

essence, what the Schmit amendment does is narrow it down to the railroad lawsuit that we now have on the 4-R Act, and that is a very limited thing, and that is fine, because, in essence, that is what I am trying to help counties be able to budget for so they do not have to have another bailout, they don't get hit again. My concern will be in the future, if for some reason another entity, such as the pipelines or what have you, are successful, the way the Schmit amendment in lines 8 and 11 are ruled is that the counties would not be able to budget for that, would not be able to do anything about that until the next following year because you have to...it is only a taxpayer who has filed a similar action in the preceding year. So the counties would not be able to, and/or school districts would not be able to budget for that and, once again, the Legislature would be in a situation of having to come up with millions of dollars in order to bail out those entities during that time period, and it was my feeling in reading the body last year that we did not want to come out with bailout money again, we did not want to fight this issue again. LB 643 as it is written would basically say to the body, we are not going to have to deal with this issue as far as the bailout ever again. We are giving some latitude to county boards who are responsible and accountable to the people that elect them, and that is to be sure, but we are giving accountability or we are giving them flexibility only in the area of tax losses, tax losses. With the pressure that is on property taxes, I can't imagine too many county boards that are going to, all of a sudden say, good Lord, look what we might be able to do on valuations and estimations, and we are really going to get that money coming in and estimating because there are two problems with that logic. Number one, the counties are going to have to increase the mill levy, which right now they are getting under tremendous pressure to keep at a minimum, not to go up, many at their maximum levies at this point. And, point two, they are assuming I think that if they do estimate and if they do have large expenditures, that they will be able to transfer those funds from that at the end of year when they say, oh, our mistake, there is no challenge. There wasn't anything pending, we are just going to use that money and slip it over there to roads and bridges. That is not going to happen, in my understanding of the counties, and, of course, please correct me if I am wrong, that is not possible to do. They may be able to carry it over. Counties are not necessarily going to be one that like to have a nice slush funds that they really can't use. So I really don't...I understand the concerns they have, I am not particularly convinced that that is reason