BEFORE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN	THE	MATTER	OF	THE	APPEAL	OF:)				
К.	CHR	ISTIAN,)	OTA	CASE	NOS.	18011923 18011924
				AI	PPELLAN'	Γ.) _)				10011724

CERTIFIED COPY

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Cerritos, California

Wednesday, October 11, 2023

Reported by:

SHELBY K. MAASKE Hearing Reporter

Job No.: 44375 OTA(A)

1	BEFORE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF:)
6	K. CHRISTIAN,) OTA CASE NOS. 18011923
7) 18011924 APPELLANT.)
8)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at
16	12900 Park Plaza Drive, Suite 300, Cerritos,
17	California, commencing at 9:34 a.m. and
18	concluding at 11:34 a.m. on Wednesday,
19	October 11, 2023, reported by Shelby K. Maaske,
20	Hearing Reporter.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:				
2					
3	Panel Lead:	Hon. Joshua Lambert			
4					
5	Panel Members:	Hon. Andrew Kwee Hon. Joshua Aldrich			
6		HOII. UOSIIUA AIGIICII			
7	For the Appellant:	K Chaigtion Townson			
8	For the Appellant:	K. Christian, Taxpayer			
9	Harry the Degree and out :				
10	For the Respondent:	Amanda Jacobs CDTFA Attorney			
11		Chad Bacchus CDTFA Attorney			
12		Jason Parker			
13		Hearing Representative			
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					

1	INDEX
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	EXHIBITS
9	
10	(Appellant's Exhibits were received at pages 7)
11	(CDTFA's Exhibits were received at page 7)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18 19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	Cerritos, California; Wednesday, October 11, 2023				
2	9:34 a.m.				
3					
4					
5	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: We are now on				
6	the record in the Office of Tax Appeals oral hearing in				
7	the appeal of Keith Mark Christian, Case Nos. 18011923 and				
8	18011924. The date is October 11, 2023, and the time is				
9	9:34 a.m. My name is Josh Lambert, and I'm the lead				
10	administrative law judge for this hearing, and my				
11	co-panelists today are Judge Kwee and Judge Aldrich.				
12	CDTFA, can you please introduce yourselves for				
13	the record.				
14	MS. JACOBS: Amanda Jacobs, attorney with the				
15	CDTFA Legal Department.				
16	MR. BUCCHUS: Chad Bucchus, attorney for the				
17	CDTFA Legal Department.				
18	MR. PARKER: Jason Parker, chief of Headquarters				
19	Operations Bureau with the Department.				
20	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you.				
21	And for Appellant, can you please introduce				
22	yourself for the record.				
23	MR. CHRISTIAN: Good morning, Keith Mark				
24	Christian.				
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you.				

And thanks, everyone, for attending.

The issues in the appeal are, first -- also

Mr. Christian, your microphone, if you bring it closer to
yourself and press the button to make it go green.

MR. CHRISTIAN: My name is Keith Mark Christian.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: And then when you are done, you can turn it off. Thanks.

The first issue is whether Appellant is personally liable under R&TC Section 6829 for the unpaid tax liabilities of EcoCrete Building Systems, Inc., for the liability period of April 1, 2002 through September 30, 2002, and the elements in dispute are whether EcoCrete collected sales tax reimbursement on its sales of tangible personal property and whether Appellant willfully failed to pay the liability or caused it to be paid.

The second issue is whether CDTFA properly conditioned relief of the amnesty interest penalty on payment of the taxes within 30 days after CDTFA notifies Appellant of the final action in this appeal or entering into an installment payment plan 30 days after CDTFA notifies Appellant of the final action in this appeal.

CDTFA provides Exhibits A through H, and Appellant provides Exhibits 1 through 14. There were no objections, and that evidence is now in the record.

1	(Appellant's exhibits were received in evidence.)					
2	(CDTFA's exhibits were received in evidence.)					
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: So					
4	Mr. Christian, this will be your opportunity to explain					
5	your position, and you can have one hour and 10 minutes					
6	and a 10-minute closing. You are going to be a witness,					
7	so I can swear you in right now. Can you please raise					
8	your right hand?					
9	(The witness was sworn.)					
10	MR. CHRISTIAN: I do.					
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you.					
12	You may proceed.					
13	MR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you.					
14						
15	OPENING PRESENTATION					
16	MR. CHRISTIAN: Good morning. My name is Keith					
17	Christian					
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Also,					
19	Mr. Christian, make sure you turn on your microphone.					
20	MR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you. Good morning. My					
21	name is Keith Christian. Obviously, I'm not an attorney.					
22	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Also, sorry to					
23	interrupt you. Maybe if you can move closer?					
24	MR. CHRISTIAN: Is that better?					
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: That's better.					

MR. CHRISTIAN: Good morning. My name is Keith Christian. I'm 64 years old, and I live in San Diego, California -- native. I have never lived elsewhere, and I have never done business outside the state of California.

2.4

Just two quick minutes about myself -- and I know I'm on the clock and I have 70 minutes to present my case. This is my 49th year at owning businesses in the state of California. So far, I've started five startups from scratch, the first one starting when I was 15 years old in 10th grade. I have had approximately 8,000 employees under my employ over the last 49 years.

With that being said, I'm not an attorney, and I'm sorry that I'm not being represented by an attorney. I know it's never the best for any group in here to not have someone represented by an attorney and, unfortunately, my attorney for 16 years, Laura Buckley, and I -- my current business had some issues through COVID, that we are still working through, trying to get our pipeline back, and I had to make a financial decision about six months ago that I was no longer able to fund Laurie to represent me. So I'm here on my own.

I will do the best I can with all of the book s that I have from my former attorney. I apologize if I don't know all of the legal nuances of what's happening today, but I will do my best under oath to explain

factually and truthfully my position in this matter. And I've waited 22 years for this. I was not afforded a hearing when Mr. Savona was given a hearing. I was not noticed that he was given a hearing until about three years later when I received a redacted copy of his hearing.

2.4

I have not received an answer in 22 years why I was not -- why I did not receive a chance to have a hearing. But with that being said, I'm going to go forward with the files and do the best I can and try to explain my position.

There's a couple different names that EcoBuilding Systems goes by. Can I just call it "Eco"?

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Yeah, that sounds good.

MR. CHRISTIAN: Okay. EcoCrete was a trademark of EcoBuilding Systems, but if we just call it Eco, that might be easier for all of us -- easier and shorter.

I was one of four individual founders of Eco in approximately 1996. My background is residential real estate, and, in 1996, we started the business in Bakersfield, California manufacturing modular homes. The business didn't go well. We were competing against stick-built residential builders.

We couldn't compete in California, so my board of

directors, made up of four venture capitalists and myself and another individual, made the decision to pivot to the manufacturing of school classrooms and buildings for California school districts and some private schools, along with cities in California and counties in California.

So we relocated the factory to Chula Vista,
California, just south of San Diego. We entered into a
20-year lease with the Port of San Diego and began the
hiring process of staff and individuals that were familiar
and had experience with manufacturing schools, classrooms,
buildings, which I had no experience in. My background
was residential real estate and manufacturing of modular
homes.

With that hire, the board of directors decided on hiring Ronald Savona who the board brought on as chief executive officer, replacing me as chief executive officer. I relinquished that role to Ron. Ron reported to the board of directors -- which I was a member of and also still chairman. I was president of the company until Ron and I left the company jointly, as a team, actually, the same day we negotiated -- Ron and I negotiated a contract to jointly leave the company together to a company called ModTech, M-O-D-T-E-C-H, of -- which Ron eventually took over as president of ModTech.

1 Ron took the lead in hiring senior management 2 that had experience in school business, manufacturing 3 school classrooms, ancillary buildings, complete campuses, 4 and I focused on the marketing side. And I also had 5 the -- I believe I had the -- I'm sorry. I had the human resources reporting to me as well as finance. 6 7 And I have a -- I made a copy of everything in 8 the book. Should I provide a copy to you while I go 9 through my documents? 10 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Is that a 11 document you submitted before? 12 MR. CHRISTIAN: Yes. There's nothing that you 13 don't already have, and I understand there's nothing new 14 that you are not going to present that I don't have. 15 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: What exhibit is it? 16 17 MR. CHRISTIAN: It's the EcoCrete, Inc., 18 organizational chart. 19 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. I think 20 we have it. I think it's Exhibit 5. So I think we have 21 it. 22 MR. CHRISTIAN: It's Exhibit 5, page 1 of 1; 23 correct. 2.4 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. We will 25 look at it on our computers.

MR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you. What I wanted to point out on that -- because there's some disparity on some readings that I read on your binder -- is that when Ron was hired as chief executive officer, he reported to the board of directors and I no longer did. I reported to Ron as president of the company. Yes, I was on the board of directors, but operationally, I reported to Ron Savona. I wanted to point that out on the organizational chart.

2.4

The next document I wanted to go over was, my former attorney presented a prehearing conference statement that I wanted to go through, and I have some documents to show regarding that -- the material facts of personal liability under Section 6829. My understanding is that -- speaking of my personal liability under 6829, may be imposed unless the Department shows that the individual willfully failed to pay or cause to be paid taxes due by the corporation.

And then further, it says "personal liability," under Section 6829, "may not be imposed unless the Department shows that the corporation included tax reimbursement in the selling price of the tangible personal property." I did not willfully fail to pay the sales taxes owed by Eco. I had no knowledge of any debt of sales tax owed by Eco under the piggyback contract.

Now, the piggyback contract that I'm speaking of

is a contract that was assumed by Eco from Cypress

Modular, Incorporated. Cypress Modular was a reseller -I should say wholesaler of modular schools, classrooms,
buildings, to the likes of General Electric, Berkshire

Hathaway, Blackstone, and public school districts.

They had a piggyback contract. They no longer wanted to be in the business, and they approached Eco and felt that our product would do well in the market, and Eco assumed Cypress Modular's piggyback contract. Their piggyback contract was with Chula Vista Elementary School District.

The piggyback contract allowed for any public entity in the state of California to purchase modular buildings from EcoBuilding Systems once the assumption was approved, which it was. I'd like to -- I'm sorry. One second. I'd like to point out something that I thought was important from day one that I have never had a chance to show that -- and you have a copy of this under your purchase order.

It's marked Exhibit A. I don't know if it's your exhibit, but it's a purchase order from the Anaheim City Elementary School District to Cypress Modular. This was a purchase order from the Chula Vista Elementary School District piggyback contract prior to Eco receiving the assumption.

And the reason I bring this up is that it's clear when Cypress approached us and we were approved by the Chula Vista Elementary School District to take over their piggyback contract, there is no sales tax on this purchase order. Cypress Modular made it clear that the piggyback contract has no sales tax in it. The school districts are exempt.

2.4

And throughout my testimony -- and you have seen these purchase orders and invoices that there's not one purchase order from any entity that purchased product off the piggyback, nor is there any invoice that shows state sales tax. So this purchase order, prior to Eco receiving the piggyback contract from Cypress, has no sales tax being owed or charged or collected by Cypress Modular, nor is it being asked of by the Anaheim City Elementary School District.

I would say about six or seven years ago, I approached Anaheim City and asked them, and their comment was they are exempt from state sales tax and federal excise tax. So while I'm on the subject of purchase orders, I'm going to jump to the purchase order section.

I have a couple other purchase orders that you have copies of and I have marked them -- am I going too fast?

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: I think it's okay for now.

MR. CHRISTIAN: Thanks. I'm no attorney. These are examples of purchase orders that Eco has received due to the piggyback contract. And this first one or the second one is from the Colton Unified School District and I marked it No. 5A, and it's a purchase order for \$742,616.00, and sales tax 0.00, total, \$742,616.00. And if you see where it says, "Important instructions to the vendor" on the left-hand side. It says, quote, "Sales tax must be shown separately."

So, again, there was no disclosure to Eco, to myself, that any sales tax should be charged or would be added to this purchase order. There's no way that we -- there's nobody at Eco including Ron Savona, including Pat Foster, including Marcus Harold, Jack Starland, Gary Ganz. There was nobody at Eco that had any knowledge that sales tax was to be collected, was owed, nor was any sales tax ever collected.

And I think that throughout my documents, you will see on a lot of the purchase orders that you already have, it's clear that it says sales tax must be shown separately. It was not. The next purchase order is Eco's purchase order from the Anaheim City Elementary School District.

Once they assumed the piggyback from Cypress, we received the purchase order \$7,158,893.50, tax 0.0 0, and

the total and approved by the board, May 8, 2011. A couple more things, the City of Daly City, we did work with cities within California that needed buildings for parks, recreational facilities, gymnasiums, and things like that.

And the City of Daly City, this is a document that is a purchase order for \$533,154.00, sales tax is blank, and it says, quote, "The City is exempt from federal excise tax." Quote, "Only if you are a non-California vendor with a State of California sales tax permit, add your California sales tax and show your permit number on the invoice."

We were not a non-California vendor, and they did not add sales tax into the purchase order, nor anywhere in the purchase order did we bury sales tax. And I'll get into it in a minute. But I'm sure you have reviewed the piggyback contract. You will see that the piggyback contract is a menu. You go to a restaurant -- it has a large menu of items -- ice tea, Coca Cola, quesadilla, burrito -- and it has the amount. That is exactly what the piggyback contract is.

So when we enter into a purchase order with a school district, that's how the purchase order reads. And it's down to every pencil that it takes for Eco to manufacture and deliver that building. Nowhere in the

piggyback contract on any order received ever mentions state sales tax. There's no disclosure anywhere about state sales tax.

2.4

One thing I found also interesting is a purchase order for the Downey Unified School District, as an example, to Eco. A small transaction, \$31,576.00, for one building, and sales tax amount 0.00. But what I found interesting on the second page of it, it says, "Conditions: Vendor must read and apply to this purchase order."

The third page of this purchase order says, quote, "Under terms and conditions, sales tax, where applicable, shall be shown separately on the purchase order," and it was not. There's no disclosure from any school district or any customer under the piggyback contract that ever disclosed that we were to collect or add state sales tax to any purchase order from any school district.

And I can tell you that we only manufactured buildings under this piggyback contract. There was no other physical or legal way for Eco to manufacture or receive a purchase order from any State entity unless it was under the Chula Vista Elementary School District piggyback contract.

