

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

March 30, 1999 LB 822

normally define as zoning. But one can argue, to the extent that a particular use is prohibited in a particular area, that that is a kind of zoning device, so if that perspective pleases you or displeases you, I suppose you can use that perspective. But that's not essentially what this bill is all about. What the bill is about is protecting the environment. And it is very limited, even in its broadest application. But perhaps what I found most interesting about Senator Schellpeper's remarks is that the assumption that he made, and the assertion that he made was that, if you did not have this amendment, this bill would not apply to duly...newly designed class A trout streams. Whereas you just heard Senator Schrock say that it makes no difference whether you have the amendment, that it would apply. So, clearly, we have confusion on the floor among the proponents of the bill as to whether the amendment is necessary or not necessary. Those were completely contradictory positions. And that, frankly, because there's some confusion as to the law in some of these cases, is the reason that I suggested that this simple, clarifying amendment be added. The amendment simply makes the bill, in accordance with what the sponsor, Senator Schrock, indicated was the committee's intent. So, if that's the committee's intent, and Senator Schellpeper is confused about the effect of the bill, then surely that is evidence that we ought to put a clarifying amendment on and simply make clear what the bill does. And that's all this amendment does. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Beutler, there are not any more senators wishing to speak on your amendment. Do you wish to close?

SENATOR BEUTLER: No, I guess, I shouldn't take up additional time. I...I think that I've been clear on what the amendment does. It is not a huge matter, it is in accordance with the intent of the introducer. It's not going to have any practical effect on streams that are no longer cold water streams, or undesignated. It doesn't say anything about those, nor do I think it's necessary to do so. But, if somebody wants to add an additional amendment to that effect, I certainly have no objection. So, I hope the body will react to logical argument and adopt the amendment, because there certainly hasn't been anything said against the amendment that would in any way