

March 21, 1980

LB 887

in your amendment. Now furthermore, our committee, the Public Works Committee has been aware of the amendment that you have proposed on this bill and on another, too, Senator DeCamp, so we have incorporated in a resolution that has been submitted to the Legislature for approval a look at condemnation and as it relates to these various areas of eminent domain. So at this point, Senator DeCamp, I do not think you go far enough. I think it is unclear and I am not too sure that in certain cases we should not since the taxpayers living in urban areas also are contributing to those things that the NRDs can do. So at this point, Senator DeCamp, I am going to oppose the amendment and I will promise you that we will invite you in with the committee to look at this thing during the interim and see if we cannot put the language in that we think you intended to put in and visit with all people that may be concerned. So at this point, Senator DeCamp, I am going to have to oppose your proposed amendment to LB 887.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Sieck.

SENATOR SIECK: Mr. President and members of the body, I would like to ask Senator DeCamp a question. Did this accusation or this amendment, so to speak, come because of the Willow Creek Project up at Pierce?

SENATOR DeCAMP: It came because of a number of projects, a number of concerns. That certainly is one of them. I think that project is ninety-six percent recreation and involves what, ten sections of farmland, so on and so forth. I think we believe that maybe that is not the direction NRDs should be going, that they have a more fundamental purpose than providing recreational lakes right now.

SENATOR SIECK: Okay, most of the members of the body got information on the Willow Creek Project, and as I studied that information, there is going to be a tremendous amount of water stored there and I am certain that in the negotiation there will not be the land taken as you mentioned, seven sections or whatever, and as I viewed the Natural Resource Districts in the past, I can't recall an instance where it was taken just strictly for recreation, and what I am afraid of with this amendment we are going to kill all the water projects because every one of them have recreation in it. And you go to the court system, you can tell us here that it will not hurt the recreational projects, it will not hurt the flood control but it will. The courts will say that there is going to be recreation. Anytime you have a water base project, it is going to stop