

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

March 29, 1999 LB 822

size of their operation. But what this amendment seeks to preclude is the waste from any of these larger facilities that may not be located in the watershed. That is, it says to DEQ, don't give us a management plan with regard to a facility that's outside the watershed that would allow them to spread waste on land that is inside the watershed. In other words, just as...just as we would preclude new class II, III and IV facilities inside the watershed because the problem of land application of waste is the major problem, so too we ought to prohibit facilities outside the watershed from putting any land applications on inside the watershed that would...or that would and could, in turn, pollute the watershed and the trout stream in just the same way as pollution from a facility located in the watershed would do or could do. So this is a pretty simple amendment and I would think logically ought to be very much in accordance with the thrust of the bill. Thank you.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Bohlke, you are recognized to speak.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Yes, Madam President and members. Senator Beutler, being as I was talking to my office on the phone, this is the amendment that would not allow you to bring the waste back into the watershed area? I support this and we've...we had some discussion of this and I think a number of people originally maybe supported this in committee and maybe now some of the industry people are in opposition, but what seems to me is why would we put a limit in the watershed area and then allow, if we do allow someone to expand outside the watershed, allow them to bring their waste from that expansion back into the watershed, which is a limited amount of ground? Now they say, well, we'll just let DEQ regulate it, but it seems to me if we're going to the trouble of making a law addressing the...the situation for those streams that that would be one that I think could bring some serious problems into an area and one that we should go ahead and put in statute. I don't think that that should be up, particularly, to the discretion of the DEQ. And so, unless I hear something different, I will be supporting Senator Beutler on this and, like I said, I think previously we've had some discussion where there was general support as we talked about wanting to protect the watershed area. And so I don't think, you know, everyone may have a difference of