

the correlation between surface and ground water. I just want to be sure that a need arises to limit pumping it will be the duty of the natural resource districts, who are very representative of the people, to police water uses. By the way, Senator Beutler, you always say that they're ran by farmers. The Lower Elkhorn Natural Resource District, with fifteen directors, has seven farmers and eight others, two of those are teachers, one's a plumber, two are city employees, one's a banker, and one's a feed manufacturer. I can assure you that if this amendment is passed that I'll support LB 108 and work hard to make sure it remains equitable to everyone's best interest. I know there are a lot of people that don't believe we need this legislation, but there are areas now that are in need and there could be more and larger areas in years to come. Please support this amendment.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Klein. Is there any discussion of the Klein amendment? Seeing none, Senator...excuse me, Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: (Microphone not activated)...Governor, members of the Legislature, LB 108 doesn't have to do with in-stream flow in and of itself at all. Back when the process started, several years ago now, and up until December, actually, of just this last year, there was a provision in LB 108 that indicated that in-stream flow appropriators, surface water appropriators who were in-stream flow appropriators under the law, like any other beneficial user of the surface water, would be able to...would be afforded the protections of LB 103 in the event of a conflict between surface water users and ground water users. In December, the last time that the Governor's Water Council met, at the request of the rural representatives to the council, an amendment was adopted which...which eliminated completely in-stream flow appropriators from the bill, LB 108. And essentially now, the only beneficial users who are protected by LB 108 are municipal users and industrial users and irrigators, all of those folks who have beneficial use appropriations which involve taking the water out of the stream as opposed to an in-stream flow appropriation. So this bill has nothing to do now, at this point, with in-stream flow appropriations. It certainly doesn't have anything to do with going back into the law and stripping out some of the provisions related to in-stream flow that are...that never were related to this particular bill. I understand that there are very strong