1	
2	
3	
4	
5	BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
6	450 N STREET
7	SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
8	STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION MEETING
9	TELECONFERENCE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
17	AUGUST 24, 2021
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	REPORTED BY: Jillian M. Sumner
28	CSR NO. 13619

1	<u>APPEAR</u>	ING TELEPHONICALLY
2	For the Board of Equalization:	Honorable Antonio Vazquez
3		Chair
4		Honorable Mike Schaefer Vice Chair
5		Honorable Ted Gaines First District
7		Honorable Malia M. Cohen Second District
8		Yvette Stowers
9		Appearing for Betty T. Yee, State Controller (per Government Code
11		Section 7.9)
12		Betty T. Yee State Controller
13	For the Board of	
14	Equalization Staff:	Brenda Fleming Executive Director
15		Henry Nanjo
16		Chief Counsel Legal Department
17 18		David Yeung Deputy Director Property Tax Department
19		Lisa Renati
20		Chief Deputy Director
21		Lisa Thompson Chief
22		Taxpayers' Rights Advocates Office
23		Henry Moon
24		Tax Counsel Legal Department
25		Cathy Taylor Chief
26		Board Proceedings Division
27 28		
/ 0	•	

1	<u>APPEAI</u>	RANCES CONTINUED
2		
3	For the Board of	
4	Equalization Staff:	Sarah Garrett
5		Appeals Attorney Legal Department
6 7		Sonia Yim Appeals Attorney Legal Department
8		negar beparement
9	Public Commenters:	Ernest Dronenburg
10		Assessor/Recorder/County Clerk San Diego County President
11		California Assessors' Association
12		David_Kline
13 14		Vice President of Communications and Research California Taxpayers' Association
15		Bart Norman
16		Taxpayer - San Joaquin County
17	Written Commenters:	Dil Kazzaz
18		Jaimie Korody
19		Tongva Land Preservation Corporation - Santa Monica
20		T.R. Jahns
21		Bea Stotzer Board Member
22		New Economics for Women (NEW)
24		Corinne Muelrath
25		Tricia Gonzalez
26		
27		
28		
٠ -		

Г

1		INDEX
2		PAGE NO.
3	Introductions	1
4	Item C1	7
5	Item C2	8 9
6	Motion	95
7	Item J1	96
8	Motion	97
9	Item J2	9 9
10	Motion	102
11	Item D3	103
12	Motion	108
13	Item E3	110
14	Motion	114
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

Ē

1	STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION	
2	TELECONFERENCE	
3	AUGUST 24, 2021	
4	000	
5		
6	MR. VAZQUEZ: Good morning, everybody. Glad	
7	to see everybody. Looks like everybody is bright and	
8	early today this morning.	
9	With that, let me go ahead and let's call	
10	this Board Meeting to order.	
11	If I can have Ms. Taylor please call the	
12	roll.	
13	MS. TAYLOR: Certainly.	
14	Chairman Vazquez.	
15	MR. VAZQUEZ: Here.	
16	MS. TAYLOR: Vice Chair Schaefer.	
17	MR. SCHAEFER: Here.	
18	MS. TAYLOR: Member Gaines.	
19	MR. GAINES: Here.	
20	MS. TAYLOR: Member Cohen.	
21	MS. COHEN: Good morning. Present.	
22	MS. TAYLOR: And Deputy Controller	
23	Stowers.	
24	MS. STOWERS: Present.	
25	MR. VAZQUEZ: So we have a full quorum.	
26	Everybody present this morning.	
27	With that, we will start with the pledge of	
28	allegiance.	

If I could get you all to please stand.

(Whereupon the pledge of allegiance was recited.)

2.7

MR. VAZQUEZ: Okay. With that, Members, once again, since we're still doing this virtual meeting here. I want to just remind us all again -- and you've all been real good about this.

And for those that might be logging in, especially today during the hearing, please, your patience is greatly appreciated as we all begin this meeting.

Because we all pretty much share one line. So if we can just remember to just please be recognized, so we can have our transcriptionist clearly state who is making motions, who is seconding them, and then document it all very as accurate as possible moving forward. Really appreciate your patience with that.

And with that, I want to open it up for some opening remarks.

I know Member Gaines wanted to say a few words. And I see his hand up.

Member Gaines, go ahead.

MR. GAINES: Yeah. Thank you, Chair Vazquez. I appreciate it.

I just wanted to give a little update in terms of the Caldor Fire in El Dorado County, not too far from where I live. And it's burned over 100,000

acres. And the blessing is that there have been no deaths.

There have been hundreds of structures that have been burned down, including people's homes. And the -- it's nine percent contained. So for many, many days there was no containment of the fire. So the fact that it's nine percent is showing some improvement.

And I think the fear is that it goes into other communities like Pollock Pines, Placerville, and even South Lake Tahoe. So I'm hoping that CAL Fire can contain it as best as possible. They're working very hard, and doing a good job, I think, of trying to contain it.

The smoke is out of control in many parts of the county. The basin, Lake Tahoe Basin, the air pollution index had been as high as 800. I think it's 500 to 600 right now.

But -- so thank you for asking about it earlier, Tony.

And then finally I just wanted to also announce that it's our 36th wedding anniversary. So Beth and I have been married 36 years today. And to celebrate, I'm at the BOE meeting. And I'm loving it.

Thank you.

MR. VAZQUEZ: That's true commitment, 36. I think you might have me by a few months.

But -- and thank you for those -- for the 1 update. Because, you know, we were out there in 2 Tahoe for the Assessors' Association. I thought the 3 air quality wasn't that bad. 4 But just for the viewing public, when we're 5 6 throwing out these numbers, 500, 800, what's good 7 quality? MR. GAINES: I think it's -- isn't it under 8 like 50 or 60, I think, is considered good air 9 quality. And I think around 100 is considered 10 moderate. 11 12 MR. VAZQUEZ: You're saying 500 to 800, right? 13 14 MR. GAINES: Yeah. Very unhealthy. That's pretty bad. MR. VAZQUEZ: 15 MR. GAINES: I've got a friend that lives up 16 17 there. And he's actually down in Yosemite with his 18 wife. He just got out of town. MR. VAZOUEZ: Is Yosemite a lot better? 19 20 MR. GAINES: Yes. 21 MR. VAZQUEZ: Okay. Thank you. 22 MR. GAINES: Thank you. 23 MR. VAZQUEZ: I see another hand up. Ms. Stowers. Go ahead, Ms. Stowers. 24 25 MS. STOWERS: Thank you, Chairman Vazquez. Controller Yee and myself would like to say 26 27 that our hearts go out to those individuals who are impacted by the current wildfires. 28

We also want to let you know that there's various tax relief, relief from property tax, which you can find information at the BOE website that will connect you to your local county assessor.

It'd be tax relief regarding income tax, like filing and tax deductions on the Franchise Tax Board website, tax relief related to sales and use tax on the California Department of Tax and Fee website.

When you go to those websites, I recommend you do a keyword search, "disaster," and those pages would pop up with the information that you need.

Also, I note since many of these areas are declared a governor's -- a disaster area, tax staff in those various agencies are out there currently in the county providing information like obtaining your tax records if something was destroyed in the fire, and just kind of recreating your financial records.

So I just wanted to make that available to those who are currently listening, and let you know if you need any additional service, you can always go to the State Controller's website at sco.ca.gov. And we have a resource page there for these type of items, including COVID-19 assistance.

Thank you.

2.7

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  VAZQUEZ: Thank you for that information.

Yes. For all those that are viewing and

listening in, there's -- and I know several of us who have our own websites, including the BOE. You know, please, by all means, reach out if there's anything we can do to assist.

2.6

2.7

With that, let me ask Ms. Taylor if she would please announce our first order of business.

MS. TAYLOR: Our first order of business is an announcement regarding public teleconference participation.

Good morning, and thank you for joining today's Board of Equalization Meeting via teleconference.

Throughout the duration of today's meeting, you will primarily be in a listen-only mode.

As you may know from our public agenda notice and our website, we have requested that individuals who wish to make a public comment, fill out the public comment submission form found on our "Additional Information" webpage in advance of today's meeting.

Or, alternatively, participate in today's meeting by providing your public comment live.

After the presentation of an item has concluded, we will begin by identifying any public comment requests that have not been received by our Board Proceeding staff, with the AT&T operator providing directions for you to identify yourself.

After all known public commenters have been

called, the operator will also provide public comment instructions to the individuals participating via teleconference.

Accordingly, if you intend to make a public comment today, we recommend dialing into the meeting on the teleconference line, as the audio broadcast on our website experiences a one-to-three-minute delay.

When giving a public comment, please limit your remarks to three minutes.

We ask that everyone who is not intending to make a public comment, please mute their line or minimize background noise.

If there are technical difficulties when we are in the public comment portion of our meeting, we will do our best to read submitted comments into the record at appropriate times.

Thank you for your patience and understanding.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you, Ms. Taylor.

With that, if you would please call our first agenda item.

## ITEM C1

2.7

MS. TAYLOR: Our first order -- agenda item of the day will be Item C1, Public Hearings,
Taxpayers' Bill of Rights Hearing.

A public hearing to allow taxpayers to

comment on items in the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate
Annual Report, or issues related to the agency's
administration of its tax programs.

Taxpayers can share their experiences with property tax problems they may be having, so the agency can help facilitate resolutions.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Good morning.

 $\hbox{ Is Ms. Thompson there? Oh, I see her on the } \\ \hbox{screen now.}$ 

Good morning.

2.5

2.6

2.7

MS. THOMPSON: Good morning, Chair Vazquez and Honorable Board Members. I'm Lisa Thompson, the agency's Taxpayers' Rights Advocate and Chief of the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office.

I'm pleased to be here today to conduct the Annual Taxpayer Bill of Rights Hearing to allow property taxpayers, as well as industry representatives, government agencies, and other parties, the opportunity to provide comments before this elected Board.

The hearing is held in accordance with the Morgan Property Taxpayers' Bill of Rights and the California Taxpayers' Bill of Rights.

Before we extend the opportunity to the public to provide their comment, I would like to share some information on the format and purpose of

this hearing, and then discuss the most recent Taxpayers' Rights Advocates Annual Report, which is fiscal year 19/20.

2.6

This can be accessed on our agency's website through the taxpayer advocate pages, as well as by viewing the agenda notice for this Board Meeting.

As to the format for the order of the speakers, we would like to extend the opportunity to speak to those that notified the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office, or the Board Proceedings Division, of their interest to speak prior to the meeting.

And then we will go to the speakers on the teleconference line who wish to provide comment.

After each speaker, I would like to make some remarks on past work that the Taxpayers' Rights Advocates Office may have had with them, or -- if that's applicable, or to provide some other comments if we have not yet had the opportunity to work with them.

As to that purpose of a hearing, it is to give taxpayers' industry representatives, assessors, and local agencies, the opportunity to provide comments on the items or problems discussed in the annual report from the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate's Office, for the purpose of correcting any problems identified in those reports.

And also to provide comments on any other issues that they may be working with our office on,

as well as on property taxes in general.

2.5

2.6

2.7

Parties may also comment on programs administered by the State Board of Equalization, the quality of our agency's services, property tax issues as well.

Individuals may present their concerns regarding issues related to the administration of any of its tax programs, including state and local property taxes, the alcoholic beverage tax, or the tax on insurers.

To publicize this Bill of Rights Hearing, we issued Letter To Assessors 2021-23 on June 10th, 2021. Which is distributed electronically to approximately 3,500 subscribers.

We distributed posters and fliers to local agencies involved in property tax for posting in public areas.

And similar to last year, we contacted the following six major organizations and asked if they could notify their membership about the opportunity to speak, as well as invited representatives from their organizations to speak.

And those organizations are the California
Taxpayers Association, commonly known as CalTax,
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers' Association,
Spidell Publishing, California Society of CPAs,
California Society of Enrolled Agents, and California
Chamber of Commerce.

Additionally, we notified the California Alliance of Taxpayer Advocates and KPMG.

2.6

2.7

Additionally, there was a news release, and the hearing was advertised on various social media platforms, Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and LinkedIn.

For the first time ever we also had a public service announcement that was recorded. And our agency worked with the media services of the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration on this. And we think they did an excellent job.

The hearing was also noticed as part of the August Board Meeting. So this year we had a lot of exposure as to it, and hopefully that will be a lot of viewers.

Over the last few months, the Taxpayers'
Rights Advocates Office has had an increase in -- in
contacts. So apparently our additional outreach is
working well to get the word out that we're available
to help taxpayers.

Our agency's Taxpayer Bill of Rights Hearing is held in accordance with certain statutory provisions. And so to provide some framework, I'd like to provide those provisions.

For property taxpayers, the Revenue and Taxation Code Section 5906(d) states that the Board shall annually conduct a public hearing, soliciting the input of assessors, other local agency

representatives, and taxpayers, to address the advocates annual report pursuant to section 5904 to identify a means to correct any problem identified in that report.

2.6

And for the alcoholic beverage tax, Revenue and Taxation Code Section 32863 states that the Board shall conduct an annual hearing before the full Board to allow industry representatives and individual taxpayers to present the proposals on changes to the alcoholic beverage tax law to improve voluntary compliance, and the relationship between taxpayers and government.

The Taxpayers' Rights Advocate's annual report that is applicable to this hearing is fiscal year 19/20, which was published in February of 2021.

That report included discussion on problems or issues in the area of property taxes, and contain examples on property tax cases, illustrating how the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office assists taxpayers.

Additionally, that report includes our involvement in education to local taxpayers. We do this through the publication of information sheets that are written in simple, nontechnical terms, and are geared to assist taxpayers in understanding various property tax topics.

Before we invite taxpayers to share their experiences or voice their concerns before this

elected Board, I would like to share some statistics on how many taxpayers we assisted in the last fiscal year, the fiscal year for that report, and also provide some information on how the advocate's office helps to resolve problems that taxpayers may have with the assessment or collection of property taxes.

2.6

2.7

And so for fiscal year 19/20, our office worked on approximately 250 cases, all in the area of property taxes.

The majority of those taxpayers contacted our office through the web inquiry form that we have, that is accessed through the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office page, or by phone.

A significant number of cases were also forwarded to us from Board Member offices after the taxpayer reached out to their offices seeking assistance.

The majority of taxpayers that the

Taxpayers' Advocate Office assisted were from

District One, Board Member Gaines' district, and

District Two, Board Member Cohen's district. But the other two districts were represented as well.

And the majority of cases pertain to valuation issues, such as value reductions, change in ownership, new constructions, exclusions from reassessments, exemptions, assessment appeals, and general property taxation.

The remaining cases were in the

administrative category, which includes topics such as creating a mailing of tax bills refunds and penalties.

2.6

2.7

This year the annual report identified problems taxpayers experienced with property tax bill penalties, property being reassessed for a change in ownership when the property owner passed away and a family member inherited it, and another problem with the transfer of the base year value from one home to another for a person over age 55.

This year, the annual report identified these problems. So I'm just going to give a little bit of information about the types of cases.

