

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

May 19, 2003

LB 608

step forward, one step back all along the way, and the... Senator Bromm, and in consultation with me, I think, as well, and I agreed to this, have suggested that we do this. The pieces in the bill are all over the place and there are two pieces worth doing and worth doing now. One of them is this--essentially the repeal of LB 270 as it now exists, because it has almost no power to genuinely "incent" behavior; and secondly, something to be done for rural Nebraska. So Al Wenstrand's suggestion here is essentially to revamp the program making it an application first, and we'll have some material for you...it's certainly in your computer, but we'll try to get some material to your desk...an application process done first on which the taxpayer identifies what they're going to do. We expect more employment, five jobs. We expect more investment than we now expect in LB 270. We do better by them with respect to the kind of benefits that they receive. We essentially double their benefits. But we cap the program for the first two years at \$2.5 million so we can't get into economic difficulty. The program, as it now exists, two years ago spent \$4.4 million, last year spent \$2.9 million. So in essence, we can't get into trouble economically because the program is capped. Senator Bromm has confidence in it and I do too think that it's a good idea. It's essentially a rural-based program in which we also have a minimum standard for wages at \$8.15. Is it \$8.15? Let me just check if my number is right, \$8.25. It is a bill that...it is an idea for which I think there is genuine incentive power, genuine incentive power, but I have to tell you that it's written in a way that it strikes all provisions of the bill, and this is important for Senator Beutler because it would, even if your amendment was successful, the amendment that's coming strikes the bill and all provisions, including yours as now drafted. Senator Beutler's amendment is aimed, I think, at using program evaluation for LB 775, and all I'd say is that after the adoption of the Bromm amendment there would not be a LB 775 provision in LB 608. Why would we do that? Well, I'll tell you what...it's a mixed bag, from my perspective. The disclosure...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...provisions that are now in LB 608 are not