

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

January 20, 2004 LB 479

then. What currently is the Department of Revenue doing with respect to qualifying amounts? I mean, are we treating these people under any...would we be treating them under a different system than what we're treating them right now?

SENATOR CONNEALY: Under the Baker amendment?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Yeah, how are they interpreting production at a minimum rate of 100,000 dollars (sic) annually? Let's say...let's say, for example, they went into production April 1...

SENATOR CONNEALY: This...

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...and they were...and the first day they produced so much alcohol. Under current law are they deemed to qualify at that point, or at what point are they deemed to qualify under current law?

SENATOR CONNEALY: This wording is written because Department of Revenue said that there's a loophole that you could qualify if you produced just for one day, and you could qualify at a higher level than maybe you should, and they asked for a broader qualification that would say that you had it be a real operating plant. They said the 30-day period would be good to do it.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CONNEALY: And so it's really addressing those concerns of a potential problem.

SENATOR BEUTLER: So the current department, the way they're currently interpreting the law, what are they allowing?

SENATOR CONNEALY: They're saying the...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Are they allowing for...

SENATOR CONNEALY: ...way the bill is currently written, it could be for a one-day period, and that we wanted to make sure that it was a facility that was able to produce.