## PROPERTY TAX NEUTRALITY METHODOLOGY

## INTRODUCTION

The Settlement Agreement ${ }^{1}$ and Stipulation ${ }^{2}$ that established the Land Conservation Commitment require that the Land Conservation Plan being developed by the Stewardship Council provide property tax revenue, other equivalent revenue source, or a lump sum payment, so that the totality of dispositions in each affected county will be "tax neutral" for each county. Section 4.3 of Volume I of the Land Conservation Plan (LCP) adopted by the Stewardship Council in November 2007 described the Stewardship Council's potential strategies and anticipated approach to achieving property tax neutrality at a programmatic level

More recently, on September 17, 2009, the Stewardship Council adopted a funding policy. This policy further clarified the Stewardship Council's approach to property tax neutrality and identified several potential vehicles to achieving this requirement. On March 30, 2011, the Stewardship Council adopted a set of guidelines which describe scenarios in which the Stewardship Council will make property tax payments to affected counties and further defined a set of overarching assumptions regarding property tax neutrality payments.

Table 1 in Appendix A lists the estimated acreage and estimated annual property taxes associated with PG\&E watershed lands which have been recommended by the Stewardship Council Board of Directors for donation. The estimated total tax liability that would be subject to tax neutrality will depend upon the total acreage actually transferred, and the types of organizations receiving fee title to the lands. No PG\&E watershed lands will be recommended for donation in counties that are not listed in Table 1.

## PURPOSE OF PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this methodology is to establish a standard payment process when lands are transferred to organizations that are exempt from paying property taxes. The following methodology will be applied to all counties which experience a loss in property tax revenues due to a recommended donation of fee title as part of the Stewardship Council's Land Conservation Commitment.

## DETERMINING TAX NEUTRALITY PAYMENT AMOUNT

Following the Stewardship Council approval of a fee-title donation, the Stewardship Council will work with the affected county to calculate the payment amount for inclusion in the Stewardship Council's Land Conservation and Conveyance Plan (LCCP).

[^0]1. Using the legal description and/or survey of lands identified for transfer to an organization which is exempt from paying property taxes, the Stewardship Council and PG\&E will prepare an estimate of the annual taxes on lands to be donated. If assessed values on the lands recommended for donation change prior to the transfer of land, the Stewardship Council will revise the payment calculation included in the proposed tax neutrality funding agreement prior to its execution by the parties.
2. The reduction in annual taxes caused by the donation of acres to organizations exempt from property tax will constitute the "Annual Base Value" for the funding calculation.
3. The county will select either the lump-sum, installment payment, or annual payment in perpetuity option (described below) for the selected fee-title donation and communicate their preference in writing to the Stewardship Council.
4. The Stewardship Council will provide a draft funding agreement for county review and approval using the Annual Base Value and payment option. The draft funding agreement is expected to include, among other items, the following acknowledgements by the county:
a. Payment by the Stewardship Council satisfies the tax neutrality requirement as specified in the Settlement and Stipulation for the subject fee-title donation.
b. The county has issued (or will not reasonably withhold) a Welfare Tax Exemption for the new landowner, if required.
c. The county will agree to distribute the lump-sum, installment payment, or annual payment to the applicable special districts as dictated in the relevant Tax Rate Area at the time of payment. In consideration for the additional administrative responsibility of the county to set up the process to allocate payments to special districts, the Stewardship Council will make a $\$ 3,000$ payment to the county for county's anticipated costs to perform such activities for the first fee title donation of lands in the county. Said payment will be made at the time the Stewardship Council makes its lump-sum tax neutrality payment or installment payments to county or sets aside funds for an endowment account to generate funds for annual tax neutrality payments to county. For subsequent fee title donations, if a county expects to incur more than $\$ 3,000$ in costs to perform such activities, then it shall make a request to the Stewardship Council for increased funding no later than 60 days following the recording of the grant deed for each additional fee title donation or the execution of a tax neutrality funding agreement, whichever comes later. The Stewardship Council will review each funding request and provide the county with sufficient funds to cover all reasonable anticipated costs.
5. The Stewardship Council will fund the settlement amount according to the terms of the tax neutrality funding agreement as described in number 4 above no later than 60 days following the recording of the grant deed for the fee title donation or the execution of a tax neutrality funding agreement, whichever comes later.

