

April 16, 1981

LB 252

made of the proposed Intertasin transfer". Now, there have been a number of people, Senator Lamb, Senator Peterson, indicated that they had troubles with taking that language "any adverse impacts" out. But let me point out to you that this shall...up above it says, "such application as demanded by the public interest shall include but not be limited to the following factors", and then it includes these factors that will be in the bill and then the bottom line after number 7, it says, "the application shall be denied if the benefits to the state from granting the application do not outweigh the benefits to the state from denying the application". All of these criteria that are in there right now is to determine the adverse impacts, and if you will count them, you will find out that number 2 is looking at the basin of origin. obviously. Number 3 is looking at the basin of origin. Number 4 is looking at the basin of origin. Number 5 is looking at the basin of origin. And number 7 of the committee amendments talks about alternative sources of water available to the basin of origin". But practically all of them are looking at the basin of origin, and yet Senator Peterson, Senator Remmers, Senator Lamb say that if they take this out you are not going to have enough protection. Goodness sakes, you have got about all the protection already. What about the basin that is asking for the transfer? Who is looking at it? Who is looking at the good that can be done there? Number one...number one does. Number 1 says economic, environmental and other benefits. Number 1 and number 5 are the two opposing sides, the basin of transfer as well as the basin of origin. Now what I am saying is by putting the language that I suggest in number 2, then number 2 and 3 will be the opposing sides as far as beneficial uses are concerned. Numbers 6 and 7 are the opposing sides. If we are going to put down a criteria, as I said earlier, we shouldn't be the judges too. I understand Senator Lamb, Senator Peterson, Senator Remmers, people that come from areas that transbasin diversion will not benefit them in any way, shape or form, but that is not our decision to make which is good and which is bad, whether we should or whether we shouldn't. That is the Director of the Department of Water Resources. We are setting the criteria for him to follow. But it is like the rules of a ball game, you don't set up the rules of a ball game to benefit one team more than the other. You set up the rules so it will supposedly be in the middle, and I would hope that that is what this body would do with this issue. As I said earlier, I live right on the divide between the Platte and Republican. I could fall either way. As a matter of fact, I'm right up there where you can shoot at me from either way is what it amounts to. And I think we should be fair and honest, set

3672