

*Law Offices of  
Albin C. ("Al") Koch*

*Attorney At Law*

*301 E. Colorado Blvd., Suite 614, Pasadena, California 91101*

*626-229-7596 (Tel); 626-229-7597 (Fax); ackoch@sbcglobal.net (E-mail)*

November 14, 2011

The Honorable Jerome Horton  
Chair, State Board of Equalization  
450 N. St.  
Sacramento, CA 94279-0080

Re: Public Notice dated September 23, 2011 of Proposed Amendments  
To Regulation 1807: **Suggestion to Clarify Proposed Amendments.**

Dear Mr. Horton,

In reviewing the above notice which is to be considered by the Board at the Meetings of November 15-16, 2011, I noticed that Board Staff is proposing to revise the written historical records on its website of the proceedings conducted by the Board in 2008 to revise the 2002 version of Regulation 1807. The September 23 notice contains the following language:

“ . . . MuniServices, LLC, suggested that the transition rules in Regulation 1807, subdivision (g) and Regulation 1828, subdivision (f) be revised to indicate that Regulations 1807 and 1828 were amended, rather than repealed and readopted, in 2008. . . .

“ . . . the Board agreed [however] with Board Staff’s revised recommendation to amend Regulation 1807, subdivision (g), and Regulation 1828, subdivision (f), to indicate that the regulations were repealed and readopted in 2008, because the amendments are consistent with the actual 2008 events and the regulations’ history notes in the California Code of Regulations. However, the Board noted that the Board’s website incorrectly indicated that both regulations were substantially ‘amended’ in 2008, not repealed and readopted, and that the language on the Board’s website likely led to MuniServices. LLC’s concerns . . . and the Board directed staff to correct the Board’s website.”

As the former Special Tax Counsel to MuniServices who represented it during the 2007-2008 proceedings to revise Regulation 1807 and 1828, I am surprised that the secondary record of the events that occurred in 2008 contained in the Barclay’s California Code of Regulations would be granted recognition by the board over the actual Agenda for the Public Hearing and other contemporaneous official records of the proceedings leading up to the revisions that were

made which show that the intent and the action taken was to “amend” and not to “repeal” the 2002 regulations. Attached is a sampling of those records showing amendments were proposed and duly adopted and nothing repealed. In any event, I urge the Board Members to reconsider the directive to Staff expunge the historical records showing amendments were adopted and nothing repealed.

Reversal of that directive would seem to be appropriate in light of the proposed language of the current proposed amendment stating that it is to have no “retroactive effect.”

I further propose that the latter language be clarified by adding to it the following phrase:

“on any intervening proceedings under the version of regulation 1807 that became effective September 10, 2008, including, but limited to, any in which Board Member hearings were granted or petitioners exhausted their administrative remedies.”

I thank you in advance for any consideration you may give to this suggestion and I apologize for bringing it to your attention at a late hour. However, I believed you would want to be fully informed on this matter.

Yours very truly

Albin C. Koch

CC: The Honorable John Chiang, State Controller  
The Honorable Betty T. Yee, Member, State Board of Equalization  
The Honorable Senator George Runner, Member State Board of Equalization  
The Honorable Michelle Steel, Member State Board of Equalization

Ms. Marcy Mandel, Deputy Controller  
Diane G. Olson, Chief, Board Proceedings Division

Enclosures:

2008 Minutes of the State Board of Equalization for May 28, 2008.  
Notice and Agenda State Board of Equalization Meeting, Proposed Amendments to SBE Regulations 1807 and 1828 May 28, 2008.  
Business Taxes Committee Minutes, January 31, 2008.



STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION  
450 N STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA  
PO BOX 942879, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 94279-0080  
(916) 322-2270 • FAX (916) 324-3984  
www.boe.ca.gov

BETTY T. YEE  
First District, San Francisco  
  
BILL LEONARD  
Second District, Ontario/Sacramento  
  
MICHELLE STEEL  
Third District, Rolling Hills Estates  
  
JUDY CHU, Ph.D.  
Fourth District, Los Angeles  
  
JOHN CHIANG  
State Controller  
  
RAMON J. HIRSIG  
Executive Director

**STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION MEETING**  
**450 N Street, Room 121, Sacramento**  
**May 28-29, 2008**  
**NOTICE AND AGENDA**  
**Meeting Agenda (as of 5/23/08, 11:43 a.m.)**

**Agenda Changes**

**Webcast Audio on Wednesday, May 28, 2008**

**Wednesday, May 28, 2008**

**9:30 a.m. Board Committee Meeting Convenes\***  
**Board Meeting Convenes upon Adjournment of the Board Committee Meetings\*\***

Agenda items occur in the order in which they appear on the agenda. When circumstances warrant, the Board's Chair, Dr. Chu, may modify the order of the items on the agenda. Items may be postponed to a subsequent day; however, items will not be moved to an earlier day.

**Board Committee Meetings\***

**Property Tax Committee+ ..... Ms. Steel, Committee Chair**

- 1. Discussion of Biopharmaceutical Industry Business Property Assessment Practice Guidelines

**Customer Services and Administrative**

**Efficiency Committee+ ..... Mr. Leonard, Committee Chair**

- 1. Update regarding the Board of Equalization's release of security deposits and a revised action plan for the security program
- 2. Update on Citation Process for the Statewide Compliance and Outreach Program (SCOP) Budget Change Proposal

**Board Meeting\*\***

**Oral Hearings**

There are no items for these matters:

- A. Homeowner and Renter Property Tax Assistance Hearings
- B. Corporate Franchise and Personal Income Tax Hearings

**C. Sales and Use Tax Appeals Hearings**

(Contribution Disclosure forms required pursuant to Gov. Code § 15626.)

- C1. Janice Diana Samsing and Mildred Kaunas, 356928 (UT)  
 For Petitioner: Mildred Kaunas, Taxpayer  
 For Department: NaTasha Ralston, Tax Counsel
- C2. Foster Poultry Farms, 77405, 265656, 304306 (KHE)  
 For Petitioner/Claimant: Brian Grant, Taxpayer  
 Rich Carlson, Representative  
 For Department: Bradley Heller, Tax Counsel
- C3. Matt Lababedy, 89002316680 (KH)  
 For Petitioner: Matt Lababedy, Taxpayer  
 Don McKaughan, CPA  
 Bruce Locke, Attorney  
 For Department: Kevin Hanks, Hearing Representative

There are no items for these matters:

- D. Special Taxes Appeals Hearings  
 E. Property Tax Appeals Hearings

**F. Public Hearings**

These items are scheduled for the afternoon session.

**Chief Counsel Matters****J. Rulemaking**

These items are scheduled for Thursday, May 29, 2008.

**K. Business Taxes**

There are no items for this matter.

**L. Property Taxes**

These items are scheduled for Thursday, May 29, 2008.

**M. Other Chief Counsel Matters**

- M1. Adoption of Formal and Memorandum Opinions+ ..... Mr. Heller

Memorandum regarding the adoption of Formal and Memorandum  
 Opinions and the publication of Dissenting and Concurring Opinions

**G. Tax Program Nonappearance Matters – Consent**(Contribution Disclosure forms not required pursuant to Gov. Code § 15626.)**G1. Legal Appeals Matters .....Mr. Levine**

- Hearing Notices Sent – No Response
  1. Synpep Corporation, 329381 (CH)
  - 2a. Jamal A. Mahgoub, 356195 (CH)
  - 2b. AMT Solutions, Inc., 356197, 392072 (CH)
  3. Kenneth Darryl Beecham, 393632, (KH)
  4. Weston James Coolidge, 386899 (CH)
  5. Simmons Duplicating Supply Company, Inc., 347724 (OH)
- Petition for Release of Seized Property
  6. Hany M. Abuelrous, 433967 (ET)

**G2. Franchise and Income Tax Matters .....Ms. Kelly**

- Decision
  1. Jack Larson, 329112

**G3. Homeowner and Renter Property Tax****Assistance Matters .....Ms. Kelly**

- Decision
  1. Gloria M. Williams, 387273

**G4. Sales and Use Taxes Matters ..... Ms. Henry**

- Redeterminations
  1. Nissan North America, Inc., 272698 (OHA)
  2. Panasonic Corporation of North America, 422116 (OHB)
  3. 4 S Casino Party Suppliers, LLC, 299497 (BH)
  4. Specialty Salvage Limited, 283580 (KH)
  5. Union Pacific Railroad Company, 326246 (OHA)
- Denial of Claim for Refund
  6. Govstor, LLC, 417205 (JHF)

**G5. Sales and Use Taxes Matters – Credits, Cancellations, and Refunds ..... Ms. Henry**

- Refunds
  1. Target Corporation, 360870 (OHA)
  2. Lighthouse Worldwide Solutions, Inc., 373666 (CH)
  3. Birchwood Cabinets of California, Inc., 389873 (KH)
  4. Pentax of America, Inc., 403453 (OHB)
  5. Daimler Chrysler Corporation, 436898 (CHA)
  6. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC, 426403 (KH)
  7. Qualcomm, Inc., 404369 (UT)
  8. KII Acquisition Company, 342751 (FH)
  9. Vertis, Inc., 396782 (OHB)
  10. Consolidated Electrical Distributors, Inc., 287507 (AC)
  11. TSK America, Inc., 417773 (OHA)
  12. Freight Systems, Inc., 395248 (OHA)
  13. Watsonville Hospital Corporation, 381029 (GHC)

**G6. Special Taxes Matters**

There are no items for this matter.

**G7. Special Taxes Matters – Credits, Cancellations, and Refunds.....****Mr. Gau**

## ➤ Refunds

- 1a. Equiva Trading Company, 254407, (MT) – “CF”
- 1b. Equiva Trading Company, 208034, (MT) – “CF”
2. Nella Oil Company, LLC, 345962 (MT)
3. Midland National Life Insurance Company, 427043 (ET) – “CF”

There are no items for these matters:

G8 Property Tax Matters

G9 Cigarette License Fee Matters

G10 Legal Appeals Property Tax Matters

**H. Tax Program Nonappearance Matters – Adjudicatory**

(Contribution Disclosure forms required pursuant to Gov. Code § 15626.)

**H1. Legal Appeals Matters .....Mr. Levine**

## ➤ Hearing Notices Sent – No Response

1. Rajinder Singh Garcha, 30060 (KH)

## ➤ Cases Heard But Not Decided

- 2a. Don Ricardo's Restaurant, Inc., 42025 (AP)
- 2b. Padrino's, Inc., 42029 (AC)
3. John Richard Dudley, 253691 (KH)

**H2. Franchise and Income Tax Matters.....Ms. Kelly**

## ➤ Opinion

1. Affiliated Funding Corporation, 317945

## ➤ Decisions

2. Bruce H. Erfer and Lynn N. Erfer, 294534
- 3a. Stanley W. Gribble, 354879
- 3b. SWG Management Company, 354880
4. Ronald C. Nelson and Marie J. Nelson, 329716
5. Teresa Rothman, 380556
6. Catherine Wimby, 354090
7. Constance Zorn, 317272

## ➤ Opinion on Petition for Rehearing

8. Larry Geisel and Rhoda Geisel, 358724

## ➤ Matter for Board Consideration

9. Daniel V, Inc., 342609

**H3. Homeowner and Renter Property Tax Assistance Matters.....Ms. Kelly**

- Decision
  1. Savann Nhem, 379885
- Petition for Rehearing
  2. Sajjad Riyaz, 349075

**H4. Sales and Use Taxes Matters ..... Ms. Henry**

- Relief of Penalty/Interest
  1. Messer Griesheim Industries, Inc., 435576 (OHB)
  2. PCS Leasing Co, L.P., 431274 (OHA)

**H5. Sales and Use Taxes Matters – Credits, Cancellations, and Refunds..... Ms. Henry**

- Refund
  1. Owens & Minor Distribution, Inc., 306485 (OHB)

**H6. Special Taxes Matters**

This matter is scheduled for Thursday, May 29, 2008.

There are no items for these matters:

H7 Special Taxes Matters – Credits, Cancellations, and Refunds

H8 Property Tax Matters

H9 Cigarette License Fee Matters

H10 Legal Appeals Property Tax Matters

**I. Tax Program Nonappearance Matters**

(Contribution Disclosure forms not required pursuant to Gov. Code § 15626.)

**I1. Property Taxes Matters.....Mr. Gau**

- Audits
  1. CallTower, Inc. (7960) – “CF”
  2. IP Networks, Inc. (7995) – “CF”

**I2. Offers-in-Compromise Recommendations .....Ms. Ograd/Ms. Fong**

1. Sharp Image Electronics, Inc.
2. Fassel Mahmoud Elder
3. Management Insultants L.P.
4. James Steven Slack
5. Fadel Mohammed Elwalani and Marina Elwalani
6. Angie Wilder

**1:30 p.m. Board Meeting Reconvenes\*\***

**Special Presentations**

Superior Accomplishment Awards Program

**C. Sales and Use Tax Appeals Hearing**

(Contribution Disclosure forms required pursuant to Gov. Code § 15626.)

