JAMES H. DOUGLAS
Governor

State of Vermont
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

May 27, 2010

The Honorable Donald G. Milne
Clerk of the House of Representatives
State House
Montpelier, VT 05633-5401

Dear Mr. Milne:

Pursuant to Chapter II, Section 11 of the Vermont Constitution, I am returning H. 485, *An Act Relating to the Use Value Appraisal Program*, without my signature because of objections described herein.

Earlier this year, I recommended full funding of the Use Value Appraisal Program – otherwise known as Current Use – as a part of my proposed FY 2011 budget. I did so because Current Use is critically important to maintaining our working landscape. Current Use allows agricultural and managed forest lands to be taxed on their use value as opposed to their fair market value, thus relieving the pressure on farmers and foresters to remove land from agriculture and forestry and develop it to pay the taxes. While some see this as simply a benefit to enrolled landowners, the entire state is the beneficiary of keeping farms as farms and forests as forests.

H. 485, however, greatly undermines the original intent of the Current Use program, is complicated, highly nuanced, difficult to understand, administratively complex, and needlessly and unfairly increases three taxes. I am disappointed that, in spite of many opportunities to compromise, the Legislature chose to move forward without addressing any of the objections and concerns raised by my Administration and many other Vermonters.

Just when Vermont's agriculture and forest products industries are facing the most daunting economic times in modern history, H. 485 imposes additional taxes and burdensome bureaucracy on the owners of our state's farm and forest land. This approach is in direct opposition to helping our traditional industries prosper in the 21st Century. We should find ways to lower costs for farmers and foresters rather than dump additional taxes and requirements on an already fragile sector of our economy.

Dedicated, long-term participants, who entered into an agreement with the state under one set of provisions, are facing significant changes when they can least afford the impact. Difficult, far-reaching, permanent ownership and enrollment decisions that will affect struggling farm and forest owners must be made in a very short time frame, and may well result in a serious negative impact on Vermont's working landscape. The bill punitively increases the Land Use Change Tax (LUCT) which, among other things, would require farmers to pay the penalty for development of a farm labor housing site and punish parents who wish to provide some land to their children by requiring them to pay a high penalty to do so.

109 STATE STREET • THE PAVILION • MONTPELIER, VT 05609-0101 • WWW.VERMONT.GOV
TELEPHONE: 802.828.3333 • FAX: 802.828.3339 • TDD: 802.828.3345

In the FY 2010 budget, the Legislature set a target for themselves to "save" $1.6 million in the Current Use program. Instead they created a new "one-time" $128 assessment on all enrolled landowners. Charging a fee to allow continued enrollment in a program that is designed to make land ownership affordable is both ironic and counterproductive.

H. 485 increases a second tax – the property transfer tax. The bill increases the tax in some cases by 150 percent – from .5 percent to 1.25 percent.

The third tax increase – the increase in the LUCT – is a significant policy change and perhaps the most troublesome aspect of H. 485. While those who support this redesign of Current Use say it will "strengthen" the program, I believe it will have the opposite effect. The current penalty calculation motivates participants to stay in the program by reducing the penalty percentage after ten years; the new calculation would not provide any benefit for long periods of enrollment.

Further, by changing from the enrolled per acre value as the basis for the LUCT to the parcel value of the removed land, the penalty on a small parcel is likely to be very large. An unintended consequence of H. 485 is that people who remove a parcel will likely take out more land than they would otherwise, so that the assessment per acre will be lower.

Some have claimed that the LUCT increase is necessary to prevent abuses, such as putting land in Current Use for a short period (called "parking") to reap tax benefits prior to development. While there are a few anecdotal instances of this behavior, it is a small problem as roughly two-tenths of one percent of the total land in the program has been subject to the LUCT annually over the past five years. If, in fact, the object is to address the "parking" problem, the penalty should be structured to accomplish that goal, and not to penalize all participants.

Above and beyond its intent, the LUCT will affect far more landowners than those who plan to sell land. Although H. 485 includes a so-called "easy out" option, it is clear there's nothing easy about it. The limitation cited in Section 8b that any parcel that has been developed as defined in 32 V.S.A. § 3752(5) will not be eligible for the "easy out" is especially problematic and raises troubling issues.

