

enough or clear enough that they could do so, so they were simply left out in the cold. So we have something that's going to be economically good for areas. We have something that a department, through administrative rule, has said, no, we're going to leave you in limbo. And this amendment does basically two things. It says, it classifies commercial use to also include maintenance of turf, which would be the private and...not private but the public and municipal golf courses. It also says that instead of having it as the old statute of saying 3,000-acre feet without a permit, we're saying, no, no, 200-acre feet without a permit. And there's also a safety net that Senator Wehrbein attached so that if there is difficulty in the future, there would...there would be a way to address that particular problem. I would emphasize that it is good discussion on water policy. And at some point this Legislature is going to have to tackle ground water transfer which we have not done so well as a body, because there are not statutes that are clear. We also have to look at conjunctive use and the combined...the combination of surface...of water transfers and so on. But this particular bill can be done now. This particular bill can be done to help many of the projects that are there, it's a very small amount, it does not deal with a great amount of water, and...and, quite honestly, as I was going to say before, this will pave the way for some of the discussion that will need to come. I do want to also talk about Senator Beutler's comments, just briefly, about if this amendment fails, we could do maybe the committee amendments on LB 79. No, we can't, in my judgment. The committee amendments that came out were absolutely different than what the bill and the hearing was about. There was no hearing on whether or not we should strike 3,000-acre feet and put it to zero. If that would have been the case in the bill, I suspect IBP would have been in, I suspect every ethanol plant would have been in because they would have now had to get a permit and may have had to shut down until that process was completed. That was not the bill, that was not the hearing, and that should not have been the amendments, that's why I did not introduce those amendments, because they did not have a hearing. Mike Jess was in the committee, talked about this particular portion of the amendment we have before us, and you can check the record. He basically said this was an adequate way of solving this difficult...this situation. I ask the body to...I thank the body for taking the time on this particular issue. I ask that you support the amendment, and then I ask that we then support 789 and move onward. Thank you.