

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

May 19, 2003

LB 655

one that there is not \$200 million of unpaid ongoing work at a point in time, so that this size and magnitude of surety bond was sufficient for the project as it evolved and developed.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Was there any testimony as to the size that the contract might be on such a facility as this? Or...

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Oh, I think it was...

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...are we talking specifically about a particular facility that's in mind here, that we're...?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes. It's a...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: ...it's a project that has been described as an \$800 million project, as I recall the testimony before the committee.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. And the protection afforded the workers is \$200 million?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Well, no, I think that's a...I'm not trying to be argumentative, but when you say "afforded the workers," you simply don't...it's a multi-year project. There isn't \$200 million...isn't more than \$200 million, pursuant to the testimony, owed at any one time.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: So they would be able...everyone involved would be able to cap their liability, protect themselves. And the project simply wouldn't move forward if you had disputes with regard to payment.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. So if we're in a situation where it would take care of itself, would you have any objection to reinstating the ability of a small subcontractor to file a lien against the state in these instances where the liability of the assurance bond...of the bond didn't cover and protect them?