

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

May 9, 2001

LB 536, 620

SENATOR RAIKES: You're the only one that noticed that, Senator.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Now I assume Union Pacific's profitability is tied to the price of fuel because fuel is a rather large component of their...of their operational budget. Would you...would you agree with that?

SENATOR RAIKES: I would...you know, I think I do, Senator. I'll...

SENATOR SCHROCK: Well,...

SENATOR RAIKES: ...I'll...I'll trust you.

SENATOR SCHROCK: ...maybe their incentives to come to Omaha and build their headquarters here should be based on a sliding scale, based on the price of fuel. Do you think you could develop something like that? We can pull that bill off Final Reading and do that on LB 620.

SENATOR RAIKES: I would be happy to work on that, Senator.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Do you see a difference between that proposal and the proposal you've just given us?

SENATOR RAIKES: Well, a difference in that we're talking about a different kind of facility. I...I would mention in that connection, Senator, that the way that bill, LB 620, the one you were talking about, is now that ethanol plants would be eligible, under that bill, just as Union Pacific Railroad was. There's a different tier but ethanol plants could, in fact, qualify for LB 620 incentives. So, yes, there is a difference. This, LB 536, would talk about production incentives above and beyond the tax incentives provided under LB 620, if that answers your question.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Well, I suppose I would take that for an answer. I still have a little trouble accepting your proposal when I see what the states around us do when it comes to "incentivizing" their ethanol production. There are those of us