

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

April 22, 1999 LB 822

that's...that's the only direct language of the bill and the amendment was designed to try to keep the status quo with regard to the county's prerogatives. That was the intent. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Bromm, on the amendment.

SENATOR BROMM: Ask Senator Beutler if he would mind discussing with me just a bit more.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Beutler, would you yield to a question?

SENATOR BROMM: Senator Beutler, if a zoning regulation now in one of these areas allows a class III or IV facility in certain parts of the county, and we pass this law and this law doesn't allow that, but it says that we're not going to change any zoning authority of the county that existed prior to this act, how do you reconcile those, how do you reconcile those situations?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, I guess in my mind and you would have to make a judgment about it, I would reconcile it by, first of all, taking the direct language of the bill, and that would be what ruled on a particular situation. So there could be no class II, III, or IV livestock facilities. But with regard to an item that wasn't regulated, the class I facilities, for example, I think they would still be allowed to regulate in that manner, or as far as the spacing of facilities are concerned, I think they would still be allowed to regulate in that manner with their zoning powers. That would be what was intended.

SENATOR BROMM: Their spacing requirement could be more or less than this act?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, this act doesn't have a spacing requirement, and that was part of the point, that this act shouldn't be interpreted to mean that because you said these facilities could or could not exist or these expansions could or could not exist, and remember this law deals with expanded facilities too, or at least it does at this point in time. I didn't want the act to be interpreted to mean that there could