

we have another major issue facing us down the line. But those people are living with this potential site, they are living with daily strife, not only among family members, but community members, and there is a grave need for some counseling services. Similar to what we did with farm mediation, and a bunch of other things, where we considered counseling for farmers who were in strife concerning the future of their farms, and this is not unlike that at all. What I have proposed in this amendment is to create for the monitoring committees a small fund of money, basically \$6,500, for the year that they are open, to be administered by the local monitoring committee for the purposes of counseling those people who reside in those counties that are under active consideration to host the facility, and who have a need for such services due to the possible siting of a facility within their county. So this isn't going to be just a bunch of money handed out for anybody that has a problem to come in for counseling. It is going to be specifically targeted for those areas under consideration. The second part of this also deals with some problems of the local monitoring committee. Senator Schmit and I sponsored an amendment which passed that we are going to study liability issues, and I think that is very good. I look forward to doing that and I think we will come back with some rather specific recommendations. But one of the things that have yet to be decided and, in fact, because the monitoring committees are up and working right now, is they are facing some possible liability for decisions they make as a monitoring committee and, quite frankly, if we...Senator Elmer and I had a little discussion about the purpose of the monitoring committee and what they are going to do, there is some concern that there may be decisions made by the local monitoring committee that if there is something that goes wrong, the facility is wrongly placed, the facility is wrongly constructed, that in a lawsuit these local monitoring committee members may be personally liable for some of the decisions that they make. Although they are only making input decisions, they are still making some decisions and I guess would possibly be named in a lawsuit. If I was doing that, probably would throw them in just because there is somebody else there to sue. What this does is it limits their liability solely for their work on the committee for services that they provide in good faith. If they have willful or wanton acts, if they are intentionally going out and doing things wrong, certainly they ought to be held liable and will be done so. This doesn't apply to them driving an automobile, so their travel to and from, if they hit somebody, they are still going to be liable for those things, but this is