

comparable to maximum value of someone who is not disabled the allowance for a higher maximum value seemed appropriate, and that's what the amendment does. Apparently when it was run by the estimated cost was so minimal that they didn't even show up so it would have no impact on the A bill. But I think there is a policy justification to acknowledge that homes for disabled because of the improvements have been made ought to have somewhat of a higher maximum value than a home that is not occupied by a disabled person just because of the nature of the improvements and ask that the bill be returned for this amendment.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS PRESIDING

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: On the motion to return. Senator Cudaback.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Mr. Speaker, members, I want to thank Senator Warner for being willing to pull this bill back for this amendment. It's an amendment that hopefully nobody in this room will have to use, the disabled on a situation where the cost of construction and so on is going up every year, many of us know that our counties are valued at 100 percent now, some aren't. I think there's ten that are so the cost is going up and up and up. Many times we have to construct areas in the home that make assessed value even higher so this will bring it in line and brings it up to 175 percent or \$110,000, and I think we owe this to the people that are disabled. And it only changes those two things so I support the amendment and hope everybody will also. Thank you.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Cudaback. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WFESELY: Thank you, Mr. President, members. If Senator Warner would yield to a question.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Yes.

SENATOR WESELY: Senator Warner, I understand what you're trying to do. You're trying to recognize that somebody with a handicap condition will need to have ramps and other additional expense