## BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN	THE	MAT	$\Gamma TER$	OF	THE	APPEAL	OF:	)			
								)			
LA	PALC	AMC	NEV	ADA	TRUS	ST,		)	OTA	NO.	18010922
								)			
					AI	PPELLANT	Γ.	)			
								)			

CERTIFIED COPY

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Sacramento, California

Tuesday, May 24, 2022

Reported by:

SARAH M. TUMAN, RPR Hearing Reporter

Job No.: 36790 OTA(B)

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE Of TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF: )
6	LA PALOMA NEVADA TRUST, ) OTA NO. 18010922
7	APPELLANT. )
8	)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at
17	400 R Street, Sacramento, California,
18	commencing at 1:02 p.m. and concluding
19	at 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, May 24, 2022,
20	reported by Sarah M. Tuman, RPR,
21	Hearing Reporter.
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:			
2				
3	Panel Lead:	ALJ SARA HOSEY		
4				
5	Panel Members:	ALJ MIKE LE ALJ TOMMY LEUNG		
6		ALO TOMMI LEONO		
7	For the Appellant:	R. TODD LUOMA		
8	ror the appellant.	R. TODD HOOFIA		
9	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
LO	TOT CITE RESPONDENCE.	FRANCHISE TAX BOARD SONIA WOODRUFF		
11		CAROLYN KUDUK		
12				
13				
L4				
15				
L6				
L7				
L8				
L9				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

1	I N D E X				
2					
3	OPENING STATEMENT				
4	PAGE				
5	By Mr. Luoma 7				
6	By Ms. Woodruff 12				
7					
8	APPELLANT'S WITNESS: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS				
9	Bill Burger 15 33				
10					
11					
12	EXHIBITS				
13	(Appellant's Exhibits 1-16 were previously received at the prehearing conference)  (Respondent's Exhibits A-W were previously received at				
14					
15	the prehearing conference)				
16					
17					
18	CLOSING ARGUMENT				
19	PAGE				
20	By Mr. Luoma 37				
21	By Ms. Woodruff 40				
22					
23	FURTHER CLOSING ARGUMENT				
24	PAGE				
25	By Mr. Luoma 48				

1	Sacramento, California; Tuesday, May 24, 2022
2	1:02 p.m.
3	
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: We are on the
5	record for the Appeal of La Paloma Nevada Trust. This
6	matter is being held before the Office of Tax Appeals,
7	Case Number 18010922. Today is May 24, 2022, and it's
8	approximately 1:00 p.m. We're in Sacramento, California.
9	I'm the lead Administrative Law Judge Sara Hosey,
LO	and with me today are Judge Tommy Leung and Mike Le. All
11	three judges will meet after the hearing and produce a
L2	written decision as equal participants.
13	Can I have the parties please state their names
L4	for the record.
15	MR. LUOMA: My name is Todd Luoma, and I
L6	represent the Appellant.
L7	MR. BURGER: My name is Bill Burger.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Mr. Burger, is
L9	the light a green light on your
20	MR. BURGER: Maybe not. Now, it is. Thank you
21	for checking.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you.
23	MS. WOODRUFF: My name is Sonia Woodruff for
24	Respondent, Franchise Tax Board.
25	MS. KUDUK: Carolyn Kudok for Respondent,

1 Franchise Tax Board. 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Okay. 3 Thank you. 4 Today the issue before us is whether Appellant has met their burden of proof as to qualifying for a 5 tax-deferred treatment regarding the real property on La 6 Paloma Road in Los Altos, California pursuant to IRC 7 Section 1031-(a). This was agreed to in the prehearing 8 9 conference minutes and orders issued on September 8, 2021. 10 We also have a pending accuracy-related penalty 11 pursuant to our Revenue and Tax Code Section 19164. For the exhibits, we premarked 1-16 for 12 Appellant, and A through W for Respondent, FTB, at the 13 14 prehearing conference held on September 2, 2021. 15 objections -- no objections were raised by either party, and all exhibits were admitted into the record, as ordered 16 17 in the prehearing conference minutes and orders issued on September 8, 2021. 18 19 All right. 20 Mr. Luoma, would you start with your opening 21 statement please. 22 MR. LUOMA: I will. 23 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: You have ten 2.4 minutes. 25 ///

## OPENING STATEMENT

BY MR. LUOMA, Attorney for Appellant:

2.4

All right. Good afternoon, Panel Members. As I mentioned, I'm Todd Luoma. I represent the Appellant in this case.

This case, as explained, is a 1031 like-kind exchange case. And, while the law is fairly straightforward, it's the facts that are going to make a determination, really, in coming to the correct conclusion that this exchange was properly completed and qualified for tax-deferred treatment.

There are several players in this -- in this case. Bill Burger, who is going to testify -- he was trustor and the beneficiary; and then, there is the Trust, the La Paloma Nevada 2006 Trust. The --

I don't know if I keep fading in and out.

The Trust came in to existence in 2006. It ended its existence in 2017. That's why we do not have a Trustee. Because the Trustee was discharged when the property, the final property, which was one of the exchanged properties — the replacement properties — in Carson City, Nevada was sold by the Trust. And everything was distributed to the beneficiaries in accordance with the Trust. And so the Trust no longer exists. It is not a tax-paying entity anymore because it doesn't exist and

has no assets.

2.4

The Trust included the sale of properties, both replacement properties, which we'll go into in more detail in a bit or, at least during testimony. They were reported on federal tax returns when they were sold. The property in Sparks, Nevada was sold in 2010. And, again, the final property, the Carson City property, was sold in 2017.

The distribution from the Trust to the beneficiaries was included on the beneficiary's tax returns in 2017. Tax was paid both federal and California.

Another player in this game is the property itself, La Paloma Road in Los Altos. And it was acquired in 1998 by Mr. And Mrs. Burger. And they acquired it as bare land, but it was zoned for single-family home only.

So they acquired it for investment and had not yet decided whether they were going to let it ride as an investment in bare land and sell it later, or whether it would be appropriate to develop it. And that took years for them to make that decision.

Then, finally, it was sold in 2009. And, in that sale, the like-kind exchanges took place.

And then there was the -- the two replacement properties that are also players here. And that is the

Sparks property -- Sparks, Nevada, and the Carson City property. The Sparks replacement property was a multiunit residential building. The Carson City was a class A commercial building.

12.

2.4

And a couple other players in this were the Franchise Tax Board, certain Audit Units. One being the 1031 Unit, and one being the Residency Unit.

These two Units are probably the most aggressive of all Audit Units in the Franchise Tax Board. It's -- it's rare that it -- that a Residency Unit will let a taxpayer not be a resident of California if there's any connection.

And for 1031 Unit, I don't think there's ever been a 1031 exchange that was not audited in California. And that was the case here, of course.

And how does a Residency Unit come into play?

The Franchise Tax Board 1031 Unit took the position that

Mr. Burger and his wife, Patricia, lived in the property,

the La Paloma Road property, for three years; yet, the

Residency Unit of the Franchise Tax Board declined to

pursue a residency audit of the taxpayers.

And that should tell you at least one thing is that the assumptions made by the 1031 Unit that the tax -- that the individuals, beneficiaries, lived in the property was certainly questionable to arrive at that conclusion.

1031 -- in this case, all of the technical requirements for 1031 have been met. Properties were identified within 45 days; replacement properties were acquired within 180 days; and, where the issue really comes down to is, was this property either used in trade or business? And we admit that it was not. Or was it in -- for investment purposes?

And 1031 permits both of those.

And one of the issues that Franchise Tax Board has raised is whether or not this was held for sale and whether or not the property was used for personal purposes. And the testimony will describe those issues.

Mr. Burger or the Trust, even if you conflate the two, they were not in the business of buying bare land, developing it, and holding it for sale.

But the question is how does somebody who does an investment in bare land get -- get the investment out, or the gain, from such an investment? Well, you have to sell it. And if the decision is to develop that property, to maximize the recovery, and they maximize the recovery -- they -- they sold the property for \$7 million dollars and had a significant profit -- then, that doesn't violate any holding out for sale. Because that's the only way you can recover your investment in any property in any event. You have to sell it. You have to hold it out for sale.

But it's not a situation where Mr. Burger, or the Trust, is in the business of buying, developing and selling.

And, on the personal use, there's just allegations that they lived there for three years because the Franchise Tax Board could not understand why property that was completed for occupancy purposes in 2005 wasn't sold until 2009. Mr. Burger will testify to those things.

And one of the more important exhibits that you can review in this is Exhibit 5. And that was the reconstructed timeline by Mrs. Burger about when they were in -- at the property to do service to the property to prepare it for sale. And when they were traveling -- either in Africa, New York City, Wisconsin, where they were in Tahoe, Southern California, wherever they might be -- that all appears in Exhibit 5.

And you can see there's very little time spent at the property. Certainly, and that's likely, the reason why the Residency Unit did not pursue it as a residency question.

The testimony is going to show that the acquisition of the property was for investment purposes. They made the choice to develop it, sell it at a high return, and that they completed the exchanges, all in accordance with 1031.

1	So at the conclusion of the hearing, I think
2	you'll find that the taxpayer has met his burden or the
3	Trust has met its burden, even though it doesn't exist
4	anymore that the exchange qualified as like-kind and,
5	therefore, tax deferment.
6	Thank you.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Thank
8	you, Mr. Luoma.
9	Mrs. Woodruff, would you like an opening
10	statement?
11	
12	OPENING STATEMENT
13	BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:
14	MS. WOODRUFF: Good afternoon, Judge Hosey, and
15	members of the panel.
16	Can you hear me? Is this
17	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Oh no, little
18	closer. Sorry. A little closer.
19	MS. WOODRUFF: Okay.
20	Thank you for your time today. The as I said
21	earlier, my name is Sonia Woodruff, and I'm joined here by
22	my co-counsel, Carolyn Kuduk. Thank you for your time
23	today.
24	The question in this appeal is whether Appellant
25	has established it is entitled to defer gain from the sale

1 of California real property in 2009 under Internal Revenue 2. Code Section 1031. 3 (Reporter interrupted) 4 MS. WOODRUFF: Still too quite? Okay. 5 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Is the green --6 Is the green light on? 7 MS. WOODRUFF: The green light is on. Can you hear me now? 8 9 (Reporter interrupted) 10 MS. WOODRUFF: Okay. 11 So, the question in this appeal is whether Appellant has established it's entitled to defer gain from 12 13 the sale of California real property in 2009 under Internal Revenue Code Section 1031. 14 15 The Appellant in this case is an irrevocable trust, the La Paloma Nevada 2006 Trust. Mr. And Mrs. 16 17 Burger are both the Grantors and the primary 18 beneficiaries of the -- under the Trust. 19 The Trust attempted to engage in a like-kind 20 exchange under IRC Section 1031 in 2009, selling Los Altos 21 real property for two Nevada real properties. 22 Section 1031 exchanges can only be performed to 23 exchange property used in a trade or business or held for 2.4 investment purposes. Because Appellant's property was not

held for a trade or business, or for investment, the

25

1 exchange is not entitled to deferral treatment under IRC 2. Section 1031. The evidence shows the Trust was intended to hold 3 4 the residence for Grantor's use, enjoyment, and occupancy, rather than for making the Trust property productive. 5 The evidence also shows that Appellant never held 6 the house out for rent, that the Grantor beneficiaries 7 alleged in loan documents that they were staying at the 8 9 home, and that they occupied the residence while they were 10 in the Bay Area. 11 Under IRC Section 1031, the taxpayers were not 12 holding the property for investment; and, therefore, it's 13 not qualified for like-kind exchange treatment. 14 Thank you. 15 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Thank 16 you, Mrs. Woodruff. 17 Mr. Luoma, would you like to call Mr. Burger for 18 testimony? 19 MR. LUOMA: Yes, I would. 20 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. I'm going 21 to swear him in. And then FTB may have some question, and 22 then the judges might have some questions for you too. 23 Okay. 2.4 Please stand and raise your right hand.

25

///

1		BILL BURGER,
2	called as	s a witness on behalf of the Appellant, having
3	first be	en duly sworn by the Administrative Law Judge, was
4	examined	and testified as follows:
5		
6		MR. BURGER: I do.
7		ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you.
8		Please begin.
9		
10		DIRECT EXAMINATION
11	BY MR. LU	JOMA:
12	Q	Mr. Burger, for the for the record, could you
13	tell us v	who you are?
14	А	My name is Bill C. Burger.
15	Q	Are you a resident of California today?
16	A	No.
17	Q	Were you ever a resident of California?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	When were you a resident?
20	A	From 1976 to the year 2001.
21	Q	And did you move out of California, at that time,
22	in 2001?	
23	А	I did.
24	Q	Where did you move?
25	А	I moved to Nevada.

