

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

May 18, 1999

LB 870

Bruning, it's the same homesteaded quarter, 160 acres, that his grandfather took through the Homestead Act in 1880-something, 160 acres. How many farmers make it on 160 acres today? Almost none, there's not many left that can still make a living on that tiny parcel of land. And so I think these hearings will ultimately be a discussion on whether that is right and how to stop that as opposed to the actual point here which is whether these particular operations will operate safely and within the bounds of the law.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: One minute.

SENATOR BRUNING: So in my mind we need to keep our eye on the ball here and the ball is the safety issue with these particular operations. That can be done by the department through comments in writing. I don't think a hearing is necessary. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to respectfully oppose my colleague, Senator Preister's, amendment. And it's difficult to be against an amendment that he very articulately says provides a public hearing for the interested public. So on its face, emotionally it would be easy to be for it. But we've got to stop and think about the practical implications and what the role of this state agency, Department of Environmental Quality, is in this whole process. What is their role and what should their decision be based on? Should their decision be based on...should their decision be based on emotion? Should it be based on opposition? Should it be based on support? Or should it be based on whether or not the application meets the criteria that have been set forth in regulations, regulations that have had public hearings, regulations that have been developed hopefully in a deliberate and based on scientific evidence? The emotion is going to come out at hearings like this. And how is that going to add any value to DEQ's opinion or decision? And if their decision is affected by the emotion that is displayed at a hearing like that, is that good policy and is that going to be a defensible decision if the applicant appeals that decision? I see some language that I don't know anyone has talked about yet in the amendment, and I would like