BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Appeal of:)	
SARATOGA SPRINGS, INC.,)) OTA NO. 2301122	50
Appellant.)))	

CERTIFIED COPY

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Sacramento, California

Tuesday, October 15, 2024

Reported by:

CHRISTINA RODRIGUEZ Hearing Reporter

Job No.: 512820TA(A)

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	In the Matter of the Appeal of:
6	SARATOGA SPRINGS, INC.,) OTA NO. 230112250
7	Appellant.)
8)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken
16	at 400 R Street, Suite 470, Sacramento,
17	California, commencing at 9:30 a.m.
18	and concluding at 10:46 p.m. on Tuesday,
19	October 15, 2024, reported by
20	Christina L. Rodriguez, Hearing Reporter.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3		
4	Administrative Law Judge:	NATASHA RALSTON GREG TURNER
5		JOSHUA LAMBERT
б	For the Appellant:	MONIKA MILES
7		JOHN HUK
8	For the Respondent:	KEVIN SMITH
9		CARY HUXSOLL JASON PARKER
10		
11 12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	
1	I N D E X
2	
3	EXHIBITS
4	
5	(Appellant's Exhibits 1-14 were admitted into evidence,
6	page 7)
7	(CDTFA's Exhibits A-F were admitted into evidence, page 8)
8	
9	
10	PRESENTATION
11	PAGE
12	By Ms. Miles 8
13	By Mr. Huk 20
14	By Mr. Smith 39
15	
16	
17	CLOSING STATEMENT
18	PAGE
19	By Ms. Miles 43
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Sacramento, California; Tuesday, October 15, 2024 9:30 a.m.

2.2

2.4

JUDGE RALSTON: We are opening the record for the hearing of Saratoga Springs, Inc. Today's date is October 15th, 2024, and the time is approximately 9:30 a.m.

Today's hearing is being heard by a panel of three administrative law judges. My name is Natasha Ralston, and I am the Lead Administrative Law Judge who will be conducting the hearing for this case. Also on this panel are Judge Turner and Judge Lambert. After the hearing, all three judges will confer and produce a written decision.

Any judge on this panel may ask questions or otherwise participate to ensure that we have all the information needed to decide this appeal. The Office of Tax Appeal is not a court but is an independent appeals body which is staffed by tax experts and is independent of any tax agency including the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration, or CDTFA.

Also present is our Stenographer,

Ms. Rodriguez, who is reporting this hearing verbatim.

To ensure we have an accurate record, we ask that

1	everyone speaks one at a time and does not speak over
2	each other. Also, speak clearly and loudly; and when
3	you're about to speak, please pull your microphone close
4	and make sure it's turned on.
5	When needed, Ms. Rodriguez will stop the
6	hearing process and ask for clarification. After the
7	hearing, Ms. Rodriguez will produce the official hearing
8	transcript which will be available on the Office of Tax
9	Appeals' website.
10	And we will ask the parties to please
11	introduce themselves and state who they represent for
12	the record starting with the Appellant.
13	MS. MILES: I'm Monika Miles, President of
14	Miles Consulting Group representing Saratoga Springs.
15	MR. HUK: And I'm John Huk, representing
16	Saratoga Springs. I'm a senior tax manager at Miles
17	Consulting.
18	MR. SMITH: I'm Kevin Smith, representing The
19	California Department of Tax and Fee Administration.
20	MR. HUXSOLL: Carry Huxsoll from the CDTFA
21	Legal Division.
22	MR. PARKER: Jason Parker, Chief of
23	Headquarter's Operation Bureau of CDTFA.

earlier, this hearing is being live stream to the public

JUDGE RALSTON: Thank you. As I mentioned

24

25

1	and is also being recorded. The transcript and the
2	video recording are part of the public record and will
3	be posted on with our website.
4	The prehearing conference in this matter was
5	held on September 23rd, 2024. Appellant submitted
6	exhibits labeled 1-14. Respondent did not have any
7	objections to Appellant Exhibit's 1-14. Just to
8	confirm, you still have exhibits 1-14?
9	MS. MILES: Yes.
10	JUDGE RALSTON: Okay. Respondent, you still
11	have no objections?
12	MR. SMITH: That's correct.
13	JUDGE RALSTON: Thank you. Appellant's
14	Exhibit 1-14 are admitted without objection.
15	(Appellant's Exhibit's 1-14 were admitted
16	into evidence.)
17	JUDGE RALSTON: And Respondent CDTFA has
18	submitted exhibits lets double check. Respondents
19	submitted Exhibit's A-F; is that still correct? Those
20	are your exhibits.
21	MR. SMITH: That's correct.
22	JUDGE RALSTON: Thank you. And you still have
23	no objections to Respondent's Exhibits?
24	MS. MILES: No objection.
25	JUDGE RALSTON: Thank you. So Respondent's

1	Exhibits A-F are admitted without objection.
2	(Respondent's Exhibits A-F were admitted
3	into evidence.)
4	JUDGE RALSTON: Neither party intends to see
5	call any witnesses in this case. Appellant will have 45
6	minutes to present their case. Respondent will have 15
7	minutes to present their case. And then Appellant will
8	have 10 minutes for rebuttal. The panel members may
9	have questions for any party at any time.
10	Does anyone have any questions before we move
11	on to our opening presentations? I see none
12	MR. HUXSOLL: Actually, Ms. Ralston, I just
13	want to know the department does not object to what was
14	provided on Friday as it's a by Appellant because
15	it's a compilation of pages previously provided
16	exhibits, so I just want to note that for the record.
17	JUDGE RALSTON: Thank you, appreciate that.
18	Okay. Please begin when you're ready.
19	
20	PRESENTATION
21	MS. MILES: Good morning. As stated, I'm
22	Monika Miles, President of Miles Consulting Group
23	representing the Taxpayer, Saratoga Springs, in today's
24	hearing.

My colleague, John Huk, and I spend our time $\,$

25

with you today to show that the taxpayer clearly relied on the results of a prior audit by CDTFA, and it is reasonable that Saratoga Springs receive relief from the taxes and interest assessed in the second audit as provided by CRTC, Section 6596. We will lay out our argument follows:

2.4

First, a brief description of the taxpayer's business. Briefly, Saratoga Springs is a family owned wedding and event venue located in Saratoga, California, since 1975.

We will show that Saratoga Springs was audited by the CDTFA for two separate audit cycles -- the period from 2013 to 2016 which we will refer to, quote, as the prior audit; and, then, again, from 2018 to 2020 which we will refer to as the current audit.

A few points with respect to this: In the current audit by CDTFA, it was determined that the company did not charge sales tax on facility fees and other gross receipts related to the sale of food and beverages, also known as venue rentals and sales when they are in fact subject to tax.

The bookkeeper for the prior audit and the current audit was Ms. Debbie Hall. She has many years of experience and is still the bookkeeper for Saratoga Springs.

Auditors in the current audit determined the amount of taxable measures from these items to be approximately \$2 million dollars; and the total tax to be approximately \$185,000 dollars plus interest. In the first audit, the auditor, Mr. Coffman, spent over 88 hours on his audit.

2.4

Specifically, we will prove based upon his own words in the audit working papers that he reviewed invoices as required by CDTFA audit principles in depth and on an actual basis, and he did not discover the error or make an adjustment with respect to the revenue in question.

We submit here that the taxability of the items at issue is not complex, the revenue at issue is clearly subject to sales tax.

We will show that during the current or second audit, the audit team encouraged the taxpayer to seek relief under California Section 6596 and relayed in Regulation 1705 as they, the CDTFA audit team, strongly believed the taxpayer relied on the prior audit.

The current CDTFA audit team felt so strongly about this that they offered to write up the request and send it up the chain.

We will remind this body of the requirements of Section 6596 and relative Regulation 1705 and how

Saratoga Springs meets all of them; including, in pertinent part, 6596 find that a taxpayer's failure to report the current amount of tax is relieved when the taxpayer reasonably relies on the CDTFA's written advice -- including from audit working papers in a prior audit.

2.4

Per Regulation 1705(c), written advice provided in the prior audit, the presentation of a person's books and records for examination by an auditor shall be deemed to be a written request for the audit report by the audited person and any person with shared counting and common ownership with the audited person.

If a prior audit report of the person requesting relief contains written evidence which demonstrates that the issue in question was examined either in an sample or sensus -- actual review, such evidence will be considered written advice from the board for purposes of this regulation.

A sensus or actual review as opposed to a sample review involves examination of 100 percent of the person's transactions pertaining to the issue in question.

For Regulation 1705, as just quoted, we will show you the prior auditor's own words within the work papers that indicated -- indicate that he reviewed records in depth and on an actually basis. And we

believe these words are important.

2.4

We will show that he spent at least six days either, quote, "Working on the sales tax accrual records;" or, quote, "working on the schedules and records," per his own permission in the working papers. What, we ask, was he working on?

Whether he did not understand the rules related to venue fees or simply, carelessly disregarded the documents in spite of this narrative, the fact remains that his conclusions were that certain taxable transactions were exempt, and the taxpayer relied on the prior auditor's conclusions to the taxpayer's detriment.

Today, we will walk you through one or two transactions within the audit working papers to prove that the auditor did review the items in question and erroneously agreed with bookkeeper's methodology -- leaving her no other rational conclusion than her existing methodology was correct and should be continued.

(Reporter interruption.)

MS. MILES: Sure.

The purpose of this will be to illustrate the documents that were provided to the auditor, and the critical nature of the review of the sales invoices to the sales tax accrual analysis that was performed by the

auditor and Ms. Hall.

2.4

The set of pages we will be going over were provided to you on Friday and were also previously included in the provided exhibits.

The underlying invoices that we will show you will show that invoices are structurally the same in both audit periods and that they show clearly which line items on the invoices are subject to tax as delineated with a "Y", yes for taxable, were not subject to tax, as delineated by an "N" for no.

We will show that the later invoices are treated consistently as compared to the earlier invoices. Obviously, the reason we are here today at OTA is because the CDTFA appeals conference holder disagreed with the request for relief under 6596.

During our time today, we will rebut her arguments appeal to this body that her disallowance should be revisited as we believe it is an error. Respectfully, we understand that the requirements of 6596 are a high hurdle to jump, and we are prepared to do so.

The statute and related regulations were written potentially to make it difficult but not impossible to invoke the relief section.

Throughout our discussions today, we will show

that the bookkeeper, Ms. Hall, reasonably relied on audit working papers and audit results of the first audit; and, therefore, did not change her methodology for taxable sales even though they were consistently an error.

We will address the obvious question: How can a rational person walk away from a prior audit after working through it in depth and reviewing the working papers and not assume she was doing things correctly.

Thank you for allowing me to lay the foundation for our presentation today. We'd like to lay out the case in more detail, per my outline, unless you have any questions.

(Pause.)

2.4

MS. MILES: As promised, we will now line out the case in a little bit more detail based on my points before.

