

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

March 16, 2004 LB 916

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. So which is it, and how would we know based on what's in this language?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Well, I think what this language is saying is that if the technology is so expensive that it makes it impracticable to use in their feeding operation, in other words, if we had to...if we require them to use that technology, their only way out would be to not feed cattle or feed pork, then I think we're being...if we take that word out, there is technology available that is too expensive to use, considering the return on the investment. As far as who DEQ likes and doesn't like, I hope they don't base their decisions on that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now let's look at something, because you introduced something, another element--based on the investment; it would be too expensive in terms of the return on the investment. If that becomes the standard, we're looking at the impact on the particular individual or operation rather than the actual cost of the technology itself, aren't we?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Yes, we are.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So two people can have a different view of what this means, and it can be applied differently in each case because there is no objective standard. It's on a case-by-case basis. Isn't that what you're saying, in effect?

SENATOR SCHROCK: You could...I would agree with it. You could interpret it that way. But I would hope...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So...

SENATOR SCHROCK: ...I would hope that DEQ would be, and I think they are, very evenhanded. I wouldn't think they would require Senator Jones to use a technology they didn't require Senator Wehrbein to use if they had the same size operations.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So if we remove the word "economically," is it your view that DEQ would look at the most expensive technology out there and say you are required to use that