

have to remember that this was not just a siting of a prison. This is not...we're in a juvenile area, we are not in the adult area. This is not just saying, where should this particular part of the prison be. This is part of an entire process of where this part of that process should be. There's a chain, and that's just one link out of that chain. If we take out that link and start redoing it, that is going to have an impact on the other links, which means...I think Senator McKenzie may have touched on this, which means we're going to be setting back the clock again and working back through on the siting, meaning the assumptions underlying where that's going to be sited are also going to be altered, which means it's going to have a spill-over effect onto some of the other parts of the juvenile services plan, which includes the community evaluations, the residential evaluations, those types of things. Once that's set back, then we're going to continue our overcrowding at Geneva and Kearney, we're not going to be addressing that. We're going to have more time having turned back the clock on the siting process. We've been complaining how long it's taken to get us to this spot. We're going to take that time again getting to this spot again, except having a broader area of where we're looking. So in doing that, in the mean time, the evaluations aren't taking place outside of Kearney and Geneva, the additional facility to relieve the overcrowding at Kearney and Geneva is not going to be around, so bottom line, juvenile crime, which we had, even though it hadn't been implemented yet, that process had been started, is going to be moved back. We're a year back now in the process. And I should remind that the...and I know there's been talks about how much, Senator Vrtiska mentioned how much the cost of land had been talked about, and that 3 million I believe is actually 1.5 million plus site development costs. The site that had been offered by the City of Omaha was a site located in a flood plain that they wanted a million five for. In order to elevate that out of the flood plain, to get the site so that you could build on it, would cost 700 to 800 thousand dollars. So, what the underlying amendment would have done was not skewed that entire schedule because we simply would have moved, as Senator Wehrbein mentioned, moved a line on a map. We're still in the same area but not bound by that city lim...that incorporated city limits. It can expand that out to the same general area but without that limitation. Now with the amendment as adopted we're now expanding that out and we have to, I think, start from ground zero and start reviewing all the sites that are coming in. Obviously, that's not going to be done over night. So I think we, at least, if nothing else,