

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

May 9, 2005

LB 748

annexation in a small town, for example, and you want to annex something that's not served, I assume you can annex it and serve it. Would that...would that be accurate?

SENATOR BOURNE: Well, I don't...I don't think that's accurate. Maybe somebody from Hastings could get up and talk about this because, as I understand it, the city of Hastings annexed an area around it and indicated to the gas company out there that they wanted to now provide municipal service to that annexed subdivision, and they were told no. And again, LB 748 is a response to that type of conduct, as I understand it, and hopefully Senator Friend will interject here if I've said anything inappropriately. But I don't believe that the current statute gives cities enough of a way...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR BOURNE: ...to start delivering gas service once they do annex a particular location.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. I suppose you could have at least two different situations: one where the annexation was of territory that isn't currently served by any public or private; and another might be a situation where...and I thought the Hastings situation involved a situation where a private was serving that Lochland area and another area, and so you had two jurisdictions butting up against one another. So right now, if a public and a private...let's say, for example, that was the case there, without knowing it, but just hypothetically, if a private is butting up against a public, under current law how is that resolved?

SENATOR BOURNE: Well, as I understand it, in my area what happens if the city of Omaha expands, there is a formula in statute that sets a value on...say they...say the city of...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time, Senator. Thank you, Senator Beutler. On with discussion. Senator Friend, followed by Senator Landis and seven others.

SENATOR FRIEND: Thank you, Mr. President. Again, members of