

is no way we can logically plan it out and do it all in one or two or three years. At the same time, this resolution in one sense doesn't mean anything, but I see its purpose as two part; one, to give us in here an internal focus on what we're planning to do; and, two, and perhaps more importantly, giving the public some definite commitment and idea about what we are willing to do. I mean we're...we're saying to the public when we do this that we think these petition ideas are not a good idea, let us move in a reasonable, rational, deliberative fashion towards the goal of property tax reduction, but, public, you have to understand that it can't all be done at once. My problem with this resolution is twofold. One, it doesn't give the public any idea of finally when this is going to be done, and it doesn't give them any benchmarks by which to judge whether we are making progress towards our goal, or whether we are, in their minds, once again fooling them on this whole...on this whole business. And that's what my first amendment deals with. The second problem I have is that I think that it would make some sense to build into the resolution a better idea of process, that is, who is going to do what, when, and present us with what in order to move logically and progressively and steadily towards the goals. That's what is in the second amendment that we will discuss later. But what I wanted to throw out for your suggestion at the moment is this AM2778, which should be on your desk. It has a couple of small technical changes, but the real change, the real change is the addition of this schedule of levy cap reductions. You will see looking at this schedule that it anticipates a graduated reduction in the levy cap starting with the political subdivision fiscal year of 1997-98, with a \$2.45 cap. Now some people are going to say, well, that isn't much, but that's the beginning, and we are just beginning on this process. We are just beginning to sort through the things we need to do to lower that cap in a rational manner, and then what it suggests, and these are minimum achievements, then what it suggests is that in ensuing years over a period of ten years the cap be reduced by a nickel every year until you get in the year, Fiscal Year 2006-07, the same goal that is outlined in the resolution presently, the goal of \$2 per \$100 of assessed valuation. The value of this, I think, is that, again, it tells the public what we are going to do. It tells ourselves what we are going to do. It puts a final time line on it. This, this will be done in ten years. This will be accomplished over a ten-year period. Now it is not my intent, for example, in the year 2000-2001 that, you know, if we can go faster, we don't