

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

April 22, 1999 LB 822

towards starting to zone should have some kind of a mechanism to use that. The first bill was brought out by Senator Raikes, was that they could adopt the zoning from one other county, and we felt like we compromised quite a little to add that they could take their zoning from five other counties, and they had to be counties that were close around so that it was somewhat similar in terrain and whatever that might be, rather than from one part of the state to another part of the state, after a lot of discussion and that kind of a compromise. And I think also in the first...the first bill that was drafted was the date of January 1 of 1999, which would have been retroactive to now. We came upon the date of June 1, 1999, as a compromise, feeling that the counties that were really serious about zoning would make an effort to do that. We felt many of them knew what was happening a year ago and still did not make an effort to start zoning. So this amendment, what it does is changes the date from...from January...or from January...or, no, June 1 of 2000 to January 1, 2000. So we are again making a compromise and extending it from June 1 to January 1, but still it's a compromise with the Schimek amendment. And then also extend the ending date on so it comprises 18 months in there. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Kremer. For discussion on the Kremer amendment, Senator Bohlke.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Yes, Mr. President and members, I rise in support of the Kremer amendment. I have visited with Senator Schimek, visited with Senator Raikes, visited with Senator Schrock, visited with Senator Beutler and...and Senator Cudaback, thought about it all and...and, no, I didn't talk to Senator Chambers about this (laugh) or Senator Hartnett, but they didn't talk to me about it...in trying to determine what is a fair time line. It seems to me that if this becomes...we enact this in law in June, July doesn't seem very reasonable, which was some discussion. I don't think that the next June also is very reasonable. I think, with the emergency clause on it, that certainly the January date gives people eight months to come into compliance. I think the steps necessary to come into compliance they can meet very easily in an eight-month time frame. I just don't see any need to have it any longer than that. I think counties have had great opportunity to act. Those that haven't, I do believe, and now that want to, have a