

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

March 16, 2004 LB 916

SENATOR SCHROCK: My understanding, Senator Chambers, is that the new language is conforming...is the same language the federal government uses in their livestock waste facility language, and so that's why we drafted it this way, because "economical" is a term the federal government uses. If you want to strike the word "economical" and reinsert "practicable," for all practical purposes...I didn't mean to say it that way...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That's all right.

SENATOR SCHROCK: ...but that would probably work, that would. But I...but the problem is, if we strike it, there are...there is technology that's available out there, but it's so high-priced that nobody can afford to use it. And so that's the reason the word "economical" is being used. And I...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But we don't know what that term means. Let's say that you come up for consideration and they like you, so they say, it's not feasible for you to do this because that change that we would want made is not achievable economically. I come along and they don't like me, or let's say Senator Vrtiska, because he is in the farming operations, I believe, and there is a change of some kind to occur, and he presents himself for these people and the very same technology that they said was not economically achievable...I meant that technology is too expensive to make the change economically achievable for you, nevertheless, is so for Senator Vrtiska. So here is the question I would ask. Does this word, which is to provide a standard, relate to the actual cost of the technology itself, or does it talk about the economic impact it has on the individual who is going to be required to use technology? And to make it clear what I'm asking, let's say we have technology A and technology B. Technology A is expensive. Technology B is less expensive. Are we going to say that technology A is not economically within the reach of the person who has to make a change because it is expensive, or we're going to say it is not economically achievable, this change, because of the impact it has on the particular individual? Do you understand what I'm asking?

SENATOR SCHROCK: I understand exactly what you're saying.