

report this summer, as a matter of fact, that was very well done by Jeannie Glenn-Heck, in the Appropriations Committee, looking at the whole area of environmental control and specifically the ability to meet financial responsibility. That's becoming an increasingly critical issue for environmental protection agencies. And there is a general accounting office study which pointed out that the lack of available or affordable insurance makes financial responsibility tests especially important. A lot of these companies cannot get adequate insurance. If you look at, for instance, the State of Illinois, their statutes show that other...it's an illustration of another state that has very intensive proof of financial responsibility criteria based upon the type of licensee and the volume and design of a particular facility. So it seems to me this isn't anything outrageous, and it's only prudent to require that the Director of Environmental Control require a surety bond if the amount of the financial responsibility is valued at \$1 million or more. If you look at the increasing concerns that we have over insurance and financial responsibility within the whole developing area of environmental industries, and usually they tend to center around disposal facilities, but there could be other instances where this would apply as well, it seems to me that we, as state legislators, have an obligation to further ensure that "permites" and licensees would be adequately...could adequately assure the taxpayers of this state that they could meet any closure costs, or that if anything goes wrong with one of those facilities, it will, in fact, be covered by the developer rather than by the taxpayer. So I would suggest that the provisions in this amendment are very uncomplicated, regardless of the length; and compared to some of the tests of financial responsibility that other states are requiring, that this is a prudent step in terms of protecting the taxpayers in line of the kinds of environmental disasters that we might be faced with paying for down the road. I think we probably need to continue to monitor this thing, and there is probably a need to look a little more carefully than this at the whole area of environmental liability. But this is a good first step. If you haven't had a chance to look at the report that was put out this fall on environmental liability and what the implications are, even for us as a state government, I would recommend that to you. It is very, very well done. With that explanation, I would be happy to respond to questions, and otherwise stress once again that, at this point in the day, pollution insurance is scarce and it's expensive and we just need to make sure that people demonstrate financial