

in agriculture there are many, many areas where water is currently being transferred that doesn't have any permit, and it is usually in small quantities for livestock. And this would apply to anybody that's in that position also. So, it looks to me like a reasonable thing to do, and makes it so that we can offer a bill that has advantages for wells, no matter where they are, especially areas where water does have to be moved for one purpose or another, whether it's livestock, or domestic use, or some other small use for irrigation purposes or commercial purposes. And I'd like to thank Senator Wehrbein for getting this ready over the noon hour. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Elmer. Senator Bromm, on the Wehrbein amendment.

SENATOR BROMM: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senator Wehrbein, would you yield to a question or two, please.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Wehrbein, would you yield, please.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes.

SENATOR BROMM: Senator Wehrbein, does your amendment basically shift the burden of the cost of showing that there's no harm done from the person taking the water to those who might be affected by the taking of the water? Is that accurate?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Well, in essence, it does at this level because it's after the fact. I...

SENATOR BROMM: I guess, you know, I understand that this may affect only one or two golf courses in the state, and I understand that. But what concerns me is that...that this is a policy which we're going to have to live with, perhaps, at least potentially for a long time. Is there a rationale for shifting this burden from the person that wants the water to the person that might be affected by the taking of the water? Is there some...could you explain the thinking on that?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Well, I'll tell you, frankly, the thrust of my amendment is...is based on the assumption that maybe a hydrology study, right now, would show there would be no damage. And so a permit is either granted or if it's under 200, they probably could go ahead and do it, let's say. My point is to address this that in case there was damage, in spite...I mean,