BILL SUMMARY

Related to the disabled veterans' property tax exemption, this Board of Equalization-sponsored bill:

- Ensures that an unmarried surviving spouse receiving the disabled veterans’ property tax exemption on their home will continue to be eligible if he or she is confined to a hospital or care facility. §205.5
- Consolidates the effective and termination dates of the exemption into one section of law. §279

ANALYSIS

CURRENT LAW

Article XIII, Section 4 of the California Constitution provides that the Legislature may exempt from property tax, in whole or in part, the home of a person or a person's spouse, if the person, because of injury or disease incurred in military service, is totally disabled. This exemption is commonly referred to as the "disabled veterans' exemption." The disabled veterans' exemption is also available to the unmarried surviving spouse of a person who dies while on active military duty or to the unmarried surviving spouse of a veteran who may or may not have already been receiving the exemption but later dies as a result of a service connected injury or disease.

Revenue and Taxation Code Section 205.5 is the implementing statute. It provides that "totally disabled" means a veteran who has a disability rating from the USDVA or the military service from which the veteran was discharged at 100 percent or has a disability compensation rating at 100 percent because he or she is unable to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation. The exemption, which is compounded annually by an inflation factor, has two tiers, depending upon the claimant's income.

For the 2011-12 fiscal year, the disabled veterans’ exemption amount will be $175,269 of assessed value for those with a household income below $52,470 (the “low income exemption”). For all others, the disabled veteran’s exemption amount will be $116,845 (the “basic exemption”).
### Occupancy Requirements

Existing law provides that a property is not eligible for the disabled veterans’ property tax exemption if the owner does not occupy the property as his or her principal place of residence on the lien date. An exception is made in Section 205.5(b)(2) to provide that property is “deemed” to be the principal place of residence of a disabled veteran who is confined to a hospital or other care facility, if that property would be that veteran’s principal place of residence were it not for his or her confinement to a hospital or other care facility, provided that the residence is not rented or leased to a third party. A family member that resides at the residence is not considered to be a third party.

Revenue and Taxation Code Section 279 provides that a claim for the disabled veterans’ property tax exemption, once granted, shall remain in effect until:

- title to the property changes,
- the owner does not occupy the home as his or her principal place of residence on the lien date, unless:
  - the veteran is, on the lien date, confined to a hospital or other care facility but principally resided at the dwelling immediately prior to that confinement (provided the property is not rented or leased to a third party).
  - the dwelling is not occupied on the lien date because it was damaged in a misfortune or calamity.
- the veteran is no longer disabled as defined in Section 205.5, or
- the property is altered so that it is no longer a residence.

With respect to this bill, while existing law addresses the case of a disabled veteran who is confined to a hospital or other care facility it is silent in the case of an unmarried surviving spouse.

### Effective Dates

Numerous sections of law (Sections 75.22, 205.5, 276.1 and 276.2) specify the effective date of the disabled veterans’ exemption pursuant to various circumstances. As noted above, once granted, Section 279 provides that the disabled veterans’ exemption will remain in continuous effect until specified events occur. Sections 276.3 and 279.5 provide that when a property no longer qualifies for the exemption, the exemption is to be immediately cancelled.
PROPOSED LAW

Occupancy Requirements. This bill would amend Section 205.5 of the Revenue and Taxation Code to expressly provide that property is deemed to be the principal place of residence of the unmarried surviving spouse of a deceased veteran who is confined to a hospital or other care facility if that property would be the unmarried surviving spouse’s principal place of residence were it not for his or her confinement to a hospital or other care facility. This will allow the spouse to continue to receive the disabled veterans’ property tax exemption.

Effective Dates. This bill would add subdivision (a) to Section 279 to consolidate into that section of law the effective date of the disabled veterans’ exemption for specified situations. This is a nonsubstantive change, since the effective dates are set forth by other sections of law. The effective dates for the disabled veterans’ property tax exemption, subject to the provisions regarding cancellations and the limitation periods on refunds, are as follows:

- **Delayed Disability Rating.** The effective date of disability as determined by the USDVA. *Section 276.1*
- **New Home Purchase.** The date a qualified claimant purchases a property that constitutes the principal place of residence, provided residency is established within 90 days of purchase. *Sections 75.22 and 276.2*
- **Rental or Second Home Conversion.** The date a qualified claimant establishes principal place of residence at a property owned by the claimant or the spouse. *Section 276.2*
- **Post-Death Qualification.** The date the veteran died, in the event the USDVA rules that the death was a result of a service-connected injury or disease. *Section 205.5(c)(1)(B)*

Termination Dates - Remarriage. This bill would add paragraph (5) to Section 279(b), which lists the events that terminate exemption eligibility, to include when an unmarried surviving spouse remarries. (Under existing law, if the former surviving spouse subsequently becomes unmarried due to divorce or death, eligibility is re-established as of the date of death or divorce.) *Section 205.5 (c)*

Technical Provisions. This bill would amend Section 279 to delete language referencing the lien date throughout the text in order to be consistent with Sections 276.2 and 276.3. Additionally, the bill would amend Section 279 to use the phrase “claimant” and “qualified claimant” throughout.

