

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

March 16, 2004      LB 916, 962

animal feeding operations under common ownership are deemed to be an animal feeding operation if they are adjacent to each other or if they utilize a common area or system for the disposal of animal waste. Then, on page 27, line 16, there's the phrase: Two or more animal feeding operations under common ownership are deemed to be dah, dah, dah, dah, dah, very same language. I'm going to leave you with the question, is that not redundant? And if it is redundant, can we not just eliminate it on page 27? It is the very same language and I think once you incorporate it on page 26, under the definition of "animal feeding operation," it would seem to me that that's all you need. And it becomes confusing when it's added then at a later section in the bill. But I would ask for a response, Senator, when our next speaking...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...opportunity comes around.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, in a way, I'm glad Senator Beutler touched on LB 962, and in a way I'm not. LB 962, that water bill, has given me great trouble and I had been able to push it somewhat out of my mind, although I'm still grappling with it. By Senator Beutler discussing these two bills together, he made me have to come face to face with the fact that LB 962 still must be dealt with, and one of the things I'm troubled by is so much in that bill that, to me, serves no purpose other than to clutter the statute, to take a lot of time to delay a point being reached where an entity that has the authority to make a definitive decision will make that decision. In other words, let's say that you're looking at the alphabet. By the time you get to the letter E, you will have gone through four steps--A, B, C, and D. Not one of them will be able to render a decision, which will be rendered at point E. So, to my way of thinking, some of what is contained in steps A, B, C, and D could be eliminated so that we could get to E, where we will have the parties interested and involved come before this entity and a