C4a. Norman P. Shockley, Jr., 306953 (GH)

C4b. Acclaim Technology, Inc., 341204 (GH)

For Petitioner/Claimant: Norman Shockley, Jr., Taxpayer

For Department: Cary Huxsoll, Tax Counsel

**F. Public Hearing**

F1. Proposed amendments to Sales and Use Tax Regulation 1807, *Process for Reviewing Local Tax Reallocation Inquiries*; and, adoption of Regulation 1828, *Process for Reviewing Transactions and Use Tax Distribution Inquiries*+.....Mr. Levine

Regulations 1807, *Process of Reviewing Local Tax Reallocation Inquiries*, and 1828, *Process for Reviewing Transactions and Use Tax Distributions*, are proposed to be amended to institute regulatory changes to the processes for reviewing petitions for local tax reallocations and transition and use tax distributions.

**Administrative Session**

The following items are scheduled for Thursday, May 29, 2008.

N. Consent Agenda

O. Adoption of Board Committee Reports and Approval of Committee Actions

P. Other Administrative Matters

**Q. Closed Session**

These items are scheduled for Thursday, May 29, 2008.

**Adjourn** - The meeting will reconvene on Thursday, May 29, 2008, at 9:30 a.m.

If you wish to receive this Notice and Agenda electronically, you can subscribe at [www.boe.ca.gov/agenda](http://www.boe.ca.gov/agenda).

If you would like specific information regarding items on this Notice and Agenda, please telephone (916) 322-2270 or e-mail: [MeetingInfo@boe.ca.gov](mailto:MeetingInfo@boe.ca.gov). Please be advised that material containing confidential taxpayer information cannot be publicly disclosed.

The hearing location is accessible to people with disabilities. Please contact Claudia Madrigal at (916) 324-8261, or e-mail [Claudia.Madrigal@boe.ca.gov](mailto:Claudia.Madrigal@boe.ca.gov) if you require special assistance.

Diane G. Olson, Chief  
Board Proceedings Division

- \* Public comment on any committee agenda item will be accepted at the beginning of the committee meeting.
- \*\* Public comment on any agenda item, other than a Closed Session item or an item which has already been considered by a Board Committee, will be accepted at that meeting.
- + Material is available for this Item.
- ++ Material will be available at a later date.
- "CF" Constitutional Function – The Deputy State Controller may not participate in this matter under Government Code section 7.9.



**STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION**

450 N STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA  
PO BOX 942879, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 94279-0080  
(916) 322-2270 • FAX (916) 324-3984  
www.boe.ca.gov

BETTY T. YEE  
First District, San Francisco

BILL LEONARD  
Second District, Ontario/Sacramento

MICHELLE STEEL  
Third District, Rolling Hills Estates

JUDY CHU, Ph.D.  
Fourth District, Los Angeles

JOHN CHIANG  
State Controller

RAMON J. HIRSIG  
Executive Director

**STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION MEETING  
450 N Street, Room 121, Sacramento  
May 28-29, 2008  
NOTICE AND AGENDA  
Meeting Agenda (as of 5/23/08, 11:43 a.m.)**

**Agenda Changes**

**Webcast Audio on Thursday, May 29, 2008**

**Thursday, May 29, 2008**

**9:30 a.m. Board Meeting Reconvenes\*\***

Agenda items occur in the order in which they appear on the agenda. When circumstances warrant, the Board’s Chair, Dr. Chu, may modify the order of the items on the agenda. Items may be postponed to a subsequent day; however, items will not be moved to an earlier day.

**Board Meeting\*\***

**Board Member Annual Photograph**

**Special Presentation ..... Dr. Chu**

- Presentation of Retirement Resolution

Joseph D. Young

**State Assessed Properties Value Setting**

**Property Tax Matter++ - “CF” ..... Mr. Siu**

Board sets unitary values of state-assessed properties annually, on or before May 31. The Board is required to value and assess all the taxable property within the state that is to be assessed by it, pursuant to section 19 of Article XIII of the Constitution and any legislative authorization there under.

**H. Tax Program Nonappearance Matters – Adjudicatory  
(Contribution Disclosure forms required pursuant to Gov. Code § 15626.)**

**H6 Special Taxes Matters ..... Mr. Gau**

- Denial of Relief of Penalty
1. Republic Indemnity Company of California, 298649 (ET) – “CF”

**Oral Hearing**

**C. Sales and Use Tax Appeals Hearing**

(Contribution Disclosure forms required pursuant to Gov. Code § 15626.)

C5. Princess House, Inc., 380967 (OHB)

- For Petitioner: Daniel L. Murphy, Taxpayer  
 Michael R. Carchedi, Taxpayer  
 Stacey Matthew, CPA  
 Scot Grierson, CPA  
 Rex Halverson, Representative  
 Andrew Wilson, CPA
- For Department: Cary Huxsoll, Tax Counsel

**Chief Counsel Matters**

**J. Rulemaking**

J1. Proposed Amendments to *Board of Equalization Rules for Tax Appeals* (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 18, § 5000 et seq.)+ ..... Ms. Scott

Proposal to adopt Section 100 changes to *Rules for Tax Appeals* regulations, which correct grammatical errors in specified sections.

**L. Property Taxes**

L1. State Assessee Property Tax Appeals Procedures+ ..... Mr. Ambrose

Alternative proposals for distribution of unsolicited late materials and revision of hearing summaries

**Administrative Session**

**N. Consent Agenda ..... Ms. Olson**

- N1. Retirement Resolutions+
  - Maria Socorro L. Concepcion
  - Thomas A. Gonzales
  - Sharon A. Hamilton
  - Galen G. Hardin
  - Loretta R. Lopez
  - Mabel Mar
  - Marco W. Morales
  - Larry D. Rackley
  - Spencer B. Stallings, Jr.
  - Patty Taylor
  - Victoria T. Winter

## N2. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes+

- March 18-19, 2008
- April 8, 2008

## N3. Adoption of 4-R Act Equalization Ratio for 2008-09+

**O. Adoption of Board Committee Reports and Approval of Committee Actions**

## O1. Property Tax Committee

## O2. Customer Services and Administrative Efficiency Committee

**P. Other Administrative Matters****P1. Executive Director's Report .....Mr. Hirsig+**

- a. Headquarters Building Remediation Update
- b. Headquarters Planning Effort Update
- c. Report on time extensions to Butte, Kern, Mariposa, Monterey, Placer, Santa Cruz and Tulare Counties to complete and submit 2008-09 Local Assessment Roll, pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code section 155+
- d. Report on suggestions submitted at 3/18/08 Business Taxpayers' Bill of Rights Hearings – refund claims filed by hospitals+ .....Mr. Gilman

## P2. Chief Counsel Report

There are no items for this matter.

**P3. Deputy Director's Report****a. Sales and Use Tax..... Ms. Henry**

1. Enhancing BOE Collections+
- b. Property and Special Taxes  
There are no items for this matter.

**c. Administration..... Ms. Houser**

1. Interagency Agreement Contracts Over \$1 Million+
  - California Department of Toxic Substances Control+
  - California Department of Motor Vehicles+
  - California Department of Technology Services+
  - Bank of America+
  - Hygiene Technologies International, Inc.+
2. Purchases Over \$1 Million
  - Dell Marketing+
3. Update on Proposed Fiscal Year 2008-2009 Budget++

**Announcement of Closed Session ..... Ms. Olson****Q. Closed Session**

- Q1. Discussion and approval of staff recommendations regarding settlement cases (Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6901, 7093.5, 30459.1 and 50156.11)
- Q2. Pending litigation: *BARNESANDNOBLE.COM LLC v. State Board of Equalization*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case Number 456465; First District Court of Appeal, Case Number A120834 (Gov. Code § 11126(e))
- Q3. Pending litigation: *BARNESANDNOBLE.COM LLC v. Betty T. Yee, Bill Leonard, Michelle Steel, Judy Chu, John Chiang, Wayne Hopkins, Joseph D. Young*, United States District Court, Eastern District of California, Case Number 2:07-cv-02776-WBS-KJM (Gov. Code § 11126(e))
- Q4. Pending litigation: *Nortel Networks Inc. v. State Board of Equalization*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case Number BC341568L (Gov. Code § 11126(e))
- Q5. Pending litigation: Status of *Computer Service Tax Cases*--San Francisco County Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4442; *Mohan et al. v. Dell, Inc. et al.*; *Dell Inc. et al. v. California State Board of Equalization*; San Francisco County Superior Court Case No. CGC 03 419192 (Gov. Code § 11126(e))
- Q6. Pending litigation: *Schroeder, et al. v. State Board of Equalization, et al.* Superior Court of California for Sacramento County, Case Number 34-2008-00004467-CU-MT-GDS (Gov. Code § 11126(e)(2)(B)(i))
- Q7. Discussion and action on personnel matters (Gov. Code § 11126(a))

**Announcement of Open Session ..... Ms. Olson****Adjourn**

If you wish to receive this Notice and Agenda electronically, you can subscribe at [www.boe.ca.gov/agenda](http://www.boe.ca.gov/agenda).

If you would like specific information regarding items on this Notice and Agenda, please telephone (916) 322-2270 or e-mail: [MeetingInfo@boe.ca.gov](mailto:MeetingInfo@boe.ca.gov). Please be advised that material containing confidential taxpayer information cannot be publicly disclosed.

The hearing location is accessible to people with disabilities. Please contact Claudia Madrigal at (916) 324-8261, or e-mail [Claudia.Madrigal@boe.ca.gov](mailto:Claudia.Madrigal@boe.ca.gov) if you require special assistance.

Diane G. Olson, Chief  
Board Proceedings Division

- \* Public comment on any committee agenda item will be accepted at the beginning of the committee meeting.
- \*\* Public comment on any agenda item, other than a Closed Session item or an item which has already been considered by a Board Committee, will be accepted at that meeting.
- + Material is available for this Item.
- ++ Material will be available at a later date.
- "CF" Constitutional Function – The Deputy State Controller may not participate in this matter under Government Code section 7.9.



BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

**BUSINESS TAXES COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

HONORABLE BETTY T. YEE, COMMITTEE CHAIR

450 N STREET, SACRAMENTO

MEETING DATE: JANUARY 31, 2008, TIME: 9:30 A.M.

---

**ACTION ITEMS & STATUS REPORT ITEMS****Agenda Item No: 1**

**Title: Proposed amendments to Sales and Use Tax Regulation 1807, *Process for Reviewing Local Tax Reallocation Inquiries*, and Regulation 1828, *Process for Reviewing Transactions and Use Tax Distributions***

**Issue/Topic:**

Proposed regulatory changes to the processes for reviewing petitions for local tax reallocations and transaction and use tax redistributions.

**Committee Discussion:**

Board Members discussed the provisions of proposed Regulation 1807(d)(4) regarding postponement of Board hearings following the issuance of a Supplemental Decision & Recommendation (SD&R) by the Appeals Division. Members expressed concern that the proposed revision to the regulations providing for postponements shift discretion from the Board to staff and has not been considered in the light of the BOE's current *Rules of Practice* or recently promulgated *Rules for Tax Appeals*.

Interested parties addressed the Committee in support of Alternative 2 and explained that they believe Regulations 1807 and 1828 should include a prospective date and a transition rule to preserve their right to argue that cases filed prior to the adoption of the regulations are open, including cases identified as denied by Board Management under the 1996 guidelines operative prior to the promulgation of the current Regulation 1807 and 1828. Staff explained its belief that the appeal cases interested parties are concerned about were closed long ago, so that including the transition rule unnecessarily prolongs the argument that those cases remain open.

**Committee Action/Recommendation/Direction:****Motion 1 – Postponement Following SD&R - Regulations 1807 and 1828**

Ms. Yee made a motion to retain the first sentence of 1807(d)(4) and 1828(d)(4) and delete the remaining language under those subdivisions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Leonard and carried without objection.

<b>MEMBER</b>	Yee	Leonard	Steel	Chu	Mandel
<b>VOTE</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>

Motion 2 – Transition Rule – Regulations 1807 and 1828

Upon motion by Mr. Leonard, seconded by Ms. Yee, the Committee approved the remainder of the regulations as proposed in Alternative 2. Alternative 2 included the transition rule language for Regulation 1807 submitted by MuniServices on January 30, 2008 at 4:43 P.M. and substantially identical transition rule language for Regulation 1828.

The vote was as follows:

<b>MEMBER</b>	Yee	Leonard	Steel	Chu	Mandel
<b>VOTE</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>

Motion 3 – Authorization to Publish – Regulations 1807 and 1828

Ms. Mandel moved to authorize for publication of the proposed Regulations 1807 and 1828. The motion was seconded by Ms. Yee and carried without objection.

