

be in support of the sale of school lands, while I, like others who have spoke against it, share the frustration that they provide to a lot of people in the state that have to deal with how the transfer of leases occur and the bidding and the inconvenience and the uncertainty. I can appreciate all those arguments but notwithstanding that, I think the better public policy is to retain those school lands as we have historically done and perhaps, if anything, (inaudible) the indiscretion that was used many years ago when some of it was sold. It's unfortunate it was not all retained. But I would not support the advancement.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Warner. The next speaker is Senator Nelson.

SENATOR NELSON: Yes, I'm sorry that I didn't get in on the earlier discussion, this afternoon we had Exec Committee in Judiciary. I have mixed emotions and, as most of you know, I have an interest in the school lands. I have a couple questions. I've done my homework on this, so to speak, the returns even at 5 percent for the investment and 5 percent appreciation, I don't know, I will ask Senator Lamb a question or two. I know that in the rangeland it seems more feasible but I, too, am against selling the school lands. I'm using 1989 information that we were given in Education Committee on LB 807, and do you have any reason to doubt these figures, or help me out if they are no longer correct. The land sold approximately 47 percent of the acres, 80 percent or more of the total value. The total sale proceeds for the land sold was \$26 million some time ago. The present value again is 26 million of those proceeds and the annual income at 7 percent interest then is about 1.8 million and we maybe stretch today to get the 7 percent, maybe not. The land retained 53 percent of the acres, the total sale, the present value of those would now...wait a minute, the total sale proceeds which would have been received if this land had been sold in the proportions and the same time would be 5.5 million. The present value of the land which was retained is somewhere between 250 and 300 million. I think I read a figure yesterday 301 million they figured. About 14 million of that is improvements put on by tenants. The present value of the income from this land is 13.6 million. Are those figures changed any from that time or are they inflated figures? Help me out.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Lamb, would you respond, please.