

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

April 4, 2006

LB 1249

opening on AM2708 to the committee amendments to LB 1249. There are 13 people wishing to speak. The first five are Senators Brown, Landis, Friend, Redfield, and Bourne. Senator Brown.

SENATOR BROWN: Mr. President, I would yield my time to Senator Landis, if he would like it.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Landis, you have almost five minutes.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you. I would like to acknowledge how many areas of agreement I feel with the way that Senator Friend has characterized the situation. There are any number of places where we come out alike. There are three of them, policywise. Flip LB 78. I think Senator Friend is accurate in that score, I think his analysis is right, I buy it. We agree on that. If one wants to take a very uncharitable view of the language, then perhaps we need the clarifying language about the extension of (inaudible). I don't see it, but you know what? Belt and suspenders is probably a good idea. That's a provision in his amendment. It's a provision in an amendment I offer down below, clarifying that Omaha can take Elkhorn; MUD can take Elkhorn. There's another area that I agree with--by the way, I think it's existing law--but I'd be happy to make that clarified. There's an amendment there. Senator Friend asks, but why exclusive territories? And after what I think is some very helpful and thoughtful analysis, we do part company. I suppose we could ask ourselves that about water and telephone lines and electricity, as well. The answer is it gives one clarity, it allows an entity to plan well for the future, because they know that logically they're going to get that. It is possible for an investor to say that's the asset base of the company. For those people who were so sensitive in the lobby about the standing of Aquila's well-being, you know, I bet you've heard some of that argument, right? Why would you make sure that you could not identify what assets were there, if you weren't trying to undermine them? Wouldn't you want them to be able to say, this is my job, this is my territory, here's my market service area? Look at my ability to do that and to render profit from it. It would be valuable for the marketplace to do that--planning, assurance, I think, in the marketplace, the appropriate distribution of territory and, by the way, a fourth idea. This