<b>MEMBER</b>	Yee	Leonard	Steel	Chu	Mandel
<b>VOTE</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>

Copies of the proposed amendments to Regulations 1807 and 1828 are attached.

/s/ Betty T. Yee

Honorable Betty T. Yee, Committee Chair

/s/ Ramon J. Hirsig

Ramon J. Hirsig, Executive Director

BOARD APPROVED

at the February 1, 2008 Board Meeting

/s/ Diane Olson

Diane Olson, Chief  
Board Proceedings Division

**Regulation 1807. PROCESS FOR REVIEWING LOCAL TAX REALLOCATION INQUIRIES.**

Reference: Sections 7209 and 7223, Revenue and Taxation Code

~~(a) DEFINITIONS. For inquiries under Revenue and Taxation Code section 6066.3, see subdivision (g) of this regulation.~~

~~(1) INQUIRING JURISDICTIONS AND THEIR CONSULTANTS (IJC). "Inquiring Jurisdictions and their Consultants (IJC)" means any city, county, city and county, or transactions and use tax district of this state which has adopted a sales or transactions and use tax ordinance and which has entered into a contract with the Board to perform all functions incidental to the administration or operation of the sales or transactions and use tax ordinance of the city, county, city and county, or transactions and use tax district of this state. Except for submittals under Revenue and Taxation Code section 6066.3, IJC also includes any consultant that has entered into an agreement with the city, county, city and county, or transactions and use tax district, and has a current resolution filed with the Board which authorizes one (or more) of its officials, employees, or other designated persons to examine the appropriate sales, transactions, and use tax records of the Board.~~

~~(2) CLAIM (INQUIRY) OF INCORRECT OR NON DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL TAX. Except for submittals under Revenue and Taxation Code section 6066.3, "claim or inquiry" means a written request from an IJC for investigation of suspected improper distribution of local tax. The inquiry must contain sufficient factual data to support the probability that local tax has been erroneously allocated and distributed. Sufficient factual data must include at a minimum all of the following for each business location being questioned:~~

~~(A) Taxpayer name, including owner name and fictitious business name or d.b.a. (doing business as) designation.~~

~~(B) Taxpayer's permit number or a notation stating "No Permit Number."~~

~~(C) Complete business address of the taxpayer.~~

~~(D) Complete description of taxpayer's business activity or activities.~~

~~(E) Specific reasons and evidence why the taxpayer's allocation is questioned. In cases where it is submitted that the location of the sale is an unregistered location, evidence that the unregistered location is a selling location or that it is a place of business as defined by Regulation 1802 must be submitted. In cases that involve shipments from an out-of-state location and claims that the tax is sales tax and not use tax, evidence must be submitted that there was participation by an in-state office of the out-of-state retailer and that title to the goods passed in this state.~~

~~(F) Name, title, and phone number of the contact person.~~

~~(G) The tax reporting periods involved.~~

~~(3) DATE OF KNOWLEDGE. "Date of knowledge" shall be the date the inquiry of suspected improper distribution of local tax that contains the facts required by subdivision (a)(2) of this regulation is received by the Board, unless an earlier such date is operationally documented by the Board. If the IJC is not able to obtain the above minimum factual data, but provides a letter with the inquiry documenting IJC efforts to obtain each of the facts required by subdivision (a)(2) of this regulation, the Board will use the date this inquiry is received as the date of knowledge.~~

~~(4) BOARD MANAGEMENT. "Board Management" consists of the Executive Director, Chief Counsel, Assistant Chief Counsel for Business Taxes, and the Deputy Director of the Sales and Use Tax Department.~~

**(b) INQUIRIES.**

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

~~(1) SUBMITTING INQUIRIES.~~ Every inquiry of local tax allocation must be submitted in writing and shall include the information set forth in subdivision (a)(2) of this regulation. Except for submittals under Revenue and Taxation Code section 6066.3, all inquiries are to be sent directly to the Allocation Group in the Refund Section of the Board's Sales and Use Tax Department.

~~(2) ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF INQUIRY.~~ The Allocation Group will acknowledge inquiries. Acknowledgement of receipt does not mean that the inquiry qualifies to establish a date of knowledge under subdivision (a)(2) of this regulation. The Allocation Group will review the inquiry and notify the IJC if the inquiry does not qualify to establish a date of knowledge.

**~~(c) REVIEW PROCESS.~~**

~~(1) REVIEW BY ALLOCATION GROUP SUPERVISOR.~~ The Allocation Group will investigate all accepted inquiries. If the Allocation Group concludes that a misallocation has not occurred and recommends that a request for reallocation be denied, the IJC will be notified of the recommendation and allowed 30 days from the date of mailing of the notice of denial to contact the Allocation Group Supervisor to discuss the denial. The Allocation Group's notification that a misallocation has not occurred must state the specific facts on which the conclusion was based. If the IJC contacts the Allocation Group Supervisor, the IJC must state the specific facts on which its disagreement is based, and submit all additional information in its possession that supports its position at this time.

~~(2) REVIEW BY REFUND SECTION SUPERVISOR.~~ Subsequent to the submission of additional information by the IJC, if the Allocation Group Supervisor upholds the denial, the IJC will be advised in writing of the decision and that it has 30 days from the date of mailing of the decision to file a "petition for reallocation" with the Refund Section Supervisor. The petition for reallocation must state the specific reasons of disagreement with the Allocation Group Supervisor's findings. If a petition for reallocation is filed by the IJC, the Refund Section Supervisor will review the request for reallocation and determine if any additional staff investigation is warranted prior to making a decision. If no basis for reallocation is found, the petition will be forwarded to the Local Tax Appeals Auditor.

~~(3) REVIEW BY LOCAL TAX APPEALS AUDITOR.~~ After the petition is forwarded to the Local Tax Appeals Auditor a conference between the Local Tax Appeals Auditor and the IJC will be scheduled. The IJC may, however, at its option, provide a written brief instead of attending the conference. If a conference is held, the Local Tax Appeals Auditor will consider oral arguments, as well as review material previously presented by both the IJC and the Sales and Use Tax Department. The Local Tax Appeals Auditor will prepare a written Decision and Recommendation (D&R) detailing the facts and law involved and the conclusions reached.

~~(4) REVIEW BY BOARD MANAGEMENT.~~ If the D&R's recommendation is to deny the petition, the IJC will have 30 days from the date of mailing of the D&R to file a written request for review of the D&R with Board Management. The request must state the specific reasons of disagreement with the D&R and submit any additional information that supports its position. Board Management will only consider the petition and will not meet with the IJC. The IJC will be notified in writing of the Board Management's decision. If a written request for review of the D&R is not filed with Board Management within the 30-day period, the D&R becomes final at the expiration of that period.

~~(5) REVIEW BY BOARD MEMBERS.~~ If Board Management's decision is adverse to the IJC, the IJC may file a petition for hearing by the Board. The petition for hearing must state the specific reason for disagreement with Board Management findings.

~~(A) Petition for Hearing.~~ The IJC shall file a petition for hearing with the Board Proceedings Division within 90 days of the date of mailing of Board Management's decision. If a petition for hearing is not filed within the 90-day period, the Board Management's decision becomes final at the expiration of that period.

~~(B) Persons to be Notified of the Board Hearing.~~ After receiving the IJC's petition for hearing, the Board Proceedings Division will notify the IJC and the following persons of the Board hearing:

- 1. The taxpayer(s) whose allocations are the subject of the petition.

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

~~2. All jurisdictions that would be substantially affected if the Board does not uphold the taxpayer's original allocation (including the jurisdictions within the statewide and countywide pools that would gain or lose money solely as a result of a reallocation to or from the pools in which they participate). For the purpose of this subdivision a jurisdiction is "substantially affected" if its total reallocation would increase or decrease by the amount of 5% of its average quarterly allocation (generally, the prior four calendar quarters) or \$50,000, whichever is less, as a result of a reallocation of the taxpayer's original allocation.~~

The notification will state that the claimed misallocation is being placed on the Board's Hearing Calendar to determine the proper allocation and that the IJC and all jurisdictions so notified are considered parties to the hearing.

~~(C) The Hearing and Parties to the Hearing.~~ The petitioning IJC and all jurisdictions notified of the Board hearing pursuant to subdivision (c)(5)(B) are parties to the Board hearing. The taxpayer, however, shall not be considered a "party" within the meaning of this regulation unless it actively participates in the hearing process by either filing a brief or making a presentation at the hearing. The hearing shall be conducted in accordance with sections 5070 to 5087 of the Rules of Practice. The Board will make a final decision at the hearing on the proper allocation. The Board's decision exhausts all parties' administrative remedies on the matter.

~~(D) Presentation of New Evidence.~~ If new arguments or evidence not previously presented at the prior levels of review are presented after Board Management's review and prior to the hearing, the Board Proceedings Division shall forward the new arguments or evidence to the Local Tax Appeals Auditor for review and recommendation to the Board. Notwithstanding subdivision (c)(5)(C) of this regulation, no new evidence or arguments not previously presented at the prior levels of review or considered by the Local Tax Appeals Auditor may be presented at the Board hearing.

**~~(d) TIME LIMITATIONS.~~**

~~(1) An IJC will be limited to one 30-day extension of the time limit established for each level of review through the Board Management level.~~

~~(2) If action is not taken beyond acknowledgement on any inquiry for a period of six months at any level of review, the IJC may request advancement to the next level of review. For the purpose of these procedures, "action" means taking the steps necessary to resolve the inquiry.~~

~~(3) By following the time limits set forth in subdivisions (c), (d)(1) and (d)(2), any date of knowledge established by the original inquiry will remain open even if additional supporting information is provided prior to closure. If the time limits or any extensions are not met, or if closure has occurred, any additional supporting documentation submitted will establish a new date of knowledge as of the date of receipt of the new information.~~

**~~(e) APPEAL RIGHTS OF JURISDICTIONS THAT WILL LOSE REVENUE AS THE RESULT OF A REALLOCATION.~~**

~~(1) If at any time during the review process prior to Board hearing, the Board's investigation determines that a misallocation has occurred, any jurisdiction that will lose 5% of its average quarterly allocation (generally, the prior four calendar quarters) or \$50,000, whichever is less, will be informed of the decision and be allowed 30 days from the date of mailing the notice, to contact the Allocation Group to discuss the proposed reallocation. The losing jurisdiction may follow the same appeals procedure as described in subdivisions (c) and (d) of this regulation. "Losing jurisdiction" includes a gaining jurisdiction where the original decision in favor of the gaining jurisdiction was overturned in favor of a previously losing jurisdiction. The reallocation will be postponed until the period for the losing jurisdiction to request a hearing with the Allocation Group has expired.~~

~~(2) If the losing jurisdiction contacts the Allocation Group prior to Board hearing, and subsequently petitions the proposed reallocation, the reallocation postponement will be extended pending the final outcome of the petition.~~

~~(f) LIMITATION PERIOD FOR REDISTRIBUTIONS.~~ Redistributions shall not include amounts originally distributed earlier than two quarterly periods prior to the quarterly period in which the Board obtains knowledge of the improper distribution.

**~~(g) APPLICATION TO SECTION 6066.3 INQUIRIES.~~**

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

~~(1) The procedures set forth herein for submitting information to the Board concerning improper distributions are in addition to, but separate and apart from, any procedures established under the authority of Revenue and Taxation Code section 6066.3 for making inquiries regarding improper distributions. If inquiries regarding suspected improper distribution of local tax are received both under the procedures set forth herein and section 6066.3, duplicate submissions will not be processed. The date of the earliest submission shall be controlling as to whether the request is to be handled under the provisions of this regulation or section 6066.3, and the date of knowledge shall be established under the controlling procedure.~~

~~(2) The terms and procedures set forth in subdivision (c)(2) through (c)(5) of this regulation shall also apply to appeals from reallocation determinations made under Revenue and Taxation Code section 6066.3.~~

~~(h) The provisions of this regulation shall apply to reallocation inquiries and appeals filed after January 1, 2003. Inquiries and appeals filed prior to this date shall continue to be subject to the existing inquiries and appeals procedures contained in the "Process for Reviewing Reallocation Inquiries", (June 1996, amended October 1998) incorporated herein by reference in its entirety. However, for inquiries filed prior to January 1, 2003, the IJC may elect in writing to proceed under the provisions of this regulation as to appeals not already decided or initiated. In such cases, failure to make such written election prior to appealing to the next step of review under the existing procedures shall constitute an election not to proceed under the provisions of this regulation. If written election to proceed under the provisions of this regulation is made, the provisions of this regulation become applicable the date the election is received by the Board. Neither election shall be subject to revocation.~~

**Regulation 1807. PETITIONS FOR REALLOCATION OF LOCAL TAX.**

Reference: Sections 7209 and 7223, Revenue and Taxation Code

**(a) DEFINITIONS.**

(1) LOCAL TAX. "Local tax" means a local sales and use tax adopted pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code section 7200, et seq., and administered by the Board.

