## PRESENTATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON LEGAL COVERNMENT BY

### THE KANSAS STATE COURT OF TAX APPEALS

### Janis K. Lee, Chief Hearing Officer

### January 30, 2012

The purpose of this testimony is to provide input about the potential impact of the proposed Senate Bill 347. Senate Bill No. 347 would amend K.S.A. 2011 Supp. § 74-2438a by exempting filing fee requirements for all "municipalities," which is defined as follows:

12-105(a) "Municipality" means and includes county, township, city, school district of whatever name or nature, community junior college, municipal university, city, county or district hospital, drainage district, cemetery district, fire district, and other political subdivision or taxing unit, and including their boards, bureaus, commissions, committees and other agencies, such as, but not limited to, library board, park board, recreation commission, hospital board of trustees having power to create indebtedness and make payment of the same independently of the parent unit.

Municipalities are involved in every equalization appeal, protest appeal, and tax grievance appeal that comes before the Court. These three categories constitute approximately 75% of the cases which the Court handles.

Municipalities appeal small claims decisions to the regular division if they do not agree with the small claims decision. If municipalities did not have to pay a filing fee, they would be provided with a very unfair advantage over any entity paying property taxes that are required to pay a filing fee for the very same appeal. In FY'10 of the 2518 appeals (EQ and PR) filed, 185 were filed by municipalities. In FY'11 of the 2451 appeals (EQ and PR) filed, 153 were filed by municipalities.

If the Court were to no longer charge filing fees to municipalities, as defined by K.S.A. 12-105a, it would cost the Court more than \$240,000 per year at the current fee schedule. That amount totals 24% of all filing fees collected by the Court. Such a reduction would require either an increase in SGF funding (which is very unlikely to occur) or require the Court to again raise filing fees on residential and commercial properties.

By statute, the Court is prohibited from imposing a filing fee on residential appeals to the small claims division and only allowed to raise the filing fee for regular division residential appeals from the current \$25 to \$35. In FY'11, there were 102

Senate Local	Governmen
(- 30 - 2	+01>-
Attachment	5

appeals (EQ and PR) with a \$25 filing fee. In FY' 12 (to date), there has been 137 appeals (EQ and PR) with a \$25 filing fee. This would indicate that even increasing the filing fee for the regular division residential appeals by the authorized \$10 would result in under a \$2,000 increase in the Court's filing fee fund.

Therefore exempting the "municipalities" would ultimately place the filing fee burden on the commercial property taxpayers.

If the cost of appealing to COTA is too high, the taxpayer is disadvantaged since the appeals process is the safety check on local decisions. Municipalities and the Department of Revenue gain power when taxpayers cannot afford to go through the appeal process - especially since the changes in 2008. In 2008 the Legislature made COTA the gatekeeper for taxpayer appeals and eliminated the District Court process. All COTA decisions that are appealed by a party go directly to the Kansas Court of Appeals, in lieu of the District Court and then the Court of Appeals.

There is the other alternative of reducing Court staff. However the Court has reduced staff from 36 to 18 over the last several years, all the while working diligently to speed up the time it takes for an appeal to make its way through the process. While the Court would acknowledge that there is still room for improvement, great strides have been made in the last couple of years. The Court is now docketing appeals within a day or two of the received date. In fact, FY'11 was the first year in which all of the appeals that were filed with the Court were docketed in the fiscal year filed with the Court. This is significant because, due to the property tax cycle, the end of the fiscal year is the busiest time for the Court. The Court has also eliminated most status conferences and is now going directly to the pre-trial conference in order to make appeals move at a more appropriate speed through the process.

All of this is to say that if the Court is required to reduce staff, we will not have the capacity to continue at the current pace let alone to continue to improve. It is ironic that the municipalities are asking to have their filing fees exempted, yet the Court is continually receiving complaints from the municipalities that the Court is not producing decisions in a timely fashion. If COTA were to be required to again reduce staff, as could happen with the implementation of this exemption, this complaint would be exacerbated dramatically.

In conclusion, as you consider SB 347, please be cognizant that, if this bill were to be approved, the Court would be left with two options. They are as follows:

- To again increase the filing fees for those entities who will be left to bear the burden; or,
- Cut staff dramatically, resulting in the potential of not having an independent and impartial arbitrator, COTA, available in a timely fashion to the taxpayers of Kansas which would be very detrimental to the taxpayers of our state.

