

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
450 N STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
TELECONFERENCE

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
JUNE 23, 2020

ITEM L
BOARD MEMBER REQUESTED MATTERS;
ITEM L2
BOARD MEMBER INITIATIVES;
ITEM L2 (b)
BOARD WORKFORCE PLANNING WORKGROUP

REPORTED BY: Jillian M. Sumner
CSR NO. 13619

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

APPEARING TELEPHONICALLY

For the Board of
Equalization: Honorable Antonio Vazquez
 Chair

 Honorable Mike Schaefer
 Vice Chair

 Honorable Ted Gaines
 First District

 Honorable Malia S. Cohen
 Second District

 Yvette Stowers
 Appearing for Betty T.
 Yee, State Controller
 (per Government Code
 Section 7.9)

For the Board of
Equalization Staff: Brenda Fleming
 Executive Director

 Henry Nanjo
 Chief Counsel
 Legal Department

 David Yeung
 Chief
 County-Assessed Properties
 Division
 Property Tax Department

 Toya Davis
 Clerk
 Board Proceedings

Public Speakers: Don Gaekle
 Stanislaus County Assessor

1 STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

2 TELECONFERENCE

3 JUNE 23, 2020

4 ---oOo---

5 MS. DAVIS: The next item is L2(b),
6 Workforce Planning Workgroup Update.

7 This item is presented by Chairman Vazquez.
8 Go ahead, sir.

9 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes.

10 Members, once again, this is another item
11 that we actually had to put on hold. But after
12 hearing all the testimony and input from assessors
13 and the AABs about workload due to COVID-19 and split
14 roll, it's critical that we move forward on this now.

15 First, I want to recap where we were when we
16 last discussed this, and make any changes we want to
17 reach a consensus on the go-forward outline for the
18 next steps.

19 I sent you all documents from the prior
20 Board Meeting discussions, and material that was
21 posted on the PAN; specifically, the January 28th,
22 2020 LA County Assessors College-Based Appraisers'
23 Training Program; The February 7th, 2020 -- my memo
24 on the Workforce Planning Workgroup framework; and
25 the third one was February 20th, 2020, the -- Member
26 Cohen's memo on recommended workgroup members.

27 We also had testimony from the California
28 Assessors' Association President Don Gaekle in

1 January and in February. We agreed to launch this
2 first Workforce Planning Workgroup in March, which
3 was interrupted by COVID-19. And then Member Gaines
4 and I volunteered to take the lead.

5 I'd like to get your input on these three
6 issues we briefly discussed on the workgroup
7 framework so we have a clear idea of what we intend
8 to do and how to accomplish it.

9 Issue No. 1, the workgroup purpose scope and
10 deliveries. Our purpose is, as discussed, in -- the
11 assessors and the BOE have the workforce talent
12 necessary for the successful administration of
13 property tax duties and functions both in individual
14 counties and statewide.

15 As to our scope, there is an expectation
16 that all workgroup meetings should be public,
17 allowing participation by the entire Board, and fully
18 transparent.

19 Member Cohen provided some specific thoughts
20 on our goal in our deliverables.

21 Our vision is to work with assessors,
22 property tax professionals and stakeholders to gather
23 data and receive recommendations regarding
24 recruitment, retention, training, and continuing
25 education, and compensation for both local and
26 statewide.

27 In terms of deliverables, Member Cohen
28 suggested the workgroup should issue monthly progress

1 reports and updates to Board, and a final report with
2 recommendations for the Board to adopt.

3 With that, if I could just ask Member Cohen
4 if she could please explain a little bit what she was
5 envisioning for the larger group, which would
6 encompass the whole statewide participation.

7 Member Cohen, go ahead.

8 MS. COHEN: Yes. Just give me one minute.
9 Let me just pull up my notes. If you can give me a
10 second.

11 MR. VAZQUEZ: Sure.

12 MS. COHEN: So, Mr. Vazquez, thank you for
13 giving me a few minutes to reiterate the vision for
14 the Board's Workforce Planning Group that I created
15 with Board approval while serving as the Chair last
16 year.

17 I've got several remarks prepared, so bear
18 with me, colleagues. I'll try to get through them as
19 quickly as possible.

20 So we're all aware that this workgroup
21 resulted from our first modernization of California's
22 property tax system statewide, the informational
23 hearing that was in San Diego last fall.

24 And at that hearing we heard very
25 informative testimony and recommendations related to
26 workforce planning.

27 And during the hearing, we asked the
28 Executive Director to present a recommendation to the

1 Board at our annual meeting regarding how we could
2 leverage the breath of experience, how we could
3 leverage the knowledge and background that was before
4 us to address these important workforce issues.

5 And what Ms. Fleming did was she presented
6 her recommendation, and I respectfully asked
7 Chair Vazquez and Mr. Gaines to lead this effort when
8 we were in the creation, the formation of our
9 workgroup -- of our workgroup.

10 MS. THOMPSON: I've got it on my regular
11 phone, not on my work phone. I got it from Brenda.
12 I just responded to it.

13 MS. COHEN: Oh, um --

14 MR. VAZQUEZ: We're getting some back-noise
15 there.

16 MS. COHEN: Ms. Thompson.

17 MR. VAZQUEZ: Somebody needs to mute --

18 MS. COHEN: There we go. She's muted.

19 MR. VAZQUEZ: Go ahead. Go ahead,
20 Ms. Cohen.

21 MS. THOMPSON: No, I'm at home. No, I'm at
22 home. Well, do you wanna -- what's -- what's
23 Laurel's text? I don't know if it was from Brenda or
24 not.

25 MS. DAVIS: Can we -- if you're not --

26 MR. VAZQUEZ: Hello? Somebody's not muted.

27 MS. DAVIS: -- can you please make sure your
28 phones are muted at this time.

1 MS. FLEMING: Ms. Thompson, mute your phone,
2 please.

3 MS. COHEN: That happens to me all the
4 time.

5 MR. VAZQUEZ: Sorry about that.

6 MS. COHEN: That's okay. It's happened to
7 me many times. It's embarrassing. But don't worry,
8 we'll continue to press on.

9 So what Ms. Fleming did was she presented
10 some recommendations, and I asked that the Chair and
11 Mr. Gaines lead this effort that we created in our
12 Workforce Planning Group. And you may recall that.

13 And the goal -- the goal of the Workforce
14 Planning Group was to allow Members to work with
15 county assessors, to work with, basically, our
16 stakeholder partners.

17 We've got the assessors, property tax
18 professionals, relevant stakeholders, so that we're
19 all collectively able to gather data and receive
20 recommendations regarding the recruitment, regarding
21 the retention, training, continuing education, and
22 compensation of -- of -- of employees.

23 Now the Board will hold a series of public
24 meetings, and issue a report containing the Board
25 Workgroup's conclusions and recommendations for
26 action.

27 Board Members' staffs will perform the work
28 and provide Board Members with the support required

1 for the workgroup action.

2 Participants would include individuals who
3 testified at the September 19th, 2019 informational
4 hearing, as well as representatives from community
5 colleges, the California State University system, as
6 well as the University of California system. Other
7 participants may also be added to the workgroup.

8 This was -- this is just a list of
9 suggestions. It's in no way meant to be exclusive.
10 But we want to be very inclusive in our thinking, in
11 our outreach.

12 By the way, Chair Vazquez, I previously
13 provided you a complete list -- a complete list of my
14 participants, recommended participants. Let me know
15 if you need me to resend that to you.

16 Frequency. Now, the Workforce Planning
17 Workgroup meetings will be held, and I envision,
18 twice a month. The frequency is important, because
19 the current workforce needs of the Board of
20 Equalization, as well of the assessors' office, are a
21 priority, and potentially amplified as we have split
22 roll initiative on the November ballot for
23 consideration.

24 Some of the rules and responsibilities I
25 also thought about: I believe that Workforce
26 Planning Workgroup will address the workforce
27 capacities and challenges related to recruitment and
28 retention, to training and continuing education, and

1 compensation, as I said before.

2 Now, support from the agency, what I
3 envision that looking like is quite simple. I think
4 we're going to need support from the agency to assist
5 in obtaining information and data.

