

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

January 30, 2003 LB 295

SENATOR BAKER: That's correct.

SENATOR RAIKES: So...okay, one question. Now, we're talking about...as Senator Landis pointed out, you've got a residence, you've got the fields, you've got the part between. It would be very unlikely that that part between would sell by itself, wouldn't it? Likely that you would either sell the house and that together, or you would sell the whole thing together, or...is that true?

SENATOR BAKER: Yes, that's true. It could happen.

SENATOR RAIKES: So how would you...how would an assessor come up with a comparable sale?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Baker.

SENATOR BAKER: I'm sorry. I was busy with legal counsel.

SENATOR RAIKES: The question, Senator Baker, was just, how would you guess that an assessor would come up with a comparable sale to use for that in-between property?

SENATOR BAKER: That's going to be considered an acreage, in my book, and they're going to have to compare it with sales of acreages in the neighborhood.

SENATOR RAIKES: But I don't think that's...is that's what's intended here?

SENATOR BAKER: You know, legal counsel made a statement here, and I...I'll rephrase it, so maybe they won't attribute it all to him. But it's hard to explain something, an amendment like this. It really does not a lot to what they should be doing now. They should be doing this now. What we're simply doing is putting it in statute. The county assessor has a lot of leeway, I think, in interpreting comparable sales. And that's what we're trying to do is define comparable sales, whether it's an acreage sale or a functioning farm site. So maybe we ought to...I'm tempted to pull the amendment and see what happens with the assessors as we just don't give them any direction on this.