Eco did not receive reimbursement of sales tax

from any customer on the piggyback contract. I don't feel I could be held personally responsible or personally liable under California Revenue Tax Code 6828. Eco did not collect sales tax. The governing contract, Chula Vista Elementary School District's piggyback, does not include the words "sales tax," nor was sales tax ever discussed with any customer.

2.4

We assumed the contract in 2001 from Cypress Modular, and we continued to manage and receive purchase orders, as did Cypress Modular, when they decided to allow us to assume the piggyback contract.

I also -- you also have a copy of the piggyback assignment approval, and also the renewal of the piggyback contract from the Chula Vista Elementary School District. I believe it's agenda item 4K. There's no sales tax in the contract on that renewal.

Regarding the piggyback contract, I had never heard of piggyback contract before we moved the factory and went into the classroom business and Ron built his team. I was not involved in the negotiations of the piggyback contract. There wasn't much to negotiate because it was assumed from Cypress, but I was not involved in the negotiations.

There was no discussion whether sales tax was included with the signor or with the customers. There's

no line item in the piggyback contract that says sales tax should be added, nor did Eco ever receive any purchase order from any customer adding sales tax.

2.4

I recall the first five or six years of this case, I was dealing with a State of California employee that -- I don't recall her name. She accused me of collecting sales tax and not remitting it to the State, which was entirely not correct. We never received a dime of sales tax from any entity. There was no way to receive it. We received the money exactly what the purchase order states.

And after, maybe, the first 10 years of this case, this issue, I went through a number of State employees and they changed their tune and said, "Okay. We understand that you didn't receive monies and you didn't withhold the money from the State, but you should have collected it." Personally, I had no way of knowing if it should have been collected. I have no way of knowing if it still should be collected. I have no idea. I did not do anything willfully wrong in not collecting state sales tax.

One thing I think that is interesting is there's a document called City of Daly City Correspondence, and there's not an exhibit marked. I know it's in your book though. It starts with a March 19, 2002 letter to Alex

Acinas, architect with the City of Daly City. It was written by Gary Ganz who was a project manager for Eco. And what's interesting is this is an example of how specific these piggyback contracts are.

If you look and go down, you will see -- just down to, like I mentioned, every pencil -- whatever it took, every pound of sand, every pound of EcoCrete material that would be used to provide these buildings. And if you get down to the end of Gary's letter, it says the total building cost is \$541,765.00. Nowhere in this document was there ever mention of sales tax.

And then if you go to the next page, he actually -- there's actually the exhibit of the piggyback contract for the Westmore Community Center. This is the -- these are the line items in the piggyback contract that make up this contract. Everything is in there. You have everything in there that we would need to manufacture, deliver, and set this building.

And at the end of it, it has the same amount, \$541,765.16. No sales tax was in the contract, and this matched the purchase order. The City of Daly City, their position was, they're exempt and they did not have any sales tax on their purchase order. So again, there is nobody at Eco, including myself, that was aware that sales tax is required. And you can see, as we have started to

bill the invoice to the City of Daly City, as we did the process, the sales tax is 0, total invoice is paid without any sales tax being added.

2.4

My next items are -- I have about 100 invoices. We had over 1,000. You have copies of these. The reason I brought these, because you will see that, there is -- there's 30 or 40 different customers on these invoices that are part of these purchase orders, and there's not one invoice that EcoCrete ever produced that had sales tax on the invoice.

We never asked for sales tax. To my knowledge, we were never aware that sales tax should have been collected. I don't even know if it should be collected as of today. I don't know that answer. But it wasn't collected, and I certainly didn't withhold it -- I didn't willfully withhold anything that I knew should be collected.

I also -- and you have copies of payments. I brought payments from the school districts that match up to purchase orders. There was a comment from a State employee years ago that said, "Well, the districts must have marked up and paid the sales tax above the purchase order," and that's not correct. Who would do that?

Nobody would do that, including a State entity.

I went back and we matched up the payments with

the purchase orders and there was no public school district, city entity, county entity, that added money to our payment to pay the state sales tax. And I know that the State's position may be, well, the sales tax is buried in your contract, it's buried in your line items, it's buried in your purchase order, and it's buried in the piggyback. It's not.

2.4

There's no sales tax that was ever disclosed by Chula Vista Elementary School District, and they were our largest customers. We manufactured 17 schools for them. There was no state sales tax. They never invoiced -- they never submitted a purchase order that ever had state sales tax listed separately. It was never in the discussion.

Debbie Allen, the director of purchasing, said they were exempt and Eco assumed the piggyback contract from Cypress, and we continued on, and there was no state sales tax. I brought with me the declaration of Pat Foster. Pat was in the accounting department who reported to Eric Blackhall. Eric was our controller. He's also a certified public accountant who handled our accounting department.

And the reason I brought this is Pat's recollection -- I don't -- I believe there's two -- there's two declarations, one is June 15th of 2004, and I don't know if this was done in conjunction with Ron

Savona's hearing or not. But Pat states, quote, "My vague recollection is that there was potentially some sales tax that was collected from one" -- "one of the school district." That's not correct. You don't collect state sales tax from one district and not 78 others.

2.4

We provided product to 79 school districts in the state of California. And when she said potentially some sales tax was collected from one, she's inaccurate. And the other thing she quotes, "I do not recall exactly how much was collected from this school district, but I do remember it as a strange amount, like, 3 percent."

I know nothing about that. I'm not aware of any sales tax being collected by a -- from a school district. I don't have all of the invoices, and I don't have all of the purchase orders, but of all of them that I have and of the folks that I discussed this with, they're not aware of any sales tax being collected.

Her second letter that you have a copy of, dated June 15, 2004, to Ron Luke of the State Board of Equalization, it appears to be a letter demand for information. And I'm just going to read what I think is pertinent. Quote, "Keith Christian and Ron Savona were the responsible persons for approving and signing checks on behalf of the company." That's absolutely incorrect.

Ron and I were both on all checking accounts as

was Pat Foster. There were three signers on all checking accounts and Pat Foster, in the accounting department, who had -- she had a limit of, I think, \$25,00.00 per check, which required a second signature, either Ron or myself.

Ron and I did not have any -- Ron and I could each sign checks without the other's approval. We only needed one check. Pat further says, "The corporation may have collected sales tax from some of the their customers," and then she says, quote, "Most of their customers were California school districts and were exempt," and that's correct. And she reported to Eric Blackhall.

"To the best of my knowledge, the officers of the corporation were Keith Christian as president, Ron Savona, chief executive officer, who I reported to." The last document from Pat Foster is just a check written to the Division of State Architects signed by her. And I just wanted to make a note that there's some documents from the State or some testimony from Ron Savona's three witnesses that I was the only signer and I was the only person responsible for the financials. That's incorrect.

There were three signers. She was one signer without me in a separate building. In fact, all the checkbooks were kept in Pat Foster's desk, and she signed checks without me and without Ron. So I was not the only

signer on checks. There were a lot of checks signed by Ron Savona without my knowledge, and there were checks signed by me without Ron's knowledge, and Pat signed checks as well.

2.4

There's a declaration of Jack Starland. If you look on the organizational chart, Jack reports to Ron Savona. He was director of engineering, and he played a large role in designing the buildings under the piggyback contract and had a lot of knowledge with the piggyback contract.

And he wrote, quote, "The other three employees besides himself involved in such negotiations and pricing were Ron Savona, Gary Ganz, and Marcus Harold" -- and he's referring to the piggyback contract -- "to the best of my knowledge and understanding, sales tax was not included within the sales price of the modular buildings nor was sales tax ever mentioned or discussed with school district customers."

He's correct. Quote, "In other words," he says,
"it's my belief and understanding is the sales price did
not include sales tax." I just bring this up because
whether it's me or Ron or Marcus or anybody -- I know I'm
being looked at because I was on the checking accounts and
I was an officer and director, I get that, but nobody at
Eco had any knowledge that tax was supposed to be

collected, should have been collected.

2.4

We had no knowledge of it because the piggyback contract doesn't state that. In fact, if you look at the piggyback contract of Chula Vista Elementary School District being our largest customer, they never included sales tax, they never asked for it. They said that they were exempt from state sales tax and federal excise tax.

My next exhibit is actually the budget, which you have. Eric Blackhall as our controller, and as a CPA, produced all of our documents, pro formas, financial statements, projections. And this document really gets down to the weeds -- really into the weeds of all documents needed to run the business -- assets, liabilities, cash flow.

There's not one document that Eric Blackhall ever produced except, I believe -- I want to say a State Board of Equalization sales tax return, that had anything to do with state sales tax. He produced a lot of documents that talked about liability for 941 tax, 940 tax, state income tax, state unemployment tax, worker's compensation insurance, liability insurance, but nowhere in any of Mr. Blackhall's work as our controller and certified public accountant did he ever disclose to myself or any board member that Eco had a liability for state sales tax.

I personally believe he didn't know we did, if we

do. Because nobody understood that the State is claiming sales tax should have been collected.

2.4

The next document is a balance sheet and profit and loss statements. All of these statements were produced by Eric Blackhall as our controller and as a CPA, under GAP accounting -- general accepted accounting principles. We have copies of this that he gets in the weeds again. We have P&Ls, revenues, the balance sheets has assets, it has liabilities, it has projections throughout the years he was with the company.

And Mr. Blackhall attended every board meeting that -- when he was with the company. And I have the minutes we need to go through next. Not one time in any meeting of the board or directors did Eric Blackhall ever discuss a liability for state sales tax.

He discussed a lot of liabilities, especially when we were contemplating having to file bankruptcy because our preferred shareholders, who were four venture capital firms headed by Bank of America, Robertson Stevens, was threatening to call their loan due, and we were trying to figure out what to do and how to get out of personal liability for 941, 940 FICA, FUTA, SUTA tax -- anything that would be looked at, the officers and directors and people holding -- signers for bank accounts, and we did that.

But there's no disclosure -- there's not one document that has ever been produced by Eric Blackhall to the board of directors or the managing officers that stated there is a sales tax liability.

Next document is our board meetings. I attended every board meeting. I did not miss one meeting, before Ron Savona joined us and after. And if you go through the agendas, Marcus Harold, he was the secretary and he was the one who kept the notes of all of the board meetings and sent the minutes of the meeting to all the directors and the people who attended the meetings.

And as I go through the meeting agenda and the meeting notes and what was discussed -- especially as we get closer to the discussion of maybe having to do a Chapter 11 filing because of the preferred shareholders putting the squeeze on us and wanting to take over the assets of the corporation, we really got into the weeds of it.

And there's, again, no mention of anything -I'll read something to you that Marcus Harold wrote,
quote, "EcoSystem's agenda and meeting minutes of board of
directors meeting November 1st, 2001, and February 20,
2002, there was no mention of the state sales tax owed in
either meeting. Eric Blackhall and Ron Savona attended
both meetings, with Eric Blackhall presenting the

financial statements of the company to the board of directors. These meetings were held during and cover the same period in which Eric Blackhall prepared and signed the state sales tax return."

2.4

"All board members attended both meetings along with Eric Blackhall, controller of the corporation and Marcus Harold, director of administration for the corporation who took the minutes."

Again, I've gone -- in the last 20 years, I have gone through this countless times with Laura Buckley for 16 years, my attorney and myself, and we can't find one item that talks about state sales tax owed on the piggyback contract.

Next document is the accountant's compilation report that Eric Blackhall presented to the board of directors on October 31, 2002, under GAP accounting, a more formal document, but it does get into the weeds and it does lay out all liabilities, all assets, statement of cash flow. And, again, there's nothing -- there's nothing in this that discussed -- there's a lot -- we discussed a lot of items, a lot of serious items involving finances and then the company moving forward, and one of the things discussed was financial statements, quote, "Review and discuss financial statements. Specific questions addressed by Eric, Keith, and Ron."

State sales tax never came up, and was never disclosed to myself as individual or to any board meeting. My next document is a November 15, 2018 letter to the Office of Tax Appeals. I don't have an exhibit. I'm sorry. It's from my former attorney, Laura Buckley. And I'm just going to go down to the second page of it. And I know you have read it, but I want to express something that I think is important.

And I'm just going to quote her. "Finally, to the best of our knowledge, the issue of collection of sales tax reimbursement by Eco was never addressed in Ron Savona's appeal. We reviewed all documents provided us by the CDTFA, but many documents were redacted and we cannot be sure we received complete copies of all documents in Mr. Savona's appeal. Nonetheless, after a thorough review of what we did receive, it does not appear this issue was ever even raised by either Mr. Savona or the CDTFA.

Mr. Savona's arguments appear to have centered solely upon Keith Christian being the sole responsible party, even though Mr. Savona was the CEO and answered directly to the board."

The reason I bring this up is after I received this document, I talked to an employee at the State, she said, quote, "We only need one. You are jointly and separately responsible. We don't need Savona, we have

you. We only need one."

So Savona has a hearing. I was never given notice that I had an opportunity for a hearing. I consider this my hearing. My only hearing I have ever had. I don't know the exact date of Savona's hearing. I'm guessing it was about 20 years ago. And I'm going to -- this isn't -- well, I might as well say how I feel.

Mr. Savona provided three witnesses, and from what we can tell, talking to one of the witnesses years ago after the case, his entire hearing was based on these three witnesses that put together form letters that -- I'm assuming they attended the meeting.

But what I want to point out -- and I'm not throwing Ron under the bus because I, certainly -- to this day, I don't think Ron, just like me, knew that these -- this piggyback contract might be written incorrectly, sales tax was owed, however, Ron was let off 100 percent as the CEO of the company, having check-signing authority ability just like me. He wrote checks without my knowledge. I wrote checks without his knowledge.

He could have written a check to pay for sales tax if he thought it was owed, he didn't. However, he produced three witnesses that 100 percent said it's all Keith Christian's fault and responsibility for the financial decisions of Eco.

These three witnesses all lied. Completely -they completely perjured themselves for Ron. Because two
of them were relatives of Ron, and I will start with
Robert Corona -- Bob Corona was Ron Savona's cousin. Ron
purchased Bob's company on behalf of Eco, and you can see
on your organizational chart that Bob Corona reported to
Ron Savona.

