

February 20, 1996 LB 1205

that made some changes in the bill. One of the important ones is that we said that the plan that the School Lands Board is to bring back, we moved the date forward that they are to have that plan for us on December of 1996, and so that was a big difference from what was originally in the bill. The Education Committee thought that that was certainly something that they would be able to prepare and have before us, and then that would also give us the opportunity, as they would bring that to the Education Committee, to see what type of progress they were making in moving the direction that the bill had asked them to take. Another change was that we did remove the restriction that the board had as far as in the interim selling or buying any of that land, realizing that we did not really want to tie their hands on some negotiations that would seem to be appropriate before this would be resolved and the plan would be implemented. So with that, those were the major changes that took place, and recommendations in...the major changes with the committee amendments, and with that, I'll answer any questions anyone may have. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Bohlke. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator Warner would move to amend the committee amendments. (See AM3248 found on pages 834 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR CROSBY: Senator Warner, to open on your amendment.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, it's a fairly simple amendment. It's not been reproduced but I will explain it. If you look at the committee amendments, it merely rolls back by one year each of the year...of the dates. For example, the committee amendment requires that the board would prepare a plan for the sale of land by December 1 of '96, it would be '97; the completion would be for the year 2012 would be 20 and...2013; and then the plan for implementing shall begin on July 1 of '97, it would move that back one year as well. The only rationale is, as I understood from the hearing, that the plan not only includes the proposal about disposing of land, but I was of the impression that it also requires that some appraisals and valuations be determined, and it just seemed to me it was a fairly short time frame, that a little longer period of time would be helpful. In addition, the amendment would also require the state investment officer would prepare a plan for