

that if we are going to make changes to make the process operate more smoothly that we do so now, and for that reason, Speaker Baack has graciously behaved as the statesman that we all know that he is, and has special ordered this bill at this time. He wasn't listening, so that is fine. We can not compliment him next time then, if he is not going to pay attention. The bill was special ordered. We are going to be proposing another fairly major amendment, not necessarily in substance, but in length and a fairly complicated set of amendments that will be the contents of LB 698, which is another bill, another clean-up bill that makes some changes to make LB 1059 operate a little more smoothly than it currently is. So in doing that, we open up practically the entire contents of the school section of our statutes, so there may be a number, quite a number of amendments to this. The committee amendment to 719, what does it do? There is a good explanation in your bill book. There are 18 specific changes that are being made. I am just going to hit on a few of the major ones, and the others are fairly clarification in nature. I will respond to any questions you may have. Change number one the committee amendments propose, if you recall, one of the pieces of this whole affiliation puzzle is that the Class I school district can request services from the high school district, and they were going to, the way the original bill played out was they were going to flow through the budget of the high school district. This reverses that and makes those services a Class I district wants, they will contract for those, and the Class I district will pay for them. It doesn't really make a lot of difference who pays, because if you remember, we are having a common levy within the entire affiliated district so that the affiliated school and the affiliating school will have those in their budget and it will be blended among the district anyway. So it doesn't make a lot of difference. It appears to go smoother if the Class I contracts for those services which it really wants. The second change that it makes is we did put a budget limitation on the amount of the budget that could go within the common levy. We are eliminating that. We are suggesting that be eliminated because we already have a budget limitation in LB 1059, just make that budget limitation applicable. The process the way we had it envisioned would have had an affiliation in effect by February 1 of next year; two years a levy, a formula based on our current nonresident tuition levy that would determine what the affiliated district would pay for high school purposes; and then two years later get into a common levy for K through 12 purposes. What the committee amendments do is they say one more