2.4

And I met Corona one time, and it's just comical that he says Keith Christian, as president of the company, took care of all company financial decisions. Not true. Corona didn't report to me. Savona wrote checks to him, wrote checks to his company. The company that Corona owned that we purchased had an office in Anaheim. I've never been to the Anaheim office.

I met Corona one time in my life. All company checks were signed and sent by Keith Christian.

Completely false. Completely not true. Quote, "There was more than one occasion when I asked Mr. Savona to try and get certain people paid, and he would tell me each time that he had no control of the company funds and he would ask me to contract Keith Christian directly." Quote, "It is clear that Ron Savona had no control over financial matters."

You can see in the organizational chart, he was a CEO. He reported to the board of directors. He had as

much control over the finances as I did, and he knew where the checkbooks were held. Ron didn't need my signature to write a check.

How much time do I have left?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE LAMBERT: You have

20 minutes.

2.4

MR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you.

His second witness, Exhibit 16, is Lisa Parsons. Lisa Parsons is Rob Corona's daughter, so Savona's niece. I have never met Lisa Parsons. She worked out of the Anaheim office for her father, for Robert Corona. And when she says, "All financial questions were directed to him only," meaning Keith Christian. That's not true.

Although she said, "I reported directly to the Bob Corona at the field construction office and dealt with Pat Foster, Eric Blackhall, and Keith Christian as the corporate office." I can tell you under oath that Lisa Parsons did not deal with me. Lisa Parsons was in the Anaheim office and reported to Bob Corona, and Bob Corona reported to Ron Savona.

Ron Savona ran the field office in Anaheim. And Lisa Parsons is correct, she did deal with Pat Foster and Blackhall to get bills paid, not me. She says, quote, "All company checks were signed and send by Keith Christian." Completely false. She worked with Pat Foster

to get bills paid. I showed you a bill paid by Pat Foster. Pat Foster signed checks for Lisa Parsons' payroll, for Bob Corona's onsite work.

2.4

I was not the only person who signed company checks. There were three of us on the signing card, and that's completely false when she said all company checks were signed and sent by Keith Christian.

The third witness was an employee named Gina Florentino, who reported to me in sales. She said, quote, "It was my direct observation that Keith Christian took care of underlying" -- all in caps -- "all financial decisions at Eco. Keith Christian signed all expense and payroll checks. He also approved and issued all vendor requested for payments. When he was out of the office or on scheduled trips, he would pre-sign checks and leave them with accounting."

All of these statements are completely false and misleading. I did not take care of all financial decisions. Once Ron became CEO and all four venture capitalists on the board said, "Keith, we like you. We know that you started this from scratch. We know you have \$3 million in your own money in the company, and we don't want you to leave, but your role is going to be changed." I accepted that. But Ron reported to the board and Ron had the final say on all financial matters.

Gina Florentino says, quote, "Ron Savona and I were located in same office space, and I never observed Ron Savona sign or authorize payments to any creditors." And she declared this under penalty of perjury. And Gina Florentina was Ron Savona's mistress at the company, and his girlfriend. Ron Savona was married at the time, and his wife was living in Los Angeles.

So these three witnesses that Ron presented, they all lied under oath. And Savona was let off because of their lies. There's a document called Sales and Use Tax Department Summary Analysis Administrative Protest, and there's a couple of things that my former attorney and I don't agree with on this, and I want to point it out. I don't have an exhibit number. It's from your file, not mine.

I just want to point out on page 3 that started with my former attorney and I wanted to pick up on it.

"The corporation had funds available for the payment of the sales tax liability and the taxpayer had knowledge of the tax liability" -- that's not true. I have no knowledge of any tax liability for state sales tax.

I clearly had knowledge of 941, DE3, 940, other tax liabilities which I took care of. "Failure to pay the taxes while continuing to pay other creditors was considered evidence of willfulness to not pay the tax

liability." Again, that's not true. I had no knowledge.

I had zero knowledge of that.

It says under the staff's position, I wanted to point out the investigation conducted by the Department shows that, "The taxpayer was the president/CFO/chairman of the board." I was never CFO. We never had a CFO. I don't have a background in accounting. My weakness is accounting. I brought in a controller. We always had a controller, Eric Blackhall was the controller. I was never a CFO. I'm not an accountant.

I wanted to point that out that I was not an accountant. It says, "Additionally, witnesses indicated that the taxpayer kept very close control over all financial decisions." He's referring to these three witnesses and who all perjured themselves. It is clear that Ron had just as much control of the finances, if not more, than I did because once the board hired him as CEO, they started working with him more than working with me, and I worked through Ron at that point in time.

It says, "The taxpayer provided invoices to show that sales tax was not a separately stated item and not added or collected," and that's correct. And it says, "Sales tax was included as part of the lump sum contract and the corporation was the retailer of those modular building," that's not true. There was no sales tax in the

contract.

2.4

There was no lump sum contract. There's no lump sum payment of sales tax. If sales tax was included in the purchase order, it would be listed under the purchase order as the purchase order states it has to be listed separately and it never was.

And it says, lastly, "The corporation CPA indicated that the company collected sales tax from its customers." We may have collected some sales tax from non-piggyback customers, non-government entities, we did some work for private institutions, maybe we might have built some homes and collected sales tax, but not under the piggyback contract. There was no sales tax collected from any school district under the piggyback contract.

Before the company filed bankruptcy, we, as a board, paid all taxes that's we thought were owed. We had no knowledge that there was any state sales tax owed and due. We did not collect any sales tax. If it was collected, it would have been paid. The company never collected any sales tax from any customer, therefore, I can't be held willful.

I do not feel that I am responsible personally.

I don't feel I did anything wrong. I did the best I could under the information that I received from the piggyback contract assumed by Cypress Modular, and we continued to

1 follow the piggyback contract the way it was, and clearly 2 school districts issued purchase orders and was clear that 3 there was no sales tax included in the purchase order, 4 included in any of the breakdown -- everything the 5 purchase order included. And that's all I have. 6 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you, Mr. Christian. 7 8 Ms. Jacobs, do you have any questions for the witness? 9 10 MS. JACOBS: No questions. Thank you. 11 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. 12 I'm going to turn to the Panel to see if they 13 have any questions. 14 Judge Kwee, any questions? 15 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: I did have a 16 couple of questions for Mr. Christian. First, my understanding is your position -- your position primarily 17 18 is that -- your understanding of the business is 19 understood that the contracts fulfilled pursuant to the 20 piggyback contract which was assumed, your understanding 21 was those were nontaxable and that you didn't collect tax 22 and, therefore, the liability -- one of the required 23 elements of 6829 liability is not met, is that a correct

understanding of your position -- a correct summary of

2.4

25

your position?

MR. CHRISTIAN: Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: Okay. And I would like to turn to the sales and use tax returns. I believe there's two of them that were attached to a copy of an exhibit to CDTFA's decision, that was the one that was appealed to OTA. Do you dispute that that was your signature in those two returns, the third quarter of 2002 and the fourth quarter of 2002 sales and use tax returns, is there a question about that?

MR. CHRISTIAN: What document is that?

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: That is the sales and use tax returns for third quarter of 2002 and the fourth quarter or 2002 for EcoCrete, Inc. -- also, the second quarter or 2002.

MR. CHRISTIAN: I'm trying to find that document.

an exhibit to CDTFA's decision, and it looks like it's signed by the president and the signature appears to be similar to the signatures that we have for you. That's why I was wondering if there was any dispute that this was your signature or there was a contention that someone else signed the return.

There was just a signature and a sales and use tax return. It's CDTFA Exhibit A, I believe -- page 30 of Exhibit A for CDTFA's decision.

MR. PARKER: Judge Kwee, we have a printed copy if we can slide over to him and he can look at it.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: That's fine. That would be much appreciated.

2.4

MR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you. This is my signature.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: Okay. The reason I ask is because my understanding is that the liability that is being asserted is not in connection with any disallowed transactions by CDTFA, but what's being asserted is because they are these non-remittance returns and then the liability that was reported on the returns, from my understanding, is what is at issue here, and on these returns, there are listed a taxable amount of transactions subject to state tax. I'm wondering, from my understanding, the company reported these transactions at issue taxable, so I'm just wondering what the taxable transactions represent then.

MR. CHRISTIAN: You're asking what the taxable transactions represent?

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: Right. So

EcoCrete reported transactions subject to tax and
non-remittance return -- that is a return without
submitting any payment -- and my understanding is that
what is being asserted, or at least part of the liability
to be asserted was the failure to pay the tax with the

sales and use tax returns on the transactions that were self-assessed, so I'm wondering if you're disputing, then, that tax liability was that represents that was collected from customers.

2.4

MR. CHRISTIAN: I don't know that answer. I'm not disputing it. This was generated by Eric Blackhall and clearly, they're both my signatures. I signed a lot of documents for the company. The question maybe you could help me with -- this is on line 21 where it says "net tax \$22,413.00," are you saying that this is tax owed for non-piggyback contracts?

administrative LAW JUDGE KWEE: That was my question, because my understanding is CDTFA is asserting the responsible person liability for the amounts that were reported here but not paid to CDTFA. So then -- and my understanding from your position is that you thought the transactions were nontaxable, but then you did report taxable transactions and that seems to be a portion of liability that's being asserted to, so I was wondering if you are disputing that those were accurately reported and the company collected tax on that or if you are just disputing something separate from what is on the returns that was self-assessed.

MR. CHRISTIAN: I know for a fact that the company did not collect any tax from any customer on the

1 | piggyback contract.

2.4

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: How about this. What portion of the business did you do that was not piggyback transactions?

MR. CHRISTIAN: It depends on the time -- the tax year.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: Okay.

MR. CHRISTIAN: Again, we transitioned from housing to school business, and I don't know -- I don't know what these numbers represent, so I don't know why Eric has net tax \$224,013.00, and on the back page factory-built schools nontaxable transaction \$5,893,593.00. I don't know what those numbers represent. Are you saying that the \$224,013.00 has not been paid to the State?

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: If you look at the returns there is the word "NR" and that's non-remittance, and then on CDTFA's decision it says that the liabilities being asserted are the ones in connection with filing a return but not paying tax. So that's why I was just wondering if you could clarify what the non-remittance amount represents, because my understanding is at least the portion of liability isn't something that -- it's something that EcoCrete assessed on taxable transactions that were reported by EcoCrete to CDTFA. I

just wanted to clarify, if you are disputing something different? Are you disputing the entire liability or only the portion that would have been in connection with the piggyback transactions and separate from the non-remittance returns?

2.4

But if you don't know -- I realize this has been a long time, and if you don't recall, that's fine too. I was just trying to understand to what extent you are disputing the liability.

MR. CHRISTIAN: It's been a long time. I don't remember signing this, but it is certainly my signature. I signed a lot of documents. What I'm here to dispute -- my understanding was that I was being looked at because we did not collect state sales tax from the piggyback customers. If this \$224,013.00 is non-piggyback revenue and the \$187,386.00 is non-piggyback revenue, I don't know where that revenue comes from. I don't know how to get ahold of Blackhall after 20 years.

I think I mentioned earlier we did do some work for some non-piggyback customers, and I don't know -- there were some private schools that were allowed to use the piggyback contract that, perhaps, could be what we are talking about here. I don't know the answer.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Thank you.

I just have one further question then and that was about

1	the piggyback contract. My understanding is the full text
2	of that contract that's not in our record and that's
3	not available by either party, I guess you or CDTFA. Is
4	that a correct understanding that you no longer have a
5	copy of the full text of the piggyback contract available?
6	MR. CHRISTIAN: I don't, no. I never have.
7	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: Great. Thank
8	you.
9	I will turn it back to the lead judge. I don't
10	have any further questions.
11	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you,
12	Judge Kwee.
13	Judge Aldrich, did you have any questions?
14	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ALDRICH: I have a
15	couple of questions. With respect to 2002, do you recall
16	if there were any sales to private entities during that
17	time?
18	MR. CHRISTIAN: I don't.
19	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. And if
20	a private sale were negotiated, who on the org chart would
21	have been responsible for making that negotiation?
22	MR. CHRISTIAN: Signing off on it or Gary Ganz
23	and Marcus Harold.
24	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ALDRICH: And that's for

signing off of making the actual --

25

MR. CHRISTIAN: Signing off would be Ron Savona.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay.

2.2

MR. CHRISTIAN: Gary Ganz and Marcus Harold put together, as you can see -- you can look at Daly City as an example. Gary Ganz and Marcus Harold, they managed the piggyback contract, they managed the process of signing the customer, and then Ron would sign off on the actual -- or signing off on the financial numbers that make up the piggyback contract. He had the experience.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. So during 2002, the order org chart that you referenced earlier, is that an accurate org chart during that time?

MR. CHRISTIAN: Just one second. I'm sorry. I got out of order here. Of course, it's always the last piece of paper.

No, it's not completely accurate. I note that Exhibit 5 has a date of 02/06/04, which is two years after I left the company. So I'm not sure who put this together or where this came from. It's not exactly accurate.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ALDRICH: And in what ways is it not accurate other than the date after you left?

MR. CHRISTIAN: So the first thing that's not accurate is Marcus Harold reported to Ron Savona, not me.

Marcus was director of admin services, contract admin and

estimating. I have no background in that. And he worked -- Marcus and Gary Ganz worked hand and hand and both reported to the Ron. Linda Brown reported to Ron Savona. She was just admin services manager. And Eric Blackhall had a dotted line. Eric reported to both of us as controller.

2.4

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ALDRICH: Going back to sales to private entities, so a non-piggyback contract sales, do you recall during 2002 what percentage, if any of them, were private?