In one of the cases, a taxpayer received penalty for not paying the second installment of the property taxes on time.

And we contacted the taxpayer -- Tax

Collector's office to find out when the payment was

made and the amount.

We then explained to the taxpayer in nontechnical terms the reason for the penalty, and that the taxpayer can submit a penalty cancellation request to the Tax Collector's office.

In another case, a taxpayer received several tax bills for a supplemental assessment that covered several years of estate assessments as well, when an assessor reassessed property for a change in ownership due to the death of a taxpayer's parent

that happened many years ago.

2.5

2.6

2.7

The Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office coordinated with the assessor's office to obtain information on the change in ownership reporting and supplemental assessment noticing.

We then explained to the taxpayer that even though the change in ownership occurred more than three years ago, the taxpayer could complete and submit the parent-child transfer claim form, and it would be considered timely, as long as the taxpayer filed with the assessor within six months of the assessor's supplemental notice.

After the claim was filed with the assessor's office, we then worked with them to expedite the claim processing, and the exclusion was granted with the reassessment reversed.

In another case, the -- when the assessor denied a base year value transfer request for a person aged 55 and over, we helped the taxpayer understand what documentation could be submitted to show that the house which was sold was in fact their principal residence, even though they had not claimed the homeowner's exemption on that.

A large part of the Taxpayers' Rights

Advocates role is to help facilitate resolution of
taxpayers' problems. And we do that by working with
the property tax agencies, such as the assessor or
Tax Collector to obtain information about the

assessment, the taxpayers' property, and the corresponding property taxes for that property, and other charges that may be included on the tax bill.

2.6

2.7

If the issue is with work performed by programs that are directly performed or administered by our agency, then we work with a particular section within a Property Tax Department or other departments on resolving that.

We review each taxpayer's situation on a case-by-case basis, conduct research and analysis pertaining to the case, contact local agency representatives, and review existing guidance on the case. And then help -- to help resolve the taxpayer's issues between -- with that agency.

We largely help taxpayers with problems that they have with the assessment or collection of property tax on their property. And oftentimes a taxpayer just needs assistance in understanding what documentation needs to be provided to the assessor's office to arrive at that solution, or to receive some confirmation by a third party, us, the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office, that they were treated fairly according to the law.

In addition to helping taxpayers with specific problems that they are having with the assessment or collection of property taxes, we also help with larger issues that can bring about change.

That can start with somebody contacting the

Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office, or with somebody attending the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office, like today, and bringing comments to the elected Board.

2.6

And if you look at the advocates 2019/20 annual report, it identifies one such project that resulted in many beneficial changes. And that is the Assessment Appeals Project.

At a past Taxpayers' Bill of Rights Hearing, a taxpayer organization came to the hearing expressing concerns that taxpayers were having with the assessment appeals process.

A project was then started by our Property
Tax Department, with the project going through the
interested parties process, with participation from
the taxpayer group that brought the issue forward,
the California Alliance of Taxpayer Advocates, as
well as the California Assessors' Association, and
California Clerks' Association.

And so in addition to property tax rule changes, that project resulted in revision to guidance issued in our agency's assessment appeals manual, as well as a new form created that all 58 county assessors must use in making requests for information to taxpayers under section 441(d).

That project was completed shortly after fiscal year 2019/20, the year of that report.

And bringing issues forward with results just shows that coming to the Taxpayers' Bill of

Rights Hearing and providing comments -- to provide comments, as well as voicing their concerns, can bring about changes. And it's very important.

2.6

2.7

So for today's hearing, we were notified that there are eight speakers. That was prior to the hearing that contacted the Board Proceedings Division through public comment, or the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate's Office.

I'll just go ahead and list them out first,
and then -- before introducing them.

For today's hearing we first have

Honorable Ernie Dronenburg, San Diego County Assessor

and President of the California Assessors'

Association, who indicated he would be calling in to

provide comment.

Mr. David Kline on behalf of the California
Taxpayers' Association, CalTax. He also indicated he
would be calling in.

Mr. Bart Norman, a taxpayer from Valley County indicated he would be calling in.

Mr. Dil Kazzaz submitted comments in writing to the Board Proceedings Division through our public comment form.

And Ms. Jaimie Korody submitted comments in writing to the Board Proceedings Division through the public comment form.

T.R. Jahns submitted comments in writing to the Board Proceedings Division through the public

comment form. 1 Ms. Bea Stotzer on behalf of a nonprofit 2 organization submitted comments in writing. Also 3 through the public comment form. 4 And, lastly, Corinne submitted comments in 5 writing through the public comment form to Board 6 7 Proceedings this morning. And that concludes my opening remarks. 8 Unless there are any questions from the Board Members 9 or comments, we can invite taxpayers that provided 10 comment to us previously to start. And then we would 11 12 invite people from the teleconference. So after -- after each speaker provides 13 their comments, then I would like to provide comments 14 and some remarks to speak to any action that we may 15 16 have had with those taxpayers, what future action 17 that could be taken. 18 So we would like to start with Mr. Ernest 19 Dronenburg, San Diego County Assessor and President 20 of the California Assessors' Association. And I'll send it back to the Board 21 22 Proceedings clerk to call that. 23 Thank you very much. 24 MR. SCHAEFER: Vice Chair Schaefer. 25 Before you go to Mr. Dronenburg --MR. VAZQUEZ: There's a couple hands up I 26

MS. THOMPSON: Oh, okay.

2.7

28

see --

1 MR. VAZQUEZ: -- before we get started.
2 MR. SCHAEFER: Ms. Cohen and I both have

3 comments.

2.5

2.6

2.7

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  VAZQUEZ: I see Member Cohen and Vice Chair Schaefer.

Member Cohen, go ahead.

MS. COHEN: Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you, Ms. Thompson.

So I -- I see from the annual report that the TRA office handled approximately 250 cases. And that the majority of these cases were in the valuation category.

My question is whether you had any recommendations for additional taxpayer education, additional outreach to assist taxpayers in understanding the valuation issues.

MS. THOMPSON: So we have -- currently we have taxpayer information sheets on -- on base year value transfers for seniors, as well as exclusions, parent-child, grandparent-child, as well as base year transfer for seniors, as well as disabled persons, those were impacted, as you know, by Proposition 19.

So we will be revising those information sheets, as well as adding another one for disaster relief. So as we do those, we will do that.

But we do have quite a bit of contact from taxpayers on base year value transfers or exclusions under, you know, family transfers. Whether that be

from, you know, current law, or under the -- I mean, current law, Prop. 19, or previous law.

So those are key areas. And those -- those also -- those impact, you know, change in ownership as far as that. Change in ownership unless the exclusion applies.

But we do take note of the areas that we get recurring -- recurring concerns about, and then we try to address those.

Thank you for that.

2.6

2.7

MS. COHEN: So is that a yes or a no, Ms. Thompson? That was a lot. Just make it simple for me.

Are there any -- can you hear me? Are there any -- are there any opportunities for education outreach to assist taxpayers?

MS. THOMPSON: Yes. So we --

MS. COHEN: Simple.

MS. THOMPSON: Yes, on our information sheets. And we will do that. Thank you.

MS. COHEN: Okay.

So also noted from the annual report that the San Francisco Assessor's Office conducted a series of taxpayer outreach and education events. These were events, included in 2020, the first welfare exemption workshop to help local nonprofits save on property taxes.

It was actually attended by 130

participants. And the Annual Signature, the Family Wealth Forum, attended virtually by over 250 viewers.

Report shows that over 90 questions from taxpayers were answered by the panel of experts.

2.6

2.7

And so my question for you is whether -- or what are your thoughts on extending these outreach education events to other counties?

I think Phong La might do something very similar in Alameda County, but I can't say with any certainty. I do know San Francisco, because that is my home county.

But I'm wondering if there's a way that we can extend this, either by individual counties, or by the Board of Ed -- Board of Equalization conducting statewide or regional taxpayer outreach education events.

I also want to note that the San Mateo
County Assessor's Office has implemented a DocuSign
solution to make it possible for users to fill out
forms, and to sign and submit online from any device,
making sure it's available 24/7.

And then my final question is whether there are any efforts by the Board of Equalization to work with other county assessors' offices to implement such -- to implement other technology, electronic solutions, to eliminate the need for wet signatures.

MS. THOMPSON: So as to your first question

that these -- that individual county assessor's offices have put on workshops. San Francisco is one of them.

2.6

In our -- in our "Improvement Section" within our Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Annual Report, we asked for input from assessors. And they submit that, and so we highlight them.

But there have been assessors that partner with their Board Members to put on these workshops. And it's definitely a way to get information out to the taxpayers. So -- so that is something, a viable alternative to look at.

As to, you know, efforts to work with assessors on electronically, I can't speak to that. The Property Tax Department would be, you know, more appropriate.

But, yes, I'm aware of, you know, certain efforts that are being made, I mean, electronically. There are changes that are in place in the works now just for tracking the base year value transfers and inner -- you know, intrafamily transfers, because of Prop. 19.

MS. COHEN: Thank you.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Vice Chair Schaefer.

And then I have Ms. Stowers after that.

I think you're muted. Vice Chair, you're muted.

MR. SCHAEFER: Yes, thank you. 1 Ms. Thompson, you had a very impressive list 2 of taxpayers who wanted to offer comments. And you 3 identified them all by name. That means we don't 4 have any anonymous commentators; is that right? 5 MS. THOMPSON: We do not. 6 7 MR. SCHAEFER: Oh, thank you. 8

MS. THOMPSON: As of now, yes.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

Ms. Stowers.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2.6

2.7

28

You're muted. There you go.

MS. STOWERS: Thank you.

Thank you, Ms. Thompson, for your opening remarks. Very detailed. I appreciate it.

I also like that you made it clear that this hearing is also for industry -- individuals who do business with the BOE and the county assessors.

I have a question, and then I wanted to kind of follow up on what Ms. Cohen was saying when she was talking about education, outreach and workshops.

I think I heard you say, yes, updating the fact sheet is definitely on your list. But I -- I would like -- and I don't know what our resources are, but I would like to see if our office, the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate could take the lead on some of these common problems and workshops, develop the workshops -- especially if we're doing it virtually -- develop the workshops, and then go out

to each county to see if they're interested in the workshop.

And partnering together to hold them virtually in their county, or sending out invitations to those people within their county. I think that would be more effective and efficient.

And -- no, go ahead.

2.5

2.6

2.7

MS. THOMPSON: Oh, no. Go ahead. Finish.

MS. STOWERS: And then my other comment or question is just -- I'm just kind of curious.

I know that we have a statutory mandate for Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office, and the annual report that you just went over. Do the assessors have a similar local mandate? Are -- are they just providing advocate services through -- or most providing advocate services through their offices?

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. So, for one, for the TRA office to kind of work with different assessors to try to get workshops, I'm happy to discuss that with our Executive Director and see if that's something that, you know, we're able to do.

Especially now that we're more in a virtual environment to do. So that would, you know, minimize, you know, travel and budgetary constraints.

So we can certainly look on that, and to see if there are -- if there's information that we could develop that could be given by different assessors' offices should they, you know, choose to do that.

And some of the provisions of

Proposition 19, you know, might be a way to do that.

Because that is new, and it is, you know, important

for taxpayers. So if having a standardized, you

know, means to provide that, would be a good idea.

So the -- I can also discuss that or bring that up at the next Assessors' Association Conference to see if they would be supportive -- would be supportive of the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office assisting in that endeavor to train their local taxpayers so that can be done.

So for the second one, as far as the, you know, mandate to have a Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office, that is actually at the state level. It's for different taxing agencies at the state.

But I think assessors, kind of as a matter of practice, their offices, you know, provide customer service. And that's kind of a lot of what it is. And advocate advocacy as well.

So -- but there isn't a mandate that they include one. I am aware that there are counties in the state that either have had kind of a designated or a specific person as their own internal Taxpayers' Rights Advocate, or similar ombudsman or something, so, you know, they've had that.

But that's just up to the discretion of that. And I don't know if that's something that, like, smaller counties would be able to designate.

But as a matter of practice, I think all assessors are very supportive, and their staff. So customer service and providing, you know, the services to them.

MS. STOWERS: Thank you, Ms. Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you.

2.6

2.7

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Those are very good comments.

Ms. Thompson, I just have a couple quick follows-ups.

I know we're going to have -- when you mentioned several of the folks that are going to be speaking to us and will be calling in, I'm going to let them chime in.

But the one -- I guess when we do get our president on board, Mr. Dronenburg, that might be a good question to ask him to see if, in fact, they're willing to partner with us for this.

Now that we can do things via Zoom or virtually, I think it's a little bit easier probably to do them. As opposed, like you mentioned, to have folks traveling up and down the state to do these.

But in your opening remarks you -- you cited, I guess, examples of cases that you're working on, or you've done with some of our taxpayers. And you kind of touched on one that I had a question about.

Because I happened to run across a couple of

because I happened to full def

folks over the weekend at a reception who, you know, due to COVID, now were -- I didn't realize that, you know, as we're hearing about so many people passing away, now they're willing over -- in some cases willing, and some cases they didn't have a will.

2.5

2.6

So, you know, their homes or their assets are now being distributed by their kids, or in some cases their grandchildren.

And a question came up, because this one was actually set up in a trust. And you kind of touched on it. What happens -- I know upon transfer of property, it gets reassessed. But if it's sitting in the trust, does it get reassessed after somebody passes away? Or only does it -- or does it sit there until it actually transfers out of the trust?

MS. THOMPSON: For property in health and trust, the date of change of ownership is what controls. Because that is the person's trust. And so in the case of, like, families where they're inheriting, that's why it's so important.

It's that even though it's held in a trust, that the change in ownership statement be filed timely following the death of that. Really, it's the property owner, because they're the beneficiary of that trust.

And they do need to advise the assessor's office through the change of ownership statement on the change in ownership, it's a death, COS -- I'm

sorry -- 502(d), I believe. And so they do have to file that within that time period.

And the same thing then is, you know, so it's not just, you know, within the date of transfer. So it's important that they keep that in mind. And the reassessment would occur as of that date of death.

So that's the importance of providing information to the assessor's office in order for them to get that parent-child transfer in place as quickly as possible.

But, again, you know, we're looking at Proposition 19 if you have a death that occurs, you know, currently, after February 15th.

So there are still different rules in place depending when the, you know, decedent passed away.

So we have two forms. Two different types of forms now for -- that are prescribed, depending on the date of change in ownership.

MR. VAZQUEZ: So just to be clear, so you're saying if it's in a trust, that, in itself, I mean, with somebody passing, doesn't constitute a transfer of ownership, or it does?

MS. THOMPSON: No, it does.

MR. VAZQUEZ: It does.

MS. THOMPSON: The date of death, yes.

MR. VAZQUEZ: So it does get reassessed at that point?

