

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

April 4, 2006

LB 1249

into something that none of us liked. Here's what we've got, and Senator Landis makes some understandable points. But I can't stress this enough. We have laws in place with 57-1301, and I'm not going to pound this into the ground; 57-1303, for example, deals with some of these issues that we're talking about, okay? Law is in place right now that I'm just trying to tweak, yet Senator Landis is saying, we need some wholesale reform. He'll forgive me if I say that, but I look at it as wholesale reform of this particular piece of the industry. No investor-owned natural gas utility or metropolitan utilities district may extend or enlarge its natural gas service area or extend or enlarge its natural gas mains or natural gas services unless it is in the public interest to do so. In determining whether or not an extension or enlargement is in the public interest, the district or the utility shall consider the following: 1) the economic feasibility of the extension or enlargement; 2) the impact the enlargement will have on the existing and future natural gas ratepayers in the metropolitan utilities district or the investor-owned natural gas utility; 3) whether the extension or enlargement contributes to the orderly development in the natural gas utility infrastructure; 4) whether the extension or enlargement will result in the duplicative or redundant natural gas utility infrastructure, and 5) finally--whether the extension or enlargement is applied in a nondiscriminatory manner. Now here's where we're at. It's really...Senator Landis had laid out a simple case scenario. I'm laying out an even simpler one. This law can be effective. It can be effective, and the PSC knows how to use it. We have a governing body that knows how to use this. We have metropolitan utilities districts, we have municipalities that know how to use this. In my view, all we really have to do, and it's that simple, is to take a piece of his legislation. That's all. But for some reason, and I can't figure out why, we've decided to throw down the gauntlet and say, let's, for lack of a better term, confuse the issue. Let's call this what it is, okay? This is and it always has been an Aquila/MUD fight. That's what it is, because let's be honest, the rest of the state this is not a huge provincial problem with certain areas. It's just not. Lockland and...the Hastings, Lockland, Kinder Morgan issue raised some concerns. Those concerns are gone. People are dealing with those issues in those areas. This is an Aquila/MUD