

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

April 7, 2003

LB 754

SPEAKER BROMM: (Laugh) I suppose they could. You said steak.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yeah, s-t-e-a-k.

SPEAKER BROMM: I imagine they could.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So these designations really don't mean anything substantive.

SPEAKER BROMM: Legally. Not legally. I think it's substantive, but that's, you know, you may not agree with that and I understand that, but it's not a legal designation in that sense.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Bromm, the next time I get a chance to speak, that's all I'll ask you right now because the time will run out, but what I will ask you is exactly what are we doing with this bill? But you don't have to try to answer it now because I don't think there's very much time.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do you think you could answer it in one minute? He said, no, so I will use that one minute. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, over the noonhour I did read through the amendment, which will become the bill. Other than that designation, which I am opposed to for the reasons I have given, I don't really see what the bill does. I must conclude that it's the first piece in a plan whose ultimate goal is to be able to put the state in a position to set a time line when a determination shall be issued by a planning commission or the county board, and after that a mandate that if whatever conditions are set by the county board or the planning commission are met then a permit shall be granted. In other words, local control will be taken away. And if that...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...is not the intent, I need to discuss it further. Thank you. Mr. President.