

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

May 19, 1999

LB 105

sure the right amendment was up here as I looked at it. I had a question. I would presume that an addition would fall under the new provisions of the bill, but I would be happy to check on that for you, if you would care,...

SENATOR SMITH: Okay, I...

SENATOR SCHIMEK: ...if you would care to have me do that.

SENATOR SMITH: ...I would feel much better with that because I think with some property that's already owned, you know, just the land itself, I think we need to get some details worked out so that we could avoid some future confusion.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Okay, thank you. I will check on that.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Smith. Senator Jones, on the Schimek amendment.

SENATOR JONES: Mr. President, members of the body, I want to stand in support of this and to answer Senator Smith's question maybe a little farther. If they've got land purchased and you go ahead, I know that it would be no problem at all because it's...be just building the new building. But if they have a building half built and that should be grandfathered in, but I...farther than that, whether you want to add any more, I don't know. But that's the way I would read it too, that anything new from there on would be...fall under the new part of the bill. So that's the way I'd look at it. But I think they're trying to get an answer for it and...but I want to stand in support of the amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Jones. For discussion on the Schimek amendment, Senator Vrtiska.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. Senator Schimek, I, in reading your amendment, I was especially attracted to the last part that says "constructed or acquired". So what that means is if you own a property and it's under the grandfather and it's acquired by somebody else, it loses that