

Omaha. That money is in a separate trailer bill and perhaps with this budget cut more money could be made available in north Omaha. But I also want you to know that clearly I think some attention needs to be paid to the R & D Authority and what they've been doing. They ended up spending something like \$2 million in the first years of their operation and spent something close to \$6 million in the last year. Now for some people that's a wonderful achievement to have been able to spend that much money in that short amount of time. They have taken a number of years to spend 2 million but only one year to spend 6 million. Another viewpoint might be that we're throwing money at projects, that instead of being cautious and careful with the taxpayers' dollars as they've been allocated to the R & D Authority that we're tending to want to do something and so just throwing money at projects. Let me give you one example. There's a project that, as I understand it, located in Scottsbluff and I don't have any objection to and I hope Senator Hillman won't object to this, but it's not based on where they're located, but what they do, and, as I understand it they're a road kill operation. Their pet food company and some of the money is to go out and pick up road kill and use it for pet food. It's a new extension of their product. I don't know if they're buying a truck or something else, but, as I understand it, we're funding through taxpayer dollars an investment in a company that their project is intended to primarily step up picking up road kill and utilizing it for pet food, not exactly a high tech activity and not exactly what we intended when we adopted the R & D Authority. Now we had a company come before the Banking Committee with Senator Landis and Senator Conway, Senator Hall, Senator Lindsay, some of the rest of us, Senator Abboud, Senator Schmit, and we heard about a company that had a computer graphic plan that would be able to use computers to identify what a project, how a project would impact an environment, how they would be able to analyze whether that was a good or bad project, make adjustments in it. It looked marvelous to me as a very exciting and sort of the high tech sort of thing that I would hope that we'd move forward in. Now these people get 10 minutes of time to actually address their concerns and get rejected summarily without really having what they felt was a fair opportunity to present their case. So we're turning down a computer graphics operation when we find it valuable to invest in the road kill pet food project. I'm not too happy. It seems to me that we're spending too much on administration and that we're throwing money at projects and we ought to slow down a little bit. So I'm suggesting two things,