A brief description of the taxpayer's business, Saratoga Springs Picnic and Campgrounds is a corporation headquartered in California since 1975. They are family owned wedding and event venue in Saratoga. Most of the company's revenue streams come from weddings and various related rentals and corporate events.

Their bookkeeper, Ms. Debbie Hall, has been

working with the company since 2016. As I mentioned, we will show that Saratoga Springs was audited by the CDTFA for those two separate periods; and, just for the record, the first period is from October 1st, 2013 through September 30th, 2016, which we refer to as the prior audit.

2.4

And, then, again, to confirm the dates on the second audit -- January 1st, 2018 through December 31, 2020, which we refer as the second audit. Again, in the current audit, it was determined that the company did not charge sales tax on facility fees and other gross receipts when they are, in fact, subject to tax.

The bookkeeper, Ms. Debbie Hall, worked with the auditor in the first audit, Mr. Walter Coffman, to develop the sales tax report that was used to determine the basis for the prior audit. We will show from the working papers that they both agreed to the numbers reflected.

Also, for the record, auditors determined the amount of taxable measures from these items to be \$2,034,452 dollars and the total tax to be \$184,681 dollars; less credits of \$694 dollars, along with interest which as of December 2022 was \$43,452 dollars.

Saratoga Springs had recently been subject to a similar audit by the CDTFA in which case after

engaging with and cooperating with the prior auditor,
Mr. Walter Coffman, over that time period. Taxpayer had
relied on those findings in a way it taxed certain items
in the prior audit; mainly venue fees and continued to
treat them as nontaxable.

2.4

During the current audit, CDTFA auditors identified the error and have assess of the tax on the measure related to the venue fees and other taxable items.

In the first audit, Mr. Coffman spent over 88 hours, per his time logs, on this audit. Specifically, we will prove based upon his own words in the audit working papers that he reviewed invoices as required by CDTFA auditing principles; on which the taxpayer had erroneously recorded venue rental revenue as nontaxable. And he did not make an adjustment; and he did not suggest they were doing anything wrong.

In the BOE-414Z, the assignment activity history, Mr. Coffman specified six days in January and February 2017, during which he either -- and, I quote, was, "working on the sales tax accrual records today," or, was, quote, "working on the schedules and records today."

In a few moments, my colleague, Mr. Huk, will walk through the requirements of proper audit procedures

-- and that means he must have been reviewing invoices, which he also said he did.

In the second audit, the auditors found the errors right away. As consultants to the taxpayer, brought in to assist with the second audit, we found the errors right away. In 88 hours of reviewing Saratoga's books and errors in depth and on an actual basis, that's a hundred percent, the prior auditor did not discover the error.

We will also refer to our Exhibit 2, an affidavit from the bookkeeper, Ms. Hall, where she refers to Mr. Coffman asking to see a, quote, "a couple of representative invoices from our wedding and other events."

She printed some out and gave them to the auditor. She then said, "I remember him looking at them then handing them back to me after indicating they looked fine."

Again, we reference the Section 6596 and related regulations and how Saratoga meets all of them; including reliance on written advice from audit working papers and items which I have mentioned previously.

I'd like to highlight, again, the a sensus or actual review, as opposed to sample review, involves examination of a hundred percent of the person's

transactions pertaining to the issue at question.

2.4

For written advice contained in a prior audit of the person to apply to the person's activities or transaction in question, the facts and conditions relating to the transaction must not have changed from those which occurred during the period of operations in the prior audit -- and they did not.

Audit comments, schedules, and other writings prepared by the board that become part of the audit work papers which reflect that the activity or transaction in question was properly reported, and no amount was due, are sufficient for a finding for relief from liability, unless it can be shown that the person seeking relief knew such advice was erroneous.

Again, we will show during the -- that during the current or second audit, the audit team encouraged the taxpayer to seek relief under Section 6596, as they strongly believed the taxpayer relied on the prior audit. The audit team felt so strongly about this that they wrote up the request to send up the chain.

To quote from the memorandum from Veronica of San Jose Office Administrator to Susanne Buehler, the Deputy Director, on November 5th, 2021 -- which is our Exhibit 1.

I quote, "In this -- in the prior audit, sales

taxes were not collected on the wedding facility fee and other related charges; and, therefore, were not reported as taxable sales on the sales and use tax returns."

2.4

The prior audit verification comments stated that the prior audit -- pardon me, that the prior auditor reviewed sales invoices and original customer invoices but failed to assess tax on these charges.

There had not been any changes to how the taxpayer invoice the customers from the audit period to the current. A sample invoice is attached in CROS for your reference.

I'd like to highlight the following quote from Ms. Santanius, "Based on a misinformation found in the prior audit of Saratoga Springs Picnic, I recommend granting the taxpayer Section 6596 relief from the payment of tax, interest, and penalty added thereto on the wedding facility fee and other related charges."

Now, I'd like to turn the presentation over to my colleague, John Huk, who will describe for this panel the specific details of not only how an audit is performed, but also how this audit was performed.

I'd like to preface this discussion by saying that prior to his employment at Miles Consulting,
Mr. Huk spent the majority of his career, over 30 years, at the California State Board of Equalization as both an

auditor; and, for 25 years, as an audit supervisor. He viewed audits every day and trained auditors on proper audit technique.

Mr. Huk.

MR. HUK: Good morning. In accordance with Regulation 1705(c), relief from liability, we will show that the tax liability assessed in the current audit was examined in the prior audit on a natural basis; and, at Saratoga Springs, relied on the comments and findings of the prior audit to it's detriment.

We will also show the facts and conditions in the current audit, and, in a prior audit, did not change. The prior auditor's comments, schedules, and assignment activity history support our contention that RTC 6596 relief must be granted to Saratoga Springs.

The support for our request is challenging because of prior auditors' verification comments are below the standard of quality that we would expect.

Regarding completeness and accuracy, the audit manual states, quote, "Working paper should be complete and accurate in order to provide proper support for findings, conclusions, and recommendations."

The test of completeness is whether a third party can review schedule, understand it's purpose, and make use of it without consulting with the auditor who

prepared it.

2.2

2.4

Regarding clarity and understandability, the audit manual states, quote, "Working papers should be clear and understandable without supplementary oral explanations. The information they reveal should be clear, complete, and concise."

The prior auditor failed to describe the specific invoices that he reviewed and what he learned in his review of the sales invoices. Out of comment should describe the verification procedures performed and explain what was found and why it was considered either taxable or nontaxable.

CDTFA's Audit Manual, Sections 0405.10 and 0406.55 emphasize that a review of sales invoices is required when a sales tax accrual account analysis is used to determine audited taxable sales as was done in the prior audit. A sales tax accrual account reviewed is not supportable if a review of the sales invoices is not made by the auditor.

A sales tax accrual account analysis devoid of a review of sales invoices is insupportable; basically, it's garbage in results, and garbage out.

It's important to state that the sales invoice that were provided to the auditor for the entire audit period and the auditor wrote that his review included

the review of sales invoices, original customer invoices, and the sales tax collected.

2.4

It is not unreasonable to conclude that the prior auditor's review of the sales invoices found no issues, and, for that reason, he did not make the obvious comment that the recorded sales tax was properly charged on sales invoices.

The following is another example of the auditor's lack of acceptable verification comments that comes from the use tax side of the prior auditor's work papers.

On the worksheet labeled "paid bills", the auditor reviewed purchase invoice for \$5,144 dollars but only assess use tax on \$4,320 dollars. What happened to the difference, the \$824 dollars between the total purchase price and the measure -- taxable measure assessed.

The auditor included no verification comments for his review of fixed assets, which is required -- he did it with fixed asset examination nor the paid bills. And, obviously, he picked this up either in fixed assets or paid bills. How does this pass the local offices' reviewer. Why doesn't he have any comments on what happened to the \$824 dollars. It's beyond me.

It's incumbent on the CDTFA, not the taxpayer,

to expect it's auditors to adhere to writing verification comments that are complete, accurate, clear, and understandable; and, when they are not, for the local office supervisor reviewer and the audit principle, to return the audit report to the auditor to correct the working papers so that they meet the standards of completeness, accuracy, clarity, and understandability.

2.4

The following of verification comments that the prior auditor wrote, quote, "The current bookkeeper and auditor discussed this issue in a more complete review of the total sales and taxable sales were then begun. This review included the review of sales invoices, original customer invoices, and the sales tax collected.

Per review by both the taxpayer and auditor, both parties are in agreement with the sales tax differences that would be assessed in the audit on a natural basis.

Another quote, quote, "The taxable sales were compared to the revenue, and tax reports were used to complete the audit. The reports were generated by the new bookkeeper and were verified by the corporate officers for accuracy."

Another quote taxable sales area was reviewed

in depth. Quote, "The current bookkeeper needed to recreate the sales and sales tax reports. The audit was based on these new reports and verified by both the corporate officers and the auditor."

2.2

2.4

The differences between recorded and reported sales tax was assessed in the audit on an actual basis. In spite of the poor quality of the prior auditors comments, we know the following:

We know that the prior auditor looked at taxable sales in depth. We know that the prior auditor wrote he assessed sales tax in the audit on an actual basis. We know that the prior auditor used the sales tax reports created by Debbie Hall, the bookkeeper, to calculate audited taxable sales.

We know that the prior audit was based on the sales tax accrual reports created by the bookkeeper that the auditor verified them and the auditor reviewed both sales invoices and sales tax collected.

We know that the current bookkeeper and auditor discussed the sales tax accrual analysis and that a more complete review of sales tax was conducted. We know this because this is what the prior auditor wrote in his verification comments.

Saratoga Springs learned two things from the prior audit: One, that the amount of tax collected from

customers must be reported to the CDTFA. They need to carefully review their sales tax accrual account and report the tax collected;

2.2

2.4

Two, the amount of tax they charged the customers for the sales and services they make was accepted as correct by the auditor. If it wasn't, they would have surely heard about it.

The bookkeeper's understanding from the prior audit was that the so called recorded tax of Schedule 12 A2 was the correct amount of tax; in other words, the total recorded sales tax on Schedule 12 A2 was the audited sales tax. This understanding was reasonable because the bookkeeper worked closely with the prior auditor.

The bookkeeper, Debbie Hall, provided the prior auditor with the sales tax accrual account transactions for the entire audit period. Every single invoice that included any amount of the sales tax was listed line by line for the entire audit period in the sales tax reports.

The sales tax on the sales tax accrual report listed the date of the invoice, the customer's name, and the amount of the sales tax collected from the customer. The auditor was provided with every customer invoice for the audit period -- he wrote that.

The auditor wrote in his verification comments that, quote: "Taxable sales were compared to the revenue and tax reports were used to complete the audit. The reports were generated by the new bookkeeper and verified by the corporate officers for accuracy."

2.4

The prior auditor did not even provide

Saratoga Springs, the bookkeeper -- their bookkeeper -with the most relevant publication for a business
selling food and beverages -- the dining and beverage
industry publication.

