

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

March 16, 2004 LB 916

fees have not been 50 percent, they have not been 40 percent or 30 percent or 20 percent, but they're down to 10 percent or less, currently, of the cost of the livestock waste program. So what I'm suggesting is not even going back to the Natural Resources Committee agreement in 1998, when this was originally done, but at least going partway back there to 30 percent, and this, even at that then, would be a bargain for this particular industry. I had passed out to you a sheet, which I hope you can look at, showing the various funds within the Department of Economic...or of Environmental Quality, and showing you generally how, what General Funds do exist in that department, how they're spent. But if you look at that, you can see that the livestock waste management program is 90 percent general funded at this particular point in time. Contrast that to the clean air program; to the integrated solid waste management program; to the waste reduction and recycling program; the litter reduction and recycling program; the chemigation program, which is an ag program, of course; the wastewater treatment certification program; and the Petroleum Release Remedial Action Fund. All of those come out of fees, other than General Funds, of one type or another, and as you can see, with the exception of the Clean Air Act, they come 100 percent out of those funds. Many of those funds...many of those fees are essentially taxes on the fees on the regulated industry. And with the Clean Air Act, to the extent that it comes out of local funds at all, it comes out 100 percent are fees, even though in that case 23 percent of the nonlocal funding is federal funding. And then, if you look further down below on the sheet at what DEQ is spending in General Funds, you'll see it's really not very much money--\$3.4 million totally. But then you look and you see the livestock waste, because it's not carrying its share of fees, is taking \$1 million of the General Fund money. So it seems to me that, in fairness to all industries and all groups, that we ought to be looking for way more of a fee from the livestock producers, and that 20 percent is very inadequate, 30 percent is inadequate but at least a reasonable start, and eventually that group ought to be up to at least 50 percent and maybe someday funding their entire program, as everyone else does. So that's basically what I'm suggesting to you in this instance, but certainly as a minimum we should get rid of language in the bill that really doesn't work to have any consequential effect, and