Prop. 26 – New Limits on Government Fees

Co. Counsels' Ass'n of CA

Fall 2011 Land Use Conference

Napa, CA December 1, 2011

MICHAEL G. COLANTUONO

Colantuono & Levin, PC 11364 Pleasant Valley Road Penn Valley, CA 95946-9000

(530) 432-7359 (voice)

(213) 542-5739 (voice)

(530) 432-7356 (fax)

MColantuono@CLLAW.US

WWW.CLLAW.US

Twitter: @MColantuono; Linked-In: Michael Colantuono

Proposition 26 – Overview

- Proponents' goal was to repeal Sinclair Paint
 Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization and make it
 more difficult for gov'ts to enact fees
- Specific target: Regulatory fees
- Reclassifies many "fees" as "taxes"
- Reiterates that gov't has the burden to prove a fee or charge is not a tax

Impact on State Government

What is a state "tax" under Prop 26?

- "Any levy, charge, or exaction of any kind imposed by the State"
- Unless it falls under one of five exceptions or is not "imposed"
- Overall effect: Legislature must now pass most charges that were formerly "fees" by 2/3^{rds} vote because they are now "taxes"

Changes in Approval Requirements

Taxes	Exceptions (any charge other than a tax)
A 2/3 ^{rds} majority of each house of the Legislature or constitutional initiative approved by a simple majority of voters (Prop. 13)	Majority of each house of the Legislature

Impact on State Government

Programs funded by fees that would likely require a 2/3^{rds} vote if adopted after 1/1/10:

- California Used Oil Recycling Fund
- Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund
- Pesticide Regulation Fund
- Air Pollution Control Fund
- Oil Spill Administration Fund

1: Exception for Benefits & Privileges

A charge imposed for a **specific benefit conferred or privilege granted** directly to the payor

- 1. Not provided to those not charged
- Doesn't exceed reasonable costs to the gov't of conferring the benefit or granting the privilege to the payor

E.g., professional & ABC licenses, franchises

2: Exception for Services & Products

A charge imposed for a **specific government service or product** provided directly to the payor

- 1. Not provided to those not charged
- Doesn't exceed reasonable costs to government of providing service / product

E.g., park services, medical services lssue: free or discounted services / products

3: Exception for Regulatory Costs

A charge imposed for reasonable regulatory costs to the government incident to

- 1. Issuing licenses and permits
- Performing investigations, inspections & audits
- 3. Admin. enforcement and adjudication Issues:
- Unclear how this different from 1st exception
- Unclear if this covers rulemaking and other general administrative costs

4: Exception for Use of Gov't Property

A charge imposed for

- 1. Entrance to or use of gov't property
- 2. Or purchase, rental, or lease of gov't property
- 3. As to state, doesn't cover Vehicle License Fees

E.g., park entrance and equipment rental fees Issue: No reasonable cost limitation; compare burden-shifting language

5: Exception for Fines & Penalties

A fine, penalty, or other monetary charge

- Imposed by the judicial branch of government or the State or a local gov't
- 2. As a result of a violation of law

E.g., criminal fines, parking fines, late penalties

More on Fines & Penalties

- Cal. Tax v. FTB (2010) 190 C.A.4th 1139
 - 20% penalty on late corporate taxes raising
 \$1.4b was not a tax
 - Distinguishing characteristics: label, revenues diminish overtime, triggered by violation
 - No need for findings, good faith defense; postpayment remedy sufficient

Revenue Neutral Laws

- Previously, Legislature arguably could raise a tax w/out 2/3 vote if it lowered another tax by the same amount because Prop. 13 applied to laws that "increased revenues"
- Now, any laws that "result in any taxpayer paying higher tax" must be approved by a 2/3^{rds} majority
- For example, the "gas tax swap"

Retroactivity

- Prop. 26 explicitly "voids" State taxes adopted after 1/1/10 unless readopted by 11/3/11
- No analogous provision for local laws
- Potential examples:
 - Gas tax swap Legislature readopted by 2/3 vote in 2011
 - AB 2398 carpet waste reduction fee
 - AB 1343 paint recovery fee

Retroactivity & AB 32

What about AB 32 (Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006)?

- Legislature adopted AB 32 in 2006
- Health & Safety Code § 38597 gives
 California Air Resources Board authority to impose fees on greenhouse gas emitters
- CARB adopted "Cost of Implementation" fees 9/25/09; OAL approved regulation 6/17/10

Retroactivity & AB 32

- Does Prop. 26 repeal the Cost of Implementation regulation?
- Does Prop. 26 require a 2/3^{rds} vote for future regulations imposing fees?
- Probably not: § 1(a) applies to any change in "state statute" that results in higher taxes
- Similarly, the retroactivity provisions of §3(C) state any tax adopted after 1/1/10 must be "reenacted by the Legislature"

Other Issues

- Changes that indirectly result in a taxpayer paying higher taxes
 - increasing the minimum wage
- Inflation adjustments & other automatic increases
 - Gov't Code § 53750(h)(2)(A) exempts automatic inflation adjustments, but applies only to local gov'ts
 - However, 2/3^{rds} vote not necessary if adjustment does not require a change in "state statute"

