

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 6, 2003

LB 165

availability of the power from that plant, and that could become even more important, I think, in the days ahead and months ahead that we have that available and on line. So with that, I just rise to support the bill and certainly willing to look at language changes if there are good suggestions. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Preister, followed by Senators Vrtiska, Jones, Janssen, Beutler, Brashear, and Quandahl. Senator Preister.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the body, I appreciate the attentiveness to the issue. I think it is one that is important to do. I want to continue where I left off with the vote that I was talking about. I...when I was talking about the 5-5 split vote by the board, I read Section 4 rather than Section 3. Essentially, the vote was to take out the indemnification provision. It, and I'll read it to be more accurate, 3 is: Beginning the process of finding a legislative solution for the contractual indemnification issue raised by NMC. What the board was split on was this very issue that we're voting on, the indemnification, and half the members thought that finding this solution of legislative indemnification release, which NMC requested to take over the operation, was not clear-cut. Half the board members didn't think it was a good idea, or so it would reflect in their vote. That was in November. Then, in December, they had another vote and in December, this was at the December 13 meeting, and they had the resolution before them and Section 3 supports...their resolution would be to support legislation clarifying the ability of public power districts to indemnify a third party operating a nuclear power plant owned by a district. Again, we're talking about the indemnification issue. That vote to take that portion out of the resolution, again, was a split vote. Wasn't even the same members this time, so people's minds had changed and five people voted to take it out and five people voted to keep it in. I mention that because this is a board of directors of NPPD who are closer to this issue, who have been given more briefing and more information than any of us have, and they're undecided on indemnification. They're split down the middle, 5-5. Once that wasn't taken out of the resolution at that point, yes, everybody did vote for the resolution, but on two different occasions, in