

April 6, 1981

LB 59, 167, 168, 168A,
329, 333, 483, 241

engrossed; 167, 168 and 168A, 329, 333 and 483 all correctly engrossed. (Signed) Senator Kilgarin, Chair.

Mr. President, LB 241 was introduced by Senator Don Wesely and Senator Haberman. (Read title). The bill was first read on January 16. It was referred to Urban Affairs for public hearing. The bill was advanced to General File. There are committee amendments pending by the Urban Affairs Committee, Mr. President.

SENATOR KAHLE: Senator Landis, will you give us the committee amendments?

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, LB 241 is the sign bill. It is the death struggle between the City of Lincoln and various members of the outdoor advertising industry. It is the Roy Mehmken Memorial Scholarship Fund bill and this bill came through the Urban Affairs Committee. The committee heard the bill and took proponents and opponents which you will find listed in the committee statement. At the conclusion of the hearing, the committee made some alterations, struck some language from the bill, striking lines 10 through 12 on page 2 and indicated a formula to describe what full economic value was and that language appears in the committee amendment, in the first ten lines of the committee amendment. The addition of the words "a legally erected" sign was for the purpose of clarification and, lastly, there is with the striking of some language that appears on page 3 and on page 4, by striking some of the new language the committee intends to create in effect a grandfathering mechanism so that signs which are now unconflicting uses may continue to be unconflicting uses or at the city's discretion, if they wish to force the taking down of a nonconforming sign that is presently legally erected that they will pay either relocation costs or the value of the formula that appears in the committee amendments. So those are the three things that the committee amendment does. It indicates clearly the formula of repayment. It adds the qualifier "a legally erected" sign, and, thirdly, by striking some of the language in the bill, it creates in effect the option of the city to keep these signs which they declare to be nonconforming uses as nonconforming uses until such time, well, in the normal course of events they would fall down or need repair, and as all of those of you who are familiar with zoning, that means that at that time you may not replace a nonconforming use but, in fact, you will have to take the sign down. That is what the committee amendments do and I would urge the adoption by the body. Let me say this, I understand there is some controversy on