

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

May 11, 1999

LB 105

partnership part of it for the private development side by them having to income qualify people, by having a smaller pool that they can even rent their units to, that we're really going to make this part of the bill, which I think is a fairly significant part of the bill, almost inoperable. And I would really ask you to think about the numbers that I have given you in terms of the impact this is really going to have. The numbers are so small in comparison to the total market that I don't believe that it is a huge issue. The realtors had four issues that they...of concern with this bill. We were able to come to agreement on three of those. This is the one issue that we were not able to come to agreement about because...because, in my opinion, we are limiting a very integral part of the bill...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR BROWN: ...by...by putting an income limitation on people who can live in these mixed income units, and we've made it...made it difficult for private developers to participate and put too many requirements, and I just think it's very problematic and it damages a very critical piece of the bill, so I am not supporting this part of the Smith amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Brown. Further discussion on the Smith amendment, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this is a large bill in terms of the number of pages, and it's large in terms of what it is attempting to do. Now I have been working with some people on other aspects of this bill and, as a result, I have a host of amendments which are being drafted that I will attempt to offer on Select File, and my amendments will restrict certain areas of activity by these agencies in terms of how they can treat, or I say mistreat, tenants and people who live in the surrounding areas where these units are located. But what I'm focusing on right now is the following, and I'll be quite frank with you. I do not see a rational reason to say that because you live in a county with fewer than a certain number of people or a county with more than a certain number of people you ought to be treated differently in the law in terms