

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

April 9, 1999

LB 179, 492

the Chair? Senator Bohlke.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Yes, Mr. Speaker and members, I think I believe that I support Senator Robak's overrule of the Chair in that I did have a bill before the Revenue Committee that is very similar, however, my bill did include both physical and mental disability. And so I would say the financial impact is quite different when you only include those people with mental disabilities. And because of that, that was certainly not the intent of my bill. It could be Senator Robak's intent to concentrate just on the mental disabilities. That was not the intent of the bill I introduced. And I do think that there's a substantial difference in the financial impact. Therefore, I think it's in the same subject area, but definitely, from my own perspective, as far as the bill I introduced, a different bill. And so I support Senator Robak's overrule of the Chair.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Mr. Speaker, I obviously rise in opposition to Senator Robak's motion. I think that they are substantially the same bill, and the amendment is substantially the same as LB 492. I hope you'll, just as a matter of textual exercise, call up LB 492. And if you look at page 2 and excise the words "physical or", and leave the rest of the bill in place, that's Senator Robak's amendment. Senator Bohlke suggests that we should consider whether or not the fiscal impact and the way that we might be able to estimate the physical impact would...fiscal impact would tell us whether these are substantially the same or not. The Fiscal Office tells us that they are unable to give us a different fiscal impact analysis for Senator Robak's proposed amendment than they would have given us for LB 492. And the fiscal cost estimated for LB 492 was slightly over \$14 million. Now that is not to suggest that the Fiscal Office is the place to go to seek and find out whether something is substantially the same here or not, because their estimates are based on a model, and their model simply doesn't separate physical or mental impairment; it's not refined enough to do that. I don't know what kind of a fiscal note that they would bring us, if the Robak amendment is adopted. At the moment they're not able to tell us that they're able to distinguish at all, for purposes of the model, between physical