

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

March 29, 2000 LB 1234

SENATOR CONNEALY: Right.

SENATOR RAIKES: And...

SENATOR CONNEALY: Other than it would...

SENATOR RAIKES: ...so the point I'm trying to make is I suspect that the price of ethanol relative to the nonethanol is really the controlling factor in how much is consumed and this bill does not directly address that issue. Is that right?

SENATOR CONNEALY: Not directly.

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay. So let me...let me go on. Suppose this bill passed and I've got my station there with the three grades. Now one thing I could do is eliminate my 87, so now I've got an 89 and a 91. So one way I could compel or...or meet the requirements of this bill is simply to eliminate one option for my consumers. You can buy either 89 or 91 and I'm complying with the law. Is that right?

SENATOR CONNEALY: It wouldn't be a very good business decision, but yes.

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay, but I...well, all right. So let's look at some of my other options. The other one is I could offer an 87 nonethanol, an 87 ethanol, and then a premium grade. Well, right now we don't have an 87 ethanol and, as I understand it, we need to get into the state this 85 base grade product so that we can blend it up. Now this 85 base grade basically won't work in most cars, is that right? They ping all the time or something like that. So we're going to establish a requirement on the industry that we stock a product in the state that's really not usable in and of itself. Is that correct?

SENATOR CONNEALY: There's many components to gasoline that are not usable in and of themselves.

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay.

SENATOR CONNEALY: You wouldn't be retailing this 85 grade.