

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

February 21, 2006 LB 872

SENATOR SCHROCK: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: What would the penalty be, if one of these outfits is going to be fined rather than shut down, if you have any idea?

SENATOR SCHROCK: I don't, Senator Chambers, but there again, we can look at that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And here's what I would like you to find out, so you won't just be at random.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is the fine that would be exacted greater than the cost of being a part of this trading program? If the fine is not greater, then the operation may as well pollute, because it's going to spend the least amount of money. Now if purchasing these credits costs more than the fine, then the entity would pollute and pay the fine, because looking at the two, it's cheaper. The fine, just to assign an arbitrary number, is 10. To purchase the credits would be 20. It would be cheaper to pay the 10 than the 20. Now on the other hand, if the fine is greater than the purchasing of these credits, having that entity worry about the fine is the quickest way to bring these emissions down, I believe. Do you disagree with that?

SENATOR CUDABACK: You may continue, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Well, Senator Chambers, I agree with you, but shutting a plant down and putting in the emissions equipment can be timely and costly, and this bill would give them more flexibility in their timing of that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then why not just give them a deadline? Tell them, don't increase your level of pollution. What this bill does is talk about a deadline further down the road, but it allows an increase in pollution. The only ones who are going to increase the overall pollution are the big polluters. They are the ones with enough clout in Congress and with state