## OPTIONS FOR FUNDING PROPERTY TAX NEUTRALITY PAYMENTS

The Stewardship Council is presenting three options for making tax neutrality payments: (1) a one-time lump-sum payment; (2) annual installment payments for a maximum number of five years totaling the lump-sum amount; or (3) funding of an independent trustee to continue annual payments in lieu of taxes in perpetuity.

## Lump-sum payment

Lump-sum payments in satisfaction of property tax neutrality would be calculated based upon the net present value of the Annual Base Value at the time that lands are removed from the property tax rolls. The lump-sum payment will be calculated using a discounted cash flows analysis for perpetual payment streams, otherwise known as a Capitalization Rate (Cap Rate).

The Cap Rate calculation requires an assumption of a long-term rate of return on comparable investments, and a long-term inflation rate. In order to develop a Cap Rate for a lump-sum payment, the Stewardship Council considered multiple long-term inputs, including long term equity and fixed income returns (Dow Jones Industrial Average, S\&P 500, U.S. Treasury, CalPERS), weighted average borrowing costs for subject counties, and discount rate assumptions for pension and other post-employment benefits.

Based upon the analysis described above, the Stewardship Council is offering counties a Cap
Rate of $\mathbf{4 . 0 \%}$ to be used in the calculation of a lump-sum payment in satisfaction of property tax neutrality. The calculation for arriving at a lump-sum payment is as follows:

Lump Sum Value $=$ Annual Base Value $\div 4.0 \%$
The following table provides an example of the application of the Cap Rate to various Annual Base Values:

| Annual Base Value | $\$ 500$ | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 5,000$ | $\$ 10,000$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lump Sum at $4.0 \%$ | $\$ 12,500$ | $\$ 25,000$ | $\$ 125,000$ | $\$ 250,000$ |

Lump-sum payments would be allocated based upon the applicable Tax Rate Area at the time of payment. The Stewardship Council envisions making these lump-sum payments as unrestricted payments in lieu of property taxes, subject to the distribution method described in section 4.c above. Counties and special districts would be free to determine the best use of the funds pursuant to the needs of the county or special district, including, if desired investment in a shared investment pool of the county's choosing.

## Installment Payments

The Stewardship Council is willing to pay the amount calculated for the lump-sum payment in annual installment payments totaling the lump-sum amount for a maximum number of five years.

## Annual payments in perpetuity

The Stewardship Council is in negotiations with a professional investment manager to act as investment manager and trustee for an endowment to support the management and monitoring of conservation covenants after the Stewardship Council's dissolution. The Stewardship Council is prepared to make this arrangement available to counties which prefer to receive an annual payment in lieu of property taxes on lands which are removed from the tax rolls.

Under this structure, the Stewardship Council will make a contribution to an endowment account which would be designed to generate enough income to compensate for the lost property tax revenues and pay for annual investment management and trustee fees. The contribution to the endowment account would be calculated based upon the Annual Base Value for lands approved for donations and the expected payout ratio of $4 \%$.

Annual payments out of the endowment account will be calculated based upon a rolling 20 quarter average of the account's ending balance ${ }^{3}$. The practice of calculating payments based upon a rolling average (smoothing) has been shown to reduce the number of significant declines in annual distributions, and increase the total value of payments and invested assets ${ }^{4}$.

Annual payments to counties would be allocated based upon the applicable Tax Rate Area at the time of payment by the receiving county. The Stewardship Council envisions making these annual payments as unrestricted payments in lieu of property taxes, subject to the distribution method described in section 4.c above. Counties and special districts would be free to determine the best use of the funds pursuant to the needs of the county or special district.

