

products. So who benefits? It's very, very hard to narrowly focus on the farmer that followed the program he had to follow to make a living because the federal government said that's how you're going to do it so he could produce food for the people in Lincoln and Omaha and all across the country and the world to eat. It's very hard for me to focus the fault on that farmer. I'm for spreading across the costs of this across the largest portion of people as we can...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: ...because ultimately that is the countries groundwater, it's not our groundwater, it's not that districts groundwater. You talk to the Supreme Court, it's not our groundwater. It's not that farmer's for sure. So if we want to burden a smaller group, fine. That's your choice. But be consistent and do it all the way across the board, low-level waste, solid waste, groundwater, highways, prisons, et cetera. If you're going to go strictly with user fees then do it that way. But then consider who all benefits and keep an open mind about it, because it's just not that farmer that might have over applied, or had a big rain storm when he was applying and caused some runoff, because the groundwater cleanup is going to be a problem. And I think spreading the costs among as many as possible will get it cleaned up sooner. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Morrissey. Senator Schmit. Okay. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Madam President and members, I was going to call the question, but with the new amendment I guess I'll speak to that. I think Senator Morrissey made some good comments. I think I'm going to oppose this amendment. I, too, agree that it ought to be spread, the cost of this ought to probably be spread across a larger area. I'd like to ask either Senator Johnson or Senator Coordsen a question, if they would respond. I'll make a statement first, and ask...But one of the reasons that I oppose concentrating this cost on a special groundwater protection area is the fact that we, I think at this stage, we still don't know where a lot of these point sources of contamination are coming from, that they could even be coming from another NRD district or something. It might not necessarily be contaminated within the area that we may want to assess under this amendment. Could that be true, Senator Coordsen?