

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

April 21, 1999 LB 605

not received any credits, but they will receive credits under this. So if you look at that chart you will see that Sutherland, down there next to the bottom, gets nothing for the year 2000. But in the year 2001, '02, and '03, they will pick up 750,000 each of those years. And that...the reason that they don't get anything in the year 2000 is because you can't dip in the well twice and they are going to be receiving their funding under the old program for the years 1999 and 2000. They are not on line yet. They will not be on line until August of this year, but it's that kind of a situation that we're looking at--how are...how can we continue the operation of ethanol and under what fiscal circumstances? So what we are doing, and I can...I can take it plant by plant and you can see how it would work, with Chief ethanol, they are talking about expanding after June of this year. They would receive a credit up to the amount of 750,000 for each of those three years that they are in actual production. The plant in Sutherland will receive nothing for the years 1999 or 2000, but will receive up to 750,000 for each of those succeeding years. The plant that Senator Baker would like to see arrive on the scene would start receiving funds of up to 600,000 for each of those three years. And this is...and then the other one that is of concern is the High Plains plant in York, and the High Plains plant did some expansion earlier but didn't receive any credit for that expansion. This would give them an additional 500,000 in the year 2000 for the expansion that they...that they accomplished, and then AGP would see...receive similarly to the Sutherland plant. So it's a method of paying out the existing funds in the ethanol program. And you will see that what...what is happening is that, although the checkoff for corn has been at three-quarters of a cent up until now, that will remain three-quarters for this year and then will drop down to a half for next year and then terminate. So we won't have a lot of money left over. That's not the idea. The idea is to inspire some new production and to see that we can finally move forward with an expanded operation. If you take the plant in Sutherland, they will have spent somewhere up to \$20 million finally getting that into operation, so we are encouraging them but not...not anywhere near to the amount that they are actually putting into this operation. So I, in essence, I just simply want to tell you that the amendment that we are going to propose changes the direction that the Revenue Committee had come up with. It changes it in such a way that,