Participating counties would be enrolled in a common service model in the investment management account. All counties would share a common investment policy and investment management agreement. Funds will be invested in a commingled account, with the investment manager providing an individual accounting to each individual county.

## Considerations of the Annual Payment Approach

The viability of the annual payment option is subject to a level of participation by the counties which meets the minimum account size (estimated at $\$ 1$ million).

Under this approach annual payments may exceed the original Annual Base Value in some years, and be lower in others, as the payment amount is reliant upon the ending market value of the account.

The Stewardship Council's transaction process is expected to occur serially, over the span of several years. It is likely that the viability and pricing of the annual payment approach will not be known for the initial transactions. Therefore, the Stewardship Council may make the initial annual payments directly to counties until the minimum account size is reached.

Please see Appendix B for more details on the annual payment option.

[^1]
## Appendix A

Estimated acreage and annual property taxes associated with PG\&E watershed lands which have been recommended by the Stewardship Council Board of Directors for donation.

## Table 1

| County | Acres Recommended for <br> Donation | Estimated Annual Taxes on <br> Lands Recommended for <br> Donation (\$) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Alpine | 410 | $\$ 2,941$ |
| Amador | 2,040 | $\$ 8,577$ |
| Butte | 1,263 | $\$ 12,329$ |
| Calaveras | 60 | $\$ 48$ |
| Fresno | 267 | $\$ 2,228$ |
| Lake | 986 | $\$ 31,795$ |
| Madera | 220 | $\$ 12,296$ |
| Mendocino | 847 | $\$ 16,778$ |
| Nevada | 1,867 | $\$ 13,103$ |
| Placer | 2,683 | $\$ 57,064$ |
| Plumas | 2,986 | $\$ 29,928$ |
| Shasta | 23,591 | $\$ 81,872$ |
| Tehama | 151 | $\$ 1,125$ |
| Tuolumne | 868 | $\$ 379$ |
| Yuba | 41 | $\$ 530$ |

Please see Appendix B for more details on the annual payment option

## Appendix B Annual Payment Details

## TRUSTEE SELECTION

The Stewardship Council is performing due diligence for the selection of an investment manager and trustee to administer the trust account for annual payments to counties. Selection will be based upon many factors, including (but not limited to): organization history and reputation, investment management experience, fee structure, and administrative capabilities. Additional information on the selection process can be provided upon request.

## Trustee's Responsibilities:

Upon the Stewardship Council's funding of the trust account, the trustee would assume all responsibilities for making annual payments to counties in lieu of property taxes, including:

## Trust administration

Interpret the trust document.
Distribute trust assets according to the trust document.
Perform principal and income accounting.
Prepare and file tax returns.
Address specific beneficiary issues, reporting, etc.

## Investment management

Invest the trust portfolio assets objectively for the benefit of all interested parties.
Manage portfolio assets in a tax-efficient and tax-effective manner.
Review investment performance to ensure the portfolio is meeting the established goals and objectives.

## The Annual Payment Structure

Using the inputs described in the term sheet, the Stewardship Council will make a contribution to the trust account on behalf of the participating county. The following example illustrates the funding and payout process.

## EXAMPLE: Calculation of Contribution to Trust Account

| Annual Base Value: | $\$ 5,000$ per year |
| :--- | :--- |
| Annual Payout Percentage: | $4.00 \%$ |

Contribution Calculation: $\quad \$ 5,000 \div 0.04=\$ 125,000$

The actual annual payout is dependent upon the following factors:
Annual Rate of Return: The annual rate of return will depend upon investment selections and market and economic performance. While past results are not an accurate predictor of future results, the annual return of the $\mathrm{S} \& \mathrm{P} 500$ has averaged approximately $9 \%-10 \%$ since $1925^{5}$.

Estimated Annual Fees: Annual investment management and trust administration fees will be deducted from the account and are expected to be approximately $1 \%-2 \%$, depending upon the selected investment manager and trustee.

