

March 19, 1980

LB 1002

desire, to make sure that we didn't have adequate representation in the distribution of this state money and now along comes people and they suggest that we ought to put more money into it in terms of the distribution. Now Senator Kremer and I are trying to work out a negotiated agreement but it is not there yet, and although I have a high sincere trust for everyone, I would rather have the body in place that is going to distribute the money before we start talking about putting any more money in. It is really strange how these things make a turnaround, isn't it? Those that were most vehement, most vehement, about putting an urban member on the board now are saying let's have more money and let's have it distributed. I think those are companion issues. That is a question, Senator Kremer, of which comes first but I think probably that would help in terms of having a voice in the distribution of the money before we put more in and I would like to ask Senator Sieck a question. Senator Sieck.

SENATOR SIECK: Yes, I yield.

SENATOR LEWIS: Senator Sieck, now you say there is \$10 million of unfunded projects here?

SENATOR SIECK: That is correct. That is what I was told.

SENATOR LEWIS: Do you know where they are?

SENATOR SIECK: The Papio is one of them.

SENATOR LEWIS: What is our chances in terms of priority?

SENATOR SIECK: It depends on how enthused the Papio Natural Resource District becomes with their project.

SENATOR LEWIS: They make the decision on that?

SENATOR SIECK: They make the decision whether they want the project or not, that is correct.

SENATOR LEWIS: Do they make a decision on how the money is given to them or not?

SENATOR SIECK: No, they do not. The State Commission does this.

SENATOR LEWIS: That is interesting.

SENATOR SIECK: And as you know, I supported the extra member (interruption).