

April 28, 1981

LB 404

amendments reestablishes the support of the County Officials Association for the bill.

SENATOR COPE: Let's use the example, say federal funds are cut down to 25%. We think we can't afford the 50% from the state and we allocate 25%. Then we would be short 25% but that would be prorated....

SENATOR FOWLER: Correct.

SENATOR COPE: ...so that the state wouldn't be in an obligated manner.

SENATOR FOWLER: Correct.

SENATOR COPE: Okay, thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Wesely, do you wish to be recognized?

SENATOR WESELY: I think we have discussed this quite a bit but just briefly, this is not a mandate for any services at this point. That was eliminated with the committee amendments. So we are not talking about mandating services so we are not talking about mandating extra cost. What we are trying to do is set up a mechanism that I think is a necessary one to allow for the state to step into the area of services to the aging which we are not now presently involved in. We are talking about 9 million and some dollars spent in this state, I think federal monies right now, to serve the aging and the state only puts up about \$400,000. Well times are changing and evidently at some point the state will have to play a role in terms of funding but that is not necessarily the case at this time. What we are doing with this bill and what the committee wanted to emphasize and that is why we would have the amendments as we have them is that we want to set up the mechanism for us to move when we decide to move in this area. But we don't necessarily through this bill take that step. So, for instance, I think we absolutely should pass this bill and I think it is in a good form at this point but if you are concerned about the cost involved, why the A bill is the point at which you can stop that funding and the support for those services but I think the bill itself certainly has got to have support because it sets up a proper mechanism. We talk about the match situation, from 84 to 16% which is now the federal-local match. We go to 75-25 and that 75% becomes a federal-state match and the 25% for the locals becomes not just soft monies which is now the case but it becomes a lot more hard, firm local support for the program. So I think it is much more fiscally prudent to do that at this point. I think that one thing ought to be mentioned is that by taking out the requirement for services

4001