

287.

SPEAKER BARRETT: LB 287 is advanced. LB 366, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 366, Mr. President, by Senator Landis. (Title read.) The bill was introduced on January 20, referred to Revenue, advanced to General File. I have no amendments to the bill, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: To explain the bill, Senator David M. Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You will recall that when we passed LB 271, changing our method for ag land valuation, we created an ag land valuation task force or advisory committee who would see that the use or methodology was, in fact, carried out by the Revenue Department and to oversee and advise them on how to do that. One of the additional duties that that group had was to advise this body of further refinements and how to make that methodology more precise and more accurate. LB 366, in essence, is the report of that advisory committee that we have created back to us, who has carried out the ag land valuation process and says it can be improved in these four small ways. In your bill books, for example, you will find that there is widespread support for the bill from the Department of Revenue, to the Nebraska Farm Bureau, to the NACO legislative committee, to county assessors who were present and the like. The first thing that the bill does is to give a little better definition to what we mean by the use of the most current information. That's the obligation in our existing formula, but because information comes in on a staggered basis, we need a particular time to stop gathering information, to freeze it in time and to take our snapshot of information at that moment and that moment will be January 1 of the year prior to the assessment on calculated land values. Secondly, the bill permits the tax commissioner to adjust the value of classes or subclasses of land to ensure uniformity between counties. It is possible to have numbers which simply do not have a rational explanation in which, perhaps, for some reason that is lost to us in antiquity and the way the soils were once classified or whatever, or the changes in those soils or whatever, there is no rational explanation for the difference between one county and another. This would permit the tax commissioner to adjust the values to make a more uniform set of numbers between those two counties where they abut. Third, there are some very large counties who contain in them geographic differences and those geographic differences are so