

that Senator Vard Johnson had published in the Journal and it's on page 1498. However, the one significant difference is that Senator Vard's amendment cuts the amount down to something just over \$4 million. This amendment does not do that. This does not cut the total amount of money in the bill. The \$11 million is still in the bill. However, I don't know how much money is going to be available for that and I don't think anybody else does. What this amendment does is say that those that suffer one percent or more get first call. And we're talking about more than just counties and cities and school districts, we're also including the technical community colleges and the NRD. So those are the groups, those are the...that's the five groups that would come in and if they suffer more than one percent valuation loss, then the money that would be generated by that valuation loss, over one percent, would be reimbursed by the state. The estimate for that amount of this money is \$4.1 million. Now, we should stress again and again that this amendment does not touch the total amount which is in the bill, which is a little over 11 million. However, it does...it does describe how the money will be distributed. It says, in effect, as Senator Hefner has explained, that those subdivisions, those five groups of subdivisions that I named will get the first call on the money and then the rest of the money would be distributed on an equal basis to the other subdivisions. I think it's an appropriate amendment, an appropriate amendment to put on at this time. It's not a new idea. It's been kicked around in the press and, as I pointed out, it's essentially in the Journal in another form, and so I would request adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Scofield, then Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR SCOFIELD: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Schmit started to ask some questions that I think need to be asked and there are probably a number of others, as you assess whether you are ready to accept this amendment today or not. Senator Lamb has pointed out that this amendment is not a lot different than the Vard Johnson amendment, other than it leaves that total dollar amount intact. I would simply point out to you that there is a big red pen down there in the Governor's office and I think it's very likely that you will end up back with the original dollar amount that the Governor has indicated that she would support, approximately the 4.2 million. And so I think you ought to be aware of that, as we would not have an option to adjust that after such a veto. I would like to address some