

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

May 19, 2003

LB 608

SENATOR BOURNE: But the language also said...didn't it say that it could be in addition to the \$250,000 that they got, for every 250 they invested, they got \$2,750?

SENATOR LANDIS: No, I think it's in increments of. So if you have to have a minimum of \$250,000, in increments of that amount you constructed \$250, and if you were over you'd do it again in those same increments.

SENATOR BOURNE: Okay. I understand. Okay, and then the benefit is there, of course, there's a minimum wage of \$8.25 per hour that each of those jobs have. We don't have any information in there regarding the insurance that was in LB 208 (sic).

SENATOR LANDIS: Yes, in LB 208 (sic) there is no information. There is no information now in LB 608 about insurance.

SENATOR BOURNE: Right. Okay. Okay. And then I guess my question then to you is...and, again, I believe that this is a more effective way of "incenting" rural economic development and I do agree with the concept. I just want to make sure I know where we're at. But my question is, Senator Landis, and maybe this is more philosophical than policy oriented, but if we're, in a sense, setting up a new economic development program and one of the biggest problems that the body had on General File with the existing economic incentive program was the lack of disclosure, I'm just asking your opinion as to why are we setting up a new program that incorporates some of the mistakes that we made originally when we adopted LB 775 some, what, 15 or 16 years ago? If we're setting up a new program, why aren't we doing it in a way that makes sense today rather than how it made sense back in 1986?

SENATOR LANDIS: I think there are a significant number of improvements in this bill than what we have now.

SENATOR BOURNE: I agree with that.

SENATOR LANDIS: Is it...for example, it doesn't have a bad actor provision. We haven't found one for the state yet. This