

need, as a state. And it strikes language that says, "All radioactive material accepted for disposal at a radioactive waste disposal site shall become the property of the state," and then also "except that", those two words, but that is something we've been arguing all along that is not good, that is bad for the state, something not needed, as well as the language that Senator Elmer is now striking. I'm glad that Senator Elmer changed his bill, his priority bill, and amended it so to basically turn it 180 degrees around from what it was doing. Previously, it was basically we were going to take title to the land, in my opinion, of course, as I argued before, it was necessary and now we're completely striking the language on taking title of the land. I applaud Senator Elmer and whoever worked on this, but I think this is another important step we need to take in amending some of the bad provisions of our legislation addressing this issue. Again, I will strike the language that says, "All radioactive material accepted for disposal at a radioactive waste disposal site shall become the property of the state", which is something we want to do because federal courts have basically held that strict liability applies even to releases of very small amounts of radioactive material but only if the facility was privately owned, like in Karen Silkwood v. Kerr-McGee Corporation case. By the way, Kerr-McGee is in our compact. But if it's not privately owned, strict liability doesn't necessarily exist. If a government entity that undertakes the ultra-hazardous activity, owns the property or owns the material, the strict liability might not exist to protect our citizens. So, as we've been saying all along, we don't need to take...we should not take title to the land and we just actually recently found out that what we have been told all along and what a lot of us believe, including myself, that we had to was not actually enforceable. It is in rule and reg at the NRC but it's backed up by law. And, as we get into this issue, we'll find there are other instances like that where we believed certain things were in law and actually weren't there and sometimes we believe they're only in rule and reg and we found out they weren't even in rule and reg. So, again, as we proceed into this process, we find more and more some of the things that we were told in the past are not true. So I would answer any questions you might have on striking the language that we should take title to the waste because I feel we should not and I would hope you all would because that would give us access or give us liability, expose us to that liability and also to taking title to the land, because, as we mentioned last year, once this facility is built and closed and buried under