On the 414E, page two, the auditor provided publications 17, appeals procedure; 70, the taxpayer's rights; and 76, audits but not the dining and beverage industry publication.

If the prior auditor had provided the dining and beverage publication, perhaps Debbie Hall, Saratoga Springs bookkeeper, would have discovered on her own that wedding cake cutting is taxable. Serving of food and beverages is taxable. Corporate fees are taxable. Dance floors are not taxable, and facility fees are taxable.

Unfortunately, the prior auditor failed to provide the publication so that the taxpayer's bookkeeper might properly learn on her own what is and isn't taxable for Saratoga Springs. We know she didn't

learn it from the prior auditor.

2.4

The bottom line is that the amount on the sales tax accrual account, which were prepared by the bookkeeper and reviewed on an actual basis by the auditor, were deemed to be the audited sales tax due for the audit period; less, the previously reported tax to the CDTFA.

The appeals conference holder, Ms. Denise
Riley, wrote in her decision, quote: "The prior auditor
in this case did not examine insufficient detail
petitioner's transactions in such a way that he could of
discovered the fact that petitioner was incorrectly
claiming taxable charges and fees as nontaxable.

Instead, as indicated above in her decision, in the prior audit, the department decided to compute petitioner's audited taxable sales by preparing petitioner's sales tax accrual accounts with reporting tax." Quote closed.

The appeals conference holder's conclusion is misplaced perhaps she did not understand that the sales tax accrual report includes a detailed listing of every tax invoice and that both the sales invoices and collected sales tax were reviewed by the auditor.

It is a simple step to trace a sales invoice and the sales tax charge on the invoice to the sales tax

accrual account. In fact, it is not only a simple step, as noted earlier, it is an essential step to a properly conduct a sales tax accrual analysis.

2.4

Ms. Riley mistakenly wrote in her decision, quote: "Accordingly, we find that where, as here, the department uses a methodology to determine audited taxable sales that would not have uncovered the errors at issue. Such methodology does not demonstrate that the issue in question was examined." Quote close.

Ms. Riley's conclusion is entirely false as previously explained. Ms. Riley also states, quote:
"There is no written evidence that the department examined nontaxable sales in the prior audit." Quote closed.

Once again, Ms. Riley's comment exposes her lack of understanding of how a sales tax accrual analysis done, and what type of sales transactions were on Saratoga Springs sales invoices.

The first step in a sales tax accrual is to review sales invoices to ensure that the tax is properly charged and that all revenue that is taxable is taxed. The nontaxable sales are readably found on Saratoga Springs sales invoices.

Taxable facility fees, which were traded as nontaxable, were on the first line of every wedding

invoice. All revenue that was not taxed on the invoices was noted with a quote, unquote, "little N" for nontaxable.

2.4

Many of these quote, unquote, "nontaxable items" were not taxed in error. Then, the auditor must total the taxable sales, apply the sales tax rate, and verify that the sales tax on the invoice matches the sales tax that was recorded in the sales tax accrual account.

The bookkeeper's sales tax report -- pardon me, yeah -- the bookkeeper's sales tax report, if not, all nine items on the sales invoices are taxed, then the auditor either accepts or denies that non-taxed amounts are correct.

The takeaway for the bookkeeper is that her method of charging sales tax to customers was blessed by the auditor. So she continued too improperly exempt taxable transactions into the current audit period that should have been assessed by the prior auditor. We know that this is true -- we know that this is true based on our cursory review of 25 invoices from the prior audit.

Saratoga Springs was improperly not taxing transactions that were assessed in the current audit.

Our test of 25 invoices is a reasonable test in light of the prior auditors written comments -- that he reviewed

taxable sales in depth and that he assess sales tax on an actual basis.

2.4

If he had, in fact, done a sensus, then he would have uncovered the errors on the 25 transactions that we reviewed. A sensus in Regulation 1705(c) is defined as, quote: "A sensus --" in parenthesis, "actual review as opposed to a sample review involves examination of 100% of the person's transactions pertaining to the issues in question." Quote closed.

It is clear that Saratoga Springs continued to charge tax incorrectly because the prior auditor accepted as Saratoga was taxing its customers. We also know that it would have been unreasonable for Saratoga Springs to change how it was charging tax to customers in light of what the findings were in the prior audit.

The prior auditor's report and findings did not provide Saratoga Springs with any reason to change how they were taxing principal with any reason to change how they were charging tax to its customers.

Finally, the auditor states on his 414(c), the assignment activity history, that, as Monika mentioned earlier, on six separate days, he was either working on the sales and used tax accrual account records today or working on the schedules and records today.

Those dates were: January 19th, 2017;

February 9, 2017; February 10, 2017; February 15, 2017; February 16, 2017; and February 22nd, 2017.

We point this out because the appeals conference holder cites the CDTFA's position with respect to the review of the sales invoices, quote:

"That department contends based on it's review of the prior audit work papers that petitioner does not qualify for relief under RTC Section 6596 because the prior audit work papers do not describe the transactions at issue herein. The department argues that although the fees and charges at issue, herein, were not assessed in the prior audit.

The prior audit work papers and comments did not demonstrate that such fees and charges were examined and considered exempt. Rather, the department asserts that the transactions were overlooked and not directly assessed in the prior audit -- as opposed to being allowed as exempt." Quote closed.

We ask, what was the auditor doing for six days if the only thing that he did was to take from the bookkeeper's sales tax report, the quarterly sum sales tax amounts, and place them in column B of Schedule 12 A2 and then take from the tax differences between reported and recorded on Schedule 12 A2 and build the schedules on 12 A1 and Schedule 12 A.

These procedures might take a few hours if the auditor footed the amounts from the sales tax report which was an excel workbook then it might take another hour to verify of that the tax amounts in the credit column of the sales tax report were properly footed.

Lets say, four total hours.

2.4

The auditor spent 88 hours on the audit and for six days -- so about 30 to 40 hours he stated that he was working on the sales tax accrual records and schedules. There was ample time for the auditor to do the necessary audit procedures for a sales tax accrual analysis in effect to verify that the tax collected on the sales invoices were correct for the audit period.

Is it reasonable to surmise, as the CDTFA did, that for six days the prior auditor, a senior tax auditor, overlooked and did not directly address sales invoices.

In other words, he effectively did nothing; or is it more fair to conclude that the auditor did what he wrote -- he reviewed sales invoices and sales tax collected. He just did a poor job of explaining the extent of his review and his conclusions, much like the transaction concerning the used tax.

So I'm just going to quickly take you through the documents that we provided on Friday, which

Mr. Huxsoll confirmed were acceptable to the CDTFA. So, you know, page one of that is simply the 141M, the transcript of the returns.

2.4

The next few pages -- two, three, four, and five -- are an exert from the sales tax reports. So for all quarters of the prior audit, this is what the sales tax report looked like.

And you can see by looking at page two that there are line-by-line descriptions of who the customer was, what the date was, and how much tax; and if you total up the credit column, which is highlighted in two, three, four, and five, you'll get to the last page -- on page five.

The 163,844, which is what the auditor described as the total sales tax reported, but, essentially, it's audited. Usually, an auditor would describe that as audited sales tax, but that's where he got it from so that's what he called it.

We asked the bookkeeper to hazardly (sic) choose 25 invoices over the audit -- the prior audit period, and, so, she did. And we provided just -- I mean, they are part of the record, but we provided just for the hearing today -- a few of the invoices.

If we cut right to the invoice, that kind of covers all the transactions that were scheduled and

1	assessed in the current audit. If we go to the KD and
2	David's wedding, we can see that \$1,155.37 was the
3	amount of tax collected on that invoice.
4	And if you go to page three, you'll see
5	highlighted in pink, \$1,155.37 cents. So the
6	JUDGE RALSTON: I'm sorry, Mr. Huk. Which
7	exhibit is this again?
8	MR. HUK: Oh, this is the one that was sent on
9	Friday.
10	JUDGE RALSTON: Oh, okay.
11	MR. HUK: Yeah.
12	JUDGE RALSTON: What
13	MR. HUK: Oh, I'm sorry.
14	JUDGE RALSTON: What number?
15	MR. HUK: Yeah. So page 15 page 15 is
16	Katie and David's wedding.
17	JUDGE RALSTON: Alright. Thank you.
18	MR. HUK: Yeah. And, so, there's \$16,425.28
19	cents was the amount charged to the customer. And then
20	the tax was \$1,155.37 cents. If you multiply the tax
21	rate 8.75 times \$16,425.28 cents, you will not get
22	\$1,155.37 cents because not everything was taxed.
23	If you look at the column "taxable", you'll
24	see that the very first transaction is a facility fee,
25	and there's a little N there it wasn't taxed. They

also didn't tax on the cake cutting, didn't charge tax on the corkage fee, and didn't charge tax on the bartender.

2.4

And then when you go to page three of the package from Friday, this is the sales tax transactions report. You'll see the 1,155.37 cents. You would expect the auditor would look at invoices -- some amount of invoices -- and tell us which ones the auditor looked at and then trace to the sales tax accrual account the amount of tax.

And, so, that's clearly an issue, and that's why we're saying goshy (sic), it's been six days, what did he do. All he had to do was go to the amount of sales tax on the last page of the sales tax report for third quarter and post that to column B of 12 A2, and you've got the audit. I'm sure he did more than that. He's just not good at writing comments, frankly.

And, so, then pages 16, 17 are -- we've highlighted much of what was said by both Monika and myself in the comments. And then you see on page 18, we've highlighted the -- all but February 22nd, where the auditor writes that he's working on the sales tax accrual records today; he's working on the schedules and records today.

There's nothing else to this audit. There's

\$300 dollars in used tax for the one item that he didn't say anything about. And then there's this, the sales tax -- so 88 hours. And then page 20 and 21 and 22 are the citations that we mentioned regarding what the audit manual chapter 4 says regarding tax accruals and the review of invoices.

And then the last three pages are the transactions that should have been assessed in the prior audit but were quickly, as Monika stated, found by the current auditor.

Monika.

2.4

MS. MILES: I think -- just one more thing I'd just like to highlight, just to emphasize. As you look at the invoices -- so pages 13, 14, and 15 -- there are, again, both taxable and nontaxable items identified.

So if the auditor had reviewed invoices, which he said he did, we're showing that he reviewed both taxable and nontaxable items, which the ACH indicated that he did not. And, he clearly did, these invoices have --

JUDGE RALSTON: Ms. Miles, could you please use your microphone. Thank you.

MS. MILES: I'm sorry.

JUDGE RALSTON: No problem.

