

rationale for this is that, if I remember it, it mirrors the time frame, the 15-year requirement that allows for benefits to be used in at least one of the other bills. And I was looking for the reference and I could not find it. But the...if there is no rationale for 5 years, it would make sense that there is the same justification for 15, that if we are going to allow for these types of facilities to derive this kind of a benefit, that if we put them on a 15-year time frame for other benefits that are accrued or to be utilized, then to mirror that same time frame in 828 for purposes of the reduction or the ability to reduce, for purposes of economic development, the rates at which they pay for utilities makes good sense. It says that if we are going to compete with the hydroelectric power as Senator Beutler said that is cheap and available in Utah, it must be wind energy that they use in Oklahoma, I don't know what source of energy except for possibly oil that they would have readily available to them. But to increase this benefit to a level at which there is a certainty for 15 years that the board could negotiate a reduced rate for these individuals, would seem to me that it would be an even more attractive proposal with regard to a...a Micron kind of facility. And I would urge the adoption of the amendment because if we truly believe that we should use public power for this purpose, then I think the time frame which we allow for it is one that ought to be far enough out there so that these companies have the ability to plan, know what their...how they use their resources, what is available to them, because I can clearly see that if we don't adopt an amendment like this very likely we'll be in changing it at some time in the future, saying that it can be renewed, or that we want to change 5 to 10 or 10 to 15. We put it out there at a level at which we have experience in doing that, I know for certain that we did that on 775 in terms of use of the sales and income tax credits, it was on a 15 year plan. This would mirror that historic benefit period that we have used in the past, and I think that it makes good sense for this proposal as well. Since there is no rationale for the 5 years that's currently in the bill, the historic perspective, the background that we have with regard to 15 and other similar types of economic development proposals with regard to use and benefits is that at least as justifiable if not more. With that, I would urge adoption of the amendment to change the 5 year standard to 15. Thank you, Madam President.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Hall. For discussion on the Hall amendment, Senator Wesely, did you want to discuss the Hall