MR. CHRISTIAN: If they were private sales, it would have been less than 5 percent. The only thing that comes to my mind is we provided some buildings to University of Southern California, USC. I don't know what year that was. I can't recall if it was a private sale or if they used the piggyback or not.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ALDRICH: Okay. Thank you. I'll refer back to Judge Lambert.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you. I believe Judge Kwee has another question.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: I actually have a question for CDTFA. I just wanted to confirm the scope of what is being asserted. My understanding is that liability being asserted is just the second and third quarter of 2002 non-remittance returns and that the rest

1 of the liability has been deleted; is that a correct 2 understanding? 3 MS. JACOBS: That is correct. 4 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: So there are no 5 board-assessed liabilities, there are only the two self-assessed liabilities at issue? 6 7 MS. JACOBS: That's correct. 8 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Thank you. 9 I'll turn it back to Judge Lambert. 10 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. Thank 11 you. 12 I just had one question for Mr. Christian. 13 to clarify, you were saying you believed or assumed that 14 the sales were exempt, and if that's true, were you told 15 anything specific or definitive or you didn't know anything? What was the basis for assuming that or 16 17 thinking that? 18 MR. CHRISTIAN: I didn't -- I didn't think about 19 that issue until I was approached by the State after I 20 left the company. It never crossed my mind when I was at 21 the company that there was an outstanding liability. You 22 know, the invoice between the purchase orders and the 23 invoices, it never came up. And not just myself, but the board of directors. I also believe Ron Savona and Pat 2.4

Foster, anybody, you know if there was a liability, we

25

1	would have invoiced for it.
2	It would have been on the purchase order. The
3	purchase order from the district states it has to be
4	listed separately, and that would have been our first
5	clue. It never was. So to answer your question, it never
6	crossed my mind when I was at the company that there was a
7	liability owing.
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. Thanks.
9	So we can move on now to CDTFA's presentation.
10	And thank you, Mr. Christian, for answering the questions
11	and your testimony.
12	Ms. Jacobs, if you are ready to proceed for
13	30 minutes.
14	MS. JACOBS: Could we actually take a break?
15	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Yes. Sure.
16	Is a 10-minute break okay?
17	MS. JACOBS: Yes.
18	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Let's go off
19	the record and come back in 10 minutes.
20	(There was a pause in the proceedings.)
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Back on the
22	record. Ms. Jacobs, are you ready to go on with your
23	presentation?
24	MS. JACOBS: I am, thank you.
25	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. Please

proceed for 30 minutes. Thanks.

OPENING PRESENTATION

MS. JACOBS: Good morning. The primary issue in this appeal is whether Appellant can be held liable as the responsible person for the unpaid tax interest and penalties of EcoBuilding System, Incorporated, or Eco, for the period of April 1, 2002 through September 30, 2002.

The Department maintains its position that the Appellant is liable as a responsible person pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 6829 for the unpaid liabilities of Eco for the liability period.

As you are aware, four elements must be met to impose personal liability under Section 6829. One, the corporation must be terminated. Two, the corporation must have collected sales tax reimbursement on its retail sales of tangible personal property, TPP. Three, the person must have been responsible for payment of sales and use tax. And, four, the person's failure to pay must have been willful.

Pursuant to the September 26, 2023, prehearing conference minutes and order, there's no dispute as to the first and third elements. Both parties agree that Eco closed as of November 15, 2002, and Appellant was responsible for the payment of sales and use tax. As to the second element, personal liability can be imposed only

to the extent that the corporation collected sales tax reimbursement on its sales of TPP in the state, but failed to remit the tax to the Department when due. Section 6829(c) and Regulation 1702.5(a).

2.4

The evidence supports that Eco collected sales tax reimbursement on it sales of TPP. At the appeals conference, the Appellant stated that all of Eco's sales of building were based on contracts assigned to it by Cypress, and he also stated that here. Exhibit A, page 7, lines 9 through 10, and the contract is pages 31 through 32.

While we only have two pages of the contract, the cover page and a bid form, the bid form states that the bid amount is to include all applicable taxes and costs, meaning that when agencies submitted purchase orders to Eco for modular building, they were agreeing to pay lump sum amounts with tax included. During the appeals process, Appellant was asked to provide an entire copy of the contract but it has never been provided.

Because the contracts between Eco and its customers were lump sum, there was no need for sales tax reimbursement to be broken out on purchase orders or invoices. This is consistent with the responsive facts the Department received on June 21, 2004 from Eco's former CPA and controller, Eric Blackhall, in which he states

that the company collected sales tax reimbursement from its customers. Exhibit D, page 12.

2.4

According to Appellant, Mr. Blackhall was the person who prepared the returns on which Eco reported substantial taxable sales after taking contract responsibilities from Cypress.

Furthermore, the Department audited Eco for the period of October 1, 1997 through December 31, 2000, and in the resulting report of field audit, the Department described Appellant's business as being a manufacturer of factory-built school buildings and stated that Eco added sales tax to the selling price of taxable sales. Exhibit D, page 17. Finally, during the liability period, Eco was reporting taxable sales and making sporadic payments. Exhibit A, pages 12 through 30.

It seems unlikely Eco would not have collected sales tax reimbursement from its customer if it knew it was making and reporting taxable sales. Appellant introduced purchase orders, Exhibit 4, into evidence. On the back of the purchase order forms, are boilerplate terms and conditions that state, quote, "Sales tax were applicable shall be shown separately," end quote. The invoices do not include a sales tax provision.

Appellant argues that the absence of sales tax on the front page of the purchase orders or invoices is

evidence that sales tax reimbursement was not collected on Eco's sales. While sales tax amounts on purchase orders and invoices would constitute evidence that sales tax reimbursement was collected, the absence of sales tax amounts is not necessarily evidence to the contrary.

2.4

A reasonable explanation may be that these purchase orders were not for sales of school buildings. For example, the purchase order for Downey Unified SD was to, quote, "Cover the cost of architectural and engineering services," end quote. Exhibit 4, pages 5 and 9.

Similar statements of nontaxable services appear on many of the purchase orders and invoices. Another reasonable conclusion for the absence may be that the actual contracts were lump sum with tax included as noted in Exhibit A, pages 31 and 3, and these were simply progress billings. Some of the purchase orders also refer to an agreement dated May 12, 2001, which Appellant has not provided. Exhibit 4 and their opening brief pages 64, 68, 73, 76 and 77.

Appellant has also conceded today and in his October 11, 2002 prehearing conference statement, that the purchase orders submitted are not all of the purchase orders created by Eco and do not cover every transaction in the liability period, meaning while the few they

selected may not delineate sales tax, there may have been some that did.

2.4

Regardless, the direct evidence demonstrates that Eco collected sales tax reimbursement on its sales of TPP which were predominantly lump sum contracts with tax included for the sale of factory-build school buildings. Exhibit A, pages 31 through 32.

As to fourth element of personal liability, the evidence shows the Appellant's failure to pay Eco's tax liability was willful. Failure to pay is willful if the person had knowledge that the taxes were not being paid and had the authority and ability to pay the taxes but failed to do so. Failure to pay may be willful even without bad purpose or motivation, Regulation 1702.5(b)(2).

Here, Eco's taxes at issue became due on the dates its returns were due, meaning on or before the last day of the month following each quarterly period. Those dates were July 31, 2002, for the second quarter 2002, and October 31, 2002, for the third quarter 2002. On or after these due dates, Appellant had actual knowledge that the taxes were due but not being paid because Appellant signed both returns for the periods at issue and did not authorize or sign checks to pay the amounts due. Exhibit D, pages 9 and 10.

This is direct evidence that he knew Eco's taxes were not being paid. Appellant also knew about Eco's history of tax issues, beginning at the very least from the results of the June 12, 2001 audit report. Exhibit G. Furthermore, the fourth quarter 2001 return was filed without remittance of almost \$340,000.00 in tax that was due.

By April 2002, Appellant had promised weekly \$10,000.00 payments against this liability, but failed to follow through. Exhibit H, page 12. Appellant knew that Eco was not meeting its sales and use tax obligations and that the taxes for second quarter 2002 and third quarter 2002 went unpaid. As for Appellant's authority to pay taxes or cause them to be paid, Appellant had the authority to direct the financial affairs of the corporation, including the authority to pay taxes.

Appellant was a founder of Eco, and at various times he was the CEO and CFO, and he was always the president and a signor on Eco's accounts. Nothing indicates that his authority was limited in any way. Appellant has conceded that he was responsible for the payment of Eco's sales and use tax.

During the liability period and after the taxes at issue were due, Appellant was in regular communication with the Department over payment of Eco's liabilities.

See Exhibit H.

On December 10, 2002, Appellant submitted a declaration as part of Eco's bankruptcy filing stating that he was the president and chairman of the board and described his duties as oversight of day-to-day operations, development of business plans, financial restricting activities, and management of assets and operations.

Appellant also stated under penalty of perjury that he had general knowledge of Eco's books and records and was familiar with its financial and operational affairs. Exhibit F, pages 43 through 49.

On July 30, 2002, he signed the second quarter 2002 return listing his position as president. Exhibit D, page 10. On October 31, 2002, he signed the third quarter 2002 return. Exhibit D, page 9. And Appellant also signed various documents on behalf of Eco as president. Exhibit D, pages 43, 48, Exhibit F, pages 20, 24, and 29.

As Eco's primary actor for operations and finances, Appellant had the authority to pay the taxes or cause them to be paid. Finally, as to the ability to pay the taxes, the evidence shows that Eco had funds available to pay the taxes when they became due.

During its last quarters of operations, fourth quarter 2001 through third quarter 2002, Eco reported

total and taxable sales of approximately \$30.5 million and \$9.5 million respectively. The records show that Eco made payment totaling \$4 million to vendors and other creditors between August 14, 2002, and November 14, 2002. Exhibit D beginning page 56. Approximately \$87,500.00 to its landlord on May 2, 2003. Exhibit D, page 24. And payments of around \$640,000.00 after September 3rd, 2002, much of which consisted of checks made out to cash. Exhibit D, pages 56 through 116.

2.4

Thus, the evidence shows that there were available funds to pay Eco's tax liabilities, but the funds were paid to other creditors instead. Also at issue is whether the Department properly conditioned relief of the amnesty interest penalty pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 6592(a) upon either payment of the taxes or entering into an installment payment plan within 30 days after the Department notified Appellant of the final action of this appeal.

In briefing, Appellant argued for what they considered a more reasonable condition for relief. The liability period, April 1, 2002 through September 30, 2002, is within the period for which amnesty was allowed, and amnesty penalties were added to Eco's liability for second quarter 2002 and third quarter 2002.

Section 6592(a) provides that the Department may

relieve Eco of the amnesty penalties if it established a reasonable cause for its failure to complete the amnesty process in a timely manner. The Department determined there was reasonable cause for Eco's failure to timely complete the amnesty process because Eco did not exist when amnesty was available; however, because the amnesty program was intended to encourage the prompt payment of taxes and interest, the Department conditioned relief on Appellant either paying the taxes and interest arising out of the amnesty-eligible periods in full or entering into a qualified payment plan within 30 days for the final action on this appeal.

2.4

In sum, Eco collected tax reimbursement throughout the liability period, and Appellant's failure to pay Eco's sales and use tax obligations was willful, meaning Appellant had actual knowledge that the taxes were not being paid, had the authority and ability to pay the taxes and failed to do so. Based on all of the evidence provided, the Department has met its burden of proving all elements for imposing personal liability to Appellant. For these reasons, we request that the appeal be denied. Thank you.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Thank you, Ms. Jacobs.

I'm going to turn to the Panel to see if they

1 have any questions. Judge Kwee, any questions? 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: I don't have any 3 questions. Thank you. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: 4 Judge Aldrich, 5 did you have any questions? 6 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ALDRICH: No questions. 7 Thank you. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: This is Judge 8 9 Lambert. I was wondering, Ms. Jacobs, with regard to the 10 days after the amnesty penalty issue under Revenue and Taxation Code 7073, it looks like 60 days if a taxpayer 11 12 does certain things. Is it reasonable to 60 days instead 13 of 30 days? MS. JACOBS: So Section 7073(a)(3) does allow for 14 15 relief of penalty within 60 days, but this is a late protest, so the Department's reasoning is that even with 16 reasonable cause for failing to previously pay timely, the 17 taxpayer can't be better off than those who follow the law 18 19 and timely pay it. 20 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. Thanks. 21 Now we can move on, Mr. Christian, to your 22 closing remarks, if you are ready? We agreed to 10 23 minutes for that. So if you are ready to proceed, you can

MR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you. I don't feel the

2.4

25

now go ahead.

State has met its burden at all. I think it's the CDTFA's burden of proof to prove that I should be held personally liable. Do they have any proof that we collected any sales tax from any customers besides the one throwaway sentence in the piggyback contract?

I signed two documents that Eric Blackhall put on my desk. But do we -- is there any proof that that tax was received from our customers? Could Eric Blackhall had been wrong? Could that tax return had been wrong? Were you able to show definitively that we collected any tax from any customer? I don't feel they met their burden of proof. And I can tell you that I had no knowledge that taxes were owed.

The State makes mention that I did, and I did not. If I knew that the taxes were owed, they would have been paid. I'd like to maybe have five minutes to look back -- the State mentioned sales of \$30.5 million and \$9.5 in revenue. I'd like to look at that for a second. I just want to go back. I had no knowledge that tax was due.

The State mentioned I was a CFO. I was not the CFO. I never was the CFO. I'm not an accountant. I graduated from high school and that's it. Accounting is not my background. I hired CPAs, controllers, to handle tax. And whether they handled the tax returns correctly

is a question I have. But I don't know today if the State can really say that definitively that any tax was collected from any of our customers.

2.3

2.4

I also would like to know why Ron Savona was not found liable as my boss. The CEO of the company who reported to the board of directors, why was he let off and why am I being looked at personally for 100 percent of tax that I didn't even know was owed?

You mention installment payment plan. I have been paying \$1,500.00 a month for forever. I don't even know how long I've paid it for. It's been forever. I don't know if it's been five years, 10 years, 15 years. They might know what it is. I've lost track of how much money I have been paying in good faith once a month.

And I'd like to ask a question if I may that -let's assume that we did not collect any sales tax from
the customers and the sales tax returns were correct and
that the company actually did not -- we collected the tax,
can I be held personally liable?

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Mr. Christian, are you asking the Panel something?

MR. CHRISTIAN: I can't ask the Panel questions; is that correct?

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Well, what was the question?

MR. CHRISTIAN: My question is, can I be held personally liable if the tax was collected? Let's assume that we did not collect any sales tax from the customers, that that form that Blackhall produced and I signed that sales tax was correct, but the company actually did not collect the tax from the customer and did pay the State, would I be held liable for that?

