

100 or 74 and 80, depending on the type of a class of property. The committee amendment changes one word which is in the bill which is being changed in a number of statutes as it comes up, but the amendment is in page 2, line 14 where the word "aggregate" is used, "shall result in the aggregate level of assessment" and the word now is being used is "average". Aggregate tends to be interpreted as only being limited to a means as opposed to average which is a broader term and it's essentially correct. Secondly, the committee amendment also adds the emergency clause in order if the bill would be effective this year in August when the Board of Equalization meets and it otherwise wouldn't be with adjournment on the second of June. So I'd move adoption of the committee amendment.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Any discussion on the committee amendment? Seeing none, the question...Senator Warner, any closing, I assume not? The question is the adoption of the committee amendments to LB 137. All in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record.

CLERK: 29 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the adoption of the committee amendments.

SPEAKER WITHEM: The committee amendments are adopted. Senator Warner, to open on the bill.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I move the bill be advanced. As I briefly explained under the committee amendment, this does place into statute the decision that the Board of Equalization made last year in that for equalization purposes next year that values for different classes of property would fall between 92 and 100 percent and for land that...for property that is at, by constitution, or by statute rather, is lower. The range would be from 74 to 80, but it's merely to reinforce what the position has been of the Board of Equalization, give them additional support to proceed with this. You will notice in the committee only a couple people appeared in support, but the representative, Jack Mills, of the County Officials and the Tax Research Council both appeared in support and I would move the bill be advanced.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Any discussion on the bill? There is none. Any closing? Closing is waived. The question is, shall LB 137 be advanced? All those in favor indicate by voting aye, opposed