

NRD ORAL HISTORY PROJECT
Interview with WARREN FAIRCHILD
at the Cornhusker Hotel
March 16, 1994

*(Interview questions by Steve Gaul, Jim Barr, and Rachel
Herpel)*

1 PROCEEDINGS, March 16, 1994:

2 MR. FAIRCHILD: The NRD program evolved through
3 many periods of legislative and other actions. It
4 originally goes back to 1937, and that was the enabling
5 legislation for soil conservation districts. They were seen
6 as the vehicle whereby the Soil Conservation Service could
7 give technical assistance to farmers. At that time, the
8 primary movers behind the organization of the district was
9 University officials, and Dr. Condra from the Conservation
10 and Survey Division was really the grand old master that
11 worked on the legislation and also pushed for the
12 organization of districts. For quite some time, the
13 University, the Conservation and Survey Division, College of
14 Agriculture, and the Extension Service were basically the
15 people that kind of kept the program going, and every year
16 they'd have a conference and the conference was usually in
17 Lincoln. The conference was the soil conservation
18 districts. As time went on, you always get a series of
19 leaders and come and go, strong people, and others that have
20 their own views.

21 In the 1950s, there was some of the soil
22 conservation figures that, certainly not in any way showing
23 disrespect to the University, but felt that, if they were
24 ever going to have some strength of their own, that they had
25 to have basically their own leadership and their own body

1 for their own association. You probably heard about these
2 people, as Bill Richards and Everett Barr is an example;
3 particularly Bill Richards felt very strongly about that.
4 This caused sort of a breach at that time between Dr. Condra
5 and all the fine work he did and the goals and aspirations
6 and desires of the Soil Conservation District supervisors
7 and the fact that they felt, even though they wanted to
8 maintain liaison with the University, that they could not
9 have the leadership and the domination from the University.

10 And so it was at a state conference that the Soil
11 Conservation District supervisors voted to sort of break
12 away from that type of leadership and they would form their
13 own state association. That would be back in the 1950s and
14 you can check out the dates of that. I don't have these
15 dates exactly. In my view, that was quite important that it
16 got the local supervisors themselves really being freer to
17 carry out some legislative and budgetary processes with the
18 Legislature. With that type of momentum, the state
19 association started to grow in stature.

20 I think it was about in 1955 they were successful
21 in getting money through the Legislature for hiring the
22 first Executive Secretary of the State Soil Conservation
23 Division. They hired the first executive secretary of the
24 state committee and that happened to be Jim McDougal. Jim
25 McDougal was with the Extension Service at the University of

1 Nebraska, and then he hired Hazel Jenkins as his secretary.
2 They were the first two that worked for the state committee
3 at that time. Jim was executive secretary for almost three
4 years, and it was at that time coming up to the next
5 legislative session that the state associations were
6 beginning to feel that "we've got to have some state
7 financial assistance to districts." The districts did not
8 have power of taxation; they didn't have any source of
9 revenue. So, they started to make overtures for some
10 funding from the State Legislature.

11 It's about that time that Jim McDougal took a job
12 with the Hastings Bank and, for whatever reason, they hired
13 me, and I came to work about that time. I was from the Soil
14 Conservation Service, at that time in Gage County. One of
15 the first things that happened that year in 1957 was that
16 Senator Don Thompson from McCook came up one morning and the
17 Legislature was in session. He says, "I think maybe I can
18 get through the Legislature on the floor some funding for
19 soil conservation districts." He was successful. At that
20 time, I think the first allocation to the state committee
21 was about \$27,000 for a biennium. It wasn't much. But
22 then, he increased it, and I think the appropriation went up
23 to somewhere like \$54,000. Most of it went to soil
24 conservation districts, and this was money that was made
25 directly available to districts.

1 Well, through the years, other things happened.
2 We got laws changed so that the counties were
3 authorized -- I forget some of that legislation -- but the
4 counties were authorized to allocate some county funds to
5 soil conservation districts. Many other things happened.
6 What I'm trying to do is show kind of an evolution of ideas
7 that came along because it didn't happen all at once.

8 Also, some of us looked at the soil conservation
9 enabling law, and there where it talked about soil, it also
10 talked about water. So we said, "Well, why don't we just
11 call them soil and water conservation districts?" And so,
12 that was when the soil and water conservation districts come
13 into view. We didn't really need any changes in
14 legislation. It was already in the legislation, and the
15 soil and water conservation committee eventually became the
16 commission.

17 Coming out of all this then, of course, was the
18 P.L. 566 program. If you'll recall, there was the need for
19 some sort of local groups to sponsor the soil and water
20 conservation planning and watershed program. In about 1953,
21 I believe that was the year that the watershed district
22 office passed, primarily by the support of the Salt-Wahoo
23 people. In 1955, it was before my time, the watershed
24 conservancy district act was passed. There are some major
25 differences between those two bills. One of the differences

1 was the watershed district law. The financing there was
2 going to be based on assessment of benefits and the
3 watershed conservancy district law was going to be an ad
4 valorem tax. It's kind of interesting that the advocates of
5 the watershed district act soon found it almost impossible
6 to work out an assessment based on benefits. It is very
7 difficult to do and, of course, they had some difficulty
8 with their particular program. Well, along with that -- I'm
9 trying to get up to date. Of course, then the allocations
10 to districts in the matter of the state water planning, the
11 concept of the state participating in watershed planning.
12 All these things that came into being, and I forget what
13 year we went forward, and there was the floodplain
14 management act with is a (indiscernible) with some of the
15 severe floods we had.

16 I think LB893 -- I think was the number of that
17 act. That was kind of an interesting thing. When we went
18 forward with that act, it sat in committee. Nobody was
19 going to touch it. But, lo and behold, unfortunately, a
20 tremendous flood hit basically the Papio. Within a week,
21 that bill was voted out of committee and it passed
22 unanimously on the floor and nobody opposed it. You're
23 sitting there and nothing happens, then the flood hits, the
24 bill passed. That's the way the floodplain management bill
25 got passed in Nebraska. Right or wrong, a flood expedited

1 the passage of the act.

2 The National Association of Conservation Districts
3 had a -- what was called a district outlook committee and,
4 of course, some of our local leaders, like Bill Richards,
5 Everett Barr, Milton Fricke, Dempsey McNiel, and others,
6 were quite active in the National Association of
7 Conservation Districts. They had this district outlook
8 committee, and what they were looking at on a national level
9 was how they could strengthen the role of conservation
10 districts, and I was asked to serve on that committee, the
11 district outlook committee of NACD. This was -- probably
12 would have been along, I suppose, sometime I would guess in
13 the late 50s or early 60s.

