KINGS COUNTY
ASSESSMENT PRACTICES SURVEY

FEBRUARY 2023

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

TED GAINES, SACRAMENTO	FIRST DISTRICT
SALLY J. LIEBER, SAN FRANCISCO	SECOND DISTRICT
ANTONIO VAZQUEZ, SANTA MONICA	THIRD DISTRICT
MIKE SCHAEFER, SAN DIEGO	FOURTH DISTRICT
MALIA M. COHEN	STATE CONTROLLER

YVETTE M. STOWERS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
PROPERTY TAX DEPARTMENT
PO BOX 942879, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 94279-0064
1-916-274-3350 ● FAX 1-916-285-0134
www.boe.ca.gov

TED GAINES
First District, Sacramento

SALLY J. LIEBER
Second District, San Francisco

ANTONIO VAZQUEZ
Third District, Santa Monica

MIKE SCHAEFER
Fourth District, San Diego

MALIA M. COHEN
State Controller

YVETTE M. STOWERS
Executive Director

February 7, 2023

TO COUNTY ASSESSORS:

No. 2023/005

KINGS COUNTY
ASSESSMENT PRACTICES SURVEY

A copy of the Kings County Assessment Practices Survey Report is enclosed for your information. The State Board of Equalization (BOE) completed this survey in fulfillment of the provisions of sections 15640-15646 of the Government Code. These code sections provide that the BOE shall make surveys in specified counties to determine that the practices and procedures used by the County Assessor in the valuation of properties are in conformity with all provisions of law.

The Honorable Kristine Lee, Kings County Assessor/Clerk/Recorder, was provided a draft of this report and given an opportunity to file a written response to the findings and recommendations contained therein. The report, including the Assessor's response, constitutes the final survey report, which is distributed to the Governor, the Attorney General, and the State Legislature; and to the Kings County Board of Supervisors and Grand Jury.

Fieldwork for this survey was performed by the BOE's County-Assessed Properties Division in March 2022. The report does not reflect changes implemented by the Assessor after the fieldwork was completed.

Ms. Lee and staff gave their complete cooperation during the survey. We gratefully acknowledge their patience and courtesy during the interruption of their normal work routine.

Sincerely,

/s/ David Yeung

David Yeung
Deputy Director
Property Tax Department

DY:dcl
Enclosure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION **1**

OBJECTIVE **2**

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY **2**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY **4**

OVERVIEW OF KINGS COUNTY **6**

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS **7**

ASSESSMENT OF REAL PROPERTY **8**
- CHANGE IN OWNERSHIP 8
- NEW CONSTRUCTION 9

ASSESSMENT OF PERSONAL PROPERTY AND FIXTURES **12**
- BUSINESS EQUIPMENT VALUATION 12

APPENDIX A: STATISTICAL DATA **14**
- TABLE 1: ASSESSMENT ROLL 14
- TABLE 2: CHANGE IN ASSESSED VALUES 14
- TABLE 3: GROSS BUDGET AND STAFFING 15
- TABLE 4: ASSESSMENT APPEALS 15
- TABLE 5: EXEMPTIONS – WELFARE 16
- TABLE 6: CHANGE IN OWNERSHIP 16
- TABLE 7: NEW CONSTRUCTION 17
- TABLE 8: DECLINES IN VALUE 17
- TABLE 9: AUDITS 18

APPENDIX B: COUNTY-ASSESSED PROPERTIES DIVISION SURVEY GROUP **19**

APPENDIX C: RELEVANT STATUTES AND REGULATIONS **20**

ASSESSOR'S RESPONSE TO BOE'S FINDINGS **21**

INTRODUCTION

Although county government has the primary responsibility for local property tax assessment, the State has both a public policy interest and a financial interest in promoting fair and equitable assessments throughout California. The public policy interest arises from the impact of property taxes on taxpayers and the inherently subjective nature of the assessment process. The financial interest derives from state law that annually guarantees California schools a minimum amount of funding; to the extent that property tax revenues fall short of providing this minimum amount of funding, the State must make up the difference from the general fund.

