

have been way above the average, some way below. One of our goals is to eventually equalize. The way the bill is now drafted, that equalization would be set back, would not be able to do that. Let me give kind of a mechanical explanation of what I...my understanding is of the current bill and what it is we are attempting to move to. The current bill, first of all, the rationale for having a lid in LB 829 is justifiable and allowable and I support it. Normally, I don't like lids but I think in these cases where the state government infuses large sums of money back to subdivisions there needs to be some sort of a mechanism to assure us that that money will be used for the purpose of replacement of property tax dollars and not for instituting new programs. So I support the concept of a lid. The way the current lid operates...the way the lid in the bill now operates on all subdivisions, as I understand it, is it imposes a zero percent lid on the property taxes that they are able to raise, monies that they are able to raise from property taxes. That is across the board. This amendment would retain an imposed zero percent lid on school districts as well as the other subdivisions. Where it differs from the current bill is what happens with a super majority. Under the current bill, all subdivisions would, with a super majority of their board, be able to move to a 5 percent increase in property taxes raised. That 5 percent increase is what is now allowable under the LB 1059 lid for all other subdivisions other than school districts. What would happen would be this 5 percent would continue to be imposed on school districts under the current bill and in addition to that they would have to operate under their 1059 lid on total expenditures. What we are proposing we do is we wipe out that middle phase for school districts and allow them with their super vote to go to their 1059 lid so that with a super majority they would not have to operate under two separate lids, one on property taxes raised, and the other on their total expenditures they would move immediately from the zero percent lid with the super majority too, their 1059 lid. Other subdivisions under the bill now are able to move by super majority' from zero percent to their 1059 lid which allows school districts to do that. I think it's fair. It retains what we tried to do in LB 1059. The 1059 lid basically works, I think. It has kept down spending. It has assured that the dollars have gone to replace property tax dollars and normal growth and not to support additional growth because more money is infused into the budget and I would urge you to support this particular amendment.