

underneath where the facility will actually be. They can study all over that 360 acres, but they do not have to do an intensive study right underneath where the building will set. We need to give these people confidence in this process, and we can give them confidence by giving them this money and giving them the direction that they will have a lot of say in the oversight of this facility. I would ask you to support this amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator McFarland, please. Senator Smith. Senator Landis, followed by Senator Elmer and Senator Schmit.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, every year, maybe a couple of times a year I teach a class for public administrators on negotiations, and I have been adding to that curriculum discussion of the siting of public facilities because it is a burgeoning area of real controversy and very difficult negotiations. The best reading that I can find on the subject comes from the Harvard negotiating project, talking about some plants on the east coast, and in reviewing the difficulties that people have, these writers conclude that if you take a beleaguered group of citizens who have found themselves placed in the disadvantage of dealing with the out of town experts, the people who fly in, look around, take a few samples, and report their findings, that they have little or no confidence in those studies. If they are done in a "supposedly neutral capacity", they lack credibility, that, in fact, it is possible to get scientists to disagree. You all know that from watching in a criminal trial when you get one psychiatrist saying the guy is sane and the other psychiatrist saying the guy is insane, and you say to the doctors, I thought this was science. I thought you were supposed to know. I thought this was black and white. Couldn't be any method of advocacy or difference of opinion here, this should be a simple matter of a test. The truth is that science isn't perfect. It makes a very big difference what kind of assumptions you begin with and that maybe people say, you know what we are going to do? We are going to have an independent look by some experts and they will answer everybody's questions. Well, they don't, they don't. Just as you know when you have got a bill in here and it is opposed by a special interest group and they pull out a think tank study and drop it on your desk and say, well, this study proves our point, you have a tendency to go through there with a fine tooth comb, look at their assumptions, question them, look at the information that was left out, exam the tests that maybe weren't