

that this bill did not have enough state oversight, that counties would be doing different things in different areas and that there needed to be some more statewide continuity in the bill. So, as the Clerk mentioned, there is an amendment, amendment 907, in your bill book. If you would care to turn to that amendment, it's 16 pages long and it does replace the original bill. But the things it does in there are very easy to explain. The main thing it does is involve the Natural Resources Commission. Under the provisions of the amendment, the Natural Resources Commission, through resolution, could designate all or any portion of a river or stream as a protected river. This would in turn allow a county board to zone the portion of the river or stream as a protected stream corridor. Now this does give it statewide continuity. Prior to the county board adopting a resolution, a public hearing would be required to gather input. That is the main part of the amendment. And I have had circulated and on your desk is a brief outline of the bill as amended, or as would be amended by this amendment, the new bill. Another part of the amendment includes a couple of the amendments which were adopted by the Government Committee previously. One of those is that, prior to the county board adopting a resolution, a public hearing would be required to gather input. Also, when a proposed...there was a problem that when a proposed river or stream acts as a boundary for two or more counties, the action of one county to designate a portion as a protected stream would not be effective until all counties bordering that portion have entered into a joint management agreement. This agreement would require the adoption of uniform regulations. The problem was brought to us that we may have a situation where a county serves as a border...or a river serves as a border for two counties. And if you had the situation where each county on opposite sides of the river would adopt separate and different zoning regulations it might not be in the public interest. So this would require those...those two counties across from each other to adopt similar zoning regulations. It also changes the term "scenic rivers" to "protected streams". I'm not sure that's all that important. And another change that has been made in the bill is that county boards would be unable to zone scenic stream corridors if that portion of the river or stream is in the zoning jurisdiction of a city. There was a fear that a city zoning jurisdiction would be overridden by the county. That was not the intent of the bill and we are making it perfectly clear that would not happen, that the cities would continue to enjoy the same zoning prerogatives that they have at the present time, that the county