MS. MILES: Again, I state that these invoices

1	show both taxable and nontaxable parts of transactions.
2	And one of the arguments from the ACH was that he only
3	reviewed nontaxable items or did not review nontaxable
4	items, but, clearly, these invoices show and these
5	are representative that there are always taxable and
6	nontaxable items on the invoices.
7	So I just wanted to highlight that for you.
8	And I believe that's all we have at this point before we
9	make our closing remarks.
10	JUDGE RALSTON: Okay. Thank you. I just had
11	a quick question: So on the invoices, they have the
12	little N was nontaxable, the Y was taxable, and there's
13	some within oh, okay. The upper case N, was that
14	supposed to be lowercase N? Or just
15	MR. HUK: Yeah. Probably. If it's an N, it's
16	nontaxable. Yeah.
17	JUDGE RALSTON: Okay. Thank you.
18	MR. HUK: Yeah.
19	MS. MILES: And, again, these are that's
20	reported by the taxpayer. These are her demarcations.
21	The big N, or the little N
22	MR. HUK: Well, that's what's on the invoice
23	to the customer.
24	JUDGE TURNER: That's right. That's the

question I had. That's the actual invoice --

25

1	MR. HUK: That is the actual invoice and
2	doesn't
3	JUDGE TURNER: with the N and a Y in it?
4	MR. HUK: That's correct. Yeah.
5	JUDGE TURNER: So if the auditor examined it,
6	that's what they would see as well?
7	MR. HUK: Right. And if a customer wanted to
8	make sure what was taxed, then the customer can add up
9	the Y's that have a dollar amount and multiply times the
10	tax rate. The tax rate is always 8.75 percent because
11	of the venue. Everything in Saratoga Springs is a 8.75
12	percent.
13	JUDGE RALSTON: Okay. Thank you.
14	MR. HUK: And, I apologize, I didn't turn my
15	mic on either.
16	JUDGE RALSTON: Were you able to catch
17	everything even though the mics were off?
18	THE HEARING REPORTER: Yes. Thank you.
19	JUDGE RALSTON: Okay. Thank you.
20	Judge Turner, did you have any other
21	questions?
22	JUDGE TURNER: No. Thank you.
23	JUDGE RALSTON: Okay.
24	And, Judge Lambert, did you have any
25	questions?

1 No questions. JUDGE LAMBERT: Thanks. 2 THE HEARING REPORTER: Can I have a second to 3 start a new file? Just one second. 4 JUDGE RALSTON: Yeah, sure. 5 Actually, lets take a five minute break. if you are CDTFA or for the Appellant, you might want to 6 turn the mics off because the live stream is still on 7 8 going. Thank you. 9 (Break.) 10 JUDGE RALSTON: We are back on the record in 11 the appeal of Saratoga Springs. Is everyone ready to 12 move forward. Okay. Thank you. And, Mr. Smith, you can begin when you're 13 14 ready. 15 Thank you. MR. SMITH: Good morning. At issue today is whether 16 appellant is entitled to relief under Section 6596 based 17 18 on prior auditor advice. 19 Appellant is a California corporation that 20 operates a picnic facility and event venue in Saratoga, 21 California. As relevant, here, it also rents its 22 facilities for weddings and other large events, offers 23 catering, and other services. 2.4 Upon review of the books and records, the

department found that appellant reported a total gross

25

sales of approximately \$15 million dollars and claimed deductions totaling approximately \$6 million dollars.

2.4

After further review, the department determined improperly claimed as nontaxable, charges the fees for wedding rentals, and wedding facilities and other miscellaneous wedding charges. The department disallowed these claim nontaxable charges for the liability period which totaled approximately \$2 million dollars.

Appellant contends that he reasonably relied on erroneous written advice given by the department during the prior audit.

Under Revenue and Taxation Code, Section 6596, the department finds that a person's failure to make a timely return on payment was due to the person's reasonable reliance on written advice, the person may be relieved for the taxes apposed of any penalty or interest.

In the previous audit of the person requesting relief contains evidence demonstrating that the issue in question was examined. Either on a sample or actual basis, such evidence would be considered written advice from the department.

Audit comments, schedules, and other writings prepared by the department that become part of the audit

work papers was reflected that the activity transaction in question was properly reported and no amount was due or sufficient to greater relief of liability. Unless it can be shown that the person seeking relief knew such advice was erroneous.

2.4

With respect to the prior audit, the records does not show that the department examined reported nontaxable sales, as well as the invoices, and found no errors.

Instead, the department of prior audit performed the audit by comparing it to sales tax accrual accounts with reported tax to compute the audit liability.

The tax was returned on a sales tax reconciliation error. There's no evidence that the prior auditor examined nontaxable sales in relation to wedding charges. Unless appellant was incorrect in claiming that the department's failure to identify incorrectly claim nontaxable sales resulted liability here.

Further, appellant's argument that the department should have known that appellant was incorrectly reporting tax during the prior audit periods because the appellant provided thorough records for examination for the prior audit, as well as invoices, is

incorrect.

2.4

The appellant is essentially arguing that the department's failure to alert appellant errors means the department provided erroneous advice to appellant of the taxability of certain transactions -- this is not the standard.

The law authorizes relief from tax based on prior audit report only when the appellant establishes that the audit report contains original evidence demonstrated that the issue in question was examined.

Thus, even if the department had access to records that could have uncovered such errors, the absence of evidence that the department actually examined the issue. The department cannot be said that examined issue nor provided any written advice.

As discussed in the precedential opinion in the appeal of Praveen, the law only authorizes relief from tax based on a prior audit report when a taxpayer establishes that the audit report contains written evidence demonstrated that the issue in question was examined.

No relief is available based on neither report that should have caught error but did not. For these reasons, no relief could be provided under Section 6596.

And this concludes my presentation. Thank

1	you.
2	JUDGE RALSTON: Thank you.
3	Judge Turner, did you have any questions for
4	CDTFA?
5	JUDGE TURNER: I do not.
6	JUDGE RALSTON: Thank you.
7	Judge Lambert, did you have any questions for
8	CDTFA.
9	JUDGE LAMBERT: No questions. Thanks.
10	JUDGE RALSTON: Thank you.
11	So you have 10 minutes for your rebuttal.
12	Thank you.
13	
14	CLOSING STATEMENT
15	MS. MILES: Thank you.
16	Thank you to the panel for hearing our case
17	today. I know that we've asked you to hear a lot of
18	detail today about audit procedures, documentation,
19	reliance by a reasonable person, and many other details.
20	I'd like to close by asking the panel to take
21	away the following main points from our detailed
22	presentation. The legislator drafted the protection of
23	6596 specifically to protect taxpayers from exactly such
24	a case where the CDTFA is an error.
25	The taxpayer relied on that erroneous advice

to their detriment, and there is a subsequent assessment based on such error. We know that Section 65 relief is hard to come by and many hurdles must be jumped to successfully claim such relief.

We believe the facts we presented shows that those requirements were met. There's no smoking gun in this case. There's not a specific line item that says we gave you this advice, but we have shown that clearly the auditor reviewed these invoices.

We have shown that the auditor in the first audit said that he spent time reviewing in depth and on an actual basis that's 100 percent of the documents for over 88 hours. This provides proof that he did sample, he reviewed on a sensus basis, he reviewed everything. And those words in the working papers matter.

He made no adjustments to the erroneously characterized venue fees after reviewing them for six days. There were only 1,150 sales invoices for the entire first audit period upon which sales tax is charged. 88 hours is ample time to review such invoices.

He did not recommend any changes nor share common publications with respect to these items. He left the bookkeeper, Ms. Hall, with the reasonable conclusion that what she was doing was correct, and she

continued to do to the company's detriment on the second audit.

2.

2.4

We also bring our surprise that CDTFA could have called the auditors as a witness in this proceeding, but they did not. Why? We presumed it had to be because he would have had to say that he did review the invoices which included the incorrect tax classification.

We have walked this panel through an in-depth flow of a typical wedding transaction from invoice through the books and records and to the audit work papers to include the primary piece of evidence required to the audited -- the invoice.

We flow the invoice to the company's sales tax accrual account. We showed that the auditor reviewed both the invoices and the accrual schedule and accepted them per his notes in the working papers. We show that in his sales tax reconciliation work paper, he reported that he and the bookkeeper agreed to the data.

We have met all the requirements under 6596, and the related regulation. There was written advice in the working papers that state that the auditor reviewed invoices in depth and on an actual basis and agreed with the bookkeeper's schedules. The company bookkeeper relied on such advice. How could she not.

The company's books and records are maintained in the same manner in those audit periods. We believe we've rebutted the arguments of the appeals conference holder and shown that if audit procedures were adhere to, and how could they not be over an 88 hour audit, the auditor must have reviewed the area in question and either accepted it an error or ignore it.

2.4

Either way, he made no change, and the taxpayer relied upon it. That was reasonable. Why would a taxpayer question the audit results and begin to change procedure that they already believed to be correct unless they were told to.

The ACH, the appeals conference holder, indicated the major reason she disallowed relief was the prior audit work papers and comments do not demonstrate that such fees and charges were examined in detail and considered exempt, and we absolutely disagree.

We remind you that Mr. Coffman spent at least six days reviewing schedules and records. He also indicated he reviewed invoices on an actual basis. Both taxable and nontaxable transactions were reflected on the invoices as previously stated.

His work papers and comments absolutely demonstrate that both taxable and nontaxable items, those marked by taxpayer with a Y or an N on the

invoices, were reviewed. It's not reasonable for him to be looking at anything else for six days.

2.4

We respectfully submit that 6596 was meant to protect taxpayers from exactly such a case. Fortunately, California's Legislature felt strongly that the relief section should be in the tax code and that it applies to both request for written advice and audit working papers.

The standard for Section 6596 relief is very high and difficult to prove when an auditor fails to explain the scope of work and its findings. It's difficult to determine what happened years later and when the auditor is not before us to ask.

However, we have proven that the evidence in the prior audit is more than sufficient to sustain written evidence in a form of comments and conclusions that the taxpayer relied on to its detriment in later years. We believe it does not stand to reason that the bookkeeper in this case would have:

One, worked for the prior audit; two, worked with the auditor -- discuss with him that there were no adjustments to the invoices reviewed; three, received no assessment on these matters; four, review the corresponding working papers and then change course.

She did not change course because she relied

1 on the audit and the audit working papers because it was 2 reasonable for her to do so. If this fact pattern does not rise to the level of 6596 relief, we ask, what does? 3 4 And, therefore, this taxpayer must prevail. 5 We, again, summarize that the taxpayer must receive relief because it is clear that they relied on 6 7 prior audit advice that was erroneous presented by a veteran auditor of the CDTFA. 8 In the private sector, if I provided this 9 10 erroneous advice to my clients -- costing them hundreds of thousands of dollars -- it would likely be deemed 11 12 malpractice. In the public sector, it's an egregious 13 error perpetrated upon this taxpayer who deserves the 14 relief that Section 6596 provides. 15 Thank you again for listening to our 16 arguments. 17 JUDGE RALSTON: Thank you. Check with me 18 co-panelist. 19 Judge Turner, did you have any questions. 20 JUDGE TURNER: No additional questions. Thank 21 you.

