

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

May 8, 2001

LB 536, 620

question was asked if the ethanol plants would be eligible to utilize funding from LB 620, and it turns out that they would be. And so I've got an amendment today that would make it...make them not eligible to do that. We feel like that the LB 536 has the proper amount of incentives for them to work without having to double-dip or going over to LB 620 for help. So, on page 5, line 9, it says, after the period, insert "Qualified business does not include any business engaged in the production of ethanol that is eligible to receive production incentive credits under the Ethanol Development Act." I would urge your support of that amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Chambers, on the Dierks amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, oddly, I don't think this amendment is necessary because those boondoggle of ethanol plants might hire an average of 27 people. They would never reach the level of employees necessary to qualify under this bill. I've paid attention to this ethanol probably more than even Senator Dierks, because he's advocating for it, but I see it as a positive evil, not in the moral sense, but something that has no positive elements to recommend it to this state. The minimum...let me ask Senator Kristensen a question.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Kristensen.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Kristensen, in one category, the minimum number of employees would be 25 and the investment of \$10 million?

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: That's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now I'd like to ask Senator Dierks a question.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Dierks.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Dierks,...