

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: You are correct, Senator Pirsch. There is a...in the bill as drafted, there is one subsection that Senator Bromm pointed out, and that is the reason I like debate is that, obviously, he picked out a section that has got a slight inconsistency in there, there is, in the bill there is a small portion of railroad appeal that would come to the equalization commission. I am uncomfortable, as I begin to discuss that, I am uncomfortable with doing that. However, that is something I am going to look at between now and Select File, to clean that up, and that was what Senator Bromm and I had been discussing earlier. To the extent if you want to...I guess what I would like to do is if we take that part out, when we do the amendment to take it out, then take out that part of this amendment as well. Instead of doing two amendments, I could do it with one.

SENATOR PIRSCH: So you can make the decision at that time, but when they do the formal equalization plan, will they take the centrally assessed property into consideration at that time?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: No.

SENATOR PIRSCH: That's strictly on residential property or...

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Well, it will be on...

SENATOR PIRSCH: ...the county property.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Well, it will be on individually assessed property.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Yeah.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: The centrally assessed property really doesn't, in terms of equalization, is still with...as long as we have a State Board of Equalization, that's where that decision is going to be made, and I don't think that the TERC, they are going to have enough problems dealing with all the other individual assessments.

SENATOR PIRSCH: So that never was a part of your plan, to tell the State Board of Equalization to include centrally assessed property, then?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Not all the centrally assessed property, that is correct?