

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

March 28, 2000 LB 1234

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Connealy, if currently a station owner or operator has two tanks and one of them is selling ethanol, what do you need this mandate for? Senator Schrock said all of them are going to have two tanks. Well, if they're already selling ethanol, what do you need this mandate in your bill for?

SENATOR CONNEALY: That retailer would not be affected by this. If that retailer was selling ethanol in the lowest grade that they're selling, it wouldn't do it. What this will do, though, it will offer ethanol-blended fuels at a lower octane than is available in the state now.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then, what you're telling me, there are some people with two tanks but neither tank can...contains ethanol right now?

SENATOR CONNEALY: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So they would have to stop selling one of those fuels in order to sell ethanol, or add a third tank.

SENATOR CONNEALY: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And that's what you want the state to mandate?

SENATOR CONNEALY: Require.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: The same thing. The lowest octane would be the gasoline probably purchased by those people who we would say are not of great means. Isn't that true?

SENATOR CONNEALY: Not necessarily so. Most cars call for the lowest octane that's sold, so it's across the board on different cars.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Let me ask the question a different way. Do you think most low income people by the lower octane?

SENATOR CONNEALY: Yes. Most people, in general. But probably