

of the amendment. It appeals...it takes care of all golf courses, not just nec...not just one. There is more than one out there that may, in fact, be transferring water illegally, and they just don't know it. This will take care of all of those, many of which are very good, economic income providers for the area. But since it was brought up by others, Woodland Hills is one out in Eagle. Let me give you just a little bit of scenario, since we need to get more detail. Woodland Hills was...assumed that since they were going to be commercial they would apply and be covered under the Commercial and Industrial Act. Certainly they were going to use less than 3,000-acre feet, way less than 200-acre feet, as a matter of fact. But they were told, in a decision I believe was an incorrect decision, that since the law did not specifically say golf courses were under commercial that they were not covered by the act. So they had to go and get a permit. And they went and got a study that showed that there would be no adverse impact at all, environmentally and in regards to water, got Ray to introduce that, and basically were told, gosh, you know, we've done some research, we're not going to have a hearing either because there's no statutes in ground water that allows you to transfer. So we had a situation where you have a major development and they simply are...cannot move because of an interpretation of an agency. What this amendment does is say let's keep in the spirit of the law we had, commercial and industrial could not have a permit up to 3,000-acre feet, we understand that we're just talking gold courses and not an ethanol plant, or not an IBP plant that would use that type...amount of water, so we'll narrow the scope...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: ...down to 200-acre feet and say, listen, commercial golf and public golf courses, that should be defined under this act anyway, need not get a permit if they use less than 200 feet. And I might add, if I were in agriculture and I put a center pivot down on that same acreage of corn, I, no doubt, would be using far more than the 200-acre feet. But nonetheless, less than 200-acre feet they don't need a permit. And Senator Wehrbein's amendment is a safety net saying that if there's going to be adverse effect, because of things that we do not know in the future, which the studies are showing will not happen, but if there would be a problem, there is now a due process that could be followed. Anything more than 200-acre feet, they're going to have to get a permit. It still keeps the