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## Message from the Assessor Lawrence E. Stone

Eueled by the largest economic recovery in over a decade, the Santa Clara County assessment roll reached a new milestone, exceeding $\$ 400$ billion. This is the third straight year of Silicon Valley's incredible economic recovery. During the last three years, the assessment roll grew in excess of $\$ 80$ billion. The gross assessed value reached $\$ 409$ billion, and the net taxable assessed value after exemptions was $\$ 388$ billion, an increase of $\$ 31$ billion, or 8.67 percent. Santa Clara County is once again one of the leaders statewide in assessment roll growth.

The assessment roll is in many ways a "barometer" of last year's "economic weather," providing a snapshot of the assessed value of all real and business property in Santa Clara County as of the January 1, 2015 lien date.

The Assessor's Annual Report provides detailed statistics, charts, and narrative information about the 2015 assessment roll. The report is an important document for public finance officials, real estate professionals and corporate, government, business and community leaders who are interested in real estate market trends and property values in Santa Clara County.

The report compares the data historically and geographically, and contains details regarding all locally assessed property, both secured and unsecured. The statistical data distinguishes between business personal property (unsecured) and real property (secured), as well as exemptions. Comprehensive
value information is provided by property type, city and school district. There is
 extensive data describing the cities and property types that contributed most to the growth of the annual assessment roll. In addition to numerical information, there is narrative about the performance of the Assessor's Office, assessment appeal trends, and how the property tax system is administered.

## Role of the County Assessor's Office

The Assessor's Office is responsible for annually determining the assessed value of all real and business property in Santa Clara County. The assessment roll is comprised of 529,627 assessable roll units, and is the basis upon which property taxes are levied. Property taxes are an essential source of revenue supporting basic public services provided by schools and local governments. These public jurisdictions form the foundation of our region's high quality of life.

## Factors Contributing to Assessment Growth

The annual increase or decline in the assessment roll is due to a combination of factors led by changes in ownership including new construction and increases in the assessment of properties that were previously reduced during the recession, business personal property, exemptions, and the California Consumer Price Index (CCPI). Institutional exemptions, such as hospitals and universities, increased significantly this year. Assessments of

## Assessment Roll Synopsis* <br> (in billions)

| Assessment Roll | $2015-2016$ | $2014-2015$ | Growth in Assessed Value |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local Roll Before Exemptions | $\$ 409.16$ | $\$ 376.39$ | $\$ 32.77$ | $8.71 \%$ |
| Less: Nonreimbursable Exemptions | $(\$ 20.83)$ | $(\$ 19.05)$ | $(\$ 1.77)$ | $(9.31 \%)$ |
| NET LOCAL ROLL VALUE | $\$ 388.34$ | $\$ 357.34$ | $\$ 31.00$ | $8.67 \%$ |

[^0]public utilities are the responsibility of the California State Board of Equalization (BOE) and are not included.

Property sales and new construction were once again the primary drivers of increases in the assessment roll. These two factors accounted for 59 percent of the $\$ 31$ billion increase in the 2015 assessment roll. The change in the assessed value of individual properties is determined by the difference between the prior assessed value and the new market value. When a change in ownership or new construction occurs, the real property is assessed at fair market value. The newly established value is referred to as the "base year value." In calendar year 2015, the number of properties that transferred ownership and were reassessed at market value dropped 12 percent. The average value per property transfer, however, increased 57 percent, following a 41 percent increase last year.

Another contributor to the growth in the assessment roll was the increase in values triggered by properties in which the market value had dropped below the previously established assessed value, as it did for 136,000 properties during the recession. Proposition 8, passed by voters in 1978, requires the Assessor to temporarily reduce the assessment to reflect the lower market value for the current year. Just as Proposition 8 requires the Assessor to reduce assessments during an economic downturn, it also mandates that assessments be restored when the market recovers. The market alone determines whether the assessed value of a property is reduced or restored to its Proposition 13 protected maximum amount.

Last year, 38,000 properties were assessed below their purchase price as a result of the collapse of the residential real estate market during the "Great Recession." This year, the market value of 13,500 of those properties has risen to the point that all the value lost has been fully restored, and the market value now exceeds the original purchase price. In addition, assessed values of another 22,000 properties were partially restored to reflect the surging residential property market. By comparison, in 2012 the total number of Proposition 8 properties hit a
record of 136,000 ; nearly one-quarter of all properties in the county.

Another indicator of the robust recovery is the modest increase in the value of business property, including machinery, equipment, computers and fixtures. The assessed values of the remaining 403,734 properties were adjusted by the CCPI of 1.99 percent as required by Proposition 13.

## Geographic Differences

Each of the 15 cities in Santa Clara County experienced strong year-over-year assessment roll growth. The cities with the lowest growth were Gilroy and Los Gatos, 6.1 percent and 6.4 percent respectively. Modest increases in the south and central areas of the county were in stark contrast to properties in north Santa Clara County. Santa Clara led all cities with a 14.5 percent increase; Cupertino, Mountain View and Sunnyvale each experienced double-digit increases. Growth in these Cities was triggered by extensive new construction in the technology sector, completion of the 49ers Levi Stadium (\$1.4 billion), and an insatiable demand for new multi-family housing. Silicon Valley is transitioning from singlestory tilt-up office and R\&D buildings, to multistory buildings and campuses occupied by Fortune 500 companies, including many new buildings still under construction. For example, the new Apple "spaceship campus," which will not be occupied for a few years, was assessed at $\$ 820$ million, a fraction of the final market value when the iconic campus is completed and furnished.

## Challenges and Accomplishments

As Silicon Valley emerges from the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, the demands on the Assessor's Office have shifted from reducing the assessment of more than 25 percent of all properties, consistent with the declining residential market, and managing a 350 percent increase in assessment appeals, to appraising and assessing properties under construction, or properties transferred by sale to new owners.

With the support of the County Board of Supervisors, the Assessor's Office has added a handful of professional appraisers combined with new

technology, innovative software, and strategic performance management techniques enabling us to maximize performance. The Assessor's Office is comprised of some of the most talented and dedicated assessment professionals in California. I have received countless letters, emails and personal anecdotal stories from property owners, complimenting my staff on their promptness and willingness to listen, explain and respond timely to complex issues and problems.

The results of our combined efforts are noteworthy, and the following are some of our most significant accomplishments.

## Assessment Roll

- Completed the annual assessment roll by the July 1, 2015 deadline mandated by state law.
- Completed 98 percent of real property assessments.
- Completed 98 percent of business personal property assessments.
- Completed 945 business audits mandated by state law.
- Processed 100 percent of recorded deeds.
- Completed 100 percent of exemptions filed by 3,970 non-profit organizations.
- Processed 72,549 business assessments.
- Processed 67,480 title documents.
- Successfully defended assessed values before the assessment appeals board, retaining 96.5 percent of the assessed value in dispute.
- Resolved 5,591 assessment appeals.
- Reduced the backlog of unworked assessments to the lowest level in ten years.


## Fiscal Management and Customer Service

- Returned \$572,000 of the Assessor's budget to the County General Fund. During my 20-year tenure as Assessor, I have returned, unspent, $\$ 10.8$ million to the County General Fund.
- Assisted 49,567 taxpayers who contacted the office by telephone, and 16,278 taxpayers who visited the public service counter.
- Assessor's Office was Awarded $\$ 1.57$ million from the State-County Assessor Partnership Program (SCAPP), a three-year performancebased pilot program providing funding to assist assessors in reducing backlogs and improving efforts to discover assessable activities.
- Completed 10,965 hours of professional training, including 3,808 hours of State Board of Equalization (BOE) training classes.
- Achieved a customer satisfaction rating of 86.1 percent from an independent survey of taxpayers who contacted the Assessor's Office.


## Business Assessments

- Increased discovery of unrecorded changes of ownership by legal entities including corporate mergers and acquisitions that had previously escaped reassessment. Penalties for the 17 companies that failed to respond to requests for information totaled $\$ 321,000$.
- Field inspections led to the discovery of $\$ 223.3$ million in assessed value for entities no longer eligible for a property tax exemption, and an additional $\$ 203$ million from businesses who had failed to file their property statement.
- Audited businesses mandated by the state, resulting in the discovery of $\$ 1.8$ billion in unassessed value.
- Continued our commitment to a first-class work environment by upgrading desktop computers, software, laptops, servers, and printers.
- Electronically imaged 146,395 documents consistent with our commitment to a paperless work environment.
- Developed the Assessor's budget entirely by service levels producing measurable increases in productivity.
- Completed a technology project designed to improve access to commercial market data, resulting in more accurate assessments.
- Four hundred thousand "visitors" accessed the Assessor's website.


## Extraordinary Technology Milestones Achieved

Our biggest achievement was successfully re-hosting our 35-year-old legacy computer system to a modern virtual platform. Re-hosting substantially reduced the financial exposure and risk to the county and public agencies that rely on property tax revenue. By eliminating the significant threat of hardware failure, we have substantially improved our disaster recovery process. The project was implemented in 11 months, at a cost of $\$ 300,000$, substantially less than the $\$ 1.5$ million originally projected by an independent consultant.

## Leadership and Legislation

- Together with the California Assessors' Association, we continue to provide leadership on critical state legislation and Board of Equalization rules and regulations.
- Completed a comprehensive strategic plan consistent with the department's long term goals.
- Designed and implemented a new model for delivering projects and enhancing customer service levels.
- Participated in a performance audit by the County's management auditor of the assessment appeals process.


## Trends and Future Goals

The Assessor's Office continues to be a model for accountability, strong management controls, transparency and high ethical standards. We continue to focus on developing creative solutions to improve efficiency, enhance productivity, and increase performance.

As County Assessor, I remain committed to the full implementation of a performance budgeting and management system that ties mission and goals directly to the budget, identifies, and rewards superior performance, and focuses resources on continuous improvement initiatives based on quality, service, innovation, and accountability.

The Assessor's Office employs a group of people that I believe are among the most talented, ethical, and dedicated anywhere in government. It is our primary objective to treat all property owners and taxpayers with the highest degree of courtesy and professionalism. For 21 years it has been my honor to serve the taxpayers, property owners, and public agencies in Santa Clara County. It is my privilege to continue managing an important county function that renders fair and accurate assessments and provides the highest level of public service.

Lawrence E. Stone


Assessor

## Largest Taxpayers 2014-2015*

|  | Taxpayer | Taxes Paid* |  | Taxpayer | Taxes Paid* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pacific Gas \& Electric | \$38,201,228 | 6 | Intel Corporation | \$10,033,366 |
| 2 | Google | \$19,943,403 |  | The Irvine Company | \$10,014,487 |
| 3 | Cisco Technology | \$15,880,736 |  | Menlo \& Juniper Networks | \$9,601,491 |
| 4 | Apple Computers | \$10,801,568 |  | Pacific Bell Telephone/AT\&T | \$8,941,684 |
| 5 | Westfield Malls | \$10,148,184 | 10 | Network Appliance | \$8,238,868 |
| * Ten largest taxpayers on the secured tax roll, includes local and state assessees. Source: Santa Clara County Tax Collector, July 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |

## How Tax Bills Are Calculated

After the Assessor determines the assessed value of each assessable property in the County, the Finance Agency calculates and issues property tax bills in early October.

The property tax bill includes an amount necessary to make the annual payment on general obligation bonds or other bonded indebtedness imposed by public agencies and approved by the voters, and the maximum property tax rate of one percent.

Property tax revenue supports elementary, high school and community college districts as well as local government agencies, including cities, the County, and special districts. The property tax revenue is divided among the public taxing agencies. Following the dissolution of redevelopment agencies (RDA's), the successor agencies created to manage RDA's
outstanding debt continue to receive a portion of property taxes which provides new, additional revenue to other entities. For example, in 201314 schools statewide received $\$ 1.2$ billion in new revenue due to
 the elimination of RDA's.

The accurate, consistent, and fair valuation of property creates the foundation that supports the delivery of vital public services provided by local governments. The Assessor's Office does not calculate taxes, collect taxes or allocate tax revenues. For information regarding the collection and allocation of property taxes, please contact the Tax Collector at (408) 808-7900 or the Controller at (408) 299-5200 or www.scctax.org.

