

May 19, 1975

purchase or development of either statewide parks or local parks and recreation projects. It has nothing to do with strictly any kind of conservation practices, despite the title.

SENATOR SAVAGE: Senator Syas, your light is on.

SENATOR SYAS: Senator Bereuter beat me to it. I think he explained it very well. I was the one, years ago, that introduced the act in this Legislature and it passed. I'm not going to repeat all he said because he was correct. One of them is the funds that you get for your city parks. Local funding is I think approximately not quite 25%, 25% state and 50% federal. The money is derived, in this particular case, from the sale of surplus property. Senator Kelly, you should research I think what you're talking about before you mislead people. This has nothing to do with water shortages and all that kind of stuff. This is recreation funds, as Senator Bereuter so ably told you about. There is some other possible funds to be used. I don't know for sure if they can or not, but there funds. One is the Pitingill Act, I've forgotten what the other act was, it was Pitman I think, which is a tax on sporting goods, generally shotgun shells and fishing equipment that go for those purposes that is sent back to the states on a dollar matching ratio. I haven't checked in the last few years, but it used to be about 3:1 federal. Those are taxes that the sportsman pays when he purchases a box of shotgun shells for instance. I don't know if they can use any of that money on this project or not. I think what Senator Koch is trying to tell you, there's a possibility of using federal funds on this project. I do believe, if I'd known this was coming up I'd have researched my material as of today. What I'm telling you, bear in mind, is ... when I had the bills a few years ago there may have been some ratios changed by now. I'm telling you about the old bill and not the new bill. It has nothing to do, as I can see it, with irrigation and that sort of thing. It is used on these watershed projects for the recreation areas sometimes, yes. Senator Kelly's right that far. When he gets into water conservation, ground level water, etc. he's now familiar with this. These funds are for recreation and nothing else. Senator Bereuter is right!

SENATOR SAVAGE: Senator Kelly. Senator Kelly, did you wish to talk?

SENATOR KELLY: Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I thank Senator Bereuter for his explanation. I wholeheartedly accept it on the basis that, evidently, that fund is very badly misnamed. I would ask specifically of Senator Koch, exactly how much state money would go into the purchase of this property that's spelled out in LB 507?

SENATOR KOCH: Right now, Senator Kelly, we anticipate that there would be no state money. I'll tell you why. It's that Mr. Gifford is giving, to the whole endeavor, his 960 acres, that's owned by Mr. Gifford. The value has been appraised, in 1974, at \$1,020,000. That would be offered as a donation to match the monies that we would be getting from the federal ... through federal funds which amount to \$675,000. I think the match is more than what we