Haines Borough
2009 Board of Equalization
May 20, 2009
MINUTES

Approved

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** The Board of Equalization meeting of the Haines Borough, held in the Assembly Chambers of the Public Safety Building, was called to order at 6:00pm by Mayor Jan Hill.

2. **ROLL CALL: Present:** Mayor Jan **HILL** and Assembly Members, Scott **ROSSMAN**, Jerry **LAPP,** Pete **LAPHAM,** Steve **VICK,** Norm **SMITH** and Doug **OLERUD**.

   Staff Present: Jamie **HEINZ**/Deputy Clerk, Tom **BOLEN**/Borough Manager John **WURST**/Lands Manager/Assessor, Jila **STUART**/Chief Fiscal Officer, Dean **OLSEN**/Property Data Collection Assistant.

   Visitors Present: Tom **MORPHET**/CVN, Pat **PHILPOT,** Glenda **GILBERT,** George & Susan **HADDOCK,** Pamela **MOORE** (via teleconference)

3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

   VICK suggested hearing appeals from those present in the order they appear on the agenda and then going back to all others in order. **ROSSMAN** asked if anyone settled since the packet was delivered. **WURST** said that the Acquistapace appeal had been settled and requested that appeal be removed from the agenda.

Motion by **LAPP:** To approve the agenda as amended. It was seconded by **VICK**. The motion carried unanimously.

4. **SWEARING IN OF BOARD MEMBERS: HEINZ** administered the oath to the members of the Board of Equalization who swore to uphold the laws of the United States, State of Alaska, and Haines Borough, and to perform the duties of BOE member to the best of their abilities.

5. **SWEARING IN OF STAFF AND APPELLANTS: HEINZ** administered the oath to **WURST** and the appellants who swore to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

6. **OVERVIEW AND INSTRUCTIONS: WURST** thanked members for serving on the 2009 BOE. He provided an overview of the BOE's rights and responsibilities. **SMITH** asked that in the future, the prior assessment be provided to the BOE.

7. **PROPERTY APPEALS**

   B. Appeal 2009-02

   Subject property: 3-EMR-00-0900
   Appellant: **George & Susan Haddock**
   2009 Assessed Value: Site-$25,710; Building-$50,400 Total: $76,110

Owner's Estimated Value: Site-$25,710; Building-$23,120 Total: $48,830
Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed values.

HADDOCK said as per the assessment notice they received, the value of their property increased $25,000 though he hadn't made any improvements. He doesn't see why it increased so much over one year. **LAPP** asked how long it had been since the property had been assessed. **WURST** said the last time the property was assessed was 1993. **LAPP** asked if that was the main reason that the property value increased. **WURST** gave an overview of the property and structures and explained how he came to the value of the property. **VICK** asked if the lack of a septic and well was taken into account when determining the value. **WURST** explained that using a percentage completed format would take those items into account. **ROSSMAN** asked if the property owners had researched the values of adjacent properties. **HADDOCK** said they had not. **OLERUD** pointed out that state law requires the property be assessed at 100% of market value and that it cannot be incrementally raised over time.

Motion by **LAPP**: Sustain the assessment. It was seconded by **LAPHAM**. The motion carried 5-1 with **SMITH** opposed.

A. **Appeal 2009-01**
Subject property: C-PTC-06-1100
Appellant: **Pamela & James Moore**
2009 Assessed Value: Site-$20,000; Building- N/A Total: $20,000
Owner's Estimated Value: Site-$6,690; Building- N/