## COMMISSIONER'S RECORD N

Douglas County Republican, Lawrence

The house is located at 1722 La., and legally described as Lots 119 and 121. She paid \$100.00 for the two vacant lots at a private sale. It cost her about \$2600.00 to build the new house. The house is assessed for \$2000.00 plus \$630.00 for the lots. The appellant claims this is too high. Hr. Stewart feels that some serious consideration should be given to this. The Board decided to view this property in the near future.

Sibyl McDonald, 633 Indiana Street, asked for an adjustment on the valuation of her property, known as Lots 159 and 161 on Indiana Street. She purchased said property for \$1650.00 from the Home Owners' Lean Corporation. She lives in the house and rents out part of it. There are ten rooms. Last year, the State Tax Commission gave her a reduction of \$100.00 on each let. Let 159 is assessed for \$720.00 plus \$800.00 for improvements, making a total of \$1520.00. Let 161 is assessed for \$720.00 plus \$800.00 for improvements, making a total of \$1520.00. The total valuation for the property is \$3040.00. Mrs. McDonald says the taxes are far too high on this place and that she will not be able to pay them. The Board assured her that it would give this due consideration and will view the property before giving her an answer.

Another appeal was heard from Thomas Kosacowski, 1107 Conn. Street, who owns the  $S_2^1$  of Lot 119 and the N 8' of Lot 21, Connecticut Street, on which he is asking for a roduction on the assessment. There are five rooms in the house and no basement. There is no furnace.  $S_2^1$  of Lot 119 is assessed for \$225.00 plus \$1200.00 for improvements, making a total of \$1425.00. The N 8' of Lot 121 is assessed for \$70.00. Total valuation is \$1495.00. The Commissioners took this request under consideration.

There appeared Mrs. Minnie V. Kilgore, in the interest of her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robison, 1105 Connecticut. They are asking for "reduction in the assessed valuation of property in the name of Rosella Robison and legally described as the S10' of Lot 117 and the N<sup>3</sup> of Lot 119, Conn. Street. S 10' of Lot 117 is assessed for \$100.00; N<sup>1</sup><sub>2</sub> of Lot 119 is assessed for \$225.00 plus \$2000.00 for improvements. The total for the property as a whole is \$2325.00. They purchased the property for \$1500.00 on contract from the Lawrence Building and Lean. There are eight rooms in the house. The Board placed this on the viewing list for further consideration.

No further business appearing, the Board adjourned to meet Wednesday, May 28, 1941.

ATTEST :

D.R. Cerhart County Clerk.

L. H. Grifffty, Chairman of the Board of

County Connissioners

## l'ay 28, 1941

The Board of County Commissioners with all members present, namely, L. H. Griffith, Chairman, J. M. Sanderson and Ed Johnson, Commissioners and T. R. Gerhart, County Clerk, mot in regular adjourned session.

A large delegation, consisting of representatives from the townships, rural schools and the city schools, met in the rooms of the Board of County Cormissioners in regard to the allocation of the residue sales tax fund.

This was a public hearing, so called, after proper notice had been published in the official county paper. The meeting was opened by Chairman Griffith who explained the reason for same. According to law, The Board of County Cormissioners may, if it sees fit, and with the consent of the State Board of Social Welfare, by resolution allocate all or any part of the entire amount of residue sales tax fund apportioned to this county, for social welfare purposes. The welfare problem was explained by the Chairman, who asked the help of all citizens in order to arrive at a solution for same. Hrs. Mildred LeSuer, Accountant, presented information in regard to actual figures of the welfare cost in this county. Such figures brought out the fact that the relief load is increasing rapidly each year. The welfare budget for the ensuing year has been severely cut, but even with such a cut, it will be necessary for the county to use funds from the Residue Sales Tax Fund in order to balance this budget.

Frank opposition was hoard from members of the delegation. Township trustees from the various townships spoke of the need for such money for their townships and brought out the point that each township had taken its proportioned share into consideration when making up their budget for this year. Such a stop of the county to take this away from them would be a serious handicap to thom. The foeling for relief for some of the clients, was bitter. Considerable discussion was given to the undeserving client, and it was strongly brought out that some very definite steps be taken toward the end of reducing this load.

A representative from the City of Lawrence said that the feeling of the city is to abide by whatever decision is made by the County Board.

The Lawrence City schools, which will not be derived of their share this year, agreed to cooperate as much as possible, and that if such action necessitated the reduction of their budget, they would be willing to do their share. One of the main points brought out during this discussion was the increasing of other levies, such as the city, schools etc. if the county took all this sales tax money for relief. The delegation rolt that this was not fair to the taxpayer.

Upon conclusion, Ralph Colman moved that it is the consenus of opinion of all representatives present that the county give the sales tax residue funds not only to the schools but, also, to the townships, as they budgeted for last year. Chester Spray seconded the motion. Said motion carried by unanimous vote.

Later, after a serious conference with all welfare workers, the following resolutions were adopted:

## RESOLUTION

WHEREAS House Bill No. 503, published in the Topeka State Journal on April 11, 1941, provides "That in any county the county commissioners by and with the consent of the state board of social welfare, may by resolution after a public hearing duly held upon twenty days' notice by publication in come newspaper of general circulation in the county, allocate all or any part of the entire amount of such residuatund apportioned to such counties (all funds inclusive) for social welfare purposes."