

April 5, 1989

LB 361

is marked at 90 percent of valuation, according to our current Supreme Court theory, would be able to be reduced to that 50 percent number because even though it happened to be 1 percent of the land of the county, that was the lowest number and you'd have to value down. This one says go to the average treatment in the county, that's the right target and that is what the provision does.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Okay, would that be weighted or simple average?

SENATOR LANDIS: It would be a weighted average depending on how much of the property in the county was in that classification. If, for example, we change that little story we had before, let's say we have two-thirds of our property at commercial, and that's at 100 percent, and one-third of our property residential and that is at 50 percent, then the average is...

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Let's see, it is two 100s and one 50 divided by three, right?

SENATOR LANDIS: Yes.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Okay.

SENATOR LANDIS: That's right, it's a weighted average.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Schmitz, please.

SENATOR SCHMITZ: Senator Landis, you used the example of a particular piece of property that was substantially under the norm, so to speak. Under this mechanism, if your land was above the norm and mine was below the norm, this mechanism would only allow for yours to be brought down to the normal average valuation, it would not provide any mechanism, would it, in this amendment to raise the property which is below the actual value? Or is that mechanism built into the State Board of Equalization, would they then do that automatically upon discovery of the situation?

SENATOR LANDIS: This says that the target for adjustment is the midpoint of all the property in the county. Appeals go one way and one way only and appeals only go down because what happens