

summary of the differences between the committee amendments and Senator Schmit's and my own amendments to those committee amendments and let me go through those very briefly. I would like to explain them in just general terms. First off, we changed the definition of disabilities in these committee amendments. The committee amendments are somewhat like the homestead exemption disability sections that we talked about earlier today. They list specific items and disabilities that would be included and as we have seen with that discussion this morning, and when you do that you get into some trouble because then you add or you subtract a specific item from that list and it is a much better, much cleaner thing to just develop a functional definition that identifies how these people are affected by their disability and the Welfare Department now uses functional disability definitions and that seems to be the pattern in other states that have a program like LB 389 would establish. So, from looking at other states and working with the Welfare Department we found that a change in the definition would be better if it would be functional rather than categorical. The second change we have is we reinsert assistance for medical assistance and architectural modifications. Now these items were deleted from the bill but we want to reinstate those and we want to reinstate those because they are not definitely going to be provided but they are an option and there are times when people will need these sort of assistance in medical and architectural changes. They are found to be necessary in other programs in other states and they would only be used if they were found to be necessary. So, our feeling is we should not delete those items at this point but, in fact, allow the Welfare Department the opportunity to include those if they find them necessary. The third change we have is inclusion of resources and determining need. The bill says that we have to look at income. We have to look at resources when we determine who is eligible. Well we say, terrific, let's look at the income of an individual and their ability to pay but when you look at resources you are looking at, for instance, Senator Schmit may have a farm and he may have a large number of resources but his income may be very small. So, we say do not include that resources because that really isn't a factor that he can call on without having to sell part of his farm. So, the thought is, just look at the income guidelines and so that is usually the way they do things in other programs and that is what we would like to change in this. The fourth change we have is the limitation on total support. We put a maximum lid of \$500,000 in any one year that could be spent. This is an indication again, that this is a pilot program to help people with a child in their home to keep that child at home and also to help those who want to work who are handicapped, to take that work and not totally lose all benefits. We also, besides identifying the fact that