

intent language on a water study. Let's put everything in perspective. We're talking about intent language in a water plan that the Natural Resource Commission has the responsibility for, and we're talking about basically two points of contention. In my opinion these two points of contention could be the difference as to whether this plan is in fact implemented, whether this body and the public have confidence in this plan, or whether it's another one of the many multitude of plans we've gone through in the past twenty-five or thirty years. We don't have time to put another plan on the shelf and have it sit there. We must have a plan with credibility. We must have a plan that all segments of this society can believe in and can support regardless of how that plan happens to affect its particular interest. Now the main source of contention is the Advisory Committee, and the Advisory Committee is nothing but an Advisory Committee and both the original bill and Senator Kremer's amendment does nothing to alter the status of the Advisory Committee. It's still just an Advisory Committee. The bill and Senator Kremer's amendment gives nothing more or less, takes nothing away, adds no more authority to this Advisory Committee. The point of contention is, is how is this Advisory Committee appointed? Now the initial bill says that the the Legislature along with the Governor shall appoint the Advisory Committee. The Exec Board and the Legislature submits to the Governor three names in each category and the Governor selects from those three names the member to serve on that Advisory Committee. I think this Legislature needs some type of oversight into this water planning process, and I think public representation needs to be as broad as possible. Now Senator Kremer's amendment says that the Natural Resource Commission shall appoint the Advisory Committee. Now can you imagine the difference of the two ways the Committee is appointed? Here the Natural Resource Commission appoints the Committee that's going to advise them. What is their motivation? What is their interest to get broad public input? There is none, and don't you think this body, this elected body, of the people of the state of Nebraska should keep some type of oversight into this planning process?

PRESIDENT: One minute, Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: The next source of contention is the degree of study primarily in the area of minimum stream flows. Now we've talked about minimum stream flows for years, but we do not have adequate information to even determine whether we need minimum stream flow legislation or not. The initial legislated bill sets out that criteria