

year after year, unlike the amendment to follow, which is Senator Hall's amendment. The third thing they said was make sure, I know that you meant it, I know that we have all said it, but we need to place in this that says ag land and horticultural land will be uniform and proportionate within the class of agricultural land. In other words, if irrigated land is at 80 percent of market, dryland should be at 80 percent of market. Grassland should be at 80 percent of market, and recognizing that those three markets are somewhat different, no matter what the market is, the step away from the actual value should be the same for all kinds of land, so that you don't have a 90, 80, 70 and 62 percent variations. That would be nonuniform. We need to make that clear. I said I always thought it was clear, meant it to be clear, let's say it again, we say it again. And those are the basic changes in this amendment. What you have, I tried to pass it out to you although I have I think some extra copies that may not have gotten to your desk, I have two documents that should be on your desk. One is a letter from Berri Balka, the State Tax Commissioner. He points out that although the goal between Senator Hall and myself, our two amendments, are exactly the same, that is to say it winds up being 80 percent of market, there is an essential difference. Senator Hall's approach strikes the use of income producing numbers. Mine leaves the use of income producing numbers and then moves away from the dictates of those numbers and the comparable sales down to 80 percent of value. Berri Balka says the better system is to have the more complete data base. We don't always have good comparable sales, and where we don't have very good comparable sales, the counties start coming in and getting a little magical in the way that they arrive at values. Better in those situations we should be able to fall back and rely on the database that we can construct for that area which would be the income figures which exist in LB 320. The more complete database then is to use the market figures, a capitalization rate drawn from the market giving you actual value, then use the adjustment factor which nets you 80 percent of market for all types of agricultural land. That is the stronger database and that is why you will see that the Department of Revenue opines that that is the better mechanism. The second document on your desk is the statement by the Nebraska Farm Bureau that they support this amendment. I would urge its adoption. And then I think we should have a very profitable discussion of the alternative to this, or potential complement once it is adopted and that is the Hall amendment and its approach.