

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, members of the legislature, let me tell you a little more of the history since Senator Lamb touched on it. LB 146 is kind of like a very fragile egg shell and it is held together with glue that can be easily taken apart if you put too much water on it. Let me start out by saying I think Senator Vickers' amendment goes to the heart of many of our water controversies, the issue of conjunctive use. Right now the, what is it, the State Water Planning and Review Process have studies on this specific subject, conjunctive use. But this very fragile egg dealing with pollution was put together very carefully in the Public Works Committee by eight people that all had a little bit of divergent views and everybody was kind of suspicious of the other guy. What we ended up with we thought was a pretty good bill that goes to the heart of the pollution issue and could structure something in that area. Now, if you interject this noble cause, I'll call it, of Senator Vickers, at this point, I think that you jeopardize step one, lets say, which is LB 146 and you probably jeopardize what help ~~it gets~~ to do the conjunctive use issue, because I think it will torpedo the bill. So not that he is on the wrong track but maybe he is slightly premature or maybe it has to be dealt with in a separate bill, but I wouldn't really think that you would want to risk what has been carefully put together in 146 by putting that amendment on at this time.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Sieck.

SENATOR SIECK: Mr. President, members of the body, I'd like to ask Senator Vickers a question. Could you give me some examples where the NRD could affect the control area with the interference with present or reasonably foreseeable uses of surface water in the district?

SENATOR VICKERS: Uses of surface water? No, I'm not saying about uses of surface water, I'm saying interference with present or reasonably foreseeable uses, okay? Give you some examples. An example would be practically anyplace in the Nebraska sandhills, the concern of the people in the Nebraska sandhills. Remembering that you, I think that you were also in attendance at the Basset hearing that the Public Works Committee had last fall. The major concern of the people in the Nebraska sandhills is how underground development is going to affect their wet meadows as they know them today. The wet meadows that provide many of the hay meadows that the ranchers use and also as it might affect the streams and rivers and lakes in the Nebraska sandhills. That's how it seems to me that underground development could affect surface water uses, remembering that that is the top of the aquifer but it is surface water when it is on top of the ground.

SENATOR SIECK: Could not this water also be affected by pollution?