

director and the technical staff, was not a political judgement but one based on the technical feasibility of the project. Is that correct?

SENATOR RUPP: I have no way of knowing. I can't read another person's mind, Senator Warner. I suspect possibly. I suspect that there was a little of both involved in it. I think it was a mixture of the two.

SENATOR WARNER: Well, not particular but the whole concept as I understand it, by current statute, is that there is a group of individuals, technicians, charged with the responsibility of reviewing any and all of these various projects as well as additions that are made to them or requested of them to go through those solely on a technical...technician's point of view as to whether or not that particular project is feasible. I would have considerable concern, if that is correct, that we would turn around and say well a board of laymen, not trained in the technical feasibility of a project, could overturn the technicians. It would seem to me that at a minimum it ought to be something more than a simple majority that would be willing to ignore what technicians said that it was not feasible. Now you know if the turn down is a political issue, and I understand with the way the commission is now that one could suspect that, but it would seem to me that for lay people to stand up and say, well, that project isn't feasible, or is feasible even though the technicians say there are serious problems with the substructure, say it was a dam or whatever it might be, would be very bad policy to make it too easy to ignore those kinds of recommendations. I would be very hesitant to advance the bill as it is. I appreciate the problems you had at Columbus. That is representative of a concern. I understand that. But I would be really hesitant to say, well, a simple majority can make a political decision ignoring what technicians point out as items that makes the project not feasible.

PRESIDENT: Senator Hoagland.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: I have only a brief comment to make for Senator Rupp. Senator Rupp, as I read the bill it would allow...it would require a majority of all members, rather than a majority of those present. I wonder if that was the intent of the drafters of the bill. In other words,...