1 Do you own a home in Nevada? 0 2. Α I do. 3 When did you buy that home? 0 4 Α The year 2000. 5 Do you still live in that same home? 0 6 Α 7 After you left California, were you engaged in 0 any way by the Franchise Tax Board Residency Unit? 8 9 Α No. 10 Did they ever question your status about being a 0 11 Nevada resident after you left? 12 Α Never. 13 I'm going to ask you --I could add to that. I retired in 2001, and so 14 Α 15 there was no need for me to be here. I'm going to ask you a few questions about the La 16 17 Paloma Road property. When did you buy that? 18 Α 2098 -- excuse me. 1998. 19 Okay. In 1998 you bought that as Bill and 20 Patricia Burger? 21 Α Correct. 22 Why did you buy it? 0 23 Well, it was a property that had a great 2-plus Α 2.4 acre lot and cost structure looked appealing, i.e., it was 25 a good investment.

1 Was there a home on the property? 0 2 Α No. 3 Was it just bare land? 0 4 Α Yes. 5 And this is in Los Altos? 0 6 Α Correct. 7 Were there any limitations on the use of that 0 property, zoning-wise? 8 No. It was for single-family residence. 9 Α 10 0 Okay. So you couldn't -- could not, if you 11 wanted to, build a multi-residential unit on the property? 12 Not allowed in Los Altos Hills, to the best Α No. 13 of my knowledge, ever. 14 Now, you bought it as bare land. Had you thought 0 15 about selling it as bare land at some point? Yes. It could have certainly been sold as bare 16 Α 17 land. At that -- Sorry. 18 Go ahead. Go ahead. 19 No. I -- but, at the point we bought it, we Α 20 didn't have a plan. It just was a good deal, a good 21 investment, and I'd make a decision later on as to what to 2.2 do. 23 At some point, did you decide to improve the 24 property? We did. 25 Α

1	Q When was that?
2	A Probably 2003 is when we decided to that with it.
3	Q So you bought it in 1998, and 2003 it is when
4	you decided to develop it into a single-family home?
5	A Correct.
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: I'm sorry. Hey,
7	I'm getting a note. Mr. Burger, can you talk a little bit
8	closer to the mic?
9	MR. BURGER: Oh, okay.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Sorry. We're
11	having
12	MR. BURGER: I thought I was going good, but
13	<pre>I'm apparently, I'm not.</pre>
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: It's Okay. I
15	think it drifts in an out for some reason. Its
16	frustrating.
17	MR. BURGER: Yeah, well I'm trying not to move my
18	head, but
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: It's it's
20	okay. Thank you, you're doing a great job.
21	MR. BURGER: Alright, we'll do better.
22	MR. LUOMA: I know that mine fades in and out.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Yeah.
24	MR. LUOMA: So I apologize for that. Hopefully I
25	can project loud enough that you can at least hear it

1 take it down. 2. BY MR. LUOMA: 3 So in 2003, you decided to develop the property 0 as a single-family home; is that correct? 4 5 Α Correct. And what was -- what was the plan at that point? 6 7 You know, how were you going to develop it? What was it going to be? 8 Well, it was going to be a single-family 9 Α 10 residence of substantial scale because that lot allowed for that. And it was going to be built to the level of 11 whatever was possible with that land to increase its value 12 13 to the maximum. And we were permitted to build what we wanted to build by the city. And the result was that it 14 15 worked out very well. 16 Now, at the time -- well, let me ask you this. 17 How long did it take to build the property itself? 18 Α Well, we completed it in, I believe, May or so of 19 2005 -- about 18 months, as I recall, actually, to build 20 it. 21 0 And at that point, could you have sold the 22 property? 23 It was possible to sell because it did have an Α

occupancy permit. But, frankly, it was not -- sorry for

this sound -- it was not completed as a -- as a project by

24

25

any means. The raw home was completed, but there was a lot of work to still be done. Because it was a big house; 7,000-plus square feet; 5-car garage; and the whole 2 acres-plus was going to get landscaped and completed, which took years, quite frankly, at the pace we chose to go at it to finish it.

Q How long was the process for building the pool and all of its accourrements?

A We started that after we got occupancy sometime, months later, and it took two and a half years, approximately.

It was a slow process because it's a hillside lot. And we wanted to make sure we had the ability to get an infinity edge in the pool. And we had a spa. And we had a bunker where all the equipment went in so you wouldn't see it. And it was on two levels. And it was quite elaborate. It had huge rocks to create the hillside effect appropriately.

And, frankly, it took two and a half years, total, to get it done.

- Q And so that would have been sometime in 2007?
- A Yeah.

- Q What additional work was required to complete the project so that you could sell it?
  - A Well, again, two-and-a-quarter-plus acres is a

lot of land.

2.4

We had at least a quarter of a mile of fencing that we put in, rot iron fence with gates, and all of the -- the things that you would go with that. And we put in other columns and gates to protect the pool area from other occupancies coming in unnaturally. So that was an additional big project.

And put in lots of grass and lots of plants. And we put in a bocce ball court, after the pool, and things of that nature.

So the whole lot -- all of it, a hundred percent of it, was landscape.

- Q And did the property have a driveway from the base up to the top?
  - A Yes, it did. It was over 300 feet long.
- Q And were there any special electronics or anything else that had to be installed in the property?
- A Well, over the course of the time after the home was occupiable, we spent a lot of time adding things.

We had low-voltage people come in and put in security systems all the way down to the gates -- that you could turn things on, cameras, you name it. It was intended to be as complete a home, for the person who wanted protection with this home, as we could provide.

MR. LUOMA: And, for the panel, I direct your

1 attention to Exhibit 7, which is a series of photographs 2 of the property that shows the pool, the landscaping, the 3 -- the road, and the fencing up to -- for the property. 4 And that's all been admitted. 5 MR. BURGER: I mean, I can think of other things that we did. 6 7 We even had some of the walls faux-painted with a scene of the hillsides near us so that, if somebody 8 looking out of that particular lower bedroom, which had an 9 10 escape route out because it was underground on that side -- that was all painted, you know, so it looked like 11 12 you were looking out at the scenery that actually was out 13 there. 14 Stuff like that was part of our plan to really 15 make it as nice a home as we could. Now, after May of 2005, when the occupancy 16 17 certificate was provided by the -- the County Authority, 18 did you live at the property? 19 Α No. 20 Did you ever live at the property? Q 21 Α No. 22 Did you spend time at the property? 0 23 Α Yes. 2.4 What did you do at the property? 0 25 Worked on the things I just implied over the Α

1 course of time. Coordinating construction, coordinating 2 landscaping -- you name it, we did it. 3 Now, in 2006, the La Paloma Nevada 2006 Trust was 0 created. Do you recall that? 4 5 Α Yes. What was the purpose of that Trust? 6 0 7 The purpose of the Trust was to hold this Α 8 property in it. 9 And was the property transferred, in 2006, to the Q 10 Trust? 11 А Yes. Now, at that time, the occupancy certificate had 12 0 13 been issued, but the project had not been completed; is that right? 14 15 Α Correct. And did you continue to provide the -- whatever 16 service was required to complete the project as you had 17 18 envisioned it? 19 Yes, we did. Α 20 And after 2005, you did not live in the property; Q 21 correct? 22 Α Correct, did not. 23 Now, there was some question that was raised, 2.4 during the course of the audit, about the -- the hardwood 25 floors that were in the property.

And Franchise Tax took the position that, because you were having those replaced, it's because of your normal wear and tear of living in the house that required the hardwood to be replaced; is that correct?

A Well, we didn't replace any hardwood. But I'll explain why this has come up, maybe, for you?

Q Yeah. Please do.

A In that, we did resurface the -- the floors, the hardwood floors. And we resurfaced those several months just before we put it on the market to sell.

And the reason we did that was, when it was built, we built it with hickory hardwood, three-quarter-inch full wood. And, apparently, that wood was never properly dried.

It was -- we needed it, we needed it, and we needed it, and it we got it. And after the installation, a year later -- nine months -- we started getting cracks that were quite broad and wide and prevalent over the whole floor, all of it.

And we've had the people out more than once, we paid money for inspections, we tried to collect money from the people who supplied it, et cetera.

And we, ultimately, decided to just live with it until we were ready to actually complete a sale plan in place. Because, otherwise, if it got scratched somehow,

1 then we'd be unhappy. So I wanted to be perfect when we 2 actually put the home on the market. 3 So we were able to repair the wood by filling the 4 cracks and refinishing with the proper stain and then 5 clear coating and all that stuff that you do. During the course of the audit, there was also a 6 7 question about a Wells Fargo loan. There was a \$3 million loan and \$500,000 dollar line of credit. Do you recall 8 that? 10 Α Yes. 11 Why did you obtain the loan? 0 Because I could. 12 Α 13 And what -- what did you use the funds for? O 14 Α I used them for other investment purposes. 15 And those loans were secured by the La Paloma 0 16 Road property? 17 Α Correct. 18 Did you live in the home? Q 19 We -- we had a primary home in Nevada. Α 20 was very nice home. It was a big enough home to satisfy

I didn't have any reason to live in that house.

I was intent on finishing it to my standard, which is pretty strict, and then sell it when the time was right.

us and our children and grandchildren.

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

Q Perhaps you could explain to the panel what your background is and why you were so intense on getting it just right.

2.4

A Well, I've got engineering degrees, if that helps you. And I've been very particular all my life about things.

I've restored cars, I've restored antique motorcycles, I built an airplane that -- that flies, et cetera. And so, you know, that's just who I am.

By the way, my wife shares similar goals, so it worked out well.

Q Okay. Now, at what point, if you can recall, did you decide to sell the La Paloma property?

A Well, we -- we decided to sell it when we were finishing it, number one.

Number two, we weren't in a hurry to sell it because the market had tanked. If you know, 2007 and '8 were disaster years. And so I bid my time.

And once we got everything done -- well, or almost done -- we said, "Well, let's sell it this year." And that was 2019.

And so we started interviewing people that I knew for putting it on the market; hired two separate companies to -- to participate in the selling process; and then we started preparing the home, probably around April, for

getting it on the market, including figuring out who was 1 2 going to stage it and, you know, finishing up the last problems that the house had. There were several that we 3 4 spent money on in the -- in -- right up until June. 5 In fact, even in July, we were still fixing the -- I had the low-voltage people in fixing a security 6 7 system board failure, or something. So we kept at it until it was, really, perfect 8 9 and then put it on the market. 10 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Mr. Burger, I'm going to ask you again, just a little but closer. 11 12 I know. I'm sorry. 13 MR. BURGER: It's okay. 14 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: I think -- I 15 caught most of it, but I'm getting notes that's its 16 getting softer again. So --17 Yeah. Alright. MR. BURGER: 18 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you, so 19 I really appreciate it. much. 20 What -- What would you like me to MR. BURGER: 21 repeat? ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: I think I got 22 23 most of it. You could --2.4 MR. BURGER: I'm sorry for that. 25 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY:

1 Judge Leung? 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: I'm good. 3 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: You can hear? 4 Okay. 5 MR. BURGER: Thank you. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: I can hear it. 6 7 MR. BURGER: Sorry. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: 8 The eyes don't 9 work. 10 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. I think 11 we're okay. Just checking in. Thank you. 12 MR. BURGER: I'll start eating it. Maybe that'll 13 help. Okay. BY MR. LUOMA: 14 15 All right. At the -- at the point you were 0 16 preparing to sell it, the -- was there a time you decided 17 that you were going to look at selling it and doing a 18 like-kind exchange? 19 I'm sorry, I didn't understand the question. Α 20 When you were selling the property, did Okay. Q 21 you decide you were just going to take the gain on it and 22 pay tax on it? Or were you going to --23 А Oh, no. No. We wanted to do a 1031 exchange from the early days. 24 25 0 All right.

1	A	Concept.
2	Q	And you engaged a third party to provide
3	assistar	nce in
4		MR. BURGER: Mm-hmm.
5	Q	executing the 1031?
6	А	Right. A San Francisco company.
7	Q	For the replacement properties, those are the
8	properti	es in which you're taking the gain on and
9	acquirin	ng
10		MR. BURGER: Mm-hmm.
11	Q	Had you identified those properties within
12	45 days	of the sale of the La Paloma?
13	А	Yes, we did.
14	Q	And did you close on those properties within
15	180 days	3?
16	А	Yes.
17	Q	Could you describe the the nature of the
18	Sparks p	property?
19	А	Well, it's it was a multifamily unit, or
20	units, I	think, actually.
21	Q	Okay. So it was residential rental?
22	А	Yes. Definitely.
23	Q	And could you describe the Carson City property?
24	A	It is a two-story, 20,000-square-foot, class A
25	office k	ouilding.