## COURT OF TAX APPEALS

TOTAL	Administration	Attorneys	Executive Director	Judges/Board	STAFF (FTE)
36	25	5	_	Çī	2
29	18	۲5 نات	_	(Jī	02
27	17	4		ω	<u>'03</u>
20	13	ယ	_	ω	04
21	14	ယ	_	ယ	05
2	14	ယ	<b>→</b>	ω	<u>30'</u>
20	12	4	_	ယ	<u>'07</u>
21	12	ري ن	_	4	80
19	10	51	0	4	<u>60'</u>
19	10	(J)	0	4	10
18	9	Q.	0	4	13
18	9	ΟΊ	0	4	12

In 2009 the Chief Hearing Officer assumed the responsibilities of the Executive Director (without any additional

in order to meet budget constraints. That action continues today.

FY'11 FY'12	1,482,559 1,637,685 1,563,589 1,367,805 1,308,004 960,738	FILING FEE REVENUES FY'10 FY'11 FY'12	\$320,435 \$354,812 \$610,295 ???	SGF PUP FEE FILING FEE Filing Fee % of budget	FY'07 1,482,559 10,206 417,733 \$1,910,498 22% FY'07 \$365,386	FY'08 1,637,685 5,000 495,409 \$2,138,094 23% FY'09 \$341,980	FY'09 1,563,589 5,000 641,234 \$2,209,823 \$2,209,823 ACTUAL I FY'09 \$320,435	\$1,367,805 1,367,805 5,000 605,242 \$1,987,046 30% FILING FEE FY'10 \$354,812	FY'11 1,308,004 5,000 682,964 \$2,036,422 34% E REVENUE FY'11 \$610,295		FY'13 970,216 . 5,000 1,032,107 \$2,002,323 51.50% FY'13 ???
1,482,559 1,637,685 1,563,589 1,367,805 1,308,004 960,738		FEE 417,733 495,409 641,234 605,242 682,964 1,018,852 \$1,910,498 \$2,138,094 \$2,209,823 \$1,987,046 \$2,036,422 \$1,979,590 ee % of 22% 23% 29% 30% 34% 51.50%	FEE 417,733 495,409 641,234 605,242 682,964 1,018,852 \$1,910,498 \$2,138,094 \$2,209,823 \$1,987,046 \$2,036,422 \$1,979,590 ee % of 22% 23% 29% 30% 34% 51.50% ACTUAL FILING FEE REVENUES FY'07 FY'09 FY'10 FY'11 FY'12	Ë	10,206	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000		თ
1,482,559 1,637,685 1,563,589 1,367,805 1,308,004 960,738 10,206 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000	10,206 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000	\$1,910,498 \$2,138,094 \$2,209,823 \$1,987,046 \$2,036,422 \$1,979,590 ee % of 22% 23% 29% 30% 34% 51.50%	\$1,910,498 \$2,138,094 \$2,209,823 \$1,987,046 \$2,036,422 \$1,979,590 ee % of 22% 23% 29% 30% 34% 51.50% ACTUAL FILING FEE REVENUES FY'07 FY'09 FY'10 FY'11 FY'12	ILING FEE	417,733	495,409	641,234	605,242	682,964		1,032
1,482,559 1,637,685 1,563,589 1,367,805 1,308,004 960,738 10,206 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000 10,733 495,409 641,234 605,242 682,964 1,018,852	10,206 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000 10,000 5,00	ee % of 22% 23% 29% 30% 34% 51.50%	ee % of 22% 23% 29% 30% 34% 51.50%  ACTUAL FILING FEE REVENUES  FY'07 FY'09 FY'10 FY'11 FY'12		\$1,910,498	\$2,138,094	\$2,209,823	\$1,987,046	\$2,036,422		\$2,002
1,482,559 1,637,685 1,563,589 1,367,805 1,308,004 960,738  10,206 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000  IG FEE 417,733 495,409 641,234 605,242 682,964 1,018,852 \$1,910,498 \$2,138,094 \$2,209,823 \$1,987,046 \$2,036,422 \$1,979,590	10,206 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000 5,000 10,000 5,00		ACTUAL FILING FEE REVENUES FY'09 FY'09 FY'10 FY'11 FY'12	illing Fee % of oudget	22%	23%	29%	30%	34%	51.50%	51.:

the budget as approved by the legislature and signed by the Governor. The Court raised filing fees substantially in Nov., 2010 and again in Sept., 2011 in order to comply with

increased to \$339,666. In FY'05, after the filing fee regulation was revised and greater emphasis was placed on the collection efforts, receipts The first year of COTA's filing fee fund existence was FY '04 and that year the filing fee collections totaled \$171,749.