6 Specifically, I believe we may need the
7 agency to create and issue a survey to counties, to
8 county assessors asking for data -- asking for data
9 on the following items: recruitment needs in the
10 local county assessor offices for entry level, for
11 mid level, and then also for senior staff.

12 Also, retention numbers. So, for example,
13 the numbers of staff who have retired or left the
14 office for the private sector.

15 Compensation information, I think this is
16 also a critical one.

17 Mr. Gaines, I heard you mention this quite
18 often.

19 We're focusing on entry level, mid level,
20 and then also on senior level, paying careful
21 attention to appraisers, to address the following
22 compensation for those most likely to be recruited as
23 new employees, compensation for mid-career
24 professionals, to be most likely to be recruited to
25 the governmental offices, or possibly even private
26 sector, and then compensation for staff within five
27 years of a discretionary retirement age.

28 Office training programs and needs also are

1 included in this, which encompasses the initial
2 training and continuing education for professionals
3 working on appraisals.

4 Now, I'm not naive. There are budgetary
5 constraints. There were budgetary constraints last
6 year. And I feel like even this year more so they're
7 even more exacerbated. So we'll take this with a
8 grain of salt, given the economic climate. But there
9 are budgetary constraints which impact addressing
10 identified workforce challenges. I acknowledge that.

11 Here are some key deliverables; the
12 Workforce Planning Group would be responsible for
13 presenting a final report for recommendations to the
14 Board. The final report would highlight objectives
15 the Board and the BOE will pursue to make significant
16 progress in addressing the workforce capacities needs
17 and challenges.

18 This report would also include specific
19 requests for action to address workforce capacity
20 issues, including recruitment, retention, training,
21 and continuing education, as well as -- as well as
22 compensation.

23 And ultimately the report would slow serve
24 as a road map for the Board, for the Board of
25 Equalization to further its constitutional
26 responsibilities in Property Tax Administration
27 statewide for all 58 counties.

28 I want to take a moment and talk a little

1 bit about Bagley-Keene, the Open Meeting Act. And
2 just acknowledging that we should make sure these
3 meetings are publicly noticed, and held in accordance
4 with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act.

5 And, Mr. Chair, this concludes my summary of
6 my vision for the Workforce Planning Group. I
7 believe it's time for us to roll up our sleeves and
8 get to work on these important issues that we started
9 working on last year.

10 Thank you, Mr. Chair. That's it from me.

11 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

12 I agree with everything -- all the comments
13 you made and suggestions. My only concern is I was
14 wondering if you were -- if you'd be open to
15 basically running two tracks here. One of them is
16 the one you just spelled out, really, that's the
17 statewide, very inclusive, large group, basically,
18 larger body that would include all the stakeholders
19 moving forward.

20 And then on a separate track, I was hoping
21 that the Members would agree that -- allow myself and
22 Member Gaines to continue on the emergency
23 certificate we're trying -- this pilot,
24 basically -- a pilot program to try to get this
25 emergency appraisers, you know, certificate approved
26 ASAP.

27 Because in talking to Jeff Prang in LA
28 County, he's real worried. And he understands that,

1 obviously we had to put everything on hold given
2 COVID-19. But he's really worried, because whether
3 split roll passes or doesn't pass, he really needs to
4 generate more appraisers. He says he's having a
5 tough time just keeping up because of folks that are
6 retiring, and then others that are just leaving into
7 the private sector.

8 So he wanted to see if there was a
9 possibility -- well, he was very supportive. Because
10 I told him we were going to cast a wider net and do a
11 larger group. Here's very supportive of that, and
12 he'll participate in that.

13 But he didn't want to get bogged down and be
14 held back from trying to expedite and fast track this
15 emergency certificate that we're trying to put
16 forward ASAP.

17 We were hoping we would have been a lot
18 further into it, but obviously given COVID, and the
19 fact that it's been difficult to gather ourselves, we
20 haven't been able to really even reconvene.

21 But I've had some conversations with
22 Member Gaines, and he's ready to roll up his sleeves
23 with me. And what we're thinking, on -- at least on
24 the pilot is to obviously include the large county,
25 which would be probably LA with Jeff now on Board,
26 and then pick, like, a mid-range county, and then a
27 small one, to at least get the pilot up and running.

28 And then on the same track is make sure that

1 we include all the individuals and stakeholders that
2 you've listed and you've shared with us, Ms. Cohen,
3 and anybody else that maybe we left out, and we maybe
4 need to look at that participated during these last
5 hearings that we've had under COVID.

6 I'm sure there was individuals that we
7 didn't even think about that exist out there that we
8 should include as part of the stakeholders.

9 So those are kind of my thoughts right now.

10 MR. GAINES: Chair Vazquez, if I could.

11 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes. Mr. Gaines, go ahead.

12 MR. GAINES: If I could just weigh in.

13 Thank you.

14 But I like the proposal that the Chair is
15 bringing forward in that Assessor Prang has a
16 program, he's already got the nuts and bolts pulled
17 together on how to execute in LA County.

18 And I think there's a lot to be learned from
19 that particular program moving forward that I think
20 could be replicated throughout the state. So I think
21 we could actually do it in each of our districts.
22 And so you'd have three other programs, plus the LA
23 program moving forward.

24 But I'd like to see -- I'd like to learn --
25 I mean, I'm familiar with what Assessor Prang has
26 brought forward. But I'd like to actually see it
27 executed, and then at the same time have
28 conversations with -- you know, I've been having

1 conversations with our community colleges. So I met
2 with the president of Sierra College, Willy Duncan,
3 and he loved the idea.

4 He talked about a program that he had
5 collaborated with with the Building Industry
6 Association, the BIA. And they put the students
7 through a 12-week program. And by the end of that
8 program, they were certified, and 100 percent of them
9 got hired.

10 Now, I'm not saying that that's the right --
11 the right sort of pathway in terms of the time line
12 or anything of that nature, but we do need to execute
13 and get something pulled together quickly, especially
14 in the advent of split roll.

15 And we have our own problems right now just
16 with the blue tsunami. We've got a lot of baby
17 boomers who are retiring, and we've got to figure out
18 how to get good, quality people.

19 And I am really concerned about if split
20 roll passes. I think every property assessor is
21 going to be -- is going to be like -- is going to be
22 like gold. I mean, they're -- they're going to be
23 getting job offers from the private sectors that
24 continue to pull away from our county assessors and
25 the BOE itself.

26 So I'd like to work together
27 collaboratively. I think that's a great idea if we
28 want to do that statewide. But it sounds like we

1 could, in my view, we could get going right now with
2 this LA program, figure out how to emulate it, and I
3 think we can get a jump start.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

6 Anybody else?

7 Hearing no others.

8 So is there a consensus from the Members
9 that we kind of run this on two tracks? We do the
10 one pilot with LA County, and -- myself with
11 Mr. Gaines, and then we'll also work with identifying
12 a medium-size county, as well as a small one, to get
13 this -- at least this emergency, the two-year
14 appraiser credential program off the ground.

15 And then on a separate track, we'll move
16 forward with the recommendations that Member Cohen
17 brought forward in terms of really bringing together
18 a larger group that may take a little longer to get
19 off the ground.

20 But at the same time, I think it's important
21 that we include as many people as possible that may
22 have an interest, or have some good ideas and
23 thoughts on how do we handle this thing at a
24 statewide level.

25 Ms. Cohen. Yes, go ahead.

26 MS. COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

27 Maybe you could explain to me a little bit
28 more so I can get a better understanding about your

1 rational on why you want to dual track this. Like,
2 what's the purpose?

3 MR. VAZQUEZ: The reason I wanted to dual
4 track it is just to try to expedite one over the
5 other.

6 Because I know -- I'm just thinking in terms
7 of what we went through just recently as we're trying
8 to organize a large group, you know, and sometimes it
9 gets really cumbersome. And I don't want to hold
10 back lost time that we've already lost because of
11 COVID.

12 And my conversation with Assessor Prang,
13 he's worried about if we sit back and try to cast a
14 white net, that we're going to have this discussion
15 about what to do and how to move this thing forward a
16 year from now still discussing it.

17 And he's really getting antsy, I guess you
18 might say, and wants to see what we can do to
19 generate this emergency credential ASAP basically.