(2) JURISDICTION. "Jurisdiction" means any city, county, city and county, or redevelopment agency which has adopted a local tax.

(3) PETITION. "Petition" means a request or inquiry from a jurisdiction, other than a submission under Revenue and Taxation Code section 6066.3, for investigation of suspected misallocation of local tax submitted in writing to the Allocation Group of the Sales and Use Tax Department. The petition must contain sufficient factual data to support the probability that local tax has been erroneously allocated and distributed. Sufficient factual data should include, for each business location being questioned:

(A) Taxpayer name, including owner name and fictitious business name or dba (doing business as) designation.

(B) Taxpayer's permit number or a notation stating "No Permit Number."

(C) Complete business address of the taxpayer.

(D) Complete description of taxpayer's business activity or activities.

(E) Specific reasons and evidence why the taxpayer's allocation is questioned. If the petition alleges that a misallocation occurred because a sale location is unregistered, evidence that the questioned location is a selling location or that it is a place of business as defined by California Code of Regulations, title 18, section 1802. If the petition alleges that a misallocation occurred because the tax for a sale shipped from an out-of-state location was actually sales tax and not use tax, evidence that there was participation in the sale by an in-state office of the retailer and that title to the goods passed to the purchaser inside California.

(F) Name, title, and telephone number of the contact person.

(G) The tax reporting periods involved.

"Petition" also includes an appeal by a jurisdiction from a notification from the Local Revenue Allocation Unit of the Sales and Use Tax Department that local taxes previously allocated to it were misallocated and will be reallocated. Such a jurisdiction may object to that notification by submitting a written petition to the Allocation Group within 30 days of the date of mailing of the notification. The petition must include a copy of the notification and specify the reason the jurisdiction disputes it. If a jurisdiction does not submit such a petition within 30 days of the date of mailing of the notification, the notification of the Local Revenue Allocation Unit is final as to the jurisdiction so notified.

(4) PETITIONER. "Petitioner" is a jurisdiction that has filed a valid petition.

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

(5) DATE OF KNOWLEDGE. Unless an earlier date is operationally documented by the Board, “date of knowledge” is the date on which the Allocation Group receives a valid petition. Where a misallocation that is reasonably covered by the petition is confirmed based on additional facts or evidence supplied by the petitioner or otherwise learned as a direct result of investigating the petition, the date of knowledge is the date on which the Allocation Group received the petition.

(6) SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECTED JURISDICTION. “Substantially affected jurisdiction” is a jurisdiction for which the decision on a petition would result in a decrease to its total allocation of 5 percent or more of its average quarterly allocation (generally determined with reference to the prior four calendar quarters) or of \$50,000 or more, and includes a jurisdiction whose allocation will be decreased solely as the result of a reallocation from the statewide and applicable countywide pools.

(7) NOTIFIED JURISDICTION. “Notified jurisdiction” is a jurisdiction that has been notified as a substantially affected jurisdiction.

**(b) REVIEW BY ALLOCATION GROUP.**

(1) The Allocation Group will promptly acknowledge a submission intended as a petition.

(2) The Allocation Group will review the petition and issue to the petitioner a written decision to grant or deny the petition, including the basis for that decision. The written decision will also note the date of knowledge, and if other than the date the petition was received, will include the basis for that date. A reallocation will be made if the preponderance of evidence, whether provided by petitioner or obtained by Board staff as part of its investigation of the petition, shows that there was a misallocation. If the preponderance of evidence does not show that a misallocation occurred, the petition will be denied.

(3) If the Allocation Group does not issue a decision within six months of the date it receives a valid petition, the petitioner may request that the Allocation Group issue its decision without regard to the status of its investigation. Within 90 days of receiving such a request, the Allocation Group will issue its decision based on the information in its possession.

(4) If the decision of the Allocation Group is that the asserted misallocation did not occur and that the petition should be denied, in whole or in part, the petitioner may submit to the Allocation Group a written objection to the decision under subdivision (b)(6).

(5) If the decision of the Allocation Group is that a misallocation did occur, it will also mail a copy of its decision to any substantially affected jurisdiction. Any such notified jurisdiction may submit to the Allocation Group a written objection to the decision under subdivision (b)(6).

(6) The petitioner or any notified jurisdiction may appeal the decision of the Allocation Group by submitting a written objection to the Allocation Group within 30 days of the date of mailing of the Allocation Group’s decision, or within a period of extension authorized by subdivision (b)(9). If no such timely objection is submitted, the decision of the Allocation Group is final as to the petitioner and all notified jurisdictions.

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

(7) If the petitioner or a notified jurisdiction submits a timely written objection to the decision of the Allocation Group, the Allocation Group will consider the objection and issue a written supplemental decision to grant or deny the objection, including the basis for that decision. A copy of the supplemental decision will be mailed to the petitioner, to any notified jurisdiction, and to any other jurisdiction that is substantially affected by the supplemental decision.

(8) The petitioner or any notified jurisdiction may appeal the supplemental decision of the Allocation Group by submitting a written objection under subdivision (c)(1) within 30 days of the date of mailing of that supplemental decision, or within a period of extension authorized by subdivision (b)(9). If no such timely objection is submitted, the supplemental decision of the Allocation Group is final as to the petitioner and all notified jurisdictions.

(9) The petitioner or any notified jurisdiction may request a 30-day extension to submit a written objection under subdivision (b)(6) or under subdivision (b)(8), as applicable. Such request must provide a reasonable explanation for the requesting jurisdiction's inability to submit its objection within 30 days, must be copied to all other jurisdictions to whom the Allocation Group mailed a copy of its decision or supplemental decision (to the extent known by the requesting jurisdiction), and must be received by the Allocation Group within 30 days of the date of mailing of its decision or supplemental decision. Within five days of receipt of the request, the Allocation Group will mail notification to the petitioner and to all notified jurisdictions whether the request is granted or denied. If a timely request for an extension is submitted, the time for the petitioner and any notified jurisdiction to file a written objection to the decision or supplemental decision of the Allocation Group is extended to 10 days after the mailing of the notice of whether the request is granted or denied. If the request is granted, the time for the petitioner and all notified jurisdictions to submit a written objection to the decision or supplemental decision of the Allocation Group is further extended to the 60<sup>th</sup> day after the date of mailing of the decision or supplemental decision.

**(c) REVIEW BY APPEALS DIVISION.**

(1) The petitioner or any notified jurisdiction may appeal the supplemental decision of the Allocation Group by submitting a written objection to the Allocation Group within 30 days of the date of mailing of the Allocation Group's supplemental decision, or within a period of extension authorized by subdivision (b)(9). Such an objection must state the basis for the objecting jurisdiction's disagreement with the supplemental decision and include all additional information in its possession that supports its position.

(2) If a timely objection to its supplemental decision is submitted, the Allocation Group will prepare the file and forward it to the Appeals Division. The petitioner, all notified jurisdictions, and the Sales and Use Tax Department will thereafter be mailed notice of the appeals conference, which will generally be sent at least 45 days prior to the scheduled date of the conference.

(A) Petitioner or any notified jurisdiction may continue to discuss the dispute with staff of the Sales and Use Tax Department after the dispute is referred to the Appeals Division. If, as a result of such discussions or otherwise, the Sales and Use Tax Department decides the supplemental decision of the Allocation Group was incorrect or that further investigation should be pursued, it shall so notify the Appeals Division, the petitioner, and all notified jurisdictions.

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

(B) If the Department sends notice to the Appeals Division in accordance with the subdivision (c)(2)(A) no later than 30 days prior to the date scheduled for the appeals conference, the Appeals Division will suspend its review and the dispute will be returned to the Department. The Department will thereafter issue a second supplemental decision, or will return the dispute to the Appeals Division along with a report of its further investigation, if appropriate, for the review and decision of the Appeals Division.

(C) If the Department sends notice to the Appeals Division in accordance with subdivision (c)(2)(A) less than 30 days prior to the date scheduled for the appeals conference, the Appeals Division will decide whether the dispute should be returned to the Department or remain with the Appeals Division, and notify the parties accordingly. If the dispute is returned to the Department, the Department will thereafter issue a second supplemental decision, or will return the dispute to the Appeals Division along with a report of its further investigation, if appropriate, for the review and decision of the Appeals Division.

(D) Where the Department issues a second supplemental decision in accordance with subdivision (c)(2)(B) or (c)(2)(C), it will send a copy of the decision to the petitioner, any notified jurisdiction, and any other jurisdiction that is substantially affected by the second supplemental decision, any of whom may appeal the second supplemental decision by submitting a written objection under subdivision (c)(1) within 30 days of the date of mailing of that supplemental decision, or within a period of extension authorized by subdivision (b)(9). If no such timely objection is submitted, the second supplemental decision is final as to the petitioner and all notified jurisdictions.

(3) The appeals conference is not an adversarial proceeding, but rather is an informal discussion where the petitioner, any notified jurisdictions who wish to participate, and the Sales and Use Tax Department have the opportunity to explain their respective positions regarding the relevant facts and law to the Appeals Division conference holder. To make the conference most productive, each participant should submit all facts, law, argument, and other information in support of its position to the Appeals Division conference holder, and to the other participants, at least 15 days before the date of the appeals conference; however, relevant facts and arguments will be accepted at any time at or before the appeals conference. If, during the appeals conference, a participant requests permission to submit additional written arguments and documentary evidence, the conference holder may grant that participant 15 days after the appeals conference, or 30 days with sufficient justification, to submit to the conference holder, with copies to all other participants, such additional arguments and evidence. Any other participant at the conference who is in opposition to the requesting participant on the issue(s) covered by the additional submission is allowed 15 days to submit to the conference holder, with copies to all other participants, arguments and evidence in response. No request by a participant for further time to submit additional arguments or evidence will be granted without the approval of the Assistant Chief Counsel of the Appeals Division or his or her designee. The Appeals Division on its own initiative may also request, at or after the appeals conference, further submissions from any participant.

(4) Within 90 days after the final submission authorized by subdivision (c)(3), the Appeals Division will issue a written Decision and Recommendation (D&R) setting forth the applicable facts and law and the conclusions of the Appeals Division. The Chief Counsel may allow up to 90 additional days to prepare the D&R upon request of the Appeals Division. Both the request and the Chief Counsel's response granting or denying the request for additional time must be in writing and copies provided

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

to the petitioner, all notified jurisdictions, and the Sales and Use Tax Department. A copy of the D&R will be mailed to the petitioner, to all notified jurisdictions, to any other jurisdiction that will be substantially affected by the D&R, and to the Sales and Use Tax Department.

(5) The petitioner or any notified jurisdiction may appeal the D&R by submitting a written request for Board hearing under subdivision (d)(1) within 60 days of the date of mailing of the D&R.

(6) The petitioner, any notified jurisdiction, or the Sales and Use Tax Department may also appeal the D&R, or any Supplemental D&R (SD&R), by submitting a written request for reconsideration (RFR) to the Appeals Division before expiration of the time during which a timely request for Board hearing may be submitted, or if a Board hearing has been requested, prior to that hearing. If a jurisdiction or the Sales and Use Tax Department submits an RFR before the time for requesting a Board hearing has expired, the Appeals Division will issue an SD&R to consider the request, after obtaining whatever additional information or arguments from the parties that it deems appropriate. If an RFR is submitted after a jurisdiction has requested a Board hearing, the Appeals Division will determine whether it should issue an SD&R in response. A copy of the SD&R issued under this subdivision or under subdivision (c)(7) will be mailed to the petitioner, to all notified jurisdictions, to any other jurisdiction that will be substantially affected by the SD&R, and to the Sales and Use Tax Department. The petitioner or any notified jurisdiction may appeal the SD&R by submitting a written request for Board hearing under subdivision (d)(1) within 60 days of the date of mailing of the SD&R.

(7) Whether or not an RFR is submitted, at any time prior to the time the recommendation in the D&R or prior SD&R is acted on by the Department as a final matter or the Board has held an oral hearing on the petition, the Appeals Division may issue an SD&R as it deems necessary to augment, clarify, or correct the information, analysis, or conclusions contained in the D&R or any prior SD&R.

(8) If no RFR is submitted under subdivision (c)(6) or request for Board hearing under subdivision (d)(1) within 60 days of the date of mailing of the D&R or any SD&R, the D&R or SD&R as applicable is final as to the petitioner and all notified jurisdictions unless the Appeals Division issues an SD&R under subdivision (c)(7).

**(d) REVIEW BY BOARD.**

(1) The petitioner or any notified jurisdiction may submit a written request for Board hearing if it does so to the Board Proceedings Division within 60 days of the date of mailing of the D&R or any SD&R. Such a request must state the basis for the jurisdiction's disagreement with the D&R or SD&R as applicable and include all additional information in its possession that supports its position.

(2) If the Board Proceedings Division receives a timely request for hearing under subdivision (d)(1), it will notify the Sales and Use Tax Department, the petitioner, any notified jurisdiction, any other jurisdiction that would be substantially affected if the petition were granted, and the taxpayer(s) whose allocations are the subject of the petition, that the petition for reallocation of local tax is being scheduled for a Board hearing to determine the proper allocation.

