

have to pay a sign owner for taking down their sign. You could just leave the sign up. Now with the adoption of the amendment, you essentially have these options. Number one, a city with a sign ordinance would perhaps leave the sign up. Number two, they could just pay for relocating the sign. They could just have it moved somewhere else where it would be in compliance. Number three, it could just wait until that sign would be altered by the change in business or ownership and then at that time bring the sign into compliance. Number four, it could remove the sign if it was deteriorating and a threat to public health and safety so that that would be another option that would not require compensation, and then, finally, and finally, and this is the one key element of the bill is that after all those options are exhausted they still have the last option that they do not have to necessarily use which would say that the sign could be taken down by the city, but if they take that person's property, they will pay that person a fair price for it, and that is, essentially, all that the bill really gets at but it allows all those additional options, and so that at the last resort, if all of these others fail, the city would have that option to take the sign down, to use their police powers to say "Your property can no longer exist and you can no longer have it standing", but if they use that police power, then that person gets compensated for the loss of that sign that they owned and that property that they possessed. And so that is what the amendment would essentially do, add a couple of more options to the city that they could use in lieu of having to take a sign down. Those two options again would be to allow for the grandfather clause, make it clear they could leave them standing, or, number two, they could require that any change in that sign would then have to bring that sign into conformance with the ordinance that it is under. So with that I think the bill is extremely fair and urge your adoption of the amendment.

SENATOR KAHLE: Senator Haberman, you are next. Senator Hefner.

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. President, colleagues, I rise to support the Wesely amendment. I think it is a good one. It institutes the grandfather clause and I certainly feel that we should have that in this bill. It also helps to update the signs that we have along our roadsides and in our cities and villages. I think the amendment is reasonable and is fair and I would just like to say that I also support the committee amendments and the bill. I feel that an owner of property such as signs, such as advertising signs, should be reimbursed at a fair and equitable