

homestead exemption because my husband is a retired policeman and the pension is taxable. Therefore, the policemen and firemen will never be able to get a homestead exemption because of the taxable situation on their pensions. These lifelong taxpayers are now facing new property tax payments due to the reevaluations that they can ill afford on their limited income. And let me tell you that some of them have been increased from say \$30,000 to 50, \$60,000 and when the homestead exemption went into effect in 1968 and '69 those people went on the homestead exemption and now will go back on the tax rolls for at least a portion of their property tax. My bill does not change the eligibility requirements for this program. It would only raise the maximum exemption level from the present \$35,000 to \$45,000 for low income elderly and the disabled homeowners. Now the disabled homeowners, if you checked the sheet that I sent out to you yesterday, are individuals that are paralyzed in both legs so as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes or wheelchairs. So it doesn't mean that everybody that is disabled say with a heart condition or diabetes, or whatever, is under this homestead exemption. It is that particular group only plus the veterans that are totally disabled. As I said, we do have an income limitation and it is strictly for the low income and elderly. The affect, according to the legislative Fiscal Office, and I will read you part of it, said, the effect of the current \$35,000 cap on homestead reimbursements would be to decrease the state's obligation for those properties near or at the \$35,000 cap. So it would be decreasing our state allocation back to the counties for reimbursement. The valuations and consequent reduction in the tax levy would reduce the amount of reimbursement from the general fund to Douglas County and I am sure in any other county that raised their valuation the situation would be the same. It goes on to say, all that can be said now is the state would likely save money due to the reevaluations and that LB 556 would cause the state to save less money or possibly the offsetting factors could cancel each other out. The original estimate that you have in your book, therefore may be more than offset by the effects of the reevaluation. In Douglas County, and I did receive these figures from Frank Beemis' office, there are 7,673 applicants in 1984 qualifying for 100 percent up to the first \$35,000 based on their low income. These homes were increased on an average, these 7,673 homes were increased by 54 percent for 1985. LB 556 just proposes an