2.4

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: CDTFA, did you have any response for that?

MS. JACOBS: One of the requirements for personal liability is that the corporation had to have collected sales tax reimbursement and not remitted it.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Thanks

Mr. Christian, you can continue. You have around five minutes.

MR. CHRISTIAN: I understand the four elements and the element in that I want to focus on is the person being willful. I don't feel I was willful in, quote, "failure to pay." The State is saying that I was willful in failure to pay what was owed. I didn't know it was owed. Nobody at the company knew it was owed. I don't even know if Blackhall's document is correct that I signed.

I would be real curious to know if we collected

1 any sales tax from any customers, but I don't -- I'm 2 steadfast that I would have paid the tax if due, if I was 3 aware of it, and the State mentions that the piggyback 4 included sales tax as a lump sum. That is completely 5 inaccurate. If the piggyback included tax, it would have been on the purchase orders, and it would have been 6 reflected on the invoices from the state agencies. That's 7 all I have. 8 9 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Okay. Thank 10 you, Mr. Christian. 11 So I'll turn to the Panel one more time to see if 12 they have questions. Judge Kwee, did you have any 13 questions? 14 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KWEE: I don't have any 15 further questions before conclude. Thank you. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: Judge Aldrich, 16 17 did you have any questions? 18 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ALDRICH: No further 19 questions. Thank you. 20 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE LAMBERT: I have no 21 questions. I want to thank both parties for coming today, 22 and if there's nothing further, I will conclude the 23 hearing. We are going to issue a written opinion within 2.4 100 days. Thank you. The record is now closed.

(The hearing was adjourned at 11:34 a.m.)

25

1	
2	
3	
4	th
5	
6	ta
7	te
8	by
9	tr
10	fc
11	pr
12	
13	in
14	
15	of
16	
17	
18	
	l

HEARING REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Shelby K. Maaske, Hearing Reporter in and for ne State of California, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing transcript of proceedings was aken before me at the time and place set forth, that the estimony and proceedings were reported stenographically y me and later transcribed by computer-aided canscription under my direction and supervision, that the pregoing is a true record of the testimony and coceedings taken at that time.

I further certify that I am in no way interested n the outcome of said action.

I have hereunto subscribed my name this 4th day f November, 2023.

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Shelby Maaske, Hearing Reporter

Index: \$1,500.00..78

\$	1,000 21:5	2001 18:8 28:22	4
\$1,500.00 60:10	10 7:5 19:12 48:19	52:18 54:4,5 55:25	4 51:19 52:10,19
\$10,000.00 54:9	50:10 53:25 55:2, 15 58:22 60:12	2002 6:11,12	40 21:7
\$187,386.00 43:16	10-minute 7:6 48:16	19:25 28:23 29:16 39:7,8,12,13,14	43 55:12,18
\$22,413.00 41:10	100 21:4 31:17,23	44:15 45:11 46:9, 25 49:7,23 52:22	48 55:18 49 8:11 55:12
\$224,013.00 42:11,14 43:15	60:7 62:24 10th 8:10	53:19,20 54:8,12, 13 55:2,13,14,15,	49th 8:7
\$25,00.00 24:3	11 2:19 5:1,8	16,25 56:4,7,21, 22,24	4K 18:15
\$3 34:22	28:15 52:22	2003 56:6	5
\$30.5 56:1 59:17	116 56:9 11:34 2:18 62:25	2004 22:24 23:19 50:24	5 11:20,22 45:17
\$31,576.00 17:6 \$340,000.00 54:6	12 51:2,15 52:18	2011 16:1	46:12 52:10
\$4 56:3	54:4,10	2018 30:3	56 56:5,9
\$5,893,593.00 42:13	12900 2:16 14 6:24 56:4	2023 2:19 5:1,8 49:20	5A 15:5
\$533,154.00 16:7	15 8:9 23:19 30:3	21 41:9 50:24	6
\$541,765.00	49:23 60:12 15th 22:24	22 9:2,7	60 58:11,12,15
20:10 \$541,765.16	16 8:16 29:11 33:8	24 55:18 56:6	64 8:2 52:19
20:20	17 22:10 51:13	26 49:20 29 55:18	6592(a) 56:15,25
\$640,000.00 56:7	1702.5(a) 50:4		68 52:20 6828 18:3
\$7,158,893.50 15:25	1702.5(b)(2) 53:15	3	6829 6:9 12:13,14,
\$742,616.00 15:6	18011923 2:6 5:7	3 23:11 35:16 52:16	19 38:23 49:10,13 6829(c) 50:4
\$87,500.00 56:5	18011924 2:6 5:8	30 6:12,19,21 21:7	
\$9.5 56:2 59:18	19 19:25 1996 9:20,21	39:24 48:13 49:1, 7 51:15 55:13	7
0	1997 51:8	56:17,21 57:11 58:13	7 4:10,11 50:9
0 15:25 21:2	1st 28:22	300 2:16	70 8:6
0.0 15:25	2	31 29:16 50:10 51:8 52:16 53:7,	7073 58:11 7073(a)(3) 58:14
0.00 15:6 17:7 02/06/04 45:17		19,20 55:15	73 52:20
	2 56:6 20 28:22 29:9 31:6	32 50:11 53:7	76 52:20
1	33:6 43:18 55:18	3rd 56:7	77 52:20
1 6:11,24 11:22	20-year 10:9		78 23:5

79 23:6	accused 19:6	agenda 18:15 28:12,21	apologize 8:23
8	Acinas 20:1	agendas 28:8	appeal 2:5 5:7 6:2,20,22 30:12,
	action 6:20,22 56:18 57:11	agree 35:13 49:22	15 49:4 56:18
8 16:1	activities 55:7	agreed 58:22	57:12,21
8,000 8:10		•	appealed 39:6
	actor 55:19	agreeing 50:16	appeals 2:1 5:6
9	actual 44:25 45:7 52:15 53:21 57:16	agreement 52:18	30:4 50:6,17
9 50:10 52:11	add 16:11,14	ahead 58:24	APPEARANCES 3:1
53:25 55:16	17:17	ahold 43:18	-
940 26:19 27:22 35:22	added 15:12 19:2 21:3 22:2 36:22	Aldrich 3:5 5:11 44:13,14,19,24 45:2,10,20 46:7,	appears 23:20 39:18 Appellant 2:7 3:7
941 26:19 27:22 35:22	51:11 56:23	17 58:4,6 62:16, 18	5:21 6:8,14,20,22 24 49:4,9,23 50:7
9:34 2:17 5:2,9	adding 19:3 Additionally	Alex 19:25	18 51:3,18,24
	36:12	Allen 22:14	52:18,21 53:21,22 54:2,8,10,14,17,
Α	addressed 29:25	allowed 13:12	21,24 55:2,9,16,
2 m 2:17 19 5:2 0	30:11	43:21 56:22	20 56:17,19 57:9, 16,20
a.m. 2:17,18 5:2,9 62:25	adjourned 62:25	Amanda 3:9 5:14	appellant's 4:10
ability 31:19	admin 45:25 46:4	America 27:19	7:1 51:10 53:9
53:12 55:21 57:17	administration	amnesty 6:18	54:13 57:14
absence 51:24	29:7	56:14,22,23 57:1,	applicable 17:13
52:4,14	administrative	2,5,6 58:10	50:14 51:22
absolutely 23:24	5:5,10,20,25 6:6 7:3,11,18,22,25	amnesty-eligible	apply 17:9
accepted 27:6	9:14 11:10,15,19,	57:10	appreciated 40:4
34:24	24 14:24 33:5	amount 16:20	approached 13:
accountant	35:11 38:6,11,15 39:2,11,16 40:3,6,	17:7 20:19 23:11 40:13 42:22 50:14	14:2,18 47:19
22:20 26:23	20 41:12 42:2,7,	amounts 41:14	approval 18:13
36:10,12 59:22	16 43:24 44:7,11,	50:17 52:2,5	24:6
accountant's 29:14	14,19,24 45:2,10, 20 46:7,17,19,21	53:24	approved 13:15
-	47:4,8,10 48:8,15,	Anaheim 13:21	14:2 16:1 34:13
accounting 22:18,20 24:2	18,21,25 57:23	14:15,18 15:22	approving 23:23
27:6 29:16 34:16	58:2,4,6,8,20 60:20,24 61:8,13	32:13,14 33:11, 19,21	approximately 8:10 9:20 56:1,5
36:7,8 59:23	62:9,14,16,18,20	Analysis 35:11	,
accounts 23:25	affairs 54:15	ancillary 11:3	April 6:11 49:7 54:8 56:21
24:2 25:23 27:24 54:19	55:12	•	
accurate 45:12,	afforded 9:2	Andrew 3:5	architect 20:1
16,19,21,24	agencies 50:15	Angeles 35:7	Architects 24:17
,	62:7	answering 48:10	architectural

argued 56:19 aware 20:24 41:6 43:18 46:5 **building** 6:10 21:12 23:12,16 50:25 51:3 59:6,8 16:25 17:7 20:10, argues 51:24 18 24:23 36:25 49:12 62:3 61:4 arguments 30:18 50:8.16 Blackhall's 26:22 В arising 57:9 61:23 **buildings** 10:3,12 11:3 13:4,14 16:3 asserted 40:8,10, Blackstone 13:5 17:20 20:8 25:8. Bacchus 3:11 24,25 41:19 42:19 16 46:13 51:11 **blank** 16:8 46:23,24 back 8:19 21:25 52:7 53:6 board 9:25 10:15, 42:11 44:9 46:7. asserting 41:13 built 18:19 37:12 16,19 12:5,6 16:1 18 47:9 48:19,21 23:19 26:16,24 assessed 42:24 51:20 59:17,19 **burden** 57:19 27:11,14 28:3,5,6, 59:1,2,11 assets 26:13 27:9 background 9:20 9,21 29:1,5,15 28:17 29:18 55:7 10:12 36:7 46:1 30:2,21 32:25 Bureau 5:19 59:24 34:20,24 36:6,17 assigned 50:8 buried 22:4,5,6 37:16 47:24 55:4 **bad** 53:14 assignment 60:6 burrito 16:20 18:13 Bakersfield 9:22 board-assessed **bury** 16:15 **assume** 18:11 balance 27:3.8 47:5 **bus** 31:14 60:16 61:2 bank 27:19,24 **Bob** 32:4,6 33:15, **assumed** 13:1,9 **business** 8:4.17 19 34:3 bankruptcy 15:24 18:8,22 9:21,23 11:2 13:7 27:17 37:15 55:3 **Bob's** 32:5 22:15 37:25 38:20 18:19 26:13 38:18 47:13 42:3,9 51:10 55:6 based 31:10 50:8 boilerplate 51:20 57:18 businesses 8:7 assuming 31:12 book 8:22 11:8 47:16 **basis** 47:16 button 6:4 19:24 assumption began 10:9 **books** 55:10 13:14,25 C beginning 54:3 **boss** 60:5 attached 39:4 56:5 break 48:14.16 California 2:2,17 attended 27:11 behalf 23:24 32:5 5:1 8:3,4,8 9:22, breakdown 38:4 28:5,11,24 29:5 55:17 25 10:4,5,6,8 31:12 briefing 56:19 **belief** 25:20 13:13 16:3,10,11 attending 6:1 18:3 19:5 23:7 **bring** 6:3 14:1 believed 47:13 24:10 46:14 25:21 30:22 **attorney** 3:10,11 Berkshire 13:4 5:14,16 7:21 8:12, call 9:13,17 27:20 **broken** 50:22 13,15,16,23 12:10 **bid** 50:13,14 **called** 10:24 15:1 29:11 30:5 brought 10:16 19:23 35:10 **bill** 21:1 34:1 35:12,17 21:6,19 22:17,22 36:8 billings 52:17 campuses 11:3 audit 51:9 54:4 **Brown** 46:3 bills 33:23 34:1 capital 27:19 audited 51:7 Bucchus 5:16 capitalists 10:1 binder 12:3 August 56:4 34:20 **Buckley** 8:16 Blackhall 22:19 authority 31:18 29:10 30:5 caps 34:11 24:12 26:9,15 53:12 54:13,15, 27:5,11,14 28:2, 16,20 55:20 57:17 budget 26:8 card 34:5 24,25 29:3,6,15 authorize 35:3 builders 9:24 care 32:10 34:11, 33:16,23 36:9 53:24

