

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

April 1, 2004

LB 1090

will be when it becomes a final nonappealable judgment, we have written in our statutes, after notice thereof--that would be the notice to the director of Administrative Services--interest shall run and be computed on such judgment from its date. There's only one date on the judgment. It was entered a year and a half ago. It was \$100 million of principal for the judgment. It's \$50 million or \$60 million of interest already, and I'm telling you the reasonable interpretation when you read all of these statutes together in what the law calls in pari materia is in the fall it'll be another \$32 million. And I don't want us to say we didn't know.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time. Thank you, Senator Brashear. Senator Beutler, followed by Senator Kremer, on the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, this has certainly been an interesting discussion on the interest problem, but I don't think that the interest problem should sidetrack us from the main focus of this matter which is of this huge principal amount that we're going to need to pay. And to me, it's a question of whether that \$151 million of principal is going to be there for us to pay. And we had some discussion earlier about the fact, well, maybe that will be mitigated to some extent by the fact that there may be an effort in settlement to locate a site in Nebraska, and that would cut down on the amount of damages we would have to pay. But I was just updating myself a little bit, and I'm seeking even more information, on what's happening with regard to low-level nuclear waste sites in the rest of the country. And that's important, of course, because the nuclear industry has indicated publicly that basically there only needs to be one additional low-level nuclear waste site in this country for the next 30 years. It can handle the waste to now...now the way that it's packaged. So if Nebraska is the only facility being built, then maybe there is some leverage in the settlement process whereby we might trade some money damages for the right to build it here. But what if we don't need it here? Then that leverage would disappear. And why might we not need it--because news coming out of Texas who, by the way, was in a compact I think with Vermont or New Hampshire, believe it not, that's how silly this got at one point in time--in Texas they're now authorizing