

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

March 17, 2005 LB 335

some of you may recall that on Select File we amended the dam and reservoir safety act onto the industrial ground water act, and I did so with the understanding that it was not controversial and that I would work with any member. And somebody took me up on that offer, so Senator Preister and his staff have been working with the Department of Natural Resources and my staff and we have come up with an amendment, and I would prefer to call this a clarifying amendment. This does not do any changes that of any subsequence. But what it does, on page 7, after line...on page 8, after line 29, it inserts the following new subsection, and this is the amendment: "The Safety of Dams and Reservoirs Act does not preempt or supersede any local zoning ordinances, resolutions, rules, or regulations regarding special use permits enacted by a political subdivision with respect to permit applications for livestock waste control facilities." We have worked with the Department of Natural Resources. We have worked with each other's staff, and this is certainly agreeable to Senator Preister and myself. If anybody has any questions, I would try to answer them, but I would also give the rest of my time to Senator Preister, if he so desires.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Preister.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, Honorable President. Thank you, Senator Schrock. Yes, this was something that kind of snuck up on me so I apologize to Senator Schrock for not working on it sooner, but I certainly thank Senator Schrock for the accommodation, and Jody Gittins, counsel for the committee. We did meet with Senator Schrock's staff and the Department of Natural Resources, and came up with some language that is clarifying because there is some preemption with the regulations that the new dam and reservoir act does imply. This just adds some clarity that where there is local zoning and where they have their own permit process, that we're not superseding that in the event that a dam which impounds water is viewed as also a lagoon. So there are some instances where there is overlapping jurisdiction with those lagoons, but where there is not then this would come in to apply. So it simply clarifies what the intent was of the dam and reservoirs act and that's the extent of it. I would encourage your adoption. Thank you.