

January 29, 1982

LB 198

whole election year because they do have people running in the primary and other areas do not have the similar situations. But anyway it straightens that one out for the next election.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President, I wonder if Senator Warner would respond to a question please.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Warner.

SENATOR VICKERS: Senator Warner, I apologize. I wasn't listening. I was working on some other things when Senator Kahle asked me a question and maybe you already answered this. You are attempting to add the emergency clause you said with your amendment...well, maybe first I should ask you, is your amendment printed in the Journal that we are discussing right now?

SENATOR WARNER: In substance it is...

SENATOR VICKERS: It is somewhat different than the one on page (interruption).

SENATOR WARNER: ...on page, what, 441. The significant difference dealt with how the mailing notice was handled. Senator Wagner and I think maybe...had expressed the concern because it was all required billings to be sent first class mail and the effect of it would have been, and this was altered slightly because some power districts, I understand, may use bulk mailing at some point. They would still have to use first class to notify about the voter but they wouldn't be compelled to send billings first class should they change.

SENATOR VICKERS: Okay, but I guess the question I was wondering, you mentioned the emergency clause in order to help those rural districts in the primary this year, but with the requirements in the amendment as I read it in the Journal, they have to have the notices mailed sixty days in advance. Is that going to cause a problem?

SENATOR WARNER: Yes, there is in that NPPD is the only one that I understand that is affected by the primary and they could not meet that sixty day notice.

SENATOR VICKERS: So you took the sixty days out?

SENATOR WARNER: No, it is in there but I understood the REAs didn't have that same problem.