

January 18, 1974

of Roads and in this particular we are opening up condemnation proceedings to people who own these signs that are being phased out of existence, and I move for the adoption of this amendment.

PRESIDENT: The chair recognizes Senator Whitney.

SENATOR WHITNEY: Mr. President, I don't have the amendment on my desk and I have a question of Senator Lewis relative to just how many dollars this might involve. I did try to listen to the Clerk when he was reading the amendment, but and I was just wondering how extensive this could be. Does this mean that..is it to the sign company or to the employer of the sign company who has put up a sign and then it has to be taken down. Which person is this amendment to, Senator Lewis?

SENATOR LEWIS: Are you asking me, Senator Whitney does this mean the user of the sign or the owner of the sign. Is that your question.

SENATOR WHITNEY: Are you directing it to the sign company that makes the sign how much it is going to hurt business.

SENATOR LEWIS: No, Sir.

SENATOR WHITNEY: How much it is going to reimburse him?

SENATOR LEWIS: Not at all. This is directed to the person who owns the sign, and who has it installed adjacent to high ways, and who is under the provisions of the Highway Beautification Act who are being forced to remove these signs.

SENATOR WHITNEY: O.K. now how much would my losses be if I were an owner of a business out there, how much could my losses be if were forced to take that sign down. And for how a long a period would be involved in the future whereby it would require the state to pay those losses.

SENATOR LEWIS: I don't think the losses are under the rather complex formula. The losses in revenue are really not being recognized. They do have a depreciation schedule that.. after these signs have been identified and phased then the longer they stand there the more they are depreciated, and unless the sign owner has these in steady use and has some income generated from them he's not in a position offset depreciation by continual upkeep of these signs.

SENATOR WHITNEY: Well is it just the cost of these signs that the owner of the sign would be reimbursed for, or would it be because of loss of business because of the fact that the sign was being torn down.

SENATOR LEWIS: The loss of business is not recognized in the formula that the federal government has set up, which is presently partially funded by the federal government and partially funded by the state. Now this has nothing to do. You mentioned cost. We already have a allocation of state funds on a matching fund formula for this fiscal year, so there are no additional funds involved. But since this program is moving so slowly, I think that these sign owners should have recourse to condemnation proceedings, if these desire to go that way.

SENATOR WHITNEY: Then we just pay them for the value of the sign that is being torn down, is that the point?