

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

May 17, 1999

LB 382

SENATOR RAIKES: ...to...to arrive at a...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...oh, excuse me. Would employment then be included as a separate item, as it is here, or would it be absorbed in the total cost of the construction?

SENATOR RAIKES: My...my understanding would be the latter, that we would have, for example, a \$200 million building project, which would include the materials and the labor required for the...for the construction effort.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So, if they're going to include the labor, they would just come up with a lump sum amount that they would attribute to the labor costs rather than reviewing...oh, let me ask you, how would they do that, in your view?

SENATOR RAIKES: Well, the...the construction part of it, I believe, simply would be the total expenditure on...on construction of the facility. And I don't know that there would be...I assume that some itemization may be required, but I don't know that you would need to separate out labor from materials on every phase of the project, for example.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So employment could be stricken from this definition, and we would be more accurate in specifying what the multipliers will be applied to?

SENATOR RAIKES: I think...I think that's correct, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now, here's why I'm dealing with that. Senator Landis and I had an extensive discussion the other day. But when we're in the definitional section and we're stating which items this investment multiplier will attach to, it would have to attach to each of the items we mention in "attributable income...revenue", wouldn't that be true, otherwise, why have it in there?

SENATOR RAIKES: Well, I...I understand the point you're making, Senator, I think.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So, let's take the language that's there and