

particular area and they're going to create at least 30 jobs, they would get tax credits; at the same time they may be reducing their overall employment on other projects or in other areas of the state. So what I have done with this amendment is to insert the word that the taxpayer, if the reduction at the end of the year, if there are an equivalent number of Nebraska employees. Now the word equivalent is interesting in how they arrive at equivalent number of employees. It's fairly simple and fairly good calculation I think. What they do is they take the total number of hours that the company pays to their employees during the entire year and then divides that total number of hours by what an employee working 40 hours a week would have as his total number of hours for a full year. So you get, in effect, equivalent employees is really how many full-time equivalent employees do you have in the state? And they would be related to Nebraska employees, Nebraska employees in the act are defined as employees who reside at least full time or part time within the State of Nebraska. So the amendment would, in effect, clarify those questions. It would designate that it's really what we're talking about as full-time equivalent employees within the State of Nebraska. It would not apply to a company's employees in other areas of the state and it would not apply on a project by project basis but it would apply on a statewide basis, how many total employees they have in the State of Nebraska. And if, at the end, of that particular year they show that instead of maintaining their level employment in the State of Nebraska, that that level of employment has in fact decreased, then they would just lose the tax credits and there is a detailed procedure set out in LB 775 that allows for a payback provision or a refunding provisions of those tax credits. It's already there in the bill and can be implemented fairly quickly. So I think that the language in this amendment clarifies the intent of the bill itself. It answers the questions that were being asked. I have to confess that I think those questions were being asked not so much as far as clarification of the bill, but as trying to give some kind of reason for the group of lobbyists that are working against this bill to try to make an excuse to vote against the concept. The concept is a good one and I think this language clarifies any ambiguities or misunderstandings about the intent of the bill. The amendment, if you look on it, it's really just a two-line amendment and in place of the word "average" you strike it and insert "equivalent Nebraska" employees instead of average number of employees. It becomes the number of equivalent Nebraska employees and I think it clarifies the bill. I would urge the