

	Yes	No	Undecided	Blank	TOTAL
Do you support the residential exemption?	21	48	10	0	79
	26.6%	60.8%	12.7%		

Why?

- Yes - It does some rebalancing of inequality in Lincoln
- Yes - I support progressive taxation.
- Yes - You've earned it!
- Yes - Believe in progressive property taxes.
- Yes - Affordability, diversity
- Undecided - May serve to preserve mid-income housing.
- Undecided - I have to look at this more closely.
- Undecided - I rent.
- Undecided - I appreciate that it is progressive and age-independent.
- Undecided - Seems unfair to shift now given that school project financing already approved, but I like it in concept.
- No - Lack of means-testing and possible negative impact on renters.
- No - Not intended for non-resort towns; does not factor in financial need.
- No - Break-even point seems too high; unfair shift; no benefits to renters and possible increase to rent; not evidenced-based.
- No - We are at/slightly above break-even point and have no financial flexibility to shoulder half the town.
- No - Not now-I believe we need to consider other ways to reduce our property taxes that do not benefit one group to the detriment of another.
- No - Not needs based.
- No - Not means-tested; unfair to renters.
- No - Not needs based.
- No - It is progressive and does not take into account actual income.
- No - It is not appropriately targeted.
- No - It is potentially divisive; it isn't fair
- No - Persuaded by dialog at SOTT
- No - No needs test.
- No - a) Not what we bargained for when school adopted; b) Fundamentally opposed to wealth distribution even though I would likely benefit from the exemption; c) concern that along with changes in federal tax law (ability to deduct property tax and mortgage interest) implementation would further disincentivize sales of \$1.5M+ homes in Lincoln already in a slow-down; d) absolutely no action by Selects without town approval.
- No - Sets up potential for conflicts/resentments between residents; potential effect of market value on property; lack clarity about who is hurt/who is helped.
- No - Should apply only to properties at or below \$808,000 value in addition to more requirements.
- Yes - If it makes financial sense and if we have enough non-resident owners to make these effective

No - Tax rates should be fair and people with more expensive homes should not subsidize others
 No - Taxes are already too high.
 No - It's biased, tax is already progressive; will drive down home values.
 No - It would be bait and switch. I voted for schools in belief all residents' property tax would increase by the same %. I was not voting to change the way property tax is assessed.
 No - Dubious correlation with actual need.
 No - People who are living in homes that are larger than they require do not need a tax abatement.
 No - Taxes already too high.
 No - This kind of program is better suited to communities with lots of commercial property owners. Property values are not a fair proxy for income.
 No - Interesting idea, bad timing.

	Yes	No	Undecided	Blank	Total
Do you support an Extended Circuit Breaker?	49	20	8	2	79
	62.0%	25.3%	10.1%	2.5%	

Why

Yes - It supports at-need residents as the expenses for residency increase; cost to more fortunate is minimal.
 Yes- I support housing equity.
 Yes - Immediate help to people.
 Yes - Fits need.
 Yes - It obviously directs relief to the targeted group.
 Yes - Seems to alleviate some problems for poorer residents.
 Yes - Better criteria and benefit; cons not as bad, but not definite reasons.
 Yes - Will assist seniors, will be even better if it helped renters.
 Yes - If focused on financial need.
 Yes - This gives everyone skin in the game while still helping those who need it the most.
 Yes - Supports those who actually need and can prove the need for support.
 Yes- More need-based, but also more predictable with respect to individual homeowners' increase.
 Yes - Highly targeted tax relief.
 Yes - Directly addresses need, yet doesn't create permanent property changes. Gives individuals choice.
 Yes - Means-tested
 Yes - Needs-based
 Yes - Community helps those most in need.
 Yes - Appropriately targeted.
 Yes - It acutally deals in legitimate financial need.

Yes - Supports the most needy.
 Yes - It is fair and humane.
 Yes - Targeted to those with demonstrated need.
 Undecided - Need to understand all the implications.

Undecided - Town approved specific property tax increases for schools and shouldn't change this without 2/3 vote at Town Meeting and empty nesters could have small properties in town and be quite wealthy, and real estate taxes shouldn't be lower for them.

Undecided - Probably not, I would be asked to pay more even though my taxes are more than 10% of my income.

