

SENATOR CLARK: Have you all voted? Once more, have you all voted please? Record the vote.

CLERK: 9 ayes, 19 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of the Beutler amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: The motion lost. The next amendment to Section one. Are there any further amendments to Section one? We're going to Section two. Are there any amendments to Section two?

CLERK: Mr. President, yes, I do have amendments to Section two. The first is offered by Senator Vickers. Senator Vickers would amend Section two. (Read Vickers amendment as found on page 353 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President, members, I would hope that my good friend Senator Kremer and Senator Schmit would not take this amendment as being a nonsubstantive amendment and as a harassment amendment because I will tell you quite frankly this amendment has quite a bit of substance to it. If you will examine the language on page 5 of Request 2505, lines 2 through 6, it is a definition of what ground water reservoir life goal shall mean. Now as we discussed a little bit earlier, as I pointed out to you, I do not like the term "ground water reservoir life", indicating that it has, in fact, got an end to it at some point in time. I would prefer to insert in place of ground water reservoir life, "ground water reservoir safe yield goal" and as the Clerk read it to you and you all have copies of this amendment on your desk, I attempt with the language to indicate that it is possible to draw water from an aquifer to borrow, if you will, from an aquifer if you have a plan established per artificial replenishment of that aquifer through an augmentation program. Now this is a...it's not the usual definition as some people have used sustained yield. This is not sustained yield language. This is a different concept that it is possible to use that water but again, use it with the idea that we're going to have it there for a longer period of time, for an indefinite period of time and that we're going to have it, we're going to use it in such a fashion that we use it as it can be replenished either naturally or through artificial means. Now again, this is a statement that I think this Legislature needs to make. Again, I need to point out that what we're dealing with here is a management area at the discretion of locally elected boards of directors of natural resources districts that they can use, excuse me, if they so desire. But it seems to me that leaving the language in there that