

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

May 18, 1999

LB 870

you want to about your concerns with DEQ. And I think a lot of times putting something down in writing is certainly less emotional and more factual than having a public hearing. We are an important livestock state. I passed around a couple of handouts that shows how many hogs we market in this state and how many cattle that are on feed. It's a little misleading because if you want to compare the cattle marketed to the swine marketed, you'll probably have to triple the number of head on feed because it takes about...each feedlot on cattle cycles cattle about three times a year. We actually probably market more cattle, more head of cattle per year than we do swine. We are not one of the major swine-producing states in the nation. We are number six. We are kind of tied with Kansas for second in cattle on feed. We're certainly a much major player for cattle production than we are swine production. And I think Initiative 300 has kept down the number of large operators who want to operate swine-producing facilities in this state. Be that as it may, I live in a county that is one of the leading counties in livestock production. And certainly between my home, which is about ten miles north of Holdrege, and the city of Holdrege there are a lot of livestock producers. And when times were good, a lot of them expanded. I cannot imagine that if somebody wants to expand a livestock facility in my area of the state who's probably been in business 30 years, probably gone through five or ten expansions over that period of time, having to hold a public hearing in front of DEQ. Let's let them...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR SCHROCK: ...put their application in to DEQ, let's let it be analyzed, and then let's proceed. Certainly how many avenues do we have to give the public of this state to protest livestock operations? We did the zoning. We did the interim zoning. I don't think we should waste DEQ's time on this, and I'm not saying it would be a waste; but I think they have better things to do. Certainly the Natural Resources Committee in the past has had public hearings on livestock facilities. So I ask you to vote against the Preister amendment. If you have any questions, I'd be glad to...I'd be glad to try and answer those. We are an important livestock state, and I was somewhat reluctant to go along with the interim zoning. But I do believe