## Santa Clara County Average Property Tax Revenue Allocation 2014-2015*



## The County Assessor's Office does not calculate taxes, collect taxes or allocate tax revenues.

*Data provided by the Santa Clara County Controller's Office

## The Assessment Roll

The assessment roll is divided into the secured roll (property subject to a lien) and the unsecured roll (property on which property taxes are not a lien against the real estate including improvements located on leased land).

Exemption values are divided between homeowner exemptions (reimbursed by the state) and other exemptions for non-profit organizations, including churches, charitable institutions, colleges, hospitals, affordable housing, and private schools (not state-reimbursed).

Improvements (the value of buildings or structures situated on land) reflect values assessed by both the Real Property and Business Divisions. Pursuant to Proposition 13, once a base year value is established as a result of a change in
ownership or new construction, the factored base year value can increase by no more than two percent annually, or the California Consumer Price Index (CCPI), whichever is lower. Since the implementation of Proposition 13 in 1978, the CCPI has been less than two percent nine times: in 1983, 1995, 1996, 1999, 2004, 2010, 2011, 2014 and 2015.

Since the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, Santa Clara County's annual roll growth has ranged from over 17 percent to -2.43 percent. Property sales and new construction were the primary source of increases in the assessment roll. Combined, these two factors accounted for 59 percent of the $\$ 31$ billion increase in the 2015 assessment roll.

| Assessment Roll Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015-2016 Assessment Roll Compared to 2014-2015 (*Exclusive of Public Utility Valuations) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2015/2016 | 2014/2015 | Difference | Change |
| Land | \$186,887,936,681 | \$173,161,340,956 | \$13,726,595,725 | 7.93\% |
| Improvements (Real Property) | \$185,632,826,805 | \$169,283,537,949 | \$16,349,288,856 | 9.66\% |
| Improvements (Business Div) | \$2,659,678,213 | \$2,387,801,233 | \$271,876,980 | 11.39\% |
| Subtotal | \$375,180,441,699 | \$344,832,680,138 | \$30,347,761,561 | 8.80\% |
| Personal Prope | \$5,973,194,467 | \$4,377,469,944 | \$1,595,724,523 | 36.45\% |
| Mobilehomes | \$648,753,471 | \$529,179,995 | \$119,573,476 | 22.60\% |
| Subtotal | \$6,621,947,938 | \$4,906,649,939 | \$1,715,297,999 | 34.96\% |
| TOTAL Gross Secured | \$381,802,389,637 | \$349,739,330,077 | \$32,063,059,560 | 9.17\% |
| Less: Other Exemptions (sec) | (\$17,609,000,312) | (\$15,627,756,032) | (\$1,981,244,280) | 12.68\% |
| NET SECURED | \$364,193,389,325 | \$334,111,574,045 | \$30,081,815,280 | 9.00\% |
| TOTAL Gross Unsecured | \$27,360,369,444 | \$26,653,733,394 | \$706,636,050 | 2.65\% |
| Less: Other Unsec. Exemptions | (\$3,218,507,192) | (\$3,426,061,494) | (\$207,554,302) | -6.06\% |
| NET UNSECURED | \$24,141,862,252 | \$23,227,671,900 | \$914,190,352 | 3.94\% |
| TOTAL Local Roll | \$388,335,251,577 | \$357,339,245,945 | \$30,996,005,632 | 8.67\% |
| Homeowners' Exemptions | \$1,874,831,586 | \$1,891,380,787 | (\$16,549,201) | -0.87\% |

(Exclusive of public utility valuation and nonreimbursable exemptions)

| Year | Net Local Roll | Change in Value | Percent Change | Inflation Factor* |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2015-16$ | $\$ 388,335,251,577$ | $\$ 30,996,005,632$ | $8.67 \%$ | $1.99 \%$ |
| $2014-15$ | $\$ 357,339,245,945$ | $\$ 22,758,371,951$ | $6.80 \%$ | $0.45 \%$ |
| $2013-14$ | $\$ 334,580,873,994$ | $\$ 25,772,654,328$ | $8.35 \%$ | $2.00 \%$ |
| $2012-13$ | $\$ 308,808,219,666$ | $\$ 9,711,486,101$ | $3.25 \%$ | $2.00 \%$ |
| $2011-12$ | $\$ 299,096,733,565$ | $\$ 2,622,622,011$ | $0.88 \%$ | $0.75 \%$ |
| $2010-11$ | $\$ 296,474,111,554$ | $(\$ 7,382,109,767)$ | $-2.43 \%$ | $-0.24 \%$ |
| $2009-10$ | $\$ 303,856,221,321$ | $\$ 541,990,393$ | $0.18 \%$ | $2.00 \%$ |
| $2008-09$ | $\$ 303,314,230,928$ | $\$ 19,801,311,453$ | $6.98 \%$ | $2.00 \%$ |
| $2007-08$ | $\$ 283,512,919,475$ | $\$ 21,597,627,615$ | $8.25 \%$ | $2.00 \%$ |
| $2006-07$ | $\$ 261,915,291,860$ | $\$ 21,773,313,717$ | $9.07 \%$ | $2.00 \%$ |

* Proposition 13 limits the inflation factor for property values to $2 \%$ per year or the California Consumer Price Index, whichever is lower.

"Delivering timely and accurate assessments in an efficient and customer friendly manner is my top priority." Assessor Larry Stone



## Supplemental Assessments

The Assessor's Office produces a supplemental roll that generates significant revenue not included as part of the annual assessment roll. Last year, the assessed value of all supplemental assessments totaled $\$ 112.3$ billion, the highest since 2007.

Supplemental assessments are processed daily, unlike the annual assessment roll which is based upon the annual January 1 lien date. This data is a useful indicator of current trends in the real estate market. During the first six months of 2015 compared to the same period last year, the number of
transactions declined 12 percent, yet the average assessed value per transaction increased 9 percent, a sure indicator that the current boom is being driven increasingly by multi-family, commercial and industrial development.

The chart below reflects both the number of supplemental assessments processed and the average assessed value per transaction for each calendar year.
*Data provided by the Santa Clara County Controller's Office


## What are Supplemental Assessments?

Complicated and confusing, supplemental assessments were created by Senate Bill 813 in 1983 to close what was perceived as loopholes and inequities in Proposition 13. Prior to the creation of supplemental assessments, changes in assessed value due to a change in ownership or completion of new construction would not result in higher taxes until the tax year (July 1 to June 30) following the lien date when the new values were placed on the assessment roll. In some instances, taxes on the new assessments would not be collected for up to 21 months. This resulted in serious differences in tax treatment for transactions that may have only been separated by one day. It also created a substantial amount of new revenue for schools and local government.

Supplemental assessments are designed to identify changes in assessed value (either increases or decreases) that occur during the fiscal year such as changes in ownership and new construction. They are in addition (supplemental) to the traditional annual assessment and property tax bill. A tax bill is issued only on the added value, and is prorated for the remaining portion of the fiscal year. For the next fiscal year, the entire new assessed value of the real property is added to the regular assessment roll. The increase in value is taxed from the first of the month following the date of completion of new construction or the change in ownership. To better understand supplemental assessments or to calculate a supplemental assessment and the supplemental taxes for a property, access an on-line, interactive tool at www.sccassessor.org/ index.php/online-services/supplemental-calculator.

|  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Percent } \\ \text { increase over } \\ \text { prior year }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { AV } \\ \text { per }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Coupita+ |  |  |  |  |  |$]$

## Santa Clara leads the Bay Area in the value of business equipment and machinery (unsecured) with 240 percent more assessed value than San Francisco...

| California's Most Populous Counties <br> 2015-2016 Unsecured, Secured, and Total Gross Assessment Roll (ranked by population) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | red Roll | red Roll | Total Gross Roll | Percent increase over prior year prior year | $\begin{gathered} \text { AV } \\ \text { per } \\ \text { Capita+ } \end{gathered}$ |
| Los Angeles | ,284,495,460 | \$1,268,382,301,563 | \$1,320,666,797,023 | 5.93\% | \$130.29 |
| 2 San Diego | \$16,337,984,273 | \$411,307,145,118 | \$457,645,129,391 | 5.62\% | \$141.80 |
| 3 Orange | \$20,394,461,974 | \$507,642,076,906 | \$528,036,538,880 | 5.85\% | \$167.76 |
| 4 Riverside | \$7,689,974,585 | \$235,026,756,666 | \$242,716,731,251 | 5.78\% | \$105.14 |
| 5 San Bernardino | \$11,719,754,189 | \$182,306,629,729 | \$194,026,383,918 | 5.05\% | \$92.21 |
| 6 Santa Clara | \$27,360,369,444 | \$381,802,389,637 | \$409,162,759,081 | 8.71\% | \$216.53 |
| 7 Alameda | \$13,776,805,453 | \$231,679,711,900 | \$245,456,517,353 | 08\% | \$153.93 |
| 8 Sacramento | \$6,488,685,253 | \$134,202,598,593 | \$140,691,283,846 | 4.60\% | \$95.65 |
| 9 Contra Costa | \$5,406,461,946 | \$171,447,287,237 | \$176,853,749,183 | 7.43\% | \$160.36 |
| 10 Fresno | \$3,515,061,522 | \$66,779,254,883 | \$70,294,316,405 | 4.64\% | \$72.30 |
| 11 Ke | \$8,657,098,342 | \$79,943,070,694 | \$88,600,169,036 | -8.90\% | \$101.34 |
| 12 Ventura | \$4,331,033,999 | \$117,396,560,325 | \$121,727,594,324 | 4.07\% | \$143.53 |
| 13 San Francisco | \$11,380,194,907 | \$179,665,184,107 | \$191,045,379,014 | 6.52\% | \$225.93 |
| 14 San Mateo | \$10,373,213,750 | \$172,580,744,401 | \$182,953,958,151 | 7.56\% | \$242.93 |
| 15 San Joaquin | \$3,820,951,566 | \$61,232,214,313 | \$65,053,165,879 | 6.01\% | \$90.41 |

[^1]
## Assessment Information by City

| Net Assessment Roll Growth by City |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| (value in billions) |  |  |  |



| City | Secured <br> CITY | Secured <br> RPTTF | Unsecured <br> CITY | Unsecured <br> RPTTF* | Total <br> Roll** | Percent <br> of Roll+ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Campbell | $\$ 7.13$ | $\$ 0.82$ | $\$ 0.19$ | $\$ 0.08$ | $\$ 8.23$ | $2.12 \%$ |

Secured Roll: Property for which taxes become a lien on real property to secure payment of taxes.
Unsecured Roll: Property for which taxes are not a lien on real property to secure payment of taxes.
*RPTTF: Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund ${ }^{* *}$ Net of nonreimbursable exemptions
+Percentages based on non-rounded values; "-" Indicates a value of 0 or less than $\$ 10$ million
2015-2016 Net Assessment Roll by City


## 2015-2016 Real Property Distribution by City <br> (value in billions)

| City | Land Value | Improvement Value | Total Value | Exemptions+ | Net <br> Total | Parcel Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Campbell | \$4.35 | \$3.71 | \$8.07 | \$0.15 | \$7.91 | 12,039 |
| Cupertino | 9.91 | 7.80 | 17.71 | 0.11 | 17.59 | 16,400 |
| Gilroy | 2.93 | 3.99 | 6.92 | 0.22 | 6.69 | 13,688 |
| Los Altos | 8.02 | 4.80 | 12.82 | 0.16 | 12.66 | 11,093 |
| Los Altos Hills | 4.04 | 2.65 | 6.69 | 0.04 | 6.65 | 3,224 |
| Los Gatos | 5.89 | 4.79 | 10.67 | 0.31 | 10.36 | 10,627 |
| Milpitas | 6.20 | 7.01 | 13.21 | 0.29 | 12.92 | 18,239 |
| Monte Sereno | 1.05 | 0.80 | 1.85 | - | 1.85 | 1,254 |
| Morgan Hill | 3.25 | 4.33 | 7.58 | 0.22 | 7.35 | 12,064 |
| Mountain View | 10.34 | 10.04 | 20.38 | 0.53 | 19.85 | 19,012 |
| Palo Alto | 15.72 | 14.94 | 30.65 | 3.41 | 27.24 | 20,823 |
| San Jose | 69.99 | 74.91 | 144.90 | 4.84 | 140.06 | 238,382 |
| Santa Clara | 12.77 | 15.19 | 27.96 | 2.05 | 25.91 | 28,803 |
| Saratoga | 8.03 | 5.08 | 13.11 | 0.18 | 12.93 | 11,138 |
| Sunnyvale | 15.73 | 15.03 | 30.77 | 0.42 | 30.35 | 31,955 |
| Unincorporated | 8.66 | 10.57 | 19.23 | 4.66 | 14.57 | 26,048 |
| TOTAL | \$186.89 | \$185.63 | \$372.52 | \$17.61 | \$354.91 | 474,789 |

