

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

April 13, 2004 LB 916

individually is important. I think the scrutiny of the larger units especially is extremely important, and that's why I have suggested this memo. The smaller units could still have potential for discharge into the waters of the state. But because there are fewer animals there, they're not as likely to pollute to the degree that one of the very large units would do. The similarity from an individual to a general permit is that they both last five years and then they have to be renewed. That wouldn't change with either one. My amendment doesn't affect that. The essential difference is that one allows the public to comment, the individual permit, which is current law. Currently, NDEQ allows for public comment on all but the smallest units. The Class I's don't have that. The Class II's, III's, and IV's currently have public comment. And so essentially what my amendment would do is maintain existing practice, and would allow for that public comment, in this case, the way the amendment is drafted, on units that have 5,000 head of cattle or more. It wouldn't affect those with 5,000 head or less. And again, the purpose of that is so that the public, keeping the public in a public process where they have a stake in this issue. And currently, where we have such large numbers of animals, and large numbers...as I understand it, a 125-pound hog can be expected to void approximately 11 pounds of feces and urine in one day; a 600-pound beef cow will void nearly 50 pounds; and a 1,400-pound dairy cow, more than 120 pounds in a day. We're talking a whole lot of waste, and I would say a whole lot more manure than some folks may even say that the Legislature generates in a session. But, at my weak attempt at humor, I would just say that there is a lot of waste that's generated from these facilities, from all sizes. But the large facilities generate a tremendous amount of waste. You can call it nutrient. But when it gets in the waters of the state, it becomes waste, it becomes hazardous to the aquatic life, it becomes a problem for those of us that live and are sustained by water. And I think the public has a right to input, I think the public needs to be involved in the process, and I think the public expects that that's what the Legislature will do. So there's no mistake, I do intend to withdraw this amendment. It's not my intention to take it for a vote. However, in the event that some people may wish to comment, I will wait. If there are no lights, I will pull it. If there is a light that's