

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

May 18, 1999

LB 870

understanding was, and maybe it's...is that if someone had requested an inspection and they didn't get around to getting it and were determined at some point then to be out of compliance or to be...to not have the proper waste facility, that they wouldn't be prosecuted, fined, or penalized, because in fact they had requested an inspection prior to January 1 of 2000 and just didn't get it.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. I think...

SENATOR BROMM: Now, is that covered somewhere else?

SENATOR BEUTLER: I think Senator, if I'm understanding you correctly, that's covered on page 10, line 13, where it says, a person who requested an inspection prior to January 1, 2000, shall not be determined by the department to be in violation of the permitting provisions prior to issuance or denial of the permit. Is that...?

SENATOR BROMM: That's what I'm...

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...is that what you were interested in?

SENATOR BROMM: ...that's what I'm looking for.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay.

SENATOR BROMM: So that's still in there?

SENATOR BEUTLER: That's still there.

SENATOR BROMM: Okay. Then I have a...Senator Beutler, if you would continue for a second. On the engineering question, again, that's been a difficult issue. And my understanding, from the way the amendment was previously, was that an existing facility would not be required to go get an engineering...to hire an engineer, unless there were evidence that there would be a potential for contamination of the environment, or that there had been contamination of the environment. Now, how does this language on engineering change that, if I understood the intent correctly previously?