

the statute as it existed. And what the Bernard-Stevens amendment did was basically allow for...it carved out that niche for golf courses and said, look, if you're using under 200 feet that isn't going to impact with the Wehrbein amendment, if there is an impact, you're going to say, look, we're going to bring you in and ask you to explain that, have those people who have priority then be able to shut that off, so to speak, with regard to the use. It does provide for a protection. Under the Beutler amendment, what you do, even though it wasn't part of the committee amendments coming out of the original LB 79, Senator Bernard-Stevens stated that he would have opposed his own bill with the committee amendments. And, frankly, one of the main reasons for that is because the costs associated with it. You're talking about people who will use a very small amount of water but yet they are going to have to go through an extremely extensive and expensive process for purposes of that permit that would be required from the department under this amendment. That alone ought to be the reason for opposing it and I would urge you to do so.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Hall. Any further discussion on the Beutler amendment to LB 789? Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Just briefly, Madam President and members of the body, I hope that you do take the time to really take note of the amendment that the committee came out with. I would like to make a couple points. Number one, when we looked at the hearing on the bill and the discussion on the bill, the discussion, when I came in and opened I was very clear on the bill that we were going to keep it very narrow in regard to maintenance of turf in golf courses, very narrow. And we were not going to make any changes in regard to the actual commercial act of changing the 3,000-acre feet, but we were going to expand the definition to include golf courses. What the committee did, what Senator Beutler is asking us to now approve is something that drastically changed the entire law that we had. And I can guarantee you if that would...if this amendment would have been the bill that I would have introduced, the place would have been packed full of people that would have been impacted by this piece of legislation. But the room wasn't packed because that wasn't the bill before the committee and, therefore, the committee made certain decisions. The amendment that we have before us now and the committee amendment really goes outside of what the committee hearing process was, in my opinion. So,