18 35:23 24:24 33:2 clock 8:6 **company** 10:20, 21,23,24 12:6 **close** 36:13 checking 23:25 **case** 2:6 5:7 8:6 23:24 27:10,12 19:5,13 31:10 24:1 25:23 **closed** 49:23 29:1,22 31:18 cash 26:14 29:19 **checks** 23:23 62:24 32:5,9,10,12,15, 56:8 24:6,25 25:1,2,4 20 33:24 34:4,6, closer 6:3 7:23 31:19,20 32:11, 22 35:5 37:8,15, caused 6:15 28:14 19 40:15 41:8,21, 12,16 33:24 34:2, **CDTFA** 3:10,11 5,6,13,15 53:24 closing 7:6 58:22 25 45:18 47:20,21 48:6 51:1 60:5,18 5:12,15,17 6:17, 56:8 clue 48:5 61:5,22 19,21,23 30:13,17 **chief** 5:18 10:16, 39:24 40:9 41:13, co-panelists 17 12:4 24:15 compensation 15 42:25 44:3 5:11 26:20 Christian 2:6 3:7 46:22 61:8 Coca 16:19 5:7,23,24 6:3,5 compete 9:25 **CDTFA's** 4:11 7:2 7:4,10,13,16,17, **Code** 18:3 49:10 competing 9:23 39:5,17,25 42:18 19,20,21,24 8:1,2 56:15 58:11 48:9 59:1 compilation 9:16 11:12,17,22 Cola 16:19 29:14 **Center** 20:14 12:1 15:1 23:22 24:14 30:19 32:9, collect 17:16 18:4 centered 30:18 complete 11:3 16,21 33:7,13,16, 23:4 37:18 38:21 30:14 57:2,5 25 34:7,10,12 **CEO** 30:20 31:18 41:25 43:14 60:16 32:25 34:19 36:17 38:7,16 39:1,10, completely 32:1, 61:3,6 15 40:5.18 41:5. 2,17 33:25 34:6, 54:18 60:5 collected 6:13 24 42:5,8 43:10 17 45:16 62:4 **Cerritos** 2:16 5:1 14:14 15:16,17 44:6,18,22 45:1,3, computers 11:25 19:17,18,19 13,23 46:11 certified 22:20 21:13,15,17 23:3, 47:12,18 48:10 conceded 52:21 26:22 8,10,13,17 24:8 58:21,25 60:20,22 54:21 **CFO** 36:6,10 26:1 27:2 36:22 61:1,15,17 62:10 conclude 62:15, 54:18 59:21,22 37:8,9,12,13,19, Christian's 31:24 20 41:3,21 49:15 Chad 3:11 5:16 50:1,5 51:1,16 Chula 10:7 13:10, concluding 2:18 chairman 10:20 52:1,4 53:4 57:13 23 14:3 17:23 conclusion 52:14 59:3,10 60:3,18 55:4 18:4,14 22:9 26:4 61:2,11,25 **chance** 9:8 13:17 condition 56:20 cities 10:5 16:3 collecting 19:7, conditioned 6:18 changed 19:14 city 13:21 14:15, 20 56:13 57:8 34:23 18 15:22 16:2,6,8 collection 30:10 19:23 20:1,21 conditions 17:9, Chapter 28:15 21:1 22:2 45:4 Colton 15:4 12 51:21 charged 14:14 claiming 27:1 comical 32:8 conducted 36:4 15:11 clarify 42:21 43:1 commencing conference **chart** 11:18 12:8 47:13 2:17 12:10 49:21 50:7 25:6 32:6,24 52:22 44:20 45:11,12 classroom 18:19 comment 14:18 21:20 confirm 46:22 check 24:3,7,16 classrooms 10:3, 31:21 33:3 11 11:3 13:3 communication conjunction 54:24 22:25 check-signing clear 14:2,5 15:20 31:18 32:22 36:15 38:2 Community connection 40:8 checkbooks 20:14 42:19 43:3

considered 35:25 56:20 consisted 56:8 consistent 50:23 constitute 52:3 construction 33:15 contemplating 27:17 contention 39:21 continue 61:15 continued 18:9 22:16 37:25 continuing 35:24 contract 10:23 12:24,25 13:1,6,9, 10,12,24 14:4,6, 17,18,21 19:1

13 15:3 16:17,18, 21 17:1,16,20,24 18:1,4,8,11,14,16, 17,18,21 19:1 20:14,15,16,20 22:5,15 25:9,10, 14 26:3,4 29:13 31:16 32:21 36:23 37:1,2,13,14,25 38:1,20 42:1 43:22 44:1,2,5 45:6,9,25 46:8 50:10,12,19 51:5 59:5

contracts 20:4 38:19 41:11 50:8, 20 52:15 53:5

contrary 52:5

control 32:20,22 33:1 36:13,16

controller 22:19 26:9,22 27:5 29:6 36:8,9 46:6 50:25

controllers 59:24

copies 14:22 21:5,18 27:7 30:14

copy 9:5 11:7,8 13:18 18:12 23:18 39:4 40:1 44:5 50:18

Corona 32:4,6,8, 11,12,15 33:11, 15,19

Corona's 33:9 34:3

corporate 33:17

corporation 12:17,20 24:7,14 28:17 29:6,8 35:18 36:24 37:7 49:14 50:1 54:16 61:11

correct 11:23 19:8 21:23 23:4 24:11 25:19 33:22 36:22 38:23,24 44:4 47:1,3,7 60:17,23 61:5,23

correctly 59:25

Correspondence 19:23

cost 20:10 52:9

costs 50:14

counties 10:5

countless 29:10

county 22:2

couple 9:12 14:22 16:2 35:12 38:16 44:15

cousin 32:4

cover 29:2 50:13 52:9,24

COVID 8:18

CPA 26:9 27:5 37:7 50:25

CPAS 59:24

created 52:24

creditors 35:3,24 56:3,12

crossed 47:20 48:6

curious 61:25 current 8:17

customer 17:15 18:1,7 19:3 26:5 37:20 41:25 45:7 51:17 59:11 61:6

customers 18:25 21:7 22:10 24:9, 10 25:18 37:9,10 41:4 43:15,20 50:21 51:2 59:4,8 60:3,17 61:3 62:1

Cypress 13:1,2,9, 22 14:2,5,13,14 15:24 18:8,10,22 22:16 37:25 50:9 51:6

D

Daly 16:2,6 19:23 20:1,21 21:1 45:4

date 5:8 31:5 45:17,21

dated 23:18 52:18

dates 53:17,19,21

daughter 33:9

day 10:22 13:17 31:15 53:18

day-to-day 55:5

days 6:19,21 56:17 57:11 58:10,11,12,13,15 62:24

DE3 35:22

deal 33:18,22

dealing 19:5

dealt 33:15

Debbie 22:14

debt 12:23

December 51:8 55:2

decided 10:15 18:10

decision 8:19 10:2 39:5,17,25 42:18

decisions 31:25 32:10 34:12,19 36:14

declaration 22:17 25:5 55:3

declarations 22:24

declared 35:4 definitive 47:15 definitively 59:10

deleted 47:1

60:2

delineate 53:1

deliver 16:25 20:18

demand 23:20

demonstrates 53:3

denied 57:21

department 5:15, 17,19 12:15,20 22:18,21 24:2 35:11 36:4 49:8 50:3,24 51:7,9 54:25 56:13,17,25 57:3,8,19

Department's 58:16

depends 42:5 designing 25:8

desk 24:24 59:7

determined 57:3

development

55:6

Index: Diego..explain

Diego 8:2 10:8,9 21 23:6 24:10 54:1,2,19,22,25 **Equalization** 23:20 26:17 38:2 55:3,10,19 56:11, dime 19:8 23 57:4,15 Division 24:17 Eric 22:19 24:11 direct 34:10 53:3 Ecobuilding 26:9.15 27:5.14 document 11:11 54:1.15 9:12,17 13:14 28:2,24,25 29:3,6, 12:9 16:6 19:23 directed 33:12 49:6 15,25 33:16 36:9 20:11 24:16 41:6 42:11 46:4,5 directly 30:20 **Ecocrete** 6:10,13 26:11,15 27:3 50:25 59:6,8 32:21 33:14 28:2,5 29:14,17 9:16 11:17 20:7 21:9 39:13 40:21 established 57:1 30:3,23 35:10 director 22:14 42:24,25 39:10,15 61:23 estate 9:21 10:13 25:7,24 29:7 45:25 documents 11:9 **Ecosystem's** estimating 46:1 12:12 15:18 24:18 28:21 **directors** 10:1,15, 26:10,13,18 eventually 10:25 19 12:5,7 27:14, Electric 13:4 30:12.13.14 41:8 evidence 6:25 24 28:3,10,22 43:12 55:17 59:6 element 49:25 29:2,16 32:25 7:1,2 35:25 50:5 53:8 61:18 dotted 46:5 47:24 60:6 51:19 52:1,3,5 Elementary 53:3,9 54:1 55:22 Downey 17:5 disallowed 40:9 13:10,22,23 14:3, 56:10 57:18 52:8 disclose 26:23 15 15:22 17:23 **exact** 31:5 **Drive** 2:16 18:5,14 22:9 26:4 disclosed 17:16 examples 15:2 22:8 30:2 **due** 12:17 15:2 elements 6:12 27:20 37:18 50:3 38:23 49:12,22 **excise** 14:20 16:9 disclosure 15:10 53:16,17,21,22,24 57:20 61:17 26.7 17:2,14 28:1 54:7.24 55:23 employ 8:11 executive 10:17 59:20 62:2 **discuss** 27:15 12:4 24:15 employee 19:5 29:24 **duties** 55:5 21:21 30:23 34:8 **exempt** 14:7,19 discussed 18:7 16:8 20:22 22:15 23:16 25:17 27:16 employees 8:10 Ε 24:11 26:7 47:14 19:14 25:11 28:13 29:20,23 **exhibit** 11:15,20, discussion 18:24 encourage 57:7 earlier 43:19 22 13:20,21 19:24 22:13 28:14 45:12 **end** 20:9,19 51:22 20:13 26:8 30:4 disparity 12:2 52:10 33:8 35:14 39:5, easier 9:18 17,24,25 45:17 dispute 6:12 39:6, engineering 25:7 **Eco** 9:13,17,19 50:9 51:2,12,15, 52:10 20 43:12 49:21 12:23,24 13:1,7,8, 19 52:10,16,19 24 14:12 15:2,10, 53:7,24 54:4,10 **enter** 16:22 disputing 41:2,6, 13,15 16:24 17:6, 20,22 43:1,2,9 55:1,12,14,16,18 entered 10:8 21,25 18:3 19:2 56:4,6,9 district 13:11,22, 20:2,24 22:15 entering 6:20 **exhibits** 4:10,11 24 14:3,16 15:4, 25:25 26:24 30:11 56:16 57:10 6:23,24 7:1,2 23 16:23 17:5,15, 31:25 32:5 34:12 entire 31:10 43:2 18,23 18:14 22:2, 49:6,11,22 50:5, **exist** 57:5 50:18 9 23:4,5,10,13 16,20 51:4,7,11, expense 34:12 25:17 26:5 37:14 13,16 52:24 53:4 entities 37:10 48:3 54:11,17 55:17, experience 44:16 46:8 22,25 56:2 57:1,5, District's 18:5 10:11,12 11:2 entity 13:13 14:10 13 45:9 districts 10:4 17:22 19:9 21:24 Eco's 15:21 50:7, **explain** 7:4 8:25 13:5 14:7 21:19, 22:2 24 52:2 53:9,16

9:11 **felt** 13:8 formas 26:10 governing 18:4 explanation 52:6 **FICA** 27:22 forms 51:20 grade 8:10 express 30:7 field 33:15,21 51:9 forward 9:10 graduated 59:23 29:22 extent 43:8 50:1 figure 27:21 Great 44:7 **Foster** 15:14 file 27:17 35:14 green 6:4 22:18 24:1,2,16 F filed 37:15 54:5 33:16,22,25 34:2 **group** 8:14 47:25 **files** 9:10 **guess** 44:3 facilities 16:4 Foster's 24:24 filina 28:15 42:20 guessing 31:6 fact 24:23 26:3 found 17:4.7 60:5 55:3 41:24 gymnasiums final 6:20,22 34:25 founder 54:17 16:4 factory 10:7 56:18 57:11 18:18 founders 9:19 Н **Finally** 30:9 51:13 factory-build fourth 39:8,13 55:21 53:6 53:8 54:5 55:24 hand 7:8 46:2 finance 11:6 factory-built front 51:25 42:12 51:11 handle 59:24 finances 29:21 fulfilled 38:19 33:1 36:16 55:20 facts 12:12 50:23 handled 22:20 full 44:1,5 57:10 59:25 financial 8:19 factually 9:1 26:10 29:1,23,24 **fund** 8:20 happening 8:24 fail 12:22 31:25 32:10.22 funds 32:20 35:18 **Harold** 15:14 33:12 34:11,18,25 failed 6:15 12:16 55:22 56:11,12 25:13 28:8.20 36:14 45:8 54:15 50:2 53:13 54:9 29:7 44:23 45:3.5. 55:6,11 **FUTA** 27:22 57:18 24 financials 24:21 failing 58:17 Hathaway 13:5 G find 29:11 39:15 failure 35:23 headed 27:19 40:25 49:18 53:9, fine 40:3 43:7 **Ganz** 15:14 20:2 10,13 57:2,4,14 Headquarters 25:13 44:22 45:3, firms 27:19 61:20,21 5:18 5 46:2 Florentina 35:5 **faith** 60:14 heard 18:18 **GAP** 27:6 29:16 Florentino 34:9 false 32:17 33:25 hearing 2:20 3:13 **Gary** 15:14 20:2 35:1 34:6,17 5:6,10 9:3,4,6,9 25:13 44:22 45:3, 23:1 31:2,3,4,5,10 flow 26:14 29:19 familiar 10:10 5 46:2 62:23,25 55:11 focus 61:18 Gary's 20:9 held 18:2 29:2 fast 14:23 focused 11:4 general 13:4 27:6 33:2 37:21 49:4 **father** 33:11 59:2 60:19 61:1,7 55:10 folks 23:16 fault 31:24 high 59:23 generated 41:6 follow 38:1 54:10 58:18 hire 10:15 February 28:22 Gina 34:8 35:1,4 forever 60:10,11 federal 14:19 16:9 girlfriend 35:6 hired 12:4 36:17 26:7 59:24 **form** 31:11 50:13 good 5:23 7:16,20 61:4 feel 18:1 31:7 8:1 9:15 49:3 hiring 10:10,16 37:22,23 58:25 60:14 11:1 formal 29:17 59:11 61:19

