

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

February 2, 1999 LB 232

been historically a good proportion of their revenues coming from the state level. What I wanted to indicate to you though that...is that the funding has been flat in a number of areas, except that we've added a Natural Resources Enhancement Fund, which is funded with the fertilizer tax, for \$2.5 million. However, that funding is currently scheduled to come to an end next year so they would be losing about \$2.5 million there, plus, in addition, you may recall that you changed the motor vehicle revenue tax last year to cut out the natural resource districts and to refocus and direct that money to school districts and I think one or two others. But the effect of that was to cut out from the natural resources districts another 1.7 or 1.8 million dollars. I think there is a bill hopefully to deal with that this session, but at this moment of time, the natural resource districts are scheduled to be without, in short order, two major funds, 1.7 of motor vehicle taxes from that fund, and 2.3 to 2.5 in fertilizer tax fees. So the only reason I'm mentioning that at this particular point in time is to indicate to you that the justice and fairness of treating natural resource districts the same as cities and counties is not the only reason for this bill. They badly are going to be in need of this money, and they are in the need for it at a particular point in time when they are trying to put into effect their ground water management plans. So this would be of some solace to them to at least recover this quarter of a million dollars and have it available for their purposes. Thank you.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Senator Beutler. To speak to the advancement of 232, Senator Schrock.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Beutler has outlined the bill well. It just means that the NRDs will not have to pay the sales-use tax, and he also outlined quite well the dilemma the NRDs are facing. They're facing a loss of their motor vehicle tax and they are facing a loss of their fertilizer tax. They are facing about a 4.5 million dollar loss. So if we give them this 230 some thousand dollars, it's not much...it's not much of, shall we say, it doesn't...it doesn't come anywhere near close to replacing what they potentially will lose. Now I think the Revenue Committee is certainly looking at the situation. They're certainly aware of the problem. So I think we can find