

MODOC COUNTY

Audit Report

APPORTIONMENT AND ALLOCATION OF PROPERTY TAX REVENUES

July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2022



MALIA M. COHEN
California State Controller

March 2024



MALIA M. COHEN
CALIFORNIA STATE CONTROLLER

March 21, 2024

Stephanie Wellemeyer, Auditor
Modoc County
108 East Modoc Street
Alturas, CA 96101

Dear Ms. Wellemeyer:

The State Controller's Office audited Modoc County's process for apportioning and allocating property tax revenues for the period of July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2022. We conducted the audit pursuant to the requirements of Government Code section 12468.

Our audit found that the county did not comply with California statutes for the apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues during the audit period because it:

- Incorrectly calculated the computation and distribution of property tax revenue; and
- Incorrectly implemented jurisdictional changes.

If you have any questions, please contact Lisa Kurokawa, Chief, Compliance Audits Bureau, by telephone at (916) 327-3138.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

KIMBERLY TARVIN, CPA
Chief, Division of Audits

KT/am

cc: Kathie Rhoads, Chair
Modoc County Board of Supervisors
Chris Hill, Principal Program Budget Analyst
Local Government Unit
California Department of Finance

Contents

Audit Report

Summary	1
Background	1
Audit Authority	3
Objective, Scope, and Methodology	3
Conclusion	5
Follow-up on Prior Audit Findings	5
Views of Responsible Officials	5
Restricted Use	5
Findings and Recommendations	6
Appendix—Summary of Prior Audit Findings	A1
Attachment—County’s Response to Draft Audit Report	

Audit Report

Summary

The State Controller's Office (SCO) audited Modoc County's process for apportioning and allocating property tax revenues to determine whether the county complied with California statutes for the period of July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2022.

Our audit found that the county did not comply with California statutes for the apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues during the audit period because it:

- Incorrectly calculated the computation and distribution of property tax revenue; and
- Incorrectly implemented jurisdictional changes.

Background

After the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, the California State Legislature (Legislature) enacted new methods for apportioning and allocating property tax revenues to local government agencies, school districts, and community college districts. The main objective was to provide these agencies and districts with a property tax base that would grow as assessed property values increased. The method has been further refined in subsequent laws passed by the Legislature.

One key law was Assembly Bill 8, Chapter 282, Statutes of 1979, which established the method of allocating property taxes for fiscal year (FY) 1979-80 and subsequent fiscal years. The methodology is commonly referred to as the "AB 8 process."

Property tax revenues are apportioned and allocated to local government agencies, school districts, and community college districts using prescribed formulas and methods defined in the Revenue and Taxation Code. In general, the amount that an agency or district receives is based on the amount received in the prior year plus a share of the property tax growth within their boundaries.

The AB 8 process involves several steps, including the transfer of revenues from school and community college districts to local government agencies and the development of the tax rate area (TRA) annual tax increment (ATI) apportionment factors, which determine the amount of property tax revenues to be allocated to each jurisdiction.

The total amount to be allocated to each jurisdiction is then divided by the total amount to be allocated to all entities to determine the AB 8 factor for each entity for the year. The AB 8 factors are computed each year for all entities using the revenue amounts established in the prior year. These amounts are adjusted for growth annually using ATI apportionment factors.

Subsequent legislation removed from the AB 8 process revenues generated by unitary and operating nonunitary properties, pipelines,

regulated railway companies, and qualified electric properties. These revenues are now apportioned and allocated under separate processes.

Other legislation established an Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) in each county. Most local government agencies are required to transfer a portion of their property tax revenues to the fund. The fund is subsequently apportioned and allocated to school and community college districts by the county auditor according to instructions received from the county superintendent of schools or the chancellor of the California community colleges.

Taxable property includes land, improvements, and other properties that are accounted for on the property tax rolls, which are primarily maintained by the county assessor. Tax rolls contain an entry for each parcel of land, including parcel number, owner's name, and value. The types of property tax rolls are:

- *Secured Roll*—Property that, in the opinion of the assessor, has sufficient value to guarantee payment of the tax levies and that, if the taxes are unpaid, the obligation can be satisfied by the sale of the property by the tax collector.
- *Unsecured Roll*—Property that, in the opinion of the assessor, does not have sufficient permanence or other intrinsic qualities to guarantee payment of taxes levied against it.
- *State-Assessed Roll*—Utility properties composed of unitary and operating nonunitary value assessed by the California State Board of Equalization.
- *Supplemental Roll*—Property that has been reassessed due to a change in ownership or the completion of new construction, where the resulting change in assessed value is not reflected in other tax rolls.

To mitigate problems associated with the apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues, Senate Bill 418, which requires the SCO to audit the counties' apportionment and allocation methods and report the results to the Legislature, was enacted in 1985.

Apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues can result in revenues to an agency or agencies being overstated, understated, or misstated. Misstated revenues occur when at least one taxing agency receives more revenue than it was entitled to, while at least one taxing agency receives less revenue than it was entitled to.

The agency that received less tax revenue than its statutory entitlement would have standing to require that adjustments be made by the county, either on a retroactive or prospective basis. The SCO does not have enforcement authority or standing to require the county to take corrective action with respect to misallocation of tax revenues, unless the misallocation resulted in overpaid state funds (funds intended for the ERAF, school districts, or community college districts). The SCO has authority to recover misallocations resulting in overpaid state funds pursuant to Government Code (GC) sections 12410, 12418, and 12419.5.

GC section 12410 provides the SCO with broad authority to “superintend the fiscal concerns of the state.” GC section 12418 provides the SCO with the authority to “direct and superintend the collection of all money due the State, and institute suits in its name” against all debtors of the State. GC section 12419.5 provides the SCO with the authority to offset any amounts due the State against any amounts owed to the debtor by the State.

Revenue and Taxation Code (RTC) section 96.1(b) allows a reallocation of current audit findings and unresolved prior audit findings.

RTC section 96.1(c)(3) limits a cumulative reallocation or adjustment to one percent of the total amount levied at a one-percent rate of the current year’s original secured tax roll. For reallocation to the ERAF, school districts, or community college districts, a reallocation must be completed in equal increments within the following three fiscal years, or as negotiated with the SCO.

Audit Authority

We conducted this audit in accordance with GC section 12468, which authorizes the SCO to audit the apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues on a one-, three-, or five-year cycle, depending on the county’s population. The audit results are reported annually to the Legislature along with any recommendations for corrective action.

Objective, Scope, and Methodology

Our audit objective was to determine whether the county complied with Revenue and Taxation Code, Health and Safety Code, and Government Code requirements pertaining to the apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues.

A property tax bill contains the property tax levied at a one percent tax rate pursuant to the requirement of Proposition 13. A tax bill may also contain special taxes, debt service levies on voter-approved debt, fees, and assessments levied by the county or a city. The scope of our audit was the distribution of the one percent tax levy. Special taxes, debt service levies on voter-approved debt, fees, and assessments levied by the county or a city are beyond the scope of our audit and were not reviewed or audited.

The audit period was July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2022.

To achieve our objective, we performed the following procedures:

- We gained an understanding of the county’s process for apportioning and allocating property tax revenues by interviewing key personnel.
- We reviewed the county’s written procedures for apportioning and allocating property tax revenues.
- We reviewed documents supporting the transaction flow for apportioning and allocating property tax revenues.
- We assessed the reliability of data from the property tax system by interviewing county staff members knowledgeable about the system, tracing transactions through the system, and recalculating data produced by the system. We determined that the data was sufficiently reliable for purposes of this report.

- We judgmentally selected a non-statistical sample of five from approximately 55 taxing jurisdictions within the county for all fiscal years in the audit period.

The actual number of taxing jurisdictions can vary from year to year based on jurisdictional changes. For testing purposes, we included the ERAF in our sample of taxing jurisdictions. We also tested a special district, a school district, a city, and the county. We selected only one of each type of local agency because when the apportionment and allocation for one jurisdiction is incorrect, the error affects every other taxing jurisdiction.

We tested the sampled jurisdictions as follows:

- We tested apportionment and allocation reports to verify computations used to develop property tax apportionment factors.
- We tested TRA reports to verify that the correct TRA factors were used in the computation of the ATI.
- We reviewed supplemental property tax administrative costs and fees to verify that recovery costs associated with administering supplemental taxes were based on actual costs and did not exceed five percent of revenues collected, as prescribed in statute.
- We verified computations used to develop supplemental property tax apportionment factors.
- We verified unitary and operating nonunitary, and unitary regulated railway computations used to develop apportionment factors.
- We reviewed property tax administration cost reports and recomputed administrative costs associated with work performed for apportioning and allocating property tax revenues to local government agencies, school districts, and community college districts.
- We reviewed ERAF reports and verified computations used to determine the shift of property taxes from local government agencies to the ERAF and, subsequently, to school and community college districts.
- We reviewed the Sales and Use Tax letter and verified the Vehicle License Fee computations used to determine the amount transferred from the ERAF to counties and cities to compensate for the diversion of these revenues.
- We reviewed California State Board of Equalization jurisdictional change filing logs and their impact on the tax apportionment and allocation system.

Errors found were not projected to the intended (total) population.

We did not audit the county's financial statements.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to

provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective.

Conclusion

Our audit found that Modoc County did not comply with California statutes for the apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues for the audit period because it:

- Incorrectly calculated the computation and distribution of property tax revenue; and
- Incorrectly implemented jurisdictional changes.

These instances of noncompliance are described in the Findings and Recommendations section.

Follow-up on Prior Audit Findings

The county has satisfactorily resolved the findings noted in our prior audit report, for the period of July 1, 2012, through June 30, 2016, issued on January 4, 2017.

