

state, and are not dangerous to our state when I would, in fact, say they are as equally dangerous if more dangerous than anything dealing with the low-level question. But I want to go back to original point I tried to make on my opening on this bill, I am completely convinced that if the site that is located in Boyd County is, in fact, as bad a site as many people have told me it is, and the Natural Resources Committee did have an opportunity during an interim study to go up to Boyd County, visit the site, talk to both proponents and opponents, if, in fact, there are springs, high water tables, wetlands, a drainage or drainage problems on the site, if all of those things exist, then why will the license review process not point those out? Why won't those deficiencies in the site not lead the Department of Environmental Control and the Department of Health to reject that site? Nobody is talking about that. We are talking about a vote that changes the siting standard. That is what we are focused on in LB 72. It has nothing to do with the actual technical review that is now ongoing, and that is where I have placed my faith in the process. It seems to me logical that that is where we should be focusing our debate. Is the technical review process flawed? Is there a mistake, is there a problem with that review process? Is it too expensive? Do we not have enough personnel or expertise to tell us whether or not that site is safe? Under the provisions in which the compact and the state joined the compact, and, in fact, guided the contract with US Ecology to find sites, we didn't give them the power of eminent domain to go out and find what may be the most technically safe site in Nebraska.

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: We gave them the provisions of finding an area which they were welcome, which the County of Boyd and the City of Butte, both, indicated interest in joining into that, that later, at least with the county, rescinded their invitation after political pressure was applied, but under the provisions of siting that facility, going out and trying to find an area of consent, Boyd County did participate. It was not until later that they rejected it. Finally, I would like to say one other thing about community consent. When LB 1092 was passed in 1988, if Governor Orr had meant that community consent should be a community vote, whether the county, the city, whatever, the village, or whatever, why then did she not veto LB 1092, because the definition of community was changed under that bill.