[^2]
## 2015-2016 Real Property Distribution of Value by Property Type

| Property Type <br> Value* | Value <br> (in billions) <br> Growth | Percent of <br> Total Value | Parcel <br> Count | Parcel <br> Percentage+ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Single Family Detached | 302.75 | $24.18 \%$ | $56.83 \%$ | 333,880 | $70.32 \%$ |
| Condominiums | 25.54 | $34.11 \%$ | $9.96 \%$ | 83,615 | $17.61 \%$ |
| Office | 23.24 | $36.65 \%$ | $6.51 \%$ | 5,177 | $1.09 \%$ |
| Apartments 5+ Units | 24.10 | $43.06 \%$ | $6.76 \%$ | 5,851 | $1.23 \%$ |
| Other Industrial/Non-Mfg | 11.50 | $13.60 \%$ | $3.22 \%$ | 3,566 | $0.75 \%$ |
| R\&D Industrial | 14.58 | $35.28 \%$ | $4.09 \%$ | 817 | $0.17 \%$ |
| Specialty Retail and Hotels | 11.08 | $15.06 \%$ | $3.10 \%$ | 5,766 | $1.21 \%$ |
| Single Family 2-4 units | 7.40 | $20.09 \%$ | $2.07 \%$ | 15,105 | $3.18 \%$ |
| Other Urban | 6.54 | $30.95 \%$ | $1.83 \%$ | 7,684 | $1.62 \%$ |
| Major Shopping Centers | 6.96 | $11.63 \%$ | $1.95 \%$ | 863 | $0.18 \%$ |
| Electronic \& Machinery Mfg. | 2.42 | $-24.83 \%$ | $0.68 \%$ | 240 | $0.05 \%$ |
| Other Industrial \& Mfg. | 3.09 | $-4.85 \%$ | $0.87 \%$ | 2,131 | $0.45 \%$ |
| Agricultural | 2.10 | $14.94 \%$ | $0.59 \%$ | 6,073 | $1.28 \%$ |
| Public \& Quasi-Public | 5.40 | $496.38 \%$ | $1.51 \%$ | 3,842 | $0.81 \%$ |
| Residential Misc. | 0.06 | $10.40 \%$ | $0.02 \%$ | 179 | $0.04 \%$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{\$ 3 5 6 . 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 0 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 4 , 7 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |

[^3]
## Qualifying Exemptions 2015-16

(value in billions)

| Exemption | Roll Units | Total Value | Percent Value Increase | Percent Exempt Value+ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non-Profit Colleges | 380 | \$8.93 | 11.34\% | 39.34\% |
| Qualifying Affordable |  |  |  |  |
| Multi-family Housing | 378 | 3.85 | 12.26\% | 16.95\% |
| Charitable <br> Non-Profit Org. | 1,300 | 2.97 | 7.49\% | 13.10\% |
| Homeowners |  |  |  |  |
| Exemption* | 267,632 | 1.87 | -0.87\% | 8.26\% |
| Hospitals | 41 | 3.17 | 9.87\% | 13.98\% |
| Religious Org. | 786 | 0.89 | 0.90\% | 3.90\% |
| Private Schools | 135 | 0.62 | -0.18\% | 2.74\% |
| Cemeteries | 41 | 0.17 | 27.76\% | 0.75\% |
| Museums/Libraries | 12 | 0.01 | -86.70\% | 0.06\% |
| Disabled Veterans | 837 | 0.10 | 9.63\% | 0.42\% |
| Misc. | 42 | 0.11 | -10.49\% | 0.50\% |
| Historical Aircraft | 18 | - | -29.13\% | 0.00\% |
| TOTAL | 271,602 | \$22.70 | 8.39\% | 100.00\% |
| Exemptions not reimbursed by the State | 3,970 | \$20.83 | 9.31\% |  |
| Includes only those non qualify in accordance wit <br> * The state reimburses the <br> + Percentages based on no than $\$ 10$ million | -profit organ th the Reven County for n-rounded v |  | have applied ion Code. nners' Exemp icates a value | and on. of $\$ 0$ or less |

## 2015-16 Affordable Housing By City*

| City | Exempt Assessed <br> Value | Number Of <br> Units |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Campbell | $\$ 55,621,714$ | 322 |
| Cupertino | $\$ 9,505,379$ | 88 |
| Gilroy | $\$ 129,187,117$ | 994 |
| Los Altos | - | - |
| Los Altos Hills | $\$ 30,831,435$ | - |
| Los Gatos | $\$ 94,688,420$ | 199 |
| Milpitas | - | 1,132 |
| Monte Sereno | $\$ 174,072,431$ | - |
| Morgan Hill | $\$ 139,122,297$ | 1,065 |
| Mountain View | $\$ 174,325,228$ | 1,380 |
| Palo Alto | $\$ 2,783,166,282$ | 18,223 |
| San Jose | $\$ 175,912,817$ | 907 |
| Santa Clara | $\$ 122,747,527$ | - |
| Saratoga | $\$ 3,491,268$ | 1,244 |
| Sunnyvale | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 8 9 2 , 6 7 1 , 9 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 , 6 5 2}$ |
| Unincorporated |  |  |
| TOTALS |  |  |

*Includes both secured and unsecured assessed value

## Exemptions

The homeowners exemption is familiar to most homeowners and typically provides an approximately $\$ 70$ reduction in property taxes for owner occupied homes. Driven by the "Great Recession" and emerging trends in homeownership, the total number of homes receiving this homeowners exemption has declined to 64 percent from 71 percent in 2008-09.

There are other exemptions available to property owners, including exemptions for properties owned by charitable nonprofit organizations, religious institutions, and private and non-profit colleges. While these entities reduced the amount of property tax revenue available to cities and schools by over $\$ 210$ million, the services they provide, and the additional charitable support they attract, far outweigh the loss in revenue.
...while mostly exempt from property taxes, in 2015 major new construction totaling over $\$ 1$ Billion at Stanford University-primarily the new hospital—also generated an exponential increase in jobs and services.

## Temporary Declines in Assessed Value

The Assessor's Office identified 22,436 properties-primarily homes --that qualified them for a reduction in the property's assessment. The total reduction was $\$ 4.9$ billion. Last year 37,989 properties qualified for a total reduction of $\$ 8$ billion.
...For most people, their home is their largest asset, so for every dollar increase in
property taxes, there is a $\$ 100$ increase in bomeowner equity...

Properties with Temporary Declines by City and Property Type: 2015-16 (value in billions)

| City <br> Campbell | Value/ Parcel Value Parcel | Townhouse/ Condo \$0.01 156 | Single Family Residential \$0.01 80 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Commercial } \\ \text { Properties } \\ \$ 0.06 \\ 52 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \$ 0.07 \\ 288 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cupertino | Value | - | - | \$0.02 | \$0.03 |
|  | Parcel | 12 | 11 | 13 | 36 |
| Gilroy | Value | \$0.01 | \$0.25 | \$0.10 | \$036 |
|  | Parcel | 85 | 1,582 | 173 | 1,840 |
| Los Altos | Value | - | \$0.01 | - | \$0.02 |
|  | Parcel | 1 | 32 | 6 | 39 |
| Los Altos Hills | Value | - | \$0.11 | \$0.01 | \$0.11 |
|  | Parcel | - | 75 | 4 | 79 |
| Los Gatos | Value | \$0.01 | \$0.06 | \$0.05 | \$0.11 |
|  | Parcel | 80 | 155 | 36 | 271 |
| Milpitas | Value | \$0.02 | \$0.05 | \$0.36 | \$0.43 |
|  | Parcel | 393 | 501 | 116 | 1,010 |
| Monte Sereno | Value | - | \$0.02 | - | \$0.02 |
|  | Parcel | - | 33 | 1 | 34 |
| Morgan Hill | Value | \$0.02 | \$0.19 | \$0.12 | \$0.32 |
|  | Parcel | 172 | 1,203 | 127 | 1,502 |
| Mountain View | Value | - | - | \$0.03 | \$0.03 |
|  | Parcel | 13 | 3 | 34 | 50 |
| Palo Alto | Value | - | \$0.02 | \$0.01 | \$0.03 |
|  | Parcel | 1 | 24 | 8 | 33 |
| San Jose | Value | \$0.36 | \$0.94 | \$1.22 | \$2.51 |
|  | Parcel | 5,487 | 8,244 | 948 | 14,679 |
| Santa Clara | Value | \$0.02 | \$0.01 | \$0.22 | \$0.25 |
|  | Parcel | 442 | 170 | 113 | 725 |
| Saratoga | Value | - | \$0.12 | - | \$0.12 |
|  | Parcel | 23 | 138 | 7 | 168 |
| Sunnyvale | Value |  |  | \$0.09 | \$0.10 |
|  | Parcel | 62 | 32 | 48 | 142 |
| Unincorporated | Value | - | \$0.30 | \$0.11 | \$0.40 |
|  | Parcel | 10 | 1,321 | 209 | 1,540 |
| Grand Total | Value | \$0.44 | \$2.09 | \$2.39 | \$4.92 |
|  | Parcel | 6,937 | 13,604 | 1,895 | 22,436 |

Note: Values represent decline in assessed value had the market value exceeded the Proposition 13 protected factored base year value. "-" Indicates a value of $\$ 0$ or less than $\$ 10$ million

2009-2015 Number of Properties Temporarily Reduced to Reflect Changes in Market Value


## Strong Recovery Restores Values for 13,639 Properties Previously Reduced

As the economy has recovered there are fewer properties assessed below their purchase price.

This year, the market values of 13,639 properties have risen to the point that all the value lost due to the "Great Recession" has been fully restored, and the market values now exceed the original purchase prices. Last year, 38,640 properties were fully restored and 2,449 properties were reassessed to a new Proposition 13 base year value due to a change in ownership.

Proposition 8 Parcels With Full Restorations By City: 2015-16

| City | Number of Parcels | Net Change |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Campbell | 425 | $\$ 43,548,055$ |
| Cupertino | 170 | $\$ 21,528,334$ |
| Gilroy | 405 | $\$ 25,416,865$ |
| Los Altos | 82 | $\$ 28,300,332$ |
| Los Altos Hills | 57 | $\$ 27,182,727$ |
| Los Gatos | 271 | $\$ 45,817,492$ |
| Milpitas | 551 | $\$ 46,081,977$ |
| Monte Sereno | 46 | $\$ 14,593,338$ |
| Morgan Hill | 331 | $\$ 24,099,544$ |
| Mountain View | 196 | $\$ 26,842,634$ |
| Palo Alto | 116 | $\$ 46,398,070$ |
| San Jose | 8,257 | $\$ 771,018,112$ |
| Santa Clara | 991 | $\$ 121,813,947$ |
| Saratoga | 410 | $\$ 130,435,773$ |
| Sunnyvale | 826 | $\$ 85,899,066$ |
| Unincorporated | 505 | $\$ 68,184,665$ |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{1 3 , 6 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 5 2 7 , 1 6 0 , 9 3 1}$ |

...403,734 properties received the CCPI increase of

### 1.99 percent in accordance with Proposition 13...

## What is Proposition 8?

Proposition 8, passed by California voters in November 1978, entitles property owners to the lower of the fair market value of their property as of January 1, 2015, or the assessed value as determined at the time of purchase or construction, increased by no more than two percent or the California Consumer Price Index (CCPI), whichever is lower. When the market value of a property declines below the previously established assessed value measured as of January 1 each year (lien date), the assessor is required to proactively reduce the assessed value to reflect the lower of the fair market value of their property (as of January 1, 2015).

