

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

January 31, 2001 LB 128

for me. In any event, Senator Schrock, could you explain the amendment once more? It's allowing a greater percentage of the money to be used...

SENATOR SCHROCK: For the demolition of...of old buildings and their clean up in cities and villages, and it was an issue brought to us because a lot of these are orphan sites that nobody wants to clean up and so it's increasing the amount of money that can be used for that purpose.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Are these sites that have been damaged environmentally by some kind of hazardous product?

SENATOR SCHROCK: That is...that is a distinct possibility. In most cases, it is a site that may have hazardous material. Just may be a site that has asbestos or something like that in it.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Could it be a site that just has old buildings on it and nothing more?

SENATOR SCHROCK: That...that is correct.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, thank you. I'm...I'm opposed to amendment of this type for a variety of reasons and we're starting down a path here which I think is not wise. This money was originally, and originally exclusively, used for the clean up of problems that were caused for environmental reasons of one type of another. I haven't seen Senator Schrock's amendment, but if this amendment, in fact, allows simply the money to go to small villages for the purpose of cleaning lots out that simply have old and decrepit buildings on them, then it seems to me that we're essentially changing the nature of these programs, and not only changing the natures of the program but narrowing those who can benefit from the program to apparently small towns and villages. Senator Schrock, let me ask you, is this money limited to small towns and villages? Senator Schrock, I would...

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Schrock, would you respond?

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...I would ask him to yield to a question.