

SENATOR CHAMBERS: The reason I wouldn't want to answer that as a yes, Senator Kristensen, because it depends on where within your agricultural use land this particular activity occurs.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay, but my example was that if you could specifically identify it, because that's different than Senator Landis' example, where that line might have went through the property and caused general nonagricultural use that you couldn't identify to a specific piece of property. I guess what I'm getting to, and tell me if I'm wrong, is that you're going to have some uses that may disqualify a certain identifiable portion. And so you would have the assessor, or someone come out and say, okay, this is the number of acres that doesn't qualify for agricultural use, thus it must be valued differently than the remaining other agricultural property.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, the only land that would get this preferential treatment, under what I'm talking about, would be the land that you could show is exclusively used for agricultural purposes.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay, and I think...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Other land would be out.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Now, when you say it would be out, it would be valued at whatever market value would be...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: ...at its other purposes. So you may have a specific piece of property that let's say a corner of your land that is used for something else, no matter how small. Could be, let's say, a storage area for something, that wouldn't be agriculture, if you had some storage that you used from time to time, Senator Landis used the example of a power line going over. But you may have use that only occurs for maybe a day or two a year, is that enough to disqualify you?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: It depends on what that use is.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Let's say that you use...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I...