

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Senator Marvel and colleagues I rise in opposition to the Newell motion. Senator Johnson and Senator Newell have an attitude about SID's. They have an attitude about SID's in terms of...in terms of their relationship with suburban growth, in relation to urban growth policies in the City of Omaha and where the population should be encouraged to settle within the city or in the suburbs and the unincorporated areas around the city. Now I think a lot of us can concur with Senator Newell and Senator Johnson's general sentiments about whether we want people to fill in vacant lots in the city or continue to expand outside the city. The problem is this bill and this issue was not an appropriate vehicle for them to exercise their political attitudes towards suburban growth and SID's. Now what this bill and what this provision effects are particular SID's that have already become formed, have already created their political subdivisions, have already put in the paving and the streets and the sewers and in many cases have already sold 400 or 450 out of 550 or 600 lots and are left with a 100 or 150 unsold lots which go back to 1974 or 1973 in which they are having a great deal of problem selling because of the recessions and the realistic market we are all familiar with. Now, they would have the interest rates on delinquent taxes apply retroactively all the way back to raise the price on those unsold lots. Now that has a punitive effect on existing SID's that are out there. It is a meat ax approach in terms of doing something to channel suburban development or to discourage suburban development. If they want to discourage suburban development they ought to come in directly with a bill to do that. But, it doesn't make any sense to be punitive in our policies against SID's that are out there that have been established that have put the developments in and are now suffering severe financial hardships because of the recession of the real estate market. We should leave those people alone. To exercise their general political attitude towards suburban development and SID's using this bill as a vehicle simply does not make sense. I mean there are other ways we can handle the urban growth problem. But it is not right to take an existing development that is already there, already has the investment, already has the construction underway and say we are going to make life more difficult for you. I think they understand that. I mean I think they understand what they are going to be doing is putting these developments that are already there in even more serious jeopardy. But how is it going to help their policy? The only way it is going to help their policy is by driving some of those into bankruptcy and then the people that are left holding the bag for the assessments