

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

April 6, 1999

LB 78

at, it's a limited bit of information as well.

SENATOR BROMM: And that leads me to my next question. In that information that they can look at, economic feasibility, et cetera, it seems to me, and whenever we deal with natural gas there's always a safety question, would you ever envision that there would be a need to include a factor here that would...that would look at safety? And I don't want to concoct something necessarily outlandish, but if we had...if we had a...whether it be MUD or whether it be an investor-owned utility that really had a bad...really had a bad run of accidents and they were asking to extend into a subdivision, that tax ratepayer was concerned about safety based on the track record the last two years or something, do you think that there would be any room in those factors for a safety concern, or what would be your response to that?

SENATOR BRUNING: I certainly would support consideration of that, and the interim study that Senator Hartnett and the Urban Affairs Committee will take on I hope will include a discussion of safety as well and perhaps...

SENATOR BROMM: Okay.

SENATOR BRUNING: ...an enforcement provision to ensure that.

SENATOR BROMM: The other thing I noticed for...

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: ...for the first time is that it mandates or it requires, I should say, that the PSC hold the hearings, if there would be a question, in the county in which the dispute arises. Now I think up till now it's been discretionary, under 75-129, where the commission holds its hearings. Is there a particular reason that...and I...there's only one MUD so I'm not terribly worried about that. If it was all over the place, I'd be a little worried about travel and all that. But was that intentionally made that way or what was the reasoning?

SENATOR BRUNING: It was an effort to be responsive to the public involved.