

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

May 20, 2003

LB 622, 759

Senator Brashear's number, the additional sales tax base that would come with the passage of LB 759, I think he mentioned the other day, that would generate an estimated \$19 million additional revenue...sales tax revenue for cities Using that as a base,...

SENATOR BEUTLER: For one year or for two years?

SENATOR RAIKES: That's...I believe that's the biennium. That's the biennial amount. This amendment, if adopted, we'd have to estimate there too. Because it's really...the impact would be guessing as to how much over the formula funding is needed in order to fund the actual formula. But we know for sure that there's about \$1.3 million this year that would be over not only the formula but what was promised. But if you took, I think, the outside guess, it would be something on the order of \$5 million for the biennium. So comparing those two numbers, the net impact for cities would be positive. The net fiscal impact for cities would be positive.

SENATOR BEUTLER: To the amount of approximately \$13 million? Is that what you're saying?

SENATOR RAIKES: Again, that's rough, rough.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. And I don't have the budget book in front of me. I wasn't expecting this. But how does that \$13 million that they gain...and, by the way, the amount that's gained is only gained by certain cities. Right?

SENATOR RAIKES: If you're referring to the fact that not every city has a sales tax, that's correct. But keep in mind now, the equalization formula would remain in place. And particularly cities that are levying high property taxes would continue to gain. And you know, to the extent that cities that have sales taxes are able to lower their property taxes as a result, then those cities that don't have sales taxes would pick up ground, so to speak, in the equalization formula, which would remain in place.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Assuming that there is a distinct parallel