

[Assembly Bill 668](#) (Gomez)

Date: 09/01/15

Program: Property

Sponsor: Habitat for Humanity

Revenue and Taxation Code Section 402.1

Effective: January 1, 2016

Michele Pielsticker (Chief) 916.322.2376

Rose Marie Kinnee (Analyst) 916.445.6777

Summary: Requires assessors to consider the impact upon value of a home purchased with a 30-year owner-occupied affordable housing use restriction imposed by a nonprofit corporation.

Summary of Amendments: The amendments since the previous analysis double joint this bill to AB 1251, which also proposes amendments to RTC Section 402.1.

Purpose: To require assessors to consider restrictions imposed by specified nonprofit corporations when determining the value of a home purchased at a below market price from a nonprofit corporation housing program.

Fiscal Impact Summary: Indeterminable.

Existing Law: When determining a property's fair market value, property tax law requires the assessor to consider the effect of restrictions on a property's use, such as zoning or environmental constraints, that can be legally enforced.¹ Similarly, when determining land value, the law requires the assessor to consider the effect of *government-imposed* restrictions on land use.² Except for certain easements granted to nonprofit organizations to preserve and protect land in its natural state,³ the law does not allow the assessor to consider the effect of a nonprofit's *organization-imposed* restriction that negatively impacts value.⁴

Proposed Law: This bill requires the assessor to consider the effect upon value of a contract with specified nonprofit corporations that have received the welfare exemption to the list of enforceable restrictions when valuing land for assessment purposes.⁵ To qualify:

- The contract must restrict the land's use for at least 30 years to owner-occupied housing available at an affordable cost,⁶
- The nonprofit corporation imposing the restriction must have received the welfare exemption the law⁷ provides for corporations organized and operated for the specific and primary purpose of building and rehabilitating single or multifamily residences for sale at cost to low-income families, with financing in the form of a zero interest rate loan and without regard to religion, race, national origin, or the sex of the head of household.
- The contract includes a deed of trust (silent second mortgage) on the property in favor of the nonprofit corporation to ensure homeowner compliance with program terms, which has no value unless the owner fails to comply with home sale terms, covenants and restrictions.
- The local housing authority finds that the long-term deed restrictions in the contract serve a public purpose. If the location isn't served by a housing authority, then an equivalent agency, or, if none exists, the city attorney or county counsel conclude such findings.
- The contract is recorded and a copy is provided to the assessor.

¹ Revenue and Taxation Code (RTC) [Section 110\(a\)](#)

² RTC Section [402.1\(a\)](#)

³ RTC Section 402.1(a)(8)

⁴ *Carlson v. Assessment Appeals Board No. 1* (1985) 167 Cal.App.3d 1004

⁵For purposes of this analysis, "nonprofit corporation" and "nonprofit organization" have the same meaning.

⁶ Health and Safety Code Section [50052.5](#) defines "affordable housing cost."

⁷ RTC Section [214.15](#).

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.

In General: Purchase Price. Existing property tax law requires the assessor to reassess property to its fair market value when it is sold. The law provides that the property's "purchase price" is rebuttably presumed to be its "fair market value."⁸ It also provides that "purchase price" means the *total consideration* provided by the purchaser or on the purchaser's behalf, valued in money, whether paid in money or otherwise.

Relevant to this bill, some government and nonprofit organizations' affordable housing programs use silent second mortgages (silent second) to assist low-income home buyers to purchase homes they could not otherwise afford. Typically, the silent second has no, or a deferred, repayment obligation.

When a home is purchased through an affordable housing program, "purchase price" may include more than the nominal sales price when the silent second is considered since "total consideration" is the measure of value for tax purposes.

Enforceable Restrictions. When determining a property's fair market value, RTC §110(a) requires the assessor to consider the effect of restrictions on a property's use, such as zoning or environmental constraints, that can be legally enforced. Similarly, when determining the value of land, RTC §402.1(a) requires the assessor to consider the effect of governmentally-imposed restrictions on land use. Except for certain easements granted to nonprofit organizations to preserve and protect land,⁹ the assessor may not consider a nonprofit-corporation imposed restriction that negatively impacts its value.¹⁰

Relevant to this bill, a nonprofit organization typically requires its home buyers to enter into a contract that limits the homeowner's ability to sell, lease, refinance, encumber, or mortgage the home. The contract is recorded and could be legally enforced should the home buyer violate contract terms.