The assessment practices survey program is one of the State's major efforts to address these interests and to promote uniformity, fairness, equity, and integrity in the property tax assessment process. Under this program, the State Board of Equalization (BOE) periodically reviews the practices and procedures (surveys) of specified County Assessors' offices. This report reflects the BOE's findings in its current survey of the Kings County Assessor/Clerk/Recorder's Office.[1]

The Assessor is required to file with the board of supervisors a response that states the manner in which the Assessor has implemented, intends to implement, or the reasons for not implementing the recommendations contained in this report. Copies of the response are to be sent to the Governor, the Attorney General, the BOE, and the Senate and Assembly; and to the Kings County Board of Supervisors and Grand Jury. That response is to be filed within one year of the date the report is issued and annually thereafter until all issues are resolved. The Honorable Ms. Lee, Kings County Assessor/Clerk/Recorder, elected to file their initial response prior to the publication of our survey; it is included in this report following the Appendices.

[1] This review covers only the assessment functions of the office.

OBJECTIVE

The survey shall "…show…the extent to which assessment practices are consistent with or differ from state law and regulations."[2] The primary objective of a survey is to ensure the Assessor's compliance with state law governing the administration of local property taxation. This objective serves the three-fold purpose of protecting the state's interest in the property tax dollar, promoting fair treatment of taxpayers, and maintaining the overall integrity and public confidence in the property tax system in California.

The objective of the survey program is to promote statewide uniformity and consistency in property tax assessment by reviewing each specified county's property assessment practices and procedures, and publishing an assessment practices survey report. Every Assessor is required to identify and assess all properties located within the county – unless specifically exempt – and maintain a database or "roll" of the properties and their assessed values. If the Assessor's roll meets state requirements, the county is allowed to recapture some administrative costs.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Government Code sections 15640 and 15642 define the scope of an assessment practices survey. As directed by those statutes, our survey addresses the adequacy of the procedures and practices employed by the Assessor in the valuation of property, the volume of assessing work as measured by property type, and the performance of other duties enjoined upon the Assessor.

Pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code[3] section 75.60, the BOE determines through the survey program whether a county assessment roll meets the standards for purposes of certifying the eligibility of the county to continue to recover costs associated with administering supplemental assessments. Such certification is obtained either by satisfactory statistical result from a sampling of the county's assessment roll or by a determination by the survey team – based on objective standards defined in regulation – that there are no significant assessment problems in the county.

This survey examined the assessment practices of the Kings County Assessor's Office for the 2021-22 assessment roll. Since this survey did not include an assessment sample pursuant to Government Code section 15640(c), our review included an examination to determine whether "significant assessment problems" exist, as defined by Rule 371.

Our survey methodology of the Kings County Assessor's Office included reviews of the Assessor's records, interviews with the Assessor and their staff, and contacts with officials in other public agencies in Kings County who provided information relevant to the property tax assessment program.

[2] Government Code section 15642.

[3] Unless otherwise stated, all statutory references are to the California Revenue and Taxation Code and all rule references are to sections of California Code of Regulations, Title 18, Public Revenues.

For a detailed description of the scope of our review of county assessment practices, ~~please refer to the document entitled *Scope of Assessment Practices Surveys,* which is available on the BOE's website at http://www.boe.ca.gov/Assessors/pdf/Scopemaster.pdf.~~ as of 10/2/2025, please refer to the updated URL on the BOE's website https://boe.ca.gov/proptaxes/assessment-practices-survey-division/scope.htm. Additionally, detailed descriptions of assessment practices survey topics, authoritative citations, and related information can be found at https://www.boe.ca.gov/proptaxes/apscont.htm.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report offers recommendations to help the Assessor correct assessment problems identified by the survey team. The survey team makes recommendations when assessment practices in a given area are not in accordance with property tax law or generally accepted appraisal practices. An assessment practices survey is not a comprehensive audit of the Assessor's entire operation. The survey team does not examine internal fiscal controls or the internal management of an Assessor's office outside those areas related to assessment. In terms of current auditing practices, an assessment practices survey resembles a compliance audit – the survey team's primary objective is to determine whether assessments are being made in accordance with property tax law.

We examined the assessment practices of the Kings County Assessor's Office for the 2021-22 assessment roll.

During our survey, we conducted reviews of the following areas:

- Administration

  We reviewed the Assessor's administrative policies and procedures that affect both the real property and business property assessment programs. Specific areas reviewed include budget and staffing, workload, assessment appeals, and exemptions. In the area of administration, the Assessor is effectively managing the workload, assessment appeals, and exemptions programs.

- Assessment of Real Property

  We reviewed the Assessor's program for assessing real property. Specific areas reviewed include properties having experienced a change in ownership, new construction assessments, declines in value, and certain properties subject to special assessment procedures, such as mineral property. In the area of real property assessment, the Assessor has effective programs for declines in value and mineral property. However, we made recommendations for improvement in the change in ownership and new construction programs.

