

February 25, 1991 LB 67

regardless. That's being too strict. The plan itself will have to be approved by the department and will have to be site specific, and we'll be flexible to these communities. If indeed they are not a threat, they should be easily licensed. If they are a threat, they're going to have to make some changes. How long will those changes be? Will the money be available? What can these people realistically do? That's why we cannot give them a date certain deadline on closing these facilities. If you tell them to do it by a certain date, and there is no way realistically that they can do it, you're going to force them to make a decision they're not ready to make. And the decisions in this area are very complicated. They relate to importation. They relate to large costs and available funding or funding that isn't available.

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: This is a fairly complicated issue. We've been studying it for a couple years, should have been studying it long before that. In discussing this with groups from across the state, one of their big concerns is guidelines. There are no guidelines for closing now. They have no idea. They want to close, they want to do the right thing. They don't care about the federal government anymore and Subtitle D. They want to do what is right for the citizens of Nebraska, but they're just saying give us some direction. LB 67, as written, gives no direction, it just says you're going to do it. It's the heavy-handed approach that Senator Schmit usually opposes. LB 67, with the committee amendments, gives the flexibility for the people across the state to do what is actually doable by them. Senator Lamb's amendment I don't think is needed. I think the flexibility is going to be there...

PRESIDENT MOUL: Time.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: ...and I guess I would then oppose Senator Lamb's amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Morrissey. Senator Rod Johnson.

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: Madam President, members, I rise as well to basically raise some concerns about the Lamb amendment. I understand the direction Senator Lamb is coming from. He's saying that, hey, if we're no threat to the groundwater then why