

strips the original provisions and carries the language that would be required to accomplish one of the reductions that is proposed on the list of areas where the appropriations might be reduced. You may recall that the sheet that was developed, passed out that many of you had, had a number of suggestions some of which was from items the Appropriations Committee had developed, some of which has been developed from the Governor's office. And on that list was a reduction potential of \$1,300,000. The program generally describes the ADC for the unborn. The committee had considered that as one of the possibilities on their list and to give you a chronological order of events during that time before we had finalized, we received a letter from one of the members suggesting that the kind of amendment included or proposed for LB 31 could be attached to LB 201 and that by implementing that particular amendment why there would be a reduction in this cost of this program of approximately \$600,000. And it seemed like a fairly appropriate possible thing to consider. And then as we further reviewed the possibility of putting the amendment on LB 201, of course, we realized that there was a potential of an increase in 201 of some eighty...there was eighty to ninety thousand dollars the first year; second year a range cost estimate somewhere between two-hundred and fifty and four hundred and some thousand, as I recall, in one fiscal note; it finally was \$400,000. And so recognizing that the amendment was placed on that bill to read...and had to be passed as a pair, the combination would mean a net saving or at least a net next year of about \$150,000 and not...a little more of a net saving this year. So the committee decided that the idea was a good one but perhaps the two ideas ought to be contained in separate bills. And what the bill does, it changes the criteria for the reimbursement for the ADC program and it changes it in such a way, and this is a program you will recall that those who qualify to become eligible for ADC assistance upon...at a time prior to the birth of a child, and the way the amendment works is that the payment once eligibility was established, if there was a single individual with no children it would be \$210 rather than \$280 per month, which is a reduction of \$70. If it was a couple with no children, unemployed parent qualification, they would be receiving \$280 with the amendment instead of the \$350 that otherwise would be qualified, or a reduction of \$70. And the same is true that if it was...one other circumstance is if there were...had a child, why the payment would be \$280 but they would not receive the additional \$70.