As envisioned, the trustee will make annual payments based upon a rolling 20 quarter average of the account balance ${ }^{6}$. The practice of calculating payments based upon a rolling average (smoothing) has been shown to reduce the number of significant declines in annual distributions, and increase the total value of payments and invested assets ${ }^{7}$. However, this does not guarantee against the possibility of losses in investment principal resulting in payments in some years being less than the county would have otherwise received from property taxes.

The following examples illustrate the payment methodology in two theoretical scenarios. Scenario A shows anticipated annual payments to a county with a stable rate of return. While it is unrealistic to expect no volatility in investment returns, Scenario A shows that the growth in annual payments should keep pace with, or exceed annual inflation, when invested in a balanced portfolio ${ }^{8 .}$

Scenario B shows actual market returns for the S\&P 500 index from 1980 to 2010. While historical returns do not predict future performance, the time period in Scenario B provides a more realistic assumption of variability in stock market returns. Please note that the proposed investment portfolio would not include a $100 \%$ allocation to the S\&P 500 or to equities. A model portfolio would include diversification among equities (small cap, large cap, international) and fixed income investments. This diversification would likely reduce the estimated annual return and reduce volatility.

Please note that both of the scenarios are provided for illustrative purposes only and do not constitute a prediction of future performance on behalf of the Stewardship Council or the prospective investment manager.

[^2]Scenario A: \$125,000 earning a stable return ${ }^{9}$

| Year | Beginning <br> Balance | Annual Return <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | Annual <br> Distribution <br> $\mathbf{( 4 \% )}$ | Fees <br> $\mathbf{- 1 \%}$ | Ending <br> Balance |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | 125,000 | $9.00 \%$ | 11,250 | - | $(1,250)$ | 135,000 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 135,000 | $9.00 \%$ | 12,150 | $(5,400)$ | $(1,350)$ | 140,400 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 140,400 | $9.00 \%$ | 12,636 | $(5,508)$ | $(1,404)$ | 146,124 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 146,124 | $9.00 \%$ | 13,151 | $(5,620)$ | $(1,461)$ | 152,194 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 152,194 | $9.00 \%$ | 13,697 | $(5,737)$ | $(1,522)$ | 158,632 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 158,632 | $9.00 \%$ | 14,277 | $(5,859)$ | $(1,586)$ | 165,464 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 165,464 | $9.00 \%$ | 14,892 | $(6,103)$ | $(1,655)$ | 172,598 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 172,598 | $9.00 \%$ | 15,534 | $(6,360)$ | $(1,726)$ | 180,046 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 180,046 | $9.00 \%$ | 16,204 | $(6,631)$ | $(1,800)$ | 187,818 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 187,818 | $9.00 \%$ | 16,904 | $(6,916)$ | $(1,878)$ | 195,927 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 195,927 | $9.00 \%$ | 17,633 | $(7,215)$ | $(1,959)$ | 204,387 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 204,387 | $9.00 \%$ | 18,395 | $(7,526)$ | $(2,044)$ | 213,211 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 213,211 | $9.00 \%$ | 19,189 | $(7,851)$ | $(2,132)$ | 222,417 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 222,417 | $9.00 \%$ | 20,018 | $(8,190)$ | $(2,224)$ | 232,020 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 232,020 | $9.00 \%$ | 20,882 | $(8,544)$ | $(2,320)$ | 242,038 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 242,038 | $9.00 \%$ | 21,783 | $(8,913)$ | $(2,420)$ | 252,489 |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ | 252,489 | $9.00 \%$ | 22,724 | $(9,297)$ | $(2,525)$ | 263,390 |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | 263,390 | $9.00 \%$ | 23,705 | $(9,699)$ | $(2,634)$ | 274,763 |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 274,763 | $9.00 \%$ | 24,729 | $(10,118)$ | $(2,748)$ | 286,626 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ | 286,626 | $9.00 \%$ | 25,796 | $(10,554)$ | $(2,866)$ | 299,002 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | 299,002 | $9.00 \%$ | 26,910 | $(11,010)$ | $(2,990)$ | 311,912 |
| $\mathbf{2 1}$ | 311,912 | $9.00 \%$ | 28,072 | $(11,486)$ | $(3,119)$ | 325,379 |
| $\mathbf{2 2}$ | 325,379 | $9.00 \%$ | 29,284 | $(11,981)$ | $(3,254)$ | 339,428 |
| $\mathbf{2 3}$ | 339,428 | $9.00 \%$ | 30,549 | $(12,499)$ | $(3,394)$ | 354,084 |
| $\mathbf{2 4}$ | 354,084 | $9.00 \%$ | 31,868 | $(13,038)$ | $(3,541)$ | 369,372 |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ | 369,372 | $9.00 \%$ | 33,243 | $(13,601)$ | $(3,694)$ | 385,320 |
| $\mathbf{2 6}$ | 385,320 | $9.00 \%$ | 34,679 | $(14,189)$ | $(3,853)$ | 401,957 |
| $\mathbf{2 7}$ | 401,957 | $9.00 \%$ | 36,176 | $(14,801)$ | $(4,020)$ | 419,313 |
| $\mathbf{2 8}$ | 419,313 | $9.00 \%$ | 37,738 | $(15,440)$ | $(4,193)$ | 437,417 |
| $\mathbf{2 9}$ | 437,417 | $9.00 \%$ | 39,368 | $(16,107)$ | $(4,374)$ | 456,304 |
| $\mathbf{3 0}$ | 456,304 | $9.00 \%$ | 41,067 | $(16,802)$ | $(4,563)$ | 476,005 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^3]Scenario B: \$125,000 at historical S\&P 500 returns ${ }^{10}$

