

that. First, while it's true in residential land there are many, many transactions day in and day out and you have a high degree, a high number of transactions to look at. Farms don't sell as often and the finding of a comparable piece of property is very difficult. Soil classifications vary, ground water levels vary, rainfall levels vary, cropping patterns vary, so it is very hard even in the best of times to find a comparable piece of property in the agricultural setting to use the market theory. The second flaw, number two, there are very, very few transactions. There are very, very few transactions. Number three, transactions should be based on a willing buyer and a willing seller. We are now in a situation when it's almost impossible to find a willing buyer and a willing seller. You do not have willing sellers. They are selling because they have to, because their note has been called, because they can't make it go, because they are being forced out of the business and what we're seeing are fire sale prices for land. Comparable sales are not based on that kind of relationship, but it assumes the arms length relationship of a willing buyer and a willing seller and we can't approximate that these days. Lastly, with respect to agricultural land, we've never found a way to really do a good version for the entire state that takes into account the variations among counties. What we've done is worked real hard for the southeast corner of the state and the northwest corner of the state. Once you've pegged those, we've feathered between them on an arbitrary basis. Those are the common flaws and difficulties in past methods of using market theory and applying it to agricultural land. What LB 271 and the committee amendments do is to replace that method with an income method and the income method is essentially a fraction. The top half of this fraction is the income stream. The income stream is...let me see if I can fold this right...the income stream is comprised of two figures, in essence, gross receipts times landowner share. This is, if you will, the best way of getting income minus expenses that we can find that's really workable. Gross receipts is comprised of the price for crops and the yield of crops per acre. Landowner share is comprised of the typical shares that landowners receive in their relationships with their renters. You multiply the two and you've tried to produce an income stream or the return to land on an acre of ground based on what ground in that county produces generally. Since this is, I think, hard to see, let me just describe the second half of the fraction,