

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

March 27, 2000 LB 1010

a viable plan. We decided that we'd try and get the attention of this board in this manner through the bill. We require...you say what's the bill do if they don't have to sell the land? They're going to be accountable to the Legislature. Senator Bromm summed it up very well. We have that authority. We are the fiduciary of these lands. The board is our agent. And if I am a fiduciary, my board, the agent, is not doing as I perceive they should be doing, in this case it's in statutes, then we better get their attention. That's what the point of this bill was. We...we hold them accountable and on page 2 of the committee amendment on line 4, "(9) the percentage of the investment", we're adding, this as new language: "the percentage of the investment portfolio remaining in real estate, including all nonagricultural real estate", that has to be included in an annual report; corresponding information on any other lands been acquired or traded. There's some accountability built into it. If they don't accept a bid, the person has a chance to raise the price. They have to be accountable back to us. They're going to have a name, tract number, offering price, legal description, so on, back to us so we can monitor their progress. There's a number of factors go into this bill besides, hey, they can't...they don't have to sell if you don't want. That's fine. They're going to have to be held accountable to us, the fidu...we are the fiduciary agent or the fiduciary of this. They are our agent. I don't see it as a problem as authority. Referring back to the program evaluation done in '97, and I'm just reading this as it is here in the report on page 41, it was the Legislature, not the courts, which in 1978, after years of making General Fund appropriations for the administrative expense of the BELF, authorized the board to pay its administrative costs directly from receipts generated on the school land. This authority was granted by the Legislature for accounting purposes. It should not be interpreted as an indication that the board has constitutional status analogous to the described to the Board of Regents by the Nebraska Supreme Court in Exon, period. This goes back...this is a program evaluation. I was not a party, obviously, to the 1996 debate on this. I can understand that there obviously was a lot of debate because that is the...the whole rationale behind this is the statutes as they now exist from LB 1205. We're simply trying to get some accountability back in here. We've left plenty of room for the Board of Educational Lands and Funds to maneuver around