

# **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS** AGENDA LETTER

Agenda Number:

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

CALIFOR	105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407 Santa Barbara, CA 93101 (805) 568-2240								
		Department Name:	Auditor-Controller						
		Department No.: For Agenda Of:	061 12/1/2009						
		Placement:	Administrative						
		Estimate Time:	1 minimum v C						
		Continued I tem:	NO						
		If Yes, date from:							
		Vote Required:	Majority						
TO:	Board of Supervisors								
FROM:	Department Director(s) Robert W. Geis, CPA (x2101)								
	Contact Info: Jennifer Christensen (x2134)								
SUBJECT: Property Tax Administrative Fee for 2009-10 (SB2557)									
County Counsel Concurrence: Auditor-Controller Concurrence:									
As to form:	Yes No N/A	As to form: $\boxtimes$	Yes No N/A						
Other Concurrence: N/A As to form: Yes No N/A									
Recommen	nded Action(s):								
<ol> <li>Receive and file report prepared by the Santa Barbara County Auditor-Controller establishing the 2009-10 Property Tax Administrative Fee (Exhibits I through III).</li> <li>Adopt the Resolution to impose the fee pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code sections 95.3 and 97.75.</li> </ol>									
Summary:									
The County is allowed to recover a portion of its costs attributable to assessing, collecting and allocating property tax revenues from cities, special districts and redevelopment agencies; school districts and the Education Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) are exempt from paying the costs. For 2009-10 the County's recoverable costs are \$2,565,157, which is approximately 25% of the total net costs.									
Backgroun	<u>d:</u>								
Revenue and Taxation Code (RTC) section 95.3 establishes the method and authorizes the County Auditor to annually determine property tax administrative costs proportionately attributable to cities and special districts and to charge each such entity its proportionate share of costs by withholding same from each entity's property tax distribution. Senate Bill 2557 established the fee in 1990; several modifications to the methodology have been approved by the legislature in the years since.									

Fiscal and Facilities Impacts:

Budgeted: Xes

# Fiscal Analysis:

<u>Entity</u>	<u>Adr</u>	ministrative Cost	<u>R</u>	<u>Not</u> ecoverable	_	irect Credit 1/4 of 1% Fee)	<u>R</u>	ecoverable (SB2557)
County of SB	\$	2,689,720	\$	(2,689,720)	\$	-	\$	-
Cities		1,025,108		-		-		1,025,108
Dependent Special								
Districts		654,498		-		(100,282)		554,216
Independent Special								
Districts		473,343		-		(72,265)		401,078
School Districts		4,609,341		(4,609,341)		-		-
ERAF		48,946		(48,946)		-		-
RDA		584,755				<u>-</u>		584,755
Total 09-10		10,085,711		(7,348,007)		(172,547)		2,565,157
Total 08-09		9,226,121		(6,685,007)		(164,130)		2,376,984
Difference	\$	859,590	\$	(663,000)	\$	(336,677)	\$	188,173

# Staffing Impact(s):

<u>Legal Positions:</u> <u>FTEs:</u>

### **Special Instructions:**

None

# **Attachments:**

Exhibits I, II and III. Resolution

# **Authored by:**

LeAnne Hagerty, CPA (x2180)

# cc:

Anne Rierson, County Counsel