

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

May 3, 1999

LB 382

had the responsibility to pay for this building should they decide to construct said building.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And, Senator Coordsen, I have been arguing all along, all day Wednesday or when we were on this bill that the committee knew, those at least who put together this deal that was brokered that resulted in the committee amendments that taxes in Omaha are going to have to be used ultimately for this building. Why did the committee think that revenue bonds would not be appropriate?

SENATOR COORDSEN: Why did the committee think that revenue...I don't believe that the committee discussed the appropriateness of revenue bonds. I believe that the committee felt that general obligation bonds were the better mechanism of finance.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Let me...

SENATOR COORDSEN: And we both understand the difference between the two types of bonds.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Did the committee feel that revenue, a sufficient amount of revenue would not be generated by this facility to retire the bonds, revenue bonds?

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR COORDSEN: I don't think that was ever directly discussed. As a standard of practice, the revenues don't flow till later in the process, that is, until the building is completed, the conventions are booked and that sort of activity finally begins to flow revenues into the coffers of the city and the perspective of increased sales tax revenues and whatever taxes there would be on the facilities, you know, the seat, the excise taxes and all of those sorts of things that cities use to share in these facilities. And rather than create a situation where both revenue and general obligation bonds would be put in place to avoid having any sort of an indication as to any state guarantees whatsoever that it would work...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Time.