

April 15, 1981

LB 241

we are saying that it should be used as a guideline and guideline only. The reason is that if you wanted to use it specifically you need to reference it more formally than this and so I don't think we can really do that but I think what Senator Koch is trying to accomplish is the right thing, that is to say if the city did decide they wanted to take down these signs and did, as a result of that, have to compensate the sign owner, then they could use as a guideline the State Highway Department's schedule that they already have established and that would simplify the process for them, it would pretty well do what the bill says they have to do anyway and so I think it makes it a lot easier for the local governments to carry out the bill. So I think it is a good amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is the adoption of the Koch amendment to LB 241. All in favor of that motion vote aye, opposed vote no. Have you all voted? Record the vote.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the motion to adopt the Koch amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is carried. The amendment is adopted.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Marsh, do you wish to be recognized?

SENATOR MARSH: Yes, thank you very much. Senator Wesely, I would like to have you explain to me how a sign that has been up for fourteen years in a business district and under current law the city could say that sign is not in a position that we would like to have it, so that they would allow another fourteen years, how much then would be required to pay for a twenty-eight year old sign? Which has been in nonconformity for fourteen years?

SENATOR WESELY: Number one, that sign was not in nonconformity when it was first put up.

SENATOR MARSH: That is right. The first fourteen years it was not but the second fourteen it was.

SENATOR WESELY: Well, after it was already erected and they changed the zoning ordinance on them, then it all of a sudden became nonconforming...

SENATOR MARSH: And fourteen years later, how much would our city be expected to pay to take down that twenty-eight year old sign?