No - Young families should not subsidize older, wealthy retirees. Deters young families from moving to Lincoln.

No - Taxes are already too high.

No - The school building vote was poor stewardship for all Lincoln residents. This is the obvious and predictable result.

No - Dubious correlation with actual need.

No - Valuations already reflect fair tax cost.

No - Taxes already too high.

No - We should not encourage or facilitate the notion that people can stay in the same home indefinitely even as their circumstances or community circumstances change. Sometimes people have to make decisions or choices they don't like.

No - Interesting idea, bad timing.

No - Town is facing significant capital costs due to underpayment by past residents already.

No - Not clear to me that the population targeted to benefit would be the one most needing of this relief.

# of "double yes's"	13	
# of "double no's"		14
% of respondents	16.5%	17.7%

	RE	CB	Undecided
If you support both, which is first priority?	9	2	2

Comments

I don't want renters to be harmed financially.
 While the RE is a good program and justified, given the needed increase in taxes to address required town spending, it is more important to aid long-term residents who many more difficulty remaining in town due to more taxes.
 Need more information and time to study.

There is a "fairness" issue inherent in extending the CB, which is the amount thereof: closing the whole gap to 10% of income vs. a fixed amount of relief. Probably doesn't affect the cost to the town, but does affect the perception of fairness.

Are the programs cumulative? Do you apply for both state CB program and Extended CB program?

We need to figure out how not to price people with fixed incomes out of Lincoln. Not sure how to do this, but the variety of ages and types of people living in Lincoln matters.

I'd like to see the benefits of the proposed economic development on the town's property taxes.

Thank you for excellent follow-up to school vote; complex issue, but caring response.

If we develop a CB program we need to look closely at the criteria for qualifying - how to distinguish house rich/cash poor or visa versa. I continue to believe that the town needs to work together to consider appropriate commercial development. We need to think out of the box to accomplish this.

Please pursue renters' help also.

Hard to know which to support. I would support one or the other, not both. I prefer to help the elderly and low-income homeowners, but believe that the committee is likely to know best about need.

If I had to choose, I tend toward the RE because it benefits more people, not just elderly, but people with lower-valued properties aren't necessarily needy.

Any exemptions for a RE should be based on exceeding a % of wealth, not income. Residents could have low income in retirement and still be quite wealthy. Should be limited to those with demonstrated need. any program should be very targeted.

Property taxes should be based on property values - higher priced properties are already paying significantly more.

I'm retired, we're empty-nesters. Enough is enough!

Both of these are going to raise my taxes. At 76 and fixed income, I am going to have to move, no matter what is done. I can no longer afford to live in Lincoln.

Every city/town I have ever lived in (admittedly only 4-5) assessed property tax at the same rate. I think it would have profound affects on our home values.

Neither of these proposals seems fair to me, especially the RE (which I would likely benefit from). I am concerned that these proposals would create a more divisive community - the haves vs. the have-nots. Instead, let's find ways to reduce, not increase our property taxes yet again. More moderate housing opportunities and business opportunities would help. Taxes have increased not only because of the school, but also because of the increase in assessed values. Do we really need another tax increase which both of these proposals require?

School building project has pushed taxes to unrealistic levels already. Considering moving out of Lincoln.

The smaller number of residents are being asked to subsidize a much larger cohort of seniors. In light of chart of age distribution of residents, we are not at risk of losing our 65+ population even if some move away.

This is great work that would have been valuable three years ago. When everyone looked at the FinCom grid in voting for the school, it would have been part of their decision. Now, we are in a period of buyers remorse where the baby-boomers are deciding whether and when to put their houses on a soggy market. The prevailing view is that making this change now would be an act of bad faith by the same people who drove the school decision. It will adversely impact any ability to get future projects (eg Community Center) through. We should table the discussion. Those of us who are left can bring it back in 3 - 5 years.

In the last few town meetings, there have been significant capital discussions around town infrastructure (school, water system, roads...) that have not had needed investment over the past 10+ years. This town is already very difficult for younger families to afford and move to, and historically has had few houses available. There is a very active and robust COA, and already seems to be a number of work-off programs available to seniors. I do not support paying higher taxes so that seniors, who haven't been paying for infrastructure!, can pay even less, and it's even harder to attract young families.