

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

May 5, 2003

LB 754

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Mr. President. I support this amendment and the next one. It is my hope we could vote on this bill this afternoon, and so my remarks will be very brief. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Stuthman.

SENATOR STUTHMAN: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body. I would like to direct one of the questions, one of my first questions to Senator Bromm.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Bromm.

SPEAKER BROMM: Yes, Senator Stuthman.

SENATOR STUTHMAN: Since the original bill had...the majority of it had to do with counties that were...had planning and zoning in place, and if all the criteria was met, that they could put an application into the state to be designated a livestock friendly county, and that had only to do with the counties that had this in place. The counties that didn't have it in place originally wouldn't have been able to get any type of a designation. Would that be right?

SPEAKER BROMM: Under the original bill or this amendment as it stands now, Senator Stuthman? Do you mean as the bill stands now?

SENATOR STUTHMAN: Yes.

SPEAKER BROMM: There is nothing in the bill as it stands now that would say that a county has to have zoning in order to request a livestock friendly designation. So unless that were a criteria that were inserted in regulations or rules by the Department of Agriculture, the bill would not prevent such a county from seeking that designation.

SENATOR STUTHMAN: Okay, thank you for clarifying that with me. Would this amendment then, it is my understanding that if a county, you know, even if they have planning and zoning or don't