As the real estate market rebounds, the assessor is required to "restore" the assessed values for properties previously reduced during the downturn. The restoration of the property's assessed value is not limited to the CCPI or two percent, until the market value of the property reaches its purchase price, plus the annual inflation increased by a maximum of two percent. Properties where the market value exceeds the assessed value as of January 1, 2015 are not eligible for an adjustment. The market alone determines whether the assessed value of a property is reduced or restored.

## Proposition 13

Passed by the voters in June 1978, Proposition 13 amended the California Constitution limiting the assessment and taxation of property in California. It restricts both the tax rate and the annual increase of assessed value as follows:

- The property tax cannot exceed 1 percent of a property's taxable value (plus service fees, improvement bonds and special assessments, many of which require voter approval).
- A property's original base value is its 1975-76 market value. A new base year value is established by reappraisal whenever there is a change in ownership or new construction. An increase in the assessed value of real property is limited to no more than two percent per year.
- The adjusted (factored) base year value of real property is the upper limit of value for property tax purposes.
- Business personal property, boats, airplanes and certain restricted properties are subject to annual reappraisal and assessment.

Long-time property owners benefit from lower assessments, while those who own property for a short time are adversely impacted by assessments that can be as much as ten times greater than that of a comparable property held for an extended time.

As the economy recovers, the gap between the market value and assessed value of single family homes increases. Historically, the difference between the assessed value and the market value is estimated to be 50 percent.


## Historical Trend of Assessed Values in Santa Clara County

The chart compares the total net assessed value of single family and condominium properties to other property, including commercial and industrial properties. Since Proposition 13 passed in 1978, the portion of the secured assessment roll comprised of commercial and industrial properties declined 15 percent, a trend consistent with data from other counties.


## Who benefits?

Every property owner benefits from Proposition 13; however, the longer a property is owned the greater the property tax benefit. For example, 43 percent of all property owners as of January 1 have not had their property reassessed to market value since 1999, yet the total assessed value of those properties equals 23 percent of the total the land and improvements in Santa Clara County. By contrast, property owners who acquired a property after 1999 account for 57 percent of all properties, yet their combined assessed values accounts for 77 percent of the total assessment roll.

The charts below provide a snapshot as of January 1, 2015, of properties assessed as of 1975 (all property owned prior to March 1, 1975) and for each subsequent year of acquisition. It also shows the 2015 gross assessed value, based upon market value as of March 1, 1975, or as of the date of acquisition, plus the inflation rate not to exceed two percent per year. For example, of the 474,789 properties in the County, 22,716 were reassessed to market value in 2015 accounting for $\$ 31.4$ billion in gross assessed value. By comparison 105,000 properties acquired before 1986, equaled $\$ 31.5$ billion, virtually the same amount of the current year's changes in ownership.

## Distribution of Assessment Roll by Base Year and Property Type

| Base Year Lien Date | Single Family/Condominium |  |  |  | Commercial, Industrial, Other |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Parcel | Parcel \% | Assessed Value | AV \% | Parcel | Parcel \% | Assessed Value | AV \% |
| Prior to 1979 | 58,391 | 13.99\% | \$6,257,727,480 | 2.62\% | 9,221 | 16.09\% | \$10,252,509,067 | 7.66\% |
| 1979-1988 | 49,108 | 11.76\% | \$13,526,709,985 | 5.67\% | 7,446 | 13.00\% | \$8,125,824,238 | 6.07\% |
| 1989-1998 | 70,605 | 16.91\% | \$32,786,832,345 | 13.74\% | 7,548 | 13.17\% | \$13,399,368,336 | 10.01\% |
| 1999-2008 | 120,289 | 28.81\% | \$94,018,498,772 | 39.40\% | 14,683 | 25.63\% | \$43,259,721,709 | 32.31\% |
| 2009-2015 | 119,099 | 28.53\% | \$92,026,951,929 | 38.57\% | 18,399 | 32.11\% | \$58,866,619,625 | 43.96\% |
| Total | 417,492 | 100\% | \$238,616,720,511 | 100\% | 57,297 | 100\% | \$133,904,042,975 | 100\% |


| Base Year <br> Lien Date | Parcels | Assessed Value (AV) <br> (Land \& Imp.) | Base Year <br> Lien Date | Parcels | Assessed Value <br> (Land \& Imp.) |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1975 | 48,867 | $\$ 13,002,634,115$ | 1996 | 8,097 | $\$ 5,372,380,802$ |
| 1976 | 5,143 | $\$ 797,428,214$ | 1997 | 8,916 | $\$ 5,818,693,487$ |
| 1977 | 6,825 | $\$ 1,209,981,228$ | 1998 | 11,324 | $\$ 7,285,924,912$ |
| 1978 | 6,777 | $\$ 1,500,192,990$ | 1999 | 12,070 | $\$ 10,025,552,858$ |
| 1979 | 6,058 | $\$ 1,415,576,256$ | 2000 | 13,467 | $\$ 11,223,849,933$ |
| 1980 | 6,395 | $\$ 1,600,427,606$ | 2001 | 11,136 | $\$ 11,660,997,418$ |
| 1981 | 4,438 | $\$ 1,414,668,479$ | 2002 | 8,595 | $\$ 9,092,771,820$ |
| 1982 | 3,289 | $\$ 1,151,781,666$ | 2003 | 12,642 | $\$ 11,766,534,909$ |
| 1983 | 3,089 | $\$ 1,238,214,250$ | 2004 | 14,945 | $\$ 13,394,520,302$ |
| 1984 | 5,287 | $\$ 2,184,235,394$ | 2005 | 18,348 | $\$ 16,592,755,706$ |
| 1985 | 6,093 | $\$ 3,532,159,241$ | 2006 | 16,358 | $\$ 17,182,605,292$ |
| 1986 | 6,569 | $\$ 2,448,453,318$ | 2007 | 13,417 | $\$ 16,196,791,935$ |
| 1987 | 7,735 | $\$ 3,452,422,165$ | 2008 | 13,994 | $\$ 20,141,840,308$ |
| 1988 | 7,601 | $\$ 3,214,595,848$ | 2009 | 13,585 | $\$ 14,710,625,358$ |
| 1989 | 8,746 | $\$ 4,182,750,924$ | 2010 | 17,001 | $\$ 12,677,582,782$ |
| 1990 | 6,368 | $\$ 3,543,326,833$ | 2011 | 17,898 | $\$ 17,242,675,384$ |
| 1991 | 5,096 | $\$ 3,000,907,205$ | 2012 | 18,265 | $\$ 18,168,035,390$ |
| 1992 | 6,457 | $\$ 3,380,199,918$ | 2013 | 22,872 | $\$ 25,037,426,099$ |
| 1993 | 7,407 | $\$ 3,790,418,689$ | 2014 | 25,161 | $\$ 31,616,453,069$ |
| 1994 | 7,564 | $\$ 4,816,613,864$ | 2015 | 22,716 | $\$ 31,440,773,472$ |
| 1995 | 8,178 | $\$ 4,994,984,047$ | Total | 474,789 | $\$ 372,520,763,486$ |

# Organizational Overview of 



## Assessment Standards, Services, and Exemptions Division

## Division Description

Responsible for locating and identifying ownership and reappraisability of all taxable real property as well as approving and enrolling all legal property tax exemptions. Professional staff members monitor assessment appeal information; process legal appeals; maintain and update assessment maps; and manage the public service center, document imaging center and oversee quality control.

## Staff Composition

A majority of the staff members of the Assessment Standards, Services and Exemption Division possess expert knowledge in exemption law, cartography and/or the legal complexities of property transfers. In addition, two staff members are certified by the State Board of Equalization as advanced appraisers.

Major Accomplishments
Ownership Title Documents Processed
Organizational Exemption Claims
Parcel Number Changes (split \& combinations)
Parent/Child Exclusions from Reassessment (Prop 58/193)

2015/2016
67,480
3,970
3,200
2,843
2014/2015
77,341
3,879
2,749
4,573

## Real Property Division

## Division Description

Responsible for valuing and enrolling all taxable real property (land and improvements). The Division provides assessment-related information to the public, and cooperates with other agencies regarding assessment and property tax related matters.

## Staff Composition

In addition to clerical staff, there were eighty-four professional appraisers including forty-six appraisers who hold advanced certificates issued by the State Board of Equalization.

Major Accomplishments
Real Property Parcels (secured; taxable)
Reappraisable changes of ownership processed
Permits Processed (reassessable and non- reassessable events)
Temporary Decline in Value Parcels (Proposition 8)
Parcels with New Construction (reassessable events)
Senior Citizen Exclusion (Prop 60/90)
Historical Properties (Mills Act)

2014/2015
474,789
23,972
30,626
22,436
6,158
325
287
472,712
26,907
28,618
28,618
37,986
5,788
232
283

## the County Assessor's Office

 in a timely, accurate, and efficient manner; and provide current assessment-related information to the public and to governmental agencies in a timely and responsive way.
## Administration Division

## Division Description

Provides executive leadership and policy development. Functions include operational oversight, policy analysis and legislative advocacy, strategic planning, performance management, and internal/external communications. Provides administrative support services including budget, accounting, personnel, payroll, purchasing, and facilities management.

## Staff Composition

A staff of ten includes two certified appraisers and one advanced appraiser certified by the State Board of Equalization. Employees possess backgrounds in assessment operations, policy development, strategic planning, communications, fiscal and contract management, accounting, and personnel.

Assessor's Office
FY 2014/2015
\$32,769,813*
Employees

* Estimate
**Authorized Positions as of July 1,2015


## Information Systems Division

Division Description
Responsible for providing systems support to all other divisions in the pursuit of preparing and delivering the secured, unsecured and supplemental assessment rolls.

## Staff Composition

The staff has a broad knowledge of advanced computer systems.

## Business Division (Business Personal Property)

## Division Description

Responsible for locating, valuing and enrolling all taxable business personal property including property (owned and leased) such as computers, supplies, machinery, equipment and fixtures, as well as mobilehomes, airplanes and boats. Last year, the Division completed 945 business audits. The Division is responsible for the administration of assessment appeals involving business personal property. Once every four years, all businesses with personal property are subject to audit.
Ninety-seven percent of all personal property is owned by 15 percent of all business entities.

## Staff Composition

In addition to clerical staff, there were forty-six staff members certified as auditor-appraisers including thirty-one employees who have advanced certification awarded by the State Board of Equalization. The staff is comprised of accountants and experts skilled in auditing and assessing high-tech businesses.

