

IMPERIAL COUNTY

Audit Report

APPORTIONMENT AND ALLOCATION OF PROPERTY TAX REVENUES

July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2023



MALIA M. COHEN
California State Controller

April 2024



MALIA M. COHEN
California State Controller

April 30, 2024

The Honorable Karina B. Alvarez, CPA, Auditor-Controller
Imperial County
940 West Main Street, Suite 108
El Centro, CA 92243

Dear Ms. Alvarez:

The State Controller's Office audited Imperial County's process for apportioning and allocating property tax revenues for the period of July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2023. We conducted the audit pursuant to the requirements of Government Code section 12468.

Our audit found an instance of noncompliance with California statutes for the apportionment and allocation of property tax revenues for the audit period. Specifically, we determined that Imperial County incorrectly calculated the qualified electric apportionment amounts.

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: Edith Anaya, Special Accounting Manager
Imperial County Auditor-Controller Department
The Honorable Luis Plancarte, Chairman
Imperial 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
Finding and Recommendation	6
Attachment—County’s Response to Draft Audit Report	

Audit Report

Summary

The State Controller's Office (SCO) audited Imperial 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, 2016, through June 30, 2023.

Our audit found that the county incorrectly calculated the qualified electric (QE) apportionment amounts.

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 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 QE 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 under the authority of 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 is 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, 2016, 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 82 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.
- We verified computations used to develop supplemental property tax apportionment factors.
- We verified unitary and operating nonunitary, unitary regulated railway, and QE property computations used to develop apportionment factors (see the Finding).
- We reviewed redevelopment agency reports and verified computations used to develop the project base amount and the tax increment distributed to the redevelopment agency.
- We reviewed Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund deposits.
- 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 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 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 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 QE apportionment amounts.

This instance of noncompliance is described in the Finding and Recommendation 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, 2007, through June 30, 2016, issued on March 29, 2019.

Views of Responsible Officials

We issued a draft report on February 12, 2024. The county's representative responded by letter dated March 4, 2024, agreeing with the audit results. The county's response is included as an attachment to this 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 TARVIN, CPA
Chief, Division of Audits

April 30, 2024

Finding and Recommendation

FINDING— Qualified electric property apportionment and allocation

During testing of the QE apportionment and allocation process, we found that the county did not make a distinction between enterprise and non-enterprise special districts when apportioning QE revenues. An enterprise district provides specific benefits to its customers, for which the customer pays a fee for the service (e.g., a water district charging water rates to its customers). A non-enterprise district delivers services that provide general benefits to entire communities and are primarily funded through property taxes (e.g., fire protection services).

The county assumed that all special districts were non-enterprise and did not consult the SCO FY 2001-02 Special District Annual Report to make a determination between enterprise and non-enterprise status. This error resulted in misallocation of QE revenues for all years in the audit period. Due to the complexity of the QE property tax allocation, we are unable to quantify the effect of the error.

RTC section 100.95 provides the legal requirements for apportioning and allocating QE property tax revenues. The statute defines qualified property as “all plant and associated equipment, including substation facilities and fee-owned land and easements, placed in service by the public utility on or after January 1, 2007,” and related to electrical substation, generation, and transmission facilities that meet specific criteria.

Recommendation

We recommend that the county:

- Review RTC section 100.95 and update its procedures to ensure that enterprise special districts are excluded from QE apportionments and allocations;
- Recalculate its QE allocation for FY 2016-17 through FY 2022-23; and
- Make monetary adjustments to the affected special districts and the county general fund.

County’s Response

The county agreed with the finding. The county stated that it will recalculate the QE apportionment amounts for FY 2016-17 through FY 2022-23 and make monetary adjustments to the affected taxing entities.

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

Karina B. Alvarez, CPA
Auditor-Controller
karinabalvarez@co.imperial.ca.us



County Administration Center
940 Main Street, Suite 108
El Centro, California 92243
Telephone: 442-265-1295
FAX: 442-265-1296

AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

March 04, 2024

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

Dear Ms. Kurokawa:

We concur with the finding.

As per your recommendation, our County will:

- Review RTC section 100.95 and update procedures to ensure that enterprise special districts are excluded from QE apportionments and allocations.
- Recalculate its QE allocation for FY 2016-17 through 2022-23
- Make monetary adjustments to the affected special districts and the county general funds.

We anticipate to be able to review, recalculate, make adjustments and communicate them to the affected districts on or before June 30, 2024.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Karina B Alvarez, CPA
Auditor-Controller
County of Imperial

Cc: Ms. Kimberly Tarvin, CPA, Chief, Division of Audits

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

www.sco.ca.gov