| Year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Beginning } \\ & \text { Balance } \end{aligned}$ | Ann $\%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Return } \\ \$ \end{gathered}$ | Annual Distribution $(4 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fees } \\ (\mathbf{1 \%}) \end{gathered}$ | Ending Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | 125,000 | 25.8\% | 32,213 | 0 | $(1,250)$ | 155,963 |
| 1981 | 125,000 | -9.7\% | $(12,163)$ | $(6,239)$ | $(1,250)$ | 105,349 |
| 1982 | 105,349 | 14.8\% | 15,550 | $(4,214)$ | $(1,053)$ | 115,631 |
| 1983 | 115,631 | 17.3\% | 19,969 | $(4,420)$ | $(1,156)$ | 130,025 |
| 1984 | 130,025 | 1.4\% | 1,820 | $(4,680)$ | $(1,300)$ | 125,865 |
| 1985 | 125,865 | 26.3\% | 33,140 | $(4,769)$ | $(1,259)$ | 152,977 |
| 1986 | 152,977 | 14.6\% | 22,365 | $(5,039)$ | $(1,530)$ | 168,774 |
| 1987 | 168,774 | 2.0\% | 3,426 | $(5,546)$ | $(1,688)$ | 164,966 |
| 1988 | 164,966 | 16.6\% | 27,401 | $(5,941)$ | $(1,650)$ | 184,777 |
| 1989 | 184,777 | 31.7\% | 58,556 | $(6,379)$ | $(1,848)$ | 235,106 |
| 1990 | 235,106 | -3.1\% | $(7,288)$ | $(7,253)$ | $(2,351)$ | 218,214 |
| 1991 | 218,214 | 30.5\% | 66,490 | $(7,775)$ | $(2,182)$ | 274,747 |
| 1992 | 274,747 | 7.6\% | 20,936 | $(8,622)$ | $(2,747)$ | 284,313 |
| 1993 | 284,313 | 10.1\% | 28,659 | $(9,577)$ | $(2,843)$ | 300,551 |
| 1994 | 300,551 | 1.3\% | 3,967 | $(10,503)$ | $(3,006)$ | 291,009 |
| 1995 | 291,009 | 37.6\% | 109,361 | $(10,951)$ | $(2,910)$ | 386,510 |
| 1996 | 386,510 | 23.0\% | 88,743 | $(12,297)$ | $(3,865)$ | 459,090 |
| 1997 | 459,090 | 33.4\% | 153,152 | $(13,772)$ | $(4,591)$ | 593,880 |
| 1998 | 593,880 | 28.6\% | 169,731 | $(16,248)$ | $(5,939)$ | 741,424 |
| 1999 | 741,424 | 21.0\% | 155,996 | $(19,775)$ | $(7,414)$ | 870,230 |
| 2000 | 870,230 | -9.1\% | $(79,191)$ | $(24,409)$ | $(8,702)$ | 757,927 |
| 2001 | 757,927 | -11.9\% | $(90,118)$ | $(27,380)$ | $(7,579)$ | 632,850 |
| 2002 | 632,850 | -22.1\% | $(139,860)$ | $(28,770)$ | $(6,329)$ | 457,891 |
| 2003 | 457,891 | 28.7\% | 131,369 | $(27,683)$ | $(4,579)$ | 556,999 |
| 2004 | 556,999 | 10.9\% | 60,601 | $(26,207)$ | $(5,570)$ | 585,823 |
| 2005 | 585,823 | 4.9\% | 28,764 | $(23,932)$ | $(5,858)$ | 584,797 |
| 2006 | 584,797 | 15.8\% | 92,339 | $(22,547)$ | $(5,848)$ | 648,741 |
| 2007 | 648,741 | 5.5\% | 35,616 | $(22,674)$ | $(6,487)$ | 655,196 |
| 2008 | 655,196 | -37.0\% | $(242,423)$ | $(24,252)$ | $(6,552)$ | 381,969 |
| 2009 | 381,969 | 26.5\% | 101,069 | $(22,852)$ | $(3,820)$ | 456,366 |
| 2010 | 456,366 | 15.1\% | 68,729 | $(21,817)$ | $(4,564)$ | 498,715 |

