

equalize at any percentage, as I've indicated, as is frequently talked about, if you look at that aspect alone, but when you look at the total requirement of the constitution and the statutes, what we require is actual value. In this whole process then in order to move the system so that that change in valuation by class of property by the State Board of Equalization could be appealed by the individual, we have to totally revamp the calendar which has been in effect for a good many years, in order that the Board of Equalization's actions take place earlier. In fact, it will be from April to May 15th. Now what we currently have there's been concerns, and I'm getting ahead of...not the committee amendment but there has been concern expressed about the time lines in some of this which were open to, certainly to looking at if there's justification for some adjustments. But, other than that, I'm not aware of people who generally are opposed. The committee amendments, to make all of these things consistent, do...one of them has somewhat of a significant impact because it changes the delinquent date for personal property taxes when they are due and delinquent, and it changes that so that they would be due on December 31st rather than November 1st, which is the current law, and they would become delinquent at the same time as real estate taxes which is May 1 or September 1 if in...other than in counties over 100,000, and in those cases it's April 1 and August 1. But those dates are changed. I'm not aware of a problem with this but, potentially, someone would raise an issue, I suppose, on cash flow by changing those delinquent dates, but over time it would make no difference. Then it also changes the deadline for recertifying personal property valuation from May 20th to June 1st, to make that the same or consistent with real estate, and then it...there's a word that we changed the other day in another bill where the word "average" is used instead of "aggregate", and you will recall when we talked about that issue, "aggregate" tends to be a presumption, at least, that its definition is more limited and more narrow, deals only with means, where "average" is a broader definition, it gives a better flexibility. And then, finally, the committee amendment adds a new section, which I think is important, which grants to county boards to then make adjustment by class if they find after the public hearings it's appropriate to do so and with the approval of the State Board of Equalization. It's my opinion, at least, that this bill, together with these amendments, will go a long ways toward addressing some of the frustrations that people have with the process. Obviously, it doesn't change, if your frustration is