

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you very much. There is a minor technical amendment suggested to us by the E & R people in their review of the bill. They thought that this amendment was a little more than an E & R amendment because it had to do with the adding of a few words. One of the things the bill does is to label a list of guidelines for assessors and for the Department of Revenue to review in analyzing which sales should be part of a comparable sales analysis, which sales should be taken into account in identifying the value of agricultural land. In one of those guidelines we lifted some language from the State of Wisconsin. Our bill drafter said, ah, you ought to write it slightly differently. Instead of saying whether a premium was paid to acquire nearby property, it should say for sales of agricultural and horticultural land a premium was paid to acquire nearby property, just adding that phrase. Technical in nature, suggested by our own bill drafting people to make clear what this provision is. I offer the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Schmit, please.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Senator Landis, I hope that I...that the amendment does what you say it does because I sort of like it, but I am concerned. What about the part of the personal property? Is that included in the...all the property ratio, and if so, how do they determine that ratio?

SENATOR LANDIS: The answer is no personal property is not part of the ratio. On the other hand, you're addressing an amendment that we just adopted and we're now on the one in the Journal on page 884. But in answer to your question, we're talking about real property with respect to the assessed level of valuation.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mmm, hmm. Well, I'm sorry to be behind the power curve, but it's not unusual for me I guess, because I don't think as fast as most of us in here, but I have another little problem and that is, it seems to me that there is a case right now which is pending in which there is dispute, is there not, between the State Board of Equalization and another, I don't know whether it is a pipeline case or what it is, relative to whether or not we can go to that midpoint or do we have to go to the lowest possible figure? Is there a problem there as you see it, or do you think we can do what we are doing? And, again, this refers to the earlier amendment.