

you will find on your desk this amendment, 490. This is the amendment which allows a Class I an additional alternative. It allows a Class I to be aligned with a K-12 high school district, aligned with the high school part of the district. The amendment is designed to meet those objections of the people who state that the Class I is not supporting a high school except on a use it basis. This would require that the Class I, if it chose this alternative, to align itself with a high school by an election process. In other words, let's say there is a nearby Class III district. Then that Class III district will divide its levy into the high school levy and the grade school levy. So then the Class I will pay the high school levy. They will keep their own attendance of their own school out there, their grade school, their Class I school. It would not affect the school board. It would not affect the Class I except they would be paying a levy to whatever high school they decided to join for high school purposes and they could continue to operate their local school. I think the great majority of the Class I residents are most interested in keeping their grade school out in the community and they are not interested in a tax shelter if there is such a thing as a tax shelter, that they are interested in the local control, the lack of travel, the lessened travel distance of their local school. And if we are talking about tax equity and if, indeed, not paying a levy to a high school district is lack of tax equity, then this takes care of that problem. So instead of nonresident high school tuition levy, you would now be paying a levy to some high school in the area. There is a voting procedure whereby the district would decide which high school to be aligned with. It would pay that levy and it is a very simple, straightforward method of reacting to the criticism of those who say these Class I's do not support a high school on a continuing basis. They would continue to support this as the mill levy goes up or down, or whichever way, and they would be sharing the support of the school, and if there are any questions about this proposal, I will be happy to respond.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Landis, then Senator Haberman.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I had a conversation, yesterday I believe it was, with Senator Lamb about this amendment and his intentions on the bill, and he said that he offered the amendment in good faith but that he had no intention of voting for 662 with the