

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

March 4, 2004

LB 962

a sprinkler. So instead of flooding the fields as they used to, a lot of them are putting them into reservoir type sump areas and they're pumping out of these through the sprinkler system, and consequently, that water doesn't return to the river. So I think it will be many years before you see the river flow as we used to know it. I don't think it will ever happen again in our lifetime, because the way that farming has changed out there and there are more circle pivots. When you talk about the cost of the thing and who's going to pay for it, my question is, is what are you buying for your cost? Are you talking about buying some of these water rights back? I don't think these water rights need to be bought back. They were given to most of these landholders or the land that they were designated to, and if there isn't any water left, then...then there won't be any water rights, simple as that. That's what part of the bill is for is they're going to extend some of those rights that you can go till 15 years if you don't have enough water to irrigate with. This is something that probably needs to be done. Perhaps in the future there will be a time when there is enough water to reappropriate it out there. The cost of the thing, as far as the regulation of it, the Department of Natural Resources, this is to hire more people to do more studying and to implement it. This is some of the things that have been studied, studied to death, really. The university has a lot of research done on it over the years, so I don't know as we need a lot of studying done on it. Most anybody involved with natural resource districts or any irrigation districts already know what the problem is. The problem is you don't have enough water and you're going to have to either share it around, and are you going to control the surface water, and is the ground water going to be controlled by the same method? So I think the first question at hand is the surface water rights. Are we going to give these people an extension on the time that they have if they don't use this surface water rights that they're entitled to and go with that part? When we consider some of the things that we've talked about on this, when we get into the cost of it, I think that comes later on in the amendment, but I don't see that we really have to be that much concerned on the \$2.5 million.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.