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

(3) The Sales and Use Tax Department, the petitioner, and all jurisdictions notified of the Board hearing pursuant to subdivision (d)(2) are parties and may participate in the Board hearing. The taxpayer is not a party to the Board hearing unless it chooses to actively participate in the hearing process by either filing a brief or making a presentation at the hearing.

(4) Briefs may be submitted for the Board hearing in accordance with California Code of Regulations, title 18, sections 5270 and 5271.

(5) To the extent not inconsistent with this regulation, the hearing will be conducted in accordance with Chapter 5 of the Board of Equalization Rules for Tax Appeals (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 18, § 5510, et seq.). The Board will apply the preponderance of evidence rules set forth in subdivision (b)(2) in reaching its decision and not the burden of proof rules set forth in California Code of Regulations, title 18, section 5541. The Board's final decision on a petition for reallocation exhausts all administrative remedies on the matter for all jurisdictions.

**(e) LIMITATION PERIOD FOR REDISTRIBUTIONS.** Redistributions shall not include amounts originally distributed earlier than two quarterly periods prior to the quarter of the date of knowledge.

**(f) APPLICATION TO SECTION 6066.3 INQUIRIES.**

The procedures set forth herein for submitting a petition for reallocation of local tax are separate from those applicable to a submission under Revenue and Taxation Code section 6066.3. If a petition under the procedures set forth herein and a submission under section 6066.3 are both filed for the same alleged improper distribution, only the earliest submission will be processed, with the date of knowledge established under the procedures applicable to that earliest submission. However, the procedures set forth in subdivisions (b), (c), and (d) also apply to appeals from reallocation determinations made under section 6066.3.

**(g) OPERATIVE DATE AND TRANSITION RULES.**

This regulation is intended to reduce the time required to decide the validity of reallocation petitions and otherwise improve the process for doing so. It is intended to have a neutral impact only on the current dispute over the continuing validity of certain petitions that are governed by prior Regulation 1807 (effective February 22, 2003).

(1) The operative date of this regulation is the date it becomes effective under Section 11343.4 of the Government Code (thirty days after it has been approved by the Office of Administrative Law and forwarded to the Secretary of State) and it shall have no retroactive effect.

(2) Petitions filed prior to the operative date of this regulation, shall be reviewed, appealed and decided in accordance with this regulation as to procedures occurring after that date. All such petitions filed prior to January 1, 2003 and denied by Board Management must perfect any access they may have to a Board Member hearing no later than 60 days after the operative date of this regulation.

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

**Regulation 1828. PROCESS FOR REVIEWING TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX DISTRIBUTION INQUIRIES.**

Reference: Section 7270 Revenue and Taxation Code.

**(a) DEFINITIONS.**

~~(1) DISTRICT. "District" means any entity, including a city, county, city and county, or special taxing jurisdiction, which levies a transactions and use ("district") tax that the Board administers pursuant to Part 1.6, Division 2, Revenue and Taxation Code (Sections 7251-7270.6).~~

~~(2) DISTRICT TAX. Any tax levied under special statutory authority that the Board administers pursuant to Part 1.6, Division 2, Revenue and Taxation Code (Sections 7251-7270.6). District taxes may be for either general or special purposes.~~

~~(3) INQUIRING DISTRICTS AND THEIR CONSULTANTS (IDC). "Inquiring Districts and their Consultants (IDC)" means any district which has adopted a district tax ordinance and which has entered into a contract with the Board to perform all functions incidental to the administration or operation of that ordinance. IDC also includes any consultant that has entered into an agreement with the tax district and has a current resolution filed with the Board which authorizes one (or more) of its officials, employees, or other designated persons to examine the appropriate sales, transactions, and use tax records of the Board.~~

~~(4) CLAIM (INQUIRY) OF INCORRECT DISTRIBUTION OR NON DISTRIBUTION OF DISTRICT TAX. "Claim or inquiry" means a written request from an IDC for investigation of suspected improper distribution or nondistribution of district tax. The inquiry must contain sufficient factual data to support the probability that district tax has not been distributed or has been erroneously distributed. Sufficient factual data must include at a minimum all of the following for each business location being questioned:~~

~~(A) Taxpayer name, including owner name and fictitious business name or d.b.a. (doing business as) designation.~~

~~(B) Taxpayer's permit number or a notation stating "No Permit Number."~~

~~(C) Complete business address of the taxpayer.~~

~~(D) Complete description of taxpayer's business activity or activities.~~

~~(E) Specific reasons and evidence why the distribution or nondistribution is questioned, including the location to which the property the sales of which are at issue was delivered. In cases that involve claims that the transactions that are the focus of the appeal are subject to the IDC's district use tax, evidence must be submitted that the retailer is engaged in business in the IDC under Regulation 1827.~~

~~(F) Name, title, and phone number of the contact person.~~

~~(G) The tax reporting periods involved.~~

~~(5) CLAIM DATE "Claim date" shall be the date the inquiry of suspected improper distribution or non distribution of district tax that contains the facts required by subdivision (a)(4) of this regulation is received by the Board, unless an earlier such date is operationally documented by the Board. The Board shall redistribute district tax revenues back from the claim date to the beginning of the applicable statute of limitations. If the IDC is not able to obtain the above minimum factual data but provides a letter with the inquiry documenting IDC efforts to obtain each of the facts required by subdivision (a)(4) of this regulation, the Board will use the date this inquiry is received as the claim date.~~

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

~~(6) BOARD MANAGEMENT. "Board Management" consists of the Executive Director, Chief Counsel, Assistant Chief Counsel for Business Taxes, and the Deputy Director of the Sales and Use Tax Department.~~

~~(b) INQUIRIES.~~

~~(1) SUBMITTING INQUIRIES. Every inquiry regarding district tax distributions must be submitted in writing and shall include the information set forth in subdivision (a)(4) of this regulation. All inquiries must be sent directly to the Allocation Group in the Audit Determination and Refund Section of the Board's Sales and Use Tax Department.~~

~~(2) ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF INQUIRY. The Allocation Group will acknowledge inquiries. Acknowledgement of receipt does not mean that the inquiry qualifies to establish a claim date under subdivision (a)(4) of this regulation. The Allocation Group will review the inquiry and notify the IDC if the inquiry does not qualify to establish a claim date. Investigation of an alleged improper distribution cannot occur until a claim date is established.~~

~~(c) REVIEW PROCESS.~~

~~(1) REVIEW BY ALLOCATION GROUP SUPERVISOR. The Allocation Group will investigate all accepted inquiries. If the Allocation Group concludes that an improper distribution has not occurred and recommends that a request for redistribution be denied, the IDC will be notified of the recommendation and allowed 30 days from the date of mailing of the notice of denial to contact the Allocation Group Supervisor to discuss the denial. The Allocation Group's notification that an improper distribution has not occurred must state the specific facts on which the conclusion was based. If the IDC contacts the Allocation Group Supervisor, the IDC must state the specific facts on which its disagreement is based, and submit all additional information in its possession that supports its position at this time.~~

~~(2) REVIEW BY AUDIT DETERMINATION AND REFUND SECTION SUPERVISOR. Subsequent to the submission of additional information by the IDC, if the Allocation Group Supervisor upholds the denial, the IDC will be advised in writing of the decision and that it has 30 days from the date of mailing of the decision to file a "petition for redistribution" with the Audit Determination and Refund Section Supervisor. The petition for redistribution must state the specific reasons of disagreement with the Allocation Group Supervisor's findings. If a petition for redistribution is filed by the IDC, the Audit Determination and Refund Section Supervisor will review the request for redistribution and determine if any additional staff investigation is warranted prior to making a decision. If no basis for redistribution is found, the petition will be forwarded to the Local Tax Appeals Auditor.~~

~~(3) REVIEW BY LOCAL TAX APPEALS AUDITOR. After the petition is forwarded to the Local Tax Appeals Auditor, a conference between the Local Tax Appeals Auditor and the IDC will be scheduled. However, the IDC may provide a written brief in addition to or instead of attending the conference. If a conference is held, the Local Tax Appeals Auditor will consider oral arguments, as well as review material previously presented by both the IDC and the Sales and Use Tax Department. The Local Tax Appeals Auditor will prepare a written Decision and Recommendation (D&R) detailing the facts and law involved and the conclusions reached.~~

~~(4) REVIEW BY BOARD MANAGEMENT. If the D&R's recommendation is to deny the petition, the IDC will have 30 days from the date of mailing of the D&R to file a written request for review of the D&R with Board Management. The request must state the specific reasons of disagreement with the D&R and submit any additional information that supports its position. Board Management will only consider the petition and will not meet with the IDC. The IDC will be notified in writing of the Board Management's decision. If a written request for review of the D&R is not filed with Board Management within the 30-day period, the D&R becomes final at the expiration of that period.~~

~~(5) REVIEW BY BOARD MEMBERS. If Board Management's decision is adverse to the IDC, the IDC may file a petition for hearing by the Board. The petition for hearing must state the specific reason for disagreement with Board Management findings.~~

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

~~(A) Petition for Hearing.~~ The IDC shall file a petition for hearing with the Board Proceedings Division within 90 days of the date of mailing of Board Management's decision. If a petition for hearing is not filed within the 90-day period, the Board Management's decision becomes final at the expiration of that period.

~~(B) Persons to be Notified of the Board Hearing.~~ After receiving the IDC's petition for hearing, the Board Proceedings Division will notify the IDC and the following persons of the Board hearing:

1. The taxpayer(s) whose district tax reporting was the subject of the petition.
2. All districts that would be substantially affected if the Board does not uphold the taxpayer's original distribution. For the purpose of this subdivision a district is "substantially affected" if its total redistribution would increase or decrease by the amount of 5% of its average quarterly distribution (generally, the prior four calendar quarters) or \$50,000, whichever is less, as a result of such redistribution.

The notification will state that the claimed improper distribution is being placed on the Board's Hearing Calendar to determine the proper distribution and that the IDC and all districts so notified are considered parties to the hearing.

~~(C) The Hearing and Parties to the Hearing.~~ The petitioning IDC and all districts notified of the Board hearing pursuant to subdivision (c)(5)(B) are parties to the Board hearing. The taxpayer, however, shall not be considered a "party" within the meaning of this regulation unless it actively participates in the hearing process by either filing a brief or making a presentation at the hearing. The hearing shall be conducted in accordance with sections 5070 to 5087 of the Rules of Practice. The Board's decision is final as provided in Regulation 5082. The Board's decision exhausts all parties' administrative remedies on the matter.

~~(D) Presentation of New Evidence.~~ If new arguments or evidence not previously presented at the prior levels of review are presented after Board Management's review and prior to the hearing, the Board Proceedings Division shall forward the new arguments or evidence to the Local Tax Appeals Auditor for review and recommendation to the Board. Notwithstanding subdivision (c)(5)(C) of this regulation, no new evidence or arguments not previously presented at the prior levels of review or considered by the Local Tax Appeals Auditor may be presented at the Board hearing.

**(d) TIME LIMITATIONS.**

(1) An IDC will be limited to one 30-day extension of the time limit established for each level of review through the Board Management level.

(2) If action is not taken beyond acknowledgement on any inquiry for a period of six months at any level of review, the IDC may request advancement to the next level of review. For the purpose of these procedures, "action" means taking the steps necessary to resolve the inquiry.

(3) By following the time limits set forth in subdivisions (c), (d)(1) and (d)(2), any claim date established by the original inquiry will remain open even if additional supporting information is provided prior to closure. If the time limits or any extensions are not met, or if closure has occurred, any additional supporting documentation submitted will establish a new claim date as of the date of receipt of the new information.

**(e) APPEAL RIGHTS OF DISTRICTS THAT WILL LOSE REVENUE AS THE RESULT OF A REDISTRIBUTION.**

(1) If at any time during the review process prior to Board hearing, the Board's investigation determines that an improper distribution has occurred, any district that will lose 5% of its average quarterly receipts (generally, the prior four calendar quarters) or \$50,000, whichever is less, will be informed of the decision and be allowed 30 days from the date of mailing the notice, to contact the Allocation Group to discuss the proposed redistribution. The losing district may follow the same appeals procedure as described in subdivisions (c) and (d) of this regulation. "Losing district" includes a gaining district where the original decision in favor of the gaining district was overturned in favor of a previously losing district. The redistribution will be postponed until the period for the losing district to request a hearing with the Allocation Group has expired.

