

be taken at the end of a certain amount of time. Unconforming uses generally run ad infinitum until the structure falls down, burns out, sold or whatever and then it is replaced but not with the timed end as the sign ordinance is and that is why we actually move closer to existing practice by passing 241 than adopting Senator Johnson's theory. Finally, let me say this, and this is I guess why I support LB 241. The city's position, generally, the League of Municipalities position, generally, is that amortization is an adequate response, amortization is an adequate compensation to the sign holder. In my own opinion, amortization is not always the adequate response. Amortization freezes in time the value of an item and as we all know inflation passes very quickly. Amortization returns to you your initial investment costs but, in fact, some objects increase in value. A sign that was set up a year ago at \$1,000 cost which lives and has an existence for seven years and that intersection becomes very busy and those materials accrete in value and has a replacement cost of \$5,000 and the visibility of that sign has increased three or four times because of its location has actually increased in value. To amortize at \$1,000 is not a fair assessment of the value of that sign. My theory then is this, that amortization is not adequate recompense in all cases, that because of inflation, because of the increase in values of a sign or a location or a business, that a sign after seven years might well be worth more than that which you have been able to write off...

SENATOR CLARK: You have one minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...on amortization, and because of that, because in the net end result of that time period, if you force the sign to be taken down only for the amortization recompense, in effect you have a certain value that is lost to the property holder, and although this may not be of constitutional standards, I would stand by the policy that is in both the state and the federal Constitution that values taken from property holders should be compensated and that is why I support LB 241.

SENATOR KAHLE: Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, as long we are studying credentials and pedigree, I, too, served on a city council. So that makes it two to one, two say yes, and one says no, so I am sorry, Senator Koch, you are outvoted on our city council. All new signs erected will conform to the zoning laws so that problem