

*file*

**Carl Handen  
321 Rialto Court  
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762**

09-0992

12-10-09

#52

To Doc 15

#27

2010 JUN 24 AM 10:36  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
EL DORADO COUNTY

June 23, 2010

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
El Dorado County Government Center  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

**RE: Attached Letter to Board Members  
(Prop. 90 Issue)**

Dear Staff Member:

Kindly arrange to give each Board member a copy of the attached letter. Also include this item in the Board's records and as an agenda item at an upcoming Board meeting.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

*Carl Handen*

Carl Handen

\eldorado\prop90j\

COPY SENT TO BOARD MEMBERS  
FOR THEIR INFORMATION

DATE 6-24-10

cc: Assessor

CAO

*file*

**Carl Handen**  
**321 Rialto Court**  
**El Dorado Hills, CA 95762**

June 23, 2010

County Supervisors  
El Dorado County Government Center  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

ATTN: Supervisors Normal Santiago, John Knight, James Sweeney, Ray Nutting, & Ron Briggs

**RE: Proposition 90 Ordinance for El Dorado County**  
**(My Letter of January 18, 2010--Copy Attached)**

Dear Supervisors:

In my previous letters to the Board and to individual Board members, I pleaded with the Board to make Proposition 90 retroactive to early 2009 and I gave reasons for doing so. But, as yet, I have not had a response from any of the Board members. It seems that the Board's reluctance to embrace this recommendation is due to the fact that they are concerned about the tax impact of doing so. I now have evidence that this is unlikely to be the case.

On June 22, 2010, I spoke with Rebecca Klare of the County Tax Assessor's Office and learned that only five applications under the Prop. 90 ordinance have been received to date and none of these have been processed as yet.

So, the tax revenue consequences of making Proposition 90 retroactive to January 1, 2009 will be minimal and it will be of substantial benefit to those seniors who moved into El Dorado County from other participating counties while the Proposition was being deliberated by the Board.

Again, I respectfully ask that the Board reconsider its position and make Proposition 90 retroactive to the beginning of 2009--or, as an alternative, one year prior to its passage on February 15, 2010.

Sincerely,



Carl Handen

Attach.

\\eldorado\prop90i\

**Carl Handen  
321 Rialto Court  
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762**

January 18, 2010

County Supervisors  
El Dorado County Government Center  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

ATTN: Supervisors Normal Santiago, John Knight, James Sweeney, Ray Nutting, & Ron Briggs

**RE: Proposition 90 Ordinance for El Dorado County  
(My Previous Letters on this Subject)**

Dear Supervisors:

Congratulations on the final passage of the referenced Ordinance for El Dorado County. I believe it was the proper thing to do. However, I am deeply disappointed that you elected not to make the Ordinance retroactive to the beginning of 2009 as recommended in my previous letters. I have obviously not done an effective job of presenting my arguments for doing so. Let me try again.

First, I believe it is the fair and equitable thing to do. The sentiment to enact this proposition was there well before its final passage. Red tape and long delays postponed its official start date to February 15, 2010. Because of this delay, seniors, who moved into El Dorado County from other Proposition 90 counties during this waiting period, will be denied the benefit of its provisions. Many of us, like me, who moved into the county in 2009, while the Ordinance was in the works, could not postpone the move even though we knew that its passage was just around the corner. We moved to be closer to family members already in the County for support and health reasons. Because we moved in just before the Ordinance was to officially take effect, we are seeing a substantial increase in our property taxes from our previous Prop.90 County of residence. In my case, I am seeing an almost 200% increase in property taxes as a result of the move. This is certainly not the welcome to El Dorado County I had hoped for.

Second, let's discuss the impact on overall El Dorado County property tax receipts if the Proposition were made retroactive as recommended. Only seven counties, besides El Dorado County, now have reciprocal Prop. 90 arrangements. But seniors who would most likely move to El Dorado County would come from only three of the closest counties: Alameda, Santa Clara, and San Mateo—a small percentage of all eligible Prop. 90 seniors. In reality, the number of seniors who qualify under Prop. 90 and who have moved into El Dorado County during 2009 is very small. Take, for example, the January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010 article in the *Sacramento Bee* entitled "Home Front: Only 2,800 new Sacramento area homes sold in 2009." These home sales are from the six counties of El Dorado, Placer,

Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba. The article indicates that, of the various areas surveyed, El Dorado Hills had among the smallest number of sales at 109. So, it can be presumed that seniors made up only a small proportion of new home purchases in El Dorado County and, by extension, seniors from other Prop. 90 counties made even fewer new home purchases. Because of the severe economic conditions in the housing market, this scenario would apply to all home purchases as well. So there should be no argument that making the Ordinance retroactive to early 2009 would have only the slightest impact on County revenue from property taxes. I previously discussed this issue with Tim Holcomb, who also felt the tax revenue impact of making the Ordinance retroactive would be small in comparison to any future impacts.

So, my plea is: Why not make the Ordinance retroactive? It would be of substantial benefit to those seniors who moved into El Dorado County in 2009 from other Prop. 90 counties while the Ordinance was being prepared and it would have minimal financial consequences to the County. This is a "win-win" situation. According the Board's wishes, the entire impact of the Ordinance will be subject to review in five years anyway.

Your decision to go ahead with my recommendation would be welcome news indeed. I have asked Board members to respond to me on this issue in the past, but have received none. So, I look forward to a favorable response this time around.

Sincerely,

Carl Handen

\\eldorado\prop90g\