JUDGE RALSTON: And Judge Lambert.

JUDGE LAMBERT: No. No questions. Thanks.

JUDGE RALSTON: Okay. So I don't have any

further questions. Thank you everyone.

22

23

2.4

25

1	Today's hearing and the appeal of Saratoga
2	Springs, Incorporated is now adjourned. And the record
3	is closed.
4	(The hearing concluded at 10:46 a.m.)
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 HEARING REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 I, Christina L. Rodriguez, Hearing Reporter in 3 4 and for the State of California, do hereby certify: 5 That the foregoing transcript of proceedings 6 was taken before me at the time and place set forth, 7 that the testimony and proceedings were reported stenographically by me and later transcribed by 8 computer-aided transcription under my direction and 9 10 supervision, that the foregoing is a true record of the 11 testimony and proceedings taken at that time. 12 I further certify that I am in no way interested in the outcome of said action. 13 I have hereunto subscribed my name this 4th 14 15 day of November, 2024. 16 17 18 19 20 21 2.2

25

23

24

Hearing Reporter

CHRISTINA RODRIGUEZ

Index: \$1,155.37..accrual

\$	14 36:14 141M 33:2	3	8
\$1,155.37 34:2,5,	15 2:19 5:1 8:6	30 19:24 32:8	8 4:7,12
20,22	31:1 34:15 36:14	30th 15:5	8.75 34:21 38:10,
\$15 40:1	15th 5:7	31 15:8	11
\$16,425.28 34:18,	16 31:2 35:18	39 4:14	88 10:5 16:10 17:6
21	163,844 33:14		32:7 36:3 44:13, 20 46:5
\$184,681 15:21	17 26:12 35:18	4	
\$185,000 10:4 \$2 10:3 40:8	1705 10:19,25 11:22	4 36:5	9
\$2,034,452 15:21	1705(c) 11:6 20:6	40 32:8	9 31:1
\$300 36:1	30:5	400 2:16	9:30 2:17 5:2,7
\$4,320 22:14	18 35:20	414(c) 30:20	
\$43,452 15:23	1975 9:10 14:20	414E 26:11	A
\$5,144 22:13	19th 30:25	43 4:19	A-F 4:6 7:19 8:1,2
\$6 40:2	1st 15:4,8	45 8:5	a.m. 2:17 5:2,8
\$694 15:22		470 2:16	49:4
\$824 22:15,24	2		A1 31:25
\$624 22.15,24	2 17:10	5	A2 25:10,11 31:23
0	20 4:13 36:3	5th 18:23	24 35:15
	2013 9:13 15:4	011 10.20	absence 42:13
0405.10 21:13	2016 9:13 15:1,5	6	absolutely 46:17
0406.55 21:14	2017 16:20 30:25		acceptable 22:9
1	31:1,2	65 44:2	33:1
<u> </u>	2018 9:14 15:8	6596 9:5 10:18,25 11:2 13:15,20	accepted 25:6
1 18:24	2020 9:14 15:9	17:19 18:17 19:15	30:12 45:16 46:7
1,150 44:18	2021 18:23	20:15 31:8 39:17 40:13 42:24 43:23	accepts 29:13
1,155.37 35:6	2022 15:23	45:20 47:3,9 48:3,	access 42:11
1-14 4:5 7:6,7,8, 14,15	2024 2:19 5:1,7 7:5	14	accordance 20:5 account 21:15,
10 8:8 31:1 43:11	21 36:3	7	17,20 25:2,16
100 11:19 44:12	22 36:3	7 4:5	27:3 28:1 29:9 30:23 35:9 45:15
100% 30:8	22nd 31:2 35:21	70 26:12	accounts 27:17
10:46 2:18 49:4	230112250 2:6	76 26:13	41:12
12 25:9,11 31:22,	23rd 7:5	20.10	accrual 12:3,25
24,25 35:15	25 20:1 29:21,24		16:21 21:15,17,20 24:16,20 25:2,16,
13 36:14	30:4 33:20		24.16,20.25.2,16,

Index: accruals..authorizes

28:1,3,16,19 29:8 41:5 42:4,15 apply 18:3 29:6 26:3 27:6,15 30:23 32:9,11 43:25 44:8 45:21, 28:13 29:18,21,23 apposed 40:17 25 47:7 48:7,10 35:9,23 41:11 30:15 31:7,9,12, 45:15,16 approximately 13,17 32:7,11,13 affidavit 17:11 5:7 10:3,4 40:1,2, 33:6,20 34:1 accruals 36:5 agency 5:21 35:16,25 36:4,9 accuracy 20:19 40:12,19,24,25 area 23:25 46:6 **agreed** 12:16 23:7,24 26:5 41:6,10,11,12,23, 15:17 45:19,23 argues 31:10 25 42:8,9,18,19 accurate 5:25 43:18 44:11,19 agreement 23:17 20:21 23:2 arguing 42:2 45:2,11 46:2,4,5, alert 42:3 ACH 36:18 37:2 10,15 47:7,15,20 argument 9:6 48:1,7 46:13 allowed 31:18 41:21 arguments 13:17 audited 9:11 activities 18:3 allowing 14:10 11:10,11 15:2 37:2 46:3 48:16 activity 16:18 Alright 34:17 21:16 24:14 25:12 18:10 20:14 30:21 **asserts** 31:15 27:5,16 28:6 amount 10:2 11:3 41:1 33:16,17 45:13 assess 16:7 19:7 15:20 18:11 24:25 **actual** 10:10 25:4,10,18,23 22:14 30:1 auditing 16:14 11:15,18 17:7,24 27:2 34:3,19 35:7, assessed 9:4 auditor 10:5 11:8 24:6,11 27:4 30:2, 10,13 38:9 41:2 20:7 22:17 23:18 12:15,23 13:1 7 37:25 38:1 **amounts** 29:13 24:6,11 29:19,23 15:14 16:1 17:8. 40:21 44:12 45:23 31:22 32:2,4 31:11,17 34:1 16 19:6 20:1.25 46:20 36:8 ample 32:10 21:7,19,24,25 add 38:8 assessment 44:1 22:13,18 23:5,10, 44:20 added 19:16 11,16 24:4,9,10, 47:23 analysis 12:25 12,17,20,22 25:6, additional 48:20 21:15,20 24:20 asset 22:20 14,16,24 26:1,6, 28:3,17 32:12 11,15,22 27:1,5,9, address 14:6 assets 22:19,21 23 29:5,13,17,19 32:16 apologize 38:14 assignment 30:11,20 31:19 adhere 23:1 46:4 appeal 2:5 5:18, 16:18 20:14 30:21 32:2,7,10,15,16, 19 13:17 39:11 19 33:14,16 35:7, adjourned 49:2 **assist** 17:5 42:17 49:1 8,22 36:10,16 adjustment **assume** 14:9 38:5 39:18 41:16 appeals 2:1 5:19 10:11 16:16 44:9,10 45:15,22 13:14 26:12 27:8, attached 19:10 46:6 47:10,13,21 adjustments 19 31:3 46:3,13 audit 9:2,4,12,14, 48:8 44:16 47:22 Appeals' 6:9 15,17,22,23 10:1, **auditor's** 11:23 Administration 5,6,8,9,17,19,20, **APPEARANCES** 12:12 20:13 22:4, 5:22 6:19 21 11:5,7,9,12 3:1 9,10 30:16 12:14 13:7 14:2,3, administrative appellant 2:7 3:6 7 15:6,8,9,10,14, auditors 10:1 3:4 5:10,11 6:12 7:5,7 8:5,7, 16,25 16:4,6,10, 15:19 16:6 17:3 Administrator 14 39:6,17,19,25 11,12,25 17:3,5, 20:2 23:1 24:7 18:22 40:10 41:17,22,24 21 18:2,7,8,9,16, 29:25 45:4 42:2,3,4,8 19,25 19:4,5,9,14, admitted 4:5,6 auditors' 20:17 20,21 20:1,3,7,8, 7:14,15 8:1,2 appellant's 4:5 10,12,19 21:3,13, audits 20:2 26:13 7:13,15 41:21 **advice** 11:4,6,16 17,24 23:4,5,18, authorizes 42:7, applies 47:7 22 24:2,6,11,15, 17:21 18:2.14 17 25 25:9,17,19,25 39:18 40:11,16,22

B
back 17:17 39:10
bartender 35:3

based 10:7 14:16 16:12 19:13 24:3, 15 29:20 31:6 39:17 42:7,18,22 44:2

basically 21:21

basis 10:10 11:25 15:16 17:7 20:8 23:19 24:6,12 27:4 30:2 40:22 44:12,14 45:23 46:20

begin 8:18 39:13 46:10

begun 23:13

believed 10:20 18:18 46:11

beverage 26:9, 13,16

beverages 9:20 26:9,19

big 37:21

bills 22:12,20,22

bit 14:16

blessed 29:16

board 11:17 18:9 19:25

body 5:20 10:24 13:17

BOE-414Z 16:18

bookkeeper

9:22,24 14:1,25 15:13 17:11 23:10,23 24:1,13, 16,19 25:13,15 26:4,7,17,24 27:4 29:15 33:19 44:24 45:19,24 47:19 **bookkeeper's** 12:16 25:8 29:10, 11 31:21 45:24