14 It was becoming more and more obvious to everybody
15 concerned that, if we were already going to move forward
16 aggressively in a broad program of soil and water
17 conservation and water management, that the institutional
18 arrangements we had just weren't fitting the bill. This
19 district outlook committee and some of the thoughts that
20 were coming along at the national level sort of energized
21 us. So, we went to these national meetings and these
22 various meetings, then we would come back and we would
23 discuss (indiscernible). Through all of these programs, the
24 state association had been building its strength and support
25 and it really got to be a major, major successful lobbying

1 organization.

2 I think it was probably in the 1959 Legislature, I
3 think that was the year, that the association broke the
4 budget. I believe that was the year that we were -- it was
5 either 59 or 61. You can check the dates. But that was the
6 year that we were trying to get some money for watershed
7 planning and, traditionally, to soil conservation districts.
8 We were pretty well assured that, while the money would be
9 in there, but the -- remember we were an extremely small
10 organization. The commission was extremely small. When the
11 budget came out, we were shocked. We were shocked how
12 little was in there. I think they doubled the amount of
13 money for the committee, which they always doubled; of
14 course, when you double a little amount, it really isn't all
15 that much. So, the state association went to bat, and they
16 got people from all over the state to come down to the
17 Legislature, and within a day -- and it was almost unheard
18 of at that time -- the budget bill on the floor of the
19 Legislature was broke by the state association. It was
20 just, like, thrown wide open by the state association. I
21 guess, to indicate the strength that the association was
22 building, so they were beginning to see that this was a
23 force of vocal people that were developing a consensus and a
24 program of where they wanted to go. This is just kind of an
25 evolving, continuing thing.

1 Going back to what I said earlier though, it
2 became obvious that you could not have watershed districts
3 and watershed conservation districts and many other
4 watershed associations and drainage districts. I think, at
5 the time, we had about 500 special purposes districts, and
6 it was obvious that, if we didn't do something, certainly
7 soon, we'd have 1000, maybe 1500 special purpose districts
8 that we refer to as "districtitis". That was all
9 preparation for work. So, at the district outlook committee
10 and our concerns about the fact that we are getting a
11 proliferation of many special purpose districts and we
12 didn't have the authority in any of these to take on a broad
13 base land and water program, that natural resources
14 districts evolved. It didn't evolve in a matter of a year.
15 It came up at several sessions of the state association. It
16 was agreed by the people in attendance, and they were quite
17 big conferences at that time -- oh, 500 to 700 people in
18 attendance -- that we will study it. We'll take a look at
19 it.

20 MR. GAUL: Was "districtitis" a term that came up?

21 MR. FAIRCHILD: That was a term that had some
22 national connotation because of what we going on in
23 California. We certainly picked it up here.

24 MR. GAUL: So, it was actually a term that was in
25 use at the time?

1 MR. FAIRCHILD: Yes, it was a term that we would
2 recognize as being a proliferation of districts.

3 MR. GAUL: That, in fact, when we were getting a
4 new natural resource responsibility, we were just creating a
5 new entity to do it in?

6 MR. FAIRCHILD: That's right. That's right.
7 Because of some strong leadership, and I can mention names
8 here, but I don't think it serves any particular purpose.
9 There got to be a sort of tug-of-war between the people that
10 were supporting the watershed district approach, primarily
11 here in Lincoln, and the farmers out here who had the water
12 conservancy district approach. They really weren't getting
13 done what they needed to get done. One of the things we
14 were successful in doing was that several of us, including
15 Bob Crosby, myself, and others, Milt Fricke and Harold Sieck
16 and people like that, we sat down on several occasions and
17 we ironed out what it would take in order to satisfy the
18 needs of both. Based on the fact that the state association
19 was lobbying for this. In other words, studying this.

20 All this time, I should point out that members of
21 the state commission, the University, and the elected
22 members were all very much together. They were supporting
23 it. The governor's office had indicated that they had some
24 sympathy with the opposed, and so it was evolving.
25 Actually, it was not fully and enthusiastically received by

1 everybody. As an example, there were some extremely good
2 conservationists down in Nemaha Basin that they felt that
3 the NRD approach was going to mean that they were going to
4 lose total control. They were always very active with the
5 program, soil stewardship and programs like that, and they
6 had a very good soil conservation district -- soil and water
7 conservation district program on a county basis. They were
8 fearful, by combining into a larger district, that they were
9 going to lose control and that they didn't know what was
10 going to happen. So, it was well-intentioned, well-meaning,
11 but there was opposition developed in several places across
12 the state. Of course, I won't ever give the impression it
13 was unanimous.

14 MR. GAUL: One of the things that I've heard is
15 that southeast corner of the state was also the last to get
16 on board for soil and water conservation districts in the
17 first place. That there had been opposition there years
18 earlier.

19 MR. FAIRCHILD: Well, some. But you know, at the
20 time, though, the NRDs were being thought about, that was
21 probably one of the real active conservation movements and
22 some of the strongest districts were down there. I think
23 there maybe was some slowness to begin with, but certainly
24 they had a very active and aggressive soil and water
25 conservation movement.

1 There was a meeting in North Platte when a very
2 critical vote came up at the North Platte Convention, and it
3 was going to be voted on whether or not the state
4 association, because at that time, basically, most all the
5 framework and the detail of the NRDs had been worked out,
6 and there was going to be a vote; they had the resolution as
7 to whether to continue to go ahead with it. A gentleman
8 from Washington, D.C., by the name of Phil Glick, he was the
9 attorney that wrote the original soil conservation district
10 enabling law, the pilot law, you know, that was used
11 throughout the United States; he had been invited to come to
12 the conference.

13 I'm not saying that he necessarily was the thing
14 that did it, but just before the vote, Phil gave the
15 luncheon address, and he indicated what he thought it was
16 going to take in the future if the local people were going
17 to continue to assume and really have control over their
18 various conservation programs. I'd have to say that,
19 probably, that presentation, along with many local leaders,
20 was what led to the state association adopting the NRD
21 concept at that convention. Those who were opposed to it,
22 and they were opposed to it at that convention, certainly
23 they went home not happy, certainly not personally unhappy,
24 but unhappy with the fact that they felt this was the wrong
25 approach. All of this led up, then, of course, to the

1 legislation.

