

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

March 22, 1999 LB 142

being cut out from recovering under the motor vehicle tax structure, are losing \$1.7 million this year and, in addition, and this is all part of the same thing as far as I'm concerned, the Revenue Committee killed outright the extension of the fertilizer tax which currently is adding \$2.3 million to NRD funding. So as between those two losses, one of which will take effect this year, the other of which will take effect next year, the NRDs are losing about the same amount of money as the community colleges--roughly \$4 million. As a general proposition, I do not understand why we want to whack the NRDs with a \$1.7 million loss today when we have the alternative of supplying that money to the NRDs and, if refinements are necessary, do the refinements next year. Why is it that we would want to disrupt NRD programs this year in order to make some kind of statement about \$1.7 million? Let me be clear then, first of all, on what this amendment does, and if this amendment should pass I would have no other amendments or discussion on the bill, but I don't think it is in any way an unreasonable amendment. What it says is essentially this. The motor vehicle tax problem, put that to one side. I don't deal with the motor vehicle tax. But the amendment adds an amendment to Section 77-27,136 of the statutes, which are the general state aid statutes to counties, to municipalities, and to NRDs. And it says, with respect to the funds currently going to incorporated municipalities, that you would reduce their funding by \$800,000. And it says, with regard to the general aid going to counties, that you would reduce their funding under the general state aid formula by \$800,000. And on the other side then it says, with regard to state aid going to the natural resources districts, that you would increase it by those two \$800,000 deductions, by \$1.6 million. So what you would be doing is making the natural resources districts almost whole for the money that they lost under this bill, and what would you be doing to the counties and municipalities? You would be taking that \$13 million excess that they never had before, \$13 million that they've never had before and simply reducing their overall contribution from the state by \$1.6 million so that the cities and the counties are still getting in excess of \$11 million more than they ever got before under the combination of their general state aid and the motor vehicle tax return. It seems to me that this is a sensible solution to a very real loss. And one can argue that perhaps they should go to their property tax levies.