

Jeff Culbertson  
HCR1611 Proponent  
March 19, 2024

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee,

I support SCR 1611 . This is the “safety valve” the CAMA system should have come out with originally in the very beginning when it was created. I worked in the county appraiser’s office when the entire state went through reappraisal in 1989. Several of us asked for something exactly like this to be put into the ‘Clarifications’ on reappraisal but didn’t have any luck getting anyone in Topeka to listen to us. We witnessed taxpayer’s values increase in many cases 1,000% or more in one year. I’ll use my parents parcel as an example. They bought their property in 1930 for \$30,000. It was assessed at \$300,000 all at once in 1990 due to reappraisal. The reason reappraisal happened was because most counties never increased appraised values after the parcel was initially put on the tax role from a sale until that parcel sold again. So they saw a 1,000% increase in taxes all at once. This was very difficult for a lot of people to handle. We commonly see values go up 25% or more all in one year since the real estate market has gone crazy over the last decade.

Another reason this is a good idea is it would not adversely affect the county budget process. An increase in parcel value is an unrealized gain to the county budget. Meaning it is money that wasn’t there the last year, it wasn’t planned for and it won’t be noticed if it doesn’t happen. The mill levy will simply be adjusted as needed to compensate. Giving people time to adjust their personal finances accordingly gradually instead of all in one year.

If a person’s value goes up 20% in one year, the increase will be spread out gradually over 5 years. People won’t see their escrow go up all in one year.

This is a good idea with almost no adverse effect on county budget. Please support this bill. Thank you.