

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

February 24, 2003 LB 689

make the workings of LB 689 easier and cheaper to do. What it says is that this time for evaluation or assessment will be done with those quadrennial applications that are made by a nonprofit. In the other years, you just simply leave it where it is. But it's when you make a filing, and apparently you do that in a cycle of about every four years. So you place a value on the...on all property for which an exemption is being sought, with the 2008 application cycle. The affidavit procedure for the intervening three years would not be affected. So you do exactly the paperwork you're doing now, except on that fourth year when you make an application to make sure that you're still a nonprofit, you would submit either...that would be the year that either the assessor would check three comparable pieces of property or you would submit the insurance figure as a way of establishing sales. So with that, I would ask for the adoption of the committee amendments. I think there will be some controversy about the content of the bill itself, but I don't think this amendment is the source of that controversy. It's just meant to give an easier, clearer process to follow. Then we can get into the meat of whether or not we want to do this, this particular disclosure bill. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Landis. You've heard the opening on the committee amendments. Mr. Clerk, there's an item on the desk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Connealy would move to amend the committee amendments. (AM0352, Legislative Journal page 639.)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Connealy, you're recognized to open on your amendment to the committee amendments to LB 689.

SENATOR CONNEALY: Thank you, Mr. President and members. This amendment would change it so that it would also put public property on the assessment. I'm going to talk about the amendment. I think I'm going to go ahead and pull it when I get to the end of my discussion. But I think it is a fairness issue. If this bill does advance, I think I'll bring it back on Select. The...if we're going to get this information, we probably ought to get it on all property. I don't see a real need for this information in the first place. But if we're