

SENATOR HALL: Madam President, members, Senator Dierks, yes, and if I said that it only dealt with property, I misspoke. I intentionally stripped both out of Section 1 and 2 of Section 16.

SENATOR DIERKS: Okay, well, I am still in opposition to this amendment, and I think that it's relatively evident that we are talking about a product that you can't equate to equipment. Senator Will, I don't think there is any way you could equate a pile of electronic or radioactive goop to a piece of equipment. The radioactive goop will go on forever and ever. It does have a half life, but you would hardly notice it, especially high-level waste. So I think that we are even remiss by not doing it more than forty years, but to do it, take the forty out and put ten in is a real good example of poor protection for the citizens of our state. I don't think anybody wants to do that and I certainly would hope they would not support this amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Dierks. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President. And, again, I rise in support of the amendment. What are we about here? What we are saying is that we are going to protect property, real and personal, four times the length that we will protect individuals who are harmed by any other type of product that is manufactured. That's what we are doing. We are saying, in this case, we are not talking about individuals, that the, what did you call it, Senator Dierks, the goop? That must be a term of art that I am unfamiliar with, and I need to get more familiar with this high-level waste, but the proposal says, in this case, in subsection (2) of Section 16, that persons: property, real property, and natural resources, or, check this one out, response costs; we are not even talking about something that we can nail down in terms of knowing just what response costs are. I guess they have got to be clean-up costs or whatever allegedly approximately resulting from a release shall be eligible for this forty-year window of opportunity. Now explain to me how someone would not know that they had the responsibility to deal with this if the release had not taken place, that the damage had not occurred already to their personal property, their real property, or their natural resources, or the response costs. You'd think that the response costs or the damage that would be evident to any of those other three, arguably natural resources