

with the 4-R Act and assure that at least that four and a quarter million is paid and distributed to local governmental subdivisions, rather than run the chance that a lawsuit might be lost. It makes a significant difference, obviously, when that lawsuit is filed. If that lawsuit is filed after levies have been set, late in the year, then you are in the position, local government is in the position where they are going to have a shortfall of revenue in anticipation of what otherwise would have been collected. The other option that probably, which would be less of a problem for local governments, would be if the railroads would file suit to enjoin the State Board of Equalization distributing the valuations by governmental subdivisions, if it occurred at that point, it would be less of a problem, probably, for local government because the levy perhaps then could be set without assuming that valuation. But it seems to me that this is a more desirable route to go. I assume there will be conversation about this issue and LB 1063 in the time in which it all occurred, and I can only speak of the knowledge that I have. It was my understanding early on that there were some requests that were being considered that came, I believe, through the Governor's Office, but, in any event, of railroads, and there may have been others, who had some suggested requirements, one of which was the constitutional amendment that if one was passed would carry provisions related to the federal statute designation of the 4-R Act, which seemed an inappropriate thing to do. I recall some discussion that it'd be an absolute mandate on the part of railroads which seemed...or on the part of the state to comply which seemed inappropriate to do, but as it developed, it seemed to me that, and I was not aware of the extent of the issue as I am now, until after LB 1063 had been advanced to, well, not only advanced to Final Reading, but was ready to be read in a couple of days. I think Senator Moore made some comments earlier that...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR WARNER: ...some of these things should have been considered in LB 1063. I don't disagree with that except the concept, you will recall, that the Legislature had, at least several members of the Legislature seemed to desire, was that LB 1063 be enacted prior to the constitutional amendment being approved, and it just simply would not have been possible to have pulled the bill back at that time and still comply with the necessity of having the constitutional amendment approved prior