20 MS. COHEN: So I still --

21 MR. VAZQUEZ: So I -- so I basically shared
22 with him that.

23 MS. COHEN: I -- I still don't -- so
24 Mr. Prang, although he represents a very large
25 county, he still is 1 of 58 assessors.

26 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes.

27 MS. COHEN: And I have not really had the
28 chance to talk to the other 23 assessors that I work

1 with and talk to on a fairly regular monthly basis.

2 So I'm not sure how I am processing -- I'm
3 not sure how I feel about the -- about dual-tracking
4 this. I'm just concerned -- I'm concerned about
5 private meetings, quite honestly.

6 I'm concerned -- I want to make sure we have
7 assurances that we're going forward, and that we've
8 learned from past mistakes, but that we're
9 transparent.

10 So is dual-tracking going to mean that
11 there's private meetings, or does that mean that
12 there will still be publicly noticed meetings, and
13 we'll just have more publicly noticed meetings? Or
14 what exactly -- how does that look? I'm just
15 struggling with how it looks.

16 MR. VAZQUEZ: Let me -- let me try to walk
17 you through this.

18 On the fast track, for example, with the
19 emergency credential, basically, that -- obviously we
20 have to be careful on that one that we, we would --
21 it would probably just be -- in terms of Members, it
22 would probably just be narrowed down to myself and
23 Mr. Gaines.

24 Now, there's nothing stopping us from
25 inviting others that might want to participate in
26 terms of the transparency piece that you're referring
27 to. But I don't think we'll be able to, for example,
28 have -- at least, if we're trying to expedite this

1 thing, have it with more than two Members from the
2 Board, because then we run into the whole
3 Bagley-Keene issue, right?

4 MS. COHEN: So I just wanted to make sure
5 that we do not -- in an effort to be expedient, that
6 we do not publicly notice the meetings. I mean, is
7 that something that we can agree to that everything
8 will still be publicly noticed, even if it's a
9 discussion?

10 MR. VAZQUEZ: I'm open to that. You know
11 what, let me ask Henry Nanjo, if he's on the line
12 real quick.

13 Mr. Nanjo.

14 MR. NANJO: Yes, I'm here.

15 MR. VAZQUEZ: I have a quick question for
16 you.

17 MR. NANJO: Sure.

18 MR. VAZQUEZ: In terms of -- if we try to
19 fast track this through our task force, for example,
20 on this emergency credential -- or I should say this
21 emergency certificate that we're looking for the
22 appraisers, for Member Gaines and myself, we could --
23 are we still confined in terms of -- do we have to
24 give notice when we call those meetings together? Is
25 it the same 10 days, or are we able to expedite that
26 a little quicker?

27 MR. NANJO: As long as it's just -- as long
28 as it's just the two Board Members' offices, and not

1 from the other Board Members.

2 In other words, if you don't have a quorum
3 of Board Members participating, you can have a public
4 notice in less than 10 days.

5 Once you have a quorum, that is either
6 representatives, or three or more Members
7 participating, that's when you have to comply with
8 Bagley-Keene, and provide the 10 days public notice,
9 yada, yada, yada.

10 MR. VAZQUEZ: Okay.

11 So -- Member Cohen, so what I'm envisioning
12 with the fast track, I guess, when we're going in
13 this two-year appraiser credential program is I'd
14 like to have that flexibility.

15 I mean, we'll notice -- we'll public notice
16 as much as possible. But we may not have -- we may
17 not go the full 10 days. It might be 5-days notice.
18 Because it will be two Members, if you're okay with
19 that.

20 That's what -- I mean, we'll try to do it 10
21 days, but I'm just thinking, for example, let's say
22 Jeff Prang tells me, you know, We need to have this
23 meeting with our Board of Supervisors this coming
24 Friday. Boom. I don't want to be strapped and say,
25 Well, you know what, we need 10 days. We only
26 have 5. We can't do it.

27 MS. COHEN: So I'm a little uncomfortable
28 with what you're proposing, because, although I'm not

1 interested in taking the lead and organizing and
2 necessarily doing the work, I am interested in
3 participating.

4 So based on the definition that, you know,
5 that you gave me, you and your Co-Chair will be the
6 only two Members able to participate. And that would
7 exclude me, Ms. Stowers, or anybody else,
8 Mr. Gaines -- or Mr. Schaefer, if we wanted to
9 participate and bring our voice to the conversation.

10 So -- and I'm uncomfortable because, again,
11 like I said, I am going to be thinking about the 23
12 counties that I represent, and the 23 assessors that
13 I represent that may or may not be able to engage on
14 the call or attend a meeting.

15 So I'm gonna -- if you put this to a motion
16 about dual-tracking, I'm going to have to vote no.
17 Because I really want to be able to participate.

18 And, again, I want to be clear about what
19 participation looks like for me. It's not running
20 the program, not running the show. I would
21 definitely be deferential and respectful to the
22 Chairs and Co-Chairs of this effort. But I really
23 want to be at the table listening and responding to
24 what we're discussing, too -- discussing, period.

25 MR. GAINES: You know, if I could -- if I
26 could --

27 MR. VAZQUEZ: Member Gaines, go ahead.

28 MR. GAINES: Yeah. Thank you.

1 My thought is that I think we can do both.
2 If -- if we're meeting -- let's say we meet with
3 Assessor Prang on this issue, and we're trying to
4 [inaudible], why couldn't we collaborate with other
5 Members that would want to participate in those
6 discussions?

7 And if we have three or more that's publicly
8 noticed with the 10-days advance notice, we could
9 also give updates on a monthly basis in terms of
10 what's happening.

11 And, you know, I think there -- I think
12 there could be an exception, though, where you're on
13 a time line that's very short, where it would just
14 be -- maybe just Tony, or Tony and me, at a
15 particular meeting.

16 So I think that flexibility is valuable in
17 that if we want to execute and try to get a model
18 moving that then could serve as an opportunity for
19 the other counties to replicate and make necessary
20 adjustments for the needs of their particular
21 counties.

22 MR. NANJO: And just -- Members, this is
23 Henry Nanjo, Chief Counsel.

24 Just to be clear, Member Gaines, be careful.
25 Because under Bagley-Keene, if you and -- for
26 example, hypothetically, if you and Chairman Vazquez
27 are meeting in a subgroup with a stakeholder group,
28 and then you discuss what happened at that meeting

1 with a third Board Member, that technically would be
2 a serial meeting and violation of Bagley-Keene.

3 MR. GAINES: Oh, yeah.

4 MR. NANJO: So that would --

5 MR. GAINES: No, I would --

6 MR. NANJO: -- be careful about that.

7 MR. GAINES: Absolutely.

8 So that would require, really, a reporting
9 back at the regular Board Meetings in terms of what
10 the status was of the program.

11 MR. NANJO: That's correct.

12 Or like you suggested, Member Gaines,
13 convening a meeting with 10-days notice, and that way
14 you can have a free discussion with the other Board
15 Members --

16 MR. GAINES: Right.

17 MR. NANJO: -- at that point.

18 MR. GAINES: That's right.

19 MR. NANJO: I just wanted to make sure a
20 clarification was made.

21 MS. FLEMING: Chairman -- Chairman Vazquez,
22 this is Brenda. If I could ask a clarifying
23 question.

24 So just running through the scenario, and,
25 perhaps, you know, more -- a detailed discussion is
26 going to be needed here. But if we run through the
27 scenario where, let's say, two Members are meeting
28 with an assessor on a program. In this case, you

1 know, Mr. Prang, for example.

2 If you're having those meetings, would you
3 be engaged in discussion to gain information and get
4 clarity about their program?

5 If you're meeting with the Board of
6 Supervisors for LA, for example, what actually would
7 be [inaudible] of the discussion? And would there be
8 commitments made or an expectation that commitments
9 are made?

10 If we can get some clarity on, perhaps, how
11 you see that -- how you see that -- that workflow
12 occurring.

13 MR. VAZQUEZ: Well, what I kind of
14 envisioned is we had some preliminary meetings
15 already. There's, for example, the county of LA,
16 they have pretty much already had laid out the
17 coursework that needs to happen. And -- which
18 includes the whole curriculum. And they've kind of
19 laid out already, I guess you might say, a track that
20 we're now trying to expedite.