BACKGROUND

AB 322 (Parra, Stats. 2003, Ch. 278) was sponsored by the California Association of County Veteran’s Services Officers to ensure that a disabled veteran who enters a rest home will continue to receive the exemption on his or her home. The practice of some counties is to disqualify the property from receiving the exemption in this situation.

AB 322 included a statement of intent providing that the Legislature finds and declares the following:

- There are many disabled veterans who own property that qualifies for the disabled veterans’ property tax exemption, but due to the fact that these disabled veterans are confined to hospitals or other medical institutions they are unable to occupy that property as their principal places of residence. In many cases the
spouses of these disabled veterans continue to occupy the property as their principal places of residence.

- It is the intent of the Legislature in enacting this act to amend the Revenue and Taxation Code to conform with the California Constitution to further extend the disabled veterans’ property tax exemption to property owned by the spouse of a living disabled veteran while that disabled veteran is confined to a hospital or other care facility and to extend the disabled veterans’ property tax exemption to an otherwise qualifying veteran who is unable to occupy that property as his or her principal place of residence because he or she is confined to a hospital or other care facility, provided that the property is not rented or leased to a third party.

AB 322 codified the existing practices of many, but not all, counties in the situation where a disabled veteran enters a rest home and a spouse continues to reside in the home. Many counties allowed the exemption to remain on the property under the rationale that the absence from the home is temporary. However, a few counties considered the home to be ineligible for the exemption due to the technicality that it is no longer “the principal place of residence” of the veteran even when a spouse is residing in the home. In these counties, if the veteran were to subsequently die, the home would re-qualify for the exemption since unmarried surviving spouses are eligible for the disabled veterans’ exemption.

Prior to AB 322, existing law and regulations were silent on this issue. However, there was BOE guidance on this subject as it relates to the homeowners’ exemption. Letter to Assessors 82/50 advises that a homeowner's "temporary absence" from a home would not disqualify the home from the homeowners' exemption provided the home is not rented or leased to others on the lien date. With respect to the situation where a parent is confined to a rest home and an adult child resides in the home, BOE has advised that if the parent is expected to return and rent is not charged, the homeowners’ exemption may continue. However, an absence of more than one year might raise questions as to whether the home is still the parent's principal residence. Some counties had extended this written advice to the disabled veterans’ exemption prior to the enactment of AB 322.

COMMENTS

1. **Sponsor and Purpose.** This bill is sponsored by the Board of Equalization. Its purpose is to (1) ensure that an unmarried surviving spouse who is receiving the disabled veterans’ exemption will continue to receive the exemption if the surviving spouse is confined to a hospital or care facility and (2) consolidate into one section of law the effective and termination dates of the disabled veterans’ property tax exemption.

2. **Amendments.** The June 29, 2011 amendments incorporate provisions previously contained in AB 946 (Butler) which are also BOE-sponsored.

3. **Issue – Occupancy.** The original legislation related to occupancy requirements, AB 322 (Parra, Stats. 2003, Ch. 278), neglected to include unmarried surviving spouses. The inequity of revoking the exemption where a person must enter an assisted living facility was corrected in 2003, but unmarried surviving spouses were not expressly extended the same benefit. This bill would amend Section 205.5 to remedy this oversight.

This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the BOE’s formal position.
4. **Issue – Effective Dates.** The current laws on the disabled veterans' exemption are widely dispersed and lack cross references. While Section 279 lists the events that would cause the exemption to be terminated, it does not specify those events that allow the exemption to be granted. Furthermore, it does not specify the effective date for each of those various circumstances. The changes made by this bill are nonsubstantive but improve the administration of the exemption by providing a complete and accurate list of key events in one section of code.

5. **Complete, Accurate, and Reader Friendly.** Complete and accurate information in a single section of code greatly assists tax administrators and tax practitioners. Consolidation of the provisions will serve to reduce errors in the administration of the exemption, make important dates more accessible, and better educate those eligible for the exemption. It is particularly useful to those who are new to this area of law or who address these issues infrequently. Additionally, making this area of law more user-friendly will better meet the needs of disabled veterans, surviving spouses, and others who assist them in claiming the exemption by ensuring that the exemption is being granted on their home as of the earliest possible date and informing them of the events that will cause ineligibility.

**COST ESTIMATE**

The administrative costs associated with this bill are absorbable.

**REVENUE ESTIMATE**

The revenue impact associated with this measure is negligible.

*This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the BOE’s formal position.*