

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

May 28, 2003

LB 622

good one, and that we ought to consider undoing what we did the other day on the floor, rather precipitously, in my opinion, and move on. If that's not doable, then I think that we ought to consider Senator Landis' amendment that would at least hold harmless some of those smaller communities. So with that, Mr. President, I return my time to the Chair.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Johnson, followed by Senator Jones and seven others.

SENATOR JOHNSON: Senator Cudaback and members of the body, third time is charm. (Laugh) I sincerely doubt that will be the case. But I think it is well for us to go over this one more time. Let's review how we do things for just a second. The current method for the lid...which, by the way, is 2.5 percent growth on restricted funds, plus an additional 1 percent that is possible. The current method bases growth on increases in net taxable valuation. I introduced a bill that died the slow death in committee to change this to net taxable sales. What the problem is for our community of Kearney is that, with the lids, one size does not fit all. There are about five or six other communities that are also going to have tight shoes in about one more year. Interestingly enough, our community is just the opposite of what we've heard around the state. Our community does very well. The last time that sales tax was calculated, I believe it was up 6 percent. Now, with the Raikes amendment, what we have is, the only option now from sales tax is property tax relief. Kearney is second lowest in the state. It, in the last ten years or so, has gone down from the lid of 45 to 12 cents. Now, I realize that there are some 240 cities that are at the 45 limit. One of the things that Senator Brashear mentioned in expanding the sales tax is that these cities were going to get a windfall of money because of the added sales tax on repairs. What we now have, however, is the Raikes amendment, as I see it, takes the money away from the cities. Therefore, the option is to increase property taxes. In the situation with Kearney, the lid is still there. We have a growing city. We take the money away. But the money we've got we still can't spend. I don't think this was in the Good Book, but it's applicable. What Senator Brashear giveth, Senator Raikes taketh away. Thank you. (Laughter)