

February 19, 1976

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Kremer asks unanimous consent to be excused the 23rd through the 26th.

Read title to LB 313. The bill was first considered on April 9th, 1975. It was again considered January 1976. Title was read February 13, 1976. There were no committee amendments. There are a series of amendments printed in the Journal. The first one is offered by Senator Dickinson which is printed on page 996 ... it's printed in last years Journal, page 996. This will be in your bill book.

PRESIDENT: Senator Cavanaugh. Well is it a Committee motion?

CLERK: No.

PRESIDENT: Alright. Apparently this has been considered so we'll recognize Senator Dickinson for purposes of his motion.

SENATOR DICKINSON: Mr. President, I do want to take up my motion at the proper time. We were discussing the comprehensive Cavanaugh amendments last week. I'm perfectly willing to take them because they affect the bill more than my amendment. I do want to take it up. I think it would be more appropriate, probably, to take Senator Cavanaugh's amendments first.

CLERK: Alright the amendments that Senator Cavanaugh offered last week were withdrawn. He has offered a new set of amendments which are found on page 702 of the Legislative Journal.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Mr. President, members of the Legislature. The amendments found on 702 are the same amendments which I distributed to you yesterday in loose-leaf form. They are a modification of the amendments offered last Friday, I believe, when we got into some confrontation over one particular amendment which, at that time, was amendment 9. I have a substitute, in this set of amendments, for amendment 9 which is amendment 8 relating to that issue and would require a public hearing before the jurisdictional governing body which would be the city council or the county board of the zoning jurisdiction in cases when an SID were purchasing park land or property from a developer who was also a trustee. This would require public notice and public hearing by that governing body in those cases. Of course it's intended to provide some review of the cost or price of that transaction. I think without that you wouldn't have very much protection of the public in the case of trustees acting and selling land to themselves in effect, but encumbering future property owners of districts.

The other amendments are substantially, as explained last Friday. The essence of the bill is to tighten the fiscal requirements on sanitary and improvement districts that require a specified period of time in which warrants must be redeemed, in this case three years for operation warrants, five years for construction warrants. They do provide that upon application to the district court and hearing by the district court and the district court making a determination as to whether or not there is some good reason why the