

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

May 5, 2003

LB 754

livestock and other operations. And we're ready to, I think, move on to the next amendment. So that's, I think, where we're at.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Beutler would move to amend, FA1338.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Beutler to open on your FA1338 to LB 754. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, I'd withdraw that amendment.

SENATOR CUDABACK: It is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Bromm would move to amend, AM1694. (Legislative Journal page 1589.)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Bromm to open on AM1694 to LB 754.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment we had prepared over the weekend. And we had been thinking about it for sure. But the discussion on Thursday, I think, reflected some concerns, and I certainly understand that, about whether or not this would apply only to livestock type permits and special conditional permits for livestock operations. And the bill and the amendment that had been adopted was not restricted to those operations. This amendment does restrict it to livestock operations identified in the county zoning regulations as a classification of use, which may require special conditions or requirements to be met within an area of a county zoned for agricultural use. So the language of the amendment is intended, and I believe it does, restrict the provisions on special use requirements, and requesting an early determination as to whether or not there would be a likelihood that you'd be able to locate in that area. It does restrict that to livestock operations. I think that in all fairness that's an appropriate thing to do. And it really, I think, sunk in with me pretty well when, I think it was Senator Schimek or someone, was questioning why, if this applied to all zoning, it didn't go to