

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

March 24, 2000 LB 968

city would like to work when...work with, is something that they had planned to use MIRF bonds for. MIRF is the Municipal Infrastructure Act. We sent out money to local political subdivisions from the cigarette tax and that's to be used as a stream of revenue that the cities could bond against. One of the things that we found was, since this wasn't a construction of infrastructure but was the refurbishment in the operation, that we couldn't use the existing language and we needed to have a somewhat broader utilization of what we could use MIRF monies for. So what the bill says essentially is that you can use, for operations and activities of municipal government and to provide services to residents, and that that is a reason for which you could have a bonding mechanism against the revenue stream of the MIRF monies. Raised at the time of the committee hearing was a point by Senator Redfield, would these monies be inside or out of the budget, and, frankly, we hadn't thought about that at the time and she made a motion in committee which the city of Lincoln has subsequently thought, well, of course, it makes perfect sense and that this should be a restricted fund, and that language is parroted in this amendment as well. The second idea that's in this amendment is another idea, another issue reported out unanimously as well from the Government Committee, as I recall. Our city of Lincoln, Class IV school along with lots of others, have a provision that says you can have bonds but they need to be callable in five years. They have to be callable in five years. And the language of the amendment changes that to make that permissive. They could be callable in five years at the discretion of the school board. In other words, they could choose whether they wanted a callable in five year provision, or they could choose not to. Why would a school board choose not to? Because in today's varying economy investors are looking for stable investments. The longer an investor can rely on a rate of return the more likely they'll pay...they'll accept a lesser rate of return in exchange for stability. Our bond counsel in Lincoln, facing as it does a \$50 million bond for new construction, has said if we put in a callable in ten years provision we would save about \$1,400,000 of bond payments because investors would accept a lower, by ten basis points, bond cost because they could then rely on their return for ten years and not five. We would like to save \$1,400,000 of bond costs. To do that, we want to turn our school board into having the choice of having the five-year