

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

March 24, 2004 LB 973

Legislature. Senator Beutler, I'll share with you some of my experience on this issue, and I came about it a little bit different situation. But this was the case where you had greenbelted land in agricultural production, and there was an opportunity to put the land in a government program, a reserve program, if you will. And apparently there are a number of different kinds. But our current requirement is that if you do that, for example, you are farming some land and then you put it in a government program under a long-term arrangement of some sort, where the land would be grassed or something like that, it would be used for conservation purposes, then our current law is that you would need to pay the recapture when you make that transfer, which would seem a little bit odd, at least from the perspective of, gosh, I'm going to put it into a lower-valued use, and I've got to pay this three-year recapture. The difficulty is, or what appears to be the case, is that if you don't take it out of greenbelt and pay the recapture, then the taxes on the continuation, say, when it's in the lease program, need to be on the agricultural production value of the land, as contrasted to, say, that if that weren't the case, then the assessor could describe it as wasteland or some lower value than agricultural production. So, now, I understand the difference between the case I'm talking about and the case you're talking about is that the eventual owner of the property, I guess, would be the city, and so the property would not be taxable. The case I'm talking about is the property would remain in private ownership. And so really, I decided not to go ahead with the bill. In fact, I think the bill was kind of the one that you knocked off the consent calendar list, which I still resent, by the way. (Laughter) But at any rate, it came to a question of, you got...all right, you're going to save some money up front, but you're going to be paying much...a higher tax rate as you go down the road. So in this case, it would almost seem like, for the landowner in question, it was not really something that was beneficial, even though up front it looked just like you pointed out: Boy, this is crazy, we've got land going to a lower-value use and you've got to pay a big lump sum of money in order to get it there. And I will tell you that I think Senators Stuthman and Janssen pointed out what was the original purpose of this is that when you're farming land next to a city and the development impact causes that price to go way up, as long as a