MS. THOMPSON: Unless an exclusion applies, 1 then, yes. 2 MR. VAZOUEZ: And what would be the 3 exclusion? 4 MS. THOMPSON: Well, like if you have a 5 family -- intra -- you know, family transfer, say, a 6 7 parent-child transfer, or grandparent-grandchild transfer. 8 MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh, if they transfer it to a 9 child or a grandchild. 10 MS. THOMPSON: If that's the case. 11 12 other than that, if it doesn't. So let's say -- let's say that, you know, 13 decedents will or trust, you know, whatever document 14 they have, says that it passes to the nephew, you 15 16 know, there's not an exclusion for that. So it's 17 reassessed. MR. VAZQUEZ: You bring up a good point. 18 19 Because, for example, in this one they 20 happen to have five -- he passed away, and he had 21 five children, right? But he did, in the trust, it was written 22 23 that upon his death, it would be transferred to one 24 of them. So when it's transferred to that one 25 individual, that would also constitute a transfer of 26 2.7 ownership I'm assuming, right? MS. THOMPSON: Well, so -- I mean, I'm not a 28

legal expert. But, yes, it would be transferred.

2.6

But if it's designated, so it's designated in the will, or, you know, in the trust, that one of the five children received that asset, is distributed that house, then, I mean, it depends on the timing of the death.

So let's say if the person died, the father or mother died in 2020, that's going to fall under the old rules.

So, actually, if that house is distributed in the will to one child is designated, they get X property, then they can file the parent-child transfer claim form and get excluded.

Doesn't matter if it's going to be their primary residence, or if it's a rental property.

Because they passed away in 2020 before this Proposition 19 was effective, then that would be eligible for an exclusion, and it wouldn't be subject to reassessment.

It would be a different situation depending on if they died, you know, after the effective date of Proposition 19.

If they died after the date of Proposition 19, then they would not be able to qualify for an exclusion, say, if it's a rental property.

But if it was a principal residence of the parents who died, and the sibling who was designated

to have that home in the, you know, trust or will moved into it and filed for the homeowner exemption within a year, then it's going to be eligible for an exclusion.

2.6

2.7

MR. VAZQUEZ: And let me just add one more wrinkle to this.

What if on the trust it actually specifies that a grandchild is allowed to stay in the home, the principal home of the deceased, for ten years?

MS. THOMPSON: Yeah. I mean, we could -- I would be happy to talk with Legal and try to provide it to you differently.

I mean, I think the scenarios would be different. Because, I mean, it depends, first of all, if the grandchild's parents are deceased themselves. Because otherwise, the grandparent-child transfer doesn't count.

So there's a lot variables. So I think it depends on the case, case-by-case basis, and the specifics of the situation. So I don't want to make a broad statement as to that.

MR. VAZQUEZ: And my last question, because I was actually on a talk show yesterday, and I made a statement. But I kind of qualified it, because I didn't want to put out wrong information. So I told them to listen in today. So hopefully folks might be listening today from that talk show.

And a question came up where -- and I think

we've had this conversation before, but I wanted to make sure I'm giving out the right information.

2.6

So on a transfer now, let's say now this is a living person, right? A person wants to -- who is retired, and decides to sell their home, and wants to either scale down or scale up, you know, move into another area. But doesn't want to -- but wants to transfer the value, the property value, or, I guess, the assessed value they have on their home. I know they're allowed to take it with them, right?

For example, under Prop. 19, before it was a little bit -- it wasn't a guarantee. But now under Prop. 19, let's say somebody lives in San Bernardino, and decides to move into Orange County, in, let's say, a smaller home, but obviously, probably, worth more, can that individual take, you know, whatever taxes he's paying, if he's over 55, from San Bernardino into Orange County?

MS. THOMPSON: So it depends when they -- when one of the events take place.

I'm not certain if Orange County was -- so before Proposition 19, in order to move the factored base year value for a person over 55 to another county, the law required that an ordinance be passed by that County Board of Supervisors where the person is moving to.

So there were only ten -- I believe ten counties in the state that accepted that. And, I'm

sorry, I don't know off the top of my head if Orange County was one of them.

2.6

2.7

Our website actually lists those counties and discusses that under "Frequently Asked Questions" for Proposition 90 and 110, so you can -- or 60, 90 and 110. If you look at that information, that would list those counties.

But currently, with the passage of Proposition 19, that expanded it. So that basically allows a senior to take their factored base year value to -- excuse me -- from one county to any of the 58 counties in the state.

So under the assumption that it's after the effective date of Proposition 19, April 1st, 2021 for the base year value transfers for seniors, that person could transfer their factored base year value of their house from San Bernardino to Orange County. And what would happen is so that factored base year value would transfer.

But if the house, like you said, the house in Orange County is probably a little more expensive than San Bernardino. So if the market value of the Orange County replacement property compared to the original property that was sold in San Bernardino is more, the excess of that market value will be actually added to the factored base year value that is transferred from that San Bernardino home.

So -- so at that -- so basically the

difference is taxed at market value and added to it.

2.6

So that's a benefit really for -- for the California taxpayers. Because before Proposition 19, you couldn't.

So basically if the market value of that replacement house was more than the market value of the original, you lost out. You couldn't actually transfer your factored base year value, because that was one of the restrictions. It had to be -- the replacement had to be equal to or lesser than the market value. So --

MR. VAZQUEZ: So if, for example, if the San Bernardino home is -- they bought it for 300,000, and they buy something for 1.3 in Orange County, 300 would be deducted, but they would be assessed only on the million, not the 1.3; is that it?

MS. THOMPSON: It's -- well, the factored base year value. So it doesn't really matter what -- it's not exactly what they bought it for in San Bernardino, because --

MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh, when it's assessed by the assessor.

MS. THOMPSON: -- they bought it ten years ago. So you have to factor it forward. So you can -- you know, you factor it forward based on the CPI. So the maximum of two percent increase each year. So it's the factored base year that will transfer.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh, I see. 1 MS. THOMPSON: Hopefully that answers your 2 question. 3 MR. VAZQUEZ: So it actually could be a lot 4 higher, right? 5 MS. THOMPSON: Yeah. More than --6 7 MR. VAZQUEZ: At the transfer. MS. THOMPSON: It definitely would be more 8 than 300,000 if -- if they bought it for 300,000, 9 10 say, ten years ago. Because the factored base year value today is going to be higher. 11 12 MR. VAZQUEZ: Gotcha. Okay. I see another -- was that an old hand, or is 13 14 that a new hand? Oh, it's an old hand. 15 16 And I saw Member Cohen -- oh, Vice Chair 17 Schaefer. That is a new hand. 18 MR. SCHAEFER: Yes. Ms. Thompson, I had just a very general 19 20 question. 21 I notice in the annual report that our 22 office generally assists taxpayers who have been 23 unable to resolve a matter through normal channels. 24 Do we enforce that they have actually tried some normal channel before they come to us? Or do 25 they come to us as their first recourse? 2.6 27 MS. THOMPSON: We don't enforce that. It's -- yeah. I mean, if they contact us 28

then we -- then we assist them. So we don't, you 1 know, require that they had reached out, you know, to 2 the assessor's office to try to resolve it ahead of 3 time. 4 MR. SCHAEFER: Yeah. 5 That's good. MS. THOMPSON: Sometimes they do, and, yeah, 6 7 sometimes they don't. But, you know, it just depends on the situation. 8 I'd say oftentimes they, you know, try to, 9 you know, try to reach out to the assessor's 10 office. 11 12 MR. SCHAEFER: Thank you. MS. THOMPSON: Certainly not always. 13 14 happy to help any taxpayer that, you know --MR. SCHAEFER: I appreciate that. Thank 15 16 you. 17 MR. VAZQUEZ: And I think I have a new hand. 18 Is that -- Member Cohen, is that your hand 19 up? 20 Member Cohen. 21 Is she -- that might be an old hand then. Okay. With that -- oh, Ms. Stowers has a --22 23 that's a new hand, right, Ms. Stowers? 24 Go ahead. MS. STOWERS: I am a new hand. And I would 25 like to ask a question. But I am sensitive to if we 26 2.7 have the people on our public lines waiting to speak. 28

MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes. We can continue the 1 conversation after the public speaks if --2 MS. STOWERS: 3 Okav. MR. VAZQUEZ: Why don't we do that. Because 4 I know there's several people waiting. 5 Ms. Taylor, if you can locate -- I guess, do 6 7 we -- we have written comments. Do you want to start with those first, or are those people on the line, 8 Ms. Taylor? 9 MS. TAYLOR: I believe the plan was to start 10 with our speakers. So I can call and see. 11 12 MR. VAZOUEZ: Yes. MS. TAYLOR: Is the Honorable Ernest 13 Dronenburg on the line? 14 All right. 15 AT&T operator, could you please let us know 16 17 if Mr. Dronenburg is on the line? 18 AT&T MODERATOR: I am not seeing him on. 19 If he's on, but did not dial in as a 20 speaker, he can press star, zero for an operator. 21 Star, zero if you're on the main line. Okay. And it looks like he may be on the 22 main line. One moment. 23 24 And they're just gathering his line. One 25 moment. Okay. And, Ernest, your line is open. 26 One moment. They're still with him. One 27 moment. 28

Sir, your line is open. Are you able to 1 hear us? 2 MR. DRONENBURG: Yes. 3 AT&T MODERATOR: Okay. Your line is open. 4 You're able to speak. 5 6 MR. DRONENBURG: Good morning, Board 7 Members. Can you hear me? MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes, I can hear you. Go 8 ahead. Welcome. 9 MR. DRONENBURG: All right. Well, again, a 10 pleasure for me to join you today. 11 12 This -- the topic of the Taxpayers' Bill of Rights is near and dear to me since I was the 13 14 proponent of this when it very first started. we -- the Board was real supportive of it. 15 16 The Harris-Katz Bill was actually written by 17 my office. And then when we wanted to complete it, 18 we, you know, it was sales tax, and then income tax, and then finally we got Senator Morgan to do the 19 20 property tax piece. 21 But -- so way back then it was a part of my 22 program. And I'm glad that it's still functioning. 23 And I wanted to compliment Ms. Thompson. It 24 is working well, as the assessors have all mentioned 25 to me they are very happy with the support that the Board is giving them with the Taxpayers' Bill of 2.6 2.7 Rights Hearings, as well as with the office during

the year.

28

I -- I noted that there were several questions. And I don't want to take all of the time. But there are several questions that you asked that I might be able to answer.

2.7

I have a taxpayers' advocate position in my office. And I know that Orange County has a taxpayers' advocate in their office.

I don't know of any others. Sort of like I can neither confirm or deny that others have them.

But I haven't heard of any others.

Jeff in LA might have one. But I haven't heard of any others other than San Diego and Orange County.

The mention of electronic signatures in 1993, we became the first office in San Diego to do an electronic signatures for a form. And that was with a "Change in Address" form.

And today we have ten other forms that are -- and some of them requiring two signatures even -- done electronically.

So this is something that I've been a champion of in trying to push other assessors to do.

It is costly at first, but the end -- end saves the office money. Because it costs quite a bit to program a form electronically.

But once you've got it in place, then it pays -- it pays back quickly. And I think it is a good idea.

Prop. 19 -- all the hearings that were going on, I think Board Member Cohen was talking about that. We had over 20 hearings in my office. This was a real information-soaking-up kind of program. Everybody wanted to know about it. So we just had to advertise that we're going to do it.

2.6

2.7

And then I think, one, we had over 500 names -- people on the line. I know San Francisco had a huge one when they very first started.

I know Board Member Cohen's office was a real part of that. And a former assessor from San Francisco was a part of it.

But as you know right now we're doing electronic classes. So electronics is a keyword as to how we can use it in greater and greater extent, will only pay dividends for us in our limited resource situations.

The question about change in ownership that Tony -- Chairman Vazquez asked, I think was adequately answered by Ms. Thompson. But I'm sure the best resource for some technical pieces of -- which are still not ironed out, because the legislation still hasn't passed for Prop. 19. But we're doing the best.

And I'd say your office is doing very, very well with the unsecured language. We just have to guess what the outcome will be. But hopefully by the end of the session, the bill will pass, and we can

give complete, with faith, the guidance for somebody 1 who wants to do change in ownership -- I mean, with 2 transfer of base or -- or intergeneration transfer. 3 Both of those situations will be finished 4 when -- when the session ends, hopefully. 5 Other than that, again, compliments to the 6 7 staff and their program. I think it's very well being used. And it's -- they're doing a good job at 8 trying to get out and get information to people now. 9 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 10 MR. DRONENBURG: That concludes my --11 12 MR. VAZQUEZ: Just -- just a quick comment. You know, it was brought up. I don't know 13 if you were listening in on the part where there was 14 a possible request that we might want to look at 15 involving the assessors in different counties 16 17 throughout the state in doing -- now that we can do 18 these things virtually, working with our staff to try 19 to get out the word, or have these hearings in 20 respective counties. 21 And I think it would be pretty effective if 22 we did a partnership with many of the big assessors 23 throughout the state of California. 24 I don't know if there's an interest in that. 25 MR. DRONENBURG: Yes, I did hear that. I did hear that, Tony. And I think it's a good idea. 2.6 MR. VAZQUEZ: Okay. Thank you. 27

With that, Ms. Taylor, if you -- do we have

28

the next -- oh, wait. 1 Ms. Thompson, did you have some comments? 2 MS. THOMPSON: I do, thank you. 3 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes, go ahead. 4 MS. THOMPSON: We appreciate 5 Mr. Dronenburg's comments. 6 7 As part of assisting taxpayers, our office works closely with management and staff in the 8 58 county assessor offices to obtain information on 9 taxpayers' properties, to coordinate with them to 10 resolve taxpayer problems or issues. So we 11 12 appreciate their continued cooperation. Our office is also pleased to assist 13 assessors in their efforts to educate taxpayers 14 through the issuance of information sheets that 15 provide topics, information on exclusion exemption 16 17 topics that provide simple, easy-to-understand 18 information that may result in property tax savings 19 to them. 20 And we are happy to explore providing 21 information and education electronically with assessors and partnership. And we'll discuss that 22 23 further later. 24 That concludes my remarks. 25 Thank you. MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 2.6 I see a hand from Member Cohen. 27 MS. COHEN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. 28

So what I'd like to suggest is that we identify the top five issues, and develop taxpayer training/presentation modules that we may roll out virtually across the entire state.

And, again, this is in partnership with our local assessors and our -- our offices to help address, facilitate this ongoing conversation. And all in all, be proactive in our outreach and education for -- on behalf of taxpayers.

So I'd like to recommend that we identify the top five issues and develop taxpayer training and/or modules in a presentation.

That's it.

2.7

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

So we're thinking of also working with the assessors. Do we want to hold until maybe after we hear from all the public to see which might be the -- I guess what would surface as the top five?

MS. COHEN: You know, I'm -- I'm fine with doing that. It's a process thing.

I just wanted to just go on the record, based on what I'm hearing from the presentation, based on my own personal experience, I thought that it would be just a good -- a good suggestion.

We can always have the Executive Director weigh in and hear her -- her thoughts as well.