21 And I think one of the things that has to
22 happen pretty quickly, and one of the reasons I'm a
23 little leery about getting too large a group that's
24 hard to move is that, for example, the County Board
25 of Supervisors have to agendize at some point here
26 real quick this item, because they also have a
27 requirement to hire appraisers in LA County with
28 four-year degrees.

1 So we need to change -- have them change
2 that to a two-year degree with this emergency
3 certificate, basically. And so do we at the state
4 level.

5 It's my understanding, I don't know if it
6 falls under a rule change or some kind of a motion or
7 resolution that we may have to do within the BOE.
8 Because I think the way it's crafted right now, the
9 BOE requires a four-year degree. And we need to
10 change that.

11 And I -- it sounds like there's a consensus
12 on the Board to do that, but I want to make sure that
13 we're not sitting back and waiting for this large
14 group to reconvene before we can act on some of these
15 things that we could do ASAP, for example, in a
16 smaller working group.

17 That's my frustration, I guess.

18 And I'm hearing, and I'm listening, and I
19 appreciate, and I'm concerned also about the whole
20 transparency piece that Member Cohen is raising.

21 So that's where we're kind of at. And I
22 think at this point if there's a -- hopefully a
23 majority on the Board that's willing to run this on
24 two tracks, I'd like to move that.

25 And with the understanding that, you know,
26 whenever possible, especially even the smaller group,
27 we'd like to, obviously, keep all the Members
28 informed. So as we have our monthly meetings, or

1 even any other special meetings, is to try to report
2 back and give you updates as they're happening on
3 this fast-track emergency appraisers credential.

4 By all means, you know, we want to obviously
5 make sure that all the Members are informed. But I
6 just don't want to get stuck at some point where we
7 need to maybe call for a quick meeting with, whether
8 it's the Board of Supervisors in LA County, or some
9 other county that we're working with in this process
10 of fast-tracking this credential. I don't want to
11 get stuck, I guess, is my real concern.

12 MR. GAEKLE: Chair Vazquez.

13 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes. Go ahead.

14 MR. GAEKLE: This is Don Gaekle.

15 MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh, Don. Yes, go ahead.

16 MR. GAEKLE: I want to -- I appreciate the
17 discussion, and I don't want to get involved in the
18 Board's Bagley-Keene decision. But I wanted to speak
19 about the program that Assessor Prang has put
20 together.

21 And I did speak with him recently. And I
22 know he is -- you're correct, he is anxious to get
23 going on that.

24 His focus primarily is on providing training
25 and coursework for people who already have four-year
26 degrees. And, you know, to kind of expedite and
27 assist in getting those people into the workforce.

28 I know he's aware of the two-year degree

1 program. That was not his original concept. And, I
2 don't know, I can't speak for him on whether he would
3 want to change his requirements to accept the
4 two-year degree or not.

5 I know that there is -- that a lot of
6 assessors -- our county requires a four-year degree.
7 And so I think there's room for discussion with the
8 Assessors' Association. We have an Education
9 Committee and a Standards Committee that looks over
10 those things.

11 So that part of it could be fruitful
12 discussion with the CAA on that. But I do know --
13 and you mentioned the two-track system. But I do
14 know Assessor Prang is anxious to get going on a
15 program that he kind of put together for providing
16 training for people who already have four-year
17 degrees. And I think that's the program that he most
18 wants to get going on.

19 And, you know, the two-year degree program,
20 if the Board wants to go through with that, and the
21 BOE change their requirements for that, that's a
22 separate issue.

23 I don't know how I know from speaking with
24 him months ago on this that it was one of his
25 concerns that a broader statewide effort would slow
26 down and impede his implementation of this program.

27 So I do want to say that he is anxious to
28 get going on that. And I think the -- what the BOE

1 is proposing is a worthwhile discussion and effort.

2 But I know that he would like to get going
3 on that. And I think if he can get going on that
4 part, then that would ultimately be a good template
5 for how the training and education program would go,
6 separate and apart from the two-year degree
7 program.

8 Again, I don't want to speak for him on
9 that.

10 And you've had discussions with him, Chair
11 Vazquez.

12 So as far as -- as far as they're changing
13 their requirements, I don't know. But I do know that
14 his original plan was to get going on providing
15 training for people who already have four-year
16 degrees to expedite their entry into the workplace.

17 MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh, you --

18 MR. GAEKLE: So -- so just -- just to keep
19 that in mind.

20 MR. VAZQUEZ: No, no. You're correct.

21 I mean, that was my original discussion with
22 him. But the last couple conversations I had with
23 him, I think you're correct, he's still looking at a
24 four-year degree.

25 Because that's kind of like the low-hanging
26 fruit, right? You have folks that already have a
27 four-year degree, now it's just a matter of
28 convincing them to go through this training that they

1 provide to actually get -- or pass this exam so they
2 get their actual credential.

3 What I was discussing with him separately
4 from that is working with the community college, in
5 which we've already had conversations with the
6 chancellor in LA, for example, that's willing to do
7 this emergency credential, basically, or certificate,
8 I should say, that would allow folks to be hired with
9 the two-year degree.

10 But it's an emergency credential, basically,
11 for this. Which doesn't mean -- they still have to
12 complete the four-year at some point, because it's an
13 emergency. Just like when we had it for the teaching
14 credential. You had, like -- we give them a window.
15 It might be four or five years where they have to
16 complete the four-year degree. If they don't, they
17 lose that credential, and they lose their job.

18 MS. COHEN: So -- time out here, and let me
19 interject here.

20 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes. Go ahead.

21 MS. COHEN: Because one thing that is
22 definitely making me uncomfortable is I feel like the
23 conversation is too anchored and too focused on one
24 assessor and one county. And that really concerns
25 me, because there are other counties.

26 I think about Santa Clara County in my own
27 district. I think about Alameda County, San
28 Francisco County that also have significant

1 challenges when it comes to staffing, significant
2 challenges when it comes to producing, you know, the
3 roll.

4 So I'm going to have to just step in here
5 and let you know that if the purpose of dual-tracking
6 this is to be expedient and to create something for
7 one specific -- for one specific -- to solve one
8 assessor's particular problems, that may or may not
9 address other assessors' problems, I'm not going to
10 support that at all.

11 I think we need to be more inclusive and a
12 little bit more global in our approach, in our
13 thinking, on how we're going to be solving the
14 challenges.

15 And, quite frankly, we've lost a lot of
16 time. We started this conversation last year, and,
17 here it is, what, June? End of June, and now we're
18 just picking it back up.

19 Yeah, I know there was a pandemic. But we
20 wasted a lot of time bull-shitting around stupid
21 things when we could have been addressing these.

22 These work proposals and everything have
23 been before us since last year. So I understand that
24 there's a sense of urgency. But I also want to
25 accept the fact that we, as a body, have been sitting
26 on this proposal, and this tool, to be able to move
27 forward.

28 So I am not going to be voting for a dual

1 track, based on some of the things that I've heard.
2 And even what I've heard from Henry Nanjo, I actually
3 would be in agreement for and support that it seems
4 like that -- that the points that he raised that we
5 should be mindful of.

6 We presented this information to the Board,
7 the Board agreed to revisit the issue in the
8 workgroup proposal. I have proposals that I would
9 like to consider.

10 But based on the structure that you're
11 proposing, would exclude my voice and my ability to
12 participate. And so that's not something that I can
13 just turn my -- turn my back to and ignore.

14 So out of the 58 counties, I mean, I
15 represent 23.

16 And, I think -- I think, Ted, you may -- you
17 represent, what, 26, or something like that, 24. A
18 fairly significant number as well.

19 So to be able to drive this conversation
20 just -- and, again, I'm listening to the language.
21 And it's just anchoring around one county -- a
22 significant one to the state, no doubt -- but one
23 county assessor, that makes me just uncomfortable.

24 And I don't think that would be fair to the
25 rest of the county assessors and counties that each
26 one of us each represents.

27 So I'm a no-vote on the dual. We can put it
28 up to a vote and, you know, continue to move on with

1 our agenda.

2 That's my piece. Thank you.

3 MR. GAINES: Chair Vazquez, if I -- if I
4 could --

5 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes. Go ahead, Member
6 Gaines.

