

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 9, 2001

LB 465

here. Now my guess is, I can take a read of the body and nobody is going to want to go...well, not enough people are going to want to go to a full court because what my amendment does is makes them a branch of the court of appeals, where they originally should have been, and they still have their duties of hearing valuation cases. They'd still do statewide equalization. If I were you, I would stand up and say, Senator Kristensen, you didn't have a public hearing on this. And do you know what? I didn't. I did raise it in the Revenue Committee in the hearing. And so you ought to say that to me, and I'm not going to have a very good defense to that, but my purpose tonight isn't to sit here and tell you that you need to switch that system tonight. I'm telling you we've got a problem. It is so fundamental to the administration of local governments and our state aid formulas that we've got to make some changes. And maybe those changes are personalities. Maybe it is part who is on the board. You know those three people started off all by themselves. It was them against the world. They were a brand new institution, and they really did a good job, and they may not believe that tonight but I really like all three of them. They did some very hard things and it hurts to stand up here and say that things aren't going very good right now, but they are not, and we've got to make some change. How do you make that change? Well, we can stick our head in the sand and say I hope it is okay. The Revenue Committee amendments make that change. They reconstitute some of the membership. The fundamental structure remains the same. I want to change the fundamental structure. It is not doable, particularly given today, May 9th, where we are at. But I do think you need to seriously consider what the Revenue Committee has done. Now I plan to vote for that. What I am going to do at this point in time is I am going to withdraw my amendment because I don't think it's fair to take up the time or interject and confuse the issue any more than it is there. But the amendment is out there for one purpose, and we've talked about it. There's a problem, and if we don't fix it, it's only going to get worse. What's at stake? Seven hundred million dollars of state aid. Do you want people who are judging on whether it's Pizza Hut or Wal-Mart that moves into town as to whether you raise or lower the values? You want people who sit there and count who wins and loses and then that's the basis for what