So I'll leave it to you in terms of process.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 1 Seeing no other hands or comments, 2 Ms. Taylor, who else do we have on the line? 3 MR. DRONENBURG: Mr. Chairman. 4 Mr. Chairman. 5 MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh. Yes, Mr. Dronenburg. 6 7 I can't see you on the screen there. ahead. MR. DRONENBURG: Yeah. I think that's an 8 excellent idea. We have our annual meeting coming up 9 10 in just a month and a half. Maybe we can survey the assessors and report back at that meeting what our 11 12 top five -- I could get our secretary to campus all the assessors and get their picks of the top five. 13 14 And then provide that to you at the annual meeting. And then you can combine that with what your 15 16 top five is, and maybe we'll have some consensus. I 17 think that's a real good idea to start with. 18 MR. VAZQUEZ: That works with me. 19 All right. Why don't we just hold that, and 20 then let's see if -- who else we have on the line, 21 Ms. Taylor. 22 MS. TAYLOR: Thank you. 23 AT&T moderator, could you please see if 24 Mr. David Kline is available to speak on behalf of 2.5 the California Taxpayers' Association. AT&T MODERATOR: Thank you. 2.6 His line is open. 27 MR. KLINE: Good morning, Chairman Vazquez 28

and Honorable Board Members.

2.5

2.6

2.7

Thank you for providing this opportunity to testify. And thank you for our prior speaker being instrumental in the legislation that created the Taxpayers' Bill of Rights Hearing.

I am David Kline, Vice President of
Communications and Research for the California
Taxpayers' Association. We are also known as CalTax,
the state's largest and oldest association
representing taxpayers.

Sometimes we appear at these hearings to voice concerns, you know, airing of grievances and such. But today we actually just want to praise the Board Members and the staff for ensuring that, despite the problems caused by the pandemic, the Board has really continued to provide the guidance and statistical updates, and assessment practice surveys, and other vital services that are so important to California.

CalTax and other groups use the BOE reports and statistics in a variety of ways to keep our members and the public informed. And so we appreciate the staff's hard work to keep the information flowing during a very, very challenging time for all of us.

And we also would like to reiterate our thanks to the Board for taking the lead on the issue of providing the option for Assessment Appeals Boards

to conduct their hearings remotely.

2.5

2.6

2.7

I know this issue is on your agenda for tomorrow's meeting and will be discussed in detail then. So I won't really go into a lot now. But we do look forward to that discussion, and getting the perspective from the assessors, from the Assessment Appeals Board members, other taxpayers' advocates of BOE, BOE staff, and property owners, and just everyone involved in the system.

CalTax continues to believe that this is a situation in which the pandemic has given us lemons, but we can really turn them into lemonade by using the remote AAB hearings, not just as a short-term solution during the pandemic, but as long-term options to give taxpayers more convenience, and to help Assessment Appeals Boards avoid some of the backlog they've experienced with the in-person hearings.

Obviously, the due process rights of taxpayers must be protected, and remote hearings should be an option for taxpayers, not a mandate.

Since some taxpayers require in-person hearings, whether it's because of technological challenges, or because they just need to be in person to effectively present their case.

We did see the January 13th Letter To

Assessors from the BOE that described the right of
taxpayers to have in-person hearings or remote

1 hearings.

2.6

So we don't anticipate that this will be a point of contention. But we just wanted to raise the issue, since it is so important to taxpayers.

So we appreciate the BOE's continuing work on this issue. We appreciate the engagement of taxpayers and their advocates, making sure their rights are protected. And we really do appreciate this opportunity to testify.

And thank you again for all the hard work in the pandemic year and going forward.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Thank you for your comments.

Ms. Taylor, do we have anybody else on the line?

MS. THOMPSON: Could -- do you mind if I provide a little bit --

MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh. I'm sorry, Ms. Thompson. I keep forgetting. Go ahead.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS.}}$  THOMPSON: So we appreciate Mr. Kline's comments.

The California Taxpayers' Association is a respected voice for taxpayers. And they have a large membership, including tax professionals working at a large range of businesses in California.

We thank them for their input, and for joining us today. And look forward to working with them in the future with any issues that they may

have. 1 Thank you. 2 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 3 Ms. Taylor, if we can go on to our next 4 5 speaker. MS. TAYLOR: Certainly. 6 AT&T operator, is Mr. Bart Norman available? 7 AT&T MODERATOR: Thank you. His line is 8 open. 9 MR. NORMAN: Hello. Can you hear me, or --10 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes, we can hear you. Go 11 12 ahead. MR. NORMAN: Hello? 13 14 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes. MR. NORMAN: Okay. I'll make this as quick 15 16 as possible. 17 I had an issue with a parent-to-child 18 transfer at our local county assessor's office. We did a -- we had a trust that property was held in. 19 20 Our local county assessor -- we -- we messed 21 up. The attorney that we hired did transfer the property to me and my brother right out of my dad's 22 23 trust. 24 From there, it was reassessed at a 25 50 percent, because it went to me and my brother, instead of just me directly. 2.6 We did do rescission deeds. And the local 27 assessor would not accept the rescission deeds. This 28

was maybe in 2018, before Prop. 19 was in effect. So Prop. 13 was in effect at the time, where a parent-to-child transfer is exempt.

2.6

2.7

Our local assessor's office gave no guidance. Didn't ask. They just said they would not accept the paperwork at all.

We asked why wouldn't the rescission deeds be accepted. They said they're going to accept them the way they're originally presented. We were not going to accept the rescission deeds.

And everything that I ever read from the Board of Equalization on the website said that county assessors should accept rescission deeds.

Well, every time you would talk to them, they would actually say that we are not -- we cannot give legal advice.

So they said that we needed a court order in order for them to -- the rescission deeds to be accepted.

So three years later, we're still fighting this out. We filed an appeal, hired an attorney to draw up the paperwork for the appeal, which cost \$2,500.

During the meantime, I actually contacted, I want to say, Ted Gaines' office. And he referred me to the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office, where I was in contact with Lisa Thompson.

And once the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate

Office got involved, this was resolved in three weeks.

2.6

2.7

There were certain things that they wanted,
I guess our assessors wanted from us. That the trust
was not closed, a few other things that we've
presented. Gave them to Lisa Thompson, and she sent
them over.

And once she was involved, this issue was resolved within three weeks. And it took me three years and countless, countless amounts of hours to get them to accept the rescission deeds.

Everyone makes mistakes. And I can't imagine living in a world where you can't fix those mistakes. And we made a mistake. We accepted it. It should have been accepted by our assessor's office, and it wasn't.

And I don't know if every assessor's office is like this. And apparently San Diego and Orange County, they have an advocate there. If we had one here in San Joaquin County, maybe this issue would have been resolved a lot quicker.

But they're not giving guidance at the county. They're not telling you anything. They're just saying, "We are not accepting your paperwork."

And thank God that I was in touch with Lisa Thompson. This was a nightmare. When she was involved, it went as smooth as anything I've ever seen go.

And I just wanted to thank her, and thank the Board, and thank whoever set this program up, that this issue was resolved.

I don't know how many people would have went through this process and given up. This took over three years. When she was involved, it took three weeks.

So thank you, Lisa.

Thank you, Board.

2.6

Thank you everyone who has anything to do with setting something like this up for the normal person that doesn't have to hire attorneys to do everything. And even if you do, sometimes they do it wrong. And I want to thank Lisa and the Board for having this program there for people.

The problem is no one knows about it. Took me three years to find out. And I'm so upset that we had to call everyone we could at that point to find out about the program.

So I could answer any questions if you had any. But we're in San Joaquin County. And pretty much what was presented to us was, "We are not attorneys. We cannot give legal advice." That's -- "We will not accept your rescission deeds." When everything I read said that they should have accepted them.

So that's my experience with my assessor's office, and my experience with the advocate,

Lisa Thompson. 1 And thank you again, Lisa. 2 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 3 And kudos to Ms. Thompson. 4 I see a hand for Member Gaines. 5 MR. NORMAN: A lifesaver. A lifesaver. 6 7 Thank you so much. And thank you, Member Gaines, for referring 8 It was a lady in your office. And thank you so 9 much. It wasn't until I called your office and was 10 set up with the advocate that we got this issue 11 12 resolved, and it was resolved very quick. actually shocked. 13 14 MR. GAINES: Wonderful. MR. VAZQUEZ: That's great to hear good 15 16 news. Usually we hear all the complaints. 17 But go ahead, Member Gaines. 18 MR. GAINES: Yeah. Yeah. 19 Thank you so much for this -- relating that 20 to the Board and publicly. Really appreciate that. 21 And, you know, we have cases that come 22 before us, and sometimes they're in favor of the 23 taxpayer. I think we would hope that they all were. 24 But there's not always justification. 25 And so I want to thank Lisa for going through the process and realizing that there was 2.6 2.7 corrective action that could be taken to resolve your

28

issue.

And I think you highlighted some of the points that we, as Board Members, have been trying to make, too, and that is how do we get the word out so that our constituents are aware of the fact that we do have a Taxpayers' Rights Advocate that can help them in cases?

2.6

2.7

So I know that we bolstered our outreach.

And we've got opportunities to -- I hope to get the word out in a bigger way so that our constituents are aware that they have these opportunities to have someone take a second look.

And sometimes, you know, they were done in the right fashion. And -- but it's nice to just have that second opinion. Because when they're not done in the right fashion, we want to make sure that people are dealt with in a fair way.

So thank you so much.

MR. NORMAN: Yeah. Thank you. It sounds like actually San Diego County and Orange County has an advocate in their office.

Now, I don't know the expense of that. And I'm sure it would be quite expensive. However, if the assessor's office has an issue like this, they should simply give the number. If they can't help someone, they should give them your number.

I literally had to find this out myself after years of just reading everything about it.

And actually calling and complaining to your

office, Mr. Gaines.

I mean, it's just so frustrating. And when you guys got involved, it was resolved so quick. It was like, "Wow. This could have been resolved years ago." But if -- I know if I was an assessor, I would probably want as much money from everyone, as much as I could.

But they should simply give -- if they can't help, and think that this -- if they're not going to give legal advice or ask people -- or tell people what paperwork is needed, they should simply give the advocate's number out. And that way they could call and have a second opinion and go from there. But they're not doing that at all.

If I were an assessor, I probably wouldn't either. But that's probably the right thing to do is get that number out if they possibly could.

MR. GAINES: Sure. That's nice to see it -MR. NORMAN: That's --

MR. GAINES: -- work right, like Chair

Vazquez was saying. That there is this -- this -- I

mean, that's why we exist. That's why the Board of

Equalization exists is we want to make sure that

people from county to county are treated in the same

fashion.

MR. NORMAN: Well, we're not. So if they have an advocate in San Diego County, Orange County, and they're having the tremendous service by having

that advocate, the rest of the state doesn't, I don't 1 believe that's fair. But that's just my opinion, I 2 3 quess. MR. GAINES: Well, we'll have to take a 4 deeper look at that. 5 6 I think that Member Cohen has some ideas on 7 how we can expand that, and would like to -- the Board would like to work on that. So --8 MR. NORMAN: Well, I just wanted to thank 9 you guys for even setting up this program. 10 And thank you, Mr. Gaines, for getting me in 11 12 contact with Lisa. And thank you, Lisa. This has been a great 13 14 experience with you guys. Absolutely great. With the assessor, it was the worst 15 16 experience of my life. I hope no one ever has to go 17 through that again. 18 So thank you again. And if that's it, I would like to -- been quite a while on the phone. 19 20 MR. GAINES: Yeah. Thank you very much. 21 appreciate it. 22 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 23 I see a hand up from Ms. Thompson. 24 MR. NORMAN: Does anyone else have questions 25 or -- sure. MR. VAZQUEZ: You're muted, though. 26 Ms. Thompson, you're muted. 27 MS. THOMPSON: Sorry. Thank you. 28

Thank you for sharing those thoughts with us, Mr. Norman, and for your kind words. We really appreciate it.

2.5

2.6

2.7

So we -- we were able to work with Mr. Norman and the assessor's office on providing information that was needed in order to reverse the reassessment, as of the recording of that rescission deed, and to restore the factored base year value.

This was a complicated case. It was not straightforward. There was a lot of research involved with the trust situation and rescission deeds.

So, fortunately, our office was able to take advantage of resources that our agency publishes in these areas, and, you know, conduct the necessary research to explain to the, you know, the county assessor's office, you know, how -- kind of how -- how it shouldn't be -- it shouldn't be reassessed.

And then also to talk with the taxpayer about information that he or his attorney could provide on the trust, to have indicated it was not -- had not been dissolved at the point of the rescission deeds being recorded.

So recently we confirmed with the assessor's office that the 2021 lien date assessment reflects that reduced factored base year value to before the property was reassessed, in part, for the transfers amongst the siblings.

And we also confirmed with Mr. Norman that he received a refund of taxes paid. So that ended well for him.

2.6

And hopefully, you know, there's other taxpayers that are aware of our services will certainly just mention that availability.

And talk with Mr. Dronenburg maybe at the next assessors' conference. He can, you know, let their association and all of the assessors, you know, know that they're welcome to provide our phone number or website to their constituents if they have problems. And maybe disseminate that out to their staff.

So we know that the assessors are aware of them. But, you know, maybe they just need to remind some of their staff, newly-hired staff that we are available.

So thank you so much.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

With that, Ms. Taylor, who else do we have on the line?

MS. TAYLOR: All right.

Next, we're going to read a series of written comments. Myself and Ms. Renati will take turns.

Our first comment is from Mr. Dil Kazzaz.

The Chief Counsel of the BOE, in his memorandum of January 8th, 2021 to the Board,

analyzed and legally reasoned the meaning of the Proposition 19, including, more importantly, the time factor of applicability.

He said in the forefront of his analysis that neither the sale or purchase of a replacement residence need be after April 1, 2021.

Now, today, you are adopting a form of that proposition that is contrary to your Chief Counsel.

Why? How can you ignore the contribution of your Chief Counsel? Are you aware that your actions will deprive many of the benefit of what we passed Proposition 19 for? Is it filling the coffers? Or votes don't matter and laws don't either?

Someday your votes will be ignored like mine are today. I hope you will not disappoint us.

Ms. Renati.

2.6

Lisa, are you going to comment?

MS. THOMPSON: Yes, I am. Thank you.

So we appreciate Mr. Kazzad's comments. He expresses concerns about information that was disseminated about Proposition 19.

We are happy to reach out to him to provide him with information to help him understand what was approved by the voters by Proposition 19 on November of 2020, as well as how the property tax rule fits within Proposition 19, and the form developed by our Board, as well as how the Proposition 19 effective dates work.

