

May 14, 1979

LB 594

me it is just simple good business judgement to make this shift because of the reduction in operating cost and the fact that most of the buildings on East campus are constructed in such a way that without adequate chiller they are not really useable either for research or for teaching or for studying on the part of the students. There is one addition which we are also suggesting which is a little better than half the cost of the replacement of a structure on the fair grounds called a beef barn. This is \$295,000. This is a structure which has a full cost of about \$560,000 approximately. This is a structure which the 309 committee has indicated was not worthy of repair because of its condition. It is a structure which has a great many of the public within it, very expensive animals. I think our feeling was that as these adjustments are made and this can still be done and still reduce the full impact of 594 that there is a potential liability for the state should something occur at that structure that either animals or humans could be hurt. The balance of that cost will come out of their own funds that they raised through the process of conducting the fair. This will be the maximum amount that we have placed in it. This was a choice of the committee on its final first recommendations on a five to four vote. It did not quite make it but I would urge that the reconsideration of this issue by the Appropriations Committee together with the effort of reducing another approximately \$350,000 of state appropriations has merit and I would urge the body to accept the recommendation. I would be glad to answer any questions. Mr. Chairman, I forgot to mention, there is considerable language I should have mentioned. Some programs are being amended from previous sessions. If you look on page 2 for example, there is a number of programs that amended...this amendment amends last year's bill and as you all know you have to include the whole section in it so there is no change from any of those items that are included. There is two other changes I neglected to mention though. One is, there is some clarification in the wording being added as far as the theatre arts building. This is words that were dropped out some where along the line as the bill was printed but what it does do is insure that the concept of private contributions for the completion of that structure will be included in its authorization and then the other change which has a reduction in appropriations of about \$50 or \$60,000 clearly takes out authorization for the finalization of the specification on Architectural Hall and the only reason for that is that the committee felt it was ill-advised to add that kind of a possible commitment to future sessions inasmuch as very little could be done now

5259