

amount of time, and Senator DeCamp says, see Senator Hoagland is trying to use up the water. This is a resource that will last indefinitely. Now the whole concept of the specified period of time does not come from Senator Hoagland, it comes from LB 375. If it is not possible for this Legislature to establish a minimum amount of time with any certainty because of the rainfall, because of the snow, because of acts of God, because of technology, then how is it possible for an NRD board to do that? It seems to me that either it can be done and if it can be done it can be done by us or the NRD board, or it can't be done at all. Now the language that Senator Hoagland's amending uses the phrase "a finite period of time" as far as the definition of a groundwater reservoir life goal. Now if the bill says such a thing is attainable, a finite period of time, then that has to be something like 30 years, a 100 years or 5 years. If it is not possible, as Senator DeCamp seems to say, as others are saying, if it is not possible to establish that period, then this bill better go back to committee and consider a few more amendments. We are saying we cannot arrive at this number, that it is impossible to do. We are passing an unworkable piece of legislation. We are giving the NRDs an impossible task it seems according to debate on this floor. If so, then this bill really is kind of a fraud. We are saying we can't establish in this Legislature a minimum life goal, how do we expect an elected NRD board to do it? I don't think we can have it both ways, one way say that the water will last indefinitely and the next day say that we can establish a finite goal. If it is possible to have a finite goal, we can establish it as a state policy or it can be established by an NRD board. If it is not possible for us to establish it, it can hardly be possible for the NRD to do it. I think that Senator Hoagland's amendment may, in fact, point out contradictions within the philosophy on this bill. If you are not willing to accept Senator Vickers' concept of an indefinite life span for the aquifer, then there seems to be a desire to use that aquifer up. If you are saying today that, no, it will never be used up because we just can't predict the future, then really the bill cannot be workable. So I think that we should either adopt the concept of Senator Hoagland's amendment for a minimum policy of life goal or if it is not possible to have any sort of finite period of time like the bills says established as a policy, then the bill better go back to the Public Works Committee and we can find out a better tool for the NRDs to use to manage.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Kremer.