

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

March 23, 2000 LB 936

who they would work for. We have proceeded with that. We have developed a number of models and the staff, and two that are particularly important in this regard are IMPLAN and TRAIN, and the staff in the Fiscal Office has developed, I think, considerable expertise in using these models and, in fact, they have applied these models in what I think is a clever fashion to this particular proposal. And what I want, and by the way, I don't know if all of you have copies of their analyses, and if you would like them, I would certainly, don't have them and would like them, I would certainly try to help see that you get them, but let me quickly summarize for you what they did. They used both models and that gave them sort of two different looks at this proposal. The IMPLAN model, they...actually there was a subdivision there that involved one model looking at the 70 counties that could actually participate in this, and another model that looked at the rest of the state. Generally speaking, what they found was for the tax credit involved, there was a small return, I would emphasize small return, in the form of increased income and increased job growth in rural Nebraska. If you look at the state as a whole, the impacts were negative. There was both a negative impact on income and a negative job growth impact. Actually the more generous of the two results was the TRAIN model, or competitive general equilibrium model, and there I think I can summarize it fairly quickly by saying that over a 10-year period if you consider a 20 million dollar state investment in sales and income tax credits, that of that \$20 million,...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR RAIKES: ...about \$2.7 million would come back in the form of increased sales and income tax revenue; \$18 million would result in increased personal income. Now keep in mind that is very much like taking money out of the General Fund and distributing it to people. And also they did an analysis of where the income would go, and of nine income groups in the state, the top three would receive over half of it. So they did come up with a net impact of additional job growth, but I guess what I'm saying is if you look at the whole package, the results of this particular program are dismal. They don't produce a good result in terms of economic development. I think it's important that we consider rural economic development but I