

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

February 23, 2005 LB 66

Senator Don Pederson. So I'm going to do that on the mike. Senator Pederson, now we're looking at the committee amendment, which is the area where you and I were beginning our discussion. And before I begin to ask Senator Don Pederson questions, I want to just stake out a bit of territory. And it may seem irrelevant to this bill. But I think it's relevant because it shows how sometimes things which are done with a particular legislative intent do not work out in reality in accord with that intent. There were various bills, when the Legislature was trying to give the state away to these various companies, when legislation relating to declaring certain land blighted came before us. I was opposed to it, because the way the language was drafted, they could come into an area which was not blighted in the ordinary sense of the term, proclaim it to be, utilize eminent domain, and take people's property and turn it over to a private company. That has been done. Areas have been proclaimed blighted which were not. This bill is talking about allowing city councils, by ordinance, county boards, by resolution, to declare certain types of property to be of historical significance. I need to be sure that this is not just a tax dodge, that it is not going to create any unintended consequences. So now I will ask Senator Don Pederson a question or two, looking at page 1 of the committee amendment. Senator Pederson, in line 9, I can understand very easily talking about real property individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Would you yield,...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That's a specific building. Then we come to line 11, "Real property within a district listed in the National Register of Historic Places." Now, that's a question that I want to pose to you, Senator Don Pederson. What constitutes a district that the National Register of Historic Places would embrace?

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Thank you, Senator Chambers. And we started to discuss this yesterday, and the time didn't allow us to continue that discussion. But I would say that both paragraph (2) and paragraph (3) deal with specific concerns. Paragraph (2) is a long-standing matter dealing with designation