

you just shortly a history of the Trail Development Fund, and I want to go through that with you a little bit because I want everybody to understand that this is not a typical request for an increase. Those of you who were here in 1991 know that we passed LB 114. And LB 114 created the Trail Development Fund. And under that fund grants up to 50 percent out of the fund could be given to various local communities who were interested in and proposed their own trail development propositions. And at that time the fund was to be \$100,000 a year, and at that time it was funded for \$100,000 starting in fiscal year '92 and '93, okay? So that's what it was. Now starts a very unusual history for an appropriation, because what happened next was after the use of the first \$100,000, the next thing that happened was in the next biennium Game and Parks, inadvertently they say, omitted completely, omitted completely the Trail Development Fund. And I'm embarrassed to stand here and say that I was paying attention to other things, I didn't look in the appropriations bill that year to see that the Trail Development Fund money was there, as most of you wouldn't after you got a program going, and what in the end happened was for that biennium there was no appropriation at all, I lost the entire \$100,000 for two years straight. So you can see on the chart, on the second...on the back side of your page that for '93-94, '94-95 the appropriation was zero both years. So what happened? As soon as I found out about what had happened I came back into the Appropriations Committee the following year and I asked them to do a deficit appropriation and also to appropriate for '94-95. And the Appropriations Committee recognized the mistake and they appropriated \$100,000 for both of those years, for each of those years. Well, then by golly the Governor decided to veto it. So never did get any money for those two years. So for the first three years of the Trail Development Fund, when we were supposed to have \$300,000 to work with, we essentially had only \$100,000. This year we've sought again to restore the original \$100,000, no more, no less, really less given inflation of course, and the Appropriations Committee saw fit in this particular budget to put in \$50,000 for each of two years. In other words they restored half of it. Well, the Governor, on the other hand, this year has agreed to the full \$100,000 per year. So I'm looking for a year when everybody can agree on the original \$100,000 a year that we agreed upon in 1991, when we passed the bill. So I hope you can understand the unusualness of the situation. I'm not asking for any more than what was agreed to in 1991. The money is more important than ever for a number of reasons. There's been probably around