

professional engineers and architects can work on buildings that go from \$40,000...we're raising it up to a \$100,000, and now that I have stated exactly what the committee decided, I'm going to back away from it because I do not believe that they should be brought from \$40,000 to \$100,000, and those of the committee that wish to speak in favor of this may do so, but I will oppose it later on. Thank you ever so much. I move for the adoption of the amendments, with tongue in cheek.

PRESIDENT: Motion on the desk. Read the motion, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Labeledz moves to amend the committee amendments. In the Committee amendments strike Section 1 added by the amendment. On Page 3, Line 10, strike the words "such documents", and insert "the project", and strike beginning with the word "and" in Line 18 through "1978", in Line 19. That's offered by Senator Labeledz. (See Page 519 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Labeledz.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Mr. President. The committee... the amendment to the committee amendments...the first section of the amendments addresses a problem resulting from the first committee amendment. As presently written, Section 81-8555 requires that all public works projects costing over forty thousand dollars must be designed and supervised by a registered professional engineer or architect, whether that engineer or architect is a state government employee or a private consultant. The committee amendment, which is not related to the original intent of LB 38, would allow for anyone to design and supervise projects costing up to a hundred thousand. I think this is too high. This amendment would keep the forty thousand dollar limit, meaning projects under forty thousand would not need professional engineering or architectural supervision. The second amendment...the second section of the amendment, the phrase "or in the administration of the construction documents and final approval of such documents", was inserted to replace "or in the inspection and in final approval thereof", because it was felt to be more precise. As this law is presently written, final project refers to the final approval of the entire project, not just the construction documents. The committee amendment unintentionally would limit the final approval requirement to the construction documents. I move for the adoption of the amendment to the committee amendments.