

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

April 5, 2006

LB 1226

several attachments that summarize their concerns, and we'll get to those, but those were very...a very good statement of this side of the argument. I am concerned that the expertise of the engineering profession continues to be taken so lightly by those who have not walked the walk. I've worked for many managers during my engineering career, and the best advocates of technically sound arguments are those who thoroughly understand the details of the issues at hand. Typically, that understanding comes from educational background and several years of experience in that specific engineering area, both of which are required to achieve professional engineering licensure. Just as nonlawyers typically underestimate the educational requirements of competence in law, nonengineers underestimate the learning curve required to make sound engineering decisions that support public safety and welfare. This problem is not alleviated by having the expertise in-house, advising the decision makers. If it were, NASA's Challenger space shuttle disaster never would have occurred. Following is a summarized list of some of the main reasons to support the current statutory requirement. In addition, attached for your information is a more detailed explanation of each of the above points, as well as a response to claims made by those in favor of altering the qualifications of the director: One, the engineering requirement has worked well for nearly a century. I didn't realize that it was that old. The director's responsibilities remain primarily technical in nature, and we've all heard the big item today are all of the water modeling studies that are going on, and that will be a big part of the work of the department. And believe me, those are complicated and you need the most intelligent decision maker and the best prepared decision maker you can...you can get. Now is not the time to make unnecessary changes to Nebraska water law. The engineering requirement follows the model of other states. Senator Kremer, I guess I don't know entirely whether...to what extent this is an accurate statement. I would be interested in what other states do do. The engineering requirement makes the director subject to the Engineers and Architects Regulation Act. Removing the engineering requirement is contrary to agreements made at the time that the Department of Natural Resources was created. It is the mission of the professional engineers to protect and promote public welfare and safety through the