

reduction, a levy cap, this seems like a small amount. By putting it in, it was a small amount initially. But 2 percent just in the second year is probably not even an inflation factor or a cost of living amount so...and I realize you can argue, well, where do we draw the line; and I think this would be less than the first year. They're going down a little bit more. But sometimes, and when I served on Appropriations I found situations where by continually cutting actually an agency is hampered from operating and doing and becoming efficient. What I think and it's a small amount, but sometimes entities need to spend a little bit more money up front in order to make the savings down the line. So I think this is, even though it's a small amount, I think that it is justified in the fact that we have the next year it will be significantly reduced in terms of a levy reduction. So what I'm saying is this 1 percent additional by, only on the second year, by a 75 percent majority vote of the governing body will allow some of those entities to prepare and get ready for that next step. And I hope it isn't a big enough one that we have our entities breaking their legs per se. So with that, I ask that you consider this small amendment and give it your support. Thank you.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Avery. Senator Kristensen.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I rise to oppose the Avery amendment. I think on General File we came to a, what I would call, a meeting of the minds and the concessions were made at that time between those interests who wanted to have a zero/zero spending limitation for this interim period of two years and those that wanted none and those that wanted something in-between and that's where we came up with the three and the one. To do this now may sound like a 1 percent increase, but actually it's a doubling of the exception and in those terms that is a big thing. The reason that the policy is there to have a difference in expenditure limitations is that next year we will ease into the levy limitations, the next year tighten a little bit more, and then the levy limitations take over in the third year. So if we're going to go up to the two, you have one more year of the Legislature in which to increase that up to three or do away with it. I think it's the good policy at this point in time leave it at the one. That's uniformly what we tend to agree on at least on General File. I think that that was a move made as