

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

March 29, 1999 LB 822

SENATOR SCHROCK: I'm willing to support this, provided it doesn't expand the area of the map. I don't believe it does, because I think the map and the language in the bill includes all the watershed of those protected streams. So, from that standpoint, I think the amendment is okay. I don't think it's anything new, and it does maybe clarify the language a little. Thank you.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Vrtiska.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. Senator Beutler, could I bother you for a question?

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR VRTISKA: You talk about directly or indirectly. When you talk about indirectly, that means if it flows to a stream directly in the area that's covered, does that mean indirectly, eventually, it gets to the Missouri River and the Gulf of Mexico, indirectly?

SENATOR BEUTLER: The...the requirement would be that it flow...it would have to flow through the affected or the protected segment. And so anything that came into the watershed that was below the protected segment, obviously would flow into the bigger rivers and eventually to the Gulf, but we would not be concerned with that portion of the watershed, because obviously it's not going to flow backwards, it's going to flow away from the protected segment of the stream.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Well, I guess, I have a problem when you talk about obviously directly into the...into the stream, and I understand that part of it. I'm having difficulty understanding indirectly, because all of the streams below it, it would indirectly flow into. Is that correct or not?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, it...the words would be...that's...I mean, in some senses that's true, but it wouldn't be true in this context, because the words directly or indirectly would be in relationship to the verb "feeds into". And it says "feeds into the cold water class A stream". Now, in...in that sense,