Determining Fair Market Value – Silent Second Mortgages. Property tax law does not address how to determine value when the total consideration for a property includes a silent second mortgage. Relevant to this bill, in the case of silent seconds that involve a governmental agency, the BOE advises assessors to estimate the property's purchase price by adding the sum of:

- the down payment,
- the first mortgage face amount, and
- the assessor's estimate of the *present economic value* of the silent second reflecting all the agreement's terms and conditions. Such terms include whether the silent second will have to be repaid, repaid at the time of sale, or assumed by the next buyer.

After determining the purchase price, the assessor is required to consider the effect of any government-imposed restrictions on value. Specifically, the assessor exercises his or her judgment under RTC §402.1 to determine whether the property's value is equal to, or more or less than, the purchase price as a result of the enforceable government restrictions.

Previous Legislation: In 2013, [SB 499](#) (Wyland) proposed legislation identical to this bill, which was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee. The bill's sponsor, Habitat for Humanity, surveyed 22 counties in 2007 regarding how affordable homes built, financed, and sold by Habitat for Humanity affiliates were assessed after the sale. The assessment treatment varied. In some areas, the assessed value is based on whether or not the construction involved city or county funds, and in others, the value is based on verbal agreements with the local assessor.

In 2007, [AB 793](#) (Strickland), related to a home purchased under an affordable housing program, would have:

- Excluded from the calculation of purchase price the amount of any "silent second mortgage" if payment is not required for at least 30 years.

⁸ RTC Section 110(b)

⁹ RTC 402.1(a)(8)

¹⁰ *Carlson v. Assessment Appeals Board No. 1* (1985) 167 Cal.App.3d 1004

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.

- Expressly provided that resale price restrictions on homes purchased through a program operated by a governmental agency must be considered when determining property value.
- Allowed resale price restrictions on homes purchased through a program operated by a nonprofit organization to be treated as an enforceable restriction that must be considered when determining property value.

The Senate Appropriations Committee held AB 793.

Commentary:

1. **The September 1, 2015 amendments** double joint this bill to AB 1251 (Gomez), which relates to greenway easements, to prevent chaptering out issues. **The June 25, 2015 amendments** required the assessor to be provided with a copy of the contract between the homebuyer and the nonprofit organization. **The May 5, 2015 amendments** limited the bill's application and added several conditions. First, the bill only applies when a use restriction is imposed by a nonprofit organization that has received a welfare exemption under RTC 214.15 for homes sold at cost and with no-interest loans. Second, the bill is limited to owner-occupied homes. Third, the silent second must operate only as an enforcement mechanism, and will be forgiven unless the owner fails to comply with the contractual restrictions. Finally, a public agency must make a finding that the contract restriction serves a public purpose.
2. **This bill requires assessors to consider the effect upon value when qualified nonprofit corporations restrict land use to affordable owner-occupied housing for at least 30 years.** When determining value for property tax purposes, the assessor may not consider any privately imposed use restrictions that negatively impact values. But, the assessor must consider the effect upon value of any government-imposed restriction or any recorded contract involving a government agency. For nonprofit organization-imposed restrictions, the law provides one exception: an easement entered into between a private land owner and a nonprofit organization for an open space, scenic, or trail easement. This bill adds a second exception for affordable owner-occupied housing use restrictions.
3. **Habitat for Humanity reports that county practices vary.** In 2015, the organization surveyed 15 counties and found that assessment practices varied on homes their affiliates sold. The organization states that in some areas the assessed value is based on whether or not the construction involved city or county funds, and in others, the value is based on verbal agreements with the local assessor.
4. **This bill requires assessors to consider the effect upon value of homes sold in affordable housing programs run by qualified nonprofits, thus allowing assessors to potentially reduce the assessed value of such homes.** Without this bill, the assessor may assess the same home at different amounts depending on whether or not the buyer purchased the home from a nonprofit affordable housing program or a city affordable housing program. For example, if the total consideration for a home was determined to be \$100,000, and, in the assessor's judgment, the enforceable restriction negatively impacted land value by \$20,000, then the property tax value would be:
 - \$100,000 if purchased from a nonprofit organization, or
 - \$80,000 if purchased from a city's affordable housing program.
5. **This analysis focuses on homes sold with silent second mortgages because this has been an area causing concern.** Some argue that a home's "purchase price" should not take into account the silent second mortgage. However, because the law requires *total consideration*, whether paid in money *or otherwise*, to be the assessment basis, it must be considered. A mitigating factor is that the face amount of the silent second, which can be substantial, will be discounted. Once the assessor analyzes the silent second terms, it is possible that no amount, or a negligible sum, is added to the nominal sales price to calculate the statutory "purchase price" definition.