books 11:8 17:7 39:24 45:11 46:1

bottom 27:2

break 39:5,9

Briefly 9:8

bring 45:3

brought 17:5

Buehler 18:22

build 31:24

Bureau 6:23

business 9:8 14:19 26:8

C

cake 26:18 35:1

calculate 24:14

California 2:2,17 5:1,21 6:19 9:9 10:18 14:20 19:25 39:19,21

California's 47:5

call 8:5

called 25:9 33:18 45:4

Campgrounds 14:19

career 19:24

carefully 25:2

carelessly 12:8

Carry 6:20

CARY 3:9

case 5:12 8:5,6,7 14:12,16 15:25 27:10 37:13 43:16,24 44:7 47:4,19 catch 38:16

catering 39:23

caught 42:23

CDTFA 5:22 6:20, 23 7:17 9:2,12,17 10:9,19,21 13:14 15:2,25 16:6,14 22:25 25:1 27:7 32:14 33:1 39:6 43:4,8,24 45:3 48:8

CDTFA's 4:6 11:4 21:13 31:4

cents 34:5,19,20, 21,22 35:6

chain 10:23 18:20

challenging 20:16

change 14:3 20:13 30:14,17,18 46:8,11 47:24,25

changed 18:5

chapter 36:5

characterized 44:17

charge 9:18 15:11 27:25 30:11 35:1,

charged 22:7 25:4 28:21 34:19 44:20

charges 19:2,7, 17 27:13 31:11,14 40:4,6,7 41:17 46:16

charging 29:16 30:14,19

check 7:18 48:17

Chief 6:22

choose 33:20

Christina 2:20

citations 36:4

cites 31:4

claim 40:7 41:19 44:4

claimed 40:1,4

claiming 27:13 41:18

clarification 6:6

clarity 21:2 23:7

classification 45:8

clear 21:4,6 23:3 30:10 48:6

clients 48:10

close 6:3 28:9 43:20

closed 27:18 28:14 30:9 31:18 49:3

closely 25:13

closing 4:17 37:9 43:14

co-panelist 48:18

code 40:13 47:6

Coffman 10:5 15:14 16:2,10,19 17:12 46:18

colleague 8:25 16:24 19:19

collected 19:1 22:2 23:15 24:18, 25 25:3,23 27:23 32:12,21 34:3

column 31:22 32:5 33:11 34:23 35:15

commencing 2:17

comment 21:9 22:6 28:15

comments 18:8 19:4 20:9,13,17 22:9,18,23 23:2,9

decide 5:18 24:8,23 26:1 31:4 46:3,13 critical 12:24 29:25 31:13 confirm 7:8 15:7 **CROS** 19:10 decided 27:15 35:17,20 40:24 46:15,23 47:16 confirmed 33:1 **CRTC** 9:5 decision 5:15 27:9.14 28:4 **common** 11:11 considered current 9:15,17, 44:23 11:16 21:11 31:15 deductions 40:2 23 10:1,16,21 40:22 46:17 11:3 15:10 16:6 company 9:18 deemed 11:9 27:5 18:16 19:10 20:7, 15:1,10 45:24 consistently 48:11 12 23:10 24:1,19 13:12 14:4 company's 14:22 defined 30:6 29:18,23 34:1 45:1,14 46:1 consultants 17:4 36:10 delineated 13:8. compared 13:12 consulting 6:14, cursory 29:21 10 23:21 26:2 17 8:22 19:23 customer 19:6 demarcations 20:25 comparing 41:11 22:1 23:14 25:23, 37:20 contained 18:2 24 33:9 34:19 compilation 8:15 demonstrate 37:23 38:7,8 contends 31:6 28:8 31:14 46:15, complete 20:20 40:10 customer's 24 21:6 23:2,11,22 25:22 24:21 26:3 demonstrated contention 20:14 customers 19:9 42:10,20 completeness continued 12:19 25:1,5 29:16 20:19,23 23:7 demonstrates 16:4 29:17 30:10 30:12,14,19 45:1 11:14 complex 10:14 cut 33:24 cooperating 16:1 demonstrating compute 27:15 **cutting** 26:18 40:20 41:12 corkage 35:2 35:1 **denies** 29:13 concise 21:6 corporate 14:23 cycles 9:12 Denise 27:8 23:23 24:4 26:5, conclude 22:3 19 32:19 department 5:21 D corporation 6:19 8:13 27:15 concluded 49:4 14:20 39:19 28:6.12 31:6.10. **Dance** 26:20 concludes 42:25 15 39:25 40:3,6, **correct** 7:12,19, 11,14,23,25 41:7, data 45:19 concluding 2:18 21 12:18 23:6 10,22 42:4,11,13, 25:6,10 29:14 date 5:6 25:22 14 conclusion 12:17 32:13 38:4 44:25 33:10 27:19 28:10 44:25 department's 46:12 dates 15:7 30:25 41:18 42:3 conclusions correctly 14:9 12:10,12 20:22 David's 34:2,16 depth 10:9 11:25 32:22 47:16 **costing** 48:10 14:8 17:7 24:1,10 **day** 20:2 counting 11:11 conditions 18:4 30:1 44:11 45:23 days 12:2 16:19 20:11 **couple** 17:12 **Deputy** 18:23 30:22 31:20 32:8, conduct 28:3 15 35:12 44:18 **court** 5:19 describe 19:19 46:19 47:2 conducted 24:21 21:7,10 31:9 **covers** 33:25 33:17 **Debbie** 9:23 conducting 5:12 created 24:13,16 14:25 15:13 24:13 description 9:7 confer 5:14 25:15 26:16 14:18 credit 32:4 33:11 conference 7:4 December 15:8, credits 15:22 descriptions 13:14 27:8,19 23 33:9

deserves 48:13 discussions 40:11 41:5 42:4 **exhibits** 4:5,6 7:6, 13:25 43:25 48:7,10 8,18,20,23 8:1,2, detail 14:12,16 16 13:4 disregarded 12:8 27:10 43:18 46:16 erroneously 12:16 16:15 44:16 existing 12:18 detailed 27:21 Division 6:21 43:21 error 10:11 13:18 expect 20:18 23:1 documentation 14:5 16:7 17:9 35:7 **details** 19:20 43:18 29:5 41:15 42:23 43:19 experience 9:24 documents 12:9, 43:24 44:2 46:7 determine 15:15 23 32:25 44:12 48:13 experts 5:20 21:16 28:6 47:12 dollar 38:9 errors 17:4,6,7 explain 21:11 determined 9:17 28:7 30:4 41:9 47:11 **dollars** 10:3,4 10:1 15:10,19 42:3,12 explained 28:11 15:21,22,23 40:4 22:13,14,15,24 essential 28:2 explaining 32:21 detriment 12:12 36:1 40:1,2,9 essentially 33:16 20:10 44:1 45:1 48:11 explanations 42:2 47:17 21:5 double 7:18 establishes 42:8, develop 15:15 exposes 28:15 drafted 43:22 19 devoid 21:20 **extent** 32:22 due 18:11 27:5 event 9:9 14:21 difference 22:15 40:15 41:2 39:20 F differences **events** 14:24 23:18 24:5 31:23 Ε 17:14 39:22 facilities 39:22 difficult 13:23 evidence 4:5,6 40:5 **earlier** 6:25 13:12 47:10,12 7:16 8:3 11:13,16 28:2 30:22 facility 9:18 15:11 28:12 40:20,22 **dining** 26:9,13,15 19:1,17 26:20 41:15 42:9,13,20 **effect** 32:12 28:24 34:24 39:20 45:12 47:14,16 directly 31:16 effectively 32:18 32:16 fact 9:21 12:9 examination egregious 48:12 15:12 27:12 28:1 Director 18:23 11:8,19 17:25 30:3 48:2 22:20 30:8 41:25 emphasize 21:14 disagree 46:17 facts 18:4 20:11 36:13 examine 27:10 disagreed 13:15 44:5 employment examined 11:14 disallowance 19:23 **failed** 19:7 21:7 20:8 28:9,13 13:17 26:22 31:14 38:5 40:21 encouraged 41:7,16 42:10,14, disallowed 40:7 10:17 18:16 fails 47:10 46:14 15,21 46:16 failure 11:2 40:14 engaging 16:1 **excel** 32:3 discover 10:10 41:18 42:3 ensure 5:17,25 17:8 **exempt** 12:11 fair 32:19 28:20 29:17 31:15,18 discovered 26:17 **entire** 21:24 false 28:10 46:17 27:12 25:17,19 44:19 family 9:8 14:21 **exert** 33:5 discuss 47:21 entitled 39:17 February 16:20 exhibit 7:14 17:10 discussed 23:11 **Equalization** 31:1,2 35:21 18:24 34:7 24:20 42:16 19:25 **fee** 5:22 6:19 19:1, discussion 19:22 **Exhibit's** 7:7,15, erroneous 18:14 17 34:24 35:2 19

fees 9:18 12:8 35:17 39:16 **history** 16:19 11:1,5 17:21 20:14 30:21 15:11 16:4,8 **goshy** 35:12 Incorporated 26:19,20 27:13 **holder** 13:14 27:8 49:2 28:24 31:11,14 granted 20:15 31:4 46:4.13 40:5 44:17 46:16 incorrect 41:17 granting 19:15 holder's 27:19 42:1 45:7 felt 10:21 18:19 greater 41:3 47:5 hour 32:4 46:5 incorrectly 27:12 **GREG** 3:4 30:11 41:19,23 file 39:3 hours 10:6 16:11 17:6 32:1,6,7,8 incumbent 22:25 gross 9:19 15:11 **Finally 30:20** 36:3 44:13,20 39:25 independent find 11:2 28:5 Huk 3:7 4:13 6:15 5:19,20 **Group** 6:14 8:22 **finding** 18:12 8:25 16:24 19:19, gun 44:6 indicating 17:17 24 20:4,5 34:6,8, findings 16:3 11,13,15,18 industry 26:10,14 20:9,22 30:15,16 Н 37:15,18,22 38:1, 47:11 information 5:18 4,7,14 21:5 **finds** 40:14 **Hall** 9:23 13:1 hundred 17:8,25 insufficient 14:1,25 15:13 fine 17:18 hundreds 48:10 27:10 17:11 24:13 25:15 fixed 22:19,20,21 26:16 44:24 **hurdle** 13:20 insupportable floors 26:20 21:21 handing 17:17 hurdles 44:3 flow 45:10,14 intends 8:4 happened 22:14, Huxsoll 3:9 6:20 24 47:12 8:12 33:1 food 9:19 26:9,18 interest 9:4 10:4 15:23 19:16 40:18 **hard** 44:3 footed 32:2,5 ı interruption hazardly 33:19 **form** 47:16 12:20 Headquarter's Fortunately 47:5 identified 16:7 introduce 6:11 6:23 36:15 forward 39:12 **invoice** 19:9,10 headquartered identify 41:18 found 17:3,5 21:23 22:13 14:20 19:13 21:11 22:4 25:18,22,24 ignore 46:7 **hear** 43:17 28:22 36:9 39:25 27:22,24,25 29:1, illustrate 12:22 41:8 7 33:24 34:3 heard 5:9 25:7 37:22,25 38:1 important 12:1 foundation 14:11 hearing 2:20 5:6, 45:10,13,14 21:23 9,12,14,24 6:6,7, **frankly** 35:17 invoices 10:9 impossible 13:24 25 8:24 33:23 12:24 13:5.6.8.11. Friday 8:14 13:3 38:18 39:2 43:16 improperly 13 16:13 17:1,13 32:25 34:9 35:5 49:1,4 29:17,22 40:4 19:6,7 21:8,9,14, **held** 7:5 18,21 22:1,2,4,7 in-depth 45:9 G 23:14 24:18 27:22 high 13:20 47:10 include 45:12 28:18,20,23 29:1, garbage 21:22 highlight 17:23 12,21,24 31:5 included 13:4 19:12 36:13 37:7 32:13,17,20 gave 17:15 44:8 21:25 22:18 23:13 33:20,23 35:7,8 highlighted 25:18 45:7 generated 23:22 36:6,14,16,19,25 33:11 34:5 35:19, includes 27:21 26:4 37:4,6,11 41:8,25 21 44:9,18,21 45:7, including 5:21 good 8:21 20:5 16.23 46:20.22

