

are asking for; we want to consider it. And I am not talking just me, this was the committee that made this decision, and we have not said to the utilities that this absolutely should not be done. But what we have said to them is that there are a lot of implications, a lot of situations here that should be analyzed and discussed. We don't have the time to do that now. This is on a fast track, and we don't think it is appropriate, under the guise of dealing with the specific Micron project to come in and ask for authority, which is above and beyond what is necessary, in order to accommodate Micron type projects. You've got to have somebody in charge. Do you really want a situation where every utility, what about MUD and its water utility, should they go out and separately decide that a particular project is worthy or not worthy of incentives; all of our different utilities making these independent decisions. Who is in charge? Who is on first base? I hope you will consider very seriously these kinds of questions because there are adverse effects on other users that are possible here that we have not explored or maybe even discovered at this particular point in time. I'd ask you to reject the amendment.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Withem, followed by Senators Maurstad, Robinson, and (mike off).

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Crosby, members of the body, I am going to attempt to walk a tightwire on this, going to maybe suggest how at least as the sponsor of LB 828 and the rest of the legislation, how I might like to see this issue proceed. First of all, as the bill was introduced, it would be, if this amendment were adopted, and that would be that the qualification for qualifying for this particular rate would simply be the load limit, and I don't see the exact language in here. What the committee chose to do was to limit it even further and indicate that it had to be one of these overall projects. I, quite frankly, as an individual, can support the bill in either form. However, I think in terms of our reaching a decision, what I would like to propose would be the following, that because we are considering LB 828 as a portion of the overall package, including the income tax credit and the property tax abatement process, that maybe 828 ought to stay that way, maybe the committee amendment should stay intact. But then on some other measure that may or may...that, hopefully, would be able to be brought forward out of the Natural Resources Committee that we can debate the policy question of whether or not this concept of rate reduction for large utilizers of electricity ought to be