

the municipalities and place them into some I think difficult positions. I understand what Senator Peterson said. Sure, I have sat on city councils and we have changed some things and we condemned something we pay people for the property that we take but that is generally a building or something of this nature and, of course, we are talking here about signs, and we do pass ordinances which have certain kinds of stringent positions in them in relation to a sign, where it should be placed, the size of it. The community in which I live, we have ordinances on signs and those have to be inspected by the inspector to see whether or not they are complying to ordinance. By the same token when they place those signs and we suddenly pass something else, we don't expect to have to pay for those signs because that is the risk you take, and for us now to come here with this kind of a bill, we could place any number of cities in this state I think in a serious position. And the last thing that I would want to happen was to put cities in a condition again where they are trying to maintain a position that has been their jurisdiction and I think that is where it ought to stay, their jurisdiction and not for us to come in and try to be the all-seeing, all-knowing body and give someone advantage at the expense of the municipality. I oppose LB 241.

SENATOR KAHLE: Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I, too, oppose LB 241. As I read existing law, as I read existing law, a municipality right now can permit a nonconforming sign to remain in place if it wants to do so and it can allow the owner of that sign to recover his investment in a signboard and the equipment by establishing an amortization schedule so that that investment is recovered over several years. Thus, if the sign has got a value of \$1,000 and the municipality concludes that that value can be amortized in five years time at \$200 a year, that means that the municipality can conclude that that sign shall stay in place even though it is now a nonconforming sign. It stays in place for five years, and at the end of five years, the sign has to come down. Now I think that is pretty good law. It looks to me like we have provided through our zoning laws for municipalities to be able to make exceptions on zoning ordinances to allow nonconforming structures as well as signs to stay in place. But the Wesely bill would prohibit, would prohibit the application of the amortization device to signs though it doesn't prohibit the application of the amortization device to apartment houses that no longer conform, to industrial tracts that no longer conform, and to a lot