Index: history..law

history 54:3 information 21:4 22:5 29:21 10,12,20 23:21 37:24 holding 27:24 **knew** 21:16 31:15 J installment 6:21 33:1 51:17 54:1,2, homes 9:22 10:14 56:16 60:9 10 59:15 61:22 37:12 Jack 15:14 25:5,6 institutions **knowing** 19:17,18 Hon 3:3,5 37:11 Jacobs 3:9 5:14 knowledge 12:23 hour 7:5 38:8,10 47:3,7 instructions 15:7 15:15 21:11 24:13 48:12,14,17,22,24 housing 42:9 25:2,3,9,15,25 insurance 26:21 49:3 57:24 58:9, 26:2 30:10 31:20 **human** 11:5 14 61:10,14 intended 57:7 35:19,21,22 36:1, 2 37:17 53:11.21 Jason 3:12 5:18 interest 6:18 49:5 ı 55:10 57:16 56:14 57:8,9 joined 28:7 59:12,19 interesting 17:4, ice 16:19 jointly 10:21,23 Kwee 3:5 5:11 8 19:22 20:3 30:24 38:14,15 39:2,11, idea 19:19 interrupt 7:23 16 40:1,3,6,20 Josh 5:9 important 13:17 41:12 42:2,7,16 introduce 5:12,21 **Joshua** 3:3.5 15:7 30:8 43:24 44:7,12 46:20,21 47:4,8 introduced 51:19 **impose** 49:13 judge 5:5,10,11, 58:1,2 62:12,14 20,25 6:6 7:3,11, investigation imposed 12:15, 18,22,25 9:14 36:4 19 49:25 11:10,15,19,24 L invoice 14:11 imposing 57:20 14:24 33:5 38:6, 16:12 21:1,2,9,10 11,14,15 39:2,11, Lambert 3:3 5:5, inaccurate 23:8 47:22 16 40:1,3,6,20 9,20,25 6:6 7:3, 62:5 41:12 42:2,7,16 invoiced 22:11 11,18,22,25 9:14 include 18:6 43:24 44:7,9,11, 48:1 11:10.15.19.24 12,13,14,19,24 25:21 50:14 51:23 14:24 33:5 38:6, invoices 14:9 45:2,10,20 46:7, 11 44:11 46:18,19 included 12:20 21:4,7 23:14 17,18,19,20,21 47:9,10 48:8,15, 18:25 25:15 26:5 36:20 47:23 50:23 47:4,8,9,10 48:8, 18,21,25 57:23 36:23 37:3 38:3,4, 51:23,25 52:3,13 15,18,21,25 57:23 58:4,8,9,20 60:20, 5 50:17 52:15 62:7 58:1,2,4,6,8,20 24 61:8,13 62:9, 53:6 62:4,5 60:20,24 61:8,13 involved 18:20,23 16,20 62:9,12,14,16,18, including 15:13, 25:12 landlord 56:6 20 14 20:24 21:24 involving 29:21 54:16 large 16:19 25:8 **July** 53:19 55:13 issue 6:8,17 19:13 income 26:19 largest 22:10 26:5 jump 14:21 30:10,16 40:12,16 Incorporated **lastly** 37:7 47:6,19 49:3 June 22:24 23:19 13:2 49:6 53:16,23 54:24 50:24 54:4 **late** 58:15 56:12 58:10 62:23 incorrect 23:24 **Laura** 8:16 29:10 24:21 **issued** 34:13 38:2 Κ 30:5 incorrectly 31:16 issues 6:2 8:17 Laurie 8:21 **Keith** 5:7,23 6:5 54:3 individual 9:19 7:16,21 8:1 23:22 **law** 5:5,10,20,25 10:2 12:16 30:2 item 18:15 19:1 24:14 29:25 30:19 6:6 7:3,11,18,22, 29:12 36:21 individuals 10:10 31:24 32:9,16,21 25 9:14 11:10,15, 33:13,16,24 34:7, items 16:19 20:15 19,24 14:24

Index: lay..minutes

38:11,15 39:2,11, lied 32:1 35:9 Maaske 2:19 matched 20:21 16 40:3,6,20 21:25 lies 35:10 made 10:1,2 11:7 41:12 42:2,7,16 14:5 56:2.8 material 12:12 43:24 44:7,11,14, life 32:15 20:8 19,24 45:2,10,20 maintains 49:8 likes 13:4 46:7,17,19,21 matter 2:5 9:1 make 6:4 7:19 47:4,8,10 48:8,15, limit 24:3 8:19 20:16 24:18 **matters** 32:23 18,21,25 57:23 limited 54:20 45:8 34:25 58:2,4,6,8,18,20 60:20,24 61:8,13 **Linda** 46:3 makes 59:14 meaning 33:13 62:9,14,16,18,20 50:15 52:25 53:17 lines 50:10 making 44:21,25 57:16 **lay** 29:18 51:14,18 **Lisa** 33:8,9,10,17, meeting 27:11,14 lead 3:3 5:9 11:1 18,22 34:2 manage 18:9 28:6,10,12,13,21, 44:9 listed 22:13 37:4, 22,24 30:2 31:12 managed 45:5,6 **lease** 10:9 54:11 5 40:13 48:4 management leave 10:23 34:15, meetings 28:5,9, 11:1 55:7 listing 55:14 23 11,25 29:2,5 live 8:2 manager 20:2 left 10:21 33:4 **member** 10:19 46:4 lived 8:3 45:18,22 47:20 26:24 managing 28:3 living 35:7 left-hand 15:8 members 3:5 manner 57:3 loan 27:20 29:5 legal 5:15,17 8:24 manufacture 17:21 mention 20:11 located 35:2 16:25 17:21 20:18 28:19,23 59:14 letter 19:25 20:9 long 43:7,10 manufactured 60:9 23:18,20 30:3 60:11 17:19 22:10 mentioned 20:6 **letters** 31:11 longer 8:20 12:5 manufacturer 25:17 43:19 13:6 44:4 liabilities 6:10 59:17,21 51:10 26:14 27:9,16 looked 25:23 mentions 17:1 manufacturing 29:18 35:23 42:19 27:23 43:13 60:7 62:3 9:22 10:3,11,13 47:5,6 49:11 Los 35:7 11:2 54:25 56:11 menu 16:18,19 March 19:25 loss 27:4 **liability** 6:11,15 met 32:8,15 33:10 12:13,14,18 38:23 49:12 57:19 **Marcus** 15:14 lost 60:13 26:19,21,24 59:1,11 25:13,22 28:8,20 lot 15:19 25:1,9 27:15,22 28:4 29:7 44:23 45:3,5, microphone 6:3 26:18 27:16 35:19,20,21 36:1 24,25 46:2 7:19 29:20,21 41:7 38:22,23 40:7,11, **Mark** 5:7,23 6:5 43:12 24 41:3,14,19 million 34:22 42:23 43:2,9 **marked** 13:20 56:1,2,3 59:17 **Luke** 23:19 46:24 47:1,21,25 14:23 15:5 19:24 mind 46:13 47:20 lump 36:23 37:2 48:7 49:11,13,25 21:22 48:6 50:16,21 52:15 51:13 52:25 53:8, market 13:8 53:5 62:4 10 54:9,23 56:21, mine 35:15 23 57:14,20 61:11 marketing 11:4 **minute** 16:16 M liable 6:9 18:3 married 35:6 minutes 7:5 8:5,6 49:4,9 59:3 60:5, 27:13 28:10,21 match 21:19 M-O-D-T-E-C-H 19 61:2,7 29:8 33:6 48:13. 10:24

Index: misleading..parks

19 49:1,21 58:23 net 41:10 42:11 observation 24 62:6 59:16 61:16 34:10 **niece** 33:9 org 44:20 45:11, misleading 34:18 observed 35:2 12 non-california mistress 35:5 16:10.13 occasion 32:18 organizational 11:18 12:8 25:6 Modtech 10:24, non-government October 2:19 5:1, 32:6,24 37:10 8 29:16 51:8 25 OTA 2:6 39:6 52:22 53:20 55:15 modular 9:22 non-piggyback office 2:1 5:6 30:4 other's 24:6 10:13 13:2,3,13, 37:10 41:11 43:15,16,20 46:8 32:13,14 33:11, 22 14:5,14 18:9, outstanding 10 25:16 36:24 15,17,19,21 34:14 non-remittance 47:21 37:25 50:16 35:2 40:10,22 42:18,22 oversight 55:5 Modular's 13:9 43:5 46:25 **officer** 10:17,18 12:4 24:15 25:24 owed 12:23,24 **Nonetheless** money 19:10,16 14:14 15:16 28:23 22:2 34:22 60:14 30:15 officers 24:13 29:12 31:17,22 27:23 28:3 **monies** 19:15 nontaxable 38:21 37:16,17 41:10 59:13,15 60:8 41:17 42:12 52:12 onsite 34:3 month 53:18 61:21,22 Nos 2:6 5:7 opening 7:15 60:10,14 49:2 52:19 owing 48:7 **months** 8:20 note 24:18 45:16 owned 32:13 operational **noted** 52:15 morning 5:23 55:11 7:16,20 8:1 49:3 owning 8:7 notes 28:9,13 operationally motivation 53:14 notice 31:3 12:7 Ρ move 7:23 48:9 operations 5:19 noticed 9:4 58:21 55:6,8,19,24 **P&Is** 27:8 notified 56:17 moved 18:18 opinion 62:23 pages 4:10 50:10, **notifies** 6:19,22 **moving** 29:22 12 51:15 52:10, opportunity 7:4 November 28:22 16,19 53:7,25 31:3 30:3 49:23 56:4 55:12,18 56:9 Ν **oral** 5:6 NR 42:17 **paid** 6:16 12:16 order 13:19,21,23 21:2,22 32:19 **named** 34:8 nuances 8:24 14:5,10,12,21 33:23 34:1 37:16, **names** 9:12 **number** 16:12 15:5,12,21,22,25 19 41:15 42:14 16:7,14,15,22,23 19:13 35:14 native 8:3 53:11,22 54:2,14 17:1,5,10,11,14, 55:21 56:12 57:17 **numbers** 42:10, necessarily 52:5 17,22 19:3,10 59:16 60:11 62:2 13 45:8 20:21,23 21:23 needed 16:3 24:7 Panel 3:3,5 38:12 22:6,12 37:4,5 26:13 57:25 60:21,22 0 38:3,5 45:11,14 62:11 negotiate 18:21 48:2,3 49:21 51:20 52:8 **paper** 45:15 negotiated 10:22 oath 8:25 33:17 44:20 35:9 orders 14:9,21,22 **Park** 2:16 15:2,19 18:10 negotiation objections 6:25 Parker 3:12 5:18 21:8,20 22:1 44:21 40:1 obligations 23:15 38:2 47:22 negotiations 54:11 57:15 50:15,22 51:19,25 **parks** 16:4 18:20,23 25:12 52:2,7,13,17,23,

Parsons 33:8,9, percentage 46:9 **pivot** 10:2 **price** 12:21 25:16, 10,18,22 20 51:12 **period** 6:11 29:3 plan 6:21 56:16 Parsons' 34:2 49:7,11 51:8,13 57:11 60:9 **pricing** 25:12 52:25 53:18 54:23 part 21:8 36:23 **plans** 55:6 primarily 38:17 56:21,22 57:14 40:24 55:3 played 25:7 primary 49:3 periods 53:23 parties 49:22 55:19 57:10 **Plaza** 2:16 62:21 principles 27:7 perjured 32:2 point 12:2,8 13:16 party 30:19 44:3 36:15 31:13 35:13,16 printed 40:1 Pat 15:13 22:17,18 36:4,11,19 perjury 35:4 55:9 prior 13:24 14:12 23:1 24:1,2,7,16, Port 10:9 24 25:3 33:16,22, **permit** 16:11 **private** 10:4 37:11 25 34:1,2 47:24 portion 41:18 43:21 44:16.20 person 24:20 46:8,10,11,15 42:3,23 43:3 Pat's 22:22 34:4 41:14 49:5,9, 16 51:4 53:11 position 7:5 9:1, pro 26:10 pause 48:20 11 20:22 22:4 61:18 proceed 7:12 **pay** 6:15 12:16,22 36:3 38:17,24,25 person's 49:18 48:12 49:1 58:23 41:16 49:8 55:14 22:3 31:21 35:23, 24,25 40:25 49:18 personal 6:14 proceedings potentially 23:2,7 50:16 53:9,10,12, 12:13,14,18,22 2:15 48:20 **pound** 20:7 13.24 54:13.16 27:22 49:13.16.25 process 10:10 53:8 57:20 61:10 55:20,21,23 56:11 pre-sign 34:15 21:2 45:6 50:18 57:15,17 58:17,19 personally 6:9 57:3,5 61:6,20,21 predominantly 18:2 19:17 26:25 53:5 produced 21:9 paying 42:20 57:9 37:22 59:2 60:7, 26:10,16,18 27:5 60:10,14 19 61:2 preferred 27:18 28:2 31:23 61:4 28:15 payment 6:19,21 persons 23:23 product 13:8 22:3 35:18 37:3 prehearing 12:10 pertinent 23:22 14:10 23:6 40:23 49:17,24 49:20 52:22 physical 17:21 54:22,25 56:3,15, profit 27:3 prepared 29:3 16 57:7,11 60:9 pick 35:17 51:4 program 57:7 payments 21:18, piece 45:15 progress 52:17 present 8:6 11:14 19,25 34:14 35:3 51:14 54:9 56:7 piggyback 12:24, presentation project 20:2 25 13:6,9,10,12, 7:15 48:9,23 49:2 payroll 34:3,13 projections 24 14:4,6,11,13 presented 12:10 26:11 27:9 penalties 49:6 15:3,24 16:17,21 29:15 35:8 56:23 57:1 17:1,15,20,24 promised 54:8 18:1,5,11,12,13, presenting 28:25 penalty 6:18 35:4 prompt 57:7 17,18,21 19:1 55:9 56:14 58:10, president 10:20, 20:4,13,15 22:7, **proof** 59:2,3,7,12 15 25 12:6 24:14 15 25:8,9,14 26:2, properly 6:17 32:9 39:18 54:19 pencil 16:24 20:6 4 29:13 31:16 55:4,14,17 56:13 37:13,14,24 38:1, **people** 27:24 20 42:1,4 43:4,14, president/cfo/ property 6:14 28:11 32:19 22 44:1,5 45:6,9 12:22 49:16 chairman 36:5 46:16 59:5 62:3,5 percent 23:11 press 6:4 protest 35:11 31:17,23 46:12 pipeline 8:19 58:16 60:7 previously 58:17

