

create housing authorities. That is current law, and then it says, "and joint housing authorities". So now we are providing for the creation of a new kind of authority except that cities of the metropolitan class...did I say line 27, I am sorry. I am reading now up on lines 4 through 8 on page 3, okay, but it says that cities of the metropolitan class shall not create or participate in joint housing authorities. So everybody can have joint housing authorities except Omaha and I am putting in there everybody except Omaha and Lincoln because to my knowledge nobody in Lincoln has come to me and said we want a joint housing authority. I personally don't see the need for a joint housing authority in Lincoln and I would just as soon exclude Lincoln from the bill. If the rest of you would like to have joint housing authorities, that is fine but the second point of the amendment is to exclude Lincoln from the power to create joint housing authorities. The third point in the amendment, the third of the four points, is back on page 36, if you want to turn there. Now one of the things that the bill does, it is a real hodgepodge. It dwells into a whole number of areas with regard to housing authorities and housing development and it looks like a number of agencies have come together and thrown in all the changes that they want in a number of different areas. And starting on page 34 there is new language that continues on to page 36, all of it has to do with the rules and regulations pertaining to tenants and the termination of tenancy and what the authority can and cannot do with regard to tenants and one of the things that it provides is that if property is left with the authority that they have the option to dispose of the personal property in any manner in which the authority deems fit. Now they have some incentive to sell the property for all they can get because the proceeds from the disposal in this case are to be paid to the general fund of the body that created the authority. But I didn't want to give them the prerogative of selling that property at less than fair market value. There is nothing in here that says that you have to sell it at fair market value. I wanted to preclude the situation where for some reason or another they may want to sell it to one individual or another just to get rid of it for less than its value. So I made a change there and required that it be sold at fair market value. Now the fourth item is possibly, and certainly in a philosophic sense and a very practical sense, the most important of the four items and I would like you to turn to page 42, if you would. You will see on page 42 a number of lines that have been stricken and then you will see some new language and the new language says that bonds may be sold or placed at either public or private sale in such manner and upon such terms as are authorized by resolution of the authority. Now what is being changed here if you look at the crossed out language