

today is not trying to fuss with or interfere with that particular study. We're saying everybody who's a proponent of this amendment, I think, would say, yes, let's proceed with that study, let's see what happens in terms of defining access and some things we really need to look at. But what we're saying is for the moment, though, we need to look at the reality of today and what we want to make it, until such time as further change might be advocated and might be approved by this Legislature. And I think what we need to look at is what exists today compared to what's being proposed to you in this particular amendment, and make a decision on that and then move forward from that particular point in time. For example, we know also that we're going to be studying the entire tier system next year and whether those tiers make sense or don't make sense. But at the same time, in 1050 we've put in there some things that actually change the tier system, in particular the aspect of the bill that deals with transportation. So we move ahead with it, even though we're studying the tier system. Similarly, what we're asking today in the Schimek amendment is that we take the same kind of look and the same kind of attitude towards special education, because that is an area that's very similar to transportation. There are widely varying needs between districts. And, as we indicated with respect to transportation in 1050, it seems to be equitable to say to those districts that have high needs, you ought to recover those costs. And to say to districts that have very low expenditures, you ought not get more than your cost and your expenditures. And that's all this special education...you know, it's a very simple amendment, despite the fact that it fits into a very complicated formula. And it just says simply this, with respect to those districts that are in tiers, and remember that Omaha is not in a tier, so Omaha is essentially unaffected by this amendment, as I believe Westside also would be, since they're not an equalization district, but for all the other districts, for those who may have high special education costs, we're saying, you ought not be penalized for that, for your efforts in this particular area, for your efforts especially in this particular area, and you ought to be able to recover those costs. And that's all that this amendment does. It simply is a matter of equity and a matter of being fair to those school districts that have particular costs in this area, just as we were fair to school districts that had particular costs in the transportation area. With that, I would simply note that the amendment does also have a cap, so that you're not allowing unlimited ballooning of