1 And who were the tenants of the building? 0 2 I had, actually, during my tenure owning it, got Α 3 the State of Nevada Department of Business and Industry, 4 specifically, into that property. They took it over in 5 certain groups of time. But, overall, they -- they own -they had all of it. 6 7 Do you recall when the Sparks property was sold 0 8 by the Trust? 9 Α Not in detail. Sometime in 2010, I believe, you 10 said. That's my best recollection. 11 Did the Trust report the sale of the Sparks 0 12 property on it's tax returns? 13 Α Oh, yes. 14 Do you recall when the Carson City property was 0 15 sold? 16 Α 2017. 17 Now, Franchise Tax, at some point, has indicated 0 18 they thought it was sold in 2011? 19 Nope. I --Α 20 Do you know what happened in 2011? Q 21 Α I think it was transition between Nevada Trust, 22 you know, La Paloma Nevada Trust -- changing it out to 23 Bill and Patricia Burger, or the Burger Family Trust, 2.4 temporarily, for financing of the property. 25 And then it was put back.

1	Q	Did the lender require that it be transferred
2	from La 1	Paloma Trust?
3	А	I wouldn't have done it otherwise.
4	Q	And then after the financing was complete, or
5	refinanc	ing was complete, you returned the property to La
6	Paloma Ne	evada Trust 2006?
7	А	It did get returned.
8	Q	Right. And then in 2017, did the Trust sell the
9	property'	?
10	А	Correct.
11	Q	And was that the last asset within the Trust?
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	Did the Trust report the sale on its tax returns?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	And what happened to the proceeds of the Carson
16	City prop	perty sale that were held by the Trust?
17	А	They they were distributed to the parties that
18	were ent	itled to receive the funds from the Trust.
19	Q	Okay. Did that include you and Patricia?
20	А	It did.
21	Q	And did you report that distribution on your
22	returns?	
23	А	Absolutely.
24	Q	Both federal and California?
25	А	Sure did.

1	Q By going through the 1031 exchange process for
2	the La La Paloma Road property and acquiring property
3	in Nevada, did you, at any time, intend to evade paying
4	California tax?
5	A As required, absolutely.
6	Q You mean you paid California tax as required?
7	A Correct.
8	MR. LUOMA: Okay.
9	I have no further questions.
10	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Great. Thank
11	you, Mr. Luoma.
12	I'm going to see Franchise Mrs. Woodruff, do
13	you have any questions for Mr. Burger?
14	MS. WOODRUFF: I would I would like to ask him
15	just one or two questions, if that's all right.
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Yeah. Go ahead.
17	Thank you.
18	MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you. Can you hear me? Is
19	this sufficiently close?
20	(Reporter interrupted)
21	MS. WOODRUFF: Little bit closer. Okay. All
22	right.
23	(Reporter interrupted)
24	MS. WOODRUFF: Okay. All right.
25	///

1	CROSS-EXAMINATION
2	BY MS. WOODRUFF:
3	Q Mr. Burger, you testified that, during 2005
4	through 2009, you spent time at the the Los Altos
5	property; is that correct?
6	A It is correct. We did spend some time there.
7	And it was to work on the property and to make the
8	improvements that I described earlier.
9	Q Great. Thank you. And so, when you say that you
10	spent time there, did you stay overnight at the property?
11	A Sure.
12	Q Okay. Thank you. And while when you stayed
13	overnight at the property, did you have anyone else stay
14	at the property with you?
15	A No.
16	Q Okay. So Mrs. Burger did not stay at the
17	property?
18	A Mrs. Burger sometimes did because she did a lot
19	of work on that property in terms of the interior
20	decorating details, et cetera.
21	Q Okay. And did you ever have family or friends
22	visit you at the residence?
23	A You know what? No. We never even used the pool.
24	Period. In all those years, never. Okay?
25	MS. WOODRUFF: Okay. Thank you.

1	I don't have any further questions.
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Thank
3	you.
4	I'm going to see if my panel members have any
5	questions for you.
6	MR. BURGER: Thank you.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Let's start with
8	Judge Le. Do you have any questions for Mr. Burger?
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LE: This is Judge Le.
10	This is Judge Le.
11	No questions at this time.
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Thank
13	you. Judge Leung?
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: Yes, I do.
15	Thank you, Judge Hosey.
16	Good afternoon, Mr. Burger. You had testified
17	that you had bought the Trust property sometime in 1998
18	and that you had lived in California to about 2000, 2001
19	and retired at that time and moved up to Nevada; is that
20	correct?
21	MR. BURGER: I did.
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: Okay. In going
23	through some of the invoices that were submitted along
24	with your your last brief, I saw a number of invoices
25	from a place called Door Hardware I guess that's

1	hardware for your, you know, locks and stuff for your
2	doors and from a landscaping company called
3	Todd-something.
4	MR. BURGER: Yeah.
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: All in 2007 and
6	all related to your La Paloma Trust property. And the
7	invoices were addressed to you at an address called 101
8	First Street Suite 451. I believe that was Palo Alto.
9	Can you tell me what's at that address?
10	MR. BURGER: Yeah. A UPS mailbox.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: Ah.
12	MR. BURGER: We we always kept something to
13	have mail to go to all the time.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: Okay. When you
15	embarked on this purchase, later exchange, your Trustee
16	was a Mr. Bayless; is that correct?
17	MR. BURGER: Correct.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: And was it he
19	who advised you as to the best way to conduct this
20	transaction to maximize your gain and minimize your costs,
21	including taxes?
22	MR. BURGER: I don't know that I would say that.
23	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: Okay. Tell me
24	what exactly he advised you on.
25	MR. BURGER: I don't remember.

1	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: Those are my
2	questions. Thank you, sir.
3	Judge Hosey?
4	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you, judge
5	Leung.
6	I think that's all I have for you, Mr. Burger.
7	Mr. Luoma, did you have any other witnesses that
8	you wanted to call before we move forward with arguments?
9	MR. LUOMA: No. No additional witnesses because
10	we had narrowed the issue.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Yeah.
12	MR. LUOMA: And Mr. Burger can answer all the
13	questions on on those issues.
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Thank
15	you.
16	Thank you, Mr. Burger.
17	Mrs. Woodruff, did you FTB have any witnesses
18	to call?
19	MS. WOODRUFF: No witnesses.
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Then we
21	will move on to our closing arguments.
22	Mr. Luoma, you are up first. Are you ready to
23	begin your presentation?
24	MR. LUOMA: Yes.
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Let's go. Thank

you.

## 3 CLOSING ARGUMENT

BY MR. LUOMA, Attorney for Appellant:

All right. Basically, you know, this is -- as I indicated during the opening, that this is a fact-driven case because the -- you know, the technical issues of 1031 were all met: 45-day requirement; 180-day requirement; the question of whether it was property used in a trade or business, which we acknowledged was not the case; and/or whether it was used for investment.

And the testimony in this case, and all the exhibits that have been submitted, are all supportive of this being an investment.

You know, they acquired the property in 1998, didn't decide what to do with it -- they acquired it because it was a good investment. That it had -- it was bare land that either would appreciate on its own as bare land because it was in a desirable location -- they bought it in 1998, which was as -- as -- as you'll recall, the economy was recovering at that time from the 1993 crash of real property in California.

So it was on the upswing, but they -- they bought it at a good rate, and in a very desirable location. And then the decision was that they could best provide, or

recover -- make gain on a property by developing it.

2.4

And in accordance with the zoning requirements it had to be a single-family home in Los Altos hills. And so they didn't have the option of developing it in any other way, if they were going to develop it at all.

As it turns out, they invested significant amounts into developing the property, but they also had the single largest sale price in -- in the county, in 2009, at \$7 million.

And you heard Mr. Burger explain and -- and go into detail on the property and what was required to get it prepared for sale.

Even though occupancy was granted in May of 2010, it very well could have been sold at that time, but the profit level would have been significantly less. But going through the process, a two-year process, of putting the pool together; the landscaping, additional time for the landscaping; and the fencing; and the driveway.

And because, as Mr. Burger indicated, the 2007, 2008 crash in the market, you know, he wasn't in any hurry to sell the property. And he didn't need it to live in because he didn't live in it. He had property in Nevada that was his primary home for over 20 years.

And so the -- there was no need to sell the property until the timing was right.

And then, in 2009, properties were starting to recover; the economy was recovering. And Mr. Burger was coming to the conclusion of the -- finishing the property in the vision that he had in order to sell it. And he did so.

2.4

And so -- in addition, his testimony was he never lived at the property. Yes, he stayed overnight at the property, but he was there to make sure that the things got done -- either he was doing it, the contractors were doing it, and it was necessary for him to be present.

But, as you go through Exhibit 5, you'll see the number of days he actually spent at the property in 2007, 8, and 9, which is when the Franchise Tax Board said he was living there full time, which the Residency Unit declined to pursue.

And so, you know, I think there's a failure of facts on the part of the Franchise Tax Board. And I think all of the facts support the position that -- that -- that the Appellant has taken, and that Mr. Burger has taken, is that this was investment property, and it was sold for investment property. And it was properly exchanged into the Sparks and the Carson City property -- and that the sales of those property -- one in 2010 and the other in 2017 -- were all properly reported for tax purposes.

You know, if the Franchise Tax Board doesn't

it could have issued an NPA for 2010, an NPA for 2017.  But they've stuck with this issue of it being an unqualified 1031 exchange. And the facts support that this, in fact, was a proper exchange under 1031, that all the requirements were met, and that the tax should have been deferred.  Thank you.  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you,  Mr. Luoma.  Mrs. Woodruff, are you prepared for your closing argument?  MS. WOODRUFF: Yes, I am.  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Please begin. Thank you.  MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.  CLOSING ARGUMENT  BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property that's held	1	think that it got its share on the sale of the property,
unqualified 1031 exchange. And the facts support that this, in fact, was a proper exchange under 1031, that all the requirements were met, and that the tax should have been deferred.  Thank you.  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you,  Mr. Luoma.  Mrs. Woodruff, are you prepared for your closing argument?  MS. WOODRUFF: Yes, I am. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Please begin. Thank you.  MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.  CLOSING ARGUMENT  BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	2	it could have issued an NPA for 2010, an NPA for 2017.
this, in fact, was a proper exchange under 1031, that all the requirements were met, and that the tax should have been deferred.  Thank you. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you,  Mr. Luoma.  Mrs. Woodruff, are you prepared for your closing argument?  MS. WOODRUFF: Yes, I am. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Please begin. Thank you.  MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.  CLOSING ARGUMENT  BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	3	But they've stuck with this issue of it being an
the requirements were met, and that the tax should have been deferred.  Thank you.  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you,  Mr. Luoma.  Mrs. Woodruff, are you prepared for your closing argument?  MS. WOODRUFF: Yes, I am. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Please begin. Thank you.  MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.  MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.  Trespondent:  CLOSING ARGUMENT  BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	4	unqualified 1031 exchange. And the facts support that
7 been deferred. 8 Thank you. 9 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you, 10 Mr. Luoma. 11 Mrs. Woodruff, are you prepared for your closing 12 argument? 13 MS. WOODRUFF: Yes, I am. 14 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Please 15 begin. Thank you. 16 MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you. 17 18 CLOSING ARGUMENT 19 BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent: 20 IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains 21 realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	5	this, in fact, was a proper exchange under 1031, that all
Thank you.  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you,  Mr. Luoma.  Mrs. Woodruff, are you prepared for your closing argument?  MS. WOODRUFF: Yes, I am.  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Please begin. Thank you.  MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.  CLOSING ARGUMENT  BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	6	the requirements were met, and that the tax should have
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you,  Mr. Luoma.  Mrs. Woodruff, are you prepared for your closing  argument?  Ms. WOODRUFF: Yes, I am.  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Please  begin. Thank you.  Ms. WOODRUFF: Thank you.  CLOSING ARGUMENT  BY Ms. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains  realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	7	been deferred.
Mr. Luoma.  Mrs. Woodruff, are you prepared for your closing argument?  Ms. WOODRUFF: Yes, I am.  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Please begin. Thank you.  Ms. WOODRUFF: Thank you.  CLOSING ARGUMENT  BY Ms. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	8	Thank you.
Mrs. Woodruff, are you prepared for your closing argument?  MS. WOODRUFF: Yes, I am.  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Please begin. Thank you.  MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.  CLOSING ARGUMENT  BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you,
argument?  MS. WOODRUFF: Yes, I am.  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Please begin. Thank you.  MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.  CLOSING ARGUMENT  BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	10	Mr. Luoma.
MS. WOODRUFF: Yes, I am.  ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Please begin. Thank you.  MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.  CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	11	Mrs. Woodruff, are you prepared for your closing
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Please begin. Thank you.  MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.  CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	12	argument?
begin. Thank you.  MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.  CLOSING ARGUMENT  BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains  realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	13	MS. WOODRUFF: Yes, I am.
MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.  CLOSING ARGUMENT  BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains  realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Please
17  18 CLOSING ARGUMENT  19 BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  20 IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains  21 realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	15	begin. Thank you.
CLOSING ARGUMENT  BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains  realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	16	MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.
BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:  IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	17	
IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	18	CLOSING ARGUMENT
realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property	19	BY MS. WOODRUFF, Attorney for Respondent:
	20	IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains
22 that's held	21	realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property
	22	that's held
(Reporter interrupted)	23	(Reporter interrupted)
MS. WOODRUFF: Okay. I'm sorry. How's this?	24	MS. WOODRUFF: Okay. I'm sorry. How's this?
(Reporter interrupted)	25	(Reporter interrupted)

MS. WOODRUFF: Much better? Okay.