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

~~(2) If the losing district contacts the Allocation Group prior to Board hearing, and subsequently petitions the proposed redistribution, the redistribution postponement will be extended pending the final outcome of the petition.~~

~~(f) OPERATIVE DATE.~~

~~The provisions of this regulation shall apply to redistribution inquiries and appeals filed after July 1, 2004. Inquiries and appeals filed prior to this date shall continue to be subject to existing inquiries and appeals procedures. However, for inquiries filed prior to July 1, 2004, the IDC may elect in writing to proceed under the provisions of this regulation as to appeals not already decided or initiated. In such cases, failure to make such written election prior to appealing to the next step of review under the existing procedures shall constitute an election not to proceed under the provisions of this regulation. If written election to proceed under the provisions of this regulation is made, the provisions of this regulation become applicable the date the election is received by the Board. Neither election shall be subject to revocation.~~

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

**Regulation 1828. PETITIONS FOR DISTRIBUTION OR REDISTRIBUTION OF TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX.**

Reference: Section 7270 Revenue and Taxation Code.

**(a) DEFINITIONS.**

(1) DISTRICT TAX. "District tax" means a transaction and use tax adopted pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code section 7251, et seq., or pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code section 7285, et seq., and administered by the Board.

(2) DISTRICT. "District" means any entity, including a city, county, city and county, or special taxing jurisdiction, which has adopted a district tax.

(3) PETITION. "Petition" means a request or inquiry from a district for investigation of suspected improper distribution or nondistribution of district tax submitted in writing to the Allocation Group of the Sales and Use Tax Department. The petition must contain sufficient factual data to support the probability that district tax has not been distributed or has been erroneously distributed. Sufficient factual data should include, for each business location being questioned:

\_\_\_\_\_ (A) Taxpayer name, including owner name and fictitious business name or dba (doing business as) designation.

\_\_\_\_\_ (B) Taxpayer's permit number or a notation stating "No Permit Number."

\_\_\_\_\_ (C) Complete business address of the taxpayer.

\_\_\_\_\_ (D) Complete description of taxpayer's business activity or activities.

\_\_\_\_\_ (E) Specific reasons and evidence why the distribution or nondistribution is questioned, identifying the delivery location or locations of the property the sales of which are at issue. If the petition alleges that the subject transactions are subject to the district's use tax, evidence that the retailer is engaged in business in the district as provided in California Code of Regulations, title 18, section 1827, subdivision (c).

\_\_\_\_\_ (F) Name, title, and telephone number of the contact person.

\_\_\_\_\_ (G) The tax reporting periods involved.

"Petition" also includes an appeal by a district from a notification from the Local Revenue Allocation Unit of the Sales and Use Tax Department that district taxes previously allocated to it were misallocated and will be reallocated. Such a district may object to that notification by submitting a written petition to the Allocation Group within 30 days of the date of mailing of the notification. The petition must include a copy of the notification and specify the reason the district disputes it. If a district does not submit such a petition within 30 days of the date of mailing of the notification, the notification of the Local Revenue Allocation Unit is final as to the district so notified.

(4) PETITIONER. "Petitioner" is a district that has filed a valid petition.

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

(5) DATE OF KNOWLEDGE. Unless an earlier date is operationally documented by the Board, “date of knowledge” is the date on which the Allocation Group receives a valid petition. Where an error in distribution that is reasonably covered by the petition is confirmed based on additional facts or evidence supplied by the petitioner or otherwise learned as a direct result of investigating the petition, the date of knowledge is the date on which the Allocation Group received the petition.

(6) SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECTED DISTRICT. “Substantially affected district” is a district for which the decision on a petition would result in a decrease to its total distribution of 5 percent or more of its average quarterly distribution (generally determined with reference to the prior four calendar quarters) or of \$50,000 or more.

(7) NOTIFIED DISTRICT. “Notified district” is a district that has been notified as a substantially affected district.

**(b) REVIEW BY ALLOCATION GROUP.**

(1) The Allocation Group will promptly acknowledge a submission intended as a petition.

(2) The Allocation Group will review the petition and issue to the petitioner a written decision to grant or deny the petition, including the basis for that decision. The written decision will also note the date of knowledge, and if other than the date the petition was received, will include the basis for that date. A redistribution will be made if the preponderance of evidence, whether provided by petitioner or obtained by Board staff as part of its investigation of the petition, shows that there was an error in distribution. If the preponderance of evidence does not show that an error in distribution occurred, the petition will be denied.

(3) If the Allocation Group does not issue a decision within six months of the date it receives a valid petition, the petitioner may request that the Allocation Group issue its decision without regard to the status of its investigation. Within 90 days of receiving such a request, the Allocation Group will issue its decision based on the information in its possession.

(4) If the decision of the Allocation Group is that the asserted error in distribution did not occur and that the petition should be denied, in whole or in part, the petitioner may submit to the Allocation Group a written objection to the decision under subdivision (b)(6).

(5) If the decision of the Allocation Group is that an error in distribution did occur, it will also mail a copy of its decision to any substantially affected district. Any such notified district may submit to the Allocation Group a written objection to the decision under subdivision (b)(6).

(6) The petitioner or any notified district may appeal the decision of the Allocation Group by submitting a written objection to the Allocation Group within 30 days of the date of mailing of the Allocation Group’s decision, or within a period of extension authorized by subdivision (b)(9). If no such timely objection is submitted, the decision of the Allocation Group is final as to the petitioner and all notified districts.

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

(7) If the petitioner or a notified district submits a timely written objection to the decision of the Allocation Group, the Allocation Group will consider the objection and issue a written supplemental decision to grant or deny the objection, including the basis for that decision. A copy of the supplemental decision will be mailed to the petitioner, to any notified district, and to any other district that is substantially affected by the supplemental decision.

(8) The petitioner or any notified district may appeal the supplemental decision of the Allocation Group by submitting a written objection under subdivision (c)(1) within 30 days of the date of mailing of that supplemental decision, or within a period of extension authorized by subdivision (b)(9). If no such timely objection is submitted, the supplemental decision of the Allocation Group is final as to the petitioner and all notified districts.

(9) The petitioner or any notified district may request a 30-day extension to submit a written objection under subdivision (b)(6) or under subdivision (b)(8), as applicable. Such request must provide a reasonable explanation for the requesting district's inability to submit its objection within 30 days, must be copied to all other districts to whom the Allocation Group mailed a copy of its decision or supplemental decision (to the extent known by the requesting district), and must be received by the Allocation Group within 30 days of the date of mailing of its decision or supplemental decision. Within five days of receipt of the request, the Allocation Group will mail notification to the petitioner and to all notified districts whether the request is granted or denied. If a timely request for an extension is submitted, the time for the petitioner and any notified district to file a written objection to the decision or supplemental decision of the Allocation Group is extended to 10 days after the mailing of the notice of whether the request is granted or denied. If the request is granted, the time for the petitioner and all notified districts to submit a written objection to the decision or supplemental decision of the Allocation Group is further extended to the 60<sup>th</sup> day after the date of mailing of the decision or supplemental decision.

**(c) REVIEW BY APPEALS DIVISION.**

(1) The petitioner or any notified district may appeal the supplemental decision of the Allocation Group by submitting a written objection to the Allocation Group within 30 days of the date of mailing of the Allocation Group's supplemental decision, or within a period of extension authorized by subdivision (b)(9). Such an objection must state the basis for the objecting district's disagreement with the supplemental decision and include all additional information in its possession that supports its position.

(2) If a timely objection to its supplemental decision is submitted, the Allocation Group will prepare the file and forward it to the Appeals Division. The petitioner, all notified districts, and the Sales and Use Tax Department will thereafter be mailed notice of the appeals conference, which will generally be sent at least 45 days prior to the scheduled date of the conference.

(A) Petitioner or any notified district may continue to discuss the dispute with staff of the Sales and Use Tax Department after the dispute is referred to the Appeals Division. If, as a result of such discussions or otherwise, the Sales and Use Tax Department decides the supplemental decision of the Allocation Group was incorrect or that further investigation should be pursued, it shall so notify the Appeals Division, the petitioner, and all notified districts.

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

(B) If the Department sends notice to the Appeals Division in accordance with the subdivision (c)(2)(A) no later than 30 days prior to the date scheduled for the appeals conference, the Appeals Division will suspend its review and the dispute will be returned to the Department. The Department will thereafter issue a second supplemental decision, or will return the dispute to the Appeals Division along with a report of its further investigation, if appropriate, for the review and decision of the Appeals Division.

(C) If the Department sends notice to the Appeals Division in accordance with subdivision (c)(2)(A) less than 30 days prior to the date scheduled for the appeals conference, the Appeals Division will decide whether the dispute should be returned to the Department or remain with the Appeals Division, and notify the parties accordingly. If the dispute is returned to the Department, the Department will thereafter issue a second supplemental decision, or will return the dispute to the Appeals Division along with a report of its further investigation, if appropriate, for the review and decision of the Appeals Division.

(D) Where the Department issues a second supplemental decision in accordance with subdivision (c)(2)(B) or (c)(2)(C), it will send a copy of the decision to the petitioner, any notified district, and any other district that is substantially affected by the second supplemental decision, any of whom may appeal the second supplemental decision by submitting a written objection under subdivision (c)(1) within 30 days of the date of mailing of that supplemental decision, or within a period of extension authorized by subdivision (b)(9). If no such timely objection is submitted, the second supplemental decision is final as to the petitioner and all notified districts.

(3) The appeals conference is not an adversarial proceeding, but rather is an informal discussion where the petitioner, any notified districts who wish to participate, and the Sales and Use Tax Department have the opportunity to explain their respective positions regarding the relevant facts and law to the Appeals Division conference holder. To make the conference most productive, each participant should submit all facts, law, argument, and other information in support of its position to the Appeals Division conference holder, and to the other participants, at least 15 days before the date of the appeals conference; however, relevant facts and arguments will be accepted at any time at or before the appeals conference. If, during the appeals conference, a participant requests permission to submit additional written arguments and documentary evidence, the conference holder may grant that participant 15 days after the appeals conference, or 30 days with sufficient justification, to submit to the conference holder, with copies to all other participants, such additional arguments and evidence. Any other participant at the conference who is in opposition to the requesting participant on the issue(s) covered by the additional submission is allowed 15 days to submit to the conference holder, with copies to all other participants, arguments and evidence in response. No request by a participant for further time to submit additional arguments or evidence will be granted without the approval of the Assistant Chief Counsel of the Appeals Division or his or her designee. The Appeals Division on its own initiative may also request, at or after the appeals conference, further submissions from any participant.

(4) Within 90 days after the final submission authorized by subdivision (c)(3), the Appeals Division will issue a written Decision and Recommendation (D&R) setting forth the applicable facts and law and the conclusions of the Appeals Division. The Chief Counsel may allow up to

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

90 additional days to prepare the D&R upon request of the Appeals Division. Both the request and the Chief Counsel's response granting or denying the request for additional time must be in writing and copies provided to the petitioner, all notified districts, and the Sales and Use Tax Department. A copy of the D&R will be mailed to the petitioner, to all notified districts, to any other district that will be substantially affected by the D&R, and to the Sales and Use Tax Department.

(5) The petitioner or any notified district may appeal the D&R by submitting a written request for Board hearing under subdivision (d)(1) within 60 days of the date of mailing of the D&R.

(6) The petitioner, any notified district, or the Sales and Use Tax Department may also appeal the D&R, or any Supplemental D&R (SD&R), by submitting a written request for reconsideration (RFR) to the Appeals Division before expiration of the time during which a timely request for Board hearing may be submitted, or if a Board hearing has been requested, prior to that hearing. If a district or the Sales and Use Tax Department submits an RFR before the time for requesting a Board hearing has expired, the Appeals Division will issue an SD&R to consider the request, after obtaining whatever additional information or arguments from the parties that it deems appropriate. If an RFR is submitted after a district has requested a Board hearing, the Appeals Division will determine whether it should issue an SD&R in response. A copy of the SD&R issued under this subdivision or under subdivision (c)(7) will be mailed to the petitioner, to all notified districts, to any other district that will be substantially affected by the SD&R, and to the Sales and Use Tax Department. The petitioner or any notified district may appeal the SD&R by submitting a written request for Board hearing under subdivision (d)(1) within 60 days of the date of mailing of the SD&R.

(7) Whether or not an RFR is submitted, at any time prior to the time the recommendation in the D&R or prior SD&R is acted on by the Department as a final matter or the Board has held an oral hearing on the petition, the Appeals Division may issue an SD&R as it deems necessary to augment, clarify, or correct the information, analysis, or conclusions contained in the D&R or any prior SD&R.

(8) If no RFR is submitted under subdivision (c)(6) or request for Board hearing under subdivision (d)(1) within 60 days of the date of mailing of the D&R or any SD&R, the D&R or SD&R as applicable is final as to the petitioner and all notified districts unless the Appeals Division issues an SD&R under subdivision (c)(7).

**(d) REVIEW BY BOARD.**

(1) The petitioner or any notified district may submit a written request for Board hearing if it does so to the Board Proceedings Division within 60 days of the date of mailing of the D&R or any SD&R. Such a request must state the basis for the district's disagreement with the D&R or SD&R as applicable and include all additional information in its possession that supports its position.