7 MR. GAINES: -- weigh in here.

8 I don't think it has to be either or.
9 Speaking to Member Cohen's comments. I don't know
10 why we couldn't move forward with the LA plan.

11 We have a template. We've got a very
12 effective county assessor who has already executed a
13 blueprint for a plan. And I think we can all learn
14 from that.

15 I, you know -- and I'd like to move forward.
16 No. 1, make a second on the motion. Because I think
17 there's value in moving forward with a template
18 that's already been created that could be replicated
19 by other counties, could be amended or changed or
20 adjusted to the needs of each particular county.

21 And I do -- I am concerned about getting a
22 big group together and trying to actually, you know,
23 come up with a decision in a timely timeframe.

24 And that if we can move forward with LA,
25 that serves as an opportunity for other counties to
26 take a look at it.

27 I've been in conversation with my counties
28 about trying to put together an education program

1 locally. I think each of us could do that in our
2 districts.

3 And so I would -- I would ask if
4 Member Cohen would reevaluate what the proposal is.
5 Because I think what it does is it can prevent and
6 provide a pathway and actually save a lot of time,
7 and we can look at the mistakes that are made, and we
8 can look at what's working, and make those
9 adjustments in the counties as we proceed forward.

10 MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

11 And just for a point of clarification to get
12 back to some of the comments Member Cohen just made,
13 this is not just LA County. I think at the very
14 beginning, hopefully I was clear, I was talking about
15 LA counties being the large one, we would also
16 include in this pilot a medium and a small county.

17 So you're welcome to -- especially if you
18 have somebody at the mid-range that you want to bring
19 forward, I'd like to hear it. Especially if they're
20 willing to work with us on this fast track.

21 Because at the end of the day, I think you
22 hit it on the nail, we don't want to sit around and
23 be talking about this. Like we said, you know, we
24 put this thing off. And there's a need, and we need
25 to fill it ASAP.

26 And so that's why I'm proposing these dual
27 tracks. But this doesn't mean we're excluding a
28 mid-range and a small county. This pilot can include

1 one of each, a large, medium, and a small.

2 MR. GAINES: Member Vazquez.

3 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes, go ahead.

4 MR. GAINES: I would -- I would ask that we
5 make a little adjustment to that. I think we all
6 need a pilot program functional in each of our
7 districts.

8 So I don't know if that would be two small
9 counties and a medium-size county, or two large
10 counties, a medium and a small, but to represent each
11 of our four districts.

12 MR. VAZQUEZ: So, in other words, you're
13 saying --

14 MR. GAEKLE: Chair Vazquez.

15 MR. VAZQUEZ: So right now it's -- I was
16 looking at three. So I guess to make sure we cover
17 the fourth one, we could have, maybe, two -- you're
18 saying either two small or two medium, and then the
19 large?

20 MR. GAINES: Yeah. My suggestion is that it
21 would be -- you could let each Member figure out, you
22 know --

23 MR. VAZQUEZ: All right.

24 MR. GAINES: -- the appropriate county in
25 their district, so we're all kind of moving forward
26 in the same -- in the same time line.

27 MR. VAZQUEZ: All right. I'm open to that.

28 So at the end of the day we would end up

1 with four. And I'll -- obviously, I'm going with LA
2 County, and then it's up to you three to decide who
3 you want to choose from your district --

4 MR. GAINES: That's correct.

5 MR. VAZQUEZ: -- to be in this pilot,
6 basically.

7 MS. COHEN: But the thing -- the thing that,
8 you know, that we're completely negating is that we
9 are eliminating the breath and depth of our -- our
10 stakeholder partners in this conversation.

11 I mean, we are -- they came before us, they
12 testified. We're in agreement. But now we're ready
13 to take a vote, and then we're going to determine
14 what -- what the scope of this pilot is going to look
15 like? I just -- I'm just really uncomfortable with
16 that.

17 We have to -- we haven't -- we haven't
18 included them in this new process. I don't know if
19 there is anyone on the line, any public commenters on
20 the line. Maybe we can listen and see what they have
21 to say on this particular item.

22 Ms. Toya, or AT&T, are there callers lined
23 up for this?

24 MR. VAZQUEZ: Ms. Davis, do we have anybody?
25 I don't think -- I haven't heard anybody.

26 AT&T MODERATOR: We -- we can check on the
27 phone if you'd like.

28 Ladies and gentlemen, if you'd like to cue

1 up on the phone for comment, please press 1, then 0
2 on your telephone keypad. Again, that is 1, then 0.

3 MS. COHEN: Thank you.

4 MR. GAINES: Member Vazquez, if I could just
5 comment again --

6 MR. VAZQUEZ: Sure. Go ahead.

7 MR. GAINES: -- to Member Cohen's comments.

8 I don't know why we can't do both. Why
9 wouldn't we engage interested parties in how we
10 implement in each of our districts?

11 And I -- the way I see it is that we would
12 engage, and that we would have all of the interested
13 parties, and we'd get their input as we move forward.

14 MR. GAEKLE: Chair Vazquez, this is
15 Don Gaekle again.

16 I didn't want to imply that, you know, we're
17 weighing in on one side or the other. I wanted to
18 make it clear what I understand about Assessor Prang
19 is that the California Assessors' Association
20 Education Committee, these are the kinds of things
21 that we deal with.

22 The CAA would be happy to participate in
23 providing as a stakeholder, providing guidance and
24 advice however the Board wants to proceed.

25 I understand that -- that time is -- time is
26 important here. In the last two weeks of June, I
27 think myself and half the assessors in the state are
28 turning over our rolls right now, and the other half

1 are still working on their rolls.

2 So the next couple of weeks probably will be
3 a little busy for assessors. But we're happy -- the
4 CAA would be happy to engage however the Board goes
5 forward

6 MR. VAZQUEZ: I appreciate it. Thank you.

7 Let me -- let me just ask from a procedural
8 question, and more of just in terms of resources, and
9 I guess this is a question for Mr. Nanjo.

10 If we wanted to move, you know, this larger
11 group, or even this pilot program looking at having
12 meetings. Because I foresee if we were going to
13 fast-track this, we're going to have to call meetings
14 almost every 10 days.

15 Is that something we can do given the
16 staff -- the staff that we have now, Mr. Nanjo?

17 MR. NANJO: Thank you, Chairman Vazquez.

18 No. Speaking on behalf of Board
19 Proceedings, I don't believe that's sustainable.

20 As you know, we are moving into SAPD season.
21 I believe we just received our first two appeals. I
22 have to dedicate some of my Board Proceedings staff,
23 of which there's only four people, to work on the
24 appeals. And that's going to take up more and more
25 time.

26 So we would not be able to turn around Board
27 Meetings that quickly.

28 MR. VAZQUEZ: That's what I thought.

1 All right. Members, let me just reiterate,
2 then, my motion, and see if my seconder's on Board.

3 And that is that I'm proposing that we set
4 up a dual track. You know, one which would be the
5 pilot that we've -- that Member Gaines and myself
6 have started already, using LA County, Jeff Prang's,
7 preliminary model.

8 And then I will ask the Members to choose a
9 county within their respective districts to be
10 included in this pilot.

11 And then on a separate track we would
12 continue doing the larger group that would include
13 all the stakeholders that were laid out already by
14 Member Cohen.

15 Is that acceptable by my seconder,
16 Mr. Gaines?

17 MS. FLEMING: So -- so request to ask a
18 question.

19 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes.

20 MS. FLEMING: I just -- before the Board
21 proceeds with the motion, I think -- and I apologize,
22 but I'm pausing, you know, with a question from staff
23 in terms of, would it be possible, just to bring
24 clarity to the issue, if we could have kind of -- if
25 it's time to pause to allow us to have some clarity
26 on exactly what the pilot would look like.

27 And -- and I'm going to request if
28 Mr. Yeung, and perhaps Mr. Gaekle, can help weigh in

1 on this.

2 Because I'm just wanting to make sure in the
3 accelerated program to be able to clarify
4 specifically what BOE's role would be to the extent
5 that the -- if, for example, LA County has a program,
6 and they've created a curriculum, our requirements
7 for certification is still the four years.

8 So I'm just trying to understand, for
9 clarity, if he's doing something in a two-year
10 timeframe, then either that requires a requirement
11 change on our end, or is it something that just the
12 counties would be doing to accelerate it -- to
13 accelerate this program?

