

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

February 23, 2006 LB 975

It could be, but I think the situation we face now is more often almost the opposite--you have a small operation that is trying to stay in business surrounded by some possibly very well established neighbors who decide that it would improve their lifestyle if there weren't a livestock operation there anymore. So I will tell you, even though it doesn't affect me, I think it's an important issue and I think this is a good way to address it. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Raikes. Senator Stuthman, followed by Senator Schrock.

SENATOR STUTHMAN: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body. I listened very closely to Senator Raikes' comments, and these are the things that are a real concern of mine, and that is the fact that he outlined them very, very closely of the fact that a possibility of not being able to continue to operate even after the engineering expense has been charged to him, which was the case. Wasn't it, Senator Raikes? Senator Raikes,...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Raikes, would you...

SENATOR STUTHMAN: ...in listening to you, you have to spend the money with no guarantee of ever being able to accomplish it to do it or to come into compliance. They could have shut you down even after you would have spent that \$75,000?

SENATOR RAIKES: That's correct. Their procedures, which I don't argue with, are that if they're going to grant you a conditional permit, they need to know what it is you're going to do and whether or not what you're going to do or what you propose to do meets the environmental requirements, and there's no way to determine that without doing the engineering work.

SENATOR STUTHMAN: And in doing the engineer work, there is a cost factor to that and you're obligated to pay that, right, before anything else happens?

SENATOR RAIKES: Right.

SENATOR STUTHMAN: But there's no guarantee that the board, the