

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

February 7, 2006 LB 874

SENATOR KREMER: I agree with you on the "continues," and it was just brought to my attention that...I'll try to use an illustration. Hope I can...it will work. Say that we're trying to eliminate something and we find out that it's had a detrimental effect on frogs, so we do something to correct that and then we find out that it continually does, has a detrimental effect on them, so we have to go further than that, and that would come out in the pesticide management plan. And so that "continues" is kind of like, lets us respond as it continues to gets worse or something, but I think it can be represented that it has to be continually going on before we respond, and that's not the intention at all. We need to respond immediately if we can. And then adjust, like Senator Beutler even talked about, in our ground water, if it continues to build up nitrates, then we have to be more responsive, more restrictive and everything as we go along. So it's kind of a...we want to act immediately, but we also want to be able to respond as things might get worse.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If my amendment were adopted, would that prevent this type of management if the...let me start over again. A harm of some kind is determined and, to use your example, it would be to frogs. Once that more rigorous management is undertaken, if it surfaces that there is another harm, one that was not anticipated, or a more serious harm, my amendment would not prevent immediate reaction because as soon as that is discovered, that would constitute the demonstration of the harm which triggers this more rigorous management. So let's say that the frogs are affected, then you discover that snakes or any other critter or even human beings. Soon as that's discovered, with my amendment there would be an immediate response to that. So here's the question that I will ask you. How do you feel about my amendment?

SENATOR KREMER: I support your amendment. In fact, I suggested that "continues" might come out of there, because we don't have the wording in there when we apply it to ground water, and I don't think it needs to be there applied to humans or environment either. So I support it. I think it's better because I think we can respond and, if it continues to have an adverse effect, we can respond differently. I don't think it