That concludes my remarks. 1 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 2 Who is next, Ms. Taylor?. 3 MS. RENATI: The next comment is from 4 Jaimie Korody. 5 She states, I represent Tongva Land 6 7 Preservation Corporation, a California 501(c)(3) in Santa Monica. 8 Over the past two years we have been working 9 on receiving a Welfare Exemption Certificate. 10 process from the perspective of an average taxpayer 11 12 is quite cumbersome. Fortunately, we have been guided by the BOE Taxpayers' Rights Advocate, 13 14 Lisa Thompson. Ms. Thompson has been instrumental in 15 16 helping us navigate an often confusing set of steps. 17 Thanks to Ms. Thompson, we are readying the final 18 stage of receiving a welfare exemption from the 19 Los Angeles County assessors. 20 The critical role of the BOE Taxpayers' 21 Rights Advocate, in good, efficient government, and Ms. Thompson in particular cannot be overstated. 22 23 That concludes the comment from Ms. Korody. 24 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 25 Ms. Thompson, did you -- I see your hand up. MS. THOMPSON: Yes, I do. Thank you. 2.6 So we appreciate Ms. Korody's comments and 27 her kinds words. 28

Earlier this year we assisted her in her organization's obtaining an organizational clearance certificate from our agency, and then working with the county assessor's office for them to expedite the processing of their -- processing of their welfare exemption claim that was filed.

So we're currently working with them to do that, to grant exemption from prior years in order for the auditor's office to refund the taxes to calculate the refund with the tax collector refunding. So we're hoping that that's done soon.

Their property actually was purchased out of tax sale from the tax collector's office, and dedicating it to property under a natural state, qualifying under the welfare exemption under the provisions of Revenue and Taxation Code Section 214.02.

So we were happy to help her navigate the process of the administration of the welfare exemption, and coordinate with different agencies.

We look forward to continuing our conversation and communication with the assessor's office in order to get this nonprofit organization granted the exemption.

That concludes my comments.

Thank you.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

Ms. Taylor, do we have anybody else on -- or

2.5

2.6

we have --

2.5

2.6

2.7

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, we have another written comment.

This comment is from T.R. Jahns.

Hello. I heard most of an interview on KVCR with Chairman Antonio Vazquez regarding issues to be discussed in the Board sessions this week, and seeking input from the public.

I want to pass along the following comments, and a suggestion for the Board of Equalization to consider.

I'd appreciate having this brought up during your session on Tuesday or Wednesday. And I'd welcome any response from Mr. Vazquez or others regarding what I'm presenting here.

I realize that the Board of Equalization is not a legislative body. But I understand that the Board could raise the issue of importance, and encourage the governor and the Legislature to create legislation to address a real need of property owners.

I believe county tax collectors are given some statewide rules or guidelines regarding how they handle annual property tax increases in the counties. I suggest that those rules be expanded to include additional factors beyond current assessed property values when setting or annually increasing property tax on individual properties within their

jurisdiction.

2.5

2.6

2.7

In particular, I think that a property owner's annual income should be considered along with issues like age range, and other unique factors, that may affect a property owner's ability to pay for property tax.

The goal would be to reduce the tax burden on those who are retired, on fixed income, or have low income while trying to hold onto their homes.

This can be restricted to those with a single home or property, and one in which they reside, and can allow for the county to do a reassessment of the property tax, should that person receiving a special allowance sell the property.

Having tax increases only consider current assessed property value is unfair. It fails to take into account other factors that involve ability to pay due to restricted income or assets.

That's why I believe that there should be options for property owners to seek some relief in the form of discounted tax assessment or similar compensation.

This special allowance would be calculated using certain strict guidelines regarding property owner's annual income, age, and other factors that might create a burden on the ability to sustain annual property tax increases.

I recommend a formula or method of

6 3

calculation be created to give homeowner's a chance to seek special allowance to keep property taxes affordable.

2.6

2.7

I realize the main objection of such an allowance would be fear of revenue loss, which would then impact the ability of counties to fund essential services, including schools.

However, I think the guidelines for qualification for such an allowance would be sufficiently strict to limit the number of property owners that could qualify.

Guidelines could include annual income limits, years of ownership, property values in the area of residence, percentage increase in property values from the previous year, and the indebtedness of a homeowner in the form of existing loans.

In any case, if property taxes are sufficiently burdensome that they impact the home owner's wellbeing or ability to even stay in the home, some form of tax relief is the right thing to do.

I urge you to raise this issue, and suggest that the Legislature or governor take up this need with appropriate legislation.

I will be passing along my ideas to the state legislators as well.

Thank you for considering my input. Regards.

That concludes that comment.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

2.5

2.6

2.7

Ms. Thompson, I see your hand up.

MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

So we appreciate T.R. Jahns submitting comments in response to yesterday's interview with Chairman Vazquez concerning the Taxpayers' Bill of Rights in our agency.

The commenter suggests that other factors be considered when handling property tax increases, such as their property owner's income. And we're happy to reach out to him to provide information on, you know, the current property tax system, and the limitations of Prop. 13 as to increases in property assessed values for the two percent in the factored base year value each year, and also the one percent general property tax.

There is some current law regarding exemptions that are available based on income. And those are the disabled veteran's exemptions. So those are certainly considered.

Changes to -- to existing California Property Tax Law would require changes to the California Constitution to a voter-approved proposition.

So we would be happy to provide some information to him about Proposition 13, which was approved by the voters in 1978.

So I think that concludes my remarks as well.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

2.6

2.7

I see a hand from Ms. Stowers, and then one from Member Gaines.

Ms. Stowers, go ahead.

MS. STOWERS: Thank you, Chairman Vazquez.

Thank you, Ms. Thompson.

And to the constituents and your concerns.

Although not directly related, I wanted to bring up the Property Tax Postponement Program that allows homeowners who are seniors, disabled or blind, to defer their current year property tax on their principal residence.

There is certain criteria, and one being that you must have at least 40 percent equity in your home, and your household income must be at a certain threshold.

This might provide some relief. And I recommend that you go to the State Controller's page, keyword search "property tax postponement," and you can find additional information.

We will be accepting the application for those postponements starting September 1st.

And, Ms. Thompson, when you reach out, I would appreciate it if you can follow your regular protocol and provide information on the property tax postponement, or at least a website link.

Thank you. 1 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 2 Member Gaines. 3 MR. GAINES: Yeah. Thank you, Chair 4 Vazquez. 5 6 I just wanted to kind of emphasize the comments that have been made. 7 Because the purpose of Prop. 13 was to 8 protect property owners. And, in particular, we're 9 talking about a homeowner in this case. 10 And we've got to figure out how to fix 11 12 Prop. 19. And that wasn't an issue. It passed by the people. But I know that there's been an effort 13 14 by Assemblyman Kiley with ACA 9. Or maybe it's an initiative that just goes to the people to correct 15 this -- this aspect between children and 16 17 grandchildren. 18 Because I'm just looking at another example 19 This is an e-mail from Tricia Gonzalez. And 20 she -- she's kind of laying out the same issue that 21 can't afford these tax increases. And she talks about -- she says, "I'm from a 22 23 working-class family that's been devastated by 24 Prop. 19. 25 Prop. 19 doesn't consider families with multiple children. 2.6

Prop. 19 doesn't consider families with

modest homes and working-class neighborhoods that are

27

28

6 7

no longer affordable due to the pandemic causing high rise in real estate in the last year.

2.6

Due to Prop. 19 changes, families are forced to choose which child receives the Prop. 13 benefit, and which ones do not.

We are not landlords. We plan on staying in these homes.

My husband's parents bought the second home that we have rented for 20 years with the plan that we can take over the home.

The home still has a mortgage with reassessment. We can no longer afford to live in the home.

Additionally, Prop. 19 was implemented on February 16th of 2021, three months to make family decisions, when we could not meet due to the pandemic.

We ask that you adjust Prop. 19, or families like ours will be forced to move out of the state."

And that's what -- that's where it really hits the nail on the head in my view. Where you've got -- you've got folks where the reassessment will make the difference as to whether they can maintain that house or not. And maybe a bigger decision as to whether they can continue to live in the state.

And it just -- I think we ought to continue to figure out ways to fix it.

And many of you have talked about this, too,

as Members of the Board of Equalization. But it just reiterates, again, that I think there's going to continue to be pain.

Because from what I've read, it's like 40-to-60,000 families are impacted by this every year as family members pass away. So I just want to throw that out again.

And it would be nice if we can figure out -maybe we would be able to sponsor something as
Members of the Board, if we could get an agreement on
what the fix should be for Prop. 19.

Obviously, the first element of Prop. 19 is good, because you have that ability to take base year value and transfer it to any county in the state.

But this -- this other side that takes away the ability to pass that property on to a child or grandchild, I think is hurting a lot more people than we realize.

Thank you.

2.6

MR. VAZQUEZ: No, I echo those comments. You're right on point.

And I'm constantly getting -- I'm hearing that as I go in more -- especially as I participate in other meetings and receptions. That's the one thing that comes up when they find out I'm from the BOE, they say, "How do we change Prop. 19?"

And that's going to be the challenge.

We've got -- seeing no other hands,

Ms. Taylor, who do we have on the line? Or who is the next written comment?

MS. RENATI: Our next written comment is from Bea Stotzer.

And Ms. Stotzer states:

Thank you for allowing me to provide a public comment regarding Taxpayers' Advocate Office, and in particular the exemplary and professional assistance of Lisa Thompson, Chief of Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office, and the Chairman's staff.

 $\label{eq:serve} \mbox{I serve as a board member of the NEW} \\ \mbox{Economics for Women.}$ 

NEW is a Latino nonprofit economic development organization that provides essential services such as housing, financial support, and economic development opportunities for low-income women and their families.

I was asked to resolve a very difficult tax lien issue that the organization had been trying to address for several years for one of its properties, the community center in San Fernando Valley of Los Angeles.

The organization did not have the means to afford an attorney to appeal the BOE's determination.

The property in question had received charitable exemption for several years. NEW was denied the tax exemption for incomplete application.

Staff tried to resolve, but with no

7 0

2.6

2.7

resolution in sight. Which resulted in a huge tax penalty and liability.

2.6

2.7

I initially approached our representative Chairman Anthony Vazquez in 2018, whose patience and counsel I will be eternally grateful. He explained the options and asked the staff to assist me.

Kristine Cazadd, in particular, spent an enormous amount of time identifying if we indeed could appeal the incomplete application, and thus the denial for tax exemption for the years in question.

She eventually connected me to Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Thompson was extremely detailed in her research,

and provided documentation so I could better

understand what had happened, and why we did not

qualify for the exemption for the years in question.

She was so responsive and enormously helpful, as I had a difficult duty to inform the board of BOE's processes and our options.

Then the pandemic hit in the middle of seeking resolution with our tax collector.

Everything seemed to stop during COVID.

Despite the setback, both the Chairman staff and Ms. Thompson continued to be responsive and worked with the tax collector to provide the documentation necessary that explained the complexity of why the late payment penalties should be cancelled.

I am happy to report that in June 2021 the

tax collector agreed to cancel penalties, with payment due by the end of July.

2.6

That payment was made, and so pleased to inform this Board that the tax collector's office confirmed that they processed proper tax payment to satisfy the defaulted taxes, and that a certificate of redemption was issued.

This positive outcome with late payment penalties being cancelled could not have happened without the help of Lisa Thompson.

In addition, her office was invaluable. And we now know they will continue to assist nonprofits such as ours, who do not have the means to get legal counsel to obtain our organizational clearance certificate, expediting the welfare exemption claims processing with our county tax assessor.

If I can be of any assistance in helping others better understand the invaluable services BOE and the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate's Office provides, I am at your services.

Respectfully, Bea Stotzer, Board Member, NEW Economics for Women.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

Yeah. Actually, I was -- I actually got involved with that issue right at the beginning. And I passed it over to Ms. Thompson.

And actually give kudos also to my legal folks, Kris did a great job with this and prepping it

and passing it on to Ms. Thompson.

2.6

2.7

And I wanted to also personally acknowledge and thank Ms. Thompson for all your work on this.

Because it's a great little nonprofit, and I was afraid they were going to go under with the taxes that they owed.

Ms. Thompson, I see your hand up.

MS. THOMPSON: Yes. Thank you.

I just want to tell Ms. Stotzer that we appreciate her comments, and for her kind words.

We had assisted her organization, as she indicated earlier, with the welfare exemption, and cancellation of penalties for late payment of property taxes.

We were able to communicate among the various government agencies involved for her to submit the appropriate information to receive the welfare exemption. And then also to support cancellation of penalties from the tax collector's office.

So I think that is a positive outcome. We truly value the work of nonprofit organizations, because they provide vital services to Californians here.

So if there are any other nonprofit organizations that are having problems with any issues they may have with the assessment or collection of property taxes, we would be happy to

assist them if they reach out to our office. 1 Thank you. 2 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you again. 3 With that, Ms. Taylor, do we -- who is the 4 next written comment or speaker? 5 MS. TAYLOR: Yes. Our final written comment 6 is from Corinne Muelrath. 7 Hello. I'm opposed to many aspects of 8 Prop. 19. This bill will significantly harm 9 families. 10 This bill did not take into consideration 11 12 the many types of living arrangements in California. This bill is harming my family. 13 Admittedly, I am not completely up to speed 14 regarding the latest work being done to repair the 15 16 damage that has been done by Prop. 19. But I would 17 like my story to be included as part of the 18 discussion. 19 Family farms often consist of multiple 20 family residences, as does ours. We all live on the 21 property. However, due to no fault of our own, 22 23 property values have skyrocketed in Sonoma County. 24 When our property was passed to us by our mother, we 25 met all the rules of Prop. 19, because we live on the farm. 2.6 But due to high property values, the new 27 property tax valuation is far over the one million 28

cap plus assessed value. The new property taxes are so high that we will no longer be able to afford to live on our own property.

The property that was passed down from my grandfather will now have to be sold to some rich guy who could care less about our farm, or our children, or our children's children.

All who also live with us on the farm, because no one can afford to buy anything in Sonoma County, or in California.

Unfortunately, this will probably mean most of us will need to move out of state.

What can be done?

2.5

2.6

2.7

Remove the one million cap. That is a completely random number, and does not represent the value of farmland homes in all California counties.

This is an urgent matter for families in our county and across California. It has been my experience that the information regarding Proposition 19 was not widely distributed, and people voted on it without having a deep understanding as to the impact to families and farms.

I believe if the average person understood how harmful this proposition was to families and farmers, they would have never voted on it.

I believe we will see a follow-up bill that will change the negative effects of Proposition 19.

If we don't, we will see many families moving out of

1 | California, and many farms closing up shop.

2.7

Do you have any data regarding the number of attendees?

I'd also like to compliment Ms. Cohen, and look forward to working with her on our tax issues in the future.

And that concludes her comments.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Thank you for your comment.

Ms. Thompson, I see your hand up go ahead.

MS. THOMPSON: Yes. We appreciate Corinne's comments.

And she's expressed concern about the provisions of Proposition 19 that was approved by the voters in November of 2020.

That voter-approved initiative constitutional amendment did include provisions for the \$1 million cap as to the maximum factored base year value that could be transferred.

In order to change that or remove that cap, another constitutional amendment would need to be -- would be required, essentially, and passed by the voters.

