

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

March 18, 2003 LB 608, 758

specific reporting of the number of employees employed at the project. Current law requires only disclosure of the number of employees statewide, so we're making it project specific. This amendment addresses Senator Landis' concerns about people employed as opposed to FTEs, full-time equivalents, and that language is incorporated into the amendment. In addition, the amendment would add more disclosure requirements, as originally provided in my bill, LB 758, in order to shine more light, as we say, on the use of LB 775 and its effectiveness. The amendment would add additional reporting, not simply the average annual wage of new employees, which is currently required, but also the number of new employees at each wage level in \$5,000 increments. It requires the average annual wage of base-year employees. That was not previously required. And it requires the amount of recaptured income, sales and property taxes as a result of failing to maintain agreed-upon levels of investment, employment or wages. That's accountability, monitoring, and responsibility. In addition, the amendment would require the Department of Revenue to report information for each county as follows. In other words, we will be county-by-county specific as follows: average wages, number of employees at each wage level in \$5,000 increments, number of jobs created, expansion of capital investment, refunds of...

SPEAKER BROMM: One minute.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: ...sales taxes, and value of personal property exempted. Mr. Speaker, did you say something?

SPEAKER BROMM: One minute

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Thank you. In order to maintain the confidentiality requirements that I think are appropriate in the competitive job creation marketplace, the Department of Revenue can aggregate the data in two or more counties and report combined results for two or more counties where it's necessary in order to avoid retrospective engineering in order to get a competitive advantage. That's what the amendment does. It tries to take the best of what the Revenue Committee has proposed, the best of that which was a part of the Governor's bill, which I was proud to introduce at his request, to increase