

May 9, 1979

LB 363

your desk this morning and if you will follow with me I will tell you very quickly what they are. What I do, the amendments that I have offered to you on your desk and it has my name in up in the corner, left hand corner, it says the summary of the Koch amendments to 263. (sic.) What we do with this amendment is strike all new matters in LB 363 dealing with capital construction, renovation, bond payments and the mill levy for such a fund. Therefore, that leaves LB 922 of last session law. Those of you who may be concerned about capital construction and very briefly, on your desk there was also a handout with from what I am reading, that shows you explicitly what we did in 922 and quickly I will refresh your memory. We said in 922 last year, any area that has obligations that will not be fully paid out of capital construction may be authorized that one mill to 1980 and only Western Central cannot have any new capital construction site, acquisition or lease purchase agreements even with a vote of the people. It went on to say if you do not have obligations that will not be paid out of the same levy, you can have new capital construction with a vote of the people. We went on to say thirdly, if you have outstanding assumed general obligation bonds, they have to be paid off prior to issuing new general bonds or using the method described in the second point I made. This particular area covers Southeast and Mid-Plains which have such assumed general obligation bonds but can pay them off under their present levies. The fourth point in 922 was as follows. Exempt from the above was (a) contracts already let, such as Southeast at Milford and Northeast; (b) land acquired for a new campus such as Elkhorn Valley campus and Metro; (c) \$100,000, new projects such as Southeast at the Milford storage building and (d) renovation and deferred maintenance. For example, the new power plant at Central Tech and some renovation at Metro that would exceed a \$100,000 of new construction but could be done only under this exemption. That was the condition of LB 922 and that remains intact. Now in addition what I would do is to give you a new funding formula. As you know, in the past this body has been giving state aid to the community colleges and it has been based upon a head count or FTE and so what we are doing here and part of the resolution was to look at funding mechanism. So what we are bringing to you in this amendment is to adopt the formula and the formula would be this way. 15% of the money granted by the Legislature for aid would go to them, to the communities based upon full time equivalency programs, in other words, a head count, and then the 85% remaining would go out to the various areas based upon a, what we

5001