

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

March 29, 1999 LB 822

manner, and I don't think it will impact those streams in that area of the state if they do expand to the limitations we have put forth in LB 822. And if you'd like to respond to that I can give you the rest of my time, but I still stand opposed to your amendment.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Beutler, a little over...right at four minutes, Senator.

SENATOR BEUTLER: I do appreciate the discussion, Senator Schrock. Let me ask you how you came to the conclusion that an additional 90,000, for example, animal units in a particular watershed would not have a detrimental effect on the water quality.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Well, how did you reach the conclusion then...I can...I can answer a question, how did you reach the conclusion that an additional 4,000 for each facility wouldn't, wouldn't impact? There's probably a lot more class I's out there than there are class III's and IV's. Matter of fact, I think there's one class IV and maybe three...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well,...

SENATOR SCHROCK: ...class III's in the impacted area.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...let me back up another step. DEQ said they couldn't tell me how many operations exist in these different areas, nor could they tell me what class they were. Do you have that information?

SENATOR SCHROCK: We have some information, Senator Beutler, that leads us to believe that there's one class I...or one class IV and at least three class III's in that area. And if you'd like to look at the reverse side of the map, it shows you the approved livestock permitted facilities in that area of the state. We don't...we don't know if they're all out there, but logic would tell you that the large ones have all either applied for a permit or are permitted.

SENATOR BEUTLER: The...part of the logic of my approach, Senator, is simply this. First of all, 4,000 animal units, even