

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

March 30, 1999 LB 822

downgrade a stream, then have the water come back and that would now have been downgraded, and you would allow expansion in the area. And so I think something currently is being worked out. But DEQ recognized that there are, I think, some positive parts to this amendment. So, hopefully, we can get this worked out that would allow us, with those streams that, for one reason or other, may have a momentary loss of those criteria that make it a cold water, but in the future could very well come back. And for about protecting the watershed, I think we have to keep that in mind. And so, with that, I will close for now. And I think Senator Beutler had some wording he was looking at that may meet with the approval of those concerned. And so thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Bohlke. Senator Wickersham, followed by Senator Jones, Beutler, and Schrock. Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Mr. President. And, Senator Cudaback, I still have difficulty with that, but I'll.... Who knows? I think there aren't any constitutional limits to being president, maybe you'll wind up being Mr. President. (Laugh.)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: I am appre...I don't know how to describe my current state of mind about the bill and the amendment, but it is increasing apprehension, because I'm not sure where all of this is supposed to lead us. We have, in a variety of ways, attempted to address livestock waste issues, their impact on water, both groundwater and surface waters. But I'm beginning to get a sense that what is being proposed in this bill is far more restrictive than anything that I think is necessarily appropriate. If we're to have, and I don't know if this is exactly directed at pristine streams, where there is no human interaction or involvement with the streams, I don't think that's exactly what's intended. But I don't know if we have the right balance here. And I wonder, in addition, quite frankly, if we aren't creeping up on something that appears to me to be almost a zoning kind of regulation that we have always left to local governments. I remember last year that there was a discussion about that in terms of a statewide moratorium on a kind of activity. Everybody said that that was not appropriate,