2.4

So IRC Section 1031 permits taxpayers to defer gains realized on the exchanges of like-kind real property that's held for productive use in a trade or business or for investment. The taxpayers acknowledge that the property was not used in a trade or business.

And so the question is whether the property was held for investment within the meaning of the statute.

In this case, because Appellant did not rent the property out, and because they personally used the residence, the property was not held for investment, under the strict definition of that term, for purposes of Section 1031.

And at the outset, here, I just want to note that this is not a residency appeal. We are not questioning whether Appellant lived in California for purposes of taxing him as a resident. So it's a very different standard and a very different look at the facts.

The Appellant in this case is the fiduciary on behalf of the La Paloma Nevada 2006 Trust. And, even though the Appellant is actually the Trust, you've heard testimony and argument relating mostly to the activities of the Grantors and beneficiaries of the Trust, Mr. And Mrs. Burger.

According to their statements, they created the

Trust in 2006 to hold a property located at 13193 La

Paloma Road in Los Altos, California. And according to

public records, they purchased the property in 1998 as an

empty lot. And in 2003, they began construction on a home

on the property.

According to the Town of Los Altos building inspection records, the Grantors completed construction in 2005. And, in that year, they individually obtained a \$3 million loan from Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, secured by the property, as well as a \$500,000 revolving line of credit, from -- also from Wells Fargo.

In order to obtain these loans, the Trustee transferred the Los Altos property out of the Trust and back to the Grantors. The security instruments for the loans required that the borrowers reside in the property and included a statement that the borrowers agreed to notify the bank immediately if ceasing to live in the property as the primary residence.

In 2006, the Grantors obtained homeowners insurance for the Los Altos property and listed their move-in date as January 1, 2006. The Grantors continued to occupy the home, periodically, from the time of completion until they ultimately sold the home in 2009.

Now, the Grantors take the position that they primarily occupied the home to oversee the swimming pool

construction and landscaping. But the pool was completed by April of 2007. The remaining work on the home, they maintained, was only landscaping, which left the main house free to be occupied.

2.4

The La Paloma Trust instrument provided that, in fulfilling the purposes of the Trust, the Trustee should hold and administrator the Trust property for the liberal use and enjoyment of the Grantors and other beneficiaries free from rent or other charges.

Under Section 6.8 of the Trust, the primary beneficiary has the sole right to the use, possession, and enjoyment of the real property, held by the Trust. The Grantors had the express right to use the property as a residence or second residence without rent. The Trustees were specifically authorized to hold any residential real property for the use and benefit of the beneficiaries.

Now, these provisions indicate an intent by the Grantors to leave the property free for their personal use. The language of the Trust instrument reflects the Grantors' intent to be able to use or occupy the residence if they so desired. And to that effect, they specifically empowered the Trustee to hold the property for their use or enjoyment.

Now, trust instruments -- (Reporter interrupted)

MS. WOODRUFF: Oh, sure. Yes. I'm sorry. Okay.

So in many cases, trust instruments can, and state laws do, require that a Trustee seek to make the Trust property productive. But these Grantors specifically authorized the Trustee to hold the residence for their own personal use.

2.4

The language of the instrument grants the beneficiaries the sole right to the use, possession, and enjoyment of the Trust property. So if the beneficiaries were the only parties with the right to occupy the residence, the Trustee could not even hold it out for rent if they determined it would be the best and most productive use of the property.

Now, Appellant has argued in the briefs that this trust language is simply boilerplate. But a trust instrument reflects the intent of the Grantors and provides instructions that a Trustee must carry out.

And the fact that lawyers can often use trust templates or drafting software doesn't mean the language of the instrument can be ignored or disregarded when it's inconvenient. On the contrary, the words in a trust instrument are to be given their ordinary and grammatical meaning.

The words "use and enjoyment" suggests application of the property for the donee's personal

benefit and consumption. The Grantors employed this language to direct the Trustee to apply the Trust property very specifically for their personal comfort and enjoyment, rather than for the production of income.

Under Section 1031, investment intent must be the primary motive of the taxpayer in holding the property.

And personal use of the property as a residence is antithetical to its being held for investment.

In Moore v Commissioner -- and that was a Tax

Court memorandum decision cited in Respondent's

briefing -- the taxpayers owned a second home. They used

the home for recreational purposes on several weekends out

of the year. But when the taxpayers moved their primary

residence farther away from the second home, they stopped

using it as a vacation home, and taxpayer visited the

property for purposes of only maintaining the home. The

taxpayers attempted to exchange that property for a

second -- another recreational home and exclude the gain

under Section 1031.

According to the taxpayers in Moore, the existence of any investment motive in holding a personal residence would render the property eligible for non-recognition treatment under Section 1031. And the Tax Court disagreed with that logic finding it is a taxpayer's primary purpose in holding the properties that counts.

The Court continued to state that exclusive use of property by the owner as a vacation residence, really, contradicts any claim by him that the property is held for investment.

2.4

There is no evidence that the taxpayers attempted to make the property produce income, but there was evidence they used it occasionally as a second residence.

The Tax Court summarized its position that the taxpayers would have us believe that they used the house only as a caretaker's cottage while expecting the -- while awaiting the expected appreciation in the value of the property as a whole.

And the Court rejected the like-kind exchange because the taxpayers were not holding the property for investment under the definition of the statute.

Now, Appellant has referenced Revenue Procedure 2008-16, and so I want to address that piece of IRS guidance. The Rev. Proc. provides a safe harbor exception to the rule in Moore for taxpayers who are also renting out their property to others but also have some personal use of the residence.

And in those cases, meeting certain criteria, the IRS has stated that they will not challenge the property as not being held for investment. But the critical requirement there is that the taxpayers actually hold the

property out for rent at a fair rental rate during the two-year period directly preceding the exchange.

2.4

Those are not the facts here. Appellant cannot claim the safe harbor because the property was never rented out and all of the available evidence. And Appellant's own admission, shows the Trust was never intended hold the property out for rent.

The available documents in the record support this intention, such as the loan documents indicating the Appellants were residing in the property, the homeowners insurance referencing a move-in date, and the Trust agreement reflecting the Grantor's intention to occupy or personally use the residence.

So it's important to note that, under the Moore case, the mere hope or expectation that the property may be sold at a gain at some point, cannot establish an investment intent if the property used -- if property was used as a residence by the taxpayers.

Under the case law and the previously cited Rev. Proc., there either needs to be no personal use of the property or some personal use, along with holding the property out for rent, in order for it to be considered investment property under Section 1031.

I also want to address the new amended 2017 return Appellants filed in June of 2020, after the filing

1	of this appeal. That amended return reflects that			
2	Appellants ultimately did sell one of the Nevada			
3	properties for a gain in 2017, but that they had net			
4	operating losses available to offset that gain in 2017.			
5	And Respondent's position is that the exchange			
6	failed to qualify in tax year 2009. And so the that			
7	gain cannot be deferred and recognized later, in in			
8	year 2017 or or any other year.			
9	Appellant has not met its burden of proving they			
10	satisfied the investment purpose requirement of Section			
11	1031 in 2009. Appellant has also failed to supply any			
12	details or support to allow for abatement of the penalty.			
13	Accordingly, Respondent's assessment should be			
14	upheld.			
15	Thank you.			
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you,			
17	Mrs. Woodruff.			
18	Mr. Luoma, you have five minutes for a final			
19	statement, if you would like to that now.			
20	MR. LUOMA: I would.			
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Please begin.			
22				
23	FURTHER CLOSING ARGUMENT			
24	BY MR. LUOMA, Attorney for Appellant:			
25	Under 1031, property is not required to be rented			

in order to qualify for investment property.

As Mr. Burger testified, he could have just left it bare and it would have been investment property. But Franchise Tax Board is saying, "Well that now that you've built something on it, it now has to be rented," even though, arguably, you don't need to rent bare land in order to qualify for investment property. So 1031 doesn't require that there's any rent being done at all.

And I'd like to point out, again, Exhibit 5 goes into the details of the amount of time that was spent at the property.

In calendar year 2007 there are 52 days that either Mr. Burger or Patricia Burger were at the property to do business in getting the property constructed and improved, ultimately, for the sale.

And in calendar year 2008, there were 40 days in which they spent time at the property. In calendar 2009 -- that's only half a calendar year since it was sold in July -- they spent 36 days. And those were for the final tweaks to the property.

So, to take the position that the Burgers lived in the property for three years is really an overreach.

And they have a property that they lived at, that

Mr. Burger testified to, in Nevada. That was their primary residence.

But in order to get the property finally constructed to the point where it satisfied his views on what the property should look like in order to sell it at \$7 million dollars and have a gain of 3 to \$4 million dollars on that, that was significantly better of an investment with the property developed.

And so, when you look at the numbers based on Exhibit 5 -- that's the reconstructed timeline -- it demonstrates that the taxpayers were not living there. It wasn't for their personal use. And the Exhibit also indicates the activities that were taking place during the time that they were at the properties.

So I urge you to take a look at Exhibit 5. I urge you take a look at my final brief, where it lays out those details. And you'll find, and you should conclude, that the transaction qualified for tax-deferred like-kind exchange under Section 1031 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Thank you.

2.4

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you, Mr. Luoma.

I'm going to see if my panel members have any questions before we close.

Let's start with Judge Le.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LE: Yes, I have a few questions.

1	First, for Appellant, was the house furnished?				
2	The house at La Paloma property?				
3	MR. LUOMA: It was not furnished, but it was				
4	staged at the end staged in order to make it appear				
5	livable.				
6	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LE: Okay.				
7	MR. LUOMA: That's that's what real estate				
8	agents do.				
9	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LE: Okay. And Exhibit 7 is				
10	pictures of the property staged? Not for				
11	MR. LUOMA: Exhibit 7 has photographs of the				
12	of the property. That's correct.				
13	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LE: Okay. Thank you.				
14	I have a question for the Franchise Tax Board.				
15	MS. WOODRUFF: Yes.				
16	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LE: Appellant argues				
17	that the FTB Residency Unit determined that the Burgers				
18	were not residents of California. Can you confirm whether				
19	or not the FTB Residency Unit actually determined that?				
20	MS. WOODRUFF: Well, I don't believe there was				
21	ever a residency audit performed. That's not my				
22	understanding. They may have looked at it. I'm not				
23	entirely sure. But there was definitely no determination				
24	letter issued regarding an audit based on residency.				
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LE: Okay. Thank you.				

