

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

March 22, 2006 LB 915

might have rented the property to.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Yeah, and I think your idea in that regard would be strengthened, if the language included owners, so I'll assume you have no objection to that, and maybe work on some language to that end.

SENATOR AGUILAR: Absolutely.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, then down...on page 3 of your bill at the very top, it says a local public health department may charge and collect fees from the owner or owners to cover the costs directly, or your amendment will say, directly associated with monitoring the rehabilitation of such property. Is it your intent that that would be optional, or can that "may"...should that "may"...be "shall"? You intend them to recover those costs.

SENATOR AGUILAR: I would say it probably should be "shall."

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. The consequence of...one of the consequences of contaminated property is that you cannot permit the human habitation or use of the property until the rehabilitation takes place. Is there any value to putting some time limitation on the agency, with regard...well, first of all, who has the obligation to rehabilitate? It's the owner?

SENATOR AGUILAR: Yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. But the owner also has to get certain approvals from the agency, in order to get approval to then reinhabit the property, right?

SENATOR AGUILAR: Yes, and I think the amendments speak to that.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Do they? Okay. The whole idea of property that can't be used...you know, I know that we have statutes elsewhere when property is so debilitated that it's unsafe for human habitation, there is language wherein the property is actually placarded. You know, somebody goes out and puts a sign up and says, you can't occupy this property, and a notice goes