SENATOR CONWAY: Senator Kristensen, not seeing your amendment, in terms of clarification I went to LB 1020 to look at it. In the amendment do you include all of the committee amendments?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: No, I do not.

SENATOR CONWAY: It is just the green copy as it was printed?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Yes.

SENATOR CONWAY: Then you mentioned the Supreme Court situation on the choice of the urine test. You dealt with that by striking the urine option in each case throughout?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: What I did to solve the urine case, and quite frankly it wasn't because I knew the Supreme Court was going to do that, that was already stricken in 1020 as drafted originally. And you'll find that on the top of page 16, the first three lines there where it says that when the officer directs the test shall be of a person's blood or urine, such person may choose whether the test shall be blood or urine. I strike that out. So it was already in 1020, there was nothing I had to add. LB 1020 was ready to go and happens to solve the problem that the Supreme Court had.

SENATOR CONWAY: There are other places, such as on page 15, line 13, where they run the litany of the test and they keep throwing in the "or urine", "or urine" as we move through that, whether it be their choice or whether it be demanded of them. I believe the Supreme Court's position on urine was it's not a measure of impairment, that the amount of alcohol in one's urine has little or nothing to do with the impairment. I believe that was kind of the discussion that they dealt with. So would not taking urine out in and of itself, since it's not considered to be reliable, be a safer way to go? Granted, I can see the loop hole, by leaving it in they say you have the choice, I'm going to take urine because I know urine isn't valid. Why do we even have urine enclosed or incorporated at all at that point?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: That's going to take me a little more time to explain. I'll gladly do it.

SENATOR CONWAY: Do it on my time, if I have it, please.