2 MR. BARR: Was the vote fairly close?

3 MR. FAIRCHILD: Before we get into that, I'd just
4 say that the Legislature had their study committees that
5 they had during summertime. We worked very closely with the
6 various subcommittees on this, and Maurice Kremer was
7 chairman of this one study committee, and he'd been there
8 for several years. Maurice was very interested, extremely
9 interested, as were many other members on his committee, in
10 soil and water conservation because he had, I think, the
11 very first irrigation well in Hamilton County. He felt very
12 strongly, he was a deeply religious man, and he felt very
13 strongly about how we should take good care of our resources
14 and agriculture around the state. We had these sessions
15 with the Legislature, and so, at the time, the state
16 association that adopted -- of course, it came through the
17 state commission. The state commission supported it and all
18 the elected members, including those from the University
19 and -- when it went to the subcommittee -- why then, they
20 adopted the bill as introduced. You have to help me out on
21 a date. In 1967, I think it was 1967, the bill was
22 introduced, LB1357, but check that out. It was introduced
23 and, again, at several conventions there tended to be
24 controversy over this.

25 It was introduced and hearings were held. The

1 hearings were standing room only. Of course, there were
2 proponents of the state association then and, again, you can
3 imagine the people were interested, on the order of Warren
4 Patefield, Elmer Juracek, Herman Lang, Milt Fricke, Dempsey
5 McNiel. You go right down the line. And all their people
6 were in here in support of it. There was some other
7 scattering of people I could get, maybe from the southeast.
8 They came in and they testified against it.

9 It was voted out of committee and, because of our
10 close relationship with Clayton Yeutter, who was then the
11 administrative assistant to Governor Tiemann and, of course,
12 having a working relationship with Governor Tiemann, we knew
13 that he also was quite supportive of the legislation. As
14 you can imagine, the pressure began to mount on the
15 Unicameral as to how they were going to vote on this. The
16 state association and state committee and, of course, a few
17 like myself were involved. There had been a lot of
18 consensus building in advance and, because of the very close
19 work we did with the Salt-Wahoo Association and the fact
20 that Milt Fricke was very active in the Papio, we had the
21 Lincoln and Omaha delegations pretty well in hand. And
22 then, with the ones we had out-state, some of these very key
23 districts, it was quite obvious that the votes were
24 available to pass the legislation.

25 But even so, though, there was great pressure put

1 on people like Senator Kremer. "Oh, Maurice, you're doing
2 wrong -- gotta pull up -- pull out." He come up to the
3 office and he said, "Warren, the pressure's getting too
4 great. I'm going to take the bill out." I said, "Oh,
5 Maurice, don't do it. I tell you, if you get up through the
6 first reading, we've the votes to pass. I can tell you.
7 We've got the votes. The votes are there." He said, "I
8 don't know whether I can take it." He was really sold on
9 it. He said, "I don't know whether I can take it." You may
10 have heard him make that statement. Then, he'd go back
11 down. He kind of hunkered down.

12 When he got up the first vote, as I recall, I
13 think the first reading, I think we got 27 votes. Of
14 course, you need a majority. We needed 27. We actually
15 needed 25 on the final reading. And the longer it went, the
16 more votes we picked up. I think it finally passed, like,
17 on 34 to 7 or something like that. There were some
18 absentees. But what was kind of interesting was that there
19 was several state senators that come along and they said,
20 "Warren, the program you have outlined is right and we agree
21 with it, but we have some opposition back home, and if you
22 need my vote, you've got it. But if you don't, we're going
23 to vote against you." So, it was kind of interesting that
24 day when it came up to vote, the green lights come on.
25 Pretty soon, some of the red lights came on, waiting to see

1 what was up there. Their vote was really not needed. So,
2 it passed the Legislature. And the governor.

3 Of course, Nobby Tiemann was very supportive of
4 Clayton Yeutter, and we just assumed that he would sign it
5 and, of course, he did. We really, at that time, we had
6 some great governors, you know, Nobby and Frank Morrison and
7 people like that were so supportive of our programs. They
8 were just really great governors and I'm sure you've had
9 many good governors since then. They're the ones that
10 really come to my mind, and they were so helpful.

11 Well, once we got the law passed, then the problem
12 came of implementing it; and one of the real challenges,
13 though, was getting the district boundaries established.
14 What we had said in the law, that the boundaries would be
15 delineated on common problem areas, it's like a lot of
16 things. How do you define that? I'm sure that a lot of
17 people had different ideas. The staff of the commission sat
18 down and started drawing up maps to try to figure out just
19 how this would be. And out of all this, finally, came that
20 the program and the boundaries for the original districts,
21 and this then was up to the state commission to adopt that
22 map, which they did. I think I have maybe indicated the
23 continuing role of the members of the commission in this.
24 They did not get so actively involved in lobbying the
25 Legislature, but as far as the strength that's behind that,

1 they were there. And so then, the boundaries were accepted
2 and it's kind of a different matter then of going out and, I
3 think, we had a certain time we had to get this thing going.
4 The changeover to financing, and that's something that Hazel
5 Jenkins would know, working on the financial transferring
6 back and forth of funds because some districts now were in
7 maybe two or three different districts and all the money had
8 to go back and forth. There was a considerable amount of
9 staff work that did go into this.

10 I want to go back just for a moment here. Some of
11 the opposition -- and I should tell about some of the
12 support, but it was kind of surprising because where some of
13 the opposition was coming from. Much of the opposition came
14 from state and federal agencies. And I always accepted the
15 opposition from local people because I could understand it.
16 I found it difficult, though, to really understand the
17 opposition from some of the state and federal agencies. I
18 think the real problem they had with it was that they wanted
19 to put the idea of a special purpose district. In other
20 words, the Soil Conservation Service had the soil
21 conservation districts. The Bureau of Reclamation had the
22 reclamation districts. The Corps of Engineers had the
23 drainage districts. The Conservation and Survey Division,
24 they had the groundwater districts, and you can keep going.
25 The Farmers Home Administration, they had the water supply

1 districts.

2 The Assistant A.D. of the Farmers Home
3 Administration, he called up and he says, "Warren, we don't
4 want to be included in that NRD legislation. We like just
5 what we got." I was a little more brash in those days than
6 I think I am today and I said, "Well, Joe [Haggerty], that's
7 tough, but you're going to be in it." I wouldn't probably
8 have said it quite that way, but I said it just about that
9 way. I said, "That's tough. Your program's going to be in
10 it. That's all there is to it." Well, I think it's
11 probably the best thing that ever happened to the rural
12 water supply program because they really didn't have much of
13 a program before.

