

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

March 29, 2000

LB 1234

if...my real concern is that we have not addressed the problem. That's the retailers. I absolutely have to state time and again till you can realize it, that the major companies require the retailers to carry gasohol. It's in the contract. They're not the ones that should be taking the blame. I might as well have everyone mad at me now, the corn growers, the wheat growers, the retailers, you name it, that retailers are the problem here. When a product is priced cheaper than no lead, I would think they should have their retail price cheaper. It wasn't that way. It is now though. It's getting that way. There are not very many stations that I have seen with ethanol priced higher than no lead now. Let the market work. And this amendment that Senator Chambers has adapted after mine, a very important amendment. We have exempted...there are 2,811 retail or commercial sites with tanks, 2,811 ret...or commercial sites with tanks. We have exempted them with the Bromm amendment last night, 1,431 of them that have two or fewer tanks. We've already exempted the problem, that's the small retailer that has two tanks that's selling no lead and diesel fuel in my country. We've exempted over half of all the commercial sites already. They're gone. Fourteen hundred and thirty-one of them are exempt from this bill. The ones that are still selling the ethanol, the big ones, there's a total of what would be fewer than 1,400 of them, 1,380 of them, are already selling ethanol, a big part of them. We can't get a breakdown from Department of Motor Vehicles or from the Fire Marshal's Office, we're working on it, but we're about to penalize the very people that are out there selling this ethanol now, and this amendment addresses the problem. If it does not pass, if it's not adopted, this amendment, you're going to require that the major retailers, the people that are associated with the Phillips, the Conocos, Amocos, we're going to require them to stop selling 89 octane ethanol and sell 87 octane ethanol. We have no guarantee whatsoever it's going to be cheaper to buy subgrade 85 octane than it is 87 octane. Right now today the fact is it's three cents a gallon higher than 87. What it does in the future I'd hate to predict. If we're going to hang our hat on the fact that Koch Industries and Ashland and these people are going to sell 85 octane cheaper than 87 to us after we mandated it, and they know they have a captive market, I don't think so. I wouldn't hang my hat on that one by any shape...no measure would I even consider that to be a given. They've said that in the