Major Accomplishments
Business Assessments on Secured Roll
Mobilehome Parcels Assessed
Business Personal Property (BPP) Appraisals Enrolled
Total Business Personal Property Assessment Activities

2015/2016
2,698
2014/2015
2,655
10,900
10,768
58,698
59,030
72,303

## Business Personal Property

Assessed values of business personal property are determined from the business property statements filed annually by 30,000 businesses. In Santa Clara County, the gross assessed value of business property represents seven percent of the assessment roll; in the State's second highest valued county, San Diego, it represents just over 3 percent. While Santa Clara County ranks 6th in population, and has historically ranked fourth in total assessed value, the assessed value of unsecured business personal property equaled the combined value of the State's third and fifth most highly assessed county, Orange and Riverside, with a combined population more than double Santa Clara County.

| 2015-2016 Bus | ess Pers | nal Prope <br> value in billions) | y Dis | ution | City |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CityGross <br> Secured* | Unsecured** | Gross <br> Exemptions+ | Net Total | Percent of Value | Value Growth |
| Campbell $\quad \$ 0.04$ | \$0.29 | \$0.02 | \$0.31 | 1.00\% | -0.67\% |
| Cupertino 0.71 | 1.09 | 0.01 | 1.80 | 5.69\% | 14.74\% |
| Gilroy 0.11 | 0.27 | 0.02 | 0.35 | 1.12\% | 0.86\% |
| Los Altos 0.05 | 0.13 | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.40\% | 18.15\% |
| Los Altos Hills | 0.01 | - | - | 0.01\% | 1.15\% |
| Los Gatos 0.05 | 0.23 | 0.05 | 0.23 | 0.74\% | -2.91\% |
| Milpitas 0.30 | 1.84 | 0.02 | 2.13 | 6.74\% | 3.40\% |
| Monte Sereno | - | - | - | 0.00\% | 8.07\% |
| Morgan Hill 0.05 | 0.30 | - | 0.35 | 1.12\% | 7.23\% |
| Mountain View 0.35 | 2.69 | 0.52 | 2.52 | 7.99\% | 18.03\% |
| Palo Alto 0.37 | 3.70 | 1.93 | 2.15 | 6.81\% | 11.64\% |
| San Jose 2.39 | 8.12 | 0.40 | 10.11 | 32.01\% | -0.01\% |
| Santa Clara 1.85 | 5.22 | 0.44 | 6.63 | 21.01\% | 13.27\% |
| Saratoga 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.16\% | 6.17\% |
| Sunnyvale 1.75 | 2.72 | 0.07 | 4.40 | 13.93\% | 7.20\% |
| Unincorporated 1.22 | 0.69 | 1.52 | 0.39 | 1.25\% | 4.68\% |
| GRAND TOTAL \$9.28 | \$27.36 | \$5.06 | \$31.58 | 100.00\% | 6.91\% |
| * Secured Roll: Property for which taxes become a lien on real property to secure payment of taxes. I interest assessments <br> ** Unsecured Roll: Property for which taxes are not a lien on real property to secure payment of taxes. Net of nonreimbursable exemptions; includes mobilehomes <br> "-" Indicates a value of 0 or less than $\$ 10$ million +Nonreimbursable Exemptions |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

...In 2015, 65 percent of businesses filed their property statements electronically (e-file), 24,816 more than a decade ago, creating significant savings. The average cost to process an e-filed statement was $\$ 3.69$, while the average cost to process a paper statement was $\$ 14.25 .$. .

| 2015-2016 Business Personal Property |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Distribution of Value by Type <br> (value in billions) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property Type | Secured* | Unsecured** | Exemptions | Net Total | Percent of Value+ | Value Growth+ | Number of Businesses |
| Professional Services | \$1.76 | \$11.32 | \$1.90 | \$11.18 | 35.39\% | 11.05\% | 13,849 |
| Electronic Manufacturering | 1.79 | 3.66 | - | 5.45 | 17.26\% | -0.53\% | 797 |
| Computer Manufacturering | 1.19 | 3.28 | - | 4.47 | 14.17\% | 1.94\% | 13 |
| Other Manufacturing | 1.20 | 1.80 |  | 3.00 | 9.51\% | 4.31\% | 2,738 |
| Retail | 0.12 | 2.24 | 0.10 | 2.26 | 7.16\% | 1.11\% | 6,276 |
| Semiconductor Manufacturing | 0.64 | 0.80 | - | 1.44 | 4.57\% | 7.85\% | 19 |
| Other | 1.80 | 2.18 | 3.04 | 0.94 | 2.98\% | 40.74\% | 617 |
| Aircraft | - | 0.91 | 0.01 | 0.90 | 2.85\% | 11.44\% | 741 |
| Leased Equipment |  | 0.93 | - | 0.93 | 2.93\% | 13.45\% | 525 |
| Mobilehome Owners | 0.65 | - |  | 0.65 | $2.05 \%$ | 34.27\% | 10,659 |
| Financial Institutions | 0.01 | 0.19 |  | 0.19 | 0.61\% | 4.43\% | 78 |
| Apartments | 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.35\% | 17.35\% | 1,000 |
| Boats | - | 0.05 | - | 0.05 | 0.15\% | 0.62\% | 3,080 |
| TOTAL | \$9.28 | \$27.36 | \$5.06 | \$31.58 | 100.00\% | 7.08\% | 40,392 |
| * Secured Roll: Property for which taxes become a lien on real property to secure payment of taxes, includes possessory interest assessments valued by Real Property Division. <br> ** Unsecured Roll: Property for which taxes are not a lien on real property to secure payment of taxes. Net of nonreimbursable exemptions <br> + Percentages based on non-rounded values. <br> "-" Indicates a value of 0 or less than $\$ 10$ million. As a result, totals of displayed numbers may be off by up to $\$ 10$ million. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Six percent of all business accounts make up over 93 percent of the assessed value of business personal property. Below are the top 25 companies in Santa Clara County as of the lien date, January 1, 2015. They were ranked by the gross assessed taxable value of their business property, which includes personal property, computers, machinery, equipment and fixtures and ranged from $\$ 140$ million to over $\$ 2$ billion. All business property is assessed annually at market value.
[Note: The ranking does not include the assessed value of real property or exempt value.]

## 2015-2016 Top 25 Companies*

(parentheses indicate last year's ranking; highlighted companies not in rankings 10 years ago)

| 1 | Apple Computer Inc (2) | 11 49ers Santa Clara Stadium (NR) | 21 | 22 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Cisco Systems Inc (1) | 12 Xeres Ventures LLC (15) | 22 | Broadcom Corp (19) |
| 3 | Google Inc (4) | 13 KLA Instruments Corp (16) | 23 Brocade Comm Systems Inc (22) |  |
| 4 | Intel Corp (3) | 14 VMware Inc (14) | 24 Hanson Permanente Coment (NR) |  |
| 5 | Lockheed Martin Corp (5) | 15 Intuitive Surgical Inc (12) | 25 Lumileds Lighting US (17) |  |
| 6 | Juniper Network Inc (6) | 16 Oracle Corp (13) |  |  |
| 7 | Applied Materials Inc (10) | 17 Space Systems Loral Inc (21) | $*$ Ranked by gross assessed value of their |  |
| 8 | Hitachi Global Storage Techs Inc (7) | 18 Equinix Operating Inc (18) | business personal property. Excludes <br> exempt entities. |  |
| 9 | Microsoft Corp (8) | 19 eBay Inc (20) |  |  |
| 10 | Hewlett Packard (9) | 20 NVIDIA Corp (11) |  |  |

## ...ten years ago more than balf of the top 25 companies, like Apple, Oracle and e-Bay, (companies shaded above) were not on the list...

## Assessor Parcels and "Added" Assessed Value Resulting From All Changes in Ownership

 (CIO) and New Construction (NC) by City and Major Property Type: 2015-16|  |  | Agricultural \& Misc. | Industrial \& Mfg | Multifamily Housing | Office | Retail | Townhouse/ Condo | Single Family Home | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Campbell | CIO | \$6,732,732 | \$9,427,458 | \$30,610,822 | \$38,498,572 | \$21,028,470 | \$25,659,687 | \$147,857,508 | \$27, 815,249 |
|  |  | 14 | 20 | 41 | 17 | 32 | 179 | 345 | 648 |
|  | NC | \$20,692,541 |  | \$29,968,606 | \$1,784,125 | \$1,316,356 |  | \$9,439,394 | \$63,201,022 |
|  |  | ) |  | 10 | 1 | 3 |  | 113 | 136 |
| Cupertino | ClO | \$83,422,018 | \$4,106,598 | \$23,736,707 | \$164,091,592 | \$172,549,707 | \$52,166,232 | \$307,106,539 | \$807,179,393 |
|  |  | 23 | 5 | 14 | 11 | 22 | 170 | 369 | 614 |
|  | NC | \$617,641,391 | \$59,159 | \$21,183,606 | \$249,410,125 | \$20,248,116 | \$166,864 | \$49,246,804 | \$957,956,065 |
|  |  | 11 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 248 | 281 |
| Gillroy | ClO | \$45,254,034 | \$3,273,369 | \$5,907,354 | (\$287,448) | (\$8,377,801) | \$3,128,781 | \$132,880,706 | \$181,778,995 |
|  |  | 185 | 12 | 25 | 5 | 16 | 38 | 719 | 1,000 |
|  | NC | \$9,422,168 | \$20,034,000 |  |  | \$650,000 |  | \$11,325,908 | \$41,502,076 |
|  |  | 57 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  | 72 | 132 |
| Los Altos | ClO | \$7,347,088 |  | \$1,041,314 | \$22,356,094 | \$5,623,398 | \$56,335,702 | \$408,929,954 | \$501,633,550 |
|  |  | 8 |  | 2 | 20 | 7 | 94 | 343 | 474 |
|  | NC | \$10,341,504 |  | \$24,664,721 | \$18,123,633 | \$8,12,676 | \$11,994,188 | \$82,401,156 | \$155,637,878 |
|  |  | 8 |  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 49 | 319 | 383 |
| Los Altos Hills | ClO | \$12,156,786 |  |  |  |  |  | \$220,048,356 | \$232,205,142 |
|  |  | 24 |  |  |  |  |  | 123 | 147 |
|  | NC | \$10,284,416 |  |  |  |  |  | \$46,396,907 | \$56,681,323 |
|  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 106 | 118 |
| Los Gatos | CIO | \$7,592,441 | \$8,50, 845 | \$8,827,821 | \$19,956,766 | \$8,817,915 | \$44,164,093 | \$226,328,972 | \$324,197,853 |
|  |  | 26 | 6 | 17 | 26 | 11 | 160 | 378 | 624 |
|  | NC | \$8,567,157 | \$14,530,570 | \$23,114,593 | \$18,672,561 | \$600,849 | \$58,373 | \$36,363,824 | \$101,907,927 |
|  |  | 22 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 194 | 231 |
| Milpitas | CIO | \$54,837,523 | \$31,103,568 | \$29,392,586 | \$113,884 | \$8,361,818 | \$271,186,909 | \$165,816,578 | \$560,812,866 |
|  |  | 33 | 38 | 16 | 7 | 9 | 680 | 520 | 1,303 |
|  | NC | \$609,112 |  | \$64,600,858 |  | \$700,000 | \$10,242,177 | \$7,272,526 | \$83,424,673 |
|  |  | 3 |  | 4 |  | 1 | 63 | 90 | 161 |
| Monte Sereno | CIO | \$1,263,014 |  |  |  |  |  | \$56,281,795 | \$57,544,809 |
|  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 59 | 61 |
|  | NC | \$3,475,799 |  |  |  |  |  | \$16,254,770 | \$19,730,569 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43 | 49 |
| Morgan Hill | ClO | \$42,946,243 | (\$10,209,625) | \$16,684,654 | \$930,097 | \$3,657,930 | \$32,364,534 | \$160,283,580 | \$246,657,413 |
|  |  | 30 | 27 | 27 | 4 | 8 | 167 | 675 | 938 |
|  | NC | \$1,659,963 | \$153,150 | (\$102,463) | \$97,500 | \$1,440,000 | \$4,387,365 | \$19,205,322 | \$26,840,837 |
|  |  | 18 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 17 | 154 | 196 |
| Mountain View | CIO | \$21,626,969 | \$443,774,640 | \$67,179,074 | \$147,805,150 | \$34,929,733 | \$183,283,260 | \$274,895,828 | \$1,173,494,654 |
|  |  | 27 | 47 | 64 | 20 | 35 | 444 | 370 | 1,007 |
|  | NC | \$7,691,426 | \$120,452,760 | \$214,529,248 | \$63,895,317 | \$22,621,034 | \$7,935,469 | \$35,338,384 | \$472,463,638 |
|  |  | 6 | 3 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 45 | 202 | 279 |
| Palo Alto | CIO | \$30,656,429 | \$96,130,242 | \$65,299,673 | \$25,665,720 | \$14,741,069 | \$80,435,757 | \$814,162,999 | \$1,127,091,889 |
|  |  | 40 | 25 | 29 | 21 | 13 | 159 | 540 | 827 |
|  | NC | \$180,591,564 | \$14,097,507 | \$1,248,650 | \$70,964,606 | \$135,756,799 | \$2,895,521 | \$144,084,367 | \$549,639,014 |
|  |  | 44 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 509 | 582 |
| San Jose | ClO | \$196,219,457 | \$365,764,822 | \$310,972,718 | \$283,745,429 | \$196,457,965 | \$562,226,378 | \$2,274,419,828 | \$4,189,806,597 |
|  |  | 266 | 279 | 498 | 176 | 306 | 3,651 | 7,414 | 12,590 |
|  | NC | \$143,729,279 | \$145,411,019 | \$1,073,885,589 | \$82,059,829 | \$73,272,023 | \$8,763,034 | \$146,319,556 | \$1,673,440,329 |
|  |  | 56 | 19 | 261 | 17 | 27 | 61 | 1,513 | 1,954 |
| Santa Clara | ClO | \$1,165,770,313 | \$112,804,733 | \$61,521,183 | \$222,728,379 | \$21,056,845 | \$47,179,949 | \$318,802,922 | \$1,949,864,324 |
|  |  | 17 | 47 | 90 | 16 | 33 | 403 | 755 | 1,361 |
|  | NC | \$1,596,535 | (\$15,028,415) | \$97,449,286 | \$162,403,928 | \$33,656,858 | \$13,585 | \$14,856,859 | \$294,948,636 |
|  |  | 8 | 12 | 8 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 254 | 302 |
| Saratoga | ClO | \$16,252,292 |  | \$1,359,975 | \$1,257,447 | \$6,183,130 | \$10,741,430 | \$317,300,618 | \$353,184,892 |
|  |  | 20 |  | 1 | 7 | 5 | 46 | 353 | 432 |
|  | NC | \$1,715,633 |  |  |  | \$94,614 | \$427,836 | \$65,787,099 | \$68,025,182 |
|  |  | 8 |  |  |  | 2 | 6 | 296 | 312 |
| Sunnyvale | CIO | \$56,059,482 | \$478,112,494 | \$395,798,097 | \$110,649,505 | \$22,395,511 | \$117,405,488 | \$465,422,952 | \$1,645,843,529 |
|  |  | 29 | 96 | 101 | 24 | 23 | 469 | 786 | 1,528 |
|  | NC | \$13,735,273 | \$148,989,869 | \$105,809,341 | \$228,167,171 | \$2,009,683 | \$22,558,524 | \$25,525,460 | \$546,795,321 |
|  |  | , | 9 | 16 | 6 | 3 | 181 | 343 | 567 |
| Unincorporated | ClO | \$39,880,070 | (\$396,035) | \$3,303,246 | \$32,813 | \$10,655,899 | \$3,392,74 | \$315,694,855 | \$372,571,592 |
|  |  | 375 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 10 | 14 | 812 | 1,225 |
|  | NC | \$22,923,425 |  | \$30,580 |  |  |  | \$59,033,526 | \$81,987,531 |
|  |  | 73 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 400 | 475 |
| Total | CIO | \$1,788,024,891 | \$1,542,402,109 | \$1,021,635,224 | \$1,037,544,000 | \$518,081,589 | \$1,489,670,944 | \$6,606,323,990 | \$14,003,682,747 |
|  |  | 1,119 | 604 | 936 | 355 | 530 | 6,674 | 14,561 | 24,779 |
|  | NC | \$1,054,747,186 | \$448,699,619 | \$1,656,382,615 | \$895,578,795 | \$300,479,008 | \$69,442,936 | \$768,851,862 | \$5,194,182,021 |
|  |  | 350 | 52 | 337 | 58 | 64 | 441 | 4,856 | 6,158 |

