

principle I'm concerned about further expansion and growth and increased loss of revenue through further tax incentives on economic development. So I'm going to oppose this amendment but recognize that there is a little more legitimate reason to support it on this point than in some other areas that we have done even more, namely LB 775.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President, and members, again, I rise to oppose this portion of the divided Hartnett amendment. The argument has been made that this is going to apply to the most blighted of areas in the state and that it is going to be those areas that would qualify for purposes of an enterprise zone. If you look at page 3 of the committee amendments, AM2885, it's the white copy in your book, it's Section 3, what it says is that the enterprise zone shall...an enterprise zone or zones shall mean, and it goes, (a), an area which is at least one-half but no more than ten square miles and which meets at least two of the following three criteria. It only has to be two of them. The first one is that the population in the area or within a reasonable proximity of the area decreased by 10 percent between the date of the most recent federal vicinal census and the date of the immediately preceding federal vicinal census. So it's got to meet that one, reduction in population. Secondly, the average rate of unemployment in the area or within a reasonable proximity of the area, for the most recent period for which data is available is at least 150 percent of the average rate of unemployment in the state during the same period. All you have to do, under that scenario, is, for example, oh, let's pick out a place like, say, Bellevue, just pull that out of our hat. It has a reduction in population and it also would have an unemployment that would be one and a half times what the state rate is for purposes of qualifying. There are no criteria there that deal with blight. There are no criteria there that deal with the issue of wealth of the area. It has to have a reduction in the number of people that have lived there since the last two censuses or since the last census and it has to have an unemployment rate that is one and a half times the state rate. In a state that only has approximately a 3 percent rate, it means that unemployment in that 12...or, excuse me, ten-mile area or a reasonable proximity to that area, according to the language in the amendment, would only have to be 4.5 percent, which would not be that difficult. And I guess one could argue that if you wanted to "gerry-rig" the numbers