

claim, similar to Richardson County's claim, that could be coming in at this time along with Richardson County?

SENATOR VRTISKA: Senator Maurstad, I'm aware that there are some situations where some counties are burdened by some undue expenses, but they do not at this time qualify because of the other element that's involved in the process that we've set out. So at this particular time, I don't know of any county that would be, or any city, or any village that would be, in fact, qualified to apply for these funds or to declare an emergency based on the total amount of the bill the way it's structured.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Okay. And that's important to me because I would think we would be in a very difficult position if there were three or four counties, at this time, that, along with Richardson County, made claim, because I think we'd be hard pressed to say, you know, yes to Richardson County and no to the other three. I think we'd also be very hard pressed to say, well, because there are four applications, we're only going to provide each of you with \$50,000, because that doesn't really solve the problem either. So that's an important distinction for me. And so I'll rely on your information that your feeling is that right now Richardson County would be the only one that would be able to access the funds, based on what's occurred in the past.

SENATOR VRTISKA: That's correct.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Okay, thank you, Senator.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Maurstad. Senator Vrtiska.

SENATOR VRTISKA: I had an opportunity to respond to what I was going to say, so I'll pass.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Vrtiska. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, on that term "viable" I want to make a couple of comments so that I can try to make it clear what it is that is somewhat troubling to me. I don't want a county, city, or village to have access to a source of revenue which they would just rather not tap into. And if we leave a qualifying word, like "viable", they could argue, justifiably, that the law is not requiring