Thank you. We appreciate the comments.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Ms. Thompson, along these lines, I'm just, you know, we're constantly hearing this one. Once again, kind of reiterates the issue of these folks, whether it's a family farm or

somebody's home that they want to keep in the family. But because of the reassessed value, in many cases it might be forced to sell.

2.6

The only way -- well, I guess it sounds like -- and I think you hit it again, it would take another constitutional amendment to change it.

Because one of the things I was thinking, what if there's some way we can provide an exemption where the people could stay in their home or their farm, paying the existing taxes. But upon the sale or the transfer of that property down the road, they would have to reimburse whatever the adjustment was that they haven't been paying over the years.

I'm assuming that would take another
constitutional amendment, right?

MS. THOMPSON: Yes -- yes, I believe so. Yeah.

So -- but we are, you know, we're, again, gearing up, once implementing legislation for Proposition 19 has been passed with our proper agency, property tax rules adopted and approved through the Office of Administrative Law, we will be -- the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office will be drafting information sheets that are short, simple, clear, to the point, that provides resources to taxpayers, you know, so they're aware, you know, of the provisions of Proposition 19 as far as exclusions or exemptions that may be available to them for

property tax savings, and as well as, you know, just 1 understanding the availability of those. 2 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 3 Ms. Taylor, I believe that concluded the 4 written comments. Do we need to check with AT&T now 5 with anybody that might be on the line? 6 7 MS. TAYLOR: Yes, we will. At&t moderator, can you let us know if there 8 is anyone who wants to make a public comment on this 9 10 matter. Each caller will have up to three minutes to 11 12 speak. For the record, a caller may provide their 13 14 name. AT&T MODERATOR: Thank you. 15 If you wish to make a comment, please press 16 17 one, then zero at this time. 18 Once again, if you wish to make a comment 19 over the phone, please press one, then zero at this 20 time. 21 I currently have no comments in queue at 22 this time. 23 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 24 I see a hand from Ms. Stowers. 25 Go ahead, Ms. Stowers. MS. STOWERS: Thank you, Chairman Vazquez. 2.6 It's been a great conversation about 27 property tax, and the services that our Taxpayers' 28

Rights Advocate provides.

2.6

2.7

But let's talk about the alcoholic beverage tax. Another program within our jurisdiction.

I have two questions, Ms. Thompson.

What type of advocate services did your office or CDTFA provide to the alcoholic beverage taxpayers?

My second question is, since this program is being administered by CDTFA, under a memo of understanding, what type of review will your office conduct to ensure the rights of taxpayers are being protected?

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. So as to the first question, we -- during this past year, we have not had any contact from taxpayers on the alcoholic beverage tax.

Historically, there has been little contact. Last year, just before the Taxpayers' Bill of Rights Hearing, I was contacted by a CEO of an organization about some beverage -- new beverages that they wanted to have -- they wanted to have additional public resources available to them on how to complete the tax return.

And so what we did was, you know, we put her in contact with some individuals with CDTFA. And we indicated that if, you know, they were having any other challenges or difficulty, that she could contact us, and we would coordinate with the CDTFA

Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office to have anything resolved. But that has not been done.

There are many publications that are published by CDTFA containing to the alcoholic beverage tax.

2.6

So as to the second one, kind of comes over to the first. Is if we were contacted by -- by a person regarding the alcoholic beverage tax, we would coordinate with the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Office at that agency on that and in that regard.

We do have a memorandum of understanding with them to administer the, you know, certain aspects of the alcoholic beverage tax program with, you know, those under our agency's responsibilities.

Both of our agencies have information about the alcoholic beverage tax on them as well.

MS. STOWERS: So are you confident that the requirements under RTC 32461 regarding education and outreach forms, and etc., for newly registered taxpayers, that is being carried out by CDTFA? Are you seeing these publications?

MS. THOMPSON: Yeah. They're -- I mean, they're posted, you know, to the website.

So -- but, you know, we're happy to, you know, look into it further to see, you know, as they're posting it.

But, yes, I reviewed their website to see the different publications. They have many tax

programs. And, you know, we can update -- even
provide another link.

2.6

MS. STOWERS: I appreciate that.

I think I'd be a little bit more comfortable, since this is our program, if we had a little bit more active role, and a little bit more oversight over it. I would hate for something to fall through the cracks.

So if you could just know -- I know we have a handshake with them and speak with them, but just take a look at it and make sure that everything is running smoothly from the advocate's perspective.

 $\label{eq:ms.Thompson: Right. I'll definitely do} \mbox{ that.}$ 

MS. STOWERS: And if that's okay with your director.

MS. THOMPSON: Yeah. I'll work with them.

I know that I don't, and the Taxpayers'
Rights Advocate Office doesn't. But I know there are other staff in our agency, you know, that monitors
CDTFA's work in the alcoholic beverage tax, reports are provided, and other information, and review. So that is done.

But from the point of advocacy on taxpayers, I'm happy to do that.

Thank you.

MS. STOWERS: Thank you.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

I see another hand from Member Gaines.

MR. GAINES: Yeah.

I think Member Stowers and I are thinking along the same tracks.

2.6

2.7

I just sent a text over about a half-an-hour ago just asking Brenda -- excuse me -- our Executive Director if we could get more information and regular updates in terms of what is happening with the alcohol tax.

But also the gross premium tax. Because, you know, these are responsibilities that fall under our purview, but we never hear anything about them.

And I realize the CDTFA has taken on that responsibility. But I got the impression that that was going to be temporary. And that as we've staffed up the BOE, and we're making great progress in that area, you know, I think we ought to consider taking on those responsibilities.

And so it would be nice to have that discussion. Maybe, you know, my suggestion is if we can put it onto a future agenda.

I realize the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate role here, and that's critical. But just -- just oversight. You know, we've talked about other areas where we want further oversight as Members of the BOE. And I think these two particular programs ought to be included.

MR. VAZQUEZ: That's a good point. I agree

with that.

I don't know if Ms. Thompson -- I see -- is that an old hand, Ms. Thompson?

I think you're muted.

2.6

2.7

MS. THOMPSON: Sorry. It is, yes. It is an old hand.

MR. VAZQUEZ: No, I agree with you,

Member Gaines. I think we should -- let's talk about
that, and see how we formulate that to put it on our
agenda.

MR. GAINES: That's great. Thank you.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Ms. Taylor, do we have -- oh, we already said there was no other folks on the line at this point.

MS. TAYLOR: Correct.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Seeing no other hands or comments at this point, I just wanted to once again thank you for your team, especially Ms. Thompson, for a great job.

I think this annual report provided a valuable overview on our progress in making our services better and improving our taxpayers' experience.

And in listening, especially to the written comments today, and even some of the folks on the line, for the most part, you know, usually when we do these hearings, and I'm used to, you know, being in a local city where you're sitting there at the dais,

and everybody that comes to testify is usually complaining about your staff.

2.6

And so it's kind of refreshing to hear people, at least written and publicly, actually giving you praise.

So kudos to Ms. Thompson and your staff for putting together this great report. And just for all the work you're doing that is helping a lot of these taxpayers. Not only the residential folks, but as we heard, you know, also the nonprofit world. Which, you know, I come out of.

You know I used to run a nonprofit. And many times, you know, you're working with board and staff that are not really experienced to handle a lot of these reporting mechanisms. And they fall back on their taxes.

And in many cases, it's to their detriment, and they end up having to close up shop. And at the end of the day, the community is the one that loses. Because whatever service they were providing is no longer available.

So thank you. Thank you for all your help, and your work along those lines.

With that, I'm getting a request from one of our Members that if we could take maybe a 15-minute break.

Is that good with everybody before we get into our next item?

And then we can come back and go on to C2. 1 I see heads nodding. I think we're okay. 2 So I have -- well, it's almost -- I have 3 Why don't we say -- actually 11:56 right now. 12:55. 4 Why don't we say about 12:10 we will reconvene? 5 that good? 6 7 I'm seeing heads nodding, waves. Okay. We'll come back at 12:10. 8 MS. COHEN: Sorry, I missed that. Would you 9 say it again, please? 10 MR. VAZQUEZ: Sorry. Who said that? Could 11 12 you say it again, please? MR. SCHAEFER: Vice -- Vice Chair 13 14 Schaefer. MR. VAZQUEZ: Vice Chair Schaefer, go ahead. 15 16 I'm sorry. 17 MR. SCHAEFER: Before we leave, I was 18 looking at the California Taxpayers' Bill of Rights 19 excerpts dealing with alcoholic beverage tax law. 20 And this is a 1992 statute. And that was almost 30 21 years ago. We have \$500 and \$7,500 amounts listed as to 22 23 when it's a big deal, or a small deal, or when it 24 could be settled simpler depending on the amount. Are these figures over 30 years frozen? Or 25 has it been changed, but it doesn't appear in the 2.6 material that I've read? 2.7 I'd like to think that the easy handling of 28

a matter if it used to be \$500, maybe it might be \$1,000 today.

Who looks at that?

2.6

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{Do}}$$  we wait until a Legislature does, or maybe a -- Ms. Thompson has a chance to do that?

MS. THOMPSON: So --

MR. VAZQUEZ: Ms. Thompson, go ahead.

MS. THOMPSON: Yeah. So the California
Taxpayers' Bill of Rights is actually in our
Taxpayers' Rights Advocate Annual Report.

There's two appendixes. And one of them includes the property tax -- Morgan Property Taxpayers' Bill of Rights provision.

And then the other one contains the California Taxpayers' Bill of Rights provisions, is applicable to our agency's, and the alcoholic beverage tax is one of them. So that is included in that.

And, yes, in the 90s was when those bill of rights provisions were first in place. And they do have those.

We looked to see if statutory changes have been made to those code sections from that -- that point forward. And if they are, we reflect those in those changes. So there are certain provisions that may have been updated.

So the dollar amounts should have -- you know, could have been updated by statute. I would

have to look at them to see. I'm happy to do that and reach out to you and let you know.

But, yes, those would require a statutory change in order to make those changes.

MR. SCHAEFER: Thank you. I'd appreciate you looking into that.

And if we find they've been asleep at the switch for 30 years and haven't done anything, then I'd like a little memorandum to support my asking the Legislature, or whoever would be involved, to some committee to argue for that. I'd even appear and speak when we return to Sacramento.

Thank you.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. I'll be happy to reach out to you and give you that information, and you can proceed forward.

MS. FLEMING: Chairman Vazquez and Members, again, I -- this is Brenda Fleming, the Executive Director.

Vice Chair Schaefer, thank you so much for your comments, and, Members, all of the comments on these additional tax programs.

What I'd like to offer for you, and consistent with what you're asking, is for staff to come back and do a comprehensive update and presentation on both the alcoholic beverage tax program and the tax on insurers.

And then I think it'll -- it's good public

2.5

2.6

2.7

discussion to drill down on both of those programs a little bit more, so, one, you're informed about what those programs are and our responsibilities, including the oversight for our service provider, CDTFA, for the collection of the tax portions of it, and the redetermination rolls.

2.6

2.7

But really so that we're clear on what their roles are as sort of contractors for us for that service, and what our role is.

And then we can come back and look at what we need to do to modernize those tax programs also.

So if you would just allow us the opportunity to come back. And I'll work with the Chairman's office to schedule an upcoming hearing on that matter, so that we can drill down on it a lot more.

We might even consider whether or not we want to include it as a part of a recurring report on our PAN.

So if you would allow the staff to have a little time to be prepared for more in-depth discussion, we would greatly appreciate it.

Thank you, Members.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. I think that's a good suggestion.

With that, Members, now we're actually at 12:00 o'clock. So we'll reconvene at 12:15. We'll take a 15-minute break. 12:15, we'll reconvene.

Thank you all, and we'll see you in a bit. 1 (Whereupon a break was taken.) 2 MR. VAZQUEZ: Members, let's go ahead and 3 get started. Because I know we have a lot to cover 4 still. And then we also have to try to work in our 5 constitutional officer, Ms. Betty Yee, as well, the 6 7 Controller. So, with that, Ms. Taylor, if you would 8 please call the next item. 9 MR. SCHAEFER: Excuse me, Chair Vazquez. 10 MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh, Vice Chair Schaefer. Go 11 12 ahead. MR. SCHAEFER: I want to say I apologize for 13 being a bit late. I just assumed you would go ahead 14 with your quorum, but I was wrong. And if there was 15 16 any inconvenience, I apologize. 17 MR. VAZQUEZ: Not a problem. Thank you. 18 MR. SCHAEFER: Thank you. 19 MR. VAZQUEZ: Ms. Taylor, if you would 20 please call our next item. 21 22 ITEM C2 23 24 MS. TAYLOR: Our next item is C2, Public 25 Hearings, Proposed Property Tax Rule 462.540. Public hearing and proposed adoption of Property Tax Rule 2.6 462.540, Change in Ownership - Base Year Value 27

Transfers, to implement and make specific provisions

28

of section 2.1 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution.

2.6

This matter will be presented by Mr. Moon.

MR. MOON: Good afternoon, Chair Vazquez, Members of the Board.

This is the public hearing for Proposed

Property Tax Rule 462.540, Change in Ownership - Base

Year Value Transfers, which will offer up an

opportunity to make comments on the proposed rule.

Following the public, the Board will have an opportunity to formally adopt.

As you know, since the passage of Proposition 19 in November of last year, we've been working to provide guidance to assessors, as well as other stakeholders regarding its new requirements.

Part of the guidance process has been drafting new regulations that clarified certain aspects.

And we've divided the rulemaking process into two curves, one covering each of the main property tax portions of the law, the intergenerational transfer exclusion, and the base year value transfer.

The intent of the rulemaking was to timely clarify some of the major issues raised by Prop. 19 points.

At the May 25th meeting, the Board authorized publication to Rule 462.540, the new

proposed rule explaining aspects of topics [Internet connection disruption].

2.6

2.7

Again, following today's public comments, the Board will have the opportunity to stop the rule.

If the Board does so, staff will then prepare the final document to go to both the Office of Administrative Law, and the Department of Finance for final publication.

If you have any questions prior to hearing public comment, I'd be [Internet connection disruption.]

MR. VAZQUEZ: You know, Mr. Moon, I'm getting a little bit of a back -- a vibration back there, so it's not real clear.

And I don't know if you're on a speaker phone, or what the situation is. But I'm assuming you're finished with your comments.

MR. MOON: I apologize. Yes, I apologize. I didn't realize I was breaking in and out. Is this better?

MR. VAZQUEZ: That's a lot better.

MR. MOON: Yeah. I'd be happy to review anything that I may have broken up on and wasn't able to be heard.

But, essentially, I had just wanted to inform the Board that this is a public hearing where the public will be allowed to make comments on the rule.