- Assessment of Personal Property and Fixtures

  We reviewed the Assessor's program for assessing personal property and fixtures. Specific areas reviewed include conducting audits, processing business property statements, and business equipment valuation. In the area of personal property and fixtures assessment, the Assessor has effective programs for conducting audits and processing business property statements. However, we made recommendations for improvement in the business equipment valuation program.

Despite the recommendations noted in this report, we found most properties and property types are assessed correctly, and the overall quality of the assessment roll meets state standards.

We found no significant assessment problems as defined in Rule 371. Since Kings County was not selected for assessment sampling pursuant to Government Code section 15643(b), this report does not include the assessment ratios that are generated for surveys that include assessment sampling. Accordingly, pursuant to section 75.60, Kings County continues to be eligible for recovery of costs associated with administering supplemental assessments.

OVERVIEW OF KINGS COUNTY

Kings County is located in central California, and was created in 1893. The county encompasses a total area of 1,391.53 square miles, consisting of 1,389.42 square miles of land area and 2.11 square miles of water area. Kings County is bordered by Fresno County to the north, Tulare County to the east, Kern and San Luis Obispo Counties to the south, and Monterey County to the west.

As of 2021, Kings County had an estimated population of 153,443. There are four incorporated cities in Kings County. Those cities include Avenal, Corcoran, Hanford, and Lemoore. The county seat is Hanford.

The Kings County local assessment roll ranks 37th in value of the 58 county assessment rolls in California.[4]

[4] Statistics provided ~~by BOE's Table 7 – *Assessed Value of County Assessed Property Subject to General Property Taxes*, for year 2021-22.~~ as of 10/2/2025, by the BOE Open Data Portal dataset - *County Assessed Property Values, by Property Class and County (Table 7)*, for year 2021-22.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As noted previously, our review concluded that the Kings County assessment roll meets the requirements for assessment quality established by section 75.60. This report does not provide a detailed description of all areas reviewed; it addresses only the deficiencies discovered.

Following is a list of the formal recommendations contained in this report.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Improve the LEOP program by: (1) reassessing all properties owned by a legal entity undergoing a change in control or ownership, and (2) properly applying penalties in accordance with section 482(b). 9

RECOMMENDATION 2: Improve the new construction program by: (1) classifying septic systems as structural improvements pursuant to Rule 124, and (2) granting new construction exclusions for claims for disabled access improvements only upon compliance with section 74.6. 10

RECOMMENDATION 3: Improve the business equipment valuation program by: (1) applying the agricultural mobile equipment percent good factors prescribed in Table 6 of Assessors' Handbook Section 581, *Equipment and Fixtures Index, Percent Good and Valuation Factors* (AH 581), as intended; and (2) correctly classifying machinery and equipment reported on the business property statement (BPS).....12

ASSESSMENT OF REAL PROPERTY

Change in Ownership

Section 60 defines change in ownership as a transfer of a present interest in real property, including the beneficial use thereof, the value of which is substantially equal to the value of the fee simple interest. Sections 61 through 69.5 further clarify what is considered a change in ownership and what is excluded from the definition of a change in ownership for property tax purposes. Section 50 requires the Assessor to enter a base year value on the roll for the lien date next succeeding the date of the change in ownership; a property's base year value is its fair market value on the date of the change in ownership.[5]

Legal Entity Ownership Program (LEOP)

Section 64 provides that certain transfers of ownership interests in a legal entity constitute a change in ownership of all real property owned by the entity and any entities under its ownership control. Rule 462.180 interprets and clarifies section 64, providing examples of transactions that either do or do not constitute a change in entity control and, hence, either do or do not constitute a change in ownership of the real property owned by the entity. Discovery of these types of changes in ownership is difficult for Assessors, because ordinarily there is no recorded document evidencing a transfer of an ownership interest in a legal entity.

To assist Assessors, the BOE's LEOP Section gathers and disseminates information regarding changes in control and ownership of legal entities that hold an interest in California real property on a monthly basis, LEOP transmits to each County Assessor a listing, with corresponding property schedules, of legal entities that have reported a change in control under section 64(c) or change in ownership under section 64(d). However, because the property affected is self-reported by the person or entity filing information with the BOE, LEOP advises Assessors to independently research each entity's property holdings to determine whether all affected parcels have been identified and properly reappraised.

