

# CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF CLERKS AND ELECTION OFFICIALS



## OFFICERS 2020-2022

BRANDI ORTH  
PRESIDENT  
Fresno County

DONNA JOHNSTON  
VICE PRESIDENT  
Sutter County

TOMMY GONG  
TREASURER  
San Luis Obispo County

MICHAEL VU  
SECRETARY  
San Diego County

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

### APPOINTED:

DEVA PROTO  
Sonoma County

RYAN RONCO  
Placer County

MARK LUNN  
Ventura County

JESSE SALINAS  
Yolo County

COURTNEY BAILEY-KANELOS  
Sacramento County

REBECCA TURNER  
Calaveras County

KAMMI FOOTE  
Inyo County

### ADVISORY COUNCIL:

JOE HOLLAND  
Santa Barbara County

REBECCA MARTINEZ  
Madera County

GAIL L. PELLERIN  
Santa Cruz County

CATHY DARLING ALLEN  
Shasta County

NEAL KELLEY  
Orange County

DEAN LOGAN  
Los Angeles County

### ELECTED AREA CHAIRS:

KATRINA BARTOLOMIE  
Northern Area  
Mendocino County

REBECCA SPENCER  
Southern Area  
Riverside County

GREGORY J. DIAZ  
Mother Lode Area  
Nevada County

DONNA LINDER  
Central Area  
Stanislaus County

CLAUDIO VALENZUELA  
Bay Area  
Monterey County

### LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

\*\* voting member

### CLERK OF THE BOARD:

JOHN MCKIBBEN \*\*  
Los Angeles County

### COUNTY CLERK:

VAL WOOD  
San Diego County

DONNA ALLRED \*\*  
Sacramento County

### ELECTIONS:

RYAN RONCO  
Placer County

TRICIA WEBBER \*\*  
Santa Cruz County

**BRANDI L. ORTH, PRESIDENT**  
Fresno County Clerk/Registrar of Voters  
2221 Kern Street, Fresno, California 93721  
(559) 600 - 3011 - Fax(559) 488-3279  
E-Mail: [Borth@fresnocountyca.gov](mailto:Borth@fresnocountyca.gov)  
CACEO website: [www.caceo58.org](http://www.caceo58.org)

December 11, 2020

The Honorable Antonio Vazquez  
Chairman, Board of Equalization  
450 N Street, MIC: 72  
Sacramento, CA 95814

### VIA EMAIL

Dear Chairman Vazquez:

**RE: December 2020 BOE Meeting: CACEO Response to CATA-Recommended Agenda Items for the COVID-19 County Boards of Equalization/Assessment Appeals Boards Collaborative Workgroup: Consensus Guidance/Letters to Assessor**

In preparation for your Board's upcoming December 2020 meeting, the California Association of Clerk Elections Officials (CACEO) submits its response to the November 24, 2020 letter submitted by California Alliance of Taxpayer Advocates (CATA).

### **Issue b. Appropriate Methods for Dealing with Document Submission**

**Sub-issue 4. Ensuring parties and AAB members can view all documents during hearings; necessity for simultaneous viewing**

### **Documentary Evidence:**

The CACEO (including Los Angeles County) agrees that the parties and AAB members should be able to simultaneously view all documents during appeal hearings.

### **Hearings on the Merits - Viewing of Witnesses and Board Members:**

Los Angeles County continues to advocate that video appearance by hearing participants should not be required either at remote evidentiary hearings or in appeals from hearing officer decisions to the AAB.

The remaining CACEO-member agencies concur with CATA's position that for evidentiary hearings on the merits of an appeal, all participants should have the ability to view each other absent free agreement otherwise by the parties and board members.

For example, there may be a circumstance where internet or wi-fi instability would require one or more remote hearing participants to switch to audio-only to ensure a better audio connection. In such a situation, the board and the parties should be free to decide whether to allow that participant to switch to audio-only for the remainder of the hearing, or whether to continue the hearing given the technological issue.

In some counties, hearing officer decisions may be appealed to the AAB. The position of Los Angeles is that video appearances are not required for such remote appeals from hearing officer decisions. The remaining CACEO agencies do not oppose the idea of allowing participants to agree to forego video for such remote appeals to the AAB from hearing officer decisions.

**Routine Non-Evidentiary Matters - Viewing of Witnesses and Board Members:**

Routine administrative hearings such as granting postponements and withdrawals, validity hearings, prehearing conferences, approval of stipulations and jointly recommended values, and other routine matters should not require that parties be able to see each other via video. By analogy, for many years, California's superior courts have permitted parties to appear telephonically for such case management activities. Each County should be free to determine whether remote hearings on such routine matters will be conducted telephonically or include a video component.

**Issue c. Technology Options**

**Sub-issue 4. Notice Requirements to parties-access instructions, coaching/training videos and accommodations for special needs**

The CACEO agreed with the BOE language in LTA 2020/57 (November 18, 2020) recited by CATA on this sub-issue. Further guidance on this subject is unnecessary.