And then following the public comments, the 1 Board will have an opportunity to adopt the proposed 2 rule. 3 MS. TAYLOR: You're muted, Mr. Chair. You're muted. 5 MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh, thank you. I'm sorry. 6 7 Mr. Moon, were you going to state the actual article? I kind of lost you there. 8 MR. MOON: Yes. It's Proposed Property Tax 9 Rule 462.540, which is title change in ownership, 10 base year value transfers. 11 12 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. With that, Ms. Taylor -- or let's -- I don't 13 see any hands or comments from anybody. 14 Ms. Taylor, can we check to see if we have 15 16 anybody that wishes to make a comment -- a public 17 comment on this? 18 MS. TAYLOR: Certainly. I could start with 19 a written comment, and then we could go to --20 MR. VAZQUEZ: Sure. 21 MS. TAYLOR: All right. Our first written comment is from Tricia Gonzalez. 22 23 I come from a working-class family who has 24 been devastated by Proposition 19. Prop. 19 doesn't consider families with 25 multiple children. 2.6 27 Prop. 19 doesn't consider families with modest homes in working-class neighborhoods that are 28

no longer affordable due to the pandemic causing high rise in real estate this past year.

Due to Prop. 19 changes, families are forced to choose which child receives the Prop. 13 benefit, and which ones do not.

We are not landlords. We plan on staying in these homes. My husband's parents bought a second home that we have rented for 20 years with the plan that we can take over the home.

The home still has a mortgage. With reassessment, now we can no longer afford to live in the home.

Additionally, Prop. 19 was implemented on February 16th, 2021, three months to make family decisions when we couldn't meet due to the pandemic.

We ask you to adjust Prop. 19, or families like ours will be forced to move out of state.

And that concludes the written comments.

AT&T moderator, can you let us know if there is anyone on the line who wishes to comment on this rule.

For the record, they may provide their name.

AT&T MODERATOR: Thank you.

If you wish to make a comment, please press one, then zero at this time.

I currently have no lines in queue at this time.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

2.6

2.7

And thank you, Mr. Moon.

One question. Are there any stakeholder concerns brought forward that this rule hasn't addressed?

MR. MOON: Chair Vazquez, the intent of the proposed rule was not to address every potential concern that could be raised by stakeholders.

Rather, it was to provide guidance for some of the larger questions that were raised by Prop. 19 base year value provisions.

Thus, there are questions and issues and factual circumstances that these rules do not address. And we would anticipate that we will be providing additional guidance in the future in various forms, LTA, legal opinions, and, if necessary, amendments to these rules.

And we would anticipate additional guidance will be going on for quite some time.

So, for example, for the Prop. 58 parent-child exclusion that was passed in 1986, we've been answering questions and providing guidance on that for the past, about, 30 years.

And so I would anticipate that we would be providing guidance addressing specific situations and issues not addressed by these rules far into the future.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

Members, do we have any questions of

9 4

2.6

Mr. Moon or this item? 1 Seeing no hands or comments, let's proceed 2 with -- if we can just proceed with a motion to adopt 3 the proposed rule. 4 And the motion should be to adopt proposed 5 rule 462.540 as reflected in the materials attached 6 to the PAN under this item. 7 MR. GAINES: So moved. 8 MR. VAZQUEZ: It's been moved by Member 9 Gaines. 10 Is that a hand or a second by Ms. Cohen? 11 12 MS. COHEN: It's actually a hand, but I can ask Mr. Moon my question after we take our vote. 13 14 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. So that's a second there. 15 Ms. Taylor, if you could please call the 16 17 roll. 18 MS. TAYLOR: Certainly. 19 The motion is to adopt staff's 20 recommendation to adopt proposed rule 462.540 as reflected in the materials attached to the Public 21 Agenda Notice under this item. 22 23 Chairman Vazquez. 24 MR. VAZQUEZ: Aye. MS. TAYLOR: Vice Chair Schaefer. 25 MR. SCHAEFER: Aye. 2.6 MS. TAYLOR: Member Gaines. 27 MR. GAINES: Aye. 28

1	MS. TAYLOR: Member Cohen.
2	MS. COHEN: Aye.
3	MS. TAYLOR: Deputy Controller Stowers.
4	MS. STOWERS: Aye.
5	MR. VAZQUEZ: So that's unanimous of all
6	those present.
7	And then Member Cohen, I believe, had a
8	question for Mr. Moon, or a comment.
9	MS. COHEN: I don't have a comment or a
10	question. Thank you.
11	MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh, okay. Thank you.
12	With that, Ms. Taylor, if you would please
13	call our next item.
14	MS. TAYLOR: Our next item on the schedule
15	is D3.
16	Are we planning to hold that until 1:00 p.m.
17	for the Controller?
18	MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes. We want to hold that.
19	And I believe we can skip the next two and
20	go to, I believe, it's J is it J1?
21	
22	<u>ITEM J1</u>
23	
24	MS. TAYLOR: Certainly.
25	The next item is J1, Administrative Consent
26	Agenda; adoption of the Board Meeting minutes for
27	July 27th, 2021.
2.8	Contribution disclosure forms are not

required pursuant to Government Code Section 15626. 1 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you, Ms. Taylor. 2 Members, do we have any questions or 3 comments of these minutes? 4 Seeing and hearing none, Ms. Taylor, do we 5 have any public comments on the minutes, or written? 6 7 Or can we check with AT&T? MS. TAYLOR: We have no comments, but I'll 8 check with the AT&T moderator. 9 10 AT&T moderator, can you let us know if there's anyone who would like to make a public 11 12 comment on this matter. Each caller will have up to three minutes to 13 14 speak. And for the record, a caller may provide 15 16 their name. 17 AT&T MODERATOR: Thank you. 18 If you wish to make a comment, please press one, then zero at this time. 19 20 I have no comments in queue at this time. 21 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. With that, Members, I'd like to entertain a 22 23 motion to approve our minutes of July 27th, 2021. 24 MS. STOWERS: This is Deputy Controller 25 Stowers. I move that we approve the minutes of 2.6 July 22nd, 2021. Is that the date? July 27th. 2.7 MR. VAZQUEZ: The 27th, right? Yeah. Okay. 28

```
MR. GAINES: Second.
1
               MR. VAZQUEZ: So it's been moved by
 2
     Ms. Stowers, and second by Member Gaines.
 3
               And seeing no other hands or comments,
 4
     Ms. Taylor, if we can call the roll on that.
 5
 6
               MS. TAYLOR: The motion is to approve the
7
     minutes as presented.
               Chairman Vazquez.
 8
               MR. VAZQUEZ: Aye.
 9
               MS. TAYLOR: Vice Chair Schaefer.
10
               MR. SCHAEFER: Aye.
11
12
               MS. TAYLOR: Member Gaines.
               MR. GAINES: Aye.
13
14
               MS. TAYLOR: Member Cohen.
               MS. COHEN: I'm here. Aye.
15
16
               MS. TAYLOR: How do you vote?
17
               MS. COHEN: Aye.
18
               MS. TAYLOR: Thank you.
19
               MS. COHEN: Thank you.
20
               MS. TAYLOR: Deputy Controller Stowers.
21
               MS. STOWERS: Aye.
               MR. VAZQUEZ: So that's unanimous of all
22
23
      those present.
24
               With that, Ms. Taylor, if you would call the
      next item.
25
26
27
                              //
28
```

## ITEM J2

2.6

2.7

MS. TAYLOR: The next item is J2, Invitation to the Annual Meeting of the Board and County Assessors; request approval to invite County Assessors to meet with the State Board of Equalization and discuss issues relating to property assessment administration.

The meeting may be virtual, pending status of the pandemic cases.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you, Ms. Taylor.

Members, for the care and safety of the State staff and public, and due to the uncertainty surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic, at this time, we anticipate that this October meeting may need to be conducted remotely.

Additionally, we have received feedback from many of the assessors that they would prefer this year's annual meeting be held remotely.

However, we will continue to monitor the situation.

As you are aware, we have the capacity to hold this meeting remotely using video and teleconference systems similar to last year.

We would prepare for a public portion with the Board Members and the CAA, and then individual breakout sessions for each districts.

Members, do you have any comments or

questions on this? 1 MR. SCHAEFER: Chair, Vice Chair. 2 MR. VAZQUEZ: Vice Chair Schaefer, go 3 ahead. 4 MR. SCHAEFER: Yes, Chair Vazquez. 5 We expect to be in Sacramento in October, I 6 7 understand. Does that affect in any way whether this meeting would be virtual or not? 8 MR. VAZQUEZ: Well, if we're in Sacramento, 9 then we'll probably be able to do it in person. 10 But we're -- I think we're kind of 11 12 reserving, or holding back, because, you know, we're just -- we're seeing this activity with this new 13 14 Delta still kind of out there, and it seems to keep spiking. So we just kind of want to have that 15 16 flexibility. 17 MR. SCHAEFER: Well, I miss the opportunity 18 to see my colleagues, and I miss the opportunity to 19 see the assessors. 20 MR. VAZQUEZ: I'm with you on that one. 21 MR. SCHAEFER: Thank you. MR. VAZQUEZ: Member Stowers, I see a hand 22 23 up there. 24 MS. STOWERS: Thank you, Chair Vazquez. 25 So are you saying that we have the ability to have four separate breakouts with our 2.6 2.7 telecommunication so that -- I'm getting feedback. So that --28

MR. VAZOUEZ: Member Schaefer -- Vice Chair 1 Schaefer, you might want to mute your mic. 2 Mute your mic, Vice Chair Schaefer. 3 Thank vou. 4 Okay. Ms. Stowers, go ahead. 5 MS. STOWERS: Okay. So we do have the 6 7 capability to have four separate breakouts by districts so that each elected official -- each 8 district member can meet with their -- the county 9 assessors separately, just understanding that part is 10 not generally a public meeting. That's generally 11 12 just between the assessors and the district member. MR. VAZQUEZ: That's my understanding. 13 MS. STOWERS: Right. 14 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes. 15 16 Any other comments, questions? 17 Seeing and hearing none, Ms. Taylor, do we 18 have any written or public comments on this item? MS. TAYLOR: We do not have any written 19 20 comments. I can reach out --21 MR. VAZQUEZ: Reach out to AT&T. 22 MS. TAYLOR: Certainly. 23 AT&T moderator, can you let us know if 24 there's anyone who would like to make a public 2.5 comment on this matter. Each caller will have up to three minutes to 2.6 speak. 27 For the record, a caller may provide their 28

1 name. AT&T MODERATOR: Thank you. 2 If you wish to make a comment, please press 3 one, then zero at this time. 4 I currently have no comments in queue. 5 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 6 7 Members, do I hear a motion to approve this invitation? 8 I see Ms. Stowers. 9 MS. STOWERS: Yes. Deputy Controller 10 Stowers. 11 12 I move that we approve the invitation to 1.3 invite the assessors to meet with the Board Members 14 on October 19th, which may or may not be virtual, depending on the circumstances. 15 MR. GAINES: Second. 16 17 MR. VAZQUEZ: It's been moved and second by 18 Member Gaines. 19 Seeing no hands or comments or questions, 20 Ms. Taylor, if you would please call the roll on that 21 motion. 22 MS. TAYLOR: Certainly. 23 Chairman Vazquez. 24 MR. VAZQUEZ: Aye. MS. TAYLOR: Vice Chair Schaefer. 25 MR. SCHAEFER: Aye. 2.6 27 MS. TAYLOR: Member Gaines. MR. GAINES: Aye. 28

1	MS. TAYLOR: Member Cohen.
2	MS. COHEN: Aye.
3	MS. TAYLOR: Deputy Controller Stowers.
4	MS. STOWERS: Aye.
5	MR. VAZQUEZ: So that's unanimous of all
6	those present.
7	(Whereupon Controller Yee joined the Board
8	Meeting via teleconference.)
9	Ms. Taylor, it's my understanding that the
10	Controller Betty Yee has joined us. So I believe we
11	can go now to our constitutional functions, D3.
12	MS. TAYLOR: Thank you.
13	MR. VAZQUEZ: And welcome. I see you're on
14	the screen now. Welcome, Controller.
15	MS. YEE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. Thank
16	you.
17	MR. VAZQUEZ: Great to see you.
18	MS. YEE: You, too.
19	MR. VAZQUEZ: Okay.
20	Ms. Taylor.
21	MS. TAYLOR: Thank you.
22	
23	<u>ITEM D3</u>
24	
25	MS. TAYLOR: Our next order of business will
26	be D3, Tax Program Nonappearance Matters - Consent;
27	Legal Appeals Property Tax Matters. Applications for
28	Review, Equalization, and Adjustment under the

California Constitution, Article XIII, section 11. 1 Confidential -- contribution disclosure 2 forms are required for -- are not required for this 3 This is a constitutional function. matter. 4 D3a, Woodland-Davis Clean Water Agency for 5 Review, Equalization and Adjustment of Assessments in 6 7 Yolo County. Appeal Nos. ARA 17-001 (2016-2017), ARA 18-001 (2017-2018), ARA 18-002 (2018-2019), ARA 8 19-001, (2019-2020) 'CF.' 9 This matter will be presented by Ms. Yim. 10 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 11 12 Is Ms. Yim available? MS. YIM: Yes, I'm available. 13 Good afternoon. 14 MR. VAZQUEZ: Please proceed. 15 MS. YIM: Yes. 16 Good afternoon, Chairman Vazquez and 17 18 Honorable Members of the Board. I'm Sonia Yim, the appeals attorney assigned 19 20 to the matter before you. 21 These are four section 11 petitions, which were filed each year for fiscal years 2016 to 2020, 22 23 and they have been consolidated. 24 They are now before the Board, consistent 25 with the Board's authority to review, equalize and adjust the value of taxable property owned by a 2.6 public entity outside of its boundaries. 2.7 Here, the parties reached an agreement in 28

2020 resolving all issues in the consolidated petitions.

Specifically, the parties have agreed that the applicant's property is now within the jurisdictional boundaries of the applicant, and, therefore, exempt from property taxation.

And as such, the parties agree the correct assessed value of the applicant's property is zero for each of the assessment years at issue.

Based on the foregoing, the appeals attorney recommends that the Board adopt the parties agreed-to assessable value of zero for each of the lien dates at issue, and the consolidated petition.

I ask for your adoption as the appeals attorney's recommendation.

Thank you.

2.6

2.7

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

I have a -- just a procedural question that doesn't affect the substance of the appeal.

But I guess my question is, this matter, I guess, this water agency in the county has been pending for like four years. Is that an average timeframe for these court appeals?

MS. YIM: I would -- I would say that this is not a court appeal, and not all of the petitions have been pending for four years. They've been filed each year until fiscal year 2020.

However, I can provide some other general

remarks about our appeals process.

2.5

2.6

For example, in general, staff are in regular contact with the parties whenever a petition is filed.

And, typically, cases are only stayed when the parties request a joint stay from our Chief Counsel.

And, generally, our staff will accommodate the party's request for a stay when it will help facilitate resolution of cases and avoid protractive litigation.

And that litigation could either be between the parties, or it could be a result of the Board's decision in the case.

But, in any case, staff does stay in regular contact with the parties, and ensures that the stays that they requested are continuing to be the will of the parties. And we ensure that the parties are moving toward resolution expeditiously.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

Members, do we have any procedural questions or comments for Ms. Yim?

