

March 26, 1979

LB 250

but I have to emphasize again all this does really is finally cutting out the endless kind of court actions that go on between various cities and the railroads of who benefits what. We finally have to put it into law. It is simply a faster and more economical way for both parties to do it that way. I don't think the railroad can cut it out if the city writes the ordinance in such a way to make very clear who benefits and who has to pay. The railroad in the hearings came out very clearly, the railroad does not object to paying if there are railroad installations involved and the bill very clearly reflects that.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is the adoption of the committee amendments...no, I'm sorry. The motion is to advance LB 250 to E & R for review. Pardon? Senator Pirsch, do you wish to be recognized?

SENATOR PIRSCH: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of Senator George if he will yield.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator George.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Senator George, the committee has left stricken the 60% of the resident owners. Is that correct, and have changed it to owners of record title?

SENATOR GEORGE: No, we did not change the 60%. That is just a different language we use here but the 60% is still in. Instead of resident owner it now says owner of record title representing more than 60% of the front footage. So the 60% is not changed.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Right.

SENATOR GEORGE: The only thing we changed is...

SENATOR PIRSCH: Resident owner or the owner of record...

SENATOR GEORGE: ...resident owner to owner of record... That means anybody who owns that piece of property can vote on that whether that person lives within city limits or not, should not really enter into that.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Could you give me some example of why you changed that to...?

SENATOR GEORGE: Well for instance, Senator Pirsch, if somebody would own an apartment building in a particular