47:1,22 live 6:25 39:7 meet 23:6 Κ invoke 13:24 local 22:22 23:4 meets 11:1 17:20 involves 11:19 located 9:9 members 8:8 **Katie** 34:16 17:24 30:7 logs 16:11 memorandum **KD** 34:1 issue 10:14 11:14, 18:21 looked 17:18 24:9 Kevin 3:8 6:18 20 18:1 23:11 33:7 35:8 mentioned 6:24 28:8,9 31:10,11 kind 33:24 15:1 17:22 30:21 35:11 39:16 40:20 lot 43:17 36:4 knew 18:14 41:4 42:10,14,15,20 loudly 6:2 met 44:6 issues 22:5 30:9 lowercase 37:14 L met all 45:20 item 36:1 44:7 method 29:16 items 10:2,14 **labeled** 7:6 22:12 M 12:15 13:8 15:20 methodology lack 22:9 28:16 16:3,9 17:22 29:5, 12:16,18 14:3 made 21:19 44:16 **Lambert** 3:5 5:13 12 36:15,18 37:3, 28:6,8 46:8 4,6 44:23 46:24 38:24 39:1 43:7,9 **mic** 38:15 main 43:21 48:22,23 microphone 6:3 maintained 46:1 J large 39:22 36:22 major 46:14 law 3:4 5:10.11 mics 38:17 39:7 January 15:8 42:7,17 majority 19:24 16:19 30:25 Miles 3:6 4:12,19 lay 9:5 14:10,11 make 6:4 10:11 Jason 3:9 6:22 6:13,14,16 7:9,24 13:23 16:16 20:25 **Lead** 5:11 8:21,22 12:21 **iob** 32:21 22:5 25:5 37:9 14:15 19:23 learn 26:24 27:1 38:8 40:14 36:12,21,23,25 **John** 3:7 6:15 learned 21:8 37:19 43:15 8:25 19:19 malpractice 24:24 48:12 million 10:3 40:1, Jose 18:22 leaving 12:17 2,8 manager 6:16 **JOSHUA** 3:5 left 44:24 minute 39:5 manner 46:2 judge 3:4 5:5,11, Legal 6:21 minutes 8:6,7,8 13,16 6:24 7:10, manual 20:20 43:11 13,17,22,25 8:4, 21:3,13 36:5 legislator 43:22 17 34:6,10,12,14, miscellaneous **marked** 46:25 Legislature 47:5 17 36:21,24 40:6 37:10,17,24 38:3, matches 29:7 lets 7:18 32:6 39:5 misinformation 5,13,16,19,20,22, matter 2:5 7:4 level 48:3 19:13 23,24 39:1,4,10 44:15 43:2,3,5,6,7,9,10 liability 18:12 misplaced 27:20 48:17,19,20,22, **matters** 47:23 20:6,7 40:8 41:3, mistakenly 28:4 23,24 13,19 means 17:1 42:3 **moments** 16:24 judges 5:10,14 light 29:24 30:15 meant 47:3 Monika 3:6 6:13 jump 13:20 line-by-line 33:9 measure 16:8 8:22 30:21 35:19 **jumped** 44:3 22:16 listed 25:19,22 36:9,11 measures 10:2 listening 48:15 morning 8:21 15:20 20:5 39:16 **listing** 27:21

move 8:10 39:12 **offers** 39:22 18:10 21:3 22:11 17:25 18:3 30:8 23:6 31:7,9,13 40:14,15 office 2:1 5:18 6:8 multiply 34:20 41:1 44:15 45:12, 18:22 23:4 pertaining 11:20 38:9 17,22 46:15,23 18:1 30:9 officers 23:24 47:8,24 48:1 Ν 24:4 26:5 pertinent 11:2 pardon 19:5 offices' 22:22 petitioner 27:12 29:10 narrative 12:9 31:7 official 6:7 parenthesis 30:6 Natasha 3:4 5:10 petitioner's Parker 3:9 6:22 opening 5:5 8:11 27:11,16,17 natural 20:8 operates 39:20 part 7:2 11:2 18:9 23:19 **picked** 22:21 33:22 40:25 Operation 6:23 **nature** 12:24 **picnic** 14:19 participate 5:17 operations 18:6 19:14 39:20 needed 5:18 6:5 parties 6:10 23:17 24:1 **piece** 45:12 **opinion** 42:16 **parts** 37:1 non-taxed 29:13 opposed 11:18 pink 34:5 17:24 30:7 31:17 party 8:4,9 20:24 nontaxable 16:5, **place** 31:22 15 21:12 27:13 oral 21:4 pass 22:22 **point** 31:3 37:8 28:13,22,25 29:3, order 20:21 pattern 48:2 4 36:15,18 37:1,3, points 9:16 14:16 6,12,16 40:4,7 original 19:6 22:1 Pause 14:14 43:21 41:8,16,19 46:21, 23:14 42:9 payment 19:16 poor 24:7 32:21 24 OTA 2:6 13:14 40:15 position 31:4 note 8:16 penalty 19:16 outline 14:12 post 35:15 noted 28:2 29:2 40:17 overlooked posted 7:3 notes 45:17 **percent** 11:19 31:16 32:16 17:8,25 38:10,12 potentially 13:23 November 18:23 owned 9:8 14:21 44:12 Praveen 42:17 **number** 34:14 ownership 11:11 performed 12:25 precedential **numbers** 15:17 19:21 21:10 41:11 42:16 Ρ period 9:12 15:4 preface 19:22 0 16:2 18:6 19:9 p.m. 2:18 21:25 25:17,19,25 prehearing 7:4 object 8:13 27:6 29:18 32:13 package 35:5 prepared 13:20 33:21 40:8 44:19 objection 7:14,24 18:9 21:1 27:3 pages 8:15 13:2 8:1 periods 13:7 15:3 40:25 33:4 35:18 36:7, 41:23 46:2 objections 7:7, preparing 27:16 11,23 permission 12:5 paid 22:12,20,22 present 5:23 8:6, obvious 14:6 perpetrated 7 **panel** 5:9,13,16 22:6 48:13 8:8 19:19 43:16, presentation 20 45:9 occurred 18:6 person 11:10,11, 4:10 8:20 11:7 12 14:7 18:3,13 14:11 19:18 42:25 paper 20:20 45:18 October 2:19 5:1, 40:16,19 41:4 43:22 7 15:4 papers 10:8 11:5, 43:19 presentations 24 12:5,14 14:2,9 offered 10:22 person's 11:8,20 8:11 15:17 16:13 17:22

presented 44:5 **PROCEEDINGS** quality 20:18 24:7 reason 13:13 22:5 48:7 2:15 30:17,18 46:14 quarter 35:15 47:18 President 6:13 process 6:6 quarterly 31:21 reasonable 9:3 8:22 produce 5:14 6:7 quarters 33:6 25:12 29:24 32:14 presumed 45:5 promised 14:15 40:16 43:19 44:24 question 10:12 46:9 47:1 48:2 prevail 48:4 **proof** 44:13 11:14,21 12:15 reasons 42:24 previous 40:19 14:6 18:1,4,11 **proper** 16:25 28:9 30:9 37:11, rebut 13:16 previously 8:15 20:2,21 25 40:21 41:2 13:3 17:22 27:6 42:10,20 46:6,10 rebuttal 8:8 43:11 properly 18:11 28:11 46:22 22:6 26:24 28:2, rebutted 46:3 questions 5:16 **price** 22:16 20 32:5 41:2 8:9,10 14:13 receipts 9:19 primary 45:12 protect 43:23 38:21,25 39:1 15:12 47:4 43:3,7,9 48:19,20, principal 30:18 receive 9:3 48:6 23,25 protection 43:22 principle 23:5 quick 37:11 received 47:22 prove 10:7 12:14 principles 10:9 16:12 47:10 quickly 32:24 recently 15:24 16:14 36:9 **proven** 47:14 recommend printed 17:15 quote 9:13 12:3,4 19:14 44:22 provide 20:21 **prior** 9:2,14,22 16:20,22 17:12 26:6,23 30:17 recommendation 18:21,25 19:12 10:20 11:5,7,12, **s** 20:22 20:20 21:3 23:10, 23 12:12 14:7 **provided** 8:14,15 20,25 24:1 26:2 15:6,16 16:1,4 9:5 11:7 12:23 reconciliation 17:8 18:2,7,18,25 13:3,4 21:24 27:9,18 28:5,9,11, 41:15 45:18 13 29:2,4 30:6,9 19:4,5,14,23 20:8, 25:15,24 26:11,15 record 5:5,25 31:5,18 10,12,13,17 21:7, 32:25 33:21,22 6:12 7:2 8:16 17 22:4,10 23:10 41:24 42:4,15,24 quoted 11:22 15:4,19 33:22 24:7,9,10,12,15, 48:9 39:10 49:2 22,25 25:8,13,16 **public** 6:25 7:2 R 26:6,15,22 27:1,9, recorded 7:1 48:12 15 28:13 29:19, 16:15 22:6 24:5 21,25 30:11,15,16 publication 26:8, 25:9,11 29:8 **Ralston** 3:4 5:5, 31:7,9,12,13,17 10,14,16,23 11 6:24 7:10,13, 31:24 32:15 33:6,20 17,22,25 8:4,12, publications recording 7:2 36:8 39:18 40:12 17 34:6,10,12,14, 26:12 44:23 41:6,10,16,23,25 records 11:8.25 17 36:21.24 42:8,18 46:15 **pull** 6:3 12:4,5 16:21,22 37:10,17 38:13, 47:15,20 48:7 16,19,23 39:4,10 30:23,24 32:9 purchase 22:13, 43:2,6,10 48:17, 35:23,24 39:24 private 48:9 16 22,24 41:6,24 42:12 problem 36:24 purpose 12:22 45:11 46:1,19 rate 29:6 34:21 20:24 procedure 26:12 38:10 recreate 24:2 46:11 purposes 11:17 rational 12:17 refer 9:13,15 15:5, procedures 14:7 9 17:10 16:25 21:10 32:1, Q readably 28:22 reference 17:19 11 43:18 46:4 19:11 ready 8:18 39:11, qualify 31:8 proceeding 45:5 14

45:21 39:21 44:2,4 46:14 47:6, 9 48:3,6,14 relies 11:4 40:17

refers 17:12 **reflect** 18:10 reflected 15:18 41:1 46:21 regulation 10:19, 25 11:6,17,22 20:6 30:5 45:21 regulations 13:22 17:20 related 9:19 12:8 13:22 14:23 16:8 17:20 19:2,17 relating 18:5 relation 41:16 relative 10:25 relayed 10:18 relevant 26:8 reliance 17:21 40:16 43:19 relied 9:1 10:20 12:11 14:1 16:3