Sections 480.1, 480.2, and 482 set forth the filing requirements and penalty provisions for reporting legal entity changes in control under section 64(c)(1) and changes in ownership under section 64(d). A change in ownership statement must be filed with the BOE within 90 days of the date of change in control or change in ownership; reporting is made on BOE-100-B, *Statement of Change in Control and Ownership of Legal Entities*. Section 482(b) requires the County Assessor to impose a penalty if a person or legal entity required to file a statement under sections 480.1 and 480.2 does not do so within 90 days from the earlier of (1) the date of change in control or ownership or (2) the date of written request by the BOE. The BOE advises County Assessors of entities that are subject to penalty, so they can impose the applicable penalty to the entity's real property.

[5] For a detailed description of the scope of our review of this topic, ~~please refer to the document entitled *Change in Ownership*, which is available on the BOE's website at http://www.boe.ca.gov/Assessors/pdf/cio_general.pdf.~~ as of 10/2/2025, please refer to the updated URL on the BOE's website https://boe.ca.gov/proptaxes/change-in-ownership/.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Improve the LEOP program by: (1) reassessing all properties owned by a legal entity undergoing a change in control or ownership, and (2) properly applying penalties in accordance with section 482(b).

Reassess all properties owned by a legal entity undergoing a change in control or ownership.

We found several properties owned by legal entities having undergone a change in control or ownership that had not been reassessed, even though the Assessor had been notified of the change in control or ownership by the BOE's LEOP Section.

Section 64(c)(1) provides that when a legal entity or any other person obtains control through direct or indirect ownership or control of more than 50 percent of the voting stock of any corporation, or obtains a majority ownership interest in any partnership, limited liability company, or other legal entity through the purchase or transfer of corporate stock, partnership, or limited liability company interest, the purchase or transfer of that stock or interest shall be a change in ownership of the real property owned by the legal entity in which the controlling interest was obtained.

By not reassessing properties owned by legal entities identified as having undergone a change in control or ownership, the Assessor may be enrolling incorrect assessments for those properties.

Properly apply penalties in accordance with section 482(b).

We found instances where penalties were not applied when an entity did not timely file a BOE-100-B, even though the Assessor had been notified by the BOE's LEOP Section that the penalty applied.

Section 482(b) states that if a legal entity required to file a statement described in sections 480.1 or 480.2 fails to do so within 90 days from the earlier of (1) the date of the change in control or the change in ownership of the legal entity, or (2) the date of a written request by the BOE, a specific penalty will be applied.

The BOE provides the Assessor with several reports, as well as copies of BOE-100-B filings, indicating whether a penalty applies. The Assessor should utilize these reports and the BOE-100-B filings to identify legal entities with late-filings, or failures to file, and apply the penalty accordingly.

By failing to apply the required penalty, the Assessor is not in compliance with statutory requirements.

New Construction

Section 70 defines newly constructed property, or new construction, as (1) any addition to real property since the last lien date, or (2) any alteration of land or improvements since the last lien date that constitutes a major rehabilitation of the property or converts the property to a different use. Further, section 70 establishes that any rehabilitation, renovation, or modernization that

converts an improvement to the substantial equivalent of a new improvement constitutes a major rehabilitation of the improvement. Section 71 requires the Assessor to determine the full cash value of newly constructed real property on each lien date while construction is in progress and on its date of completion, and provides that the full cash value of completed new construction becomes the new base year value of the newly constructed property.[6]

RECOMMENDATION 2: Improve the new construction program by: (1) classifying septic systems as structural improvements pursuant to Rule 124, and (2) granting new construction exclusions for claims for disabled access improvements only upon compliance with section 74.6.

Classify septic systems as structural improvements pursuant to Rule 124.

We found several examples where the Assessor incorrectly classified septic systems as land.

Rule 124(b)(2) provides that buried tanks are classified as improvements. While some components of septic systems may include grading that could be classified as land, septic systems are generally classified as improvements and should be valued as such.

By classifying and assessing septic systems as land, the Assessor is underassessing the structural improvements, while overassessing the land. This may also result in incorrect special assessments.

Grant new construction exclusions for claims for disabled access improvements only upon compliance with section 74.6.

We found several examples where the Assessor excluded from new construction assessment disabled access improvements constructed for the purpose of making a building or structure more accessible to, or more usable by, a disabled person without the information required by section 74.6. If the permit description indicates it is for a disabled person to have access to an improvement, the permit is filed with the building record and notes are made indicating the permit description. The Assessor does not assess the new construction nor request BOE-63-A, *Claim for Disabled Accessibility Construction Exclusion from Assessment,* be filed to qualify for the exclusion.

