

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

April 5, 2004

LB 1065

any of those people that have contracts, and unless the state agreed to renegotiate to give them more money, this language, if it were removed, would not hurt anything or change anything, would it?

SENATOR BAKER: No, I think it could cause a lot of mischief. People would either change names and file new contracts under the new language that has no limit on it. I think that's the first mischief we'd see tried. They'd come in...they wouldn't modify their current contracts. They'd just form another entity and say we're going to qualify under this name with a new contract. Now that's...that would be one scenario I could think of.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But they would have to produce something. They couldn't just take a name. They would have to have a facility and be producing a certain amount to come in for other subsidies under the program, wouldn't they?

SENATOR BAKER: That is correct, at 8,333 gallons on a monthly basis by June 30.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And if they couldn't do that by June 30, after June 30 passes, even that is gone.

SENATOR BAKER: That's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So why don't you give me this?

SENATOR BAKER: Because I think somebody would come in there and produce 8,333 gallons in the month of May or June and say, oh, we'll...you know, we'll sign a new contract, produce it, and then thereby qualify for an unlimited subsidy quantity for 8...or, 96 months.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And you're telling me that if they produce that amount, under the existing law, the state would be required to give them certain subsidies,...

SENATOR BAKER: That's...