14 There was a feeling, and this manifested itself
15 really, again, in some of the agency personnel. I think in
16 the case of a few SCS personnel, it also kind of generated
17 back to the soil conservation districts and that feeling
18 pretty much came on up through the state office and other
19 offices, too. Through all of it though, none of it was ever
20 personal. I think there were just some real strong feelings
21 that this was not the appropriate way to go. So, anyone who
22 sees the NRDs today and feels there was a controversy, there
23 really was considerable controversy. I doubt if, in that
24 session of the Legislature, no bill was better known than
25 LB1357. In fact, the day it passed, the headlines, "LB1357

1 Enacted". That was exactly what it was. People in the
2 state knew what that was. It was headlines.

3 MR. BARR: One of the few that I remember!

4 MR. FAIRCHILD: Well, 1-3-5-7. Kind of easy,
5 isn't it? 1-3-5-7.

6 One other interesting piece about the opposition
7 was that Glen Kruescher, who was farm editor of the Lincoln
8 Star, he became very closely affiliated with some of the
9 people in the southeast, and he felt that they were doing a
10 fine job down there with the soil stewardship and soil
11 conservation programs, which they really were. So, he
12 became a very -- I'd call him strident opponent, and his
13 articles in the paper, extremely strident. It really got
14 into politics. It got into the governor's race that year,
15 and the eventual winner, Governor Exon, of course, that was
16 one of the issue he ran against Nobby Tiemann on. It was
17 that Tiemann was responsible for the income tax. A lot of
18 people did not like the fact of more taxes. That probably
19 was the key thing. But also, another thing, though, that
20 Exon, because Glen Kruescher to to him, was that Exon was
21 opposed, supposedly opposed the NRD. This was an election
22 issue.

23 And it was about that time that I left the state.
24 There's no other reason other than it was a good
25 professional opportunity for me, and I did go back to

1 Washington. That's the reason. There were a couple of
2 other things in the back of my mind. There was a feeling
3 among some of the opponents that, if Fairchild would just
4 leave, this whole thing would just crumble and go away. I
5 knew that wasn't a fact. There was just too strong a local
6 support, the staff, and everything. It just wasn't going to
7 go away. The history will show that, really, it went
8 extremely well and has continued to go extremely well,
9 although there are still problems ahead. Also, another fact
10 was that I was very interested in going back to Washington,
11 become an assistant commissioner of the Bureau of
12 Reclamation, because I wanted to see the O'Neill and the
13 North Loup projects get authorized and we got them
14 authorized. That wasn't easy either. There's a story
15 behind that. But we got them authorized. There were
16 several reasons, but the main reason I went back was because
17 of the fact it was a professional opportunity. It also, I
18 think, served the fact -- even though -- I'm not saying this
19 to be self-serving.

20 But I think the lightning rod had left. Then,
21 they had to face the fact that, well, it is a heavily
22 supported operation here. It went forward, and the
23 commission staff and the commission members, the local
24 leaders have brought it to where it is today. What it
25 showed was -- what I'm trying to indicate here, the same way

1 when you talk about any program -- I don't believe that you
2 just go in and, in a matter of one legislative turn, and
3 you're going to knock down the doors and say, "Well, this is
4 what we're going to do." You got to build consensus. You
5 got to build your support. Once you got your support, then
6 you can get these things done in the Legislature.

7 Obviously, the Legislature, most all members, I think all
8 members are extremely interested in soil and water
9 conservation. They want to do the right thing, but they
10 also want to do the thing that they think their constituents
11 back home want. They could care less what an agency head
12 thinks. If that's not supported back home, it's not going
13 to go very far.

14 I think that's true about this program. It was an
15 evolutionary program that I say that was in the building
16 process that started before me. That started back about
17 Condra, with him nourishing these districts to start out
18 with, and then the districts kind of got on their feet and
19 they said, "Now wait a minute. Dad, we want to leave the
20 farm and be on our own for a while." So then, they got on
21 their farm and on their own. It's been a long and
22 continuing process. The legislation that came through
23 before NRDs was always so well-supported by the Legislature.
24 The appropriation process, of course -- when I came to the
25 Legislature for the state commission in 1957, I think our

1 appropriation was \$27,000 a year. The state commission was
2 used as a terrible example or a good example, however you
3 want to do it, of bureaucratic bull. We were increasing
4 each biennium. We were increasing our appropriation by
5 three or four hundred percent. The reason was the
6 appropriation started out so low.

7 The Legislature was very good, behind us. There
8 was this man from Hastings, a big, tall man, [Senator] Dick
9 Marvel. He certainly was a difficult man to appear before,
10 but if you presented your case, he would try to stay it out
11 with you. You might not get everything that you thought you
12 should, but he'd give you a reasoned attention and you'd do
13 quite well. I always felt that he treated us well and I'm
14 sure that many agencies at that time thought he was an
15 extremely difficult person to work with. My feeling was
16 that, well, he had in mind maintaining a certain budget
17 within certain areas, and this was one area that he would
18 see some protest. There were many other senators, you know,
19 that obviously did work with us. The history after that,
20 people like Dayle Williamson and Hazel Jenkins and Gayle
21 Starr, will know much better than I do. That's the
22 evolution you need.

23 MR. BARR: Well, the concept of soil and water
24 conservation districts that picked up (indiscernible) and I
25 think every district in the nation is now a soil and water

1 conservation district. It started here.

2 MR. GAUL: Add the name "and water". So adding
3 "and water" --

4 MR. BARR: I didn't realize that --

5 MR. FAIRCHILD: That was a Nebraska issue that did
6 go nationwide. So, that was something we started here and
7 it's very simple and I think about every state has done
8 that. I would say that the program always intrigued other
9 states. I think they felt, in a way, that maybe the people
10 from Nebraska were a little bit brash going forward with
11 this. Why don't you just settle back here? Keep your
12 little districts here and just maintain the way they are.
13 Then the question came up to choose the national
14 association. It became sort of a sensitive issue because we
15 had fewer districts.

16 There were some interests, but the general feeling
17 among the people I've visited with is that, oh, we'd like to
18 do it, but we don't think we can get it done. They don't
19 think they can get it done for several reasons. One reason
20 is, I don't think they feel they have the strength and
21 leadership at this point in time to do this. The second
22 thing is, they see a great difficulty in their legislatures
23 and opposition from other vested interest groups. They
24 didn't have strong people at the local level and the state
25 level and the legislature and the governor's office to

1 really pull together a consensus to do that. Now, it's my
2 understanding, because of some of the Clean Water Acts and
3 things like that, that, again, there is some thought of
4 encouragement of some of this in other states. I know my
5 state of Virginia I lived in, they have made some contacts
6 and we're weeding them down and see if we can get something
7 going there. It's going to be extremely hard to get this
8 going in many states.

