

opinion, a lot of progress has been made in the last two, three years with another...some legislation that was enacted last session meets that goal, too, but the assumption is that the constitution would be followed and there would be a process of valuing property that would reflect that which is market value as it is spelled out. There is another place in here that perhaps it's not too clear, it was part of the Revenue Committee's report, and that's we had as a general goal taxpayer accountability, which requires local governments to pass property tax levies by ordinance or resolution. The legislation that would be considered is a little more...well, significantly more detailed than just that sentence, but what it would require is that local governments now, as you know, set their budgets, which are submitted to the county board, and the county board then makes a calculation as to what levy is necessary to raise that dollar amount times the valuation that is in that taxing district. The process that would be changed is that that governing board would be given the information as to what the valuation...the new valuation for that district was going to be for the upcoming year, and then they would be given what last year's budget would have required in the way of mill levy against the higher valuation, which, obviously, would be lower. It could work the other way if valuations went down. And then that board would...governing board would have to take two actions. One is they would, obviously, set their budget, and, secondly, they would have to set...also be responsible for establishing the levy that would be needed to reflect that budget. What is aimed at calling to the public's attention...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR WARNER: ...more forcefully than we have now is that if an entity was to take advantage of increased valuations and maintained their same levy described as no tax increase, as you point out, well, that is a tax increase if the valuation went up and the levy stayed the same. But the process here would be that the levy would be, in effect have to be reduced to reflect that new valuation. Then if they were going to take advantage of it, they would have to take action to put that levy back up. So there is an attempt to address the broad issue within legislation that is introduced both on the equity side of uniform equalization across the state, as well as at least a change in the process that will make more available or more accountable to the taxpayer...