

February 28, 1996 LB 1373

policy. I would caution you that's not always the case, that there still needs to be some basic judgment by this Legislature what good policy is. But in an effort to reach that good policy, a model like this is certainly extremely useful, will give us some continuity over time, and in the long-term perspective, these are exactly the types of models that we should develop and can use. But I don't want people to begin to say, look, whatever the numbers say, that's how I'm going to vote, because there may be a project that shows it makes good sense and can make lots of profits for the state, and yet you may think that's poor policy for a variety of other reasons. The reverse is also true, that it may not show as much revenue, it may show losses, but still may be good policy in your judgment. Use the models for what they're intended, and that's to assist you in some consistency, some continuity and to give you some judge of where these projects will be. And so, with that, I don't...as we begin to look at legislative history of what these models are going to do, I want to make sure that the numbers themselves don't determine how you vote, rather they assist you in making good policy choices as to whether we should have incentive packages at all and, if so, which ones. I will support the bill as it is written and would hope that the rest of the body would do so as well. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. As I was talking about, when time ran out, the figures I want to ensure that you are aware of is the...when you talk cost/benefit analysis, the reason that this has been of great concern to me is that originally, when the bill passed, there was discussion that there would be a cost/benefit that would have a payback within seven years. The figures now are more in the range of 17 plus years. And currently it looks as though we come ahead on the current revenue losses that I was going over with you, which total about a billion dollars in the year 2015. But the problem is that we keep having companies that are currently qualifying. When the seven-year period runs out with the contracts that they sign, they reapply and get new contracts, and thus the effort continues into the future. So that, in my view, the fact that we're 17 years away, or, in fact, 18 or 19 years away from actually breaking even, we will never actually reach the point where we come out ahead total for the state of Nebraska, as long as we have this open-ended qualifying