

May 8, 1981

LB 326

by us even though we really don't intend it. And I am seeking to eliminate Section 4 because I am suggesting to you that we are developing a hopeless bureaucracy on the water question by the creation...or by the reference to an interagency water coordinating committee which is not even established or has never been established in our statutes, and yet in Section 4 we are saying that this agency, this coordinating committee, not agency, is going to be assisting the Natural Resource Commission in this water planning process. Now the state water plan, the state planning process is supposed to be itself coordinated by the Natural Resources Commission. That is their job. They are the coordinating agency. And last year the Public Works Committee in order to make that coordination work a little better assigned each member of the Public Works Committee to work with the NRC in its different studies that it is trying to coordinate to be sure that all the different code agencies were working with the NRC. For myself, for example, I have been assigned to the instream flow study, and to my knowledge in the last year there have been no complaints about coordination. The state agencies have, in fact, been cooperating with the Natural Resources Commission. But now we are going to establish this coordinating committee which is going to be doing the same job that the Natural Resources Commission is supposed to be doing, and is doing, and one is a code agency...or excuse me, one is a noncode agency, the Natural Resources Commission, and the committee is nothing. It is a nebulous voluntary committee that the Governor has organized and which he could continue to organize without this provision, Section 4, in the law. So what I am saying to you is that Section 4 is not necessary in the first place, but to the extent that we give it status in law then we are giving status to two separate coordinating agencies, and I suggest to you that not very long into the future there is going to be bureaucratic bickering and more trouble than we anticipate because both of them are setting out to do the same job. We have had a couple of bad experiences in the Education Committee already with these coordinating commissions. The Commission for Coordinating Aid to the Handicapped, for example, has been a disaster. They ended up they didn't even meet any more after a while. But don't forget that in addition to the Natural Resource District acting as a coordinator we have the Public Advisory Board which is getting its input into this. And I just think that this new committee that we are referencing which is not a legal entity, is window dressing at best but cumbersome and may inhibit real coordination in the second place. So I would just ask you to strike Section 4 so that we leave the Natural Resource Commission as the legally recognized coordinator in the statutes, and if the Executive Branch

4813