

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

May 19, 1999

LB 105

or wording correction, I should say on page 67 of the Amendment 7149, the E & R amendment, on...it begins, the amendment begins working on the wording starting on line 5, Section 54, subsection (1). What that paragraph is intended to say is regarding eligibility for...based on income in a mixed-income development. Income...income eligibility is determined by relationship to the median income in the county. So what is intended here is that in a mixed-income development there are at least 40 percent of the occupants that have an income between zero and the eligible income and not more than 60 percent of the residents or occupants that have an income between that eligible income and 100 percent of the median income. Now implied in that statement is that the eligible income is somewhere between zero and 100 percent of median income for the county, or...yes, for the county. There would not be anyone allowed in the development whose income exceeded 100 percent of the median income. This is not meant...this amendment is not meant to be a substantive change in terms of those percentages or the concept of mixed income, rather it's simply intended to clarify the wording and I don't happen to have a copy of the wording that's being substituted. I'll try to get that, and if there are any questions, I'll try to answer them. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: It should be on your machine, Senator. Senator Schimek, on the Raikes amendment.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. I rise in support of the Raikes amendment and I think what happened here is that in the course of adopting the amendment on General File, the language somehow got twisted in the E & R copy, and so Senator Raikes was really on the ball and came to me and said this doesn't sound right. And the more we looked at it, we realized it didn't say what it was supposed to have said and what it did say in the original bill. So I'm happy that Senator Raikes has found this and we can get it corrected before we get to Final Reading. We talked about trying to amend it on Final Reading but thought this would be the preferable way of doing it, but I know that you've just gotten the language up on your gadgets, so I wanted to be sure to give a little time for you all to look at it. But it does what Senator Raikes says. It does what the bill was meant to