## Annualized Return : $\quad 9.6 \%$ (1980-2010)

[^4]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Opinion Modifying the Proposed Settlement Agreement of Pacific Gas \& Electric Company, PG\&E Corporation and the Commission Staff, and Approving the Modified Settlement Agreement, December 18, 2003 :
    http://www.stewardshipcouncil.org/documents/Settlement_Agreement.pdf
    ${ }^{2}$ Stipulation Resolving Issues Regarding the Land Conservation Commitment, September 25, 2003: http://www.stewardshipcouncil.org/documents/Stipulation_Agreement.pdf

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ During the initial four years, the trustee will calculate payments based upon the number of available quarters (e.g. year 1 - rolling 4 quarters, year 2 - rolling 8 quarters, etc.)
    ${ }^{4}$ Smarter Giving for Private Foundations, AllianceBernstein, https://www.alliancebernstein.com/Research-Publications/Black-Books/Foundations-and-Endowments/Stories/Foundations_BlackBook.htm

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ Based upon Historical Average Return of the S\&P 500 index 1925-2010. http://apps.finra.org/investor_information/smart/401k/401104.asp
    Past performance does not guarantee future results.
    ${ }^{6}$ During the initial four years, the trustee will calculate payments based upon the number of available quarters (e.g. year 1 - rolling 4 quarters, year 2 - rolling 8 quarters, etc.).
    ${ }^{7}$ Smarter Giving for Private Foundations, AllianceBernstein, https://www.alliancebernstein.com/Research-Publications/Black-Books/Foundations-and-Endowments/Stories/Foundations_BlackBook.htm
    ${ }^{8}$ Bureau of Labor Statistics, CPI Rate: Jan 1913 to Nov 2011 http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm

[^3]:    ${ }^{9}$ Annual return based upon historical performance of the S\&P 500 index 1925-2010. These figures are provided for illustrative purposes only and do not constitute a prediction of future performance on behalf of the Stewardship Council or the prospective investment manager.

[^4]:    ${ }^{10}$ Annual return based upon historical performance of the S\&P 500 index 1980-2010. These figures are provided for illustrative purposes only and do not constitute a prediction of future performance on behalf of the Stewardship Council or the prospective investment manager.