Note: New construction with negative assessed value may be the ressult of a natural disaster or other circumstances that may trigger demolition andlor site preparation. Not all CIO or NC result in a change in assessed value.

## Major Changes in Ownership* 2015-2016 <br> (assessed value in millions)

...In San Jose, all reassessable residential transactions declined 8
percent, even
though the
assessed value

## jumped

17 percent...
this pattern
occurred
in every city...

| Company (Assessee) | Property Type | City | Net Value+ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Offfice |  |  |  |
| Google Inc | Mountain View |  |  |
| BVK Perimeter Square Retail LLC | Mixed Use | Cupertino | $\$ 168.09$ |
| MV Campus Owner | Office | Mountain View | $\$ 158.10$ |
| Essex Porffolio LP | Apartment | Sunnyvale | $\$ 152.15$ |
| PR 3975 Freedom Circle | Office | Santa Clara | $\$ 151.64$ |
| Essex Porffolio LP | Apartment | Milpitas | $\$ 149.37$ |
| Google Inc | Office | Mountain View | $\$ 146.88$ |
| Metropolitan Life Insurance Co | Office | San Jose | $\$ 137.80$ |
| JBGCOM Sunnyvale Investors LLC | Office | Sunnyvale | $\$ 128.52$ |
| M West Propco XXV LLC | Office | San Jose | $\$ 125.46$ |
| * |  |  |  |

* Income generating properties only.
+ Includes only properties with $100 \%$ change in ownership in 2013.


## Major New Construction** 2015-2016

| Company (Assessee) | Property Type | City |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Apple Computers (Campus Holdings) | Office | Cupertino |
| Forty Niners-SC Stadium Company | Stadium | Santa Clara |
| MT3D | Office | Sunnyvale |
| MGP IX CP Venture | Apartment | Mountain View |
| Essex OSM Reit | Apartment | San Jose |
| Earthquakes Stadium | Stadium | San Jose |
| Stanford University | Medical Office | Palo Alto |
| Fairview Tasman | Apartment | San Jose |
| River View Apartments $5 \& 6$ | Apartment | San Jose |
| Moffett Place | Office | Sunnyvale |
| ** Includes partial or completed construction. |  |  |

## How much time to value new construction?

On average an appraiser spent approximately 5.31 hours during the prior assessment roll to value residential new construction,
while the average amount of time to value construction of commercial and industrial properties increased to approximately 23.91 hours.
...In 2014, Cupertino's growth in assessed value from new construction was $\$ 33$ Million. In 2015 it leaped to $\$ 958$ Million. Palo Alto and Mountain View had increases of 179 and 190 percent respectively...

| 2015-2016 Net Assessed Value (AV) and Number of Parcels (APN) by High School and Elementary Districts and by Major Property Type (Value in Millions**) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School District | Count | Mobilehome | Multifamily <br> Housing | Single family Housing | Non <br> Residential | Total Net Secured | Total Net <br> Unsecured | Grand Total | Other <br> Exemption | Home Owner <br> Exemption | Total Value Growth |
| Campbell Union High School* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Burbank | Val | \$0 | \$99,301,892 | \$179,643,320 | \$56,243,942 | \$335,189,154 | \$6,231,899 | \$341,421,053 | \$8,305,959 | \$1,993,600 | 5.48\% |
|  | APN |  | 180 | 592 | 118 | 890 |  |  | 3 | 285 |  |
| Cambrian | Val | \$1,962,866 | \$541,654,080 | \$3,916,181,483 | \$962,839,483 | \$5,422,637,912 | \$111,056,104 | \$5,533,694,016 | \$63,828,833 | \$37,184,000 | 6.77\% |
|  | APN | 14 | 472 | 8293 | 508 | 9287 |  |  | 50 | 5212 |  |
| Campbell Union* | Val | \$8,897,025 | \$2,756,531,132 | \$11,012,752,758 | \$3,827,957,210 | \$17,606,138,125 | \$637,784,787 | \$18,243,922,912 | \$703,280,507 | \$90,960,800 | 6.35\% |
|  | APN | 110 | 2364 | 20892 | 1580 | 24946 |  |  | 193 | 13006 |  |
| Moreland | Val | \$0 | \$1,049,890,818 | \$5,402,282,141 | \$944,111,384 | \$7,396,284,343 | \$118,944,778 | \$7,515,229,121 | \$131,274,679 | \$49,709,800 | $5.51 \%$ |
|  | APN |  | 1089 | 10706 | 363 | 12158 |  |  | 62 | 7107 |  |
| Union Elementary | Val | \$29,435 | \$286,555,757 | \$7,171,468,751 | \$635,065,366 | \$8,093,119,309 | \$64,010,836 | \$8,157,130,145 | \$102,289,811 | \$64,467,200 | 5.79\% |
|  | APN | 1 | 378 | 13617 | 284 | 14280 |  |  | 74 | 9220 |  |
|  | Total Value | \$10,889,326 | \$4,733,933,679 | \$27,682,328,453 | \$6,426,217,385 | \$38,853,368,843 | \$938,028,404 | \$39,791,397,247 | \$1,008,979,789 | \$244,315,400 | 5.98\% |
|  | Total APN | 125 | 4483 | 54100 | 2853 | 61561 |  |  | 382 | 34830 |  |
| East Side High School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alum Rock Union | Val | \$3,826,609 | \$554,402,292 | \$5,818,706,117 | \$1,085,533,822 | \$7,462,468,840 | \$143,594,043 | \$7,606,062,883 | \$642,296,802 | \$74,883,200 | 4.72\% |
|  | APN | 122 | 863 | 19164 | 1443 | 21592 |  |  | 208 | 10479 |  |
| Berryessa Union | Val | \$128,926 | \$238,002,739 | \$9,198,426,933 | \$730,904,824 | \$10,167,463,422 | \$247,231,301 | \$10,414,694,723 | \$144,292,103 | \$93,983,400 | 6.83\% |
|  | APN | 2 | 91 | 22363 | 518 | 22974 |  |  | 101 | 13439 |  |
| Evergreen | Val | \$29,224,857 | \$180,225,164 | \$14,431,848,815 | \$1,130,472,762 | \$15,771,771,598 | \$191,979,853 | \$15,963,751,451 | \$177,481,735 | \$113,972,600 | 4.56\% |
|  | APN | 561 | 71 | 25387 | 792 | 26811 |  |  | 129 | 16304 |  |
| Franklin McKinley | Val | \$104,117,920 | \$755,407,150 | \$4,925,639,563 | \$2,046,985,940 | \$7,832,150,573 | \$305,359,823 | \$8,137,510,396 | \$758,178,266 | \$61,062,275 | 5.29\% |
|  | APN | 2142 | 935 | 14251 | 1519 | 18847 |  |  | 126 | 8731 |  |
| Mount Pleasant | Val | \$82,001 | \$9,954,372 | \$1,898,797,136 | \$125,936,090 | \$2,034,769,599 | \$10,621,054 | \$2,045,390,653 | \$15,433,413 | \$20,493,200 | 6.97\% |
|  | APN | 1 | 28 | 5008 | 178 | 5215 |  |  | 27 | 2930 |  |
| Oak Grove | Val | \$74,873,150 | \$1,251,350,821 | \$9,763,975,754 | \$2,206,398,417 | \$13,296,598,142 | \$593,891,880 | \$13,890,490,022 | \$420,280,359 | \$107,713,200 | 6.58\% |
|  | APN | 1290 | 513 | 25583 | 620 | 28006 |  |  | 131 | 15402 |  |
| Orchard | Val | \$41,160,667 | \$1,047,480,981 | \$1,190,302,778 | \$5,734,793,834 | \$8,013,738,260 | \$1,342,459,494 | \$9,356,197,754 | \$125,851,786 | \$11,671,800 | 4.24\% |
|  | APN | 890 | 32 | 2195 | 1330 | 4447 |  |  | 26 | 1669 |  |
|  | Total Value | \$253,414,130 | \$4,036,823,519 | \$47,227,697,096 | \$13,061,025,689 | \$64,578,960,434 | \$2,835,137,448 | \$67,414,097,882 | \$2,283,814,464 | \$483,779,675 | 5.60\% |
|  | Total APN | 5008 | 2533 | 113951 | 6400 | 127892 |  |  | 748 | 68954 |  |
| Fremont Union High School* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cupertino Union | Val | \$0 | \$2,493,296,905 | \$26,046,022,731 | \$5,737,973,710 | \$34,277,293,346 | \$1,313,740,794 | \$35,591,034,140 | \$236,973,824 | \$177,836,400 | 46.64\% |
|  | APN |  | 1561 | 36128 | 1346 | 39035 |  |  | 163 | 25425 |  |
| Sunnyvale Elementary* | Val | \$67,512,336 | \$3,007,961,681 | \$7,852,752,744 | \$10,963,472,278 | \$21,891,699,039 | \$2,379,329,411 | \$24,271,028,450 | \$347,181,381 | \$74,216,800 | 49.63\% |
|  | APN | 905 | 1332 | 15985 | 1424 | 19646 |  |  | 114 | 10612 |  |
|  | Total Value | \$67,512,336 | \$5,501,258,586 | \$33,898,775,475 | \$16,701,445,988 | \$56,168,992,385 | \$3,693,070,205 | \$59,862,062,590 | \$584,155,205 | \$252,053,200 | 48.13\% |
|  | Total APN | 905 | 2893 | 52113 | 2770 | 58681 |  |  | 277 | 36037 |  |
| Gilroy Unified High School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Val | \$9,400,601 | \$362,101,379 | \$5,715,928,245 | \$2,352,847,585 | \$8,440,277,810 | \$301,238,448 | \$8,741,516,258 | \$234,267,473 | \$54,656,000 | 5.67\% |
|  | APN | 166 | 561 | 12844 | 3596 | 17167 |  |  | 133 | 7815 |  |
|  | Total Value | \$9,400,601 | \$362,101,379 | \$5,715,928,245 | \$2,352,847,585 | \$8,440,277,810 | \$301,238,448 | \$8,741,516,258 | \$234,267,473 | \$54,656,000 | 5.67\% |
|  | Total APN | 166 | 561 | 12844 | 3596 | 17167 |  |  | 133 | 7815 |  |
| Los Gatos - Saratoga Joint Union High School* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lakeside Union* | Val | \$0 | \$439,576 | \$100,464,190 | \$22,340,662 | \$123,244,428 | \$176,812 | \$123,421,240 | \$1,397,372 | \$788,200 | 9.29\% |
|  | APN |  | 1 | 171 | 126 | 298 |  |  | 3 | 113 |  |
| Loma Prieta Union* | Val | \$0 | \$5,284,078 | \$195,226,877 | \$40,059,110 | \$240,570,065 | \$1,144,016 | \$241,714,081 | \$930,055 | \$1,526,000 | 6.27\% |
|  | APN |  |  | 328 | 255 | 586 |  |  | 2 | 218 |  |
| Los Gatos Union* | Val | \$3,167,005 | \$338,560,521 | \$8,827,977,460 | \$1,245,620,688 | \$10,415,325,674 | \$142,834,642 | \$10,558,160,316 | \$215,091,753 | \$40,689,600 | 7.45\% |
|  | APN | 51 | 251 | 8757 | 1474 | 10533 |  |  | 52 | 5824 |  |
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| San Jose Unified High School |  |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | Val |
|  | APN |
|  | Total Value |
| Santa Clara Unified High School |  |
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| Los Altos Hills |
| :--- |
| Los Gatos |
| Milpitas |
|  |
| Monte Sereno |

