

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

April 7, 1999

LB 271

And, in fact, could converting this Capitol Building into an office building or a private corporation or business or converting it into a hotel be for a public purpose? I think that's a stretch but maybe there's some other people think that's a public purpose, and that may have to be debated, that may have to be debated at some time. Now you have a different set of circumstances if the governmental owner of the property isn't making a direct use of the property. Now when I say they are not making a direct use of the property, there are two ways in which they wouldn't make a direct use, or arguably not make a direct use. One is if they don't use it at all. It simply sets out there as vacant property and there is some of that around airports. The committee amendments and the language that we're going to propose to you would not subject that property to tax. That property would be subject to an in lieu of tax payment for what you might characterize as the most essential governmental services, fire, safety, rescue, streets, that kind of thing. So that unused property would be eligible for an in lieu of tax payment for direct governmental services that are rendered to it. Now what's the other way in which a governmental entity might own property and not make its own use of that property? They could lease it to someone else. Now if the governmental body has leased the property to somebody else, what considerations do you want to take into account? First of all, you have to look to the purposes of the governmental body itself and say, well, is it a part of its public purposes to lease the property to that...for that purpose, such as a housing authority? A housing authority has to lease property to low-income individuals. That's directly stated in its public purposes. Would you want to tax the residence that a housing authority has to lease to a low-income person? No. All right, so that category would be exempted. If, on the other hand, you have a governmental entity that has excess land and they lease it or they have property that they've developed and they lease it for a private purpose, let's say they lease it for farming. Remember, the airport calls. Let's say they lease that property for farming. Should that property be subject to tax? The answer in the committee amendments is that, yes, that property should be subject to tax. Now let's make another supposition. Let's say that they lease the property to a charitable organization or to another governmental entity, and the use that the charity or the other governmental entity makes for the