to that, we have a community college that has a difficulty in reaching its 7 percent lid and we talked about that yesterday and this is one of those problems that we have throughout the state, and until we can resolve that, I feel it is imperative then that we would allow Western Tech and any community college for that example if they have to, to go beyond the 7 cents per 100 when they cannot get the 7 percent of their budget because based upon their property tax and other kinds of funds which are sent to the community college. Now Western Tech has unusual problems. They are not able to get there. They just can't get their 7 percent so we are saying to you and advising you to allow this to happen, allow them some flexibility. Their board would have to by two-thirds vote would have to say that we do, indeed, have to exceed and we will go only up to what we are allowed under 285, which is 7 percent, and that is the way that will work. We don't anticipate other community colleges will have the same problem. But you've got to remember because of the problems of property tax assessments and some of these things which are unique to that area probably more than others, that...and they also have some declining enrollment and declining state aid. I think that we have got to try and help them with this problem, at least temporarily. And another item we have is that at the present we say that they can spend their money in a certain way at 2 1/2 mills. What we say presently is that they can levy the 1/2 mill for capital construction, but the revenue must be spent for, one, retirement of student bonds; two, renewal work and deferred maintenance; three, retirement of newly issued bonds; and, four, after paying for the first three items, new capital construction or facility improvements, even then such capital improvements are limited to \$100,000. Now they cannot go to a vote of the people even if they wanted to, so what we are saying is that rather than repeal this, we have increased that amount of \$100,000 to \$200,000 and allowing them to go to a vote of the people. I think most of us are aware of the fact that it doesn't take long to get to \$100,000 today in deferred maintenance. And I think that by leaving this in here we are impugning the integrity of the system, and so we are saying, let's increase it to \$200,000 and when you go over that then you will go to the vote of the people and see whether or not they want to approve of