

May 6, 1981

LB 146

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I am a little surprised at this sleeper of an amendment that Senator Maresh is trying to put up here. We had a bill earlier I believe in this legislative session dealing with the ground water conservancy districts which overlapped...had functions which overlapped those of the Natural Resource Districts. I doubt that these ground water conservancy districts should exist at all, much less have the authority for the additional property taxation that they have now, and I think if we are going to start to dismantle the ground water management act and its ability to function by giving exemptions for these ground water conservancy districts, then let's get rid of the ground water conservancy districts. Senator Maresh, I think maybe if your amendment is successful I will put one on the desk to eliminate those districts and we can get done with it, but what you are doing seriously undermines the ability of the Natural Resource Districts to carry out the functions which this Legislature has given them and I would very strenuously oppose Senator Maresh's amendment which gives special consideration to those farmers who live in the ground water conservancy district. Bad news.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Koch, did you want to talk on the Maresh amendment?

SENATOR KOCH: No, on the Haberman amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Schmit. Senator Schmit, did you want to talk on the Maresh amendment? Senator Sieck, did you want to talk on the Maresh amendment?

SENATOR SIECK: Yes, Mr. President, members of the body, I think I need to explain this a little bit. The ground water conservation district levies one quarter mill now. The Natural Resource District can levy one mill and you can recall when we passed the ground water conservation district extension that we lowered the mill levy for that conservancy district because they did not need it and was not using it. I accepted this even though with some regret. I was told on the floor here that if the Natural Resource District needed the money it would come forward. Well, this is for the Natural Resource District. It is not for the conservation ground water district. It is for the Natural Resource District for the management of their control area and I do feel that it is needed in the Republican Valley or Republican District. I don't think we do need it in the Upper Blue at the present time and I don't think we are going to be taxed for it. I am assured of this that we are not going to increase the taxes in the Upper Blue until the regulations come into play and that is going to be one more year and that is coming to play if the ground water continues to drop. So I am going