

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

April 13, 2004      LB 625

does...allows the landlord, or...I guess that would be the only word for it, the person renting the home, to get information regarding the investigation. And the second thing it does is allow copies of all investigation reports, if there's not an aggrieved person, but a tester doing the testing. And I'm trying to balance the benefit of those two provisions being in statute, in our new statute, versus the detriment or the down side of potentially losing \$500,000. And I'm trying to reconcile those two. And I'm going to yield my time to Senator Brown, but I can't see that the benefits of LB 625, given the limited purpose that it will achieve, is worth the detriment, the potential of losing \$500,000 in federal funds. So again, I'm not certain that...I'm not sure that Senator Chambers' amendments go far enough. I'm wondering if we should just wait on the bill, given that this amount of money is at risk. And Senator Brown, I will yield the rest of my time to you. But I'm...I spoke on this motion to return rather than on the bill, because obviously, the first motion didn't go through. And I want to know what the facts are. And I know everybody in here is getting tired of arguing about all the bills and that, but it just doesn't seem to me, given the limited upside to LB 625, that it's worth the downside potential of losing a half a million dollars. Senator Brown, if you'd like the remainder of my time to explain that, I'd be happy to yield it to you.

SENATOR BROWN: Thank you. I...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Brown, about two, ten.

SENATOR BROWN: ...I said on Select File, when the question was raised by Senator Beutler, that if I thought that there was a chance that we would lose funds, I would not be interested in pursuing in LB 625. I have spent a lot of time with this. I absolutely believe that we will...we will be required to go through a hearing, there is no question about that. There is a hearing whenever there has been a change in law. But I think the change is...it's not to the underlying issue of whether people can receive the information. It is to the issue of how they shall receive that information, how they shall be notified about the information. And I believe that HUD's own language says that aggrieved parties and respondents can receive the