

February 16, 1995 LB 830

very significant. So, specifically for this project, we do need the wider area to choose from. It is not a particular project to be just dropped down at any particular site and so that's another rationale for not supporting the Jones amendment.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Warner, on the Jones amendment.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, just briefly I, too, would rise to oppose the amendment for all the reasons that have, I guess, have been stated, but I would just indicate that, as Senator Withem just pointed out, there are a variety of conditions that need to be met, obviously, roads, water, convenience for an interchange. If you look at the project background that was put out, it designates the number of those sites and the likelihood of...and, by the way, they wanted to stay away from some developed area that was residential so they'd have plenty of open space. They want four to six hundred acres. All those provisions, the condition of having it within ten miles is not an unreasonable one and I would hope you would reject the amendment. Incidentally, I noticed in one thing I read that they preferred to be closer than that. They prefer to be within one to four miles, I believe, if available, but there's a lot of sites...it simply isn't available, and there are so many combinations of inherent factors, power lines. They have to be close to a power line and we've got bills in here, Senator Coordsen has one, people objecting to putting in new power lines. You ought to be able to site this plant where there's a power line, perhaps rail facilities, and interchange for the interstate. There are so many factors. If you narrow the selection down to such a small site, the odds are that you're not...you simply may not be able to find all the conditions that would be appropriate, and, more important, not important to Micron but important to the community as to its location because they're really the ones that have something at stake. They don't want added concern about new power lines. They don't want added traffic where its located because the roads aren't adequate. They don't want it located where there's a concern about waste-water facilities which is a part of the proposal. There's a whole series of those things, and I would suggest that you're protecting the community and the people who live in that community by giving a broader option as to the site than if you narrow it down where some of the things that would have an adverse effect on the city would be inherent because of the location being too close.