relieve 57:1 **prove** 59:2 quarters 55:24 reasoning 58:16 reasons 57:21 relinquished **provide** 11:8 20:8 quesadilla 16:19 50:18 10:18 auestion 39:9 recall 19:4.6 23:9 provided 23:6 41:8,13 43:25 43:7 44:15 46:9, relocated 10:7 30:12 31:8 36:20 46:20,22 47:12 remarks 58:22 46:13 50:19 52:19 48:5 60:1,15,25 receive 9:8 17:22, 57:19 61:1 remember 23:11 25 18:9 19:2,9,15 43:11 30:16 proving 57:19 questions 29:24 33:12 38:8,10,13, remit 50:3 provision 51:23 **received** 4:10,11 14,16 44:10,13,15 7:1,2 9:5,7 15:2, remittance 54:6 **public** 13:5,12 48:10 58:1.3.5.6 25 17:1 19:8,10 22:1,20 26:23 60:22 62:12,13, remitted 61:12 30:14,22 37:24 15,17,19,21 purchase 13:13, 50:24 59:8 remitting 19:7 quick 8:5 19,21,23 14:5,9, receiving 13:24 renewal 18:13,16 10,12,20,21,22 quote 15:8 16:8,9 14:12 15:2,5,12,19,21, replacing 10:17 17:12 23:1,22 recollection 22,25 16:7,14,15, 24:9 25:11,19 report 29:15 22,23 17:4,9,11, 22:23 23:2 28:21 29:23 30:9, 32:11 41:17 51:9 13,17,22 18:9 24 32:17,21 33:23 record 5:6,13,22 54:4 19:2,10 20:21,23 34:9 35:1 51:21, 6:25 44:2 48:19, 21:8,20,22 22:1,6, reported 2:19 22 52:9,10 61:19 22 62:24 12 23:15 37:4,5 10:18 12:4,5,7 38:2,3,5 47:22 quotes 23:9 records 55:10 22:18 24:11,15 48:2,3 50:15,22 56:2 32:6,25 33:14,19, 51:19,20,25 52:2, 20 34:9,24 40:11, R recreational 16:4 7,8,13,17,23 62:6 15,21 41:15,20 redacted 9:5 42:25 45:24 46:3, purchased 14:10 **R&tc** 6:9 30:13 5 51:4 55:25 60:6 32:5,13 raise 7:7 refer 46:18 52:17 Reporter 2:20 purchasing raised 30:17 22:14 referenced 45:11 reporting 11:6 51:14,18 ran 33:21 purpose 53:14 referring 25:14 36:14 reports 25:6 read 12:3 17:9 pursuant 38:19 23:21 28:20 30:7 49:9,20 56:14 reflected 62:7 represent 8:21 40:17,19 42:10,13 readings 12:3 put 31:11 45:3,18 regard 58:9 59:6 Representative reads 16:23 regular 54:24 3:13 putting 28:16 ready 48:12,22 Regulation 50:4 represented 58:22.23 53:14 8:13,15 Q real 9:20 10:13 reimbursement represents 41:3 61:25 6:13 12:21 17:25 qualified 57:11 42:22 30:11 49:15 50:2, realize 43:6 6,22 51:1,17 52:1, request 57:21 quarter 39:7,8,12, reason 14:1 21:5 4 53:4 57:13 13,14 46:25 requested 34:14 22:22 30:22 40:6 61:12 53:19,20 54:5,12 55:13,15,25 56:24 required 20:25 reasonable 52:6, relatives 32:3 24:4 38:22 14 56:20 57:2,4 quarterly 53:18 relief 6:18 56:13. 58:12,17 requirements 20 57:8 58:15

Index: reseller..signatures

61:10 reviewed 16:16 23 41:1 43:14 selected 53:1 30:12 44:16 46:8,9,11 reseller 13:2 self-assessed 47:14 49:15,17,24 **Rob** 33:9 41:2.23 47:6 residential 9:20. 50:1,2,5,6,7,21 24 10:13 Robert 32:4 33:11 51:1,5,12,14,17, selling 12:21 18,21,23,24 52:1, 51:12 resources 11:6 Robertson 27:19 2,3,4,7 53:1,4 send 33:24 role 10:18 25:8 54:11,22 56:1 respect 44:15 34:23 57:15 59:4,17 senior 11:1 Respondent 3:9 60:16,17 61:3,5, **Ron** 10:18,21,22, sentence 59:5 12 62:1,4 response 61:9 24 11:1 12:4,6,7 separate 24:23 **San** 8:2 10:8,9 responsibilities 15:13 18:19 22:25 41:22 43:4 51:6 23:19,22,25 24:4, sand 20:7 5,14,19,25 25:2,6, separately 15:9, responsibility **Savona** 9:3 10:16 13,22 28:7,24 21 17:13 22:13 31:24 12:7 15:13 23:22 29:25 30:11 30:25 36:21 37:6 responsible 18:2 31:14,15,17 32:2, 24:14 25:2,7,13 48:4 51:22 3,4,7,22 33:2,20, 28:7,24 30:17,20, 23:23 24:21 September 6:12 25 31:2,8 32:7,11, 21 34:19,24 35:1, 30:19,25 37:22 49:7,20 56:7,21 3,5,6,8 36:16,19 18,22 33:20,21 41:14 44:21 49:5, 45:1,7,24 46:3 35:1,3,6,9 45:1,24 9,17,24 54:21 services 45:25 46:4 47:24 60:4 47:24 60:4 46:4 52:10,12 responsive 50:23 Ron's 25:3 Savona's 23:1 **set** 20:18 rest 46:25 24:19 30:12,15,18 **Ronald** 10:16 shareholders 31:5 32:4 33:9 restaurant 16:18 27:18 28:15 run 26:13 35:5 restricting 55:7 **sheet** 27:3 scheduled 34:15 resulting 51:9 S sheets 27:8 school 10:3.4 results 54:4 11:2,3 13:5,10,22, **Shelby** 2:19 sale 44:20 46:15 23 14:3,6,15 15:4, **retail** 49:15 53:6 shorter 9:18 22 16:23 17:5,15, retailer 36:24 17,23 18:5,14 **show** 12:12 13:18 **sales** 6:13,14 21:19 22:1,9 23:3, 16:11 36:20 56:2 return 26:17 29:4 12:23,24 14:4,6, 6.10.13 24:10 39:22,24 40:22 59:10 12,13,19 15:6,8, 25:17 26:4 37:14 42:20 54:5 55:14, 11,15,16,20 16:7, showed 34:1 38:2 42:9 51:11 16 59:9 10,11,14,15 17:2, 52:7 53:6 59:23 **shown** 15:9,20 3,7,12,17,25 18:4, **returns** 39:3,7,8, 17:13 51:22 6.15.24 19:1.3.7. schools 10:4,11 12 40:10,11,13 9,20 20:11,20,23, 13:3 22:10 42:12 **shows** 12:15,20 41:1,22 42:17 24 21:2,3,9,11,12, 43:21 43:5 46:25 51:4 14:11 36:5 53:9 22 22:3,4,8,11,12, 53:17,23 59:25 55:22 56:10 **scope** 46:22 17 23:2,5,8,13,17 60:17 24:8 25:15,16,17, side 11:4 15:8 scratch 8:9 34:21 revenue 18:3 20,21 26:6,7,17, **sign** 24:6 35:3 **SD** 52:8 18,24 27:2,15 43:15,16,17 49:10 45:7 53:24 56:14 58:10 59:18 28:4,23 29:4,12 secretary 28:8 30:1,11 31:17,21 signature 24:4 revenues 27:8 section 6:9 12:13, 34:9 35:10,19,21 33:2 39:7,18,21, 19 14:21 49:10,13 **review** 29:23 36:21,23,25 37:3, 23 40:5 43:11 50:4 56:15,25 30:15 8,9,12,13,17,18, signatures 39:19 58:14 20 38:3 39:3,8,11,

Index: signed..threatening

41:7	36:18	sum 36:23 37:2,3	20 38:3,21 39:3,8,
signed 24:17,24	starting 8:9	50:17,21 52:15 53:5 57:13 62:4	12,24 40:14,21,25 41:1,3,10,21,25
25:1,3 29:3 32:16 33:24 34:2,4,7,12	starts 19:25	summary 35:11	42:5,11,20 43:14
39:18,22 41:7	startups 8:8	38:24	49:5,15,18,24 50:1,3,6,17,21
43:12 53:22	state 2:2 8:4,7	supports 50:5	51:1,12,17,21,23,
55:13,15,17 59:6 61:4,24	13:13 14:11,19	supposed 25:25	24 52:1,2,3,4,15
	16:10 17:2,3,17,	• •	53:1,4,5,9 54:3,6,
signer 24:20,22	22 19:5,7,13,16,	SUTA 27:22	11,22 56:11
25:1	20 21:20,24 22:3,	swear 7:7	57:13,15 59:4,7,9,
signers 24:1,22	11,12,16 23:4,7,		10,19,25 60:2,7,
27:24	19 24:17,19 26:3,	sworn 7:9	16,17,18 61:2,3,5,
	7,16,18,19,20,24	System 49:6	6,12 62:1,2,4,5
signing 23:23	27:1,15 28:23	•	taxable 40:13,16,
34:5 43:11 44:22,	29:4,12 30:1,23	Systems 6:10	18 41:18 42:24
25 45:1,6,8	35:21 37:17 40:14	9:13,17 13:14	51:5,12,14,18
signor 18:25	42:15 43:14 47:19		56:1
54:19	50:2 51:21 59:1,	T	Taxation 49:10
oimiler 20:40	14,17,21 60:1		56:15 58:11
similar 39:19	61:6,20 62:3,7	takes 16:24	30.13 30.11
52:12	State's 22:4		taxes 6:19 12:17,
simply 52:16	stated 28:4 36:21	taking 51:5	23 35:24 37:16
slide 40:2	50:7,9 51:11 55:9	talked 26:19	50:14 53:11,12,
Silue 40.2	50.7,9 51.11 55.9	30:23	16,22 54:1,12,14,
small 17:6	statement 12:11		16,23 55:20,22,23
sole 30:19	29:18 52:22	talking 31:9 43:23	56:16 57:8,9,16,
	statements 26:11	talks 29:12	18 59:13,15
solely 30:18	27:4 29:1,23,24		taxpayer 3:7
sounds 9:15	34:17 52:12	tangible 6:14	35:19 36:5,13,20
		12:21 49:16	58:11,18
south 10:8	states 19:11 23:1	tax 2:1 5:6 6:10,13	
Southern 46:14	37:5 48:3 50:13,	12:20,24 14:4,6,	tea 16:19
	25	12,13,19,20 15:6,	team 10:21 18:20
space 35:2	stating 55:3	8,11,16,20,25	40 mm in a4a d 40.44
speaking 12:14,	_	16:7,9,10,11,14,	terminated 49:14
25	steadfast 62:2	15 17:2,3,7,12,17,	terms 17:12 51:21
	Stevens 27:20	25 18:3,4,6,15,24	testimony 14:8
specific 20:4	stick-built 9:24	19:1,3,7,9,21	24:19 48:11
29:24 47:15	Stick-Dulit 9:24	20:11,20,23,25	
sporadic 51:14	strange 23:11	21:2,3,9,11,12,22	text 44:1,5
COLLOGZO 20:46	subject 14:20	22:3,4,8,11,13,17	thing 17:4 19:22
squeeze 28:16	40:14,21	23:2,5,8,13,17	23:9 45:23 46:12
staff 10:10		24:8 25:15,17,21,	
staff's 36:3	submitted 11:11	25 26:6,7,17,18,	things 16:2,4
3.01.3 30.3	22:12 50:15 52:23	19,20,24 27:2,15,	29:22 35:12 58:12
Starland 15:14	55:2	22 28:4,23 29:4, 12 30:1,4,11	thinking 47:17
25:5	submitting 40:23		•
start 32:3	· ·	31:17,22 35:10, 19,20,21,23,25	thought 13:16
	substantial 51:5	36:21,23,25 37:3,	31:22 37:16 41:16
started 8:8 9:21	Suite 2:16	8,9,12,13,17,18,	threatening
20:25 34:21 35:16		0.0.14.10.17.10.	

Index: throwaway..years

27:20 wanting 28:16 wrote 25:11 28:20 U 31:19,20 32:11,12 throwaway 59:4 ways 45:21 throwing 31:14 weakness 36:7 underlying 34:11 Υ time 5:8 27:13 Wednesday 2:18 understand 32:8,15,19 33:4 5:1 11:13 19:15 43:8 year 8:7 42:6 35:6 36:19 42:5 61:17 46:15 weeds 26:12 27:8 43:7,10 44:17 28:17 29:17 understanding **years** 8:2,9,11,16 45:12 62:11 12:13 25:15,20 9:2,5,7 14:17 weekly 54:8 timely 57:3,4 38:17,18,20,24 19:4,12 21:21 58:17,19 Westmore 20:14 40:7,12,15,23 27:10 29:9,11 41:13,16 42:22 31:6,9 43:18 times 29:10 54:18 wholesaler 13:3 43:13 44:1,4 45:17 60:12 today 5:11 8:25 wife 35:7 46:23 47:2 21:14 52:21 60:1 willful 37:21 understood 27:1 62:21 49:19 53:10,13 38:19 told 47:14 57:15 61:19,20 unemployment total 15:6 16:1 willfully 6:15 26:20 20:10 21:2 56:1 12:16,22 19:20 **Unified** 15:4 17:5 21:16 totaling 56:3 52:8 willfulness 35:25 **TPP** 49:16 50:2,6 University 46:14 withhold 19:16 53:4 unpaid 6:9 49:5, 21:15,16 track 60:13 10 54:13 witnesses 24:19 trademark 9:16 **USC** 46:14 31:8,9,11,23 32:1 transaction 17:6 35:8 36:12,15 42:12 52:24 ٧ wondering 39:20 transactions 40:14,16 41:2,19 **vague** 23:1 42:21 58:9 40:9,14,15,17,19, 21 41:1,17,18 vendor 15:8 word 42:17 42:4,25 43:4 16:10,13 17:9 words 18:6 25:19 34:13 **TRANSCRIPT** work 16:2 26:22 2:15 vendors 56:3 34:3 37:11 43:19 transitioned 42:8 venture 10:1 worked 33:10,25 27:18 34:19 trips 34:15 36:19 46:2 **Vista** 10:7 13:10, true 32:10,17 worker's 26:20 23 14:3 17:23 33:13 35:20 36:1, 18:5,14 22:9 26:4 25 47:14 working 8:18 36:18 truthfully 9:1 W write 33:3 tune 19:14 written 20:2 24:16 turn 6:7 7:19 waited 9:2 31:16,21 62:23 38:12 39:3 44:9 wanted 12:1,8,9, 47:9 57:25 62:11 wrong 19:20 11 13:7 24:18 37:23 59:9 35:17 36:3,11

43:1 46:22