

April 10, 1981

LR 243

there is another bill in this Legislature, LB 512, has to do with lien laws. If we pass that bill, it is going to impact upon a lot of existing contracts and they are going to work from that day forward. I could go into many, many other statutes, when we pass the law, it becomes effective and that is it. If we don't leave Section 2 in the bill or if we adopted the Haberman amendment, I am afraid there may be, Senator Haberman, ambiguity regarding the legislative intent because there would be, on the one hand a definite purpose relative to the use of eminent domain, on the other hand a specific exemption, and I am not sure that it would work. I would ask you to oppose the amendment and, Rex, I would certainly work with you in further detail. I am sorry I only saw the amendment just before lunch. If it doesn't pass, I would like to talk to you about it further, and I hope it doesn't pass.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Clerk has an amendment on the desk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Beutler moves to amend the Haberman amendment by deleting the words "construction bids were let" in line 8 and replace it with the words "funds have been expended or obligated".

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I am very much in favor of Senator Haberman's amendment which, as he stated, would make the application of this bill prospective rather than retrospective, that is it would not apply the criteria to projects where construction bids had been let in the past, prior to the effective date of the act. Well, the only thing I would like to do is refine Senator Haberman's amendment just a bit and go back a little bit further in time and say that the bill should not apply to any project for which funds have been obligated or expended prior to the effective date of this act instead of going back to just when the construction bids were let and the reason I want to do that, Senator Haberman, the reason I think it is important is because feasibility studies on these different projects run into hundreds of thousands of dollars and so I think you should go back far enough so that if a particular NRD has expended hundreds of thousands on a feasibility studies, that that project also should be exempt from the retrospective application of this bill. So that is, essentially, all that the amendment does. It is a refinement to Senator Haberman's refinement and it follows the same philosophy that his amendment follows which is simply once you have laid out the law to a political subdivision and they are