

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

March 29, 1999 LB 822

one way or another, and I'm really concerned on this issue. And I know that people behind the glass are opposed to it, but before hearing from those people there was general support for this philosophy that if we're about protecting the watershed then we should protect it, and from the large operations that we are allowing outside the watershed area they simply should not be able to bring their waste into the watershed and apply it in a limited area. Those of us who worked on 1209 last year know that we talked a great deal about best management and the amount of acres that should be necessary according to the amount of...I think one of the better words we used was nutrients, the amount of nutrients that need to be spread on the ground. Well, this goes absolutely counter to that, it seems to me, and counter to why we have the bill. If we're going to say that it's to protect the streams and we aren't going to allow any new large confinements and we are going to allow some expansion for those who are currently operators, and so I think we've tried to be reasonable, and then we're going to turn around and say, however, if you have a brand new operation outside the watershed and you want to haul your nutrients or waste, or whatever, back in and apply on the ground, we're going to leave that up to the discretion of DEQ. I think we should be very clear as to our intent about protecting the streams. I do not think that we should leave this up to DEQ. And if this is not resolved on General File, I really consider this a major, major issue, and so I hope we're paying very close attention and if you have questions that you're asking them so that you can make that determination as to how you want to protect the watershed and what you think is reasonable or not reasonable. I stand, once again, in support of the Beutler amendment.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you, Senator Bohlke. Senator Schrock, you are next to speak.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Madam President, members of the Legislature, livestock waste is a nutrient and it's beneficial to growing crops. It probably matters little whether we're spreading livestock waste or whether we're spreading commercial fertilizer. The argument could be made that that commercial fertilizer, in the form of nitrate and phosphates, could be just as damaging to a trout stream or any other stream as livestock waste, and I think, if permitted by DEQ, the proper application