

# ORANGE COUNTY

Audit Report

## APPORTIONMENT AND ALLOCATION OF PROPERTY TAX REVENUES

*July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2021*



**BETTY T. YEE**  
California State Controller

October 2022



**BETTY T. YEE**  
California State Controller

October 27, 2022

The Honorable Frank Davies, CPA, Auditor-Controller  
Orange County  
1770 North Broadway  
Santa Ana, CA 92706

Dear Mr. Davies:

The State Controller's Office audited Orange County's process for apportioning and allocating property tax revenues for the period of July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2021. We conducted the audit pursuant to the requirements of Government Code section 12468.

Our audit found that the county complied with California statutes for the apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues for the audit period.

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/lr

cc: Salvador Lopez, Chief Deputy Auditor-Controller  
Orange County  
Yani Painter, Property Tax Manager  
Orange County Auditor-Controller's Office  
Doug Chaffee, Chair  
Orange County Board of Supervisors  
Chris Hill, Principal Program Budget Analyst  
Local Government Unit  
California Department of Finance

# Contents

## Audit Report

<b>Summary</b> .....	1
<b>Background</b> .....	1
<b>Audit Authority</b> .....	3
<b>Objective, Scope, and Methodology</b> .....	3
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	5
<b>Follow-up on Prior Audit Findings</b> .....	5
<b>Views of Responsible Officials</b> .....	5
<b>Restricted Use</b> .....	5

# Audit Report

## Summary

The State Controller's Office (SCO) audited Orange County's process for apportioning and allocating property tax revenues for the period of July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2021.

Our audit found that the county complied with California statutes for the apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues for the audit period.

## 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 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 of revenue 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 its 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 (e.g., funds intended for the ERAF, school districts, or community college districts). Pursuant to Government Code (GC) sections 12410, 12418, and 12419.5, the SCO has authority to recover misallocations resulting in overpaid state funds.

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

Revenue and Taxation Code 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 under the authority of GC section 12468, which requires 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 requirements 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 concerned with 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, 2017, through June 30, 2021.

To achieve our objective, we performed the following procedures:

- We interviewed key personnel to gain an understanding of the county's process for apportioning and allocating property tax revenues.
- 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 judgmentally selected a non-statistical sample of five from approximately 262 taxing jurisdictions within the county for all fiscal years in the audit period.<sup>1</sup> Then, we:
  - Tested apportionment and allocation reports to verify computations used to develop property tax apportionment factors;

<sup>1</sup> 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.

- Tested TRA reports to verify that the correct TRA factors were used in the computation of the ATI;
- 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;
- Verified computations used to develop supplemental property tax apportionment factors;
- Verified unitary and operating nonunitary, unitary regulated railway, qualified electric property computations used to develop apportionment factors;
- Reviewed redevelopment agency reports and verified computations used to develop the project base amount and the tax increment distributed to the redevelopment agency;
- Reviewed Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund deposits;
- 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;
- 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;
- 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;
- Reviewed reports to determine any increases in property tax revenues due cities having low or nonexistent property tax amounts; and
- Reviewed California State Board of Equalization jurisdictional change filing logs and their impact on the tax apportionment and allocation system.

No errors were found.

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 Orange County complied with California statutes for the apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues for the audit period.

**Follow-up on  
Prior Audit  
Findings**

Our prior audit report, for the period of July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2017, issued on July 6, 2018, included no findings related to the apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues by Orange County.

**Views of  
Responsible  
Officials**

We discussed our audit results with Orange County's representative during an exit conference conducted on September 8, 2022. The county's representative responded via email the same day, stating that the county agreed with the audit results.

**Restricted Use**

This audit report is solely for the information and use of Orange 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](http://www.sco.ca.gov).

*Original signed by*

KIMBERLY TARVIN, CPA  
Chief, Division of Audits

October 27, 2022



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

**<http://www.sco.ca.gov>**