Views of Responsible Officials

We issued a draft audit report on December 21, 2023. Modoc County's representative responded by letter dated December 29, 2023, concurring with the audit results. The county's response is included as an attachment to this final audit report.

Restricted Use

This audit report is solely for the information and use of Modoc County, the Legislature, the California Department of Finance, and the SCO; it is not intended to be, and should not be, used by anyone other than these specified parties. This restriction is not intended to limit distribution of this audit report, which is a matter of public record and is available on the SCO website at www.sco.ca.gov.

Original signed by

KIMBERLY TARVIN, CPA
Chief, Division of Audits

March 21, 2024

Findings and Recommendations

**FINDING 1—
Computation and
distribution of
property tax revenue**

During testing of the computation and distribution of property tax revenue process, we found that the county incorrectly calculated the ATI by using incorrect assessed values for FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22. This error resulted in a misallocation of property tax revenue to all taxing jurisdictions in the county.

We could not quantify the monetary impact for each affected taxing entity due to the cumulative effect of the various errors affecting the computation and distribution. The error occurred because the county incorrectly implemented the applicable statutes, especially RTC section 96.5(d).

RTC sections 96 through 96.5 provide the legal requirements for computing the ATI and for apportioning and allocating property tax revenues.

ATI is the difference between the total amount of property tax revenues computed each year using the equalized assessment roll and the sum of the amounts allocated pursuant to RTC section 96.1(a). Each TRA receives an increment based on its share of the incremental growth in assessed valuations. ATI is added to the tax computed for the prior fiscal year will develop the apportionments for the current fiscal year.

Recommendation

We recommend that the county:

- Review RTC section 96.5, with special attention to subparagraph (d), and update its procedures to include the correct assessed values from the computation and distribution of property tax revenue process;
- Recalculate its property tax revenues for FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22; and
- Make monetary adjustments to school districts and the ERAF. Monetary adjustments to other affected taxing entities will be necessary if the amount is significant.

County’s Response

The county concurs with the recommendation and stated that it has corrected the error.

**FINDING 2—
Jurisdictional changes**

During testing of the jurisdictional change process, we found that the county incorrectly calculated property tax exchange ratios for the annexation of the Alturas Wastewater Treatment Plant and the Millsite reorganization. This error resulted in a misallocation of property tax exchange ratios to all taxing jurisdictions in the county.

We could not quantify the monetary impact for each affected taxing entity due to the cumulative effect of the various errors affecting the computation

and distribution. The error occurred because the county incorrectly implemented RTC section 99.

RTC section 99 provides the legal requirements for jurisdictional changes.

A jurisdictional change involves a change in the service area or responsibilities of a local agency or school district. As part of the jurisdictional change, the agencies or districts are required to negotiate any exchange of base-year property tax revenues and ATIs. Consequently, the agency or district whose responsibility increased receives additional ATI, and negotiated agreements adjust the base property tax revenues accordingly.

Recommendation

We recommend that the county:

- Review RTC section 99, and update its procedures to include the correct property tax exchange ratios outlined in the jurisdictional change agreement;
- Recalculate the jurisdictional change using the correct property tax exchange ratios outlined in the jurisdictional change agreement; and
- Make monetary adjustments to all affected taxing entities.

County's Response

The county concurs with the recommendation and stated that it has corrected the error.

Appendix— Summary of Prior Audit Findings

The following table shows the implementation status of Modoc County's corrective actions related to the findings contained in our prior audit report dated January 4, 2017.

Prior Audit Finding Number	Prior Audit Finding Title	Status
1	Calculation and distribution of annual tax increments	Fully implemented
2	Jurisdictional Changes	Fully implemented
3	Vehicle Licensing Fee and Sales and Use Tax adjustments	Fully implemented

**Attachment—
County's Response to Draft Audit Report**



COUNTY OF MODOC

Auditor/Clerk
108 E. Modoc Street
ALTURAS, CALIFORNIA 96101

(530) 233-6204 Office
(530) 233-6666 Fax

STEPHANIE WELLEMEYER
*Auditor, Clerk, &
Registrar of Voters*

December 29, 2023

Lisa Kurokawa, Chief
State Controller's Office
Compliance Audits Bureau
Division of Audits
PO Box 942850
Sacramento, CA 94250

Re: Draft Audit Report, Apportionment and Allocation of Property Tax Revenues July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2022

Dear Ms. Kurokawa,

I am in receipt of the above-referenced audit report and concur with each of the recommendations. As stated, the County corrected the errors so they would be good moving forward.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me at the phone number above, or by using my direct line at (530) 233-6207. I can also be reached by email at stephaniewellemeyer@co.modoc.ca.us.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Wellemeyer

**State Controller's Office
Division of Audits
Post Office Box 942850
Sacramento, CA 94250**

www.sco.ca.gov