1 No further questions. 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Thank you, Judge 3 Le. 4 Let's moved to Judge Leung. Do you have any 5 questions? ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: Yes, I do. 6 7 Thank you, Judge Hosey. I'll start with Ms. Woodruff, first. I'd like 8 you to follow up on what Mr. Luoma argued -- that if the 9 10 Burgers had not stayed a day at all at the property, it 11 would qualify for 1031 treatment. Is that a correct 12 statement? 13 MS. WOODRUFF: I don't believe so. With all of 14 the evidence that we have available to us, we can see 15 evidence of what the -- the Grantors' intention was when 16 they were forming the Trust and placing the property into 17 trust. 18 And, you know, between the loan documents, the 19 Trust instrument, the home owner's insurance, and the fact 20 that they stayed there, all of the evidence seems to show 21 that there was an intention to use and occupy the 2.2 residence. 23 So it's -- it's not just the one factor. 2.4 really is all of the evidence weighed together.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: Mr. Luoma, would

25

1 you agree with that? 2 MR. LUOMA: No, I disagree. 3 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: Okav. And --4 and do you have any citations that would just -- would say 5 that, if the Burgers had never stayed at the property at all, that they would qualify for 1031? 6 7 MR. LUOMA: I can't draw a case at this time, but, absolutely. 8 9 1031, you know -- Franchise Tax Board is looking 10 at this as -- as too narrow, you know. 11 Let's say the Burgers never developed it, but 12 they never rented out the bare land, you know, for 13 whatever purpose. And under their argument, that wouldn't 14 qualify for a 1031 exchange, even though the testimony 15 that was provided to you today, under oath, was that they bought the property with the intent to invest because it 16 17 was -- it was a good property that had the ability to 18 appreciate, either as a bare land or developed into a 19 single-family home. 20 And so let's say they developed it into a 21 single-family home and never stayed on the property; yes, they would still qualify -- that would qualify as a 1031 22 23 exchange.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: Mm-hmm.

2.4

25

And Ms. Woodruff, I believe you said the test was

1 primary intent.

2.4

MS. WOODRUFF: Correct.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: So how much is primary?

MS. WOODRUFF: Well, I don't know that there is a definition of primary. But I think it means the first, or the most important, motive.

And just to follow-up on something that Mr. Luoma said, I don't think it's correct that if this was a -- a plot of land, an undeveloped piece of land, we would consider this to be not held for investment. That would be a completely different situation.

In that case, there wouldn't have been any residents on the property, any ability to stay there, or use the property as a second residence.

And so I think that would be a different situation. It might be more likely to be held for investment in that case.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: Okay. And something that you mentioned in your closing -- you talked about the Moore case and the IRS procedure in 2008 -- about the Moores, and the taxpayers, and the IRS procedure, owning property and living in it themselves, and later on changing their minds, and so forth, so on.

In this case, the taxpayers are not the Burgers.

1 It's the Appellants. And the individuals or persons
2 living in -- on the property were the Burgers and not the
3 Trust.

Is there -- is there a distinction or a difference? Or what do you say about that?

2.4

MS. WOODRUFF: Are you referring to the fact that the Appellant is actually the Trust -- Trustee on behalf of the Trust?

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: The Trust is the Appellant; correct?

MS. WOODRUFF: Right. Yeah. Well, I think, in this case, there really isn't much of a distinction. The Trust was a Grantor Trust, which means it's taxed for income purposes as if its disregarded for -- for income tax purposes.

You can file a separate trust tax return, as they did in this case. But if you look at the Trust, it was a Grantor Trust. The Grantors transferred property in, and back out, of the properties. There's a lot of just, you know, treating the Trust as if it were not really not an entity.

And so I don't think it matters too much in this case to look to whether, you know, the Trustee or the Grantors actually lived in the property.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: Okay.

Mr. Luoma, your comment, if any?

MR. LUOMA: I raise that issue in one of my briefs about the Franchise Tax Board conflating the two separate and distinct taxpayers. The Trust is a separate and distinct taxpayer and, frankly, it no longer exists, no longer has assets.

No matter what the panel decides, I guess there's going to be a question about what happens to the tax liability if Franchise Tax Board is successful?

Anyway, I guess that's really a non-issue that you're going to have to deal with. But they conflated the two separate entities, taxpayers.

And our position all along has been that the individuals, the beneficiaries, were not living in the property. They were there to ensure that it was constructed in accordance with Mr. Burgers vision of what that property could be.

And again, they spent minimal amount of time in the property in 2007, 8, and 9, as I lay out in my final brief: You know, 40 days in 2007; 36 days in -- sorry -- 40 days in 2008; 36 days in 2009; and --

MR. BURGER: Five, two?

MR. LUOMA: Yeah. 52 days in the -- in 2007.

So Franchise Tax is trying to collapse everything and say, "Well, they were there; therefore, that negates

1 the fact that they could sell that property for \$7 million 2 and get a gain of 3 to \$4 million." And somehow that --3 that no longer is an investment, even though that's the 4 way it started, and that's how the individuals decided to 5 develop the property because that could maximize the gain that they would get out of this thing. 6 7 And so I think the -- the Trust is the taxpayer at issue here. The individuals, essentially, acting on 8 9 behalf of the Trust, were ensuring the Trust could 10 maximize the gain. 11 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: 12 MR. LUOMA: I don't know if that answered your 13 question, or if I got two far into the weeds. 14 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LEUNG: Thank you, 15 Mr. Luoma. Thank you, Ms. Woodruff. 16 Judge Hosey, I'm done. 17 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Thank 18 you, Judge Leung. 19 If there's -- do you have any other questions 20 before we close for the afternoon? 21 Can you hear me? 22 Any questions, Mr. Luoma? 23 No, I have no further questions. MR. LUOMA: 2.4 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Mrs. Woodruff? 25 MS. WOODRUFF: No questions.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE HOSEY: Okay. Then we 2 are ready to submit the case today. The record is now 3 closed. 4 This concludes our hearing for today, and the 5 panel will meet and decided the case, based on the 6 documents and arguments presented. We will aim to send 7 both parties our written decision no later than 100 days 8 from today. Thank you for coming in today. The hearing is 9 10 now adjourned. The next one is tomorrow at 9:30 a.m. 11 Thank you. 12 MR. LUOMA: Thank you. 13 MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you. 14 MR. BURGER: Thank you. 15 (Proceedings concluded at 2:15 p.m.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION			
2				
3	I, the undersigned, a Registered			
4	Professional Reporter of the State of California, do			
5	hereby certify:			
6	That the foregoing proceedings were taken before			
7	me at the time and place herein set forth; that any			
8	witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to			
9	testifying, were duly sworn; that a record of the			
10	proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand, which			
11	was thereafter transcribed under my direction; that the			
12	foregoing transcript is a true record of the testimony			
13	given.			
14	Further, that if the foregoing pertains to the			
15	original transcript of a deposition in a federal case,			
16	before completion of the proceedings, review of the			
17	transcript [] was [x] was not requested.			
18	I further certify I am neither financially			
19	interested in the action nor a relative or employee of any			
20	attorney or party to this action.			
21	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed			
22	my name.  Sarah Tuman			
23	Dated: June 14, 2022			
24				

Index: \$3..activities

<b>\$</b>	<b>1:02</b> 2:18 5:2	<b>2022</b> 2:19 5:1,7	8
	2	<b>2098</b> 16:18	
<b>\$3</b> 25:7 42:9		<b>24</b> 2:19 5:1,7	<b>8</b> 6:9,18 26:17 39:13 56:19
<b>\$4</b> 50:4 57:2	<b>2</b> 6:14 20:3	<b>2:15</b> 2:19 58:15	39.10 30.19
<b>\$500,000</b> 25:8 42:10	<b>2-plus</b> 16:23 <b>20</b> 38:23	3	9
<b>\$7</b> 10:21 38:9 50:4 57:1	20,000-square-	<b>3</b> 50:4 57:2	<b>9</b> 39:13 56:19
	foot 29:24	<b>300</b> 21:15	<b>9:30</b> 58:10
1	<b>2000</b> 16:4 34:18	<b>33</b> 4:9	Α
<b>1</b> 42:21	<b>2001</b> 15:20,22 16:14 34:18	<b>36</b> 49:19 56:20,21	
<b>1-16</b> 4:13 6:12	<b>2003</b> 18:2,3 19:3 42:4	<b>37</b> 4:20	<b>A-W</b> 4:14 <b>a.m.</b> 58:10
<b>100</b> 58:7	<b>2005</b> 11:7 19:19	4	abatement 48:12
<b>101</b> 35:7 <b>1031</b> 7:6 9:7,13,	22:16 23:20 33:3 42:8	<b>40</b> 4:21 49:16	<b>ability</b> 20:13 53:17 54:14
14,17,23 10:1,2,8 11:25 13:2,14,20,	<b>2006</b> 7:15,17 13:16 23:3,9 31:6	56:20,21 <b>400</b> 2:17	absolutely 31:23
22 14:2,11 28:23 29:5 32:1 37:7	41:20 42:1,19,21	<b>45</b> 10:3 29:12	32:5 53:8 accordance 7:23
40:4,5,20 41:2,13 45:5,19,23 47:23	<b>2007</b> 20:21 26:17 35:5 38:19 39:12	<b>45-day</b> 37:8	11:25 38:2 56:16
48:11,25 49:7 50:17 52:11 53:6,	43:2 49:12 56:19, 20,23	<b>451</b> 35:8 <b>48</b> 4:25	accoutrements 20:8
9,14,22	<b>2008</b> 38:20 49:16		accuracy-related
<b>1031-(a)</b> 6:8	54:21 56:21	5	6:10
<b>12</b> 4:6	<b>2008-16</b> 46:17	<b>5</b> 11:10,16 39:11	acknowledge 41:5
<b>13193</b> 42:1 <b>15</b> 4:9	<b>2009</b> 8:22 11:8 13:1,13,20 33:4	49:9 50:8,13	acknowledged
<b>18</b> 19:19	38:9 39:1 42:23 48:6,11 49:18	<b>5-car</b> 20:3	37:10
<b>180</b> 10:4 29:15	56:21	<b>52</b> 49:12 56:23	<b>acquired</b> 8:14,15, 17 10:4 37:15,16
<b>180-day</b> 37:8	<b>2010</b> 8:6 30:9 38:13 39:23 40:2	6	<b>acquiring</b> 29:9 32:2
<b>18010922</b> 2:6 5:7	<b>2011</b> 30:18,20	<b>6.8</b> 43:10	acquisition 11:22
<b>19164</b> 6:11	<b>2017</b> 7:18 8:8,11		acre 16:24
<b>1976</b> 15:20	30:16 31:8 39:24 40:2 47:24 48:3,4,	7	acres 20:25
<b>1993</b> 37:21	8	<b>7</b> 4:5 22:1 51:9,11	acres-plus 20:4
<b>1998</b> 8:15 16:18,	<b>2019</b> 26:21	<b>7,000-plus</b> 20:3	acting 57:8
19 18:3 34:17 37:15,20 42:3	<b>2020</b> 47:25	1,000-pius 20.3	activities 41:22
<b>1:00</b> 5:8	<b>2021</b> 6:9,14,18		50:11

Index: add..beneficiary's

add 16:14 aim 58:6 47:3 48:9,11,24 **audit** 9:6,9,21 51:1,16 55:7,10 23:24 25:6 51:21, airplane 26:8 adding 21:19 24 appellant's 4:8, addition 39:6 **ALJ** 3:3,5 13 13:24 47:6 audited 9:14 additional 20:23 allegations 11:5 **Appellants** Authority 22:17 21:7 36:9 38:17 alleged 14:8 47:10,25 48:2 authorized 43:15 address 35:7,9 55:1 allowed 17:12 44:5 46:17 47:24 application 44:25 19:10 awaiting 46:11 addressed 35:7 Alright 18:21 apply 45:2 adjourned 58:10 27:17 appreciation В Administrative **Alto** 35:8 46:11 5:4.9.18.22 6:2.23 back 30:25 42:14 appropriately Altos 6:7 8:14 12:7,17 13:5 55:19 13:20 17:5,12 20:18 14:15,20 15:3,7 33:4 38:3 42:2,6, background 26:2 18:6,10,14,19,23 approximately 13,20 5:8 20:11 27:10,14,18,22,25 **ball** 21:9 28:2,3,6,8,10 amended 47:24 April 26:25 43:2 bank 42:17 32:10,16 34:2,7,9, 48:1 12,14,22 35:5,11, area 14:10 21:5 **bare** 8:16,19 **amount** 49:10 14,18,23 36:1,4, 10:14,17 17:3,14, 56:18 arguably 49:6 11,14,20,25 40:9, 15,16 37:18 49:3, 14 48:16,21 amounts 38:7 argued 44:14 6 53:12,18 50:19,24 51:6,9, 52:9 and/or 37:10 base 21:14 13,16,25 52:2,6, argues 51:16 25 53:3,24 54:3, antique 26:7 based 50:7 51:24 19 55:9,25 57:11, argument 4:18,23 58:5 antithetical 45:8 14,17,24 58:1 37:3 40:12,18 Basically 37:5 anymore 7:25 41:22 48:23 53:13 administrator 12:4 **Bay** 14:10 43:7 arguments 36:8, 21 58:6 apologize 18:24 Bayless 35:16 admission 47:6 arrive 9:25 apparently 18:13 bedroom 22:9 admit 10:6 24:13 assessment began 42:4 admitted 6:16 48:13 appeal 2:5 5:5 22:4 begin 15:8 36:23 12:24 13:11 41:15 asset 31:11 40:15 48:21 advised 35:19,24 48:1 assets 8:1 56:6 behalf 15:2 41:20 Africa 11:14 appealing 16:24 55:7 57:9 assistance 29:3 afternoon 7:3 **Appeals** 2:1 5:6 beneficiaries 12:14 34:16 57:20 assumptions **APPEARANCES** 7:23 8:10 9:24 9:23 agents 51:8 3:1 13:18 14:7 41:23 attempted 13:19 43:8,16 44:8,9 aggressive 9:8 appears 11:16 45:17 46:5 56:14 **agree** 53:1 Appellant 2:7 3:7 attention 22:1 beneficiary 7:14 5:16 6:4.13 7:2.4 agreed 6:8 42:16 43:11 12:24 13:12,15 Attorney 7:2 agreement 47:12 14:6 15:2 37:4 12:13 37:4 40:19 beneficiary's 39:19 41:9,16,19, 48:24 8:10 ahead 17:18 21 44:14 46:16 32:16

