

This whole bill came about...last session the Government Committee was asked to consider LB 1089 and it was the precursor of LB 254. The problems with...the problem with 1089 is that it was poorly drafted, for one, and the other one...and the other problem that we had was whether or not the changes that we were making in our relocation assistance were necessary according to federal mandate. The Department of Roads came in last year and said, we have to have this bill because of a federal mandate. They had no documentation of that at that time and that was one thing that the committee said we had to have. We had to show that we absolutely needed this to meet a federal mandate. They came up with that documentation. We do have to have this in place. This has to be in place, in fact, by April 2nd of this year, of 1989. So, therefore, this bill does contain the emergency clause and must be passed with the emergency clause. If we do fail to enact this bill by April 2nd, we stand to lose...we stand to lose a lot of federal dollars that are based on relocation assistance and the Department of Roads would be the most affected by this because they use relocation assistance more than any other agency and they estimate that we would lose approximately \$25 million in federal funds if we do not pass this by the 2nd of April and it's not in place by the 2nd of April this year. LB 254 is the result of the committee counsel. Cynthia Johnson Howard has been working all summer with the Department of Roads and also with the Federal Highway Administration to try and take the federal mandates that were passed in the federal relocation assistance laws of 1987 and make those applicable to Nebraska law and make them fit within our laws. And she has done an excellent job of that. And the bill is rather technical in nature and I will continue to explain some more about the bill. First of all, first of all, this is going to apply to all publicly funded projects, not just federally funded projects and this was a decision by the Government Committee to do this this way. It's not mandated that it be for all projects. It's mandated that it be just for federally funded ones. We decided that, as a policy matter, it would be better to do it for all public projects, then you have one set of rules and regs governing relocation assistance for all agencies. You have it all in place and then everything is equal and consistent across the board. We felt that to do it any differently and to say, well, the federally funded ones will have one scheme of things, state and local will have another scheme of things, that, for one thing, it would probably be a bone of contention and another it may be unconstitutional to do that. So we made it apply to all publicly funded projects