14 And if that's their program, I'd like to
15 make sure we've got clarification on what exactly
16 BOE's role would be, so that we could adjust our
17 workload capacity.

18 And then if it's something that -- that we
19 are engaging, let's say that we're engaging locally
20 with LA County, whatever actions are committed
21 through there, that content would have to come back
22 to the Board for a Board discussion and a vote. And
23 then that's when we get into the Bagley-Keene.

24 And, you know, as Henry's indicated, you
25 know, to try to turn meetings around every two weeks,
26 we could not be able to sustain that.

27 So I'm just trying to establish what -- what
28 our role would be, one; and then, secondly, how do we

1 ensure that whatever is happening in those local
2 conversations in the pilot, how do you pull that
3 information back out of the localized levels and
4 bring it back to the Board, to the extent that any
5 actions or decisions or anything that's needed which
6 requires us to change any program or commit resources
7 in the space, in our training space, how would we
8 support that, and how do we accommodate that?

9 I just want to make sure that we've got, you
10 know -- hopefully this helps to bring some clarity to
11 what our role would be, and how -- how we would need
12 to at least consider how we were going to move
13 forward with it.

14 And I do support understanding what
15 Mr. Prang was trying to do in doing the acceleration.
16 And, you know, I think each Equalization district
17 probably has a similar, you know -- similar need.

18 But as I mentioned, we're going to have to
19 bridge that back into a public discussion, and then
20 really assess what is the training for, that if there
21 is a change in any of our requirements for
22 certification, if it's in our lane, or if it's
23 something that would be exclusive to localized work.

24 MR. VAZQUEZ: Well, it's my understanding
25 that, you know, we do at some point have to bring it
26 back to the BOE, to the Board.

27 Now, I know the county is looking to
28 fast-track it within their own county. But I don't

1 think they can even move -- they can do it -- I mean,
2 they might be able to pass the resolution locally.
3 But I think at the end of the day, that still has to
4 come back before us, the BOE.

5 And I think you're right, it would mean some
6 participation from staff to make that happen. I'm
7 trying to figure out a way where we minimize as much,
8 in terms of what we need from you folks at the state
9 level, with the exception of when this thing comes
10 together within, let's say, the county pilot program.

11 Then when we bring it back, hopefully it's
12 pretty much laid out so it's just -- all we have to
13 do is allow for you folks to -- I don't know if it
14 comes through a form of a resolution, or a rule
15 change, or whatever it takes to make that adjustment
16 up at the state level.

17 MS. FLEMING: Yes.

18 I think maybe what we can help do is to
19 provide some clarification on what our requirements
20 are for that certification process, both
21 educationally, experience, etc., so that we can see
22 where we are lined with what, you know, the localized
23 pilots would like to do, and what they're trying to
24 achieve versus what we're required to do.

25 If there's alignment, then great. But if
26 there are any gaps, then, you know, to allow for some
27 discussion to determine how to fill those gaps.

28 We're totally on board with our need to --

1 to help them in getting some additional staff on
2 board, and getting more, you know, appraisers.

3 And we're just trying to -- I'm just trying
4 to really clarify where BOE is going to be engaged in
5 this. And making sure that we are not -- that we
6 are -- we're still meeting our requirements for the
7 certification process.

8 I think there's just one missing element for
9 me there in terms of if we're meeting within the
10 pilot, what would you need from us?

11 MR. VAZQUEZ: No, I appreciate that.

12 And if this thing moves forward, we'll
13 definitely make sure that we include, if not
14 yourself, somebody from --

15 MS. FLEMING: Yeah.

16 MR. VAZQUEZ: -- your staff as we begin to
17 formalize, especially, this pilot with -- with the
18 assessor.

19 MS. FLEMING: So Mr. Yeung's on the line.

20 Mr. Yeung, do you have any questions or --

21 MR. YEUNG: Yes.

22 If I may, can I offer just a little bit of
23 clarity on what is actually required for -- for a
24 certification to do Ad Valorem appraisal work.

25 So there is a requirement for a four-year
26 degree to get that certification, if you do not have
27 any other qualifying experience. And there are some
28 other qualifying experience that will count.

1 There -- they include that of real estate
2 agent, accountant-type work. So there are some other
3 qualifying experience.

4 So with -- so either you have a -- you have
5 a four-year degree that will qualify for you to take
6 the exam. If you pass, you can be certified.

7 If you do not have a four-year degree, you
8 can -- we will be able to substitute a year-for-year
9 of qualifying experience to count towards that
10 four-year degree.

11 The exception to that is if you are to do
12 audit work. So it's a little different. If you do
13 assessment of personal business property, then you
14 need a four-year degree with a specialization in
15 accounting.

16 So my understanding of it is -- and I don't
17 know this for 100 percent certainty -- is that there
18 was discussion about using a two-year degree instead
19 of a four, having that qualify you to at least do
20 either on a temporary basis, or qualify you to
21 actually do Ad Valorem appraisal work for an
22 assessor's office for property tax purposes.

23 That, if it is truly to substitute the
24 two-year degree for a four-year degree, at the very
25 minimum, that would require a change in the Property
26 Tax Rule and the Regulation. Because it's actually
27 spelled out in our regulations. And the whole
28 regulations is 281 through 283.

1 And they -- these are the Board's
2 regulations on what is and is not required in order
3 to get a certification to do appraisal work.

4 So I -- once again, I understand what
5 Mr. Prang, or -- and we're trying to do here. We're
6 trying to figure out if there is a way in order for
7 us to get more people qualified at a different -- in
8 a different track than what is normally required.
9 But much of it depends on exactly what model they
10 want to use in order to get them to qualify.

11 MR. VAZQUEZ: So listening to your
12 explanation, potentially what could happen then is
13 that we could bring people into the fold with a
14 two-year degree, and we may have to make a rule
15 change or whatever it is you said --

16 MR. YEUNG: Right.

17 MR. VAZQUEZ: -- to get them to qualify.

18 But it's giving them basically an
19 emergency-appraiser credential that would only be
20 sufficient -- would only be active -- or they would
21 only be able to use it to get employment if they're
22 enrolled in a program to get the four-year degree,
23 for example.

24 MR. YEUNG: That is -- that is -- that is
25 one track to do so.

26 If you bring -- under the current
27 requirement, if you do not have any other qualifying
28 experience, and you only have a two-year degree, you

1 would not qualify.

2 So if the assessor brings you in and employs
3 you, then you could not do Ad Valorem appraisal work.
4 What you can do is you can do other support work.
5 You can either gain experience in the office as the
6 other qualifying experience, and then later on meet
7 the two-year -- have an additional two years of
8 qualifying experience, and you could qualify for it.

9 Or you could -- that's one track. The other
10 track is you are -- you actually change the
11 regulation and allow a two-year degree person to do
12 work. Once again, that would require a regulation
13 change.

14 And they can attack it one of two ways. It
15 all depends on what type of program they want to set
16 up, and how quickly they want somebody to come in and
17 actually start doing work.

18 MR. VAZQUEZ: So what -- so as I'm listening
19 to you, so one of the -- I guess one of the tracks we
20 can develop here is if we, let's say, set it up where
21 the two-year degree would qualify for the four-year,
22 if, maybe, they just pass the exam.

23 Isn't there an exam that they have to pass
24 anyway?

25 MR. YEUNG: There is. There is.

26 The actual certif -- there is an actual
27 certification exam that you have to get a passing
28 grade in order to -- in order to be certified --

1 fully certified by us, by the BOE.

2 MR. VAZQUEZ: So they have to pass that exam
3 even if they have a four-year degree, for example,
4 right?

5 MR. YEUNG That is correct. That is
6 correct.

7 MR. VAZQUEZ: So maybe the --

8 MR. YEUNG: A four-year degree --

9 MR. VAZQUEZ: -- rule change --

10 MR. YEUNG: -- qualifies --

11 MR. VAZQUEZ: So I'm thinking maybe the rule
12 change would be that a two-year degree has to pass
13 that exam, and then be enrolled in the program to get
14 the four-year degree through this emergency-appraiser
15 credential that we create.

16 MR. YEUNG: That is one option.

17 Once again, it -- we are -- we are
18 working -- I'm attacking it. I'm addressing it in
19 the current statutory and regulatory scheme.

