

May 5, 1981

LB 400

have made promises. They have given Senator Kremer and myself assurances that they will be able to work out the problems in regard to the bill, in regard to the bill which mainly are contractual problems if given a little more time. So we are taking them at their word. The thinking of Senator Kremer and myself at this point is to pass over the bill and leave it for consideration early in the next session. If at that time the utilities have not accomplished the purpose of the bill, then it will be our intention to bring the bill back, get the bill passed with the emergency clause so that it will be effective for the irrigation season in 1982. At this point, I believe before we withdraw the bill Senator Kremer would like to comment.

SENATOR CLARK PRESIDING

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Kremer. Senator Lamb, was it your purpose to hold this bill over until next year? Senator Lamb, was it your purpose to hold the bill over until next year?

SENATOR LAMB: Yes, but before I would pass over it (interruption).

SENATOR CLARK: I will let him talk. Go ahead, Senator Kremer.

SENATOR KREMER: Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, Senator Lamb and I discussed the position we have taken at the present time at some length and at different times. We did meet with the various segments of the industry yesterday and we found there was a great deal of disagreement in the industry itself because they felt at this time they were not in a position to iron out the problems that may be before us. We had a long discussion with them. Senator Lamb and I both feel that we have something here that is going to be needed as we recognize what is happening in the field of development and what could happen to the peak loads in the summertime and the experience that the irrigators have with the ratchet provision, and unless something can be done to relieve that, we think that we might be in some difficulty at least to some extent in the way of lifting this water and applying it to the land. So this excess power that is being shipped out of the state at a cost less than to the ratepayers today in many cases could just as well be kept in the State of Nebraska that would benefit the State of Nebraska. We want to be fair with all segments of the industry and I think what we are doing here is about the same as what we did with LB 132 when we asked the industry, "Now you get in that room and stay there and