MS. YEE: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes. Go ahead, Madam

Controller.

MS. YEE: Thank you very much.

First of all, I really applaud the parties for coming to a resolution on this matter.

And I think my only procedural question has 1 to do with the timing where the agreement was reached 2 in 2020 that we've got years at issue prior to that. 3 And I quess a practical effect of what would happen 4 if these properties were subject to tax. 5 But are we essentially just honoring the 6 7 agreement of the respective parties that are part of this joint agency as it relates to all years? Or are 8 there statutory, I guess, kinds of considerations 9 that we need to think about relative to the prior 10 years before the agreement was reached? 11 12 MS. YIM: I believe we are respecting the agreement that the parties came to, which affects the 13 year that they filed appeals for. 14 MS. YEE: Okay. So their -- their agreement 15 16 is encompassing all the prior years, and their 17 elegant resolution with now the county joining just 18 essentially has the property now within the 19 boundaries of the entity, right? 20 MS. YIM: Yes, that's correct. 21 MS. YEE: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair. 22 23 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 24 Any other comments, questions? 2.5 Seeing --MR. GAINES: Chair Vazquez, this is 2.6 Member Gaines. 2.7 MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh, Member Gaines. 28 Go

ahead. 1 MR. GAINES: Just to clarify to make sure I 2 understand this correctly. 3 So this was a -- this was a GPA set up with 4 Woodland and Davis. And to resolve the -- okay. 5 And then to resolve the tax issue at hand, 6 7 it included the addition of Yolo County; is that -is that correct? 8 MS. YIM: Yes, that's correct. 9 MR. GAINES: Okay. Just so I understood 10 that. Thank you. 11 12 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 13 Any other comments, questions? Seeing and hearing none, if there are no 14 other further comments, Members, do we have a motion 15 to adopt the staff's recommendation for settling --16 17 for settling these appeals? 18 MR. SCHAEFER: So moved. 19 MS. YEE: Mr. Chairman -- yeah, I'll 20 second. 21 MR. VAZQUEZ: Okay. It's been moved, and 22 second by the Controller. 23 Seeing no other hands, Ms. Taylor, could you 24 please call the roll on that motion. 25 MS. TAYLOR: Would we like to take public comment before I call the roll? 2.6 27 MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes. Yes. Yes. 28

MS. TAYLOR. Thank you. 1 AT&T moderator, can you let us know if 2 there's anyone who would like to make a public 3 comment on this matter. 4 Each caller will have up to three minutes to 5 speak. 6 7 For the record, a caller may provide their name. 8 AT&T MODERATOR: Thank you. 9 Ladies and gentlemen, if you wish to make a 10 comment, please press one, then zero. That's one, 11 12 then zero to make a comment. And at this time we have no one in queue. 13 14 MS. TAYLOR: Thank you. MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 15 16 Ms. Taylor, if you would now please call the 17 roll. 18 MS. TAYLOR: The motion is for the Board to 19 adopt the parties agreed-to assessable value of zero 20 for each of the lien dates at issue in the 21 consolidated petition. 22 Chairman Vazquez. 23 MR. VAZQUEZ: Aye. 24 MS. TAYLOR: Vice Chair Schaefer. 25 MR. SCHAEFER: Aye. MS. TAYLOR: Member Gaines. 2.6 MR. GAINES: Aye. 27 MS. TAYLOR: Member Cohen. 28

MS. COHEN: Aye. 1 MS. TAYLOR: Controller Yee. 2 MS. YEE: Aye. 3 MR. VAZOUEZ: So that's unanimous of all 4 5 those present. 6 With that, you know, I would just like to 7 make one final comment that, you know, as a Board -- I guess we're on the procedural matters. 8 You know, we can't control the time court takes on 9 10 some of these appeals. But at the end of the day, as the Chair, I'd 11 12 like to make sure we stay on top of these, and hopefully do a better job of monitoring these 13 14 appeals. Because, to me, it just seems -- well, even 15 though Ms. Yim, I guess, mentioned that it wasn't as 16 17 long as four years, but still, I think some of these 18 take -- usually are pretty lengthy. 19 With that, Ms. Taylor, if you would please 20 call our next item. 21 22 ITEM E3 23 24 MS. TAYLOR: Our next item is E3, Tax 25 Program Nonappearance Matters - Adjudicatory; Legal Appeals Property Tax Matters; Petitions for Penalty 26 2.7 Abatement on Private Railroad Car Tax.

3a, The Proctor & Gamble Manufacturing

28

110

Company (5891), PCP21-003 'CF.' 1 3b, Trinseo, LLC (6529), PCP21-001 'CF.'. 2 3c, Blue Cube Operations, LLC (6590), 3 PCP21-002 'CF.' 4 Contribution disclosure forms are required 5 pursuant to Government Code Section 15626. 6 Contribution disclosure forms were received 7 prior to the beginning of the Board Member -- Board 8 Meeting. 9 This is a constitutional function. 10 This matter will be presented by 11 12 Ms. Garrett. MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 13 Is Ms. Garrett available? 14 MS. GARRETT: Yes. 15 Good afternoon, Chairman Vazquez and 16 17 Honorable Members of the Board. 18 As Ms. Taylor mentioned, I am Sarah Garrett, 19 the appeals attorney assigned to those three cases 20 under today's E3 calendar. 21 The three separate petitions mentioned are private railroad car tax penalty abatement petitions 22 with the same questions of law and similar effects. 23 24 Accordingly, my remarks will cover all three 25 petitions. Here, each petitioner paid their private 2.6 railroad car tax late, but sufficiently timely to 2.7 qualify for an abatement, provided that a petition is 28

filed that establishes reasonable cause to the satisfaction of the Board.

2.6

2.7

However, each petition at issue was filed outside of the time period required.

Nevertheless, the Board has the authority to extend the deadline for timely filing the instant petitions by up to 30 days if good cause is shown.

Here, the conditions of the COVID-19 pandemic are cited for both good cause and reasonable cause purposes in each petition.

Additionally, if the Board grants an extension of time to each petitioner, the State-Assessed Properties Division and each petitioner are in agreement with the penalty abatement recommendation before the Board.

Accordingly, the appeals attorney recommends that the Board grants an extension of time under Government Code 15620 until February 23rd, 2021, to timely file the Proctor & Gamble Manufacturing Company, Trinseo LLC, and Blue Cube Operations, LLC petitions due to the good cause conditions of the COVID-19 pandemic.

And then also grant each petition abating the penalty interest and related recovery fees of each petitioner's late payment due to the reasonable cause stemming from the unique challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic.

I ask for your adoption.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Thank you, 1 Ms. Garrett. 2 Members, do we have any comments or 3 questions for Ms. Garrett? 4 Seeing and hearing none --5 MS. YEE: Mr. Chairman, I have one. I'm 6 7 sorry. MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead. 8 Go ahead, Madam Controller. 9 MS. YEE: It speaks to the current 10 Government Code Section 15620. 11 I know that for these three matters before 12 us, the timeliness related to the pandemic. And I 13 14 just wanted to be sure that that Government Code section was pretty clear with respect to the various 15 16 factors by which we would look at granting the 17 extension of time. 18 MS. GARRETT: Thank you, Controller Yee. 19 So under 15620, good cause is needed to 20 satisfy the Board. And in this instance, staff --21 staff's recommendation is to -- to grant the 22 extension of time for each petitioner. MS. YEE: So there's not a definition of 23 24 what good cause or reasonable cause is in the statute itself? 2.5 MS. GARRETT: No, it is the Board's 2.6 2.7 pleasure. MS. YEE: Okay. Thank you. 28

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 1 With that, seeing no other comments or 2 questions, Ms. Taylor, do we have any written 3 comments on this? 4 MS. TAYLOR: We do not have any written 5 comments. 6 7 MR. VAZQUEZ: Can we check with AT&T and see if there's anybody on the line that wishes to speak 8 on this? 9 10 MS. TAYLOR: Certainly. AT&T moderator, can you let us know if 11 12 there's anyone who would like to make a public comment on this matter. 13 14 Each caller will have up to three minutes to speak. 15 For the record, a caller may provide their 16 17 name. 18 AT&T MODERATOR: Thank you, ma'am. 19 Please press one, then zero if you wish to 20 make a comment. That's one, then zero if you wish to 21 make a comment. 22 And there is no one in queue at this time. 23 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 24 Members, this item is now before us. I'd 25 like to entertain a motion to approve this matter. MS. YEE: I'll move to adopt the appeals 2.6 2.7 attorney's recommendation. MR. SCHAEFER: Second. 28

MR. VAZQUEZ: Been moved by the Controller, 1 and second by our Vice Chair Schaefer. 2 Seeing no other hands or comments, 3 Ms. Taylor, if you would please call the roll on the 4 motion. 5 MS. TAYLOR: Certainly. 7 The motion is to approve the staff's recommendation. 8 9 Chairman Vazquez. MR. VAZQUEZ: Aye. 10 MS. TAYLOR: Vice Chair Schaefer. 11 12 MR. SCHAEFER: Aye. MS. TAYLOR: Member Gaines. 1.3 MR. GAINES: Aye. 14 MS. TAYLOR: Member Cohen. 15 MS. COHEN: Aye. 16 17 MS. TAYLOR: Controller Yee. 18 MS. YEE: Aye. 19 MR. VAZQUEZ: So that's unanimous of all 20 those present. 21 With that, Ms. Taylor, I believe that concludes our constitutional responsibilities, 22 23 correct? 24 MS. TAYLOR: Correct. 25 MR. VAZQUEZ: And I believe, Controller Yee, you're welcome to stay. But I believe you're 2.6 2.7 probably off to another meeting or another convention, I'm sure. 28

MS. YEE: Thank you. It's great to see 1 everyone. Thank you for your indulgence. Appreciate 2 it. 3 MR. VAZQUEZ: No, thank you. MS. YEE: All right. 5 MR. VAZQUEZ: You came in at perfect timing. 6 7 Because now we're going to have to hold off a little bit. 8 MS. YEE: All right. Good. Take care, 9 10 everyone. MR. VAZQUEZ: Your timing was perfect. 11 12 MS. YEE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 13 With that, Ms. Taylor, I believe we're 14 getting ready to go into closed session; is that 15 16 correct? 17 MS. TAYLOR: That is correct. 18 MS. FLEMING: Chairman Vazquez and Members, 19 this is Brenda Fleming, Executive Director. 20 At this time, Members, if you recall, sir, 21 we will be taking up closed session at specifically 3:00 p.m. today. 22 MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh. So do we -- we don't have 23 24 any other items on the agenda, do we? MS. TAYLOR: We do not. 25 MS. FLEMING: No, not at this time, sir. 2.6 So what we would do at this point is take a 27 recess, if Members wanted to enjoy the pleasure of 28

maybe a lunch out of today's hearings. 1 And then we would reconvene the regular 2 meeting a little bit before 3:00 o'clock. And then 3 we would immediately go into closed session for some 4 confidential briefing. And then follow the normal 5 processes after the closed session. 6 7 MR. VAZQUEZ: All right. So we don't actually adjourn the meeting, we're just going to put 8 it on hold; is that correct? 9 MS. FLEMING: No, sir. You will do a 10 recess. At this point, we'll --11 12 MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh, a recess. MS. FLEMING: We'll recess for a lunch 13 break, and then we'll reconvene -- how about we 14 reconvene at about 2:55 -- 2:50, 2:55. 15 16 MR. VAZQUEZ: Why don't we say 2:50. 17 MS. FLEMING: Okay. Sounds good. Thank 18 you. MR. VAZQUEZ: All right. So we will go 19 20 ahead and take a recess until -- take a lunch break 21 until 2:50, and then we'll reconvene. 22 If we can have everybody come back probably 23 at 2:50, and then we'll go ahead into our closed 24 session. 25 Thank you all. And we'll see you in a bit. Enjoy your lunch. 2.6 (Whereupon the lunch recess was taken.) 27 MR. VAZQUEZ: Okay. Welcome back, 28

everybody. 1 We're going to go ahead and reconvene. 2 And if we could just get Ms. Taylor. 3 Do we have to take roll again, or just go 4 ahead and start the meeting? 5 6 MS. TAYLOR: No, we can just --7 MR. VAZQUEZ: So we're going to go ahead and reconvene. 8 We have all the Members present. Member 9 Schaefer will be joining us shortly. 10 And with that, I will turn it back over to 11 12 Ms. Taylor, so we can all have the instructions of how to close this, and then get into our closed 13 14 session. MS. TAYLOR: Thank you. 15 16 17 ITEM O 18 19 Our next item of business is O, Closed 20 Session, Pending Litigation. 21 O1, Paloma -- La Paloma Generating Company v. California State Board of Equalization, et al., 22 23 Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC645390. 24 02, Michael D. Myers v. State Board of 25 Equalization, et al., Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District, Consolidated Case No. B307981, on appeal 2.6 2.7 from Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. BS143436, Related Cases, BS18 -- 158655,

28

BS157999, BC324947, BC655980. 1 03, Swanson David W., et al. v. Franchise 2 Tax Board, et al., San Diego County Superior Court 3 Case No. 37-2019-00030244-CU-MC-NC. 4 The Board Members will now go into closed 5 session to discuss pending litigation matters. 6 7 So we will exit and go to our closed session. 8 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you. 9 So, Members, we gotta go ahead and leave 10 this, and we'll move into our closed session. 11 12 Just click back onto your calendar, and then we'll reconvene in the closed session. 13 (Whereupon closed session took place.) 14 MS. TAYLOR: Good afternoon. 15 The Board Members met in closed session to 16 discuss pending litigation matters, and no action was 17 18 taken. 19 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you, Ms. Taylor. 20 Members, do we have any final remarks for 21 the day? 22 We're not going to adjourn. We're just 23 going to recess. 24 But let me just remind folks that, one, 25 thank the Members, and Ms. Fleming, and the staff for all your dedicated work on all these business matters 2.6 that we took on today. 2.7 And we will address agenda Items K, L, M and 28

N during tomorrow's Board Meeting session. And if there's no other comments or questions, we will stand in recess of this meeting until tomorrow, August the 25th, and reconvene at 10:00 a.m. Okay. We'll see you all. Thank you, staff. And we'll see you again tomorrow, virtually. MS. FLEMING: Thank you, Chairman Vazquez and Members. Thank you to staff. (Whereupon the Board Meeting concluded.) 

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	State of California )
4	) ss
5	County of Sacramento )
6	
7	I, Jillian Sumner, Hearing Reporter for
8	the California State Board of Equalization, certify
9	that on August 24, 2021, I recorded verbatim, in
10	shorthand, to the best of my ability, the
11	proceedings in the above-entitled hearing; that I
12	transcribed the shorthand writing into typewriting;
13	and that the preceding pages 1 through 121 constitute
14	a complete and accurate transcription of
15	the shorthand writing.
16	
17	Dated: October 25, 2021
18	
19	
20	Jillian Sumner
21	JILLIAN SUMNER, CSR #13619
22	Hearing Reporter
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	