

encouraging more of them. In the meantime, I realize there are some implementation questions about how this amendment would be put forward, but...and so I'm not going to proceed with it, but I am going to suggest that it raises the issue of how better we could do this bill than it currently is standing and I'd like to suggest we look at it further, but for now I'll ask that that amendment be withdrawn.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Wesely. The amendment is withdrawn. Do you have further amendments?

CLERK: Madam President, the next amendment I have to the bill is by Senator Landis. (See AM2013 as found on page 2388 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Clerk, has that been published in the Journal?

CLERK: Yes, sir, it has, 2388, Senator.

SENATOR LANDIS: 2388, thank you very much. Following our discussions on General File, colleagues, I did have a chance to take some of the concerns that were expressed, meet with interested parties and draft some changes. Senator Beutler raised the question of the role of the actuary in the determination of the adequacy of these plans and we have used the word independent actuary and there is a body of self-regulating governance for actuaries in their professional standards. On the other hand, in response to Senator Beutler's concern, we have added that the actuary is not only independent but who is not an employee of the plan's sponsor, that means the city or the school. Selection of an independent actuary by a plan's sponsor shall comply with the conflict of interest provisions of the Nebraska Political Accountability and Disclosure Act. In other words, you have to follow the same rules which prohibit the hiring of close relatives and the like as any potential way of lessening the independent status of the actuary. Secondly, this amendment also indicates that, with respect to the keeping of confidential information, something that's provided for in the bill, the medical histories of employees, for example, that we were asked by opponents of the bill to put in some teeth into that provision. We chose to do so. We used the open records law as the objective standard