

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

February 28, 2000 LB 1107

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time. Thank you, Senator Suttle and Senator Raikes. And, Senator Raikes, your light is next, so you may continue.

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you, Mr. President, members. Senator Wickersham, I'll have you continue on with that, if you would like.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Would you wish to, Senator Wickersham?

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: So under...under the bill, if the local effort rate was calculated at 90 cents, then the minimum levy would be at 85 cents. So it has the opposite effect of what you're describing because 10 percent of...if we kept the current law and we had a local effort rate at 90 cents, then the...or the...I'm sorry, the maximum levy was at \$1, 10 percent of that is 10 cents, the minimum levy would be 90 cents, the same as the local effort rate.

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay. I think I follow you there, but an option would be, would it not, to...to...rather than having the minimum levy penalty 5 cents below the local effort rate, have it 1 cent below the local effort rate?

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Yes, you could state it at any relationship that you want, although I don't know why we'd pick 1 cent. I...if we were going to do something...

SENATOR RAIKES: Well, that's what it is right now, for example.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Well, that is just because of a relationship between the numbers.

SENATOR RAIKES: Right, right. But you asked why would we pick that, and one answer possibly would be because that's what it is right now.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Yeah.

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay. One other question for you on that. We also have a nonequalized minimum levy penalty. Would