For buildings other than owner-occupied dwellings, section 74.6 provides that "newly constructed" and "new construction" does not include the construction, installation, removal, or modification of any portion or structural component of an existing building or structure to the extent that it is done for the purpose of making the building or structure more accessible to, or more usable by, a disabled person. For this exclusion to apply, the following must be met: (1) the construction, installation, removal, or modification must be completed on or after June 7, 1994, to an existing building; (2) the work performed must be for the purpose of making the building

[6] For a detailed description of the scope of our review of this topic, ~~please refer to the document entitled *New Construction,* which is available on the BOE's website at http://www.boe.ca.gov/Assessors/pdf/newconstruction_general.pdf.~~ as of 10/2/2025, please refer to the updated URL on the BOE's website https://boe.ca.gov/proptaxes/new-construction/.

more accessible to, or more usable by, a disabled person; and (3) the construction must not qualify for the construction exclusion provided by section 74.3(a).

To receive the exclusion, the following shall be submitted to the Assessor: (1) notification by the property owner prior to, or within 30 days of, completion of any project that the property owner intends to claim the exclusion for improvements making the building or structure more accessible to, or usable by, a disabled person; (2) a statement from the property owner, primary contractor, civil engineer, or architect identifying those portions of the project making building or structure more accessible to, or usable by, a disabled person; and (3) all documents necessary to support the exclusion, filed by the property owner, no later than six months after the completion of the project.

Use of BOE-63-A facilitates this process. This form guides the property owner in providing the Assessor the statements and certifications necessary to receive the exclusion. If the information required by section 74.6 is not provided, the Assessor is not authorized to exclude new construction from assessment for improvements intended to provide accessibility or usability for a disabled person.

Failure to obtain the necessary information required by section 74.6 may result in the Assessor granting exclusions for new construction that would otherwise be taxable.

ASSESSMENT OF PERSONAL PROPERTY AND FIXTURES

Business Equipment Valuation

Assessors value most machinery and equipment using business property valuation factors. Some valuation factors are derived by combining price index factors with percent good factors, while other valuation factors result from valuation studies. Under this methodology, value for taxation purposes is established by multiplying a property's historical cost by an appropriate valuation factor.[7]

RECOMMENDATION 3: Improve the business equipment valuation program by: (1) applying the agricultural mobile equipment percent good factors prescribed in Table 6 of Assessors' Handbook Section 581, *Equipment and Fixtures Index, Percent Good and Valuation Factors* (AH 581), as intended; and (2) correctly classifying machinery and equipment reported on the business property statement (BPS).

Apply the agricultural mobile equipment percent good factors prescribed in Table 6 of AH 581, as intended.

When valuing agricultural mobile equipment, we found that the Assessor uses the Board-prescribed average percent good factors published in Table 6 of AH 581 for all agricultural mobile equipment, regardless of whether the taxpayer reported that the equipment was purchased "new" or "used".

Section 401.16(a)(2) allows the Assessor to average the new or used percent good factor tables for agricultural mobile equipment when the property owner does not indicate on the BPS whether the equipment is first acquired new or used. However, when the condition is known, the Assessor may not average the published percent good factor tables to apply these factor tables to both classes of new and used property. Mobile equipment depreciates at different rates depending on its condition when purchased. In order to ensure the most accurate value indicator possible, appropriate valuation tables should be utilized when sufficient information is available. When the condition is known, the Assessor should apply the appropriate percent good factor tables.

By using average percent good factors on all agricultural mobile equipment, regardless of whether the condition at the time of purchase is known, the Assessor is failing to follow statute and may be enrolling incorrect assessments.

[7] For a detailed description of the scope of our review of this topic, ~~please refer to the document entitled *Business Equipment Valuation,* which is available on the BOE's website at http://www.boe.ca.gov/Assessors/pdf/businessequipval_general.pdf.~~ as of 10/2/2025, please refer to the updated URL on the BOE's website https://boe.ca.gov/proptaxes/business-equipment-valuation/.

Correctly classify machinery and equipment reported on the BPS.

We found that the Assessor does not consistently allocate machinery and equipment costs between personal property and fixtures on the assessment roll. The Assessor does not consistently allocate a percentage of machinery and equipment to fixtures when acquisition costs are reported in bulk, despite standardized fixture allocation tables. In addition, we observed some service station fixtures classified as personal property upon enrollment.

Classification is an important element of the local assessment function for several reasons. Principally, it is important because property tax law requires the assessment roll to show separate values for land, improvements (including fixtures), and personal property. It is also significant because of the assessment differences between real property and personal property. Special assessments are levied only on real property, which includes fixtures, and personal property is appraised annually at market value, while fixtures are subject to article XIII A of the California Constitution and considered a separate appraisal unit when measuring declines in value.

