

been handed out, and you should disregard page 2, we have had some discussion in the committee that there was no guidelines and there was concern, at least on my part, that there would be a lack of uniformity between counties for assessing different kinds of equipments. And we had discussion on the fact that...or at least I did, that suggested that the depreciation schedule, particularly for 1991, would be appropriate to use because you had something to go back with that the citizen would know what they are expected to comply with and they could...as to value, and you could use the depreciation schedule. Well, since having this drafted, it's been brought to my attention in the 1970 Supreme Court decision which explicitly says you cannot use the depreciation schedule, the case dealt with farm equipment, for the purpose of determining value. It can be used as a guide. And page 1 of what was handed out then does do...give reference that those depreciation schedules can be used as a guide. What's more important in the bill or in the amendment is that it would require the Tax Commissioner and I, as a practical matter, I suspect it will be done in cooperation with the county assessors to develop a manual for the valuation of agricultural equipment and for livestock. I would like to have stuck in a manual also for...for business equipment but I'm told that's probably pretty difficult to do, if not impossible. I'm also told that, as a practical matter, it's probably impossible to develop a manual for uniform valuation in a very complete fashion to be used this year. But at least there will be...the basic principle is that the state will have a responsibility for determining the values of...or the manual rather that may then be used by county assessors so there is some uniformity of valuations used across the state beyond what is in the bill at the moment. So I would...I would move its adoption. I think, based on that Supreme Court decision, it doesn't give as much guidance as I would like to see placed in statute. It does give more guidance than what exists in the bill now because now it just simply says that this property is the responsibility of the citizen to voluntarily assess themselves and comply with the law and we've got heavy penalties if you fail to comply with the law. And if you have a manual, at least you have a guide that the individual citizen can protect themselves for having complied with the...at least with the manual. They won't have to go out and defend that value if they do that. They are, obviously, free as was under the old system to use a different value than what was in the guide if they chose to do so and if they could substantiate that within the true value and frequently people did that. But at least