

May 12, 1981

LB 243

is so different. But that NRD and the Directors that I visited with from that NRD certainly support LB 243. Some of them were a little concerned when we adopted the amendments that we have that weakened the bill somewhat. But anyway, they support LB 243 and I don't believe that as concerned as they are about water storage, that they would be supporting this bill if they thought it was a serious problem. So those many in the field who work in this area do not necessarily share the position of their association that this bill should be opposed. In fact, they support it. I urge you to support this bill. I think it is a wise move and will result in the expenditure of our dollars for water projects on higher priority items than has been the case in the past.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, several urban Senators the last time this bill came up stood up and opposed Senator Schmit's position, and of great surprise to Senator Schmit I am going to rise and support his position on this bill. Many times in this Legislature we have had to adopt restrictions and controls on political subdivisions on expenditures, particularly on expenditures for capital items. Capital construction of any type whether you are building a school building, a community college or a water project is a very attractive thing. It is attractive politically because you come up with something tangible and it gives you a sense of accomplishment. It's something physical. We have found all too often, let's take a community college as an example that once construction starts it is hard to stop and that it is very difficult at times to limit these subdivisions and I think we may be running into that problem with the Natural Resource Districts. Senator Schmit has pointed out that not only is there a scarcity of water perhaps but there is a scarcity of money to deal with the problem and that we will have to establish some priorities. Now the priority that Senator Schmit is suggesting I think is very reasonable and that is that a project be at least 25 percent nonrecreational. Now I have no idea how many different categories of things would fall into nonrecreational, but I think you are talking about habitat, you are talking about water storage, you are talking about water and soil conservation, you are talking about flood control, probably a whole variety of factors. Senator Schmit says when you add all those together that at least 25 percent of the project benefits be in those areas. Now that seems very generous to let recreation be 75 percent, in fact, it might even be excessive, but Senator Schmit can be a generous man. It does

5014