

April 6, 1981

LB 410

ment of a community. If you have all of the land surrounding a urban area taxed at a development rate, you automatically encourage property be developed perhaps before its proper time from the cities point of view because of excessive taxes and, obviously, the assessor has no way to predict on the circle of the city what particular piece of ground will come up first, or within the next year or which one will come up in five years and so forth. The city is protected because they control the zoning, and if the zoning is for urban development, then the land is not eligible for the greenbelt consideration. Secondly, if you get the rate up at the level that Senator Newell or the bill suggests, all you are doing is in effect adding to the price of the lots if it is residential property, because obviously at that higher level of interest rate, it is going to be part of the consideration in the sale of land and eventually will fall upon the eventual purchaser of the lot. Now if you project the fourteen percent back for five years, at fourteen percent interest rate, you would in essence almost come up with the same amount of tax paid those last five years if they had been paying each year. It is not particularly a problem for the seller but I think it is a problem for the eventual purchaser of the property, particularly in the case of residential land. And because of that, it seems to me that an interest rate, since it is not a delinquent tax, the interest rate in the vicinity of six percent is a reasonable level. It does provide additional revenue to a local governmental subdivision at the time that the development might be taking place to assist with those costs but it does not become a detriment to the eventual purchaser of lots by artificially inflating the value of that land to the purchaser of lots, particularly residential lots, when all of it would be just going for interest in any event. So I would urge that the body consider retaining the level of six percent. That may sound, I suppose, a little low right now but it is not low in terms of what you can generally earn on funds which are put in for a nonrestricted amount or for an unspecified amount of time. The six percent rate is about what could be earned. So I would urge the body to accept the amendment that reinstates the old language.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Newell, do you wish to speak on the Warner amendment?

SENATOR NEWELL: Yes, Mr. President, I would. You know I think that we have a difficulty here because people cannot relate this issue to anything else and it seems to be one of those kinds of issues that no one really understands and/or does not care about. But the truth of the matter is that this