

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

January 13, 2000 LB 419

SENATOR COORDSEN: I'm ready.

SENATOR JONES: Okay. I've got two examples on my own place, and you tell me what the land should be taxed at. I bought two farms, and the building sites have deteriorated. I went up to the assessor and had the building sites removed off of both places, but there are still trees, a corral that I still use for livestock. Under this, how would that be taxed?

SENATOR COORDSEN: I don't believe that would change. As I understand the current method of valuing farm sites as acreages, that it would have to have a utility connection of some type in order to be considered as having potential for a farm site. An exception to that might be a separately surveyed small area that you could sell off without anything other than finding a buyer. And that might have a situation where you would have a discussion with the assessor and with the...potentially with the county board of equalization. But that is why we have...we provide guidelines and the particular circumstances, we have a system in statute that hopefully should take care of that. But I think in your case probably would not change the use. And my assumption is that it's either valued as pasture or...or I doubt that it's farmland?

SENATOR JONES: No, it's over in where the hills are and pasture...

SENATOR COORDSEN: My assumption is that it's currently valued as pasture, unless you have an electrical line going into it.

SENATOR JONES: That I do, I have a stock well.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Then it becomes an issue of whether it has potential as a farm site. And, if that's the case, and if it is currently valued at its highest and best use by the assessor's definition that it has potential to be a farm site, then this would change that and it would return it to agricultural use only, which it was two or three years ago.

SENATOR JONES: Right, right.