

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

March 16, 2004 LB 916

continuously be kept on file at the department, and at least annually the operator shall update any changes made to the nutrient management plan." And that's important. We're essentially saying you only have a requirement to update if you've made changes. I want to stress here they don't have to submit an entire new plan. They don't have to do any...and if they have no changes, if they haven't made any adjustments, they have no requirement. It's only submittal of any changes that have been made to the nutrient management plan. In line 24, where we struck "for permits" prior, we're leaving that language and we're inserting "the contents of." I'm sorry. That's what we had done. The substitute amendment changes that. On page 23, line 24, after the period we would insert, "A copy of the nutrient management plan and supporting documentation shall continuously be kept on file at the department, and at least annually the operator shall update any changes made to the nutrient management plan." Then it adds a new second sentence, and that's the distinction between the two. That would add, "The department shall require an operator submitting an application for construction approval or major modification to submit a plan that contains, at a minimum, the information which the department required to be included in all nutrient management plans on January 1, 2004." So they would still have this information available currently that they have required up to this point, up to essentially the beginning of this year. That's new language. It deletes the last part of AM3035, which struck "for permits" and added "the contents of." So the last sentence in Section 18 is restored to its original language. And I make the distinction between the two amendments for those who may have been first reading the original amendment and looking at that, that I introduced last week, and also for the benefit of those who just got the adjusted amendment now. So I attempted to address the issue of requiring some of the small operators to submit more information or go through more compliance regulations than some people wanted to have happen. I'm trying not to confuse an already confused issue, but I may be doing that. This additional language is necessary under the minimum requirements of the National Pollution (sic) Discharge Elimination System, or NPDES for short, CAFO rule under the Clean Water Act. The plan may be kept on site of the private operator and only must be made available to the regulator, i.e.,