

was uniform, the same rules and regulations would have to be applied, but if there was a variation they could apply different rules and regulations. Now the control area regulations can vary this at the present time but not those NRDs not under control. Okay, Section 24, page 22, an NRD with a control area is granted certain authorities relating to the use of groundwater supply. The adoption, the amendment or repeal of any control is subject to approval by the Director of Water Resources. Controlled area regulations can vary according to conditions and so on, when they are under control. Under the new proposal the well spacing authority would be deleted, our guidelines for the district to consider adopting, amending or repealing controls, the director here again would also be required to use the same guidelines in approving the districts' action. The district could adopt controls on groundwater withdrawals in one or more adjoining townships which are more restricted than those of the surrounding area if required by at least 51% of the landowners in each of the requesting townships. Now, let me give you an example again. I will use the Upper Republican as an example because this is where a comment came from that brought about this change in the statutes. In the Upper Republican using it only for an example now, a controlled area was designated and rules and regulations were adopted and a group of people informed this committee that they thought that the restrictions were not severe enough and they lived in an area, a number of them said that we, instead of allocating 18" of water we feel that we should have only 14" of water. That is an example again. So in this case if there were those in a subarea of an NRD under control that wanted more restrictive controls, they have got 51% of the signers, then that authority would be granted to the NRD to do so. Now, that concludes the groundwater management, namely LB 577, provisions that have been changed, it includes, as I have explained it, Senator Sieck's bill which would allow for a late permit. Now we go to LB 984, a bill submitted to the committee by Senator Schmit and it had to do with the development, the encouragement of development, so not only would we need good management practices but we also need to have a look at some of the water that is going to waste in our state and we need to consider development as well as management. Now this bill consists generally of legislative intent, and coincides pretty generally with legislation passed by this body in past years directing the Natural Resources Commission to have a look at some of these things that could be done and should be done in the way of development. Here is the language that is in the bill as amended. Number one, Section 25, page 26, legislative intent is expressed that aspects of Nebraska groundwater and surplus water need to be clarified. Page 27, legislative intent is expressed that the Natural Resource Commission consider the impact of the state adopting various water policies as part of the policy issues