

is not about a particular trail. The fund that's being set up with this bill is not about a particular trail. It's true, there are people in Lincoln who would like to have a part of that fund for a particular trail, but there's nothing that the people of Lincoln can do to have an advantage over anybody else. The fund is to be distributed by Game and Parks, they will be the ones that will decide whether there is a better project some place else for the funds that are available. Everybody has equal access to the fund. The fund may go on for 10 years, at the level of funding provided in the bill, or it may not. It may be that the Appropriations Committee, in future years, will decide that not enough money is available for that level of funding. It may be that this body, as a whole, will make that decision. So even the level of funding is not something that is set in stone for a number of years. And it's not just for city people either. The experience of America, with regard to these trails, has been that rural folks use these trails just as much or more than urban folks. The young rural folks tend to like these trails just as much as the young folks from the urban areas. So I don't think you should look upon it as an urban-rural kind of thing. It's true that the particular trail that the people in Lincoln are interested in at this point in time goes off into the rural area. It does, because it's going to connect with a series of recreation lakes that are at the other end of the 20 miles, which will be connected to the City of Lincoln with this trail. And those recreational lakes that are out there for flood control purposes in the countryside are basically built with funds from the City of...from the people of the City of Lincoln, because we're the basic, the large contributors to our NRD, and that's fine. I think we should think in terms of conjunctive uses. I notice that in several different states, where there are large amounts of money being put into trails projects, some of them are doing them in conjunction with conservation projects. Wisconsin, for example, has approved a \$250 million program, \$250 million program, that goes over 10 years, that combines habitat, conservation, stream bank protection, and trails. They're working these things together, and that's beginning to be what we do with our NRDs. The NRDs are starting to take a more liberal attitude with regard to the importance of recreation, and I think we should encourage that. I think we should encourage that instead of discourage it, because the more these uses are mixed and put together, and the more that everybody sees some benefit from them, the more public support they're going to have. Whereas if you want to maintain the attitude of just stomping down on all