

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

January 21, 1999 LB 62

That's the normal approach. It's probably for the caring of somebody in declining health, the care of somebody who maybe doesn't want to manage the property for somebody else, and those are the circumstances in which you use this.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Thank you, Sen...

SENATOR LANDIS: It's simple and it's also capped at \$100,000.

SENATOR HARTNETT: At a hundred thou.... Thank you, Senator Landis.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Hartnett. Chair recognizes Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I could ask Senator Landis to yield to a question, if he would, please.

SENATOR LANDIS: I'll do my best.

SENATOR BROMM: Senator Landis, on the top of page 4 of the bill, you have the provision about complying with the Uniform Prudent Investor Act and then it says, however, a custodial trustee, in the custodial trustee's discretion, may retain any custodial property. Okay. This is the line that I am asking the question about, the second line: On or after the effective date of this act, in the absence of effective contrary direction by the beneficiary while not incapacitated, the custodial trustee shall comply with the Nebraska Uniform Prudent Investor Act. Now, in this arrangement, you've got the transferor who put the property in trust, you've got the trustee, custodial trustee, and then you've got the beneficiary that ultimately receives the benefit of the trust. Are we saying, and maybe I'm taking this out of context, but to me it would make more sense if it said, absence effective contrary direction by the transferor, instead of the beneficiary. Does the beneficiary...beneficiary doesn't always have the ability to tell the trustee, I don't want you to comply with the Prudent Investor Act, I want you to do something different, normally. But is this the proper term, or should it...or should it be transferor in that line?