

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

April 24, 2003 LB 540

SENATOR RAIKES: Yes.

SENATOR KREMER: Okay. Then you mention here in the explanation on the front page that the exclusion of the temporary aid adjustment would continue, so they would be able to go to \$1.04, plus whatever they exceeded their levy limit before, in order to compensate for what they were cut. Is that correct then?

SENATOR RAIKES: That's correct, Senator.

SENATOR KREMER: So they could basically go...I don't even know what it took, but maybe \$1.05 or something like whatever it might have taken that...

SENATOR RAIKES: And one of the reasons we didn't go further with that type of proposal is that the amount a school district would need to raise property taxes in order to recoup the lost state aid varies greatly depending upon the valuation per student. So the difficulty with that proposal, if you make it a bigger amount of money, is that it impacts school districts very differently and, in particular, would impact low wealth districts much more than higher wealth districts. But back to your question, yes, that was a three-year proposal and that is still or would carry on through the upcoming biennium.

SENATOR KREMER: Okay. Many of the schools did not even use that last year. If a school did not take advantage of the over...to exceed the levy in one year, could they go back the second and third year and exceed that levy then if they wanted to? They didn't really...they didn't decide that for all three years probably. Is that correct?

SENATOR RAIKES: That's correct. It's a decision made each year,...

SENATOR KREMER: Okay.

SENATOR RAIKES: ...as is the decision as to whether or not to take the additional 1 percent budget authority, as is the decision, for that matter, as whether to, if the levy lid is at