

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

February 25, 2005 LB 503

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Bourne, on your amendment.

SENATOR BOURNE: Thank you, Mr. President, members. Again, I just want to add a little clarity. What Senator Landis said is absolutely true. There will be a temporary increase in property taxes, but then there will be a corresponding reduction in property taxes, but an increase in the state's obligation. And, again, everything he has said is accurate. Everything Senator Raikes has said is accurate. This is simply a policy choice. I personally think that...and for those of you who are new or perhaps don't know, there's two levies, or two budget limitations, as I would characterize it. One is the levy authority. They can only assess \$1.10 per hundred. And the other is, their budget can only grow by, I think it's 3 percent annually. This would simply allow them to raise the levy only to the amount that they need to, to respond to this uncontrollable cost of the retirement fund shortfall, and it would also remove from their 3 percent budget restriction this same amount. I do want to point out...and Senator Stuhr, I appreciated her comments very much on this. We did discuss this in committee and she has made no commitment to support this, although she did say she would listen to it. But one thing I'll point out to you is, if you recall, last year we had the water issue and we gave the NRDs additional budget authority of a penny per hundred, which was about the same amount, \$13 million to \$15 million. And Senator Stuhr argued accurately at the time that this might not necessarily mean an increase in that property tax by that amount. I don't know if it has increased or not, but we did give budget authority last year to the NRDs to expand their budget to respond to a water issue. So, I mean, this is...this has been done and, again, I think that my personal feeling, and if there are school administrators or former board members in the body that want to comment on this, my personal sense is that the budget authority, the limit on how much their budget can grow on an annual basis is to control negligent spending, for lack of a better word. What I'm suggesting to you is that this is not a controllable cost to the school districts, nor to the teachers. Did they foresee this? Could they have seen this coming? Yes, they could have. Could