

situation by saying that with regard, under LB 830, with regard to contiguous property that is contiguous to the city, that is declared blighted under 830, then in that event the old law will apply. With regard to property that is not contiguous, then in that event the rural will have the option of providing the services until, until that point in time when the city annexes out to the blighted property, and as soon as it gets out to the blighted property, then at that point in time you revert back to the provisions of current law and allow the municipality to buy that service area. So we're restoring current law as closely as you can in the context of a noncontiguous area. Those are the two concepts in my portion of the amendment.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, Senator Beutler, let me ask if I understand this correctly because I agree I think with what you said as I understand it with one exception and that is that the purchase price, when that land becomes contiguous, is the purchase price as if the annexation would have occurred upon the date that the whole project started before anything was there. And if that's true, I would have a problem that the rural had invested a substantial amount of money no doubt. It would have its rates for the rest of its customers adjusted. By the way, I agree that the initial system should serve the area that is inside the town and I totally agree with that. But if I'm understanding this correctly, it would look to me as if the price that is outlined in 70-1008 would be calculated as to what was in existence upon the date on which the connecting intervening territory had been formally annexed which could have been 20 years before, and if that's the case, it would appear to me that...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, to the chagrin of the municipalities, that is not the case, Senator, in terms of how this language was intended to be constructed and I hope is constructed because the price that must be paid is the price at the time of the annexation of the intervening property, that is the value as of the time that the city moves out to that facility, not at the time of the original annexation by the city. So the way you want it is the way it is intended and hopefully is the way that it is. The rurals have seen this amendment and have agreed to it, Senator, and that's their understanding of it. LES, for one municipality, is not really entirely happy with this amendment because they feel it does not restore their rights entirely