

bill first came up on General File, I was concerned about the fact that I didn't think it clarified and specified, as much as I would like, as to the fiscal implications of the tax incentive programs that we have in place. I understand the intent and I support the intent. In fact, the idea of a cost/benefit analysis and utilization of that and decision-making on cost...on tax incentives has been something I've argued since the bill, LB 775, passed in 1987. I have long felt that we needed to take and separate the good from the bad projects and a cost/benefit analysis would help accomplish that. The problem is that, and I think it was made apparent last year when we discussed the Micron bills, that a cost/benefit analysis...everybody wants the ideal, the perfect, balanced, clear approach and then the answer, the solution. But what we found out last year is that one person's formula that makes projects look good, that's bad; and so somebody else's idea that the formula works and makes the project look bad, well, that's good and we've got varying perspectives about how best to measure the value of these incentives. By simply having a different formula, by recognizing some projects would happen anyway and some would not and what formula you use in accomplishing that and then the rippler effect, the multiplier effect that comes from some of the projects not balanced by the fact that there are additional infrastructure costs involved, all of this compounds itself into what seems simple which is a concept of taking tax incentives and doing a cost/benefit analysis and from that reaching a conclusion whether or not the incentive is worthwhile or not. That simple concept to apply is rather complex. That's the reason, though we've talked about the idea for so many years, this is the first time that we are actually seeing, my hope is seeing, success in putting it forward and laying it out and moving forward with it. Last year we came very close to seeing it pass. And, as I mentioned, there was amendments to the Micron bill that changed the whole formula in such a way that it was not felt to be an accurate reflection of the cost/benefit and so the whole concept was dropped at that time. To his credit, Senator Warner has not let it fall by the wayside; and to Senator Hartnett's credit I believe, you picked this as a priority bill and I commend you as well that we are continuing to examine this and trying to reach a conclusion as to what is good and what is bad tax incentive policy. Anyway, that's a long summary of what I'm proposing here. What I want to clarify through this amendment is that there is both a positive net return in terms of revenues to the