

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

March 30, 1999 LB 822

little conversation away here from the microphone to decide what's going on, but I'm not quite sure that we need this amendment. I'm not sure that it hurts the bill, but I'm not quite sure that we need it. So, maybe something can be worked out. But time remains to...we'll see what time does for us here. With that, I'll conclude my remarks to see what the sponsor of the amendment...if he wants to pursue this any further.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Schrock. Senator Schellpeper, on the Beutler amendment, followed by Senators Bohlke, Wickersham and Jones. Senator Schellpeper.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members. This amendment, on its face, sounds like it's something that we could accept, wouldn't be too bad. My problem with it, I think we're giving more authority to DEQ and taking away from the Legislature. I'm not sure I want to go down that path. I think the Legislature needs to keep control of designation of different streams and how we're going to head down this path. I am not ready to give up my responsibility as a senator and head down that path. On its face it looks like it's kind of an innocuous amendment, but it has a lot more into the amendment, I think, than what people are actually...actually reading into it. Now maybe there can be some kind of a compromise on this amendment. Maybe we can come up with something that would be acceptable to everyone. But in my opinion right now I'm not going to support the Beutler amendment because I don't think it's the path I want to go down right now with DEQ and these cold water streams. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Schellpeper. Senator Wickersham, to speak on the Beutler amendment. Senator Bohlke to speak on the Beutler amendment. Excuse me, Senator Wickersham. Senator Bohlke.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Yes, Mr. President and members, currently, there's some conversation going on. My staff had conversation with DEQ. DEQ said that it's very difficult to downgrade. The EPA does not allow it very often and, yes, that the water could come back. And so I think that that's the point I was trying to get to. We wouldn't want to not allow...we wouldn't want to