

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

February 18, 1999 LB 86

an advisory board. Well, yes, it creates an advisory board. But this is a very limited advisory board, and I hope that you would find that it has a useful purpose. The purpose of the advisory board, to be convened by the State Auditor's Office, is to advise that office about reform of the budget documents that are currently filed with the State Auditor's Office. Can those documents be simplified? Can they be unified? Can they be made more user-friendly? What can we do to assist local political subdivisions to meet their objectives within the budgeting process, and at the same time keep the documents that are filed with the State Auditors' Office in bounds? Something that a person of reasonable intelligence could work through and still provide the necessary information. The board would terminate on July 1st of the year 2000. I don't know how often they would meet. It would be composed of representatives from local governing bodies, professional public administrators, private sector accountants whose practice includes performing financial audits of local governments. One of those people has to be from a school, one from a municipality, and one from a county, and one shall represent the other types of political subdivisions required to file annual budgets under the act. There is...there is some current law that says that the Auditor's Office can produce the types of forms that are going to be used after consultation with local bodies. But I think it's time, quite frankly, to review the structure of all of the documents and to see if we can't simplify it. If you've ever worked through one of these documents, they're very long, they're complex, and I would hope that we could make that a little more user-friendly. The committee amendments do a couple of rather technical things. If you recall, a couple years ago, we required political subdivisions to budget, in a specific fiscal year, 70 percent of their prior year's motor vehicle receipts. That provision has long expired as a useful provision and is struck. There is a change in the definition of "restricted funds" so that we would not include within restricted funds the amounts necessary to pay the principal or interest on bonds. Of course, it's not appropriate to include those items in restricted funds because those have been voter approved, so they're exceptions to what we would normally think of as restricted funds. And it specifically then includes, within restricted funds, monies that would be received as motor vehicle tax. Remember, we've changed the way that that works. It's not an ad valorem tax anymore,