

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

April 1, 1999

LB 738

SENATOR HARTNETT: Yeah.

SENATOR BROMM: ...the gist of it?

SENATOR HARTNETT: Yeah, it's...and it's limited to about two blocks or there's also feet marks in it.

SENATOR BROMM: Right.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Yeah.

SENATOR BROMM: The...the question I have, just for a little bit of legislative record, if...if it were deemed to be repair, even though it were major repair, rather than the installation of a new type of surface to upgrade the standard, that would not be able to be levied against the property owners, is that right? That would have to be a general expense of the municipality?

SENATOR HARTNETT: That's correct, Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: And this is not intended to change that.

SENATOR HARTNETT: No.

SENATOR BROMM: So, in order for this to be applied, it would be the replacement of an existing surface street with a higher level of street to meet standards of the city?

SENATOR HARTNETT: Yes, that's right, Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Okay. Let's take another situation, and I'm not going to take much time, but I do need to ask a couple questions.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Yeah.

SENATOR BROMM: The...let's say I've got a paved street in front of my house, but it's getting in real bad repair, and the city decides they're going to replace that with...with an asphalt street. Now, would this allow them to, on the gap paving statute, to assess me for that asphalt, and if not, why not?