

and winter of 1987, seeking a middle ground solution. We came up with a report. We had that report introduced in bill form in LB 940. The hearing of 940, in the 1988 session, we had a broad-based group of people supporting the idea of a middle ground approach to school district reorganization. At the edges, at the extremes we had those individuals who believed that the only thing we could do would be to force involuntary, mandated reorganization that opposed 940. We had people on the other end of the spectrum who felt that the only thing that we could do was to leave the Class I's alone, send them a letter of apology for bothering them all these years, and keep the status quo as it is and actually was. Consequently, when we passed 940, we brought about a number of amendments to it that made it so it was not the final solution. But when we, as a Legislature, in 1988, did pass LB 940, we were very explicit on what we expected. We said that the Class I's and the Class II's and the Class III's had to get together at the county level and formulate new school district reorganization plans, the county committee had to do that, and they had until this last January to complete those studies. We said that the Department of Education had to come up with new standards for accreditation which would allow the smaller schools to meet accreditation if they genuinely were quality schools. And we did a number of other things in 940. The most significant thing we did in 940 was as a Legislature, and those of you who were here remember, it was a very emotional day, when we finally amended 940 on Select File and put it in the shape that we wanted for final passage. We repealed nonresident tuition formula, affective July 1, 1991. We, as a Legislature, this was the first of two things that we did in the area of education policy where we, as a Legislature, took a canon and put it to our heads and said, we are going to seek a final solution to this problem. We passed 940, the ad hoc committee was then reformulated, met again for another year and, frankly, that was not a successful process. The process of the ad hoc committee at that time really broke down, because, frankly, we had too many extremists on both positions on that committee--those who thought the only good Class I is a dead Class I, and those who felt that you can't do anything to change the existing structure. I introduced LB 259, last year in its green copy form, merely as an attempt to continue the discussion process and to force people to the table. Prior to the introduction of the bill in committee I did inform everybody on the ad hoc committee, and did send a letter out to everybody that had an interest in this issue, that at the committee hearing I was going to be proposing a new set of