

March 10, 1983

LB 26

include situations where the land was not in an agriculture use zone, the land was not being used for agriculture purposes, the land is being subdivided and developed, or land being used for nonagriculture or industrial development. There are people that will be affected by this change in the law and Senator Beyer's efforts and mine are to make that less punitive for those people who are affected. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Is there further discussion? I will recognize you, Senator Warner, hopefully to close.

SENATOR WARNER: No, Senator Pirsch's amendment.

PRESIDENT: Excuse me, that is correct. I stand in error. Thank you.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would oppose the amendment but I want to explain the reasons why. First I should say that section 3 of...part 3 of Senator Pirsch's amendment was included in the amendment we just adopted so I have no problem with that. Part 2, I have no problem with of her amendment. The basic disagreement on the amendment is whether the parcel of land should be 10 acres or more or 20 acres or more. The reason that we have used 20 acres is to be consistent with a number of other sections of the law. The farmsteads, for example, are defined in both Section 15-905 as well as Section 23-114.03 as consisting of 20 acres or more, and since the laws already have established that an area ought to be at least 20 acres or more to constitute agricultural land or farmland, we use that 20 acre provision here. Secondly, there have been at least some assessors who felt that the 20 acres was preferable. When it gets too small, you get a lot of acreages that really are obviously not agriculture. There may be some hobby agricultural use there or something but they are not really earning agricultural land and probably would create greater administrative problems if that size of the parcel is too small. In fairness I also want to point out that I offered a similar amendment to drop it to 10 acres at the public hearing on the bill before the Revenue Committee so I do not have real strong objections to that, but on the other hand, I think that the bill is...the law is better if we stay at the 20 acres. The Revenue Committee did not adopt that amendment either. They stayed at the 20 acre provision and I think that the necessity of some continuity throughout the statutes for definitions of farmsteads is reasonable and the 20 acres does do that. So I would hope that you would not vote for the amendment although I can understand certainly Senator Beyer's and