

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

April 26, 1999 LB 271

Raikes, on the Broom amendment.

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you, Madam President and members of the Legislature. I am...I appreciate Senator Bromm offering the amendment. It provides an opportunity for some possible clarification. I do think, as Senator Wickersham has pointed out, the situation of MUD is accommodated in the current bill. For example, suppose you had a municipal well in the middle of a 40-acre field, if you will. If the municipality could argue that that 40 acres, including the well site, was a public purpose and it was not leased out and not used for any other purpose, then it would not be taxed. On the other hand, if...and I think what would be a reasonable argument could be made, would be that the site right around the well is for a public purpose, but the rest of it is something that isn't needed or doesn't directly serve the public purpose. In that particular case, under the language of LB 271, if that property outside the well site is not used, it would be subject to an in lieu of tax. The subdivision would have to make an in lieu of payment on that property. And I think Senator Wickersham pointed out that we spent some time and detail considering the implications of such in lieu of payments, how they might be implemented in such a manner that would not bring grief at a later point. The third possibility is that...or a third possibility is that everything outside the location of the well may, in fact, be leased for a nonpublic use such as farming. Well, in that case, LB 271 would provide that property tax is paid on that property. You might argue...I'll throw in one other scenario which has come up before. Suppose that that property was leased but that was leased under certain restrictions. For example, maybe the farmer who farmed it couldn't use herbicides. All right? Well, in that event the argument has been made, well, it isn't fair to charge full property tax because really there's not full revenue being received. And again, I would point out that in the bill there is provision that the revenue stream allowable be taken into account in coming up with the assessed value so that if ordinary farm land, the property tax was \$20 per acre, then this farm land with the restrictions may be \$10 an area, \$5 an acre or whatever. So I do think that the situation brought up by Senator Bromm is incorporated in the bill and, therefore, I don't think we need the amendment. Thank you.