

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

March 22, 2004 LB 1093

body. I'd certainly oppose this amendment, AM3027. I feel that it's, a little bit, got some smoke and mirrors mixed up in it, mostly because the valuation is raising every year on most of the land across the state. The rural land is certainly raising. In the county where I am, our valuations have raised. There's some of the counties out west there, the valuation on some farm ground has lowered. It's been changed from irrigated ground to dryland because of the water situation, but that isn't...that isn't the most part. That's a small part, for the most part. Where they need the money, school districts that need the money, and I...Senator Tyson is quite right, these...they can have a special meeting or advertise for a special meeting and raise their budget levy to whatever is necessary. They also can work...they have their budget lid that has to be considered, but the money can be raised from the bottom side with specially...with a special election. And that isn't that hard to have the special election. Many school districts do that now. They usually advertise their budget meeting and the special election at the same time and they have one meeting prior to the other and so that isn't a big deal to raise the levy. By us passing something like this, this amendment, about all that does is give them the authority. That takes the buck away from them and puts it on us that we've raised their property taxes. Now if you leave that decision with your local people, they're the ones that can decide how important it is they want to...how much money they want to spend on their schools and that sort of thing. They're the ones that vote the bond levies up and down in these school districts. So I think the way the system is set up now, to leave the voting and the decision making at the local level is probably the best way to go. I don't see where we'll gain anything by putting this on the property tax. The state aid was something that came out several years ago and the idea originally with state aid was to make it so they could do some consolidation easier, and now the consolidation is still out there floating around but the state aid is dwindling every year. So I think if we go back to let some of these local areas run their own operations, we'll be better off than trying to micromanage it from here. So at the present time, I'm certainly opposed to this amendment and I maybe haven't decided yet on the underlying amendment whether to extend it for two or three years or not. I really don't think