9 MR. BARR: Congressman Stenholm showed an interest
10 at the hearing in -- that was the one that he wanted to ask
11 more questions about.

12 MR. FAIRCHILD: I'm hopeful that many other states
13 will do it, but if they don't -- well, I'm hopeful for this
14 reason, I think that, if every state had a similar
15 organization, I think it'd be easier for the national -- the
16 federal legislators at the Federal level to come up with
17 laws that would more fit NRDs. But Nebraska's the only ones
18 and they've got to do something for all the other states and
19 we have to kind of fit our way within it. From that
20 standpoint, it's unfortunate from our standpoint that they
21 haven't done it. But having said that, notwithstanding that
22 we're so far ahead and able to do so much that, certainly,
23 there is no reason why we should go back to the other way.
24 So, there's interest; but whether it's going to happen or
25 not? I think it's going to have to take some initiative.

1 There is, though, at the national level on the
2 part of some organizations, a real concern about strength in
3 state and local units of government. Because they have been
4 so successful in recent times in lobbying a group together
5 in Washington and going down and having the pressure felt in
6 Washington and the slam on these requirements on state and
7 local units of government that they see that a strong system
8 of local units could be difficult for them to combat. When
9 you're successful and just a Washington lobbying
10 organization, why would you want to take the risk of having
11 some local group? In fact, I've heard them say that, "Oh,
12 my goodness, these local units are just nothing but
13 obstructionists. We've just got to find some way of getting
14 around them." I think it's unfortunate. It's got to
15 certainly be a partnership between local, state, and
16 federal. There is that also.

17 MR. BARR: Yesterday, I think you alluded a little
18 bit to institutional organizations in other countries that
19 you've run into. Is there any either similarities to this
20 or anything in the institutions in other countries that
21 either parallel or provide a good example?

22 MR. FAIRCHILD: Well, based on experience in
23 Nebraska, we did use the experience in getting the provinces
24 in Pakistan and water user associations and they adopted
25 ordinances which would be the same as our legislation, state

1 bills. What we told the country and the province was that,
2 if we're going to finance water management projects on your
3 irrigation system, that you're going to have some sort of a
4 local sponsoring organization to make sure the farmers are
5 involved and the farmers will be responsible for operating
6 and maintaining these once they're in place. Because the
7 university had prepared a model law for water use
8 associations and basically we took that law, which was
9 prepared by the Colorado state association, and gave that to
10 four provinces as part of the requirement for them to come
11 and get assistance from the World Bank for a loan. They
12 enacted that model ordinance with some variation, as you
13 would anticipate. Once that was in place, then each of
14 these what they call water courses, before they'd get help
15 in, say, lining their ditches and turn outs and things like
16 that, then the farmers had to organize together a water user
17 association for those water courses. They have about some
18 of the same authorities as the natural resources districts.
19 Some of the very same authorities. Now, I wouldn't want to
20 equate them as being the same size, the same operation.
21 They're much smaller, but I'd say they are mini NRDs is what
22 they are. It's worked out quite well.

23 The interesting thing is to see that,
24 historically, the word of the state engineer for the
25 irrigation department was law. In other words, if there was

1 any sort of a conflict, and the irrigation department is one
2 that decided the allocations and deliveries, and if there's
3 any sort of conflict, why, it would come up to the state
4 head and he'd make a decision. The big decision, of course,
5 is right within the same body that was the judge and jury
6 all there right together. This had operated this way for a
7 century or two and, all at once here, you get these farmers
8 organized and they start asking questions. "Well, why is it
9 that our water course here is not getting as much water as
10 that water course over there?" Well, the reason for it is,
11 off the record, is that there had been some behind-the-scene
12 payments and things like that. And so, as a consequence,
13 you start seeing some improvement in equity. Equity and the
14 timing of delivery is improved just by the farmers'
15 participation. Not only in the improvements, but also in
16 the question, "Hey here, what's going on?" They may be
17 illiterate, many of them, but they're intelligent. They
18 could see these things. There was one example where we used
19 the leverage of the bank in order to cause institutional
20 change to come into being. And there are other ways in
21 which the bank has done this. We did use it and it's based
22 a lot on my experience here in Nebraska.

23 MR. GAUL: So, looking at NRD laws and the
24 organizations in the last 20, 25 years, now, any reflections
25 on how they've operated in terms of how they might have been

1 expected to?

2 MR. FAIRCHILD: Well, I'm probably a poor one to
3 analyze because of my experience with these. But my
4 observation from afar would be they probably have evolved
5 and have developed overall generally as fast or faster than
6 I would have imagined. That's pretty much to the credit of
7 the NRD people and to the state officials involved. Now,
8 could they have gone faster and done more? Well, obviously,
9 you can always go faster and do more, and they probably
10 should have. They're going to have to in the future.
11 There's no getting around that. But, as I said there today,
12 I think that we've got to recognize that there is a
13 diversity in what should be the programs of the NRDs, and I
14 think it's important that each NRD develop its own
15 operational plan and it be very substantial and it show a
16 positive proactive program for the future. One thing that I
17 would be concerned about -- there are probably many things
18 to be concerned about, but now that the framework has been
19 developed for these institutions, I hear a kind of disgust
20 at the (indiscernible) say "Well, maybe we need a new
21 authority on the Platte. Maybe we need a new institution
22 over here." A small state like Nebraska doesn't need any
23 more institutions. It really don't. Maybe what you need to
24 do is to consolidate a few institutions yet. You may need
25 to do that, but I think it'd be terrible if there was a

1 regression back into getting more institutions. More
2 different kinds of institutions. I think that would be
3 terrible. What we should be thinking is how do we make the
4 ones we got today -- the agencies and the University, the
5 agencies and state government, the NRDs -- how do we make
6 them more effective? I think that's really what we should
7 be really striving to do, rather than thinking about others.

8 MR. BARR: Has the movement to one person, one
9 vote changed significantly from the original idea? Is that
10 any difference?

11 MR. FAIRCHILD: Go back and I'll answer your
12 question. Again, this is a first for Nebraska. This is
13 changed in the soil conservation district enabling law and
14 we're the first one to do it in Nebraska, was that we went
15 and we included, by legislation, urban areas. Originally,
16 urban areas were not included in soil conservation district
17 law. So the consequence, they did not have representation
18 because representation was all from rural areas. Well, as
19 things were evolving, it became obvious that the program
20 being carried out here had significance on the urban areas
21 also. So, when the urban areas were voted in, then you had
22 to give representation to the urban areas. At that time,
23 and you could probably argue the concept now, but we were
24 quite careful that time to make sure there's still, even in
25 the areas, like, around Lancaster County, that the farms

1 would still have majority vote. Incidentally, that also
2 started in Nebraska. That was a move that was picked up and
3 carried nationwide, was including urban areas and putting
4 that vote on the ballot box. That was another first to come
5 out of here.

