

researching a little more and I found out that they didn't use oats and alfalfa, two principal crops in northeast Nebraska. And so I didn't want to add just oats and alfalfa so this amendment uses nine crops, nine crops that are produced or raised in Nebraska. The printout shows that the total statewide average would be reduced 3.3 percent from the 1984 valuation and here is just some of the...and you can follow me because you have a printout now, but for instance Cedar County where I live would be...the plus would drop from 10.5 percent, this is on a countywide average of all land, down to one-tenth of 1 percent increase which I feel is a lot more realistic. Knox County goes from a plus 7 percent to a minus 5.8 percent. Dixon County in Senator Conway's district which had a 12.4 increase would drop to just a 2 percentage point increase. Dakota County from a 14.2 percent increase to a 5.7 increase. Dodge County, Senator Lowell Johnson's district, he had a minus 7.9 and this would make that minus .85. But I guess what I'm trying to say is that I think this brings a formula into a more realistic form and I want to commend Senator Landis and Senator Jerry Miller and Senator Carson Rogers and the rest of the committee. They spent a lot of hours on this. They did a lot of research. I don't know whether I can support the whole bill or not, but at least it certainly brings it into a form that is a lot better. I still have a problem with irrigated land in the counties that I represent. This formula does not bring the value of irrigated land down very much and so I think we need to do a little more probing and see what we can do with this. Senator Landis has agreed to go along with me on this amendment to the committee amendment and I'm sure that he may want to talk about it a little bit. If you have any questions, well, I'd be real happy to try and answer them for you.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Landis, you're next.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, what Senator Hefner has identified is a way of making this methodology work better. It's a refinement. It adds a number of crops to the analysis in which this method is to be used. In other words, it will create a fraction that will take into account additional crops than what we had listed previously. It doesn't question or alter the basic fraction that we have outlined. It has just made sure that that fraction gets applied to more crops and crop utilization. Crop patterns affect the value of land in that