

offered as an amendment to LB 320. You have all seen that in terms of the amendment that is filed in your book. You can just open your bill book. There is a slight change. The slight change is that the technical amendment that I had offered to 320, the first one to that amendment, is incorporated in this draft, so there was some things that just had to be restructured. They really amount to nothing more than E & R amendments and they are incorporated in this proposal so that there is no substantive change at all. There is really virtually no change. There just had to be some corrections made in terms of really nothing more than typographical error kinds of proposals. So there is no substantive change. When you are looking at that amendment you are looking at the same amendment. The proposal is the one that we have come to call Governor Nelson's plan B. You are receiving right now the handout from the committee staff on what the proposal does. I would just like to very briefly walk you through that. I know that there are a number of amendments to this amendment, as well as amendments to the bill that will follow. The explanation that you have in front of you lists eight different items that are substantive in nature and then four that follow that really are not. They're boilerplate. The first proposal and the substance in the bill is the...one of the issues that we dealt with when we talked about personal property and I would like to say that we talked about personal property on three different occasions. We had two full hearings and a hearing on this proposal yesterday where they were all well attended and the public had much input, as well as interest groups, in determining what form this proposal should take, or at least making public comment on ideas that have been surfaced to date. Section (a), as you look at that on the...or point (a) on your sheet that you have deals with the statute of limitations with regard to the refunds of property, personal property statutes. These have been much of the debate that is, I guess, centered around the whole personal property tax crisis. The issue of what happens when refunds are filed by these entities that are, I guess, perfected and are due and owed to them. This provision does not impact any of those that are currently in the works. This provision with regard to refund statutes is only prospective, meaning that it will only apply down the road, it is not retrospective and it is not something that will affect any of those folks who currently potentially could file for refunds, but we don't want to have the same problems. We want to have as uniform a refund system in place and this first portion of the amendment would deal with that issue. The second portion is the motor vehicle fee