

INYO COUNTY

Audit Report

APPORTIONMENT AND ALLOCATION OF PROPERTY TAX REVENUES

July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2023



MALIA M. COHEN
CALIFORNIA STATE CONTROLLER

June 2024



MALIA M. COHEN
CALIFORNIA STATE CONTROLLER

June 27, 2024

The Honorable Amy Shepherd, Auditor-Controller
Inyo County
168 North Edwards Street
Independence, CA 93526

Dear Ms. Shepherd:

The State Controller's Office audited Inyo County's process for apportioning and allocating property tax revenues for the period of July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2023. We conducted the audit pursuant to the requirements of Government Code section 12468.

Our audit found instances of noncompliance with California statutes for the apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues for the audit period. Specifically, we determined that the county incorrectly calculated the:

- Supplemental property tax administrative costs;
- Unitary and operating nonunitary apportionment and allocation factors; and
- Vehicle license fee adjustments.

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

Sincerely,

Original signed by

Kimberly A. Tarvin, CPA
Chief, Division of Audits

KAT/rs

Copy: Jen Roser, Chairperson
Inyo 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 Inyo County's (the 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, 2015, through June 30, 2023.

Our audit found instances of noncompliance with California statutes for the apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues for the audit period. Specifically, we determined that the county incorrectly calculated the:

- Supplemental property tax administrative costs;
- Unitary and operating nonunitary apportionment and allocation factors; and
- Vehicle license fee (VLF) adjustments.

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 (BOE).
- *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 (e.g. 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, 2015, through June 30, 2023.

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 30 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 determine whether 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 (see Finding 1).
- We verified computations used to develop supplemental property tax apportionment factors.
- We verified unitary and operating nonunitary computations used to develop property tax apportionment factors (see Finding 2).
- We reviewed property tax administrative 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 the Sales and Use Tax letter and verified the VLF computations used to determine the amount transferred from the ERAF to counties and cities to compensate for the diversion of these revenues (see Finding 3).
- We reviewed BOE 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 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 the county did not comply with California statutes for the apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues for the audit period. Specifically, we determined that the county incorrectly calculated the:

- Supplemental property tax administrative costs;
- Unitary and operating nonunitary apportionment and allocation factors; and
- VLF adjustments.

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, 2010, through June 30, 2015, issued on February 24, 2017.

Views of Responsible Officials

We issued a draft audit report on April 4, 2024. The county's representative responded by letter dated May 3, 2024 (Attachment), agreeing 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 the 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 A. Tarvin, CPA
Chief, Division of Audits

June 27, 2024

Findings and Recommendations

FINDING 1— Supplemental property tax administrative costs

During our testing of the county's supplemental property tax administrative costs, we found that the county could not provide sufficient supporting documentation for the costs associated with administering supplemental taxes. As a result, the county could not support all of the fees that it collected during the audit period.

We could not quantify the monetary impact due to the cumulative effect of the various errors affecting the computation and allocation. The error occurred because the county did not correctly implement the applicable statute.

RTC section 75.60 provides the legal requirements for reimbursing supplemental property tax administrative costs.

The statute allows a county to charge an administrative fee for collecting supplemental property tax revenues. This fee is not to exceed five percent of the supplemental property tax revenues collected.

Recommendation

We recommend that the county review RTC section 75.60 and update its procedures to ensure that it maintains sufficient supporting documentation for the costs associated with administering supplemental taxes.

County's Response

The County will review RTC section 75.60 and request the Assessor, Tax Collector & Auditor-Controller to track time spent processing supplemental tax administration.

FINDING 2— Unitary and operating nonunitary apportionment and allocation

During our testing of the county's unitary and operating nonunitary apportionment and allocation process, we found that the county had incorrectly calculated unitary factors by using incorrect assessed values for FY 2016-17 and FY 2017-18. This error resulted in a misallocation of unitary and operating nonunitary revenue to all affected taxing jurisdictions.

We could not quantify the monetary impact due to the cumulative effect of the various errors affecting the computation and allocation. The error occurred because the county did not correctly implement the applicable statute.

