

76

mail message

8/16/07

From: Rvanfos6@aol.com
Date: Fri, Mar 31, 2006, 10:22am (EDT-1)
To: Spletth@aol.com
Cc: berndog2@juno.com, billmum1@msn.com, chalkbd@tampabay.rr.com, dotnaugle1@earthlink.net, herbanne@verizon.net, jjobrien1@webtv.net, jwdietz999@earthlink.net, jwwcaw401@verizon.net, Langtonjr@cs.com, RommeTerre@aol.com, yobo5855@webtv.net, gmapam1@juno.com, RJMusgrave@aol.com
Subject: Re: Your letter of 3/28 to Bernie

Harry: I know you pride yourself as being a logical person, so let's talk a little logic. Take a good look at your statement from Ken Burton, Manatee County Tax Collector. It consists of two separate sets of numbers, one being the AD VALORUM TAXES we all pay to the county to cover the costs of county government and schools, the other being a NON ADVALORUM ASSESSMENT which the county collects on behalf of Trailer Estates and the Fire District. As is noted with the first part of the statement, we are charged a millage rate per \$1000 of taxable value, which the county determines by periodic appraisals of all private, taxable property in the county. That is what is meant by Ad Valorum, if you look it up in the dictionary. Some of our County Taxes have gone to help pay for the work done on Florida Blvd., and in repairing and replacing our sewer and water system, but every tax payer in the county has also participated in sharing those costs with us. This is a common system of cost sharing that I know you are familiar with, and makes sense, as I'm sure you agree. The residents of Trailer Estates could never afford the considerable costs of what has been and is being done in our community by the County, if we had to pay the full costs ourselves. One inequity that I see is the fact that we all pay school costs in our taxes, even though none of us in Trailer Estates has children in the local school system, but, again, we are sharing costs with everyone else in the county, and all of us benefit in some way from the money we pay every year.

As for the Non Advalorum ASSESSMENT collected from all residents of Trailer Estates - and no other County residents - these funds are used entirely internally right here at home on good old TE. We together pay for our twice a week garbage collection, our excellent cable TV service, and all the great work our hired employees do to keep our buildings and grounds looking so good. I'm sure you would agree that we, and no one else in the County, are the beneficiaries of this annual assessment. Our annual assessment is set up the way it is, with each PROPERTY paying the same amount, regardless of lot size or house value, because we each get EXACTLY the same benefit from these funds. A three-lot property, with a large new home on it, gets no more and no less services from TE than does a little 1950's model trailer sitting on a single lot. When this Park was created and the developers were selling lots to folks who wanted to live here, they made no distinction between those who bought only one lot and those who bought more, as they knew that they were providing service to the HOME not to the LOT, and this system is still in place today, for which we should be thankful. I find it hard to understand why anyone would feel the need to change a system that is working so well and is so fair to every one of the owners of property in Trailer Estates. Our annual assessment is a fee for services rendered to us, NOT A TAX, and should be regarded in that way.

As for your comments re the number of units assessed being actually less than the 1291 being used by our Treasurer, I would agree that he should keep more current than he has. But I wish you would do the rest of the math on the money you say is being lost by using this incorrect figure. That \$5000 amount is just over one half of one percent of our new budget total, and certainly is not grounds for tearing up our charter as seems to be what some owners are trying to promote. We do need to be sure our numbers are correct every year, but let's not throw the baby out with the bathwater and try to fix something that is not broken.

Sincerely Bob Van Fossen

71