

February 28, 1996 LB 1322

outside the scope of what we ought to be getting involved in. Now I want to preface once again, this isn't to say that I have a problem with the development of low income housing. But I think that the direction that this bill intends to take us is that the state would, in fact, after a study done by the Housing Code Task Force and with the other commission that's developed in this bill, would ultimately get into the business of solving the problems that are varied across the state relative to the size and scope of the low income housing problems. And I just think it's an area that the state ought to not get involved in at this particular juncture. So the first start, from my perspective, is that I do not see that the Housing Code Task Force needs to get up and rolling. I don't see that what we're asking the task force to do, within the scope of the committee amendment, is doable, and as such is not necessary, and would ask the members to adopt my amendment to the committee amendments eliminating the Housing Code Task Force. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Senator Maurstad. On the Maurstad amendment, Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. I rise in strong opposition to the Maurstad amendment. Let me tell you that this proposal comes from a task force that was working on this over the interim that included representatives from the Chamber of Commerce, League of Municipalities, the homebuilders, the realtors, the bankers, the Department of Economic Development, NIFA and other individuals interested in housing. It came to us and a strong request was made to take a look at the current structure of regulation in the housing industry, because what we have are duplicative situations of inspections, we have inconsistent rules and regulations in some cases, and this isn't...the focus isn't totally local. We have this problem at the state level, we do not have our act together in this area. As we've worked on health and human services to bring the pieces together, so too we need to see in the housing area what we can do to reduce duplication and waste in this particular area. I have been a supporter of strong codes, I want to see quality housing. And at the same time, I have recognized that the reason we have moved forward in some greater uniformity in codes is the cost savings that you have, not having a different code in every area was a problem. We now don't have that problem as much because we have taken that step, yet we do allow local enforcement and