

boards would not be able to zone this protected river in the cities, in that part of the city which is under the city's jurisdiction as far as zoning is concerned. It was never the purpose of the bill to do that, but this amendment makes that perfectly clear. Also there is inserted in here an amendment which would deal with the situation where two county...the river acts a border between two counties and in that situation those two counties would have to have a joint management agreement and it would require the adoption of uniform regulations on both sides of the river so that you would not have different regulations on one side of the river from the other. With those comments, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the amendment be adopted, and it is in your bill book, has been there for a number of days. It's AM0907 to LB 511.

SENATOR WARNER PRESIDING

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, as I understand Senator Lamb's amendment, it still in the end, it still in the end leaves absolute control of this issue at the county level and I'd like to ask Senator Lamb a couple of questions if I may.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Lamb, do you yield?

SENATOR LAMB: Yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: First of all, am I not correct in my assumption, Senator Lamb, that absolute control as to whether anything is done or not done on this matter is left with the counties under this proposal?

SENATOR LAMB: Only after the Natural Resources Commission has acted. They cannot do anything until the Natural Resources Commission has acted and then we do leave it in the hands of the locally elected county board.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, so in a sense you're taking some power away from the counties in that it has to be initiated by the Natural Resources Commission, but they have absolute veto power over the Natural Resources Commission. Is that a correct description?