

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Wesely. Senator Wesely, please.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. Speaker Barrett, I am again sorry to raise so much concern here. Senator Warner, could I ask just one quick question? If we approve this resolution, does that pretty well give our stamp of approval on the plan or is it our suggestions on approving the plan? Exactly, kind of, what are we doing here?

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Wesely, as I understand the statute that it now exists, we can make, in a very broad sense, recommendations on the predisbursement plan which would not be and is not a project specific and if we fail to take any action, why, of course, then under that statute if it's not reacted to within 30 days, why it automatically goes ahead. So...

SENATOR WESELY: Okay, for instance, I guess in follow-up to that, if we adopt this resolution, is it still possible, for instance, for Senator Conway, as Chairman of the Building and Maintenance Task Force which did do this 309 study and to go in to the Governor and say, maybe you ought to look at making some changes and putting some money in this direction? Or would that, I mean, are we done in terms of any discussion on this?

SENATOR WARNER: I would assume that potential is there. I would imagine it would have to be within the broad guidelines at least...well, they certainly could change but I would be inclined to believe that it would have to be within the broad guidelines of their predisbursement plan. I also would suggest that if we are going to recommend that some area be increased, that we, at the same time, indicate what area we think should be decreased. You, obviously, cannot spend 40 million out of 19.9 million, which, by the way, is the same truth as the budget, but that's not the subject.

SENATOR WESELY: Okay, thank you, Senator Warner. I have had a chance to look further on this 309 Task Force Report and what it calls for is...and one element that is in this proposal is \$150,000 for an energy team to work on this matter but it also calls for a \$5.5 million revolving loan fund to go out and work on state buildings and it would save, in 10 years, \$13.7 million. And that gets back to my concern about one way to do this would be to have a revolving loan fund, fix up some state buildings, save the tax dollars that would have gone to