(2) If the Board Proceedings Division receives a timely request for hearing under subdivision (d)(1), it will notify the Sales and Use Tax Department, the petitioner, any notified district, any other district that would be substantially affected if the petition were granted, and the taxpayer(s)

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

whose distribution (or nondistribution) are the subject of the petition, that the petition for redistribution of district tax is being scheduled for a Board hearing to determine the proper distribution.

(3) The Sales and Use Tax Department, the petitioner, and all districts notified of the Board hearing pursuant to subdivision (d)(2) are parties and may participate in the Board hearing. The taxpayer is not a party to the Board hearing unless it chooses to actively participate in the hearing process by either filing a brief or making a presentation at the hearing.

(4) Briefs may be submitted for the Board hearing in accordance with California Code of Regulations, title 18, sections 5270 and 5271.

(5) To the extent not inconsistent with this regulation, the hearing will be conducted in accordance with Chapter 5 of the Board of Equalization Rules for Tax Appeals (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 18, § 5510, et seq.). The Board will apply the preponderance of evidence rules set forth in subdivision (b)(2) in reaching its decision and not the burden of proof rules set forth in California Code of Regulations, title 18, section 5541. The Board's final decision on a petition for redistribution exhausts all administrative remedies on the matter for all districts.

**(e) LIMITATION PERIOD FOR REDISTRIBUTIONS.**

For redistributions where the date of knowledge is prior to January 1, 2008, the standard three-year statute of limitations is applicable, based on the date of knowledge. For redistributions where the date of knowledge is on or after January 1, 2008, redistributions shall not include amounts originally distributed earlier than two quarterly periods prior to the quarter of the date of knowledge.

**(f) OPERATIVE DATE AND TRANSITION RULES.**

This regulation is intended to reduce the time required to decide the validity of redistribution petitions and otherwise improve the process for doing so. It is intended to have a neutral impact only on the current dispute over the continuing validity of certain petitions that are governed by prior Regulation 1828 (effective June 17, 2004).

(1) The operative date of this regulation is the date it becomes effective under Section 11343.4 of the Government Code (thirty days after it has been approved by the Office of Administrative Law and forwarded to the Secretary of State) and it shall have no retroactive effect.

(2) Petitions filed prior to the operative date of this regulation, shall be reviewed, appealed and decided in accordance with this regulation as to procedures occurring after that date. All such petitions filed prior to July 1, 2004 and denied by Board Management must perfect any access they may have to a Board Member hearing no later than 60 days after the operative date of this regulation.

\*\*\*\*\*

The proposed amendments contained in this document may not be adopted. Any revisions that are adopted may differ from this text.

Wednesday, May 28, 2008

The Board met at its offices at 450 N Street, Sacramento, at 10:20 a.m., Dr. Chu, Chair, Ms. Yee, Vice Chairwoman, Mr. Leonard and Ms. Steel present, Ms. Mandel present on behalf of Mr. Chiang in accordance with Government Code section 7.9.

**SALES AND USE TAX APPEALS HEARINGS**

Janice Diana Samsing and Mildred Kaunas, 356928 (UT)

September 29, 2004, \$2,982.00 Tax

For Petitioner:

Mildred Kaunas, Taxpayer

For Department:

NaTasha Ralston, Tax Counsel

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Issue: Whether the purchase and use of the vehicle by petitioners is subject to California use tax.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Mandel and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board ordered that the petition be submitted for decision.

Foster Poultry Farms, 77405, 265656, 304306 (KHE)

1-1-95 to 9-12-98, \$131,576.77 Tax, \$0.00 Penalty

1-1-99 to 12-28-02, \$112,320.84 Tax

12-29-02 to 6-19-04, \$805,488.00 Claim for Refund

For Petitioner/Claimant:

Rich Carlson, Representative

For Department:

Bradley Heller, Tax Counsel

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Issue: Whether petitioner's lease of equipment that injects a vaccine into eggs also included a separate technology transfer agreement so that a portion of petitioner's otherwise taxable lease payments were not subject to tax.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Mandel and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board ordered that the petitions and claim be submitted for decision.

Matt Lababedy, 89002316680 (KH)

1-1-95 to 12-31-97, \$10,502.00 Tax, \$2,267.53 Amnesty Interest Penalty

For Petitioner:

Matt Lababedy, Taxpayer

Don McKaughan, CPA

For Department:

Kevin Hanks, Hearing Representative

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Issue: Whether the evidence supports further adjustments for check-cashing fees.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Mandel and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board ordered that the petition be submitted for decision.

Wednesday, May 28, 2008

**OTHER CHIEF COUNSEL MATTERS****Adoption of Formal and Memorandum Opinions**

Deborah Cooke, Tax Counsel, Legal Department, made introductory remarks regarding the adoption of Formal and Memorandum Opinions and the publication of Dissenting and Concurring Opinions. (Exhibit 5.14.)

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Mr. Leonard and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board amended staff's recommendation for implementing the provisions of the *Board of Equalizations Rules for Tax Appeals* with regards to the adoption and publication of Formal and Memorandum Opinions and the submission and publication of Concurring and Dissenting Opinions as follows: reflect a vote to adopt a formal opinion to mean the Member agrees with the result and the rationale set forth in the formal opinion; concurring opinions submitted by Members who vote to adopt the formal opinion must be consistent with the result and rationale of the formal opinion; update the Board's publications to reflect the foregoing; remove "motion to continue hearing to a later date" and "motion to take matter under submission" from staff's flow chart; and, clarified that the Appeals Division will promptly notify the taxpayer of the Board's decision when the Board asks that a Formal Opinion be drafted.

Exhibits to these minutes are incorporated by reference.

The Board recessed at 12:40 p.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m. with Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel present.

**SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS****Superior Accomplishment Award Presentations**

Ramon Hirsig, Executive Director, and Members of the Board presented the 2007-08 Sustained Superior Accomplishment Awards to employees in recognition of their outstanding achievements.

**LEGAL APPEALS MATTERS, CONSENT**

The Board deferred consideration of the following matters: *Jamal A. Mahgoub, 356195*; and, *AMT Solutions, Inc., 356197, 392072*.

With respect to the Legal Appeals Matters Consent Agenda, upon a single motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Mr. Leonard and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board made the following orders:

Synpep Corporation, 329381 (CH)

4-1-01 to 3-31-04, \$78,361.87 Tax, \$7,836.22 Negligence Penalty, \$5,222.79 Double Negligence Penalty, \$6,042.19 Amnesty Interest Penalty

Action: Redetermine as recommended by the Appeals Division.

Wednesday, May 28, 2008

Jamal A. Mahgoub, 356195 (CH)

1-1-02 to 3-19-03, \$3,686.02 Tax, \$0.00 Finality Penalties, \$327.44 Amnesty Interest Penalty

AMT Solutions, Inc., 356197, 392072 (CH)

3-20-03 to 5-31-05, \$3,489.09 Tax, \$0.00 Penalty

3-20-03 to 5-31-05, \$10,000.00 Claim for Refund

Action: The Board took no action.

Kenneth Darryl Beecham, 393632, (KH)

8-1-04 to 2-12-06, \$51,307.00 Tax, \$5,130.70 Penalty

Action: Redetermine as recommended by the Appeals Division.

Weston James Coolidge, 386899 (CH)

12-1-98 to 3-31-00, \$79,555.76 Tax, \$33,992.48 Penalty

Action: Redetermine as recommended by the Appeals Division.

Simmons Duplicating Supply Company, Inc., 347724 (OH)

4-1-02 to 6-30-05, \$44,030.07 Tax, \$5,685.96 Penalties, \$1,187.47 Amnesty Interest Penalty

Action: Redetermine as recommended by the Appeals Division.

Hany M. Abuelrous, 433967 (ET)

October 10, 2007, \$175.50 Approximate Value

Action: Determined that staff properly seized the tobacco products.

**CORPORATE FRANCHISE AND PERSONAL INCOME TAX MATTERS, CONSENT**

With respect to the Corporate Franchise and Personal Income Tax Matters Consent Agenda, upon a single motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Mr. Leonard and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board made the following orders:

Jack Larson, 329112

2003, \$1,449.00 Assessment

Action: Sustain the action of the Franchise Tax Board.

**HOMEOWNER AND RENTER PROPERTY TAX ASSISTANCE MATTERS, CONSENT**

With respect to the Homeowner and Renter Property Tax Assistance Matters Consent Agenda, upon a single motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Mr. Leonard and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board made the following orders:

Gloria M. Williams, 387273

2006, \$347.50

Action: Sustain the action of the Franchise Tax Board.

Wednesday, May 28, 2008

**SALES AND USE TAX MATTERS, REDETERMINATIONS AND DENIALS OF CLAIMS FOR REFUND, CONSENT**

With respect to the Sales and Use Tax Matters, Redeterminations and Denials of Claims for Refund, Consent Agenda, upon a single motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Steel and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board made the following orders:

Nissan North America, Inc., 272698 (OHA)

4-1-98 to 6-30-02, \$753,095.18

Action: Approve the redetermination as recommended by staff.

Panasonic Corporation of North America, 422116 (OHB)

1-1-01 to 6-30-04, \$181,307.35

Action: Approve the redetermination as recommended by staff.

4 S Casino Party Suppliers, LLC, 299497 (BH)

1-1-98 to 6-30-04, \$285,562.71

Action: Approve the redetermination as recommended by staff.

Specialty Salvage Limited, 283580 (KH)

7-1-95 to 11-30-97, \$107,775.80

Action: Approve the redetermination as recommended by staff.

Union Pacific Railroad Company, 326246 (OHA)

1-1-99 to 9-30-02, \$4,593,357.48

Action: Approve the redetermination as recommended by staff.

Govstor, LLC, 417205 (JHF)

10-1-05 to 12-31-06, \$75,779.00

Action: Approve the denial of claim for refund as recommended by staff.

**SALES AND USE TAX MATTERS, CREDITS, CANCELLATIONS AND REFUNDS, CONSENT**

With respect to the Sales and Use Tax Matters, Credits, Cancellations and Refunds, Consent Agenda, upon a single motion of Ms. Steel, seconded by Ms. Yee and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, Ms. Mandel not participating in accordance with Government Code section 87105 in *Target Corporation, 360870*, the Board made the following orders:

Target Corporation, 360870 (OHA)

1-1-00 to 6-30-03, \$238,090.57

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff. Ms. Mandel not participating in accordance with Government Code section 87105.

Wednesday, May 28, 2008

Lighthouse Worldwide Solutions, Inc., 373666 (CH)

7-1-04 to 6-30-07, \$50,816.59

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff.

Birchwood Cabinets of California, Inc., 389873 (KH)

1-1-03 to 6-30-06, \$619,597.44

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff.

Pentax of America, Inc., 403453 (OHB)

1-1-06 to 9-30-06, \$130,134.19

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff.

Daimler Chrysler Corporation, 436898 (CHA)

7-17-07 to 12-06-07, \$487,897.67

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff.

Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC, 426403 (KH)

11-15-07 to 1-23-08, \$180,804.00

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff.

Qualcomm, Inc., 404369 (UT)

7-28-04 to 7-28-04, \$2,258,156.28

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff.

KII Acquisition Company, 342751 (FH)

1-1-03 to 12-31-05, \$1,216,627.59

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff.

Vertis, Inc., 396782 (OHB)

4-1-06 to 3-31-07, \$56,995.79

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff.

Consolidated Electrical Distributors, Inc., 287507 (AC)

1-1-02 to 12-31-04, \$920,073.75

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff.

TSK America, Inc., 417773 (OHA)

1-1-07 to 3-31-07, \$176,252.45

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff.

Freight Systems, Inc., 395248 (OHA)

10-1-04 to 12-31-06, \$325,367.74

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff.

Watsonville Hospital Corporation, 381029 (GHC)

7-1-03 to 12-31-04, \$66,622.83

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff.

Wednesday, May 28, 2008

**SPECIAL TAXES MATTERS, CREDITS, CANCELLATIONS AND REFUNDS,  
CONSENT**

With respect to the Special Taxes Matters, Credits, Cancellations and Refunds, Consent Agenda, upon a single motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Mr. Leonard and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, Ms. Mandel not participating in accordance with Government Code section 7.9 in *Equiva Trading Company, 254407*; *Equiva Trading Company, 208034*; and, *Midland National Life Insurance Company, 427043*; the Board made the following orders:

Equiva Trading Company, 254407, (MT)

Equiva Trading Company, 208034, (MT)

3-1-99 to 12-31-01, \$3,427,542.73

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff. Ms. Mandel not participating in accordance with Government Code section 7.9.

Nella Oil Company, LLC, 345962 (MT)

10-1-05 to 12-31-05, \$192,683.70

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff.

Midland National Life Insurance Company, 427043 (ET)

1-1-04 to 12-31-06, \$488,280.81

Action: Approve the refund as recommended by staff. Ms. Mandel not participating in accordance with Government Code section 7.9.

