

experience at a county level. I'd move the bill be advanced.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Warner. For discussion, the Chair recognizes Senator Vrtiska, followed by Senator Robinson.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask Senator Warner a couple of questions if I could, please.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Warner.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Senator Warner, I have had some inquiries about obviously the bill that was passed a year ago making the filing at the local level, at the county assessor, rather than at the Revenue Department. Seemed to be that your bill is to protect the confidentiality of those who are filing but a local attorney wrote me a letter and he basically says attempting guaranteeing confidentiality at the local level is wishful thinking. I guess, as I read the bill, I don't see any penalty for the lack of confidentiality except perhaps, and I guess I want your input, except to say that perhaps that's a malfeasance of office if the county assessor would, in fact, release that information. Is that your feeling?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: That may well be the case, Senator Vrtiska. You're correct that there is not a (inaudible) penalty in this statute. I would assume there must be some general statutes that covers breach of violation of confidentiality and I can't respond to that specifically but certainly will look into it. And I also should have indicated that the same...there is a level of confidentiality required in the bill both locally as well as the state. I don't think I stated that plainly the first time.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Well I understand that and I guess I haven't...I believe that probably you're correct. The question that the gentleman, the attorney that wrote me this letter wonders why and maybe you can't answer this but you remember the bill last year. Why was it ever moved from the Department of Revenue to the county assessor where basically it has to be cross-checked by the Department of Revenue anyway, doesn't it?

SENATOR WARNER: Yeah, I don't recall specifically why we did that last time, but I assume there was an assumption that it