

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

January 31, 2006 LB 1003

SENATOR BEUTLER: I'd yield to Senator Landis...

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...for a response.

SENATOR LANDIS: There isn't a significant fiscal impact. In fact, I don't think any of the other provisions had A bills. I can't recall a fiscal note on any of them. Essentially, they took areas of ambiguity and defined more clearly. They were all...they were the kinds of bills you have on the first day of hearing that were all administrative in nature. So I don't recall any financial impact on any of the bills that I know of.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. Second question then, and I didn't think I would come up so quick, so I haven't had a chance to read through here enough, and you may want to pause and look at it, in which case it can be answered later, but I notice on page 19 and thereafter, Section 10, it deals with when an audit needs to be done. And it looks like a five...an audit every five years on all the companies that are affected by this particular provision of law. But it appears to say that that audit doesn't have to take place once the number of companies are, I take it, so small that you couldn't do the audit without revealing confidential information that allows identification of a company. And there were...there are a number of confidentiality provisions already in the law, including a provision that the Tax Commissioner needs to confirm in writing that the report does not reveal any confidential information before it's given out. Can you just describe a little bit how this came up and what the context is, and how many companies are affected, or what's happening?

SENATOR LANDIS: This is part of the expired Invest Nebraska Act that we're doing, so it's not...in fact, I think these provisions exist in our newer laws because we caught this administrative problem. And the administrative problem was this, a statutory obligation to do an audit, but the audit would reveal information that couldn't be shared with anybody because it violated the confidentiality standards, which is sort of a