

thing ahead. The Appropriations Committee has a bill which categorically puts this project somewhere where it belongs, has got somebody in charge of the project, is trying to do these things, and I just think that if you defeat the committee amendments, we will work closely with the Transportation Committee and counsel to come up with a proposal that will continue the reporting requirements identical to what the committee amendments now have, but also put in sort of an escape valve so that if we know, in fact, that this project cannot go on line January 1, 1995, it won't. No one is going to shove this down the counties' throats before it's ready and before they are willing and able to accept it openheartedly and I think that's the approach to take. If you move it back to 1997, the heat is off and, frankly, this is a project that needs a little heat on it. We need to move this thing ahead. We've waited long enough, it's delayed long enough, it's floundered, and unless we move it ahead we'll have committed seven to \$10 million for a project that maybe we'll just trash and I don't think we can afford to do that at this point. So I would urge rejection of the committee amendments although I understand and accept a good part of them, understanding that I think that Appropriations and the Transportation will get together and come up with a proposal that is very fair and that's what I would ask the body to do today.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Hohenstein. Any further discussion on the committee amendments to 841? Seeing none, Senator Byars, would you like to close?

SENATOR BYARS: Yes, Madam President, I would, and I thank the body for it's indulgence relative to this issue. I think basically what we're talking about here is an agreement to disagree or a disagreement to agree, I'm not sure exactly where we're at on that, but we're in a situation where both the Appropriations Committee and the Transportation Committee understands we have to have some mandates. The disagreement is on where those mandates should fall and when can they be completed. I think their arguments can be made both ways. The preponderance of testimony that came before the Transportation Committee was that the counties were not completely comfortable with that mandated date. The Department of Motor Vehicles came in on the bill basically neutral. I think we have alleviated a lot of the fears that have been presented in LB 491 last night by the dollars that are being made available to the counties to complete this project. Does it need to be done? Yes. We need