

right now came about, so there isn't anything in the record to suggest what our intent was at all. But if you look at the language about the local monitoring committee, it says, "The committee shall represent the citizens of the proposed site areas and maintain communication with the developer and the department to assure protection of public health and safety and the protection of the air, land, and water resources of the area. It is the intent of the Legislature that the local monitoring committees provide significant input concerning local needs and resources regarding all relevant aspects of the site selection, and after a site is selected, that the remaining local monitoring committee provide significant input concerning local needs and resources regarding all relevant aspects of the construction, operation, monitoring, closure, and custodial care of the facility." It seems to me that this...Senator Schmit makes an interesting and somewhat valid argument about the wheat boards, but I think you could argue that in this case this is enough different in terms of the responsibilities that this committee is being asked to carry out that we should think very carefully, that we have an opportunity here to really clarify what we really meant, and I am not sure that it is all that inappropriate to continue to let the local governments decide who they best think can look out for their interests. And it is only fair to point out that I don't know that I have a community in my entire district that would have the necessary expertise to not just find this whole process terribly frustrating, which it has already been. And so I think we have got a choice here and we have an opportunity to say, we didn't anticipate this happening, but since it has, let's go ahead and let that community do as it has decided is in its own best interest. I think to do otherwise makes what has not been a very pleasant or a very pretty process even worse. It probably takes away even more of the credibility of this process than the process already has and I don't think it has a whole lot in most of the communities out there. So I guess I am suggesting that even though we didn't anticipate this situation arising, that I don't think this is an unreasonable choice, particularly given where we are today, and it might make communities feel a little bit better if they have at least the freedom to pick whoever they think might do the best job for them on that committee. So I think I am going to oppose this amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Dierks, please, followed by Senator Smith, and then Senator Schmit.