

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

March 17, 2004 LB 962

be that General Fund or Environmental Trust, and then the remaining amount they would have the authority to levy for, except that they could not exceed the levy limit by more than 1 cent. So, looking around, I don't think that clarified anything, but I tried. Thank you. (Laughter)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Raikes. Senator Bourne.

SENATOR BOURNE: Thank you, Mr. President, members. Say, I'm not going to speak on this again until Select File. I do want to say one last thing. Senator Stuhr indicated, she said, I think Senator Bourne is being misleading. Well, I don't think that's the case at all, obviously. I ask you to look at your...look at your gadgets there on the floor. Look at the fiscal note for LB 962, okay? General Fund appropriation in Fiscal Year 2004-2005 is \$2.5 million; Fiscal Year 2005-2006 is \$4.7 million, and that's an ongoing basis. The amendment we're talking about right now, AM3199, would allow natural resources districts to assess an additional penny per hundred of evaluation. Okay? It doesn't say they have to; it says they may. I know a lot of people in here were on county boards, NRD boards and that before. Ask yourselves, have you ever had a levy that you didn't live up to, and you'd probably say no. So, when you add all these numbers together, an additional revenue from 1 cent on \$100 valuation, which was prepared by in-house in the Legislature so these are, in my mind, are accurate numbers, that equals \$9.8 million that an NRD could assess under this amendment, AM3199. So, doing some very simple math, \$4.7 million for Fiscal Year 2005-2006 on an ongoing basis, and the potential to levy an additional \$9.8 million, if you add those two numbers together that's \$14.5 million on an ongoing basis. It's not a one year, it's not a two year, it's a perpetuity. So how is it misleading that I look at the fiscal note, read it, pay attention, I look at the amendment, I get some information on the valuations in each of the 23 NRDs, figure out what the 1 cent on \$100 valuation means? Doesn't say they have to. The potential exists to raise property taxes by \$9.8 million. You add those two numbers together. It's \$14.5 million in perpetuity. How is that misleading? All of you have access to this information. You can add 4.7 and 9.8. It is not misleading whatsoever. How am I wrong? Senator