

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ASSESSMENT AND TAXATIONThe meeting was called to order by Senator Paul "Bud" Burke at  
Chairperson11:00 a.m./p.m. on January 27, 1983 in room 526-S of the Capitol.All members were present ~~except:~~  
~~XXXXX~~Committee staff present: Don Hayward, Revisor's Office  
Tom Severn, Research Dept.  
Wayne Morris, Research Dept.

## Conferees appearing before the committee:

The chairman informed the committee that Senator Angell had been working with the State of Tennessee and during the interim discussed these ideas with regard to methods of valuation of property. He suggested that Senator Angell describe the Tennessee process and if a different concept is desired, to get this input into the bill now so the people in the field know what they are working with, and if the committee endorses that concept, include it in the bill.

Senator Angell said the basic difference from HB 2611 is methodology, psychological differences, allowing the county assessor to initiate the process, contract with the State Board of Tax Appeals as to how they will appraise the county, and set up guidelines for the Board to approve. He said if this concept is used, it would be necessary to come up with a contract agreement with the state. He told the committee there is a ten-step approach used by Tennessee to implement the reappraisal program and described the process to the committee. (See Attachment #1)

Senator Angell suggested exploring the area of how you can persuade the counties to feel they have some leeway so they do not feel that re-appraisal and the computer system is being forced on them. Phil Martin, Director of Property Valuation, said they would want to get greater input from the county appraisers as to what their plan would be on this and on his staff supplementing areas where they are weak or having problems. He said they would cooperate totally with the County Appraisers Association on an individual basis and would recognize that in some cases the local level would have more expertise than Topeka. He said that after a bill was signed, it would take about six months for preparations, staffing, data processing, etc. He said this would be an expensive process if done by local individuals but less than if firms were contracted to come in here. Property Valuation and the counties would need to pick up 51 competent people and will probably need to go outside the state to pick up some of these people. Some present appraisers may resign or retire rather than go through the hassle of reappraisal. In response to an inquiry as to the price tag for this, Phil Martin said approximately \$18 million if done locally or \$60 million otherwise. He will have an up-to-date fiscal note later.

In response to an inquiry from the chairman as to whether it would be fair to say we are going to reappraise with or without legislation, Phil Martin responded yes.

Senator Angell recommended that the Revisor's Office prepare amendments for a subcommittee to work on and then come back to the committee with those recommendations. Property Valuation could prepare guidelines and work closely with appraisers in order for the process to work, thereby taking some of the sting out of forced appraisal. Phil Martin said Property Valuation is going to administratively set up some type of structure to deal with county appraisers and commissioners who have expertise in this area to deal with these problems and who will be an important part of the process.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ASSESSMENT AND TAXATION

room 526-S, Statehouse, at 11:00 a.m./~~p.m.~~ on January 27, 1983

Gary Smith, Shawnee County appraiser, endorsed retaining the concept of fair market value as contained in SB 27. He believes the appraisers statewide would be relieved if the legislature would pass a reappraisal bill so they could get on with it.

Tom Severn continued briefing the committee on HB 2611, Section 3 and 4. Following discussion of Section 4, Phil Martin and Gary Smith agreed to draft some language pertinent to Section 4 and bring it back to the committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 12 noon. The next committee meeting will be held at 11 a.m. on February 1.

ASSESSMENT AND TAXATION

OBSERVERS  
(PLEASE PRINT)

DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	REPRESENTING
JAN. 27	Charles W Sessler	Ellinwood,	Barton Commissioner
	Charles H Clark	Ottawa	Franklin County
	Frank C. Furniss	Columbus, KS	Cherokee Co
	Ed Zwick	Topeka	United Tel
	Frank Caches	Topeka	KACI
	David Furnas	Wichita	Chambers
	Marian Harmon	Lawrence	RWVK
	Janice Marcum	Topeka	P/D
	Tom Whitaker	Topeka	Ks Motor Carriers Assn
	Jeff Brewer	Topeka	D.I.S.C.
	Phil Martin	Topeka	PUD
	R.C. Walters	Topeka	PUD
	Tim Underwood	Topeka	KAR
	Mary Harper	Healy	AAM
	Pat Kahlberg	Topeka	KRA
	Lee Weber	Topeka	KLA
	Devin Darnell	Lumaca	KU (?)
	Harry M. Small	Shaw	KCAA
	Timothy H. Hageman	H.P. 6 LAKIN KS	LPC
	Chris Walker	Mayetta	NFD
	Jack Stutz	Junitor City	FU NFD
	Leslie D. Piffers	Enterprise	KS BOE AGI
	Ivan W. Wyatt	McPherson	KS Farmers Union
	Barbara Leubinger	Kansas City	sn. Mulick

ASSESSMENT AND TAXATION

OBSERVERS  
(PLEASE PRINT)

DATE                      NAME                      ADDRESS                      REPRESENTING

FEB. 1

L. Clark

Topeka

PV

J. Meetz

Topeka

KLA

Phil Mart

"

"

Schedule of Events  
For  
Reappraisal Program Implementation  
(Pursuant to T.C.A. 67-680)  
September 1, 1982

1. State Board of Equalization sets a priority and sequence of reappraisal whereby counties with lower prevailing appraisal ratios are the first to be reappraised.
  2. Each county assessor is notified of action taken by the State Board of Equalization and directed to prepare and submit a plan for reappraisal to the State Board of Equalization by a specific date. State law requires that the assessor's plan be first presented to the county executive and county legislative body.
  3. Each assessor presents his reappraisal plan to the county executive and county legislative body.
  4. The county legislative body may (1) take no action, (2) approve the assessor's plan, (3) disapprove the assessor's plan with no further action, (4) disapprove the assessor's plan and submit an alternate plan.
  5. The assessor forwards his plan to the State Board of Equalization along with the results of any action taken by the county legislative body.\*
  6. The State Board of Equalization considers each plan submitted and evaluates them in accordance with guidelines previously provided to the assessor.
  7. After a reappraisal plan is approved by the State Board of Equalization, the assessor and county executive are notified and instructed to proceed with the county legislative body to provide financing.
  8. Notice of a date for reappraisal program commencement of at least ninety (90) days is given by the Director of the State Division of Property Assessments to each appropriate county assessor and county executive.\*\*
  9. A resolution is prepared by the assessor for consideration by the county legislative body authorizing the county executive to execute such documents as necessary for a reappraisal contract and financing.
  10. Reappraisal contract and promissory note (if applicable) is executed in duplicate originals, one copy remaining on file in each county and one copy on file in the State Comptroller's Office, Office of Management Services.
- \* The assessor must submit his reappraisal plan to the State Board of Equalization.
- \*\* If after receipt of this notice any county shall fail to take such steps as may be necessary to initiate the reappraisal program, action shall be initiated by the State Board of Equalization in accordance with T.C.A. §67-680(J).

Atch. 1