6 But in answer to your question, yes, it appears
7 that there has been significant change. I observed it in
8 the type of individual that's on the NRD board. To me, I
9 would say that, overall, it's (sic) probably have (sic) to
10 be good. To some farmers and rural interests, they might
11 consider this is as (sic) unfortunate. They've lost some of
12 their control. I think that this is something that you
13 would have to analyze for yourself. It has changed the
14 nature of the board. For instance, as I understand it, in
15 the matter of the president of the national association from
16 out here in McCook [Jerry Vap], well, 20 years ago, that
17 would never happen. I think that's great. I think that's
18 great. Now that I've said that, I think it's extremely
19 important that the agriculture orientation of these
20 districts never be completely out of whack. Because, after
21 all, Nebraska is an agricultural state. But people in the
22 urban areas have got to have a voice if they're going to be
23 financing it. They've got to have a voice. And so, one
24 man, one vote, that's -- I've been around the world many
25 times and I don't know a better approach. Everybody's got

1 to vote.

2 MS. HERPEL: Why is there certain ways enabling
3 legislation in Nebraska -- the way I understood it
4 (indiscernible).

5 MR. FAIRCHILD: Idealistically, that would be
6 probably a good way to think about it, but the model law
7 that came out that Nebraska modeled their legislation of
8 1937 after actually came out from USDA. And it came out
9 from Bill Glick. He was the one who drafted that
10 legislation to take care of the requirements of the Soil
11 Conservation Service moving and supplying and assistance to
12 farmers. There's enabling legislation. The farmers in each
13 county had to, or a combination of counties, had to organize
14 their soil conservation districts. Yes, that law could've
15 gone further, but it did not have to go further to meet the
16 intent of the requirement of the Soil Conservation Service
17 or USDA at that time.

18 Now, over a period of time, there was an evolution
19 through the National Association of Conservation Districts
20 and others that that law was not adequate really to make it
21 possible for local districts to fully assume their
22 leadership role. That was the reason for the district
23 outlook committee and that was what was leading to the
24 evolution of thinking on the part of the Soil Conservation
25 District supervisor in Nebraska. "Hey, we don't have the

1 authority, we don't have the wherewithal to do what really
2 we should be doing." At that time -- and I'm not
3 downplaying what they were doing. Basically, what they were
4 doing at that time was carrying out a local program that
5 sort of endorsed what the Soil Conservation Service was able
6 to provide for them. So, many people looked upon this as
7 sort of being a passive group that really their substance
8 was not all that important. Although they did do some fine
9 things. Please understand. It was just that feeling that,
10 well, we don't have the wherewithal, we don't have the
11 authorities to really participate so we can really make
12 decisions as to where we want to go with these things. That
13 was what led to the NRDs.

14 MS. HERPEL: At that point in 1937, all the states
15 were required to have and pass enabling legislation. I
16 guess, from that, is there a starting point for other states
17 to kind of take that approach?

18 MR. FAIRCHILD: They all took the same model
19 law --

20 MS. HERPEL: It seems like they should have all
21 come to the realization that Nebraska did, but somewhere
22 along the way, they didn't.

23 MR. FAIRCHILD: I think you got to give full
24 credit to a lot of leadership in the state. Not only that
25 is something needed, but willingness to spend the effort to

1 see that it's done. Others could say that, "Oh, yes, we
2 need the power of taxation. Oh, yes, we need more money.
3 Oh, yes, we need this. We need that." But then, they got
4 to these meetings and they would have a nice meal and they
5 would go home and nothing would happen. Well, that didn't
6 happen in Nebraska. You have these leaders who would say,
7 "Wait a minute now. Some things have to happen here. We
8 can't be satisfied with what we have because it just won't
9 do it. It just won't cut the mustard."

10 MR. BARR: Would you care to mention a few of the
11 people?

12 MR. FAIRCHILD: The most aggressive person, of
13 course, was Mr. Bill Richards who just recently passed away.
14 But then, when you got into the NRD program, the people who
15 were actively involved in that were Milt Fricke, Warren
16 Patefield, Dempsey McNeil, Emmet Lee, Herman Link, Wayne
17 Warner, Harold Sieck, there was Harold Kopf. There was a
18 good many people that immediately come to my mind. And, of
19 course, then in the Papio. There were people in the Papio,
20 including the county board, and here in the Salt-Wahoo,
21 there was people like Bob Crosby and Hal Schroeder, who was
22 the director of the Salt Valley-Wahoo. So there was many
23 people that did come forward at that time.

24 MR. BARR: Was there any support in southeast
25 Nebraska?

1 MR. FAIRCHILD: Depends on what you mean by
2 southeast Nebraska. I can say that Gage County, strong
3 support. Oh, Chet Ellis. I should have mentioned Chet
4 Ellis and Jefferson County, Saline County, Lancaster County.
5 But, basically, Richardson, Otoe, and Nemaha. Pawnee County
6 was for us.

7 MR. BARR: Was there any particular individuals
8 that stood out in opposition with that area or any area?

9 MR. FAIRCHILD: There was Paul Antes. Nice guy.
10 Please understand. I wouldn't want anyone to think other
11 than the best of these people. Paul was such a fine person,
12 but he just felt it was not right. There were some others
13 that don't come to my mind right now. [Vernon Niebur,
14 Franklin Gee, and Ernest Bredemier.]

15 MR. BARR: Was that a strong part of the primary
16 in the governor's race that year between Senator Burbach and
17 Governor Exon?

18 MR. FAIRCHILD: It may have been. That may have
19 hurt Burbach because he supported the NRDs. It may have
20 been.

21 I'm not aware of that. I probably was aware at
22 that time, but Senator Burbach was a supporter. He was a
23 fine man, but there may have been other things also. I
24 don't know what. It was quite interesting the Governor Exon
25 was opposed to it. Of course, then later on, he changed.

1 Course, we all know that story.

2 MS. HERPEL: I'm really interested in the
3 perception of creating the hydrologic boundaries and not
4 really concentrating so much on the county lines or the
5 existing subdivisions so much as watershed boundaries and
6 hydrologic boundaries, and if that -- at that time, was that
7 something that really was really hard for people to accept,
8 to envision themselves cooperating with people in the same
9 watershed?

