

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

May 19, 2005

LB 673

that there are people that will...there is a way that they can manage them prairie dogs on places that...where the prairie dogs aren't managed; for instance, your...probably your school lands or your federal lands. And there are a few people out there in places that don't do any control on their prairie dogs, and they're encroaching on other people's property. That's the reason I said the bill is a management plan and mostly a management plan for encroachment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But, Senator Louden, when you offered the original version of your bill, why did the counties come in and oppose it?

SENATOR LOUDEN: Well, most of them said there wasn't enough money appropriated in the A bill to take care of hiring their specialists to do that. That was one of the complaints. And of course, that was...that appropriation money was cut down somewhat. At the present time, I think it's probably sufficient to get us by for two years, but that was one of the major complaints to start with, is they didn't think there was enough money involved to...they wanted the state or someone to pay more of the cost of hiring specialists to do...

SENATOR CUDABACK PRESIDING

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR LOUDEN: ...to work on this.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And if the state didn't pay it, they would have paid it. Let me ask it a different way. Under the original version of your bill, would the counties have to have paid any of the cost of managing prairie dogs?

SENATOR LOUDEN: Under the original version; there wasn't any difference in the original version than what there is in this one here. That's never been changed in the bill.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So what is changed that made them no longer oppose it? Or are they just that simple-minded?