

interest I mean by that it doesn't excite me and it doesn't trouble me. I don't mean I lack interest in the sense of not even wanting to know what the amendment entails. Senator Beutler, when you put, in line 17, the term "five possible changes", is this based on culling five notions from maybe a host of ideas that will be developed during the study?

SENATOR WILL: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: That's essentially correct, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Suppose it's felt that there are more than five which would be worthy of consideration?

SENATOR BEUTLER: I don't think there's anything in the law that would preclude them from putting additional suggestions in.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, but there's...

SENATOR BEUTLER: It was in...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Oh, excuse me.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ..it was intended to hopefully be a minimum, to give us at least five ideas to work with.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, but it's not to do away with flexibility, that's the main thing.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, that's all that I have. Thank you.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Mr. President and colleagues. I just rise to support the proposed amendment. We did discuss this in Natural Resources Committee. The wording of the amendment is similar to what the committee felt was appropriate for requiring or suggesting that the Natural Resources Districts look very strongly at how they can also become more efficient and avoid duplication, perhaps save some administrative costs. Back when the districts were formed in 1972 or so, they were formed just basically on river basin concepts and that's still a very viable