Monte Sereno

## Morgan Hill
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## Assessment Appeals Process

In Santa Clara County, a Notification of Assessed Value indicating the assessed (taxable) value of each property is mailed in June to all property owners on the secured roll. A taxpayer who disagrees with the assessed value is encouraged to take advantage of the Assessor's "online tool," available $24 / 7$. Last year, this tool enabled 352,000 property owners to review the comparable sales used to determine their assessment. Also online they can request a review by presenting to the Assessor's Office, before August 1, any factual information pertinent to the determination of the property's market value. If the Assessor agrees that a reduction is appropriate, an adjustment is made prior to the mailing of the property tax bill in October.

If a difference of opinion still exists, the taxpayer may file an assessment appeal. The appeal is then set for hearing before the local, independent Assessment Appeals Board. In Santa Clara County, appeal applications must be filed between July 2 and September 15 with the Clerk of the Board (Clerk to the County Board of Supervisors). State law requires that all assessment appeals be resolved within two years of filing, unless the property owner signs a waiver of the statute. To appeal a roll change or supplemental assessment, typically triggered by a change in ownership, audit, or completed new construction, the application must be filed within 60 days of the date of the notice.

Due to the large increase in assessment appeals during the recession, a Value Hearing Officer program was established in 2011. Designed to expedite resolution of residential assessment appeals, the program
 has been very successful. Between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015, the Value Hearing Officer program resolved 632 appeals. As a result 68 percent of all residential assessment appeals are resolved within 12 months.

If the Assessment Appeals Board or Value Hearing Officer renders a decision granting a temporary reduction in value (Proposition 8), that value and the corresponding reduction in property taxes apply only to the property tax due for the year for which the application was filed.

Should the Assessment Appeals Board order a change in the base year value set by the Assessor for new construction or a change in ownership, the reduction in value applies to the tax bill(s) for the year the application was filed, and establishes a new base year value for the future. When a taxpayer appeals the Assessor's determination of the reassessability of a change in ownership, the matter is heard and adjudicated by an independently appointed legal hearing officer.

> Last year, 52.2 percent of all assessment appeals were withdrawn by the appellant; 27.5 percent were resolved prior to the hearing; 14.8 percent were denied due to lack of appearance and 5.5 percent were resolved at an assessment appeals board hearing.

## Appeals Filed By Homeowners Drop

## 13 Percent

Reflecting the strong economic recovery, the number of valid assessment appeals (1509) filed by homeowners dropped 13 percent. This is the fourth year that fewer appeals were filed than the prior year. In 2009, there were 6,698 residential appeals filed. The amount contested declined by 14 percent to $\$ 581$ million, just 1.9 percent of the total value in dispute.

Similarly, the number of appeals filed by commercial and industrial property owners also declined by 10 per-
 cent. Ten companies account for 71 percent of the total amount in dispute ranging between $\$ 1.6$ billion and $\$ 5.4$ billion.

Between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015, the Assessor's Office resolved 5,591 appeals. Ninety-six percent of the Assessor's originally enrolled assessed values disputed by appellants were sustained by the Assessment Appeals Board and the Value Hearing Officers.

| Assessment Appeals Filed: 2014-2015 <br> (value in billions) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Appeals | Total Local Roll ${ }^{* *}$ | Value in Dispute * | Percent of Roll at Risk+ |
| 2014 | 4,853 | \$388.34 | \$30.04 | 7.73\% |
| 2013 | 5,443 | \$357.35 | \$22.75 | 6.8\% |
| 2012 | 7,371 | \$308.81 | \$22.10 | 7.2\% |
| 2011 | 8,578 | \$299.10 | \$21.41 | 7.2\% |
| 2010 | 9,163 | \$296.47 | \$23.67 | 8.0\% |
| 2009 | 11,168 | \$303.86 | \$25.34 | 8.3\% |
| ** Local roll value: Net of nonreimbursable exemptions <br> * Value in dispute: The difference of value between the assessed roll value and applicants' opinion of value compiled at the end of the filing year. Percentages based on non-rounded values Note: Report shows all appeals filed between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015, including appeals fater determined to be invalid. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

...In 2014, the

## Assessor's Office

expended 4.91 staff hours to resolve each residential appeal and approximately 11.74 staff hours to resolve each appeal for business equipment and machinery (business personal property)...

## Performance Counts

Led by County Assessor Larry Stone, the Assessor's Office has implemented an ambitious performance-based budgeting and management initiative. Based on the simple idea that what gets measured gets done, the Assessor's Office has a clear mission statement and measurable performance indicators designed to quantify improvement over time, all tied directly to the budget.

The Assessor's Office utilizes an automated telephone based customer satisfaction survey which measures clarity of information, courtesy, helpfulness, professionalism, promptness, and overall satisfaction.

Last year 531 taxpayers participated in our customer satisfaction survey and results were consistent with the prior year. Participants gave the staff an average rating of 4.25 on overall satisfaction ( 5 point scale, with 5 being the highest).


## What Our Customers are Saying

Each year, scores of customers respond to customer surveys with comments about the office and the staff. Below is a small sample.
"I just read your Annual Report and it was informative and well-written."
"Nora, by the way, has been fabulous. I'd really like to do something to thank her after this is over sometime. What is legally permissible?" [Editors note, sorry we can only accept notes of appreciation, no gifts.]
"I spoke with Susan and she was extremely helpful. She gave me a great answer to my question and made my client very bappy as well! Another point for the Assessors Office"

> "... We just finished [completing our filings for 600+ locations in California] and I wanted to take a minute and let you know how much we appreciate the SDR filing system (e-filing for major corporations, from grocery stores to airlines). With our volume and limited resources, it saves us a lot of time, money and effort. We appreciate the uniformity and consistency of all the filing requirements throughout the state. In some other states, we find that every county wants a different format... I always cite CA to them as an example of a system that works for everybody." [National Retailer]

The following are the Assessor's comprehensive performance measures. By reporting high-level quantitative and qualitative data that tracks levels of customer satisfaction, timeliness of product delivery, accuracy of assessments and overall financial efficiency, these measures allow the Assessor to identify and record service levels from year to year, designed to achieve specific continuous improvement objectives. The data is compiled from the results of similar, more detailed measures in each Division of the Assessor's Office. The performance measures in each Division were developed in collaboration with both line staff and managers.

## Performance Measures

1. Completed 97.6 percent of assessments (98.5 percent in 2014)
Why is this important? The assessment roll is the basis by which property taxes are levied. The completeness of the assessment roll assures public agencies dependent upon property tax revenue that the assessment roll accurately reflects current market activity.
2. 165 was the average number of days, to deliver supplemental assessments to the Tax Collector. (179 in 2014)
Why is this important? Supplemental assessments occur upon a "change in ownership" or "new construction" of real property. This performance measure ensures timely notification to those property owners who acquire or complete new construction on their property.
3. The average number of days to resolve an assessment appeal in 2015 was 494. (582 in 2014) Why is this important? By statute, assessment
appeals must be resolved within two years of filing, unless a waiver is executed by the taxpayer. This performance measure ensures a timely equalization of assessments for property owners.
4. Customer satisfaction rating from surveys in FY 2014-15 was 85.8 percent. ( 86.3 percent in 2013-2014)
Why is this important? This outcome measure rates the satisfaction level of both our internal and external customers who rely on the Assessor for timely service and accurate information.
5. Total expenditures were 98.3 percent of the budget in FY 2015. (97.2 percent in 2014) Why is this important? The budget/cost ratio compares the department's actual bottom line expenditures at the end of the fiscal year to the budget to ensure that costs do not exceed anticipated resources.

## Appraising and Assessing: Is There a Difference?

Yes. An appraisal is the process of estimating value. Most taxpayers assume the market place exclusively determines a property's assessment. However, the market value may be only one component in the process of determining the property's assessed value. While at least one of the three approaches to value, (1) sales comparison, (2) income, and (3) cost, is always considered in the
appraisal of a property, the Assessor is required to incorporate additional factors when determining when and how to assess property under state law. Frequently, court decisions, laws, and rules promulgated by the State Legislature and State Board of Equalization amend the assessment process, and redefine what, when and/or how the Assessor must determine the assessed value of a property.

## Cost Accounting

A critical component of the Assessor's performance-based budget and management system is the comprehensive cost accounting system that allows the Assessor to financially account for nearly every task performed by office staff. The data captures the fully loaded cost, including compensation, benefits, overhead, etc., of activities such as the cost of a residential or commercial appraisal, or an audit of a major company.

Managers use the cost accounting data to measure performance and establish quality standards, allocate work assignments, and measure completion rates. Managers are able to review hours worked, essential in calculating the cost per unit. This information is critical for achieving increased productivity, and improving customer service to property owners, taxpayers, and public agencies that depend on property tax revenue.

## How The Assessor's Staff Expended 287,428 Hours During the Prior Fiscal Year



## Frequently Asked Questions

Q. Can I transfer my current assessed value to a new home to avoid higher property taxes? A. Yes, under Proposition 60, if you are age 55 or older and qualify. When a senior citizen sells an existing residence and purchases or constructs a replacement residence valued the same or less than the residence sold, the Assessor can transfer the assessment (factored base year value) of the original residence, to the replacement residence anywhere in Santa Clara County. Additionally, Santa Clara and eight other counties currently participate in Proposition 90, and will accept base year value transfers from any county in California. Propositions 60/90 require timely filing, are subject to approval by the Assessor, and can be granted only once. To receive more information or an application, go to www.sccassessor.org.
Q. What can I do if I think my assessment is too high (i.e., higher than market value)?
A. Submit an informal "assessment review request" on-line at www.sccassessor.org. Any supporting data (appraisals, comparables, multi-
ple listings, etc.) will be helpful in expediting a reduction if an adjustment is warranted. To file a formal appeal with the Assessment Appeals Board, contact the Clerk of the Board at www.sccgov.org/assessmentappeals or (408) 299-5088.
Q. I plan to transfer my home to my child. Can he/she retain my assessment?
A. Yes, upon qualification. The voters of California modified the Constitution (Propositions 58 and 193) to allow parents, and in some cases, grandparents who want to keep their home "in the family" to transfer their assessed value to their children or grandchildren, in certain circumstances. Tax relief is provided when real property transfers occur between parents and their children (Proposition 58) or from grandparents to grandchildren (Proposition 193), if the parents are no longer living. Interested taxpayers should contact the Assessor to receive more information and an application. All claims must be filed timely and are subject to final approval by the Assessor.


