

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

March 3, 2004

LB 962

involved.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, if people are having a domestic dispute, do you think they ought to be required to enter binding mediation?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Oh, I would probably prefer voluntary. I think it's less threatening and people feel less threatened, and they can sometimes resolve issues. It's not going to resolve all the issues. But I think in this case, we can prevent a lot of things from going to the Water Board.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But it's probably impossible to craft legislation that would prevent all disputes. Would you agree with that?

SENATOR SCHROCK: That's true. And I will tell you, Senator Chambers, this was a very contentious issue for the 15...for the 49-member task force. They did discuss it in length. And you know, we're talking about parties that are used to dealing with each other. We're talking about the NRD representatives on that board, the ag people. We're talking about the whole...the Department of Natural Resources. The Attorney General's Office was involved. And so I think this portion of the bill on how to resolve disputes is pretty well thought out. And I'm not saying I'm not open to change, but I think it was pretty well thought out by the members on the task force. And they did spend a lot of time on it, and it was contentious. But in the end, this is what they agreed upon, and I think it's probably a pretty good compromise. Let's put it this way. They mediated, voluntarily mediated this solution.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But, Senator...and it's not binding on us, or even them. But here's...if it becomes law then it becomes, not binding in the sense of compelling them to accept what the mediation does, but it's binding in terms of this actually being a part of the law now, and an existing entity that is legal and there. Nobody...well, let me ask this question. Is there a requirement that this procedure be utilized before going to the Water Review Board?