

March 11, 1980

LB 689

Sieck amendment? Record the vote.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of Senator Sieck's amendment.

PRESIDENT: Motion carries. The Sieck amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Vickers moves to amend the bill and his amendment is on page 1010, but before we get to that, he wants to amend his own amendment. If you look at the amendment found on page 1010, Senator Vickers would amend that by inserting the word "new" before the word "irrigation".

PRESIDENT: All right. We are now on the Vickers amendment to the Vickers amendment. Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President, members, if you don't mind, I will just explain both amendments at once.

PRESIDENT: That will be fine.

SENATOR VICKERS: As 689 came across on General File and as I read on page 2 of the committee amendments that in fact was the bill now, line 24 through line 2, where it says "No penalty shall be charged in excess of \$1,000 per year. For purposes of this section improvement shall mean any new structure or addition to any existing structure." Since we are talking about real estate taxes, I visited with Senator Carsten following the advancement of LB 689 to Select File as to whether or not this would include an irrigation well, if in fact some dryland became irrigated land with the construction of an irrigation facility, would that then fall under the guidelines of being addressed here by LB 689. This came to my attention because of a bill that Senator Sieck had before the Public Works Committee and mentioned the fact that when his area NRD had a control area established they determined that there was some irrigated land that hadn't been recognized as irrigated land in the past. I am sure this probably could happen elsewhere in the state but to clarify things it seemed to me that we should put it in the statutes. Now I was further informed by Senator Carsten that he did check with the Revenue Department and they indicated to him that under the language that the committee was putting in 689 that an irrigation well wouldn't in fact be included as a new structure. Now what I had printed in the Journal on page 1010 was an irrigation well and then it dawned on me that I had no intention of