

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

May 20, 2003

LB 622

but I want to give you a little bit of background on this. The Municipal Equalization Fund program is a program in place now to equalize property tax burdens, basically, in cities. There is a formula that has got to do with the average...the calculation of an average property tax rate in cities, and then provision of funds, depending in part on how heavy the property tax burden is in a city. There's also, in effect, a minimum levy provision in this that is much the same sort of a provision as is being provided in this bill to the county property tax relief program. There are two dedicated funding sources for this MEF, Municipal Equalization Fund program. One of them is a 3 percent administrative fee on city sales taxes, and the other one is 30 percent of the insurance premium tax distribution. The way that money is distributed is, if the...we begin with the formula. If there is not enough money generated by those two dedicated fund sources, then the amount going to each city is prorated in the formula. But if there is more money than is needed to fund the formula, the overage is distributed to cities on a per capita basis. The way cities are notified of this...and I'll give you an example. Last June, I think it was, they were given notice of the amount they would be provided through the formula. And then in addition, it was anticipated that...at that time, that the overage would amount to about another \$1 million. So cities were put on notice that they would receive the funded amount through the formula, plus another million dollars, little bit over that, to be distributed on a per capita basis. The actual receipts from those two funding sources are almost \$2.4 million greater than what is required to fund the formula. So what this amendment does is the following two things. It says that the formula will be funded. The \$1 million, plus a little bit, that was promised to cities in last June will be honored. But the amount over that, that cities were not planning on, would not be distributed. It would be returned to the General Fund. And in future years, the formula would be funded, but in the event there is an overage, that money would go back to the General Fund rather than being distributed under the current procedure as an overage. Now, this is a little bit complicated, but I hope you get the general idea. This distribution can be returned to the General Fund. And I would argue with you that...or, argue to you, I guess, not with you necessarily, that this is something that is fiscally