

the issue in the meeting last week, the committee, in its discussion, tried to look at those items on the list of items vetoed that might fit a...or most closely fit, at least, a definition for a deficit appropriation that we had utilized earlier during the budget discussions. The one item that stood out more than any others appeared to us to be the appropriation for aging, aid to aging, and the basis for that having some significantly different category than any of the other vetoes that were made is that there had been substantive changes made, in fact, made from the time we had considered the appropriation bill in committee and when it was considered on the floor that significant difference was the impact of the increase in minimum wage that will be affecting those programs in communities across the state. And so with that criteria we did recommend that one override of around four hundred and sixty some thousand, as I recall. I do want to make some other comments, however, generally before we get into the override of vetoes, particularly those that have substantive impact, fiscal impact on the budget. As you know, if you look at the sheet that was just handed out, we are running closer to the legally required minimum reserve than we have for a number of years. This is utilizing, of course, the projections for revenues for the biennium which we are in and then when we look at the following biennium which there is no legal requirement but, obviously, what we do now does affect what will be available for funds and for the support of ongoing programs during the '91-93 fiscal year. You will see, if you look at the bottom of the sheet, there's a...it would indicate in order to maintain a minimum 3 percent reserve, about 9.5 million of overrides could be done collectively as far as impact this year and still stay above the minimum of 9...of the 3 percent, that is without the passage of LB 1059. If 1059 is overridden, then that dollar amount is 4.1...or almost 4.2 million. The reason for the difference, the reason for the difference has nothing to do with the funding appropriated in 1059. It's the simple fact that with that higher level of appropriation, \$178 million, it has the impact on the amount of the reserve that at least the state is required to hold by statute. And it is, I think, probably relatively significant that we keep that in mind. We do have fiscal staff over here which as overrides are done, if any, but as overrides are done we will be able to report to you the balance based on the projections that we're using, the balance that would be available for overrides and still stay above that minimum 3 percent reserve. I do want to indicate that, as we all know, those estimates receipts are recommendations from the Advisory