

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

April 21, 1999 LB 605

They...they went ahead. The people who bought Sutherland are not the same people we had trouble with several years ago. This is a whole new group that really know what they're doing, which distinguishes them from the previous group. But, anyway, these people are going forward with this program. They are spending a lot of their own money and at the time they committed to do this there wasn't any other incentive beyond this year and next year. But, you know, there's always that hope that something would occur to increase it. But I would like to say, they are spending a great deal of money and they're not...they're not doing it based solely on credits. They're based...it's a business judgment. They believe that business will expand. Senator Raikes and Senator Schrock both mentioned marketing. Senator Schrock was disappointed that there isn't much usage of ethanol product in the western part of the state, but I mentioned in my earlier comment that there is no ethanol plant west of Hastings in the state of Nebraska. And I think...statistics would have to show this, but I think that the usage of ethanol is price driven, to a large extent. And in western Nebraska there is a great differential between unleaded and unleaded with ethanol, and I don't know why that's true, except maybe the marketer thinks he can get that, and I think the reason he thinks he can get it is because there's an increased octane rating for ethanol, so I think he thinks it's kind of like...it's kind of like premium gasoline so they can charge more. There really should not be that kind of a differential, and I think that's a marketing situation. I do not think that the state of Nebraska has done as good a job marketing ethanol as it could be doing, and I think that's where we should go, not cutting down the program, but trying to market it so that it's...this is a...this is a viable thing that helps the ag communities in the state and I think that's something that we should nurture. We shouldn't try and say how can we squash it. I think we should try and encourage it. This program is not an unreasonable use of money. This is taking the money that's in the EPIC Fund, will be in the EPIC Fund, and encouraging additional production, not old production but for the newer production that we're talking about, and I think that's a logical, reasonable usage of that fund. I would encourage the defeat of the committee amendment and when this new bill that we have or the new amendment comes on, we can discuss that issue at that time. I think this offers