**LEGAL APPEALS MATTERS, ADJUDICATORY**

Rajinder Singh Garcha, 30060 (KH)

7-1-95 to 6-30-98, \$10,894.69 Tax

Considered by the Board: April 8, 2008

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Mandel and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board ordered that the petition be redetermined as recommended by the Appeals Division.

John Richard Dudley, 253691 (KH)

7-1-00 to 6-30-03, \$15,019.87 Tax, \$6,112.27 Penalty, \$3,615.91 Amnesty Interest Penalty

Considered by the Board: December 11, 2007

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Mandel and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board ordered that the petition be redetermined as recommended by the Appeals Division.

Wednesday, May 28, 2008

Don Ricardo's Restaurant, Inc., 42025 (AP)

4-1-95 to 12-31-06, \$37,111.60 Tax, \$3,711.16 Penalty

Padrino's, Inc., 42029 (AC)

4-1-95 to 3-31-98, \$179,168.19 Tax, \$17,916.81 Penalty, \$76,605.02 Amnesty Interest Penalty

Considered by the Board: February 27, 2008

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Action: Upon motion of Dr. Chu, seconded by Mr. Leonard and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard and Ms. Steel voting yes, Ms. Mandel not participating, the Board ordered that the amnesty interest penalty be relieved, otherwise redetermined as recommended by the Appeals Division.

#### **CORPORATE FRANCHISE AND PERSONAL INCOME TAX MATTERS, ADJUDICATORY**

Affiliated Funding Corporation, 317945

2003, \$14,446.88 Claim for Refund

Considered by the Board: Formal Opinion

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Mandel, seconded by Ms. Yee and duly carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee and Ms. Mandel voting yes, Mr. Leonard and Ms. Steel voting no, the Board adopted a decision sustaining the action of the Franchise Tax Board but did not adopt a formal opinion.

Ronald C. Nelson and Marie J. Nelson, 329716

1985, \$1,048.54 Accrued Interest

Considered by the Board: February 27, 2007

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Mandel and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board adopted a decision modifying the action of the Franchise Tax Board.

Constance Zorn, 317272

1992 to 1994, \$216,732.36 Assessment

Considered by the Board: Presented for Separate Discussion

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Mandel and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board adopted a decision sustaining the action of the Franchise Tax Board.

Bruce H. Erfer and Lynn N. Erfer, 294534

2001, \$756.75 Claim for Refund

2002, \$953.18 Claim for Refund

Considered by the Board: Presented for Separate Discussion

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Action: Ms. Steel moved that the petition be granted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Leonard but failed to carry, Mr. Leonard and Ms. Steel voting yes, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee and Ms. Mandel voting no.

Wednesday, May 28, 2008

Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Mandel and duly carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee and Ms. Mandel voting yes, Mr. Leonard and Ms. Steel voting no, the Board adopted a decision modifying the action of the Franchise Tax Board.

Stanley W. Gribble, 354879

1994, \$1,239,603.62 Claim for Refund

SWG Management Company, 354880

1994, \$95,441.22 Claim for Refund

Considered by the Board: Presented for Separate Discussion

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Mandel, seconded by Ms. Yee and duly carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard and Ms. Mandel voting yes, Ms. Steel voting no, the Board adopted a decision reversing the action with concessions by the Franchise Tax Board in the appeal of *SWG Management Company, 354880*; and, modified the action with concessions by the Franchise Tax Board in the appeal of *Stanley W. Gribble, 354879*.

Teresa Rothman, 380556

2004, \$2,909.00 Tax, \$727.25 Penalty

Considered by the Board: Presented for Separate Discussion

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: No contribution disclosure forms were filed. The Members noted that their records disclosed no contributions from this taxpayer, his agent or participants.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Mandel, seconded by Mr. Leonard and duly carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard and Ms. Mandel voting yes, Ms. Steel voting no, the Board adopted a decision sustaining the action of the Franchise Tax Board. The Board did not impose a frivolous appeal penalty.

Catherine Wimby, 354090

2005, \$851.00 Claim for Refund

Considered by the Board: September 12, 2007

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: No contribution disclosure forms were filed. The Members noted that their records disclosed no contributions from this taxpayer, his agent or participants.

Action: Upon motion of Mr. Leonard, seconded by Ms. Steel and duly carried, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, Dr. Chu and Ms. Yee voting no, the Board adopted a decision modifying the Franchise Tax Board's denial of claim for refund to allow for Child and Dependent Care Credit expenses in the amount of \$984.80.

Larry Geisel and Rhoda Geisel, 358724

2000, \$92,424.00 Assessment

Considered by the Board: December 12, 2007

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Mandel, seconded by Ms. Yee and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, Mr. Leonard abstaining, the Board adopted a decision denying the petition for rehearing.

Wednesday, May 28, 2008

Speakers: Marty Dakessian, Attorney, Akerman Senterfitt LLP, representing *Daniel V, Inc.*,  
342609  
Ron Lane, Taxpayer, *Daniel V, Inc.*, 342609

Daniel V, Inc., 342609

1997, \$40,759.23 Assessment

1998, \$840,010.32 Assessment

Considered by the Board: May 15, 2008

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Action: Mr. Leonard moved that the petition be granted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Steel but failed to carry, Mr. Leonard and Ms. Steel voting yes, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee and Ms. Mandel voting no.

Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Dr. Chu and duly carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee and Ms. Mandel voting yes, Mr. Leonard and Ms. Steel voting no, the Board adopted a decision sustaining the action of the Franchise Tax Board.

#### **HOMEOWNER AND RENTER PROPERTY TAX ASSISTANCE MATTERS, ADJUDICATORY**

Savann Nhem, 379885

2006, \$1.00 or more

Considered by the Board: Presented for Separate Discussion

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Mr. Leonard and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board dismissed the appeal.

Sajjad Riyaz, 349075

2004, \$300.00

2005, \$300.00

Considered by the Board: March 19, 2008

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: No contribution disclosure forms were filed. The Members noted that their records disclosed no contributions from this taxpayer, his agent or participants.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Mr. Leonard and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board adopted a denying the petition for rehearing.

#### **SALES AND USE TAX MATTERS, REDETERMINATIONS, RELIEF OF PENALTIES AND DENIALS OF CLAIMS FOR REFUND, ADJUDICATORY**

Messer Griesheim Industries, Inc., 435576 (OHB)

1-1-01 to 12-31-04, \$50,534.74

Considered by the Board: Presented for Separate Discussion

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Mr. Leonard and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board approved the relief of penalty as recommended by staff.

Wednesday, May 28, 2008

PCS Leasing Co, L.P., 431274 (OHA)

1-1-07 to 3-31-07, \$59,230.00

Considered by the Board: March 19, 2008

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: No contribution disclosure forms were filed. The Members noted that their records disclosed no contributions from this taxpayer, his agent or participants.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Mr. Leonard and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard and Ms. Mandel voting yes, Ms. Steel not participating in accordance with Government Code section 87105, the Board approved the relief of penalty as recommended by staff.

**SALES AND USE TAX MATTERS, CREDITS, CANCELLATIONS AND REFUNDS, ADJUDICATORY**

Owens &amp; Minor Distribution, Inc., 306485 (OHB)

1-1-02 to 12-31-05, \$2,072,102.77

Considered by the Board: Presented for Separate Discussion

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Steel and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board approved the refund as recommended by staff.

**TAX PROGRAM NONAPPEARANCE MATTERS NOT SUBJECT TO CONTRIBUTION DISCLOSURE STATUTE****PROPERTY TAX MATTERS****Audits**

CallTower, Inc. (7960)

2004, \$560,000.00 Escaped Assessment, \$56,000.00 Penalties, \$184,800.00 In-lieu Interest

2005, \$40,000.00 Escaped Assessment, \$4,000.00 Penalties, \$9,600.00 In-lieu Interest

2006, \$640,000.00 Escaped Assessment, \$64,000.00 Penalties, \$96,000.00 In-lieu Interest

2007, \$290,000.00 Excessive Assessment

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Steel and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard and Ms. Steel voting yes, Ms. Mandel not participating in accordance with Government Code section 7.9, the Board adopted the audit escaped and excessive assessments, plus penalties and in-lieu interest, as recommended by staff.

IP Networks, Inc. (7995)

2004, \$1,570,000.00 Escaped Assessment, \$157,000.00 Penalties, \$518,100.00 In-lieu Interest

2005, \$130,000.00 Excessive Assessment

2006, \$1,600,000.00 Escaped Assessment, \$160,000.00 Penalties, \$240,000.00 In-lieu Interest

2007, \$200,000.00 Excessive Assessment

**Wednesday, May 28, 2008**

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Steel and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard and Ms. Steel voting yes, Ms. Mandel not participating in accordance with Government Code section 7.9, the Board adopted the audit escaped and excessive assessments, plus penalties and in-lieu interest, as recommended by staff.

#### **OFFERS-IN-COMPROMISE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Steel and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board approved the Offers in Compromise of *Sharp Image Electronics, Inc.*; *Fassel Mahmoud Elder*; *Management Insultants L.P.*; *James Steven Slack*; *Fadel Mohammed*; *Elwalani and Marina Elwalani*; and *Angie Wilder*; as recommended by staff.

#### **SALES AND USE TAX APPEALS HEARING**

Norman P. Shockley, Jr., 306953 (GH)

Acclaim Technology, Inc., 341204 (GH)

7-1-03 to 9-30-03, \$51,488.23 Tax, \$11,728.85 Failure to Pay Penalty

For Petitioner/Claimant:

Norman Shockley, Jr., Taxpayer

Norman Shockley, Sr., Witness

For Department:

Cary Huxsoll, Tax Counsel

Contribution Disclosures pursuant to Government Code section 15626: None were disclosed.

Issues: Whether petitioner is personally responsible for the unpaid liability of Acclaim Technology, Inc. for the third quarter 2003.

Whether the failure-to-pay penalty should be relieved.

Whether Acclaim's overpayments related to unclaimed bad deduction for the fourth quarters of 2000, 2001, and 2002 can be offset against its liability for the third quarter 2003, with corresponding adjustments to petitioner's personal liability.

Action: Upon motion of Mr. Leonard, seconded by Ms. Yee and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board ordered that the petition be submitted for decision, granting the petitioner 30 days to file supporting documents, the Department 30 days to respond, and the Appeals Division 30 days thereafter to review the petitioner's supporting documents, the Department's response and provide its recommendation to the Board.

#### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

##### **Proposed Amendments to Sales and Use Tax Regulation 1807, *Process for Reviewing Local Tax Reallocation Inquiries*; and, adoption of Regulation 1828, *Process for Reviewing Transactions and Use Tax Distribution Inquiries*.**

David Levine, Tax Counsel, Appeals Division, Legal Department, made introductory remarks regarding the proposed amendments to Regulations 1807, *Process of Reviewing Local Tax Reallocation Inquiries*, and 1828, *Process for Reviewing Transactions and Use Tax Distributions*, which are changes to the process of reviewing petitions for local tax reallocations and transition and use tax distributions. (Exhibit 5.15.)

Wednesday, May 28, 2008

Speakers: Fran Mancia, Director of Government Relations, Muniservices  
Dan Carrigg, Legislative Director, League of CA Cities  
Matt Hinderliter, Audit Manager, HDL  
Al Koch, General Counsel, MuniServices, LLC  
Bob Cendejas, Attorney, Cendejas & Associates  
Dave McPherson, Deputy Finance Director, City of San Jose

Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Mandel and unanimously carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, the Board adopted the proposed amendments.

**FINAL ACTION ON SALES AND USE TAX APPEALS HEARINGS HELD MAY 28, 2008**

Janice Diana Samsing and Mildred Kaunas, 356928 (UT)

Final Action: Ms. Steel moved that the petition be granted. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Upon motion of Mr. Leonard, seconded by Ms. Mandel and duly carried, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Steel and Ms. Mandel voting yes, Dr. Chu and Ms. Yee voting no, the Board ordered that the petitioner be relieved of the interest that accrued from August 8, 2005, when the Department should have sent a follow up letter to petitioners, and May 12, 2006, when the Department issued the Notice of Determination, and otherwise redetermine in accordance with the recommendation of the Appeals Division.

Foster Poultry Farms, 77405, 265656, 304306 (KHE)

Final Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Mandel and duly carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee, Mr. Leonard and Ms. Mandel voting yes, Ms. Steel voting no, the Board ordered that the claim be denied and the petition be redetermined as recommended by the Appeals Division.

Matt Lababedy, 89002316680 (KH)

Final Action: Upon motion of Ms. Yee, seconded by Ms. Mandel and duly carried, Dr. Chu, Ms. Yee and Ms. Mandel voting yes, Mr. Leonard and Ms. Steel voting no, the Board ordered that the petition be redetermined as recommended by the Appeals Division.

The Board adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

*The foregoing minutes are adopted by the Board on June 24, 2008.*