

and included in here include all of the ethanol plants and the projected, of course, projected production that they will have over the next five years with the exception of Sutherland.

SENATOR HALL: But are you guaranteeing the body, I guess, when we say that by...because I can see where Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendment could work both ways. I don't necessarily see it as a necessary or a definite rather evil because in the past, as you know, I've been very supportive of these types of programs. I think they ought to be funded maybe in a different way, but I also could see where some General Fund monies may be appropriate. My question is, are you guaranteeing the body when we enact this that there won't be a request for additional funds? If the argument is that we want to know definitely up front, be very straightforward and square about how much money we're going to spend in this area, if there should be need in the future, the Sutherland plant, possibly additional production that might occur at plants, are we guaranteeing the taxpayers that this is the absolute limit to the amount of money that will be potentially allocated?

SENATOR MCKENZIE: Senator Hall, we are attempting to guarantee that, however, besides the limit that a plant can receive, which is \$25 million over five years...

SENATOR HALL: Correct.

SENATOR MCKENZIE: ...even if Cargill produces ten times that, they will only receive the 25 million.

SENATOR HALL: Correct.

SENATOR MCKENZIE: There are variables in the funding mechanisms already within the EPIC Fund such as gas tax collected that continues for the next two years. All of these things affect how much money ends up in the fund, but also production to some extent affects what we believe we will need. If a plant drops below that, then they might receive...need less money. This is a best estimate at what we believe the deficit will be.

SENATOR HALL: So the answer is no.

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR MCKENZIE: No.