

you look at what it is supposed to, this characteristic study is supposed to give us, it's to talk about significant community problems. What is that? Does that include the school battle that took place some years ago between Spencer, Naper and Butte? Should that be included in the study as well, because I think that has a lot to do with the problems we have right now in that particular question. And what about the other two sites, even though they are not being considered as a preferred site, we would have to do a study in each of those sites as well, even though, the way the bill is written currently, it says that we will not go back to those two specific sites. US Ecology, the contractor, cannot go back there. It just seems to me that a lot of these questions, while they are social in nature, and I suppose important to the psyche of the people that may live around the site, is that a determining factor in denying the license for the operation, the building and operation of the facility? I am concerned about...I have always thought the basis in which we were going to decide whether this facility was going to be built someplace in Nebraska, and currently it looks, at this point, the process looks like it will be in Boyd County, the question is, are we basing our decision on building that site on environmental concerns or on social concerns? Like I said, I am willing to admit that we should consider social concerns, but is that a basis to deny the license? I don't know. It could be. But my point has been from the beginning, this bill was never introduced for the purposes of benefiting the generators, benefiting US Ecology, at least not in my mind. Maybe some people read that into this bill. I have often seen this bill, at least I hope it will somewhat be viewed in the light of providing some kind of responsible check and balance to this whole process, giving the folks of Boyd County, or if the site is denied there, some other place as we set up these sites or this siting process, that will give those people some kind of consumer protection to check into this. But I don't know what this study will do that will improve the situation or cause some concerns up there to be...to dissipate. It just seems to me it is unnecessary at this time and, as I said, I will oppose the amendment.

**SPEAKER BAACK:** Thank you, Senator Rod Johnson. Senator Morrissey.

**SENATOR MORRISSEY:** Thank you, folks. Again, I say, it is needed, it is called for in federal regs. I have a provision from the NRC regulatory guide, 4.18, talking about socioeconomic