

February 28, 1996 LB 1373

incentives; impact on local infrastructure needs, which currently is not done at all, at least at the state level, as I understand it; three, impacts on firms receiving benefits and employees; fourth, impacts on other firms and employees; and then, five, other impacts that might be determined as to be important by the committee. No one opposed the bill, there were some neutral positions. But I think this is a step in the right direction. The Revenue Committee has been very interested in trying to begin to address these problems or issues with more of an objective definable measurement, if that is all possible to do, and I think this will be the first step toward moving in that direction. But again, I'd ask for adoption of the committee amendment which essentially is corrective. It adds the one Ethanol Development Act and retains the requirement of confidentiality on some of the equipment, and then the other is essentially improved wording. But I'd ask for the committee amendment to be adopted.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Warner. For discussion on the committee amendments, Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature. I do rise in support of LB 1373 and the committee amendment. Senator Warner, though, if you don't mind, could I ask you a couple questions.

SENATOR WARNER: I don't mind?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WESELY: Senator Warner, I was looking at Section 4, and it deals with what will be looked at in this model. And it talks about the tax shifts and infrastructure, impacts on employees. You went through that already. But one of the big concerns that has always been on my mind is the revenue gains and losses. I would assume that would be part of any cost/benefit analysis, but I don't actually...I don't actually see that in here.

SENATOR WARNER: The revenue gains and losses, by state and local government?

SENATOR WESELY: Right.