

Sophomore Pilgrimage luncheon for today has been postponed. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Coordsen. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator Maurstad has the next amendment, as per the Speaker's directions, Madam President, AM3993. (See pages 1421-23 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT ROBAK: The Chair recognizes Senator Maurstad to open on his amendment.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Thank you, Madam President. This amendment, basically, takes a slightly different approach from the Revenue Committee's amendment, and yet adheres to the basic principles of the committee amendment. The amendment's significant change takes out the language dealing with budget authority and replaces it with the concept that Senator Warner spoke about earlier relative to restricted funds. And the main reason for going in this direction is because I...I believe like many that property taxes are the target. And the way that we can get to targeting relief in property taxes and still provide some means for local governments to go about a normal course of the way they've deliver services, not necessarily the same amount, but just the process of going through delivering those services, that restricted funds would allow...would allow that to occur. This amendment uses the restricted funds concept to identify funds that directly impact tax rates, property tax rates at the local level. This approach approves the ability of the bill to bring about the desired result, that being reducing property tax, as opposed to strictly limiting alternative revenue sources, such as fees-based revenue. The major difference is that instead of broadly trying to include everything on both sides of the tax and spend equation, the proposal simply identifies restricted funds and directly puts a lid on increases to those funds, and ties increases in state aid to reduce the property tax revenue in those funds to fit under the lid. This approach makes it easier to enforce statewide because it accounts for the wide variety of political subdivisions funds, expenditures and revenue sources. It also uses a similar concept relative to the potential for an increase in the levy amount stated in the bill, whereas the committee amendment talks about a 2 percent the first year restriction, and a zero percent the second year, and now, with the amendment that was just