Still More Issues

- Unfunded mandates
 - Under the provisions affecting local governments, more funding measures will be subject to voter approval
 - A mandate is "unfunded" if the local agency needs voter approval to fund program

Conclusion as to State

- State fees not falling under any of 5 exceptions are now taxes subject to 2/3^{rds} vote requirement
- Some fees may fall w/in 2 or more exceptions
- Will have significant impact on funding of State environmental, public health, and social programs
- Fees passed before 1/1/10 grandfathered

Local Government Perspective

- Most of what has been said about State also applies to local government but:
 - No retroactivity (protects all existing legislation, including implementation)
 - Much clearer interpretive rules b/c 26 amends
 Prop. 218, so Prop. 218 & Omnibus
 Implementation Act (GC 53750 ff.) apply; cf.
 Greene v. Marin Co. Flood Control & Water Cons.
 Dist. (2010) 49 Cal.4th 277

Exceptions Limited to Cost of Service or Regulation

- Specific Benefit / Privilege (permits, franchises)
- Specific Service / Product (utility charges, park & rec. fees)
- Reasonable Regulatory Fees for licenses & permits (permits, inspections)

Prop. 26 Exceptions Not limited to Cost Recovery

- Fee for entry, use or purchase of gov't property (park & rec. entrance fees, equipment rental, franchises)
- Fines & penalties

Prop. 26 Exceptions Specific to Local Gov't

- Fees imposed as a condition of property development (limited to cost by AB 1600, Gov't Code § 66000 et seq., and other law)
- Assessments & property-related fees subject to Prop. 218 (limited to cost by 218)

Language discrepancies between State & local provisions

- Exceptions for benefits / privileges & services / products: State provision ends w/ providing or granting "to the payor."
- Exception for reasonable regulatory costs state version refers to costs "incident to issuing licenses and permits;" local says "for issuing …"

Another oddity

- Exceptions for reasonable regulatory costs for both State and local governments reference "agricultural marketing orders"
 - Local governments do not enforce such orders

Definitional issue

- State & local provisions define as taxes "any levy, charge, or exaction ... imposed ..."
 - What does "imposed" mean?
 - Ponderosa Homes v. City of San Ramon (1994) 23
 Cal.App.4th 1761, 1770 (dictionary definition suggests force or authority required)
 - Can we exclude:
 - voluntary payments?
 - prices set in competition w/ non-gov't providers?

Another Definitional Issue

- Exceptions refer only to "charges," but seem to have same breadth as "levy, charge or exaction"
- Limiting exceptions to "charges" would make them nearly moot
- Cf. Bighorn-Desert View Water Agency v. Verjil (2006) 39 Cal.4th 205 ("fee" and "charge" synonymous under Prop. 218)

Burden of Proof

- Gov't bears burden to prove by preponderance:
 - Not a tax
 - Fee amount doesn't exceed cost
 - Cost allocation reasonably related to payor's benefits from / burdens on gov't activity
- Burden of Production, too:
 - Homebuilders Ass'n v. Lemoore (2010) 185
 Cal.App.4th 554

More on Burden of Proof

- Doesn't impose cost limit on exceptions 4 7
 - When other law imposes cost limit on a fee, gov't bears burden of proof, but this is not an independent source of a duty to limit fees to cost
- Gov't can choose whether to use benefit or burden justification under Sinclair Paint line of cases from which this test is drawn

Major Impacts on Local Gov't

- Gas & Electric Utilities
- Non-property-based assessments
- Park & Rec. service fees? Cf. Gov't Code § 50402
- Discounts & free passes for fees excepted as benefit
 / privilege or service / product
- Scope of recoverable regulatory costs
- Application to voluntary payments (development agreements, e.g.)
- In-lieu fees

More Impacts of Prop. 26

- Gas & electric rates exempt from 218; not 26
 - General fund transfers now problematic
 - But Prop. 26 is not retroactive
- Some good news for some local governments at expense of other agencies:
 - Fish & Game Fees
 - Booking Fees
 - Property Tax Administration Fees

Prop. 26 Litigation

- Citizens for Fair REU Rates v. City of Redding (Shasta CSC filed 2/11/11)
 - Does PILOT from electric utility violate Prop. 26 when rates, but not PILOT increased post-26?
- Ventura v. United Water Conservation Dist. (Ventura CSC filed 08/11)
 - Challenge to 3:1 ratio of agricultural to M&I groundwater charges under Props. 218 & 26

More Prop. 26 Litigation

- Schmeer v. County of Los Angeles (LASC filed 10/3/11)
 - Does \$0.10 fee on paper bags collected by retailers under County plastic bag ban violate 26?

Prop. 26 To-Do's

- Protect grandfathered fees / fee components
- Be careful when adopting or increasing fees
- Review existing fees
- Considering segregating discretionary from non-discretionary fee proceeds
- Consider fees by agreement rather than by ordinance or rule
- Stay tuned!

Questions?