

commercial property, in dollar amounts, to agricultural land.

SENATOR HALL: Is that a question?

SENATOR ELMER: Yes.

SENATOR HALL: Okay. You know, Senator Elmer, I would disagree with that I guess. I mean, yes, the amount of...If there was a correlating reduction, if the county or the subdivision said we see that ag land is going to go up this much because we have to raise the valuation to be commensurate with these other classes of property, if they then in turn went over and said in order to offset that so our budget...we don't raise any more money is it possible that those others...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...could go down? Yes, it's possible. I don't think that will happen, but it is in the realm of possible.

SENATOR ELMER: So what you're saying is that it's likely that the counties will...

SENATOR HALL: No, I'm not saying it's likely. I'm...

SENATOR ELMER: It's likely that the counties will just leave their levies nearly the same and fund more of their programs with the additional money that they received from the increased values, assuming that the residential and commercial properties are going to be valued as they have in the past.

SENATOR HALL: I would agree with that. I would think that they will probably leave their levies the same. I don't think that there will be a major reduction. If there is an increase, it will be in the area of ag land based on LB 361. That I agree with.

SENATOR ELMER: Okay. The point is made then that a larger share of the tax burden is going to go to agricultural through 361. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Withem, followed by Senator Nelson.

SENATOR WITHEM: I would call the question.