

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

May 11, 1999

LB 105

they live there not receiving a direct subsidy does not mean that there's an expense or a savings incurred there. I think that we need to have these limits. And in continuing the numbers that I was using before and even on some prior amendments, this would rein in the numbers so that someone living in Omaha could basically live there even though they could afford a \$1,340 a month apartment. In Norfolk it would be \$1,050, and in Sioux County it would be \$672.50. And so I think we need to set some limits there to rein that in and make sure that there's fair competition and all things will be considered evenly. Thank you, Mr. President, and I would entertain any questions or concerns and certainly urge the adoption of this amendment.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Smith. For discussion on the Smith amendment, Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES: Mr. President and members of the body, could I ask Senator Smith a question, please.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Smith, would you yield?

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

SENATOR JONES: Do I understand it now we're talking about urban and rural here far as the income, and that this would lower the rural down to equal the urban? Explain that just a little bit more.

SENATOR SMITH: Right, it evens out the numbers. Before there...the consideration was 100 percent of median income in counties greater than 30,000, and 125 percent in counties less than 30,000.

SENATOR JONES: So it would lower the rural down then to match the urban.

SENATOR SMITH: Essentially, yes. You know, there could be a lot of different factors in there, but this would create the more level playing field and consider some things. I think we might have run into some other questions with that difference in playing field.