

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

March 24, 2004 LB 973

TERC committee to...for a review. Is that all, I guess what would we say, is that the nice way to do it? Because the assessor is an elected official. Should an appointed official have the authority to pull a license on an elected official? And should that still be in there on page 16, in Section 20?

SENATOR LANDIS: Yeah. Senator Louden, two things. That essential power has been that way for about 20 years.

SENATOR LOUDEN: How many?

SENATOR LANDIS: About 20. But, that is to say, the idea of, if you lose your license you lose your status as being able to do the business. If you were to read the stricken section and the new section, you would find that the only substantive difference is a change in language, as opposed to power. The section that says...the underlined section says that it's...that grants this...any county aggrieved by a determination of the Property Tax Administrator after a hearing of this section, or alleging that its suspension is no longer justified, or any assessor or deputy assessor whose county assessor certificate has been revoked, may appeal within 30 days after the date of the order to TERC, essentially. Here's what was stricken: any county aggrieved by a determination of the Property Tax Administrator by this section, or alleging that his suspension is no longer justified, may have review--may have review, not appeal, but that phrase--may have review of such determination or continued suspension in accordance with the Tax Equalization and Review Commission Act. Any assessor or deputy assessor whose county assessor certificate has been revoked may appeal the decision to the property tax...of the Property Tax Administrator, and the appeal shall be in accordance with the Tax Equalization and Review Commission. In other words, one says they can have a review of their determination by TERC, and the other one says they can have an appeal to TERC. That's the substantive change in that language. What it is, is using current terminology for exactly the same process. And that substantive law is 20 years old. In other words, there is no substantial extent of power to either the TERC board or DPAT that has not either have its precedent in law, or does not now exist in existing law. This is not a grant of substantive authority to DPAT or TERC. They