

May 4, 1981

LB 567

The specific project probably a savings, or at least it is going to be more expensive to do the two projects two separate times. When we were looking at the project it would have been a total of \$500,000 this year plus the \$715,000 second year funding to complete all of the renovation as well as the mechanical equipment that was included this time this being done in one contract would make more sense than spreading it over two years with the balance to be done at some other time in the future. Let me say that there are probably half a dozen different capital construction projects, any one of which by itself can be logically justified. The issue however is keeping capital construction at a minimum this year for operations and secondly to keep commitments in the long run as flexible as possible from the states point of view or that they handle whatever changes we may be faced with next year because of changes in federal funds and federal allocation or a whole variety of programs. It seems to me the prudent management of the state money then dictates that capital construction be kept at a minimal as is recommended by the Appropriations Committee that no major projects be done. I would hope that the committee would support that concept without expansion of major projects as proposed by this as well as some of the other amendments that will be before you during the afternoon.

SENATOR CLARK: I would like to introduce Mr. and Mrs. Al Eden from Grand Island. They are guests of Howard Peterson. They are under the north balcony. Will you stand and be recognized please. Will you have them stand and be recognized. Welcome to the Legislature. Senator Koch, would you like to close on your motion?

SENATOR KOCH: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Senator Warner talks about the impact of the federal government and we realize that that is rather evident. In fact as I understand this morning coming down here that they expect to vote on that budget tomorrow or the next day. Then we will know what is really in it. But I believe that once we make a study and we find that there is need that for us to delay this is not in the best interest of the tax payers. That is generally what we always talk about. We can continue to do patch work on this type of facility. If we do then the patch work proves to be very costly and indeed is not in the best interest of this body or anyone else. Because if we allow this to be laid over and then we decide next year if those moneys are forth coming, and I don't know