

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

February 8, 2000 LB 900

Select File, if there seems to be some interest in any of them. But this one simply deals with the Natural Resources Enhancement Fund, which is part of this bill, and would eliminate the sunset date on the fertilizer tax so that the Natural Resources Enhancement Fund could continue to be funded beyond December of this year. I think all of you are aware that everybody in the area of natural resources and especially the natural resource districts have worked very hard on their water quality management systems. But a very real part of that, of course, is having the funding to carry out the management plans and to effectuate a real control over, especially at this point in time in our history, the pollution from fertilizers and nitrates. And in that regard, I simply wanted to point out to you an article that appeared in the paper just a couple of days ago with respect to some of the costs involved in battling nitrates and one of the reasons why it's good to get a handle on this problem in a preventative sense. As you can see from the article, it indicates that over the last 20 years small towns have spent more than \$24 million, mostly relocating wells that have become polluted beyond the federal standards by nitrates. And this study, which I cannot yet get my hands on, does not apparently deal with Omaha or Lincoln, who are also spending very large amounts of money on nitrate equipment relating to the public water system. But it points out some interesting information, that 37 percent, for example, of small towns and villages have exceeded the federal health standard at one point in time or another, more than a third of them; and that almost 20 percent of the individual wells have exceeded those standards. All this article is doing in a sense is pointing out what I think most of us know is true, that we have a problem here, that we need to get a handle on it, that to the extent that we don't it causes us additional problems, both with our drinking water sources and with the federal government and our neighbors to the extent that it's flowing out of the state in the surface water. So I wanted to encourage you as close to the beginning of this session as possible to take a strong look at the continuation of that fertilizer tax, because that's \$2 million a year that has gone into water quality programs. And it would be a big hit to the system at exactly the wrong time if that money were not...did not continue to be forthcoming. So take a look at that problem, if you would, and think about the fact that this problem is not just a problem of