

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

May 28, 2003

LB 622

and '04, it's cut down to 8.8, \$8,800,000. Is...?

SENATOR RAIKES: I don't have the book, Senator, but I'm roughly familiar with those numbers.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Okay. All right. My question is, how does this amendment affect that? Is this of a bigger cut, a lesser cut, or what happens with this? Because I think what the Appropriations Committee did with both the cities and the counties, have brought part of the budget, passed both a 10 percent cut in counties, a 10 percent cut in cities. What does your amendment...or, the amendment we adopted the other day, have any impact upon this eight point...is it...does this give them more money, less money? Senator Raikes, if you can answer.

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay, Senator. Let me try to respond. First off, here we're talking about Senator Janssen's amendment, which would undo an amendment that I offered and the body accepted some days ago. The bill, as currently drafted, would eliminate the so-called roll-over provision of the MEF formula. Now, we kind of...and it was in rough fashion the other day, you might remember. The key development here is the passing, or the advancement, or now the completed advancement of the sales tax base expansion. So if you look at that new element, along with the cuts that have...you referred to, the Appropriations Committee has recommended, and the body has accepted, the net impact on cities, taken as a group...and we've already had several comments about the fact there are differences between cities in the group. But cities taken as a group, with that trade, the trade for...you take the cuts, but you'll get in exchange an expanded sales tax base, the best estimate that...is that that would leave cities better off by about \$7.5 million than before the session began.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Above the \$8 million?

SENATOR RAIKES: Yes. Yes. So in effect, they would be gaining, particularly if you compare to county governments, as Senator Jones mentioned. County governments would still be suffering a reduction. Cities, without the loss of the