benefit 43:16 45:1 30:23 32:13 33:3, 41:9,19 47:15,19 collapse 56:24 16,18 34:6,8,16, 53:7 54:13,18,21, **bid** 26:18 collect 24:21 21 35:4,10,12,17, 25 55:12,17,23 big 20:2 21:7 22,25 36:6,12,16 58:2.5 columns 21:5 25:20 38:10,19 39:2,19 cases 44:2 46:22 comfort 45:3 41:24 49:2,13,24 **Bill** 4:9 5:17 7:13 56:22 58:14 caught 27:15 commencing 15:1,14 16:19 2:18 Burgers 49:21 ceasing 42:17 30:23 51:17 52:10 53:5, comment 56:1 certificate 22:17 **bit** 8:4 18:7 32:21 11 54:25 55:2 23:12 commercial 9:4 56:16 **board** 3:10 5:24 6:1 9:6,9,17,20 cetera 24:22 26:9 Commissioner **business** 10:6,14 10:9 11:6 16:8 33:20 45:9 11:2 13:23,25 27:7 39:13,17,25 companies 26:23 30:3 37:10 41:4,6 challenge 46:23 49:4 51:14 53:9 49:14 56:3,9 changing 30:22 company 29:6 **buy** 16:3,17,22 54:24 35:2 **bocce** 21:9 **buying** 10:14 11:2 charges 43:9 complete 20:23 boilerplate 44:15 21:23 23:17 24:24 checking 5:21 borrowers 42:15, 31:4,5 C 28:11 16 completed 7:10 children 25:21 **bought** 16:19 11:7,24 19:18,25 calendar 49:12, 17:14,19 18:3 **choice** 11:23 20:1,4 23:13 42:7 16,17,18 34:17 37:19,23 43:1 **chose** 20:5 California 2:2,17 53:16 3:9 5:1,8 6:7 8:12 completely 54:12 citations 53:4 briefing 45:11 9:11,14 11:15 completion cited 45:10 47:19 13:1,13 15:15,17, briefs 44:14 56:3 42:23 21 16:7 31:24 city 7:22 8:7 9:1,3 **broad** 24:18 Concept 29:1 32:4,6 34:18 11:14 19:14 29:23 37:22 41:16 42:2 **build** 17:11 19:13, 30:14 31:16 39:22 conclude 50:15 51:18 14,17,19 claim 46:3 47:4 concluded 58:15 call 14:17 36:8,18 building 9:3,4 class 9:3 29:24 concludes 58:4 20:7 29:25 30:1 called 15:2 34:25 42.6 concluding 2:18 35:2,7 clear 25:5 **built** 19:11 24:12 cameras 21:22 close 29:14 32:19 conclusion 7:9 26:8 49:5 9:25 12:1 39:3 50:22 57:20 caretaker's 46:10 **bunker** 20:15 closed 58:3 conduct 35:19 Carolyn 3:11 5:25 burden 6:5 12:2,3 12:22 **closer** 12:18 18:8 conference 4:13, 48:9 27:11 32:21 15 6:9,14,17 carry 44:17 Burger 4:9 5:17, **closing** 4:18,23 confirm 51:18 cars 26:7 18,20 7:13 8:15 36:21 37:3 40:11, conflate 10:13 9:18 10:13 11:1,8, 18 48:23 54:20 **Carson** 7:22 8:7 11 13:17 14:17 conflated 56:11 9:1,3 29:23 30:14 co-counsel 12:22 15:1,6,12,14 31:15 39:22 conflating 56:3 16:20 18:7,9,12, coating 25:5 **case** 5:7 7:5.6.7. 17,21 22:5 27:10, connection 9:12 13 9:15 10:1 **Code** 6:11 13:2,14 13,17,20,24 28:5, 13:15 37:7,10,12 50:17 considered 7,12 29:4,10

doors 35:2 47:22 CROSSdesired 43:21 **EXAMINATION** drafting 44:19 constructed detail 8:3 30:9 33:1 49:14 50:2 56:16 38:11 draw 53:7 construction details 33:20 D dried 24:14 23:1 42:4,7 43:1 48:12 49:10 50:15 drifts 18:15 consumption determination date 42:21 47:11 7:9 51:23 45:1 driveway 21:13 day 52:10 38:18 continue 23:16 determined days 10:3,4 28:24 44:12 51:17,19 **duly** 15:3 continued 42:21 29:12,15 39:12 46:1 develop 8:20 49:12,16,19 10:19 11:23 18:4 Ε 56:20,21,23 58:7 contractors 39:9 19:3,7 38:5 57:5 deal 17:20 56:11 contradicts 46:3 earlier 12:21 33:8 developed 50:6 **decide** 17:23 contrary 44:21 53:11,18,20 early 28:24 26:13 28:21 37:16 developing 10:15 coordinating **eating** 28:12 decided 8:18 11:2 38:1,4,7 23:1 18:2,4 19:3 24:23 **economy** 37:21 difference 55:5 correct 7:9 16:21 26:14 28:16 57:4 39:2 17:6 18:5 19:4,5 58:5 direct 4:8 15:10 **edge** 20:14 23:15,21,22 24:4 21:25 45:2 decides 56:7 25:17 31:10 32:7 effect 20:18 43:21 directly 47:2 33:5,6 34:20 decision 5:12 elaborate 20:17 35:16,17 51:12 8:21 10:19 17:21 disagree 53:2 52:11 54:2,9 37:25 45:10 58:7 electronics 21:16 55:10 disagreed 45:24 declined 9:20 eligible 45:22 cost 16:24 disaster 26:18 39:15 embarked 35:15 costs 35:20 discharged 7:19 decorating 33:20 employed 45:1 cottage 46:10 disregarded defer 12:25 13:12 empowered 44:20 55:14 40:20 41:2 **counts** 45:25 43:22 distinct 56:4,5 deferment 12:5 county 22:17 38:8 **empty** 42:4 distinction 55:4, deferral 14:1 couple 9:5 end 51:4 12 deferred 40:7 court 21:9 45:10, ended 7:17 distributed 7:23 48:7 24 46:1,8,13 31:17 **engage** 13:19 definition 41:12 cracks 24:17 25:4 distribution 8:9 46:15 54:6 engaged 16:7 crash 37:21 38:20 31:21 29:2 degrees 26:4 create 20:17 documents 14:8 engineering 26:4 demonstrates 47:8,9 52:18 58:6 created 23:4 50:9 enjoyment 14:4 41:25 dollar 25:8 43:8,12,23 44:9, Department 30:3 24 45:4 credit 25:8 42:11 dollars 10:21 describe 10:12 50:4,5 **ensure** 56:15 criteria 46:22 29:17,23 donee's 44:25 ensuring 57:9 critical 46:24 desirable 37:19, **Door** 34:25 24 entities 56:12 CROSS 4:8

Index: entitled..Grantors

Francisco 29:6 entitled 12:25 **exhibits** 4:13,14 **federal** 8:5,11 13:12 14:1 31:18 6:12,16 11:9 31:24 **frankly** 19:24 37:13 entity 7:25 55:21 feet 20:3 21:15 20:5,19 56:5 exist 7:25 12:3 envisioned 23:18 fence 21:3 free 43:4,9,18 existence 7:17,18 **equal** 5:12 fencing 21:2 22:3 friends 33:21 45:21 38:18 frustrating 18:16 equipment 20:15 exists 7:24 56:5 fiduciary 41:19 **escape** 22:10 FTB 6:13 14:21 expectation figuring 27:1 36:17 51:17,19 essentially 57:8 47:15 **file** 55:16 fulfilling 43:6 establish 47:16 expected 46:11 **filed** 47:25 full 24:13 39:14 established expecting 46:10 12:25 13:12 funds 25:13 31:18 filing 47:25 explain 24:6 26:1 estate 51:7 38:10 filling 25:3 furnished 51:1,3 **evade** 32:3 explained 7:6 **final** 7:20 8:7 48:18 49:20 50:14 G event 10:24 **express** 43:13 56:19 eyes 28:8 evidence 14:3,6 **gain** 10:18 12:25 finally 8:22 50:1 46:5,7 47:5 52:14, 13:12 28:21 29:8 15,20,24 financing 30:24 35:20 38:1 45:18 F 31:4 47:16 48:3,4,7 **EXAMINATION** 50:4 57:2,5,10 find 12:2 50:15 15:10 fact 27:5 40:5 44:18 52:19 55:6 gains 40:20 41:3 examined 15:4 finding 45:24 57:1 **game** 8:13 finish 20:6 exception 46:18 fact-driven 37:6 garage 20:3 exchange 7:7,10 finishing 25:23 **factor** 52:23 9:14 12:4 13:20, 26:15 27:2 39:3 gates 21:3,5,21 23 14:1,13 28:18, facts 7:8 39:17,18 fixing 27:5,6 goals 26:10 23 32:1 35:15 40:4 41:18 47:3 flies 26:8 40:4,5 45:17 good 7:3 12:14 fades 18:22 46:13 47:2 48:5 16:25 17:20 18:12 floor 24:19 50:17 53:14,23 fading 7:16 28:2 34:16 37:17, floors 23:25 24:8, 24 53:17 exchanged 7:21 **failed** 48:6,11 9 39:21 grammatical failure 27:7 39:16 **follow** 52:9 44:22 exchanges 8:23 fair 47:1 11:24 13:22 40:21 follow-up 54:8 grandchildren 41:3 fairly 7:7 25:21 forming 52:16 exclude 45:18 **family** 30:23 granted 38:13 forward 36:8 33:21 exclusive 46:1 Grantor 14:7 Franchise 3:10 55:13.18 **Fargo** 25:7 42:9, **excuse** 16:18 5:24 6:1 9:6,9,17, 11 20 10:9 11:6 16:8 Grantor's 14:4 executing 29:5 24:1 30:17 32:12 farther 45:14 47:12 **Exhibit** 11:10,16 39:13,17,25 49:4 Grantors 13:17 faux-painted 22:1 39:11 49:9 51:14 53:9 56:3,9, 41:23 42:7,14,19, 22:7 50:8,10,13 51:9, 24 21,24 43:8,13,18 11

