

and the problem with writing a flawed formula into the bill, and whether the flawed formula would be what DED now does, what the Revenue Committee wanted, or what the Brashear,...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SPEAKER WITHEM: ...Will, Lindsay amendment would have done. I think we all would like to see these projects have a favorable cost-benefit analysis and, as Senator Wesely has indicated, individuals want to continue to work on that. I think I ought to caution people, however, although it is to my benefit to talk about, yeah, we will get that handled, absolutely no problem, Senator Wesely knows from years and years of working on this issue that it is not necessarily an easy thing to do, that it will be a lot of hard work, but I'm certainly prepared to work on a cost-benefit analysis of this bill, and I will sure be happy to participate in that process.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. I, again, I commend Speaker Withem and Director Moul for their willingness and their commitment to try and work on that issue. It is a very, very important one as we've found when we discussed the bill last week. And I think it is more than just important to the members of the Legislature, but it is important to the public. If you, again, I don't know how much discussion you had back in your districts when you went home this weekend, but having a cost-benefit analysis in there would fundamentally alter the perception of the public about whether or not these incentives are a good idea or a bad idea. Knowing that there would be a rigorous evaluation, a long-term view, and a weighing of the costs and as well as the gains from these changes would help ease a lot of the concerns, not just the members of the Legislature, but of the public, and fundamentally that is the key question is what will the public support in terms of tax incentives. And I think there is a lot of concern right now because that isn't in the bill but it helps a great deal, I think, to at least look at the issue further and, hopefully, come back and deal with the issue in the future. Again, I want to follow up on a couple of additional points. If you didn't get a chance to see it, late Friday I got an Attorney General's Opinion regarding LB 830, which we did pass Friday, and for your information, the Attorney General, not a whole lot of surprise here, found that the Constitution does not define the term "substandard and blighted"