

appropriateness of stating something, stating the share of an entity to pay in terms of dollars per day, as opposed to, example, stating it in terms of percentages, and I think that we do that sometimes when we intend to have joint responsibility, and then we fail to pay attention to the situation, and our failure to pay attention to the situation essentially changes our policy because the share that one entity will pay will decline over time very significantly. If you take this situation, for example, that \$15 a day, that \$10 a day, that \$3 per day for the beyond 30-day care, those 3 figures were set in 1969; 1969, 27 years of inflation have occurred, and it has been the state, essentially, that bears the burden of that inflation. For example, right now the charge for short-term in-patient care at these different institutions, Beatrice excepted, just to give you an example, is \$269 a day, \$269 a day. That's been increased every year for the last five years, the only years I can get figures on. You know, four years ago it was 233. So it has dropped more...it has increased more than 15 percent in 4 years. If you look back at inflation rates, that charge in 1969 had to be about \$100. So in 1969, when the statute was enacted, the county was to pay \$15 out of \$100, or about 15 percent. That was determined to be the policy that provided for some county input, and was a fair share; 85 by the state, 15 by the county. So what's happened over time? Well, over time that \$100 has gone up to \$269, which means that the county's share, by virtue of us doing nothing at all, has reduced from 15 percent or somewhere in that area, to roughly about 6 percent. If you look at the long-term extended care, the county's share has decreased from 3...from a very small 3 percent, to begin with, to just over 1 percent, almost nothing. So what this amendment would do would be to simply change the \$15 to 15 percent to restore the original policy that we made, and likewise with Beatrice, which was separately dealt with in the statute for some reason, from \$10 to 10 percent, and the long-term care from \$3 to 3 percent. That, as best I can figure it, would return us to the original policy. So I'm interested in what folks think about...about the amendment itself, and the percentage amounts in the amendment, but even more importantly, I'm interested in what you think about using a percentage as opposed to a dollar amount, so that whatever policy we effectuate this year is not just simply eroded and changed dramatically by the passage of time. And I think I'll leave it at that, and invite questions, and see what you all are thinking. Thank you.