

April 9, 1996

LR 1039

SENATOR WARNER: It doesn't work that way, Senator. You've never experienced it obviously. Most people who have would argue. But the reason for leaving it out, I assume the concept is that the local government will acquire it for less cost than they otherwise would.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay.

SENATOR WARNER: Most states allow for it that have a similar provision.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Most states who have greenbelt allow for the nonpayment in the event of eminent domain taking?

SENATOR WARNER: Several states do anyway. I got the list here if you would like to look at it.

SENATOR BEUTLER: How many states...do you have the states that do and the states that don't, some do some don't?

SENATOR WARNER: Yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Oh, well, it's too late in the session. I just don't quite understand the rationale for this particular part of the amendment.

SENATOR WARNER: Well, at the hearing, those who appeared were both...I don't recall for sure. I believe there was representatives of the county or at least, no, it was an NRD I believe was a representative that was there as well as one landowner that had been involved and all of whom felt that the exemption...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR WARNER: ...for eminent domain was appropriate because it reduced the cost of the acquired...public entity.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, thank you.

SENATOR WARNER: That was the argument.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you. Senator Warner, your light is on.