# **NUMBER OF APPEALS PER YEAR**

TOTAL FILINGS	REGULAR DIVISION	SMALL CLAIMS		
11,113	6,423	4,690	FY'07	
11,176	6,584	4,592	FY'08	
7,422	4,852	2,570	FY'09	
10,522	5,984	4,538	FY'10	
8,596	<u>5,419</u>	3,177	FY'11	
7,769	4,479	3,290	FY'12	projected

	Old Fee	Nov,'10 Fee	Sept,'11 Fee (with \$960 K SGF)	
PV				
\$250,000 or less	\$25		\$125	
\$250,000 to \$1,000,000	\$50		\$200	
\$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000 \$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000	\$100		\$300	
\$5,000,001 to \$10,000,000 \$5,000.001 to \$10,000,000	\$175		\$400	
more than \$10,000,000	\$250		\$500	
more than \$10,000,000	·			
DT	<b>***</b>	¢100	\$100	
\$1,000 or less	\$25	\$100	\$150 \$150	
\$1,001 to \$10,000	\$50	- \$150		
\$10,001 to \$100,000	\$175	\$250	\$300 8500	
More than \$100,000	\$250	\$250	\$500	
. TO TREATH S. P. P. St < \$100,000	\$10	\$10	- \$10	
EQ/PR Not for Profit < \$100,000	\$50	\$125	\$125	
EQ/PR \$250,000 or less .	\$75	\$125	\$200	
EQ/PR \$250,001 to \$1,000,000	\$125	\$200	\$300	
EQ/PR \$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000	\$175	\$200	\$400	
EQ/PR \$5,000.001 to \$10,000,000	\$200	\$200	\$500	
EQ/PR more than \$10,000,000	\$0	\$25	\$25	
EQ/PR single family residential	\$0	\$25	\$25	
EQ/PR farmsteads	\$0	\$25 \$25	\$25	
EQ/PR mobile/man. homes	Ψ0	\$50	\$150	
All other personal property		400	4	
IRBX for property with value in excess of \$1 million	\$250	\$5.00	\$1,000	
IRBX for property with value of \$1 million or less	\$250	\$250	\$500	
IRB Filing Statements	\$250	\$250	\$500	
EDX for property with value in excess of \$1 million	\$250	\$500	\$1,000	
EDX for property with value of \$1 million or less	\$250	\$250	\$500	
TX (personal property except oil leases)	\$50	\$75	\$100	,
TX (real estate & oil leases 79-201t)	\$50	\$125	\$400	
TX not-for-profit < \$100,000	\$10	\$10	\$10	
1 X not-tor-pront < \$100,000			er e	
TG	. \$15	\$25	\$25	
Mortgage Registration Protests	\$15	\$25	\$25	
No Fund Warrants	\$50	\$150	\$150	
Requests for Reappraisal	\$50	\$250	\$2,000	
Appeal by Co. Com. concerning PVD ratio determination		•	\$2,000	
	#10	\$10	\$10	
Small Claims not-for-profit < \$100,000	\$10	\$10 \$0	\$0	
Small Claims single family residential	\$0 #0		\$0 \$0	
Small Claims DT Homestead /\$500 or less	\$0	\$0 0.50	\$50	
Homestead above \$500	\$0	\$50	. 450	
Small claims other EQ/PR & PV	***	#1 AA	\$100	
\$250,000 or less	\$20	\$100		
\$250,001 to \$1,000,000	\$20	\$100	\$150	
\$1,000,001 to \$1,999,999	\$20	\$100	\$200	
Small Claims DT		* *	m = o	
\$500 but less than \$10,001	\$20	\$50	\$50	
\$10,001 to \$14,999	\$20	\$50	\$150	- •