The Assessor should make a concerted effort to prorate machinery and equipment costs reported on Schedule A of the BPS between personal property and fixtures, particularly when enrolling taxable property related to industries that are likely to mix fixtures and personal property in reported cost data. The Assessor's current practice may lead to inaccurate allocations between fixtures and personal property in specific industry settings and cause incorrect assessments.

APPENDIX A: STATISTICAL DATA

Table 1: Assessment Roll

The following table displays pertinent information from the 2021-22 assessment roll.[8]

	PROPERTY TYPE	ENROLLED VALUE
Secured Roll	Land	$3,659,455,896
	Improvements	$7,810,529,238
	Fixtures	$472,742,801
	Personal Property	$463,749,852
	Total Secured	$12,406,477,787
Unsecured Roll	Land	$10,203,766
	Improvements	$40,867,511
	Fixtures	$233,282,007
	Personal Property	$425,670,949
	Total Unsecured	$710,024,233
Exemptions[9]		($582,924,302)
	Total Assessment Roll	$12,533,577,718

Table 2: Change in Assessed Values

The following table summarizes the change in assessed values over recent years:[10]

ROLL YEAR	TOTAL ROLL VALUE	CHANGE	STATEWIDE CHANGE
2021-22	$12,533,578,000	4.5%	4.1%
2020-21	$11,990,879,000	5.4%	5.0%
2019-20	$11,374,051,000	6.0%	6.1%
2018-19	$10,725,913,000	3.4%	6.5%
2017-18	$10,377,491,000	4.0%	6.3%

[8] Statistics provided by BOE-822, *Report of Assessed Values By City*. County 16 Kings, for year 2021.

[9] The value of the Homeowners' Exemption is excluded from the exemptions total.

[10] Statistics provided ~~by BOE's Table 7 – *Assessed Value of County Assessed Property Subject to General Property Taxes*, for years 2017-18 through 2021-22.~~ as of 10/2/2025, by the BOE Open Data Portal dataset - *County Assessed Property Values, by Property Class and County (Table 7)*.

Table 3: Gross Budget and Staffing

The Assessor's budget has decreased from $2,417,785 in fiscal year 2016-17 to $2,291,453 in fiscal year 2020-21, with a reported high of $2,613,520 in fiscal year 2017-18.

As of the date of our survey, the Assessor had 24 budgeted permanent staff. This included the Assessor, 4 managers, 9 real property appraisers, 2 auditor-appraisers, 1 cadastral draftsperson, and 8 support staff.[11]

The following table identifies the Assessor's budget and staffing over recent fiscal years:[12]

FISCAL YEAR	GROSS BUDGET	PERCENT CHANGE	PERMANENT STAFF
2020-21	$2,291,453	-10.4%	24.00
2019-20	$2,556,920	3.9%	23.00
2018-19	$2,462,105	-5.8%	23.00
2017-18	$2,613,520	8.1%	24.00
2016-17	$2,417,785	2.2%	23.75

Table 4: Assessment Appeals

The following table shows the number of assessment appeals filed in recent fiscal years:[13]

FISCAL YEAR	ASSESSMENT APPEALS FILED
2020-21	63
2019-20	28
2018-19	22
2017-18	30
2016-17	22

[11] Statistics provided ~~by *A Report on Budget, Personnel, and Appeals Data* for years 2016-17 through 2020-21 & *Roll Data* for years 2017-18 through 2021-22.~~ as of 10/2/2025, by the BOE Open Data Portal dataset - *Budgeted Permanent Positions*.

[12] Statistics provided ~~by *A Report on Budget, Personnel, and Appeals Data* for years 2016-17 through 2020-21 & *Roll Data* for years 2017-18 through 2021-22.~~ as of 10/2/2025, by the BOE Open Data Portal datasets - *Gross and Net Budget* and *Budgeted Permanent Positions*.