**RESPONSE TO CATA'S SUGGESTIONS RE PREHEARING CONFERENCES AND CATA'S SUGGESTED NEW MEET AND CONFER/CASE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE**

CATA's letter encourages use of the existing prehearing conference process authorized by Property Tax Rule 305.2 and additionally suggests implementing a new "meet and confer" process.

CACEO emphasizes that different counties have different appeal workloads, staffing resources, and resolution dynamics within their jurisdiction. Any actions taken by the BOE should continue to respect the need for each County to maintain local administrative discretion over its local assessment appeal board procedures.

### **Prehearing Conferences**

The CACEO supports BOE issuance of an LTA that reminds stakeholders that Property Tax Rule 305.2 permits counties to adopt local rules governing the use of prehearing conferences; encourages counties to adopt such local rules and utilize such prehearing conferences where appropriate for that County; and encourages Applicants and Assessors to utilize prehearing conferences in those counties that offer prehearing conferences. As already stated in the Assessment Appeals Manual, prehearing conferences can be a useful case management tool for determining when Applicants will finish providing information responsive to the Assessor's 441d requests so that hearing dates can be scheduled, for discussing potential bifurcation and consolidation of cases, for determining the anticipated duration of evidentiary hearings, and for scheduling mutually convenient hearing dates.

CACEO does not support the mandatory use of prehearing conferences. Such a requirement would ignore the needs and circumstances of the local appeal board. In some circumstances, mandatory use of prehearing conferences would, rather than providing a positive benefit, merely impose additional processing time and administrative burdens on already over-burdened appeals boards and their staff, thus increasing the backlog and decreasing the available time for AABs and their clerical staff to focus on completing their evidentiary caseload.

### **Applicant & Assessor Discussions/CATA's Meet and Confer Proposal**

As previously noted, CACEO strongly supports encouraging applicants and assessors to meet privately together without the AAB to discuss case management issues relating to pending appeal applications such as potential bifurcation, potential case consolidation, and status of information exchanges being utilized by the parties, and also for the parties to identify and narrow the substantive issues in dispute and to reach agreement on the value of the subject property where possible. CACEO strongly supports applicants and assessors meeting to discuss such matters as far in advance of the hearing date as possible.

CATA and the CACEO agree that such meetings should be between assessors and applicants and should not involve the appeals board clerk or AAB members attending the meeting.

CACEO disagrees with CATA's proposal that, following their meeting, the applicant and assessor may submit a completed meet and confer/case management form to the Appeals Board Clerk/Staff to report the outcome of their meeting. First, this risks information being provided to the AAB that the AAB should not have prior to the evidentiary hearing on the merits of the appeal application. Second, the receipt and processing of such forms, even if one page long at most, would add to counties' administrative burdens and costs at a time when counties are experiencing budget cuts and an inability to increase staffing levels. Third, submission of such forms would inevitably result in posturing by the parties. Property Tax Rule 305.2 already permits each county to promulgate local rules governing their prehearing conference procedures. Those counties, if any, that desire the parties to submit some sort of written joint case management statement as part of the local rules governing prehearing conferences may do so.

CACEO would support the creation of an optional formal meet and confer process as follows:

- a. A formal meet and confer/case management process would be an option that each County could choose whether or not to adopt and implement via its own local rules. (Similarly, Property Tax Rule 305.2 permits counties to adopt rules governing their prehearing conferences and hold prehearing conferences under those rules).
- b. Any BOE-approved meet and confer/case management form for the Assessor and Applicant to use during their private meeting together would not be submitted to the appeals board or to the board's clerk or staff unless the County, through its own local rules, permits or requires submission of that form to the assessment appeals board.
- c. If the parties agree on a proposed hearing date or range of dates, they may submit a joint scheduling request to the AAB Clerk (or to the AAB during a prehearing conference); however, that scheduling request would not be binding on the AAB or its Clerk/staff.
- d. Where the parties are proposing hearing date(s) that will occur within 120 days of the expiration of the time to hear appeals under Revenue and Taxation Code section 1604, the applicant must execute a time waiver and submit that waiver together with the scheduling request, unless Applicant has already previously executed such a waiver that still remains in effect.

Chairman Vasquez  
December 11, 2020  
Page 5

The CACEO continues to appreciate the leadership and guidance provided by the BOE in this difficult time. Thank you for considering the viewpoints of the CACEO set forth in this letter.

Sincerely,

S/Thomas R. Parker

Thomas R. Parker  
Deputy County Counsel  
Los Angeles County



Jennifer Tran  
Acting Chief, Assessment Appeals Division  
Executive Office, Board of Supervisors  
Los Angeles County

JM:sg

c: The Honorable Ted Gaines  
The Honorable Malia Cohen  
The Honorable Mike Schaefer  
The Honorable Betty T. Yee  
Yvette Stowers, Deputy Controller  
Henry Nanjo, Acting Chief Board Proceedings  
Catherine Taylor, Chief, Board Proceedings  
Brandi Orth, CACEO President  
Don Gaekle, President, California Assessors' Association  
Breann E. Robowski, CATA Ad Hoc Committee on Remote Hearings

*Marcy L. Berkman*  
Marcy L. Berkman  
Deputy County Counsel  
Santa Clara County