

necessary. If we...if the licensing procedure is to go forward, the commitment for this transaction and the very complex lease arrangements that surround it are a part of that license application. An amendment that will come will make it very, very clear in statute, in this bill, that the land transfer, itself, is authorized only if every other part of the license application has been approved first. A contractor cannot go ahead and build a house or even make all the arrangements for one without clear commitment from the owners of this property that he may do so. How is he to know if he can go ahead or not, depending on some future action that may or may not take place? This is needed this year. This is needed if we are going to show the other states involved in this we are proceeding in good faith. I'd ask to defeat the IPP motion.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Elmer. We will now go to Senator Dierks, followed by Senator Schellpeper.

SENATOR DIERKS: Mr. Speaker and members of the body, again, I rise today to support this IPP motion. Senator Elmer has said there is a necessity for expediency here but that is just not true. We don't need to do this today. We have ample time to get this little piece of legislation done. The thing that I object to I guess is the fact that we are sending another negative sign to the people in Boyd County with the passage of this legislation. Of course, we are being very heavily lobbied on this issue. U.S. Ecology, the Compact Commission, and the power companies are just working their bones...their skin to the bones trying to get this thing taken care of, and I just think it's...it's really a bad bill to get passed. I think we don't want to do this. We don't want to send this sort of a message to people that I represent, I surely don't want to. You should understand that at this point U.S. Ecology does have title to that property. They have already paid \$1,000 an acre for it. They own the land. It isn't like we are keeping them from buying it. I don't think they made a very frugal purchase because I think you could have bought it for \$300 an acre, but I don't understand the need for giving a thousand dollars an acre. I suppose that if there is a possibility that LB 72 can get out of committee and we can actually take a vote on whether these people have to accept this site or not, U.S. Ecology might be in a little bit of trouble trying to find a market for thousand dollar an acre land up there. Quite possibly that is the reason for this piece of legislation trying to get them bailed out. If they did make that decision, while I don't think this