

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

January 30, 2003 LB 295

same as the other 40 acres or the other 160 acres. That one acre where the homestead...where the house is on, is valued at \$5,000 an acre. It can have a house that is almost unable to live in; it's still got a house on, and it's valued at \$5,000 an acre. The acreages of ten acres or less, ten, five, four, or three, with the site on, are not valued at that \$5,000 an acre under that house. They're valued as the total acreage, which would be probably \$5,000 an acre for the whole acreage. So that's the difference that we have. Now, I don't know if we're doing it right in Platte County or not. But that's the way our assessors value it. The function part of it is, you know, there could be...the house could be rented out, the grain bins could be used by the farm, but it's still part of that 160 acres. And that acreage under the buildings is valued as the ground right aside of it. Maybe it would be dryland ground at maybe \$1,400 an acre. That would be the value there. But that one acre under the house is \$5,000. And we get a lot of complaints on that. But that's for the farm site of that total farm. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator. Senator Hartnett, followed by Senators Bourne and Raikes.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Mr. President, members of the body. Senator Baker, I'm going to make some statements, and then you can respond to me.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Baker.

SENATOR HARTNETT: A functional house is one that somebody lives in. That's valued at 100 percent, as I understand it. The farmland around it, with this, is not. What if the house is not functional, it's one that somebody does not live in? How is that treated under this amendment? Is that treated as Senator Stuthman said, at \$5,000 an acre, or not? Is there a difference...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Baker.

SENATOR HARTNETT: ...if a house is functional, or one that's nonfunctional?