20 If you are proposing to change the statutory
21 or regulatory scheme, then there's a lot more -- I
22 guess there's a lot more freedom in who can and
23 cannot do Ad Valorem appraisal work.

24 But under -- under the current -- under the
25 current regulatory and statutory scheme, either you
26 need a four-year degree, or you need four years of
27 qualifying experience, and pass the certification
28 test in order -- in order to do Ad Valorem appraisal

1 work.

2 So if they're -- if they're proposing a rule
3 change or a different -- or apprenticeship program,
4 that is -- that is a different track.

5 MR. VAZQUEZ: Okay.

6 Ms. Stowers, go ahead. I see your hand.

7 MS. STOWERS: Thank you.

8 My question is for Mr. Yeung.

9 You talked about a rule change.

10 MR. YEUNG: Yes.

11 MS. STOWERS: If we wanted to go to just a
12 two-year degree in qualifying experience --

13 MR. YEUNG: Yes.

14 MS. STOWERS: -- is that a rule change only,
15 or do we have to change the underlying statute?

16 MR. YEUNG: It -- it -- it really -- it
17 really depends.

18 The statute only requires a four-year degree
19 specializing in -- in accounting if they are to
20 appraise personal property, personal business
21 property. That is a requirement.

22 If they're -- if you are doing real
23 property, we have -- we have, and many counties have
24 appraisers that do not have a four-year degree, but
25 have four years of qualifying experience. And that
26 would qualify them to sit for the certification exam.
27 And if they pass, then they would get a
28 certification.

1 MS. STOWERS: Okay. So it's just a rule
2 impassing. I wasn't really clear if it was --
3 because you said rule 281 or 283. And I just wasn't
4 clear if we have to go further in making changes to
5 the actual underlying law. But it sounds like we
6 wouldn't have to.

7 MR. YEUNG: Yeah, we wouldn't -- we would
8 not if you are only talking about appraisers that
9 appraise real property.

10 It's a different -- it's a little different.
11 We actually have an additional requirement for
12 prop -- for auditor/appraisers that -- those that
13 appraise personal business property --

14 MS. STOWERS: Mm-hm.

15 MR. YEUNG: -- equipment. They actually
16 require a degree in accounting or a specialization in
17 accounting.

18 There is one extra provision in there. If
19 they actually pass a certification exam that tests
20 their proficiency in accounting, then they can waive
21 that requirement. Those are already provisions in
22 law, and in our -- in our rules.

23 So there are a couple ways around it. But
24 typically the person that comes in and does the
25 auditor/appraiser type of work, they usually have an
26 accounting degree.

27 MS. STOWERS: Understand.

28 Thank you for that clarification.

1 MR. YEUNG: Of course. Any time
2 MR. GAINES: Question, if I could.
3 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes, Mr. Gaines. Go ahead.
4 MR. SCHAEFER: Chair Vazquez.
5 MR. GAINES: Oh, is that Mr. Schaefer?
6 MR. SCHAEFER: Yes, I'm here.
7 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes.
8 Mr. Schaefer, go ahead.
9 MR. GAINES: Go ahead, please. I'll speak
10 next.

11 MR. SCHAEFER: Okay. Well, this is Vice
12 Chair Schaefer.

13 Do we have to decide this today? We could
14 put it over for another month and have another --
15 have a meeting with ourselves and the leadership of
16 our assessors.

17 And, you know -- and have Ms. Cohen pull
18 your herd.

19 And, you know, I think that might bring a
20 little less rushed, and more elevated scrutiny to
21 what we're being asked to do.

22 MR. VAZQUEZ: Mr. Gaines.

23 MR. GAINES: Yeah. I appreciate
24 Mr. Schaefer's comments, and we can discuss that in a
25 minute.

26 But let me make my point here, because I
27 just wanted a point of clarification. And that had
28 to do with rule 282, temporary certification. I was

1 wondering if Mr. Yeung could explain how that works.

2 MR. YEUNG: Yes.

3 So a temporary certification is -- is a --
4 it's just that it is a temporary, one-year
5 certification from the Board that allows somebody to
6 do Ad Valorem work while they are employed by the
7 assessor or the Board.

8 They -- that is they are expected to meet
9 the full qualification requirements of a permit
10 certification at the end of the year.

11 The temporary certifications are not
12 renewable. So you have one year in which to study
13 for the exam, take whatever courses the assessor may
14 require -- their -- their educational requirements
15 may be different from ours -- and pass the exam.

16 So in some cases, rarely, some folks do not
17 pass it upon the first attempt at the exam. That
18 gives them a year. So they do have another
19 opportunity or chance to retake it.

20 And -- but the requirements are that you
21 are, one, have bonafide -- either employed by the
22 assessor or have a bonafide offer, and that you will
23 meet the requirements within that timeframe.

24 MR. GAINES: Okay. You have to have the
25 four years of experience, qualifying experience, or a
26 degree?

27 MR. YEUNG: Yes, that is -- that is still
28 part of it. You still have to meet the same

1 requirements that you would for a permanent one.

2 So, you, as a temporary -- if your question
3 is, can you be in your third -- three-and-a-half
4 years into your degree and hope to finish it
5 within -- within that one year, the answer is yes.

6 And you do have -- but you have to meet it
7 at the end of the four years.

8 MR. GAINES: Okay.

9 MR. YEUNG: Oh, I'm sorry. At the end of
10 the one year you have to meet the requirements that
11 would get you a permanent certification.

12 MR. GAINES: Thank you. Thank you.

13 MR. GAEKLE: Chair Vazquez.

14 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes, go ahead.

15 MR. GAEKLE: This is Don Gaekle.

16 MR. VAZQUEZ: Go ahead, Don.

17 MR. GAEKLE: I know that, you know, we're
18 all -- we're all talking here about, you know, what
19 we -- we want to do something good to help, and what,
20 I think, overall, could be a very good program. But
21 we're kind of getting hung up on some of the details.

22 I -- this is designed primarily to help
23 assessors' offices get employees. And I know the
24 State Board of Equalization has issues in retaining
25 them, too.

26 You know, there are a lot of technical
27 issues here that are being talked about, but it's
28 nothing in writing.

1 I think it could be very useful for the
2 Board if BOE staff and assessors, through their
3 Education Committee, get together and toss some of
4 these issues out, and present a written report to the
5 Board that outlines the requirements -- the
6 requirements that could potentially be changed, and
7 what -- what the program might look like. So that
8 you're all working off a, you know -- a template, and
9 information from the folks that are going to be
10 affected by it.

11 MR. VAZQUEZ: No, I think that's a good
12 point.

13 Well, let me -- let me see. I mean, we have
14 the motion here on the floor. I was just wondering
15 if there's support to move it forward.

16 Because now I'm thinking as we -- if it does
17 get approved, I think the goal, at least for this
18 first initial meeting, would be to get to reconvene
19 with some of the players we've already regrouped with
20 a few months back, which would be, obviously, Jeff
21 Prang from LA, myself, Mr. Gaines, and then some of
22 the folks that we have involved already from the LA
23 community college chancellor's office. And maybe we
24 come back in the July meeting and present a work plan
25 for the rest of the Members to review.

26 And then, at that point, get your
27 suggestions, comments, and try to expedite this as
28 quick as we can.

1 MS. FLEMING: Chairman Vazquez, this is
2 Brenda, if I may comment.

3 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes. Go ahead.

4 MS. FLEMING: To the extent, I think that
5 would be a good approach. And I understand, too,
6 what Assessor Gaekle is also saying.

7 So to the extent that you're going to have a
8 follow-up meeting, perhaps, with LA County, if, you
9 know, some representatives from our office, and, you
10 know, might participate. Just to make sure that we
11 can build a bridge between what you're trying to
12 achieve and the agency's responsibility.

13 So if that would be something that could be
14 considered, we could participate in whatever level in
15 those discussions and meetings to come back with a
16 report for the Board for the July meeting.

17 MR. VAZQUEZ: Sure.

18 Is there a consensus from the -- from the
19 Members to do that?

20 MR. SCHAEFER: Chair.

21 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes. Go ahead, Vice Chair.

