

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

April 22, 1999 LB 822

this amendment?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Schrock, will you yield to a question?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Yes, I will.

SENATOR C. PETERSON: Thank you. If I'm understanding, you're removing the way that the expansions would be determined and allowing that to go back to DEQ, depending upon the potential degradation of the cold water class A stream, is that right?

SENATOR SCHROCK: That is correct, and I wanted to read into the record that if the potential is there to further "degrade" a stream or there's a threat to it because of the expansion, then it would be my intention and I would expect DEQ to deny the permit.

SENATOR C. PETERSON: And maybe I didn't understand this, have they had to...is this going to happen if the person has already "degraded...degraded" the stream, or is this a new potential?

SENATOR SCHROCK: This would be new potential and, you know, fortunately, according to what I understand, that the cold water streams in this state are in pretty good shape at the present time. And if you look at the map in Scotts Bluff County, there is...there is a lot of cold water streams, and in talking to the manager of the NRD out there, he said there is trout in them and I understand there has been some fishing in that area of the state. And so this...this I would like to have you interpret this to mean that if a permit for an expansion is in front of DEQ and they determine that the potential there is to further "degrade" a stream, then they would deny that permit. If they determine that the expansion permit will not threaten the stream, then they will expand...they will allow the expansion. One of the reasons we're offering this is because if you have a livestock facility in that area of the state, that is in one of these cold water class A type streams, and you do not allow expansion, even though a lot of expansion in the cattle industry is not taking place now, and I don't see anything to change that in the future. I don't think it's going the same way the hog