44:4,16 45:1 **Hey** 18:6 hurry 26:16 38:20 instrument 43:5, 55:18,24 19 44:7,16,20,22 hickory 24:12 52:19 I Grantors' 43:20 high 11:23 instruments 52:15 hills 17:12 38:3 42:14 43:24 44:2 i.e. 16:24 grants 44:7 hillside 20:12,17 insurance 42:20 identified 10:3 **grass** 21:8 47:11 52:19 29:11 hillsides 22:8 great 16:23 18:20 intend 32:3 immediately 32:10 33:9 hired 26:23 42:17 intended 14:3 green 5:19 13:5,6, hold 10:25 14:3 21:23 47:7 implied 22:25 7 23:7 42:1 43:7,15, intense 26:2 22 44:5,11 46:25 important 11:9 groups 30:5 47:7 47:14 54:7 intent 25:23 guess 34:25 56:7, holding 10:15,23 43:17,20 44:16 improve 17:23 10 14:12 45:6,21,25 45:5 47:17 53:16 improved 49:15 guidance 46:18 46:14 47:21 54:1 improvements home 8:16 14:9 **intention** 47:9,12 33:8 Н 16:1,3,5 17:1 18:4 52:15,21 19:4 20:1 21:18, **include** 31:19 interior 33:19 23,24 22:15 25:2, half 20:10,19 included 8:2,10 18,19,20 26:25 **Internal** 13:1,14 49:18 42:16 38:3,23 42:4,9,22, 50:17 hand 14:24 23,25 43:2 45:11, including 27:1 interrupted 13:3, 12,14,15,16,18 happened 30:20 35:21 9 32:20,23 40:23, 52:19 53:19,21 25 43:25 income 45:4 46:6 homeowners harbor 46:18 47:4 55:14 interviewing 42:19 47:10 26:22 hardware 34:25 inconvenient hope 47:15 44:21 35:1 **invest** 53:16 Hosey 3:3 5:4,9, hardwood 23:24 increase 19:12 invested 38:6 18,22 6:2,23 12:7, 24:4,5,9,12 indicating 47:9 14,17 13:5 14:15, investment 8:17, head 18:18 20 15:7 18:6,10, 19 10:7,17,18,24 individually 42:8 14,19,23 27:10, 11:22 13:24,25 hear 12:16 13:8 individuals 9:24 14,18,22,25 28:3, 14:12 16:25 17:21 18:25 28:3,6 55:1 56:14 57:4,8 10 32:10,16 34:2, 25:14 37:11,14,17 32:18 57:21 7,12,15 36:3,4,11, 39:20,21 41:5,8, Industry 30:3 heard 38:10 41:21 14,20,25 40:9,14 11 45:5,8,21 46:4, infinity 20:14 48:16,21 50:19 15,24 47:17,23 hearing 2:21 5:11 52:2,7 57:16,17, 48:10 49:1,3,7 12:1 58:4,9 inspection 42:7 24 58:1 50:6 54:11,18 held 5:6 6:14 inspections 57:3 house 14:7 20:2 10:10 13:23.25 24:21 24:3 25:22 27:3 invoices 34:23,24 14:6 31:16 40:22 installation 24:16 43:4 46:9 51:1,2 35:7 41:4,8,11 43:12 45:8 46:3,24 How's 40:24 installed 21:17 IRC 6:7 13:20 54:11,17 14:1,11 40:20 instructions huge 20:17 41:2 **helps** 26:4 44:17 hundred 21:11 iron 21:3

irrevocable
13:15

IRS 46:17,23
54:21,22
issue 6:4 10:4
36:10 40:3 56:2
57:8
issued 6:9,17
23:13 40:2 51:24
issues 10:9,12
36:13 37:7

J

January 42:21
job 18:20
joined 12:21
judge 5:4,9,10,18
22 6:2,23 12:7,14
17 13:5 14:15,20

judge 5:4,9,10,18, 22 6:2,23 12:7,14, 17 13:5 14:15,20 15:3,7 18:6,10,14, 19,23 27:10,14, 18,22,25 28:1,2,3, 6,8,10 32:10,16 34:2,7,8,9,10,12, 13,14,15,22 35:5, 11,14,18,23 36:1, 3,4,11,14,20,25 40:9,14 48:16,21 50:19,23,24 51:6, 9,13,16,25 52:2,4, 6,7,25 53:3,24 54:3,19 55:9,25 57:11,14,16,17, 18,24 58:1

**judges** 5:11 14:22

July 27:5 49:19 June 27:4 47:25

Κ

knew 26:22

knowledge 17:13

**Kudok** 5:25

**Kuduk** 3:11 5:25 12:22

L

La 2:6 5:5 6:6 7:15 8:14 9:19 13:16 16:16 23:3 25:15 26:13 29:12 30:22 31:2,5 32:2 35:6 41:20 42:1 43:5 51:2

land 8:16,19 10:14,17 17:3,14, 15,17 19:12 21:1 37:18,19 49:6 53:12,18 54:10

landscape 21:12

landscaped 20:4

landscaping 22:2 23:2 35:2 38:17,18 43:1,3

language 43:19 44:7,15,19 45:2

largest 38:8

**law** 5:4,9,18,22 6:2,23 7:7 12:7,17 13:5 14:15,20 15:3,7 18:6,10,14, 19,23 27:10,14, 18,22,25 28:2,3,6, 8,10 32:10,16 34:2,7,9,12,14,22 35:5,11,14,18,23 36:1,4,11,14,20, 25 40:9,14 47:19 48:16,21 50:19,24 51:6,9,13,16,25 52:2,6,25 53:3,24 54:3,19 55:9,25 57:11,14,17,24 58:1

laws 44:3

lawyers 44:18

**lay** 56:19

lays 50:14

**Le** 3:5 5:10 34:8,9, 10 50:23,24 51:6, 9,13,16,25 52:3

lead 3:3 5:9

**leave** 43:18

**left** 16:7,11 43:3 49:2

lender 31:1

**letter** 51:24

Leung 3:5 5:10 28:1,2,6,8 34:13, 14,22 35:5,11,14, 18,23 36:1,5 52:4, 6,25 53:3,24 54:3, 19 55:9,25 57:11, 14,18

level 19:11 38:15

levels 20:16

liability 56:9

liberal 43:7

life 26:5

light 5:19 13:6,7

like-kind 7:6 8:23 12:4 13:19 14:13 28:18 40:21 41:3 46:13 50:16

limitations 17:7

listed 42:20

livable 51:5

live 16:5 22:18,20 23:20 24:23 25:18,22 38:21,22 42:17

**lived** 9:18,24 11:5 34:18 39:7 41:16 49:21,23 55:24

**living** 24:3 39:14 50:9 54:23 55:2 56:14

**loan** 14:8 25:7,8, 11 42:9 47:9 52:18 **loans** 25:15 42:12,15

located 42:1

location 37:19,24

locks 35:1

logic 45:24

**long** 19:17 20:7 21:15

longer 7:24 56:5,6 57:3

looked 16:24 22:11 51:22

**Los** 6:7 8:14 13:20 17:5,12 33:4 38:3 42:2,6,13,20

**losses** 48:4

**lot** 16:24 19:10 20:2,13 21:1,11, 19 33:18 42:4 55:19

lots 21:8

**loud** 18:25

low-voltage 21:20 27:6

lower 22:9

Luoma 3:7 4:5,20, 25 5:15 6:20,22 7:2,4 12:8 14:17, 19 15:11 18:22,24 19:2 21:25 28:14 32:8,11 36:7,9,12, 22,24 37:4 40:10 48:18,20,24 50:20 51:3,7,11 52:9,25 53:2,7 54:8 56:1, 2,23 57:12,15,22, 23 58:12

M

made 9:23 11:23

mail 35:13

mailbox 35:10

Index: main..Paloma

**main** 43:3 mine 18:22 **Nevada** 2:6 5:5 52:21 7:15,22 8:6 9:1 maintained 43:3 **minimal** 56:18 office 2:1 5:6 13:16,21 15:25 29:25 maintaining minimize 35:20 16:1,11 23:3 45:16 25:19 30:3,21,22 offset 48:4 minutes 6:9,17, 31:6 32:3 34:19 make 7:8 8:21 24 48:18 opening 4:3 6:20 38:22 41:20 48:2 17:21 20:13 22:15 7:1 12:9,12 37:6 49:24 **Mm-hmm** 29:4,10 33:7 38:1 39:8 53:24 operating 48:4 44:3 46:6 51:4 nice 22:15 25:20 money 24:21 27:4 option 38:4 non-issue 56:10 making 14:5 **months** 19:19 order 39:4 42:12 market 24:10 25:2 non-recognition 20:10 24:9,17 47:22 49:1,7 50:1, 45:23 26:17,23 27:1,9 3 51:4 38:20 Moore 45:9.20 normal 24:3 46:19 47:14 54:21 ordered 6:16 matter 2:5 5:6 note 18:7 41:14 56:7 **Moores** 54:22 orders 6:9,17 47:14 **matters** 55:22 ordinary 44:22 Mortgage 42:9 notes 27:15 maximize 10:20 **OTA** 2:6 motive 45:6,21 notify 42:17 35:20 57:5,10 54:7 outset 41:14 **NPA** 40:2 **maximum** 19:13 motorcycles overnight 33:10, 26:8 number 5:7 meaning 41:8 13 39:7 26:15,16 34:24 44:23 move 15:21.24 39:12 overreach 49:22 18:17 36:8,21 means 20:1 54:6 numbers 50:7 oversee 42:25 55:13 move-in 42:21 47:11 owned 45:11 meet 5:11 58:5 0 moved 15:25 owner 46:2 meeting 46:22 34:19 45:13 52:4 oath 53:15 owner's 52:19 members 3:5 7:3 multi-residential 12:15 34:4 50:21 owning 30:2 objections 6:15 17:11 54:23 memorandum obtain 25:11 multifamily 29:19 45:10 42:12 multiunit 9:2 Ρ mentioned 7:4 **obtained** 42:8,19 54:20 occasionally **p.m.** 2:18,19 5:2,8 Ν mere 47:15 46:7 58:15 met 6:5 10:2 12:2, occupancies **names** 5:13 pace 20:5 3 37:8 40:6 48:9 21:6 **narrow** 53:10 paid 8:11 24:21 mic 18:8 occupancy 11:7 32:6 narrowed 36:10 14:4 19:24 20:9 Mike 3:5 5:10 painted 22:11 22:16 23:12 38:13 **nature** 21:10 mile 21:2 29:17 **Palo** 35:8 occupiable 21:19 million 10:21 25:7 needed 24:15,16 Paloma 2:6 5:5 occupied 14:9 38:9 42:9 50:4 6:7 7:15 8:14 9:19 negates 56:25 42:25 43:4 57:1,2 13:16 16:17 23:3 occupy 42:22 net 48:3 25:15 26:13 29:12 minds 54:24 43:20 44:10 47:12 30:22 31:2,6 32:2

Index: panel..purpose

35:6 41:20 42:2 47:13 presentation 8:6,7,13 9:1,2,18, 43:5 51:2 36:23 19,24 10:5,11,19, persons 55:1 21,24 11:6,12,18, panel 3:3,5 7:3 presented 58:6 photographs 22 13:1,13,21,23, 12:15 21:25 26:1 24 14:5,12 16:17, 22:1 51:11 pretty 25:24 34:4 50:21 56:7 23 17:1,8,11,24 58:5 prevalent 24:18 pictures 51:10 19:3,17,22 21:13, part 22:14 39:17 17 22:2,3,18,20, piece 46:17 54:10 previously 4:13, 14 47:19 22,24 23:8,9,20, participants 5:12 place 8:23 24:25 25 25:16 26:13 34:25 50:11 **price** 38:8 28:20 29:18,23 participate 26:24 30:4,7,12,14,24 placing 52:16 primarily 42:25 parties 5:13 31:17 31:5,9,16 32:2 44:10 58:7 plan 17:20 19:6 primary 13:17 33:5,7,10,13,14, 22:14 24:24 25:19 38:23 42:18 party 6:15 29:2 17,19 34:17 35:6 43:10 45:6,13,25 37:9,15,22 38:1,7, plants 21:8 Patricia 9:18 49:25 54:1,4,6 11,21,22,25 39:3, 16:20 30:23 31:19 **play** 9:16 7,8,12,20,21,22, problems 27:3 49:13 23 40:1,21 41:3,6, player 8:13 Proc 46:18 47:20 7,10,11 42:1,3,5, pay 28:22 players 7:12 8:25 10,13,15,18,20 procedure 46:16 paying 32:3 9:5 43:7,12,13,16,18, 54:21,23 22 44:4,9,13,25 penalty 6:10 **plot** 54:10 proceedings 45:2,6,7,16,17,22 48:12 2:16 58:15 **point** 17:15,19,23 46:2,3,6,12,14,20, 19:6,21 26:12 pending 6:10 23 47:1,4,7,10,15, proceeds 31:15 28:15 30:17 47:16 17,21,22,23 48:25 **people** 21:20 49:9 50:2 process 20:7,12 49:1,3,7,11,13,14, 24:20,22 26:22 26:24 32:1 38:16 17,20,22,23 50:1, 27:6 **pool** 20:7,14 21:5, 3,6 51:2,10,12 produce 5:11 9 22:2 33:23 percent 21:11 52:10,16 53:5,16, 38:17 42:25 43:1 46:6 17,21 54:14,15,23 perfect 25:1 27:8 position 9:17 production 45:4 55:2,18,24 56:15, performed 13:22 24:1 39:18 42:24 17,19 57:1,5 productive 14:5 51:21 46:8 48:5 49:21 41:4 44:4,13 protect 21:5 56:13 period 33:24 47:2 profit 10:22 38:15 protection 21:24 possession periodically 43:11 44:8 project 18:25 provide 21:24 42:22 19:25 20:24 21:7 23:16 29:2 37:25 preceding 47:2 **permit** 19:24 23:13,17 provided 22:17 prehearing 4:13, permits 10:8 proof 6:5 43:5 53:15 15 6:8,14,17 40:20 41:2 proper 25:4 40:5 proving 48:9 premarked 6:12 permitted 19:13 properly 7:10 provisions 43:17 prepare 11:13 **person** 21:23 24:14 39:21,24 public 42:3 prepared 38:12 personal 10:11 properties 7:21 40:11 purchase 35:15 11:4 43:18 44:6, 8:2,3,25 10:2,3 preparing 26:25 25 45:3,7,21 13:21 29:7,8,11, purchased 42:3 46:20 47:20,21 28:16 14 39:1 45:25 **purpose** 23:6,7 50:10 48:3 50:12 55:19 present 39:10 45:25 48:10 53:13 personally 41:10 property 6:6 7:20

purposes 10:7,12 11:7,22 13:24 25:14 39:24 41:12,16 43:6 45:12,16 55:14,15 pursuant 6:7,11 pursue 9:21