RTC section 100 provides the legal requirements for apportioning and allocating unitary and operating nonunitary property tax revenues.

In FY 1988-89, the Legislature established a separate system for apportioning and allocating unitary and operating nonunitary property tax revenues. The system created the unitary and operating nonunitary base

year, and developed formulas to compute the distribution factors for the fiscal years that followed.

RTC section 723 defines unitary properties as properties “that are operated as a unit in the primary function of the assessee” (i.e., public utilities, railroads, or qualified electric properties) and on which the BOE “may use the principle of unit valuation.

RTC section 723.1 defines operating nonunitary properties as properties “that the assessee and its regulatory agency consider to be operating as a unit,” but the BOE considers “not part of the unit in the primary function of the assessee.”

Recommendation

We recommend that the county:

- Review RTC section 100 and update its procedures to include the correct assessed values;
- Recalculate the unitary and operating nonunitary apportionment and allocation for FY 2016-17 through FY 2022-23; and
- Make monetary adjustments to all affected jurisdictions if amounts are material.

County’s Response

The County will correct the values for FY 16-17 and FY 17-18 that were converted in error during the implementation of our property tax system and correct the allocation factor.

FINDING 3— Vehicle license fee adjustments

During our testing of the county’s VLF adjustments, we found that the county had incorrectly calculated the VLF shift by using incorrect prior-year VLF amounts for FY 2020-21 through FY 2022-23. This error resulted in a misallocation of property tax revenues to the City of Bishop and the ERAF.

We could not quantify the monetary impact due to the cumulative effect of the various errors affecting the computation and allocation. The error occurred because the county did not correctly implement the applicable statute.

RTC section 97.70 provides the legal requirements for VLF adjustments.

The VLF permanently provided additional property tax revenues to counties and cities in lieu of the discretionary VLF revenues that these agencies previously received.

Recommendation

We recommend that the county:

- Review RTC section 97.70 and update its procedures to include the correct prior-year VLF amounts;
- Recalculate the VLF adjustments for FY 2020-21 through FY 2022-23; and
- Make monetary adjustments to the City of Bishop and the ERAF.

County's Response

The County will correct the values for FY 20-21 that were converted in error during the implementation of our property tax system and correct the allocation of tax revenue to the City of Bishop and ERAF fund.

Appendix— Summary of Prior Audit Findings

The following table shows the implementation status of Inyo County's corrective actions related to the findings contained in our prior audit report dated February 24, 2017:

Prior Audit Finding Number	Finding Title	Status
1	Calculation and distribution of annual tax increment	Fully implemented
2	Supplemental property tax	Fully implemented
3	Unitary and operating nonunitary apportionment	Fully implemented
4	Property tax administrative costs	Fully implemented
5	Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund	Fully implemented
6	Vehicle licensing fee and sales and use tax adjustments	Fully implemented

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



COUNTY OF INYO OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

P.O. Drawer R, Independence, California 93526
(760) 878-0343 • Fax (760)-878-0391

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

Subject: Response to Property Tax Audit Finding for the period of July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2023

Dear Ms. Kurokawa,

In response to the property tax audit findings conducted by the State Controller's Office. We have thoroughly reviewed the audit report and accept the findings outlined therein.

We acknowledge and appreciate the diligence of the State Controller's Office in conducting the audit and ensuring accuracy in the property tax process. The audit findings provided opportunities for improvement in our processes and to ensure accuracy.

Finding #1 – Supplemental property tax administrative cost – The County will review RTC section 75.60 and request the Assessor, Tax Collector & Auditor-Controller to track time spent processing supplemental tax administration.

Finding #2 – Unitary and operating nonunitary apportionment and allocation – The County will correct the values for FY16-17 and FY17-18 that were converted in error during the implementation of our property tax system and correct the allocation factor.

Finding #3- Vehicle License Fee adjustment – The County will correct the values for FY20-21 that were converted in error during the implementation of our property tax system and correct the allocation of tax revenue to the City of Bishop and ERAF fund.

Sincerely,

Amy Shepherd

Amy Shepherd
Auditor-Controller

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

www.sco.ca.gov