10 MR. FAIRCHILD: Once the bill was enacted, there
11 was certainly a lot of input and involvement on the part of
12 locals on the boundaries of the districts. I would say that
13 was not a real problem to overcome. You look at the maps.
14 We basically come up with -- we didn't follow exactly the
15 hydrologic boundaries. We'd use legal descriptions so it's
16 possible to file for taxation purposes, for voting, and
17 things like that. I think what maybe was unique about this
18 and, over time, maybe should be looked at again, that is
19 where the common boundaries that were delineated at that
20 time were, they (sic) the right ones. Basically, in the
21 eastern part of the state, they are on hydrologic in the
22 eastern and southern part of the state. But you get up and
23 come into the Tri-County area and some of those areas we
24 basically did it there on the basis of groundwater and, very
25 frankly, the Tri-County project. We were thinking at one

1 time maybe Tri-County might go on out and even take in Adams
2 County, which it's really authorized to do. Up in the
3 Sandhills, what better way to do it than just doesn't make
4 any difference. Might as well do it on county boundaries up
5 there. It just seems like it just kind of just fell into
6 place. But that doesn't mean that they are immutable or
7 anything like that. I would think that some time, as
8 transportation and communication improved, that there could
9 be some additional consolidation, like we have an upper and
10 lower unit that maybe they'd go together into one unit.
11 Whether that will happen and when it should happen, that's a
12 decision for, certainly, the local people and our state
13 officials to work out. I would think that might come
14 sometime.

15 MR. GAUL: Missouri Tribes was the first example of
16 that happening, and that was partially on the money grounds.
17 I have one question related to the money grounds. One of
18 the things I've heard is that in other states if you look at
19 just what soil and water conservation districts spend
20 compared to what we spend on natural resource districts
21 here, it's quite a bit of difference. We're spending a lot
22 more, but obviously those other states maybe still have a
23 touch of "districtitis". Would you say that Nebraska,
24 because of natural resources districts, is spending more on
25 getting resource problems solved or are we spending less or

1 do you have any feel for that?

2 MR. FAIRCHILD: Certainly we're investing more,
3 but hopefully we're accomplishing considerably more. I
4 don't think there's any question but more's being invested
5 in Nebraska. That was the intent. We needed some funds for
6 investment. Nobody can argue what more money is being
7 expended by these districts. Now, they're doing things that
8 it's impossible, it's inconceivable, for other states to do.
9 But things that need to be done. The homeless person, he
10 doesn't need to spend much money, but I'm not sure that the
11 way we want to live. We all think we got to have a house,
12 so we spend on these things. I don't think that's a valid
13 criticism of NRDs unless they're squandering money. Now, if
14 they're squandering money, of course, then somebody should
15 take them to task, but I haven't heard that said about them.
16 If anything, they're probably, I guess, pretty prudent with
17 their expenditures. I would wonder, knowing how
18 conservative many of them are, maybe they should be
19 encouraged to make additional investments, particularly in
20 developing their programs, their plans about where they want
21 to go with their district in the future.

22 MS. HERPEL: In connection with my question
23 earlier about the boundaries, I guess, a greater question
24 is, you know, instead of having smaller counties and what
25 not, do people think of themselves as, "I live in this NRD,

1 and I live in this environment"? If they could think of it
2 as more as an environmental district, instead of just a
3 county area, would that help promote NRDs and natural
4 resource issues and environmental issues and, also, a sense
5 of well-being? It's a sense of being a Nebraskan and closer
6 to the environment.

7 MR. FAIRCHILD: Well, I really am visiting, but
8 that's true. My view would be yes. Yes. It's both those.
9 Certainly, I'm born and raised on a farm on the banks of the
10 Little Blue River. The people down there, of course they
11 are in the Little Blue NRD and they feel very much tied to
12 all drainage area of the Blue. I think that is, for the
13 purpose of natural resource management, I think that is
14 good. Also, I think there is a certain camaraderie at the
15 state level because we all know our state has this. We just
16 did something that's much better than other states. I think
17 there is a pride; I sense a pride. We've done this, and now
18 you got to go beyond pride. You really got to show that you
19 can do it. "I'm a NRD director. We're doing things out
20 here. Well, that's good. Now, let's make sure we're really
21 getting things done." I think there is that.

22 MR. BARR: Do you think the fact that we have a
23 Unicameral and public power and some other different things
24 in the state was helpful?

25 MR. FAIRCHILD: The Unicameral was very helpful.

1 The very fact that we had a unicameral system was a key
2 element. Yes. We knew that, to be very candid with you, 25
3 votes and we could pass the act. Because through the
4 readings we knew we had, this sounds really boisterous, I
5 don't mean to sound that way, but we knew we had more than
6 25 votes. We knew that.

7 (Changed to Side B of Tape.)

8 I'm sorry if I can't (indiscernible) who was there
9 and who voted. There were many more than Maurice Kremer
10 that were very staunch and stalwart supporters.

11 MR. GAUL: Any particular anecdotes or personal
12 experiences that stick out in this period of developing this
13 idea? First, the act and then to the actual districts and
14 boundaries and everything that --

15 MR. FAIRCHILD: Well, I don't think anything comes
16 particularly to mind right now. Certainly, we had many
17 interesting experiences as relates to, like, when we broke
18 the budget. Those were kind of traumatic affairs because,
19 at the time, the University was having difficulty with their
20 budget and there was an editorial in the Lincoln Journal
21 saying that the University Board of Regents should pattern
22 their lobbying efforts after the state association. They
23 would probably do a better job with their budget. That was
24 an editorial because that would give you some indication as
25 to the strength of the association at that time. It really

1 was. It was an organization that you didn't want to mess
2 around with because they were very well-meaning people, but
3 they basically knew what they wanted done and they just went
4 after it. That's all there was to it.

5 MR. BARR: You mentioned Mel Steen today in
6 summation. Was he a factor in this at all or any of the
7 other agencies? State agencies? Resource agencies?

8 MR. FAIRCHILD: I would say that the participation
9 and cooperation of people in the Game Commission at that
10 time was extremely close. Mel Steen and Willard Barbie. At
11 that time, we were very short of water facilities,
12 particularly here in the eastern part of the state. They
13 thought the organizations, and they saw such organizations
14 and activities as the Salt-Wahoo and the Papio and the P.L.
15 566, as an instrument to get some water for water-based
16 recreation. Mel went and he got special appropriation from
17 the Legislature in order to get facilities around these
18 lakes. Yes, the cooperation and involvement of the State
19 Game Commission at that time was 100 percent.

