

determines interstate water rights. The language in the bill itself talks about interstate compacts and we have a few of those, but by and large a great majority of those compacts that might exist are not in fact interstate compacts but rather are court decrees allocating certain portions of water between Nebraska and whichever what other state might be involved. I will acknowledge that that is not excluded from the language, but it seems to me that it would not be inappropriate to add it. Secondly, the other portion of the amendment that I would propose to put on the bill is up there, is specific direction that all agencies of state government are authorized and in fact required to be of assistance to the Director of Water Resources in compiling the information they may feel is relevant. I think both of those things are oversights that ought to be added to the bill. Now in addition I have had passed out to you another concept which if the bill came back I would have drafted into specific language, none of which deals at all with the criteria that is to be used with one exception. That one exception is that I have some difficulty with the one criteria that indicates that any reasonably foreseeable future benefit of uses of water for the basin of origin. My problem lies probably with many of these that they are somewhat vague and undefined and obviously would lead I am sure, as one supporter indicated to me this morning, it was intended to be, it would probably lead to a number of court cases come up with some kind of a definition. So the thing that I had passed out suggested at least one definable way to limit the reasonable foreseeable future, was to condition that the right of a transfer should be granted, would not extend for a period longer than a period of time that the cost for transversion would have to be advertised to be paid off. That could be ten years, fifty years or whatever year period of time, but there is no reference to reversing water diversion and it may well be in the long run that it would be appropriate to reverse a water diversion should it occur, but I don't know if the bill now permits that. It seems to me a very clear definable criteria could be used if that process was one that was put into the bill of measuring that time frame and it could be appropriately changed or be suitable rather for different conditions. The other suggestion that is included in these proposals is one that I'm trying to get back to the concept that I thought the legislature talked about three or four years ago when we first embarked upon a water study in that almost all of us no matter which side we came from on the whole issue of water, almost all of us said water decisions ought to be based as much as possible