

a major street improvement simply because we had some obstinate kinds of people who didn't agree with the chamber and with the council and with the business sector. So, it took us five years to get something done that we should have been able to accomplish in one year. But why should someone care who really doesn't have a very direct interest there other than the fact that they may be an owner. So, I'm suggesting to you that we should adopt my amendment to allow the resident owner to have the fair treatment that he deserves because after all he or she, they know best about the kinds of improvement that that community needs to keep it viable and to keep it a place where people want to live and enjoy the better life. I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator George, do you wish to be recognized on the Koch amendment?

SENATOR GEORGE: Yes, Mr. President. I have to speak against the Koch amendment for a variety of reasons. The bill has gone through a considerable two year process of revision and amendments, last year it was LB 832 when we had it here on the board, General File, and we ran out of time. This year it is LB 250, the committee considered quite a number of amendments previously. You change from resident owner to owner of record is nothing new. We already do have that in state law. If you live in the first class city then the voting would go by owner of record. This law simply would adjust the second class city to the same entitlement that citizens have who live in the first class city. The example that Senator Koch mentioned, the railroad, is not the only example. If you for instance have a piece of property that may be an apartment house or a house that you rent or a business and you live only half a block away from that...lets take a street improvement district you would not live in that district. Then you simply could not vote. While there is an equal protection under the law, there is a due process in the law, and I believe that everybody that is asked later on to pay ought to have a vote whether that person lives a half a block away from that street improvement district or not. I think that it is basically an adjustment to what so far has worked pretty well, with first class cities, and I do think that if you for instance would own a piece of property with an apartment house on there why would you be against a street improvement district. As long as it serves that property you certainly would vote for it. I just don't believe that for second class cities we can take that right