For example, cross referencing to the definition of development includes activity such as cutting trees contrary to a forest management plan. The increased penalty will apply, as a result, to forest landowners who have been found to have "cut contrary" to their forest management plan – even if unintentional. This is a severe penalty for what can be a small mistake. H. 485 is clear that the penalty is due "at the time of development," thereby unfairly increasing the penalty for landowners.

Because there is no database for parcels that have been "cut contrary," county foresters will need to review paper files, chewing up precious time and creating an unnecessary administrative burden. How this limitation is defined and/or interpreted will be important and will require further refinement prior to application on a parcel-by-parcel basis. Ultimately, this provision raises more questions than it answers. Does it apply to any parcel that had a "portion" developed? What if the parcel was sold and subdivided? What if the parcel was found in

violation of its management plan, removed from the program, and then re-enrolled after 5 years? What if the parcel is now under new ownership?

Section 6 is fundamentally unfair to the pending program applicants, who filed their applications under the old rules. With the new LUCT, it is expected that some may want to amend their applications, but they can't do so without paying a penalty. Common sense and basic fairness dictate that an applicant should be able to amend an application based on a major change in the program.

H. 485 requires that the Department of Taxes provide timely notice to all program participants of the changes to the current use penalty and the participant's options in terms of continued enrollment of some or all of their current use property. Those applicants who have applied to enroll some 900 parcels in 2009 must be informed of their option to choose not to enroll under the new penalties, taxes and fees. They must respond by July 1, 2010—an unworkable and unfair time frame of just over a month in which timely notification and responses must occur.

In addition to the notice provisions there are a number of difficult administrative issues associated with the implementation of H. 485. In order to assess and collect the $128 per owner surcharge through municipal property tax bills, electronic information systems will have to be developed and in place by July 1, 2010, as electronic files must be transmitted from the State to towns identifying which properties within each municipality are to be assessed the surcharge. Changes to the New England Municipal Resource Center (NEMRC) tax billing and collection software modules to get the assessment on all tax bills will be necessary for Towns to account for the surcharge and issue reports on collection status.

Collectively, the administrative issues in H. 485, given the timeframe within which they have to be accomplished, would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to implement. Not only would implementation issues associated with H. 485 be problematic for the Tax Department, they would result in a significant burden for municipal listers and treasurers to change the grand list values and revise tax bills to be consistent with changes required by the bill.

Prior to the legislative session, the Tax Commissioner warned legislative leaders about the inevitable confusion and cost that would be involved in the implementation of broad changes to the Current Use program for FY 2011. In his letter, he suggested that a more realistic timeframe that would allow all parties to be engaged and to do the necessary education and outreach would be for any changes to become effective in FY 2012.

The change in the LUCT is clearly a policy issue that deserves a full and open public discussion, along with other aspects of the Current Use program. Section 8 of the bill raises important issues that need to be thoughtfully considered. In addition to those, other facts must be gathered and other issues must be discussed more fully prior to making any major changes to the program. These include: the identification and analysis of parcels/acres removed from the program for the last five years and the subsequent use of those parcels; the level of productivity expected from smaller parcels; review of the eligibility standards in Title 32 § 3752 to determine

if they need to be revised or updated; the need to monitor the actual use of enrolled farm structures; consideration of a per acre cap for municipal reimbursement; and the advisability of decentralizing the calculation of fair market value when assessing the LUCT by transferring that responsibility from the state to the towns in which the property is located.

Any revenue implications from not implementing this legislation can be addressed if necessary in the FY 2011 budget adjustment or supplemented through contingent appropriations or excess FY 2011 revenue.

I continue to support the Current Use program, and believe that it has provided great benefits to our state. It is unfortunate that the General Assembly chose to raise taxes unnecessarily and punitively on the stewards of Vermont's working landscape in an effort to address the perceived misuse of the program. A more calibrated approach is required to achieve the desired objectives.

Therefore I am returning H. 485 without my signature.

Sincerely,

James H. Douglas
Governor

JHD/pem