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.

6. **Assessment of affordable housing sold when encumbered with silent second mortgages.** In 2007, BOE published Property Tax Annotations [460.0004](#) and [535.0006](#), to set forth a recommended approach for homes sold by *government* agencies (in this case a city's affordable housing program). The approach has two steps, as explained in comment 7. Without this bill, the approach's second step, which can result in a value reduction, cannot be used for homes sold by affordable housing programs operated by nonprofit corporations. This is because the restriction limiting use of the property is imposed by a nonprofit corporation and not by a government agency.
7. **The BOE recommends the following assessment approach.** First, the purchase price of the home must be determined by adding the sum of:
- the down payment,
 - the face amount of the first mortgage, and
 - the *present economic value* of the silent second reflecting all the terms and conditions of the agreements. Such terms would include whether, if at all, the silent second will have to be repaid at the time of sale, or must be assumed by the next buyer.

In practical application, the discount on a silent second, which may have a delayed payment as long as 30, 45, or an indefinite number of years, may be a negligible sum.

The second step in the process, which is the subject of this bill, is for the assessor to consider the effect upon value, if any, of enforceable restrictions on land use required under RTC §402.1.

This approach is administratively complex. The assessor must calculate a discount period and discount rate appropriate for the terms of the silent second mortgage. After determining the purchase price, the assessor is required to consider the effect of the government-imposed restrictions on value. Specifically, the assessor must exercise judgment under the RTC §402.1 requirement to determine whether the value of the property is equal to, or more or less than, the purchase price due to the use restriction.

8. **Silent Seconds and Recorded Contracts Vary.** When the BOE reviewed this issue, it didn't find a standard or pro forma "silent second." The specific terms and conditions of each silent second must be analyzed separately and independently to determine their respective property tax implications. Some silent seconds may only take effect if the purchaser violates the agreement, and are forgiven if the agreement is fulfilled. Such silent seconds operate primarily as an enforcement mechanism to encourage compliance with the enforceable restrictions. In these cases, the BOE generally does not regard the silent second as part of the purchase price. In other cases, while the silent second may or may not have some enforcement goal, it nevertheless is payable whether or not the purchaser breaches the enforceable government restrictions. In such cases, where the purchaser has unconditionally committed to pay the silent second under its terms and conditions, the assessor must consider the silent second in the determination of the purchase price. Moreover, regulatory agreements related to the resale of affordable housing units also vary. Therefore, to determine whether enforceable restrictions have an effect on value, the assessor must review and analyze the agreement's specific restrictions and conditions, as well as take into consideration the local marketplace for homes subject to similar or identical enforceable restrictions.

Administrative Costs: The BOE's costs to update its documents, website materials, and provide guidance to assessors are absorbable.

Revenue Impact: It is not possible to determine the revenue impact of this measure with any degree of certainty due to the number of variables. Each assessor must exercise his or her judgment to determine whether the value of the property at that particular location is equal to, or more or less than, the purchase price as a result of the impact of the enforceable restriction placed by the nonprofit corporation.

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.