

From: <sue-taylor@comcast.net>
Date: Fri, Feb 6, 2015 at 2:49 PM
Subject: Fwd: El Dorado County Board of Supervisors Considers Extension to Ordinance 4832 (Prop. 90 - Transfer of Homeowner's Property Tax Assessment)
To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, pamela.knorr@edcgov.ca
Cc: Chris Daley <cdaley@mtdemocrat.net>

Agenda Item #21: Regarding Extension to Ordinance 4832 (Prop. 90):

In the spirit of transparency and legal public process there are serious information and notification issues lacking in the process for the continuation of Ordinance 4832 (Prop 90). (It would be nice if Prop 90 had been mentioned in the agenda item.)

According to the attachments in the legistar a letter was sent out from the County to around 82 special districts and agencies on January 29, 2015. As I recall from 2009, when this was first adopted, there were over 400 agencies that needed to be notified. Being that this notification letter was mailed out on a Thursday it can be assumed that it did not arrive to these organizations until the weekend. **This would give the agencies and districts only a few days to draft something and send a representative to the 1:30 p.m. February 5th meeting.** Most districts and agencies are required to form a quorum in order to respond to such a notice. Allowing only a few days to respond puts to question the County's desire to truly consult with the local affected agencies and districts.

Also the information presented to the Board of Supervisors for decision making was seriously lacking at the January 27th Board Meeting. The Board seemed surprised at the end of drafting the motion for approval, when they asked the CAO's office for their recommendation of how many years to extend the ordinance, it was stated that the CAO's office would recommend denial of the extension. In 2009 the Board of Supervisors had planned on only adopting this ordinance for 24 months. Since State Law required it to be adopted for a min. of 5 years, the Board went with the 5 years. These extensions will continue to be a loss to County revenues which are needed for services to serve these new residents, causing a long-term impact on existing residents. By not confronting the problems with this ordinance, the Board is kicking the issue down the road for new members of the Board to address as to not offend the large real estate lobby group that has promoted this proposition and ordinance.

For agencies that may have not been notified by mail, the notice below does not mention that this is the window in which these agencies / districts have the opportunity to comment to the impact of this extension. This feels very similar to how this approval was swept through 5 years ago (see below). The agencies / districts were not noticed in time to meet as a quorum in order to craft a letter to send to the Board and the few that did comment were forced to assemble emergency meetings. If you have until April 1st, why only allow a short comment period?

I would ask that the County extend the time for these agencies and districts to respond after clear knowledge has been given to them as to what the impact will be due to the extension.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,
Sue Taylor

From 2009:

It appears that the noticing requirements for this proposition have been violated. On 9/2/09 the assistant CAO had requested direction from the Board of Supervisors in contacting the "some 400 agencies/districts within the county" the Prop 90 protocols require be contacted. The County listed 89 agencies/districts that they claimed they had notified by mail to let them know of the public workshop. The workshop was held at 3:00 a.m on Monday, 9/14/09. There was no posting of this workshop on the County's website, which is a standard for these types of meetings/workshops. I had requested by phone and email that I receive notice of the meeting. I did not receive a reply until 9/17/09, three days after the workshop! Then on 10/5/09 I received a copy of the undated notice that was sent out to the districts. In the meantime I was at a Board of Supervisors' meeting on 9/15/09, saw the County Assessor and asked him when the workshop was to be held. He pointed to a paper taped on the Board of Supervisors door and said it was yesterday. I found out that only 7 agencies/districts attended the workshop. [In 2009 I did not realize that Steve Ferry was not an agency/district] I contacted the 7. One, the Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Chief told me he never received a notice but he saw it come up on an agenda. (The mailed notice is still not attached to the agenda). The Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Chief protested the proposition as did the other 2 agencies that have so far returned my request for information. The DS - ED Fire Chief's protest was not attached to the Board agenda. I think someone on the Board stated there was no contest from the Fire Departments. Another letter from the Fire Chief's Association was attached to the agenda contesting the Proposition.

On 12/8/09 the Board was to have the second reading of Prop 90. El Dorado County was hit by the biggest storm of 10 years which shut down county offices and much of the town. On 12/9/09 we found that the Board moved the agenda to 9:00 a.m. on 12/10/09. I had received a call from the Board Clerk the night of 12/8/09 stating that the Board was contemplating holding the meeting at 2:00 p.m. on the 10th. She was hoping that they would wait until the next week because she had a trip planned. The date and time of the meeting became very confusing even for those that were following the schedule. We requested that the Board move the development issues to the next week giving the public time to be noticed of the change of date. Many areas were still without power and the roads were not yet drivable. The Board went ahead and held the meeting and passed Proposition 90 and a General Plan Amendment for Mixed Use. They knew I had left the State, and that many others that had planned to contest this could not be

notified. Yesterday, at the Board meeting I handed out a request of verification to the Board and CAO of the noticing to these agencies/districts. The CAO came and told me that they mailed out to the 89 on the list. I asked if the Board had meet with each agency as required by 65.5 (2)(a)? She said "No". I asked if there was an accounting that each agency had been properly notified with a response? She said "No".

From: "El Dorado County" <eldoradocounty@service.govdelivery.com>
To: "sue-taylor" <sue-taylor@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 5, 2015 12:17:48 PM
Subject: El Dorado County Board of Supervisors Considers Extension to Ordinance 4832 (Prop. 90 - Transfer of Homeowner's Property Tax Assessment)

You are subscribed to News & Hot Topics for El Dorado County. This information has recently been updated, and is [now available](#).

[El Dorado County Board of Supervisors Considers Extension to Ordinance 4832 \(Prop. 90 - Transfer of Homeowner's Property Tax Assessment\)](#)