18:18 20:9 40:10 43:25 45:25 46:9 47:17,25 48:6 relief 9:3 10:18 11:13 13:15,24 18:12,13,17 19:15 20:6,15 31:8 39:17 40:20 41:3, 4 42:7,17,22,24

relieved 11:3

remains 12:10

remarks 37:9

remember 17:16

remind 10:24 46:18

rental 16:15

rentals 9:20 14:23 40:5

rents 39:21

report 11:3,10,12 15:15 23:5 25:3, 21 27:21 29:10,11 30:16 31:21 32:2, 5 33:7 35:6,14 42:8,9,18,19,22

reported 2:19 18:11 19:2 24:5 25:1 27:6 31:24 33:15 37:20 39:25 41:2,7,12 45:18

reporter 2:20 12:20 38:18 39:2

reporting 5:24 27:17 41:23

reports 23:21,22 24:2,3,13,16 25:20 26:3,4 33:5

represent 6:11

representative 17:13 37:5

representing 6:14,15,18 8:23

request 10:22 11:9 13:15 18:20 20:16 47:7

requesting 11:13 40:19

required 10:9 16:13 21:15 22:19 45:12

requirements 10:24 13:19 16:25 44:6 45:20

respect 9:16 10:11 31:5 41:6 44:23

respectfully 13:19 47:3

Respondent 3:8

7:6,10,17 8:6

respondent's 7:23,25 8:2

Respondents 7:18

resulted 41:19

results 9:2 14:2 21:22 46:10

return 23:5 40:15

returned 41:14

returns 19:3 33:3

reveal 21:5

revenue 10:11,14 14:22 16:15 23:21 26:3 28:21 29:1 40:13

review 11:15,18, 19 12:15,24 17:24 20:24 21:9,14,18, 21,25 22:1,4,19 23:12,13,16 24:21 25:2 28:20 29:21 30:7 31:5,6 32:22 36:6 37:3 39:24 40:3 44:20 45:7 47:23

reviewed 10:8 11:24 16:13 19:6 21:8,17 22:13 23:25 24:17 27:4, 23 29:25 30:5 32:20 36:16,17 37:3 44:9,14 45:15,22 46:6,20 47:1,22

reviewer 22:23 23:4

reviewing 14:8 17:1,6 44:11,17 46:19

revisited 13:18

rights 26:13

Riley 27:9 28:4,11

Riley's 28:10,15

rise 48:3

Rodriguez 2:20 5:24 6:5,7

RTC 20:15 31:8

rules 12:7

S

Sacramento 2:16 5:1

sale 9:19

sales 9:18,20

10:15 12:3,24,25 14:4 15:11,15 16:21 18:25 19:3, 6 21:9,14,15,16, 17,18,20,21,23 22:1,2,4,6,7 23:12,13,14,17, 20,25 24:2,6,10, 11,12,14,16,18, 20,21 25:2,5,11, 12,16,18,20,21,23 26:2 27:3,5,16,17, 20,22,23,24,25 28:3,7,13,16,17, 18,19,20,22,23 29:6,7,8,10,11,12, 16 30:1,23 31:5, 21 32:2,5,9,11,13, 16,20 33:5,6,15, 17 35:5,9,14,22 36:2 40:1 41:8,11, 14,16,19 44:18,19 45:14,18

sample 11:15,19 17:24 19:10 30:7 40:21 44:13

San 18:22

Santanius 19:13

Saratoga 2:6 5:6 6:14,16 8:23 9:3, 8,9,11,24 11:1 14:19,22 15:2,24 17:20 19:14 20:9, 15 24:24 26:7,16, 25 28:18.22 29:22 30:10,12,13,17

38:11 39:11,20 49:1	18:15 20:6,11 37:1,4 41:7 45:17	standards 23:7	supervisor 20:1 23:4
Saratoga's 17:6	showed 45:15	start 39:3	supplementary
schedule 20:24	showing 36:17	starting 6:12	21:4
25:9,11 31:22,24, 25 45:16	shown 18:13 41:4 44:8,10 46:4	state 2:2 6:11 19:25 21:23 36:25 45:22	support 20:14,16 21
scheduled 33:25	shows 44:5	stated 8:21 19:4	supportable 21:18
schedules 12:4 16:22 18:8 20:13	sic 33:19 35:12	32:8 36:9 46:22	supposed 37:14
30:24 31:25 32:10	side 22:10	STATEMENT 4:17 43:14	surely 25:7
35:23 40:24 45:24 46:19	similar 15:25	states 20:20 21:3	surmise 32:14
scope 47:11	simple 27:24 28:1	28:11 30:20	surprise 45:3
section 9:5 10:18,	simply 12:8 33:2	statute 13:22	Susanne 18:22
Section 9:5 10:18, 25 13:24 17:19 18:17 19:15 31:8	single 25:17	Stenographer 5:23	sustain 47:15
39:17 40:13 42:24 44:2 47:6,9 48:14	Smith 3:8 4:14 6:18 7:12,21 39:13,15	step 27:24 28:1,2,	Т
Sections 21:13	smoking 44:6	stop 6:5	takeaway 29:15
sector 48:9,12	speak 6:1,2,3	stream 6:25 39:7	tax 2:1 5:19,20,21
seek 10:17 18:17	speaks 6:1	streams 14:22	22 6:8,16,19 9:18
seeking 18:13 41:4	specific 19:20	Street 2:16	21 10:3,15 11:3 12:3,25 13:8,9
	21:8 44:7	strongly 10:19,21	15:11,12,15,21
selling 26:9	specifically 10:7	18:18,19 47:5	16:7,21 19:3,7,16 20:7 21:15,17,20
send 10:23 18:20	16:11 43:23	structurally 13:6	22:2,6,10,14
senior 6:16 32:15	spend 8:25	subject 9:21	23:14,17,21 24:2, 6,11,13,16,18,20,
sensus 11:15,18 17:23 30:3,5,6	spent 10:5 12:2 16:10 19:24 32:7	10:15 13:8,9 15:12,24	21,25 25:2,3,4,9,
44:14	44:11 46:18	submit 10:13 47:3	10,11,12,16,18,
separate 9:12	spite 12:9 24:7		20,21,23 26:3 27:3,5,6,17,18,21,
15:3 30:22	Springs 2:6 5:6	submitted 7:5,18, 19	22,23,25 28:3,16,
September 7:5	6:14,16 8:23 9:3,	subsequent 44:1	19,20 29:6,7,8,10, 11,16 30:1,11,14,
15:5	8,11,25 11:1 14:19 15:2,24	successfully	19,23 31:21,22,23
services 25:5 39:23	19:14 20:9,15	44:4	32:2,4,5,9,11,12, 15,20,23 33:5,7,
Serving 26:18	24:24 26:7,17,25 28:18,23 29:22	sufficient 18:12	10,15,17 34:3,20
set 13:2	30:10,14,17 38:11	41:3 47:15	35:1,2,5,9,10,14, 22 36:1,3,5 38:10
share 44:22	39:11 49:2	suggest 16:17	41:11,12,14,23
shared 11:10	staffed 5:20	Suite 2:16	42:7,18 44:19 45:7,14,18 47:6
show 9:1,11 10:16	stand 47:18	sum 31:21	taxability 10:13
11:23 12:2 13:5,6, 7,11,25 15:2,16	standard 20:18 42:6 47:9	summarize 48:5	42:5

Index: taxable..written

taxable 10:2 timely 40:15 type 28:17 W 12:10 13:9 14:4 times 34:21 38:9 typical 45:10 15:20 16:8 19:3 21:12,16 22:16 today 9:1 12:13 walk 12:13 14:7 23:12,20,25 13:13,16,25 14:11 U 16:25 24:10,14 26:2,18, 16:21,23 30:23,24 walked 45:9 19,20,21,25 33:23 35:23,24 uncovered 28:7 27:13,16 28:7,21, 39:16 43:17,18 Walter 15:14 16:2 30:4 42:12 24 29:6,18 30:1 today's 5:6,9 8:23 underlying 13:5 wanted 37:7 38:7 34:23 36:15,18 49:1 37:1,5,12 46:21, understand 12:7 website 6:9 7:3 24 told 46:12 13:19 20:24 27:20 wedding 9:9 Taxation 40:13 **total** 10:3 15:21 understandabilit 14:21 17:13 19:1, 22:15 23:12 25:11 **y** 21:2 23:8 17 26:18 28:25 taxed 16:3 28:21 29:6 32:6 33:11, 34:2,16 40:5,6 29:1,5,12 34:22, understandable 15 39:25 41:17 45:10 25 38:8 21:4 23:3 totaled 40:8 weddings 14:23 taxes 9:4 19:1 understanding 39:22 40:17 totaling 40:2 25:8,12 28:16 witnesses 8:5 taxing 29:22 trace 27:24 35:9 unquote 29:2,4 30:12,18 words 10:8 11:23 traded 28:24 unreasonable 12:1 16:12 25:10 taxpayer 8:23 9:1 22:3 30:13 trained 20:2 32:18 44:15 10:17,20 11:4 **upper** 37:13 12:11 16:2,14 transaction 18:4, work 11:23 18:9 17:4 18:17,18 5,10 32:23 34:24 22:10 31:7,9,13 19:9,15 22:25 41:1 45:10 ٧ 41:1 45:11,18 23:16 37:20 42:18 46:15.23 47:11 transactions 43:25 46:9,10,25 11:20 12:11,14 venue 9:9.20 12:8 workbook 32:3 47:17 48:4,5,13 18:1 25:17 27:11 14:21 16:4,8,15 worked 15:13 taxpayer's 9:7 28:17 29:18,23 38:11 39:20 44:17 25:13 47:20 11:2 12:12 14:18 30:4,8 31:9,16 verbatim 5:24 26:12,23 33:25 35:5 36:8 working 10:8 37:1 42:5 46:21 verification 19:4 11:5 12:3,4,5,6,14 taxpavers 43:23 20:17 21:10 22:9, 14:2,8 15:1,17 47:4 transcript 2:15 18 23:2,9 24:23 16:13,21,22 17:21 6:8 7:1 33:3 team 10:17,19,21 26:1 20:20 21:3 23:6 18:16,19 treat 16:5 30:22,24 32:9 verified 23:23 35:22,23 44:15 technique 20:3 treated 13:12 24:3,17 26:5 45:17,22 47:8,24 test 20:23 29:24 true 29:20 verify 29:7 32:4, 48:1 12 **thereto** 19:16 **Tuesday** 2:18 5:1 worksheet 22:12 Veronica 18:21 thing 31:20 36:12 turn 19:18 38:14 write 10:22 39:7 veteran 48:8 things 14:9 24:24 writes 35:22 turned 6:4 video 7:2 thousands 48:11 writing 23:1 35:17 **Turner** 3:4 5:13 viewed 20:2 time 5:7 6:1 8:9,25 writings 18:8 37:24 38:3,5,20, 13:16 16:2,11 40:24 22 43:3,5 48:19, 32:10 44:11,20 20 written 5:15 11:4, 6,9,13,16 13:23

17:21 18:2 28:12 29:25 40:11,16,22 42:15,19 45:21 47:7,16

wrong 16:17

wrote 18:20 21:25 23:10 24:11,23 25:25 26:1 27:9 28:4 32:20

Υ

Y's 38:9

years 9:23 19:24 20:1 47:12,18