

recharge appropriation if there was going to be a reduction in either...in their stream flow right. That is all that it is intended to do. It is intended to work in conjunction with the transfers allowed under 99 and it is intended to avoid what would essentially be a bifurcation of a water right between a surface water right and an incidental ground water recharge right. I might note that if you're examining the language of the amendment, it is slightly...it is different than the wording of LB 100 but that it does exact...in my opinion, it does exactly the same thing. So, with that, I would be happy to respond to questions if any of you have questions. I intentionally brought this as a separate issue because I thought it might engender separate discussion aside from the basic principles of LB 99.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Madam President and members of the Legislature, the Natural Resources Committee looked at this one as critically as they possibly could but within the context of what Senator Wickersham is doing it seems to make sense also. For me, I think the bottom line is that the total amount of water that a district uses is not increased by either 99 or LB 100, and within that context we are...this is...this goes further along the line of providing greater flexibility which seems to me to make sense. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Elmer.

SENATOR ELMER: Thank you, Madam President. This is a little aside from the bill that Senator Wickersham is bringing but when he mentioned the 1 and 70 rule or that one cubic foot per second is considered to be adequate to irrigate 70 acres, I wanted to present to you a little figure here. Our Game and Parks Commission has made a request to appropriate a large amount of in-stream flow right in the Platte River and at certain times that would exceed 5,000 cubic feet per second in stream flow. Now if one cubic foot per second would irrigate 70 acres, that 5,000 cubic feet would represent enough to irrigate 350,000 acres, and if that were corn acreage and that corn would average 150 bushel of irrigated corn, which is conservative, that would represent almost 53 million bushels of corn or potential revenue for the state in bucks of \$125 million. So you can see why there is a great deal of controversy over this