

April 10, 1981

LB 243

a memorandum that I distributed before lunch to members of the Public Works Committee from Dale Williamson. It is a two and a half page memorandum that he sent over following some testimony before our committee on LB 527. And I would really encourage you to read that carefully because a lot of people who are very knowledgeable about this issue, including Mr. Williamson and the members of the Natural Resources Commission, are strongly against this particular provision. The most important part of Dale's memorandum is the last third of the memorandum where he describes those projects that are currently under way, in other words those completed projects that could not have been completed had LB 243 passed in its original fifty percent form. Now I was talking to a gentleman over the lunch hour who is very much in support of this bill who indicated to me that the Clatonia project which is in Senator Burrows Legislative District is indeed an excellent project that has provided all sorts of flood control benefits and recreational benefits and other kind of benefits. Now according to Dale the Clatonia project simply could not have been built if LB 243 in the fifty percent form had been constructed, the same with the Crystal Lake recreational project in Senator Marvel's District, and the same with the Cub Creek project in Senator Lamb's District, and the same with the Maskenthine Flood Control and Recreation project in Senator Chronister's District, and the same with the South Fork ; project in Senator Remmers' District, and the same with the Summit Lake project which I understand is very close to Senator Goll's property in Senator Goll's District, and the same with the Walnut Creek Flood Control project in Senator Maresh's District. Now Mr. Williamson is asserting that if the fifty percent standard had stayed in none of these projects could have been built where condemnation authority would have been needed to completely purchase all the land. Now we don't know what effect this seventy-five percent provision is going to be but all of you who really want to take a thoughtful approach to this issue, and I know that most of us do in this body, I would really encourage you to read this memorandum and to think through these issues and understand the extent to which this bill, perhaps even in the seventy-five percent form, and I don't know that, could and probably will significantly hinder the development of future surface water projects. Now I indicated earlier the extent to which this is going to impact even more severely on the eastern one-third of the state. So I really hope the urban legislators will stand up and take note and realize that this is going to impact on us more severely than it will people elsewhere. So, just in conclusion because of the long range policy importance of developing as many surface water