

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

February 28, 2002 LB 600A

probably on Select File simply because of Senator Tyson. Senator Tyson says there is no question, that's what Senator Tyson said; there is no question that ag land valuation in Nebraska is not done correctly. Now I'm paraphrasing, but at least he acknowledged we have a problem with ag land valuation in the state. But he goes on to say, in his defense, that this is not the answer in his mind, and we only have part of the equation. And we've talked about it privately, and the second part of the equation is he thinks it ought to be on the income producing ability of the land gross, gross proceeds. That's a legitimate difference of opinion. We have a legitimate difference of opinion which I agree with Senator Raikes in using a cap rate of 8 percent statewide. I acknowledge that, too. I don't know what Senator Chambers... I don't... I guess you are not at the point that you think that ag land is valued unfairly. I'm trying to... I've been sitting here for two days trying to understand your opposition to this bill and it seems to ebb and flow slightly, even though you still come down on being opposed to it, but you've made an issue of the \$29 million, which is valid, but no one of us knows where that's headed. The basic issue to me ought to be what is the way to fairly value ag land? That's my issue. I've stuck with this because I think Coordsen has got this as far as we've ever gone in understanding the problem with valuing ag land. Now, apparently, it is not to be solved this session, and for that I feel badly because I think we should solve it. It does have ramifications in the school aid formula, and perhaps we are not going to get the cap rate set right. So back to this indefinitely postpone, I have to post... oppose the indefinitely postpone because we do need the A bill if the bill is going to go. If the bill does not advance, which any good strategist will tell you, 25 votes on General File hardly ever, if ever, makes it to Final Reading, and I don't think it's going to this time either, (inaudible) Senator Coordsen works more magic. So I oppose the IPP simply on the fact of the process, that the A bill must stay with the bill, and if rises and falls later, whatever, and all the issues that have been raised, the webs that have been raised, among other connections in other bills, I'll let that, each one of you decide that. But I've been staying with the bill because I think we needed the education process of some way to change our ag land valuation process.