May 17, 2005   LB 312

force, that they're going to maintain that. I guess I look a little bit, even like the events over the weekend with the base closings across the United States. And certainly, maybe you can't compare that with business, but they also are in the process, the armed forces are, in trying to be more efficient and with less duplication. And so that is just a part of business, that you constantly are trying to come up with better...bigger and better ways to produce a product, whatever that might be, whether it be even housing, or whatever it is. And so I would act, or would urge you to act with a little caution on this particular issue, that it might have a short-term effect, but it also might have a long-term detriment in that it actually might cause a greater movement out of the state. So I would just want to run that by you and have you think about that, just for a moment. I think LB 312 is crafted well. I applaud Senator Landis on his working through this, with the many entities that he had to work through, and I think at this point in time I will maintain the commitment to stay with the bill, as written, and not do any changing via amendments. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Jensen. Further discussion? Senator Baker, on AM1615 to LB 312.

SENATOR BAKER: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I have a question for Senator Redfield, if she'd respond, please.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Redfield, would you respond, please?

SENATOR REDFIELD: Yes, I would.

SENATOR BAKER: Senator Redfield, thank you. I'm trying to clarify in my mind if somebody qualifies, say, under the $3 million, 30 jobs, that tier, and then goes to tier 6, I think, is what's investment only, is that going to affect, say, that tier, the $3 million, 30 jobs, if they cut jobs? They make the investment. Is that going to go back and reflect on, I think it's, tier 2? I can't remember which tier 3 and 30 is. But is that going to reflect back on that qualifying tier that they worked under?