20 I don't know but maybe it continued that way, but
21 Mel and Willard Barbie and others were extremely supportive
22 of the O'Neill project. At the time I left Nebraska, there
23 wasn't one particle of opposition to the project. It just
24 came as a shock how things sort of come unraveled at the
25 seams. And maybe the story was told, but it just seemed

1 like to me the story of the O'Neill project just never was
2 told. It didn't get out to people in the press because it
3 just wasn't for irrigating land up around Ainsworth and
4 O'Neill. It would do that, but that water that just now
5 flows out at the Missouri River and it's lost to the state.
6 It's just as well, you know, when you have lake recreation,
7 you can have some releases for fisheries and in-stream uses
8 and rafting down below. I just can't fathom -- one of the
9 leading politicians, and he's been very successful, made a
10 statement that, I guess, because there isn't a flood control
11 function, and I thought, "Oh, my God." At least be
12 reasonable if we oppose this and we really have a reason for
13 doing it. It should not be something as stupid as it
14 doesn't have flood control in it. It really was totally
15 asinine.

16 MR. GAUL: I got a kick because I had written down
17 a question to ask you when you got here and I was going to
18 say, "What was your most rewarding job experience and what
19 was you biggest disappointment?"

20 MR. FAIRCHILD: They really are and, of course,
21 I've been very fortunate. Professionally, I've had a lot of
22 experiences and so life has treated me well. But my
23 experiences in Nebraska are certainly one of the high points
24 and I'm forever grateful to the people of this state. They
25 helped me a lot. We all make a lot of mistakes. I made a

1 lot of mistakes here. Gosh, I look at some of those early
2 conservation practices I laid out in Gage County. Some of
3 them failed, you know. I didn't know that much. You find
4 what you need and you do better and better. Go down an
5 alley and see those terraces and those structures that are
6 still working and, therefore, adding to them. It makes you
7 feel pretty good. I makes you feel pretty good.

8 MR. BARR: One more. I was going to quit. With
9 all the development that happened in southeast Nebraska,
10 what did you run into in the northeast? You don't see that
11 much. Is it because of the deep soils?

12 MR. FAIRCHILD: The difference is basically soil.
13 In southeast Nebraska, you have a glacial developed soil.
14 It had to originally -- well, anywhere from four to maybe
15 16, 18 inches of topsoil on very rolling land. Right under
16 that was this glacial till that was rocky and heavy clay.
17 When you lost that topsoil, it's very difficult -- well, you
18 can't hardly till it. It's almost impossible to till and
19 it's very difficult to even get grasses to start back in
20 there. So, the farmers knew that, if they didn't take care
21 of that little bit of topsoil, then they really had a
22 problem. It was bad. Of course, up on the crown of the
23 hills was the windblown soil, the loess. Those also were
24 heavy.

25 Of course, you go up in northeast Nebraska so you

1 have deeper soils and the farmers can erode. You get back
2 in and put in fertilizer and they could farm it again year
3 after year after year. It was always easier to get a
4 conservation program going in southeast and south central
5 Nebraska and in northeast and north central Kansas. You
6 won't find an area anywhere in the United States with more
7 conservation than that area down there and an awful lot of
8 it has to do with the soil. I was fortunate that I worked
9 in that area and that made it easy. In 1956 in Gage County
10 when I was working as a conservationist, if we would have
11 got all the work done and as far as the books worked up, we
12 would have actually constructed over a thousand miles of
13 terraces that one year in Gage County. Things were really
14 booming then. It was a good experience.

15 MR. GAUL: This has really been interesting.

16 MR. BARR: I appreciate you doing that. I want to
17 close on this.

18 MR. GAUL: I should have asked before I turned on
19 the tape recorder, but I was afraid we'd miss something and
20 we didn't want that.

21 MR. FAIRCHILD: I would hope -- I want to make it
22 very clear. Things come out that I'm being critical to some
23 individuals. I want to put it in context that it was not in
24 any way ever personal -- personal disagreement. It was
25 strictly a professional disagreement and one that everybody

1 had in their own mind a just cause. But I don't want to
2 overemphasize the disagreement because in the sum of our
3 district supervisors I would guess at no time was the
4 opposition any more than probably 15 percent to 20 percent
5 of the supervisors. But it was significant and they had to
6 be certainly reckoned with. But it wasn't, like, 49 to 51
7 percent.

8 MR. BARR: Out of my curiosity, that state
9 association meeting was relatively --

10 MR. FAIRCHILD: And in the watersheds, again, it
11 was pretty dominantly in support.

12 MR. GAUL: You said there wasn't really any point
13 where you were kind of discouraged, where you wondered if
14 you were going to get this thing through or not?

15 MR. FAIRCHILD: The only despairing thing was
16 whether or not, eventually, whether or not we had the
17 support of the Legislature. But soon, it became obvious we
18 had that, too. I don't think we ever felt that we couldn't
19 get it accomplished. Of course, there was some unfortunate
20 news coverage that wasn't as good as it might have been.
21 That kind of ran off our backs. By and large, the Lincoln
22 Journal, World Herald, and people like that were very
23 objective at that time. And the Nebraska Farmer. So, we
24 certainly had very good coverage. I thought very objective
25 coverage for the most part. Just except for the one case.

1 And, again, I think he felt very strongly that we were
2 wrong. I hope that the history has proven that we were not.

3 MR. BARR: I remember your time here very much and
4 have heard a lot of things.

5 MR. FAIRCHILD: Well, my memory is not as good as
6 it should be, so you have to check some of these dates out.

7 MR. BARR: Sure. Sure.

8 MR. FAIRCHILD: The point I was trying to make was
9 the current evolution and people would think and that's the
10 reason why I said yesterday now, like McKay said, that
11 problem with Kansas. You got to face up to that because we
12 have a contract there. But on these others, I tell you,
13 these things have been going on for a long time and we've
14 taken the time to work it out. Make sure we have the
15 support of people in a very proactive and significant way.
16 I don't think we should ever get to the place where we feel
17 that we're being pushed impetuously into taking actions that
18 we really don't know for sure what we're doing. That's what
19 is happening in a lot of this back in Washington at the
20 present time. I think there are certain feelings on the
21 part of certain groups that we -- we've got the momentum.
22 We have the administration behind us and now is the time to
23 go. And here we are, we're talking about doing away with
24 the P.L. 566 watershed program at the very time that the EPA
25 wants to get into watershed programs. What they want to do,

1 I don't have any idea. Don't have any idea what their
2 program would be. They have the air. They are the white
3 hats right now.

4 MR. BARR: But they may overplay that hand --

5 MR. FAIRCHILD: Well, could be --

6 (Whereupon, on March 16, 1994, the interview was
7 concluded.)

8 - - -

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25