[13] Statistics provided ~~by *A Report on Budget, Personnel, and Appeals Data* for years 2016-17 through 2020-21 & *Roll Data* for years 2017-18 through 2021-22.~~ as of 10/2/2025, by the BOE Open Data Portal dataset - *Distribution of Assessment Appeals by Property Types.*

Table 5: Exemptions – Welfare

The following table shows welfare exemption data for recent roll years:[14]

ROLL YEAR	WELFARE EXEMPTIONS	EXEMPTED VALUE
2021-22	256	$443,927,635
2020-21	286	$427,308,491
2019-20	262	$422,911,678
2018-19	285	$481,002,750
2017-18	197	$393,750,098

Table 6: Change in Ownership

The following table shows the total number of transfer documents received and the total number of reappraisable transfers due to changes in ownership processed in recent roll years:[15]

ROLL YEAR	TOTAL TRANSFER DOCUMENTS RECEIVED	REAPPRAISABLE TRANSFERS
2021-22	6,827	2,899
2020-21	6,372	2,827
2019-20	8,048	2,975
2018-19	8,627	2,886
2017-18	7,583	2,957

[14] Statistics provided by BOE-802, *Report on Exemptions* for years 2017-18 through 2021-22.

[15] Statistics provided by Assessor for roll years 2017-18 through 2019-20. Remaining statistics ~~provided by *A Report on Budget, Personnel, and Appeals Data* for years 2019-20 and 2020-21 & *Roll Data* for years 2020-21 and 2021-22.~~ as of 10/2/2025, provided by the BOE Open Data Portal dataset - *Real Property Workload Data, Transfers*.

Table 7: New Construction

The following table shows the total number of building permits received and the total number of new construction assessments processed in recent roll years:[16]

ROLL YEAR	TOTAL BUILDING PERMITS RECEIVED	NEW CONSTRUCTION ASSESSMENTS
2021-22	5,206	869
2020-21	4,711	877
2019-20	3,110	948
2018-19	3,671	1,187
2017-18	4,260	1,736

Table 8: Declines In Value

The following table shows the total number of decline-in-value assessments in recent roll years:[17]

ROLL YEAR	DECLINE-IN-VALUE ASSESSMENTS
2021-22	1,918
2020-21	2,360
2019-20	2,996
2018-19	3,382
2017-18	3,829

[16] Statistics provided ~~by *A Report on Budget, Personnel, and Appeals Data* for years 2016-17 through 2020-21 & *Roll Data* for years 2017-18 through 2021-22.~~ as of 10/2/2025 by the BOE Open Data Portal dataset - *Real Property Workload Data, New Construction*.

[17] Statistics provided ~~by *A Report on Budget, Personnel, and Appeals Data* for years 2016-17 through 2020-21 & *Roll Data* for years 2017-18 through 2021-22.~~ as of 10/2/2025, by the BOE Open Data Portal dataset - *Real Property Workload Data, Proposition 8*.

Table 9: Audits

The following table shows the minimum number of audits required to be conducted and the total number of audits completed in recent fiscal years.[18]

MINIMUM NUMBER OF AUDITS REQUIRED[19]	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Largest Assessments			12	13	12
All Other Taxpayers			13	12	13
Total Required			**25**	**25**	**25**
NUMBER OF AUDITS COMPLETED					
Total Audits Completed	**17**	**26**	**39**	**1**	**12**
Largest Assessments	14	14	6	1	5
Over/(Under) Required			**(6)**	**(12)**	**(7)**
All Other Taxpayers	3	12	33	0	7
Over/(Under) Required			**20**	**(13)**	**(6)**
CCCASE AUDITS					
Prepared for other County Assessors	0	0	0	0	0

[18] Statistics provided ~~by *A Report on Budget, Personnel, and Appeals Data* for years 2016-17 through 2020-21 & *Roll Data* for years 2017-18 through 2021-22.~~ as of 10/2/2025, by the BOE Open Data Portal dataset - *Business Property Workload Data, Audits*.

[19] See Letter To Assessors (LTA) No. 2009/049, *Significant Number of Business Property Audits*, for the minimum number of annual audits required pursuant to the provisions of section 469 for years 2016-17 through 2018-19. Effective January 1, 2019, section 469 was amended to give Assessors more flexibility in completing the number of audits by allowing for the four-year total of required annual audits to be completed within a four-year period of time, rather than annually, beginning with the 2019-20 fiscal year. For more information on the amendments to section 469, see LTA No. 2018/067.

