

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

May 3, 1999

LB 382

reconsideration but he called something to my attention. It's in Section 9 of the bill, subsection (2). That would be on page 7, line 13 of the committee amendment. Maybe I ought to go on up and read subsection (1) first: If an application, which would be line 6 on page 7, if an application is approved, the board shall: (1) Audit or review audits of the approved convention and meeting center facility to determine the number of participants at the facility that are registered from an out-of-state address and to assure the number of conventions which were not held in the state during the three years prior to the construction of the facility. I will read that again later and get the sense of it. (2) Determine the amount of attributable revenue with regard to construction of the eligible facility, employment at the eligible facility, and out-of-state participants attending conventions that were not held in the state in the three years prior to the construction of the eligible facility. If what Senator Landis says is correct and if this language that he called to my attention and which I read just now means that there is some formula by which the state will start giving over to this political subdivision money, then that makes the bill even worse than it was before, because prior to any convention being held, this political subdivision is going to start getting money from the state. But when we talk about the multipliers, the multipliers are based only on the number of participants. So if the multipliers are based on the number of participants, then there's going to have to be another formula for determining money that the city will get back based on construction costs. Now I don't know if this language that Senator Landis showed me means that the city can hope to recoup all that they spent in construction costs. I don't know what they are going to be able to determine as attributable revenue with regard to construction because you're going to look at the company that gets the job. If the company makes money, then I guess the company will pay corporation income taxes. If you're going to say that you look at the income of each employee, then you'd look at their income taxes. But Senator Landis, if I understood him correctly, would also include any sales tax that these people would spend. But I don't know that a person who does a job on construction spends more sales tax simply because he or she is working on that construction job any more than somebody who is in the Legislature will spend more sales tax because he or she is in the Legislature. But there is no