

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

May 5, 2003

LB 754

local counties to develop livestock friendly regulations, and this amendment does not affect anything in the bill having to do with the right of the Department of Agriculture to do that. It leaves that part totally intact. The second part that it leaves totally intact and in the bill is the part having to do with requiring the counties to have factual findings with respect to their determinations on a conditional permit. Having to make those factual findings I think is going to be far and away the key important thing to seeing that counties make the decisions for the right reasons, the right reasons being environmental reasons or reasons having to do with the spatial relationship of the operation to other neighbors, air quality maybe. If you require factual findings, they will have to write down on paper why they're making a decision. They cannot write down on paper some vague, general concept relating to their idea of what's good or bad for the rural community. That won't wash with the courts. And Senator Bromm knows that and that's why he wants factual findings and that's why there should be factual findings. I think the factual findings part will go almost the total way in getting where Senator Bromm wants to be with regard to making decisions based on the right reasons, and that combined with the ability of the Department of Ag to encourage counties to put into place livestock friendly rules should make this a very good bill. The part that my amendment would take out of the bill is that part which has to do with changing procedural language to try to work in some concept of final, quote, unquote, determination, the purpose of which and the affectation of which is highly dubious and, in light of the uncertainty about it even affecting the purpose, would seem to be something we should stay away from because it injects several new words and terms which I think will be the subject of considerable litigation. And you might find that rather than clearing up the situation, this portion of the bill might immerse the whole thing into even deeper controversy with a whole plethora of new issues now related to the new language in this part of the bill. And that's why I would suggest that we strike this part of the bill; see if the factual determination combined with Department of Ag educational information solves whatever...what is perceived to be the problem, if I'm understanding what the perceived problem is, i.e., the injection of socioeconomic theories into land use planning law. Let me