

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

March 9, 2004

LB 78, 888

that's right about that. So those of you who say, gosh, I'm not sure I like Dave's language, or we need a study committee or a task force, didn't we have that this last year when everybody knew this was ready to be solved and nobody did anything about it except one, one-sided bill? There are three ideas in this amendment and every one of them is fair. Let me tell you what they are. Everybody in the state, city, investor-owned, and MUD, gets where they are now and that's their territory. Second, cities get their natural growth. Cities who have city systems, these are city natural gas systems, they get the city and the zoning jurisdiction. And when the city's boundaries grow, the zoning jurisdiction grows. And when they bump up against somebody else's system, they got two choices: Either let them stay on the edge of the city, don't do anything, or condemn them, pay them a fair price and take over the system as part of the city's. Idea two, cities get their real actual growth at their boundaries. Third idea, in the no man's land where nobody is now in a territory--and namely, this is Sarpy County--we have a law that says you can go in and challenge the actions of the other side after they've taken them. So Aquila can challenge MUD, MUD can challenge Aquila after they've taken their action. This says, no man's land, go to the Public Service Commission and get permission to grow in no man's land. If you are outside in areas that's not assigned, if you're in an unassigned territory and you need gas, take it to the PSC and let them decide who are the fair...who's the best person to do that. And we list eight factors. By the way, most of these factors are in our LB 78 anyway. But it says, what's the preference of the landholder or the resident? What's the most economically feasible option? Where's the most sensible place for orderly growth? Another one says, by the way, do they have a right to vote for the leadership of the company that they're doing it for? And this is, to me, it serves only as a benefit one way and that's to MUD. If in fact MUD extended its territories and you got to vote for the leadership of your natural gas company, that's a virtue. I think it's a plus and that should count as a plus. If you get to determine who is running your natural gas company, I think that's a virtue. Otherwise, I think it's a nonentity. It's a nonfactor. Those eight factors are recited. Three ideas: everybody gets where they are, cities get their natural growth, and no man's land,