APPENDIX B: COUNTY-ASSESSED PROPERTIES DIVISION SURVEY GROUP

Kings County

Deputy Director

David Yeung

Survey Program Director:

Holly Cooper	Principal Property Appraiser

Survey Team Supervisor:

Gary Coates	Supervising Property Appraiser

Survey Team:

James McCarthy	Senior Petroleum and Mining Appraisal Engineer
Amanda Lopez	Senior Specialist Property Appraiser
Alexander B. Fries	Senior Specialist Property Auditor Appraiser
Nicole Grady	Associate Property Appraiser
Hanju Lee	Assistant Property Appraiser
Dany Lunetta	Associate Governmental Program Analyst

APPENDIX C: RELEVANT STATUTES AND REGULATIONS

Reference	Description
Government Code	
§15640	**Survey by board of county assessment procedures.**
§15641	**Audit of records, appraisal data not public.**
§15642	**Research by board employees.**
§15643	**When surveys to be made.**
§15644	**Recommendations by board.**
§15645	**Survey report, final survey report, Assessor's report.**
§15646	**Copies of final survey reports to be filed with local officials.**
Revenue and Taxation Code	
§75.60	**Allocation for administration.**
Title 18, California Code of Regulations	
Rule 371	**Significant assessment problems.**

ASSESSOR'S RESPONSE TO BOE'S FINDINGS

Section 15645 of the Government Code provides that the Assessor may file with the Board a response to the findings and recommendations in the survey report. The survey report, the Assessor's response, and the BOE's comments regarding the Assessor's response, if any, constitute the final survey report.

The Kings County Assessor's response begins on the next page. The BOE has no comments regarding the response.

KRISTINE LEE
COUNTY OF KINGS
ASSESSOR / CLERK / RECORDER

KINGS COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER
1400 WEST LACEY BLVD
HANFORD, CALIFORNIA 93230-5905

ASSESSOR'S OFFICE (559) 852-2486
FAX – ASSESSOR (559) 582-2794
CLERK/RECORDER'S OFFICE (559) 852-2470
FAX – CLERK/RECORDER (559) 582-6639

January 3, 2023

Mr. David Yeung, Deputy Director
Property Tax Department
California State Board of Equalization
P.O. Box 942879
Sacramento, CA 94279-0064

RE: Kings County Assessment Practices Survey Response

Dear Mr. Yeung:

On behalf of the Kings County Office of the Assessor/Clerk/Recorder, I wish to convey our sincere appreciation to the State Board of Equalization survey team for their thorough review, courtesy, and professionalism during the survey process. We believe that the review and feedback regarding our assessment practices provide objective insight and direction for improvement. Pursuant to Government Code Section 15645, I have reviewed the 2022 Assessment Practices Survey Report and have included, on the following page, my response to the specific recommendations contained therein.

We value the ongoing opportunity to partner with the Board of Equalization to maintain the integrity of the property tax system in Kings County and throughout the State of California. The survey program promotes uniformity, equity and standardized practices which supports public confidence in the reliability of the assessment procedures.

I would like to express my gratitude for the hard work and diligence of the Assessor/Clerk/Recorder staff, including their commitment to providing outstanding customer service by fostering accuracy, efficiency, and effective responses to the needs of the public. Over the last few years, they have worked to generate significant progress and improvements, leading to the minimal recommendations and overall positive survey results.

Respectfully,

Kristine Lee

Kristine Lee
Assessor/Clerk/Recorder

Kings County Assessor's Responses to BOE 2022 Assessment Practices Survey Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Improve the LEOP program by: (1) reassessing all properties owned by a legal entity undergoing a change in control or ownership, and (2) properly applying penalties in accordance with section 482(b).

Response 1: We concur with both issues. This recommendation had been carried out in prior years, but due to staff shortages over the last couple of years, we fell behind in this duty. We have implemented a plan to become current by the end of this fiscal year.

Recommendation 2: Improve the new construction program by: (1) classifying septic systems as structural improvements pursuant to Rule 124, and (2) granting new construction exclusions for claims for disabled access improvements only upon compliance with section 74.6.

Response 2: We concur with both issues and have put procedures in place to comply.

Recommendation 3: Improve the business equipment valuation program by: (1) applying the agricultural mobile equipment percent good factors prescribed in Table 6 of Assessors' Handbook 581, Equipment and Fixtures Index, Percent Good and Valuation Factors (AH 581), as intended; and (2) correctly classifying machinery and equipment reported on the business property statement (BPS).

Response 3: (1) Partially concur. Due to our prior property system limitations on categories of equipment, we were, *at times*, unable to include the breakdown of all categories without hand calculating. Our staffing levels did not allow for hand calculations. When there were available categories in the system, the breakdown between new, used, and average equipment was made. Consequently, it was often the large assessments that had equipment combined into the "average" category during processing of Business Property Statements and many of those underwent any corrections during their mandatory audits. We now have a property system that allows for the additional categories necessary to fully implement this recommendation. (2) We concur and will implement this recommendation by ensuring that certain machinery and equipment costs are prorated between personal property and fixtures.