## Explanation of Terms *

Ad Valorem Property Tax Taxes imposed on the basis of the property's value.
Assessed Value (AV) The taxable value of a property against which the tax rate is applied.
Assessment Appeal Due process initiated by taxpayer if the assessed value of her or her property cannot be agreed upon with the assessor.

Assessment Appeals Board (AAB) A three-member panel appointed by the Board of Supervisors to resolve disputes between the Assessor's Office and property owners. Qualifying owners may alternatively select a Value Hearing Officer to hear their appeal. Typically a real estate professional, the VHO process is considered an expedient and convenient alternative to the more formal Board proceedings, and may provide a faster resolution to an appeal.

Assessment Roll The official list of all property within the county assessed by the Assessor.
Base Year (Value) The fair market value of a property at the time of the 1975 lien date, or on the date of the subsequent new construction or change in ownership.

Basic Aid "Basic Aid" school districts fund their revenue limit entirely through property taxes and receive no general purpose state aid.

Business Personal Property Property which is movable and not affixed to the land, and which is owned and used to operate a business, such as furniture, computers, machines and supplies.

Change in Ownership A transfer of real property resulting in the transfer of the present interest and beneficial use of the property.

CCPI California Consumer Price Index; determined annually by the California Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Escaped Assessments Assessments levied outside the normal assessment period for the lien date(s) in question.

Exclusions Qualifying transfers of real property which are excluded from reappraisal if a timely claim is filed with the Assessor's Office.

Exemption Legally qualified deduction from the taxable assessed value of the property.
Factored Base Year Value (FBYV) A property's base value, adjusted annually by the change in the CCPI, not to exceed 2 percent. It is the upper limit of taxable value each year.

Fiscal Year The period beginning July 1 and ending June 30.
Fixture Tangible property securely affixed to real property.
Full Cash Value (FCV) The amount of cash or its equivalent value that property would bring if exposed for sale in the open market, and as further defined in Revenue \& Taxation Code $\$ 110$.

Improvements Buildings or structures generally attached to the land.
Lien The amount owed and created by the assessment of the property, or the amount levied against property by a taxing agency or revenue district.

Lien Date The date when taxes for any fiscal year become a lien on property. In California, all tax liens attach annually as of 12:01 am on January 1
*Explanation of terms are provided to simplify assessment terminology, but do not replace legal definitions.

New Construction The construction of new buildings, additions to existing buildings, or alterations which convert the property to another use or extends the economic life of the improvement.

Parcel Land that is segregated into units by boundary lines for assessment purposes.
Personal Property Any property except real estate, including airplanes, boats, and business property.
Possessory Interest (PI) Interest of a lessee in government-owned property. Examples of a PI include the exclusive right to use public property at an airport such as a car rental company's service counter or a concession stand at the county fair. In both cases, the vendors are subject to property taxes.

Proposition 13 Passed by California voters in June, 1978, Proposition 13 is a Constitutional amendment that limits the taxation of property and creates a procedure for establishing the current taxable value of locally assessed real property, referencing a base year full cash value.

Proposition 8 Passed by California voters in November 1978, Proposition 8 requires the temporary reduction in the assessed value when there is a decline in market value below the property's factored base year value.

Real Property Land that has been legally defined and improvements that have been made to the land.

Secured Roll Assessment roll on which the taxes are secured by a lien against the real estate.
Special Assessments Direct charges or flat fees against property which are included in the total tax bill but are not based upon the Assessor's valuation of the property. Examples are sewer charges or school parcel taxes.

State Board of Equalization (SBE) The Board consists of four members elected by California voters by district, and the State Controller. Their duties include administering various State taxes and fees and serving as an appellate body for property, business, and income tax assessments. Through guidelines and rules and the Board promotes uniformity in local assessment practices.

Supplemental Assessment Upon a change of ownership or completion of new construction, a supplemental assessment is issued in addition to the annual regular assessment and is based on the net difference between the previous assessed values and the new value for the remainder of the assessment year(s).

Tax Rate The ratio of the tax to the tax base. The minimum ad valorem property tax rate is $1 \%$ of the net taxable value of the property. The total tax rate may be higher due to voter-approved general obligation bonds that are secured by property taxes for the annual payment of principle and interest.

Tax Roll The official list of property subject to property tax, together with the amount of assessed value and the amount of taxes due, as applied and extended by the Auditor/Controller.

TRA Tax Rate Area; a geographic area having the same property tax allocation factors.

Transfer of Ownership Change in ownership or change in manner in which property is held.
Unsecured Roll Assessment roll consisting largely of business personal property, on which the property taxes are not secured by a lien against the real estate.

## Property Assessment Calendar

January 1

February 15 Deadline to file all exemption claims.
April 1 Due date for filing statements for business personal property, aircraft and boats. Business property owners must file a property statement each year detailing the cost of all supplies, machinery, equipment, leasehold improvements, fixtures and land owned at each location within Santa Clara County.

April 10 Last day to pay second installment of secured property taxes without penalty. This tax payment is based on property values determined for the January 1 lien date 15 months earlier.

May 7 Last day to file a business personal property statement without incurring a 10 percent penalty.

## End of June

July 1 Close of assessment roll and the start of the new assessment roll year. The assessment roll is the official list of all assessable property within the County.

July 2 First day to file assessment appeal with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.
August 1 Last day to request an informal Proposition 8 review.
August 31
Last day to pay unsecured property taxes without penalty.
September 15
Last day to file an assessment appeal application for reduced assessment on the regular roll with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

## December 10

January 1 Lien date for next assessment roll year.

## Frequently Asked Questions

Q. My house was destroyed by a fire. Is property tax relief available until it is rebuilt?
A. Yes, assuming you qualify. Owners of real property who incur significant damages (ten thousand dollars or more) as the result of a natural disaster, such as a fire, flood or earthquake, can file for temporary property tax relief (reassessment) with the Assessor's Office. Applicants must file a written application within one year of the disaster. Items such as home furnishings, personal effects and business inventories are not assessable.
Q. How many properties are still protected by Proposition 13, passed by the voters in 1978?
A. All properties in Santa Clara County and throughout California receive the full protections and benefits of Proposition 13, whether a property was purchased last year or in 1975. The base year value is established at the time of purchase or new construction, and increases in the assessed value are limited to an inflation factor of no more than 2 percent annually.

## Responsibility of the Assessor＇s Office

The Assessor has the responsibility to locate all taxable property in the County，identify ownership，establish a value for all property subject to local property taxation，list the value of all property on the assessment roll，and apply all legal exemptions．The Santa Clara County Assessor does not compute property tax bills，collect property taxes， establish property tax laws，establish rules by which proper－ ty is assessed，or set property tax rates．

Santa Clara County contains more than 470,000 separate real property parcels．There were 3,200 changes in parcel numbers，and there were over 67,000 change in ownership documents as reflected by deeds and maps filed in the County Recorder＇s Office．The Assessor＇s professional staff maintains a comprehensive set of 214 Assessor＇s parcel map books．The office appraised more than 6,100 parcels with new construction activities，and processed more than 72,000 business personal property assessments．

The assessments allow the County of Santa Clara and 204 local government taxing authorities to set tax rates （as limited by Proposition 13 and other laws），and collect and allocate property tax revenue which supports essential public services provided by the County，local schools，cities，and special districts．
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## Santa Clara County Assessor＇s Mission Statement

The mission of the Santa Clara County Assessor＇s Office is to produce an annual assessment roll including all assessable property in accordance with legal mandates in a timely，accurate，and efficient manner； and provide current assessment－related information to the public and to governmental agencies in a timely and responsive way．


## 您需要任何語言方面的協助嗎？ <br> 我們財稅估儧（估稅）部門的工作人員能流利地說你的語言來協助您的需要請撥 與我們聨絡，敬謝

Cần giûp？Văn Phòng Giảm Dịnh có nhân viển thồng thạo ngốn ngự cúa qù̀i vị．Xín gọ̣ cho chứng tôi tại $299-5500$
¿No habla ingles？La Oficina del Tasador tiene empleados que hablan español．Llámenos al （408）299－5500

[^5]Lawrence E. Stone, Assessor
County of Santa Clara Government Center
70 West Hedding Street, 5th Floor, East Wing
San Jose, California 95110-1771
Permit \# 1406
San Jose, CA
Website: www.sccassessor.org

## Santa Clara County

Board of Supervisors
Mike Wasserman, District I
Cindy Chavez, District II
Dave Cortese, District III
Ken Yeager, District IV
Joe Simitian, District V

## County Executive

Jeffrey V. Smith
To download this report in pdf
format scan this QR code


# Thank you for requesting a paper copy of the annual report <br> Please e-mail us at assessor@asr.sccgov.org if your address has changed or to receive electronically 

For information regarding general County financial information including taxes by tax rate areas and methods of property tax revenue allocation contact:
Santa Clara County Finance Agency (408) 299-5200
For information about Santa Clara County Assessments:
Public Information and Ownership
(408)299-5500

Real Property (land and improvements)
(408)299-5300
rp@asr.sccgov.org
Personal Property, including Businesses
Mobilehomes, Boats and Airplanes
Property Tax Exemptions
(408)299-5400

Change in Ownership Issues
(408)299-6460
busdiv@asr.sccgov.org
(408)299-5540 exemptions@asr.sccgov.org
propertytransfer@asr.sccgov.org
(408)299-5550 mapping@asr.sccgov.org

Administration
(408)299-5570

Administration Fax
(408)297-9526

Assessor Website
County Website
www.sccassessor.org
www.sccgov.org

For information about a tax bill, payments, delinquency, or the phone number of the appropriate agency to contact about a special assessment, contact:
Santa Clara County Tax Collector
(408)808-7900
www.scctax.org
For information about filing assessment appeals, contact:
Santa Clara County Assessment Appeals Board Clerk
(Clerk of the Board of Supervisors)
(408)299-5088
www.sccgov.org/portal/site/cob
For information about Recording documents, contact:
Santa Clara County Clerk/Recorder
(408)299-5688
www.clerkrecorder.org
California State Board of Equalization
The State Board of Equalization is responsible for assuring that county property tax assessment practices are equal and uniform throughout the state. For more information, contact the State Board at
(800) 400-7115 or www.boe.ca.gov


[^0]:    Note: Minor discrepancies may occur due to rounding calculations. Percentages based on non-rounded values.

    * Exclusive of Public Utility Valuations.

[^1]:    + California Department of Finance, County population est., January 2015, Assessed Value (AV) per Capita/per 1000

[^2]:    Note: Does not include mobilehomes; Now includes possessory interest assessments which, until 2014-15, were previously on the unsecured roll.
    Totals based on non-rounded values.
    "-" Indicates a value of 0 or less than $\$ 10$ million +Nonreimbursable Exemptions

[^3]:    + Percentages based on non-rounded values
    * Net of nonreimbursable exemptions. Does not include mobilehomes. Now includes possessory interest assessments which, until 2014-15, were previously on the unsecured roll.

[^4]:    

[^5]:    Disclaimer：This document presents a distribution of the 2015－2016 Santa Clara County property tax local assessment roll by City／Redevelopment Successor Agency and major property types．It does not include state－assessed property（unitary roll）．It is not the source document for deriving the property tax revenues to be received by any public entity．For example，the Controller＇s AB8 calculations do not include aircraft assessed valuation，which is incorporated into this report．Numbers reported in tables and charts reflect up to 0.01 units．Items less than 0.01 units have been reported as a dash．Minor discrepancies may occur due to rounding calculations and／or clarifica－ tion in definition of terms．

