

adequately, because they followed every rule and every law that was in place at the time. And in some cases where a point source has been identified, for example, where that particular industry, say a refinery or something of that nature, has always done exactly what regulations require, now find themselves obligated in multimillion dollar assessments for things that happened that they did, purely legally. And that kind of addresses what we're talking about here. The University of Nebraska and other state agencies, the USDA, and the federal government advised agriculture, advised people how they should use these products. And as a large majority the agriculture people, municipalities, the individual homeowners all followed those recommendations exactly, or even more conservative. And here we are with the insidious problem that that's caused. Now, to proceed with that logic, since all these things have been used to the largest extent purely as they were intended to do, and as they were recommended to do, by everyone, unrealizing...not realizing what the genesis or what the evolution of the problem would be, it seems to me that the obligation rests with all of us, government, and individuals, and the university alike. And that as such we should recognize that we are all obligated. And I would ask you, in that light, with that logic to reject this amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: ...Senator Elmer...thank you, Senator Elmer. The speaking order now is Senators Coordsen, Beutler, Morrissey, Schmit, Wehrbein, and Lynch. Senator Coordsen.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. To put the Beutler amendment in a practical perspective, if you recall some time ago I mentioned the amount of money that could be raised in the current...the only SPA that I know of that is operating, there may be more in the last year, they currently have the potential, under the 2 cent special SPA levy, of raising \$9,500. This...the Beutler amendment would increase that by 50 percent. So you'd have about, what, a \$14,000 additional levy. This levy is permissive, this levy is permissive. Those districts have elected not to use it. Generally speaking, it appears that the boards of directors of NRDs view these districts to be a...these SPAs to be a district-wide problem, and have, to date, funded their costs through the district-wide budget. The reason that LB 21 was introduced in the form that it was, which was simply doing away with the...the permissive 2 cent levy, was that at a state average NRDS, in the '91...'90-91 year, I don't know what the