**put** 21:3,4,8,9,20 24:10 25:2 27:9 30:25

11:19 39:15

putting 26:23 38:16

## Q

**qualified** 7:10 12:4 14:13 50:16

**qualify** 48:6 49:1, 7 52:11 53:6,14, 22

qualifying 6:5

quarter 21:2

**question** 10:16 11:20 12:24 13:11 14:21 16:10 23:23 25:7 28:19 37:9 41:7 51:14 56:8 57:13

questionable 9:25

questioning 41:15

**questions** 14:22 16:16 32:9,13,15 34:1,5,8,11 36:2, 13 50:22,25 52:1, 5 57:19,22,23,25

R

raise 14:24 56:2 raised 6:15 10:10 23:23 rare 9:10

rate 37:24 47:1

raw 20:1

**ready** 24:24 36:22 58:2

**real** 6:6 13:1,13,21 37:22 40:21 41:3 43:12,15 51:7

realized 40:21 41:3

**reason** 11:18 18:15 24:11 25:22

recall 19:19 23:4 25:8 26:12 30:7, 14 37:20

**receive** 31:18

**received** 4:13,14

recognized 48:7

recollection 30:10

reconstructed 11:11 50:8

record 5:5,14 6:16 15:12 47:8 58:2

records 42:3,7

recover 10:24 38:1 39:2

**recovering** 37:21 39:2

recovery 10:20

recreational 45:12,18

RECROSS 4:8

**REDIRECT** 4:8

referenced 46:16

referencing 47:11

referring 55:6

refinancing 31:5

refinishing 25:4

reflecting 47:12

reflects 43:19 44:16 48:1

rejected 46:13

related 35:6

relating 41:22

remaining 43:2

remember 35:25

render 45:22

**rent** 14:7 41:9 43:9,14 44:11 47:1,7,22 49:6,8

rental 29:21 47:1

rented 47:5 48:25 49:5 53:12

renting 46:19

repair 25:3

repeat 27:21

replace 24:5

replaced 24:2,4

replacement 7:21 8:3,24 9:2 10:3 29:7

report 30:11 31:13,21

reported 2:20 8:5 39:24

reporter 2:21 13:3,9 32:20,23 40:23,25 43:25

represent 5:16 7:4

require 31:1 44:3 49:8

required 20:23 23:17 24:3 32:5,6 38:11 42:15 48:25

requirement 37:8 46:25 48:10 requirements

10:2 38:2 40:6

**reside** 42:15

residence 14:4,9 17:9 19:10 33:22 41:11 42:18 43:14,20 44:5,11 45:7,14,22 46:2,7, 21 47:13,18 49:25 52:22 54:15

residency 9:7,10, 16,20,21 11:19 16:8 39:14 41:15 51:17,19,21,24

resident 9:11 15:15,17,19 16:11 41:17

residential 9:3 29:21 43:15

residents 51:18 54:14

residing 47:10

**Respondent** 3:9 5:24,25 6:13 12:13 40:19

respondent's 4:14 45:10 48:5, 13

restored 26:7

result 19:14

resurface 24:8

resurfaced 24:9

**retired** 16:14 34:19

return 11:24 47:25 48:1 55:16

returned 31:5,7

**returns** 8:5,11 30:12 31:13,22

**Rev** 46:18 47:19

**Revenue** 6:11 13:1,14 46:16 50:17

Index: review..supportive

**review** 11:10 secured 25:15 situation 11:1 **state** 2:2 3:9 5:13 30:3 44:3 46:1 42:9 54:12,17 revolving 42:10 **slow** 20:12 **stated** 46:23 security 21:21 ride 8:18 27:6 42:14 **softer** 27:16 statement 4:3 road 6:7 8:14 9:19 seek 44:3 6:21 7:1 12:10,12 16:17 22:3 25:16 software 44:19 42:16 48:19 52:12 32:2 42:2 sell 8:19 10:18,25 **sold** 7:22 8:5,6,7, 11:23 19:23 20:24 statements 41:25 rocks 20:17 22 10:21 11:8 24:10 25:24 17:16 19:21 30:7, **status** 16:10 rot 21:3 26:13,14,16,20 15,18 38:14 39:20 28:16 31:8 38:21, **statute** 41:8 46:15 42:23 47:16 49:18 route 22:10 24 39:4 48:2 50:3 **stay** 33:10,13,16 **RPR** 2:20 57:1 sole 43:11 44:8 54:14 rule 46:19 **selling** 11:3 13:20 Sonia 3:10 5:23 **stayed** 33:12 39:7 17:15 26:24 12:21 52:10,20 53:5,21 28:17,20 S sound 19:25 staying 14:8 send 58:6 Southern 11:15 stopped 45:14 Sacramento 2:17 separate 26:23 spa 20:14 5:1,8 55:16 56:4,12 straightforward **Sparks** 8:6 9:1,2 7:8 safe 46:18 47:4 September 6:9, 29:18 30:7,11 14,18 **Street** 2:17 35:8 **sale** 8:2,23 10:10, 39:22 15,23,25 11:13 series 22:1 strict 25:24 41:12 special 21:16 12:25 13:13 24:24 service 11:12 structure 16:24 29:12 30:11 specifically 30:4 23:17 31:13,16 38:8,12 43:15,21 44:5 **stuck** 40:3 40:1 49:15 **share** 40:1 45:3 stuff 22:14 25:5 sales 39:23 **shares** 26:10 spend 22:22 33:6 35:1 San 29:6 show 11:21 52:20 **spent** 11:17 21:19 submit 58:2 27:4 33:4.10 Sara 3:3 5:9 **shows** 14:3.6 submitted 34:23 39:12 49:10,17,19 22:2 47:6 37:13 **Sarah** 2:20 56:18 side 22:11 substantial 19:10 satisfied 48:10 square 20:3 50:2 significant 10:22 successful 56:9 stage 27:2 38:6 satisfy 25:20 sufficiently 32:19 staged 51:4,10 significantly scale 19:10 suggests 44:24 38:15 50:5 **stain** 25:4 **scene** 22:8 **Suite** 35:8 similar 26:10 stand 14:24 scenery 22:12 summarized **simply** 44:15 standard 25:23 46:8 scratched 24:25 41:18 single 38:8 supplied 24:22 **Section** 6:8.11 **start** 6:20 28:12 single-family 13:2,14,20,22 34:7 50:23 52:8 **supply** 48:11 8:16 17:9 18:4 14:2,11 40:20 19:4,9 38:3 53:19, started 20:9 41:2,13 43:10 support 39:18 21 24:17 26:22,25 40:4 47:8 48:12 45:5,19,23 47:23 57:4 48:10 50:17 sir 36:2 supportive 37:13 starting 39:1

swear 14:21 37:7 53:15 58:2,4,8,9 Trustees 43:14 templates 44:19 **Todd** 3:7 5:15 7:4 trustor 7:14 swimming 42:25 Todd-something **sworn** 15:3 temporarily **Tuesday** 2:19 5:1 30:24 35:3 system 27:7 **Tuman** 2:20 ten 6:23 Tommy 3:5 5:10 turn 21:22 systems 21:21 tenants 30:1 tomorrow 58:10 turns 38:6 T tenure 30:2 top 21:14 tweaks 49:20 term 41:12 total 20:20 two-and-a-**Tahoe** 11:15 Town 42:6 terms 33:19 quarter-plus taking 29:8 50:11 20:25 test 53:25 trade 10:5 13:23, talk 18:7 25 37:9 41:4,6 two-story 29:24 testified 15:4 talked 54:20 33:3 34:16 49:2, transaction two-year 38:16 24 35:20 50:16 47:2 tanked 26:17 **TRANSCRIPT** testify 7:13 11:8 tax 2:1 3:10 5:6,24 2:16 U 6:1,11 8:5,10,11 testimony 8:4 9:6,9,17,20,23 10:12 11:21 14:18 transferred 23:9 10:9 11:6 12:5 ultimately 24:23 37:12 39:6 41:22 31:1 42:13 55:18 16:8 24:1 28:22 42:23 48:2 49:15 53:14 transition 30:21 30:12,17 31:13 underground that'll 28:12 32:4,6 39:13,17, traveling 11:13 22:10 24,25 40:6 45:9, thing 9:22 57:6 treating 55:20 23 46:8 48:6 49:4 understand 11:6 things 11:8 21:4, 51:14 53:9 55:15, 28:19 treatment 6:6 9,19,22 22:5,25 16 56:3,8,9,24 7:11 14:1.13 understanding 26:6 39:8 45:23 52:11 tax-deferred 6:6 51:22 thought 17:14 7:11 50:16 trust 2:6 5:5 7:14, undeveloped 18:12 30:18 15,17,22,24 8:2,9 tax-paying 7:25 54:10 three-quarter-10:13 11:2 12:3 taxed 55:13 unhappy 25:1 inch 24:13 13:16,18,19 14:3, taxes 35:21 5 23:3,6,7,10 **unit** 9:7,10,13,16, time 11:17 12:20, 30:8,11,21,22,23 17,20,23 11:19 22 15:21 19:16 taxing 41:17 31:2,6,8,11,13,16, 16:8 17:11 29:19 21:18,19 22:22 18 34:17 35:6 taxpayer 9:11 39:14 51:17,19 23:1,12 25:24 41:20,21,23 42:1, 12:2 45:6,15 56:5 26:18 28:16 30:5 **units** 9:6,8,9 13 43:5,6,7,10,12, 57:7 32:3 33:4,6,10 29:20 19,24 44:2,4,9,15, 34:11,19 35:13 taxpayer's 45:24 18,21 45:2 47:6, unnaturally 21:6 37:21 38:14,17 11 52:16,17,19 taxpayers 9:21 39:14 42:22 unqualified 40:4 55:3,7,8,9,13,16, 14:11 40:20 41:2, 49:10,17 50:12 17,18,20 56:4 5 45:11,13,17,20 **upheld** 48:14 53:7 56:18 57:7,9 46:5,9,14,19,25 **UPS** 35:10 timeline 11:11 47:18 50:9 54:22, Trustee 7:19 50:8 25 56:4,12 upswing 37:23 35:15 42:12 43:6, 22 44:3,5,11,17 timing 38:25 tear 24:3 urge 50:13,14 45:2 55:7,23 today 5:7,10 6:4 technical 10:1 12:20,23 15:15

work 20:2,23 28:9 ٧ 33:7,19 43:2 **worked** 19:15 vacation 45:15 22:25 26:11 46:2 written 5:12 58:7 views 50:2 violate 10:22 Υ vision 39:4 56:16 year 15:20 16:4 visit 33:22 24:17 26:20 42:8 visited 45:15 45:13 48:6,8 49:12,16,18 W years 8:20 9:19 11:5 20:5,10,19 26:18 33:24 38:23 walls 22:7 49:22 **wanted** 17:11 York 11:14 19:14 20:13 21:24 25:1 28:23 36:8 Ζ wear 24:3 weeds 57:13 **zoned** 8:16 weekends 45:12 zoning 38:2 weighed 52:24 zoning-wise 17:8 Wells 25:7 42:9, 11 wide 24:18 wife 9:18 26:10 Wisconsin 11:14 witnesses 36:7,9, 17,19 wood 24:13 25:3 Woodruff 3:10

words 44:21,24

58:13

4:6,21 5:23 12:9, 13,14,19,21 13:4, 7,10 14:16 32:12, 14,18,21,24 33:2, 25 36:17,19 40:11,13,16,19,24 41:1 44:1 48:17 51:15,20 52:8,13 53:25 54:2,5 55:6, 11 57:15,24,25