

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

January 26, 2004 LB 32

could be in trouble. And that has happened in other states. Now, I don't know if that's going to happen this year or three years from now. And I appreciate your accolades, but I don't need that. I need your vote. Or if you don't want to support this amendment, then keep in mind, this is about the third or fourth proposal we've come up with to try to appease the opposition.

SENATOR MINES: That's right.

SENATOR SCHROCK: If you don't want to support this, what will you support? Do you just want to give the cities more levy leeway so they can raise the levy on property? Which I don't think is appropriate because that isn't...because the owning of property or the value of the property doesn't necessarily determine the amount of runoff you're having.

SENATOR MINES: Well, in effect...

SENATOR SCHROCK: That's the frustrations we've dealt with.

SENATOR MINES: ...in effect, this simply shifts the cost. And frankly, we're looking at property tax. Your committee, have they looked at just simply a property tax levy? The mechanism is in place already for cities and counties. Was that part of the discussion, as opposed to identifying certain parts and identifying how we're going to do the taxes? Why not just let cities and counties decide how they're going to do it?

SENATOR SCHROCK: We could do that. But it didn't...we didn't think that was appropriate. Remember, the first proposal was based on impervious surfaces, and I personally think that's where it should lay, because I've heard that the metropolitan city of Omaha, the impervious surfaces, the amount that's being paved every year is considerable. And I've heard some numbers, but I don't dare say what it is because I don't have them. But it's considerable.

SENATOR MINES: Well, it's difficult on your end. You're looking for answers and we're throwing up roadblocks. However, I'm not certain that the mechanism allowing NRDs an additional