22 MR. SCHAEFER: I'd like to make a substitute
23 motion to hold a special meeting of the Board in July
24 to vet this very important issue and get input from
25 the assessors and the stakeholders.

26 I have not had an opportunity to consult
27 with my assessors on this. And I just don't know
28 that we can make a decision today on this.

1 MS. FLEMING: If I may, Chairman.

2 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes.

3 MS. FLEMING: Vice Chair Schaefer, I don't
4 know that we would need a special meeting for that.
5 That would require a different public agenda notice
6 process.

7 So my recommendation would be that we would
8 present and come back to the July meeting, which is
9 scheduled for July 22nd, as a part of the July
10 agenda.

11 MR. SCHAEFER: That would -- that would
12 work.

13 MR. VAZQUEZ: Okay. So why don't we -- why
14 don't we do this. It sounds like what I'm hearing,
15 and I think there's a consensus, is why don't you
16 allow Mr. Gaines and myself, with the county
17 assessors and the other players that we met with,
18 regroup with BOE staff and come back with a work
19 plan, basically, that we would present back to the
20 Board at our July 22nd meeting.

21 MR. SCHAEFER: Chair, this is my substitute
22 motion that's before the floor.

23 Do I have a second?

24 MR. VAZQUEZ: Looks like --

25 MS. COHEN: Yes, I'll second that --

26 MR. VAZQUEZ: -- Ms. Cohen.

27 MS. COHEN: -- motion. It's Malia.

28 MR. VAZQUEZ: And this --

1 MS. FLEMING: Members, may I ask Chief
2 Counsel --

3 MR. VAZQUEZ: Go ahead.

4 MS. FLEMING: -- to clarify the motion.

5 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I was going to ask the
6 same thing.

7 So, Mr. Schaefer, what -- so what -- can
8 you restate your motion?

9 I think you're muted.

10 MR. GAINES: Your mic is not on.

11 MR. SCHAEFER: It's a substitute motion that
12 takes precedence over the pending motion.

13 MR. VAZQUEZ: You're correct. But can you
14 repeat the substitute motion?

15 MR. SCHAEFER: It's to hold a special
16 meeting -- it's to hold a meeting as part of our
17 July 22nd meeting, and to vet this issue that
18 segregated part of our agenda for July 22nd. Will
19 give us time to confer with our stakeholders in each
20 of our districts.

21 MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh. Well, I think that was
22 basically that I was saying.

23 So you're not asking for a meeting before
24 the 22nd, you're saying to include it in the
25 July 22nd meeting?

26 MR. SCHAEFER: Yes, I'm willing to do
27 that.

28 MR. VAZQUEZ: Is the seconder on Board with

1 that, Ms. Cohen?

2 I see a head nodding.

3 Okay. All right.

4 So basically what we will do is come back on
5 the July 22nd meeting to just address this issue as
6 part of the agenda?

7 MS. FLEMING: As part of the agenda, that
8 would be correct. So it's not exclusive to the
9 agenda, but would be included. And we can clarify if
10 we will continue to take it up as an L item --

11 MR. VAZQUEZ: Exactly.

12 MS. FLEMING: -- or if we set it as a K item
13 from a staff, you know, operationalizing it, and if
14 there's some implementation task.

15 But once we have the discussion and see the
16 report, we could then make that determination.

17 But it would be one of the agenda items at
18 the July 22nd meeting.

19 So, Mr. Schaefer, to clarify, it would not
20 be a special meeting.

21 MR. SCHAEFER: Can I clarify that
22 Member Gaines has an informational meeting the next
23 day on the 23rd?

24 MR. VAZQUEZ: He does.

25 MR. SCHAEFER: I'd [inaudible] for that.

26 MR. GAINES: That's great.

27 If I could just get clarification from the
28 maker of the motion.

1 Would this be an agendized item that we
2 would then vote and take action on?

3 MR. SCHAEFER: Yes.

4 MR. GAINES: Okay. All right. Yeah, that's
5 fine.

6 MR. VAZQUEZ: Ms. Stowers, I see a hand.

7 MS. STOWERS: Thank you.

8 In addition to voting and take action, we
9 will also have a summary report from BOE staff on the
10 different certifications and requirements so that
11 we're all on the same page?

12 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes.

13 MS. STOWERS: Yes. Okay.

14 MR. VAZQUEZ: It looks like there's a
15 consensus.

16 Do we need a vote? I think there's a
17 consensus, right?

18 Oh, we need a vote.

19 Maybe we should cast a vote.

20 MS. FLEMING: So, again, before,
21 Mr. Chairman Vazquez, Chief Counsel, please state the
22 motion clearly, so we can be clear before the vote is
23 taken, please.

24 MR. NANJO: So as I understand the motion,
25 the motion is to have, as part of the July 22nd
26 meeting, an agenda item which will be regarding the
27 process and this accelerated process, or whatever
28 alternate process is for certification.

1 And prior to that meeting, there will be a
2 meeting with Assessor Prang and Chairman Vazquez and
3 Vice Chairman Schaefer -- not Schaefer -- excuse
4 me -- Member Gaines.

5 And that BOE staff will be involved, and
6 that there will be a report as part of that agenda
7 item for a possible vote and action, which would
8 include the option and the current ground rules for
9 certification so that the Members can be fully
10 informed.

11 MR. VAZQUEZ: Correct.

12 Can we get a roll-call vote?

13 MS. DAVIS: Chairman Vazquez.

14 MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes.

15 MS. DAVIS: Vice Chairman Schaefer.

16 MR. SCHAEFER: Aye.

17 MS. DAVIS: Member Gaines.

18 MR. GAINES: Aye.

19 MS. DAVIS: Member Cohen.

20 MS. COHEN: Aye.

21 MS. DAVIS: Deputy Controller Stowers.

22 MS. STOWERS: Aye.

23 MR. VAZQUEZ: So that's unanimous.

24 Thank you, folks.

25 With that, Ms. Davis, if you could call the
26 next item.

27 MS. COHEN: Excuse me.

28 MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh, I'm sorry. Ms. Cohen.

1 MS. COHEN: Excuse me. Excuse me, everyone.
2 I'm sorry. I need to make a motion to rescind the
3 vote. I'm not -- I apologize, but I'm a no-vote on
4 that. My apologies.

5 So I'll make a motion to rescind the vote.
6 Is there a second?

7 MS. STOWERS: Second.

8 MS. COHEN: Thank you very much.

9 So this is just a simple motion. You all
10 can keep your votes the same way, I'm going to change
11 mine.

12 Thank you.

13 So --

14 MR. VAZQUEZ: But, Ms. Cohen --

15 MS. COHEN: Yes.

16 MR. VAZQUEZ: -- weren't you -- were you the
17 second on the motion, or you weren't?

18 MS. COHEN: I was not the second on any
19 motion for this, no.

20 MR. VAZQUEZ: Oh, I thought you second the
21 substitute motion that Mr. Vice Chair Schaefer just
22 made.

23 MS. COHEN: Oh, excuse me. For Vice Chair's
24 motion, yes, I was.

25 MR. VAZQUEZ: That's what we were voting on,
26 so I'm a little confused here.

27 MS. COHEN: So am I. Give me one second,
28 please.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

MR. VAZQUEZ: Okay.

MS. COHEN: Thank you. I will -- the motion
and the vote will stand as -- stand.

I apologize for the confusion.

We can go on to the next item.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

Ms. Davis, next item.

MR. NANJO: I'm sorry.

Chairman Vazquez, just so the record is
clear, the motion to rescind has been withdrawn, and
the original vote as tallied by Clerk Davis will
remain standing on the record; is that correct?

MR. VAZQUEZ: Yes.

MR. NANJO: Thank you.

MR. VAZQUEZ: Ms. Davis, next item.

---o0o---

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

State of California)
) ss
County of Sacramento)

I, Jillian Sumner, Hearing Reporter for the California State Board of Equalization, certify that on June 23, 2020 I recorded verbatim, in shorthand, to the best of my ability, the proceedings in the above-entitled hearing; that I transcribed the shorthand writing into typewriting; and that the preceding pages 1 through 59 constitute a complete and accurate transcription of the shorthand writing.

Dated: June 30th, 2020

Jillian Sumner

JILLIAN SUMNER, CSR #13619
Hearing Reporter