

sponsoring agency. But in the Natural Resource District when a condemnation comes before them, that board of directors has to make that decision and they are dealing with their people. I know that Senator Schmit is for water projects and so am I. If we are going to do anything in the State of Nebraska to correct what is happening, we are going to have to have a lot more of them and we are always going to find individuals that will not give. I was directly involved because I actually did the negotiating on a lot of projects and I am going to tell you it is a difficult thing to go into a home and say, "Here, we want to build this project", and that individual blows his top and says you are going to build it for recreation when we was not. It was practically for flood control, but anytime you put water on somebody's land, there is going to be recreation involved. One of the most ridiculous provisions of the bill that I see is the retroactivity and that is primely for the Oliver Project. That project is now completed other than the issues in the court of the Singleton ranch. I feel this is special legislation. Before this project was built, the Singleton was like any other ranch or any other farm. When the project was completed, he saw the value of developing it as a development area, and if this had not been a part of the project, it would have lost a lot of its potential as far as recreation was concerned. This project had the endorsement of the people in that particular area and I am sure that when we build a project, and I have had experience in many, we do not want to give up the property. I know that is a fact and it is difficult but yet I haven't seen anyone who I have dealt with that did not come out the better end of the deal. Now in this particular case it was because of a potential monetary gain on the individual's part. I don't feel that in this instance that he was going to lose his home or anything of that nature but it was because of the gain that he could develop on his part. You cannot blame that individual for trying but you have to respect the people of that community and their efforts and what they have come forward with in developing a project that was defunct and coming up with a viable project. Another item that I feel is very unclear in LB 243 is the multiple structure that is for floodcontrol, water recharge, irrigation and recreation. You could possibly kill the whole project because it is very difficult to define recreation as such. I know now since the amendment passed that it is seventy-five percent for recreation, that eminent domain cannot be used. It doesn't say that you can't buy the property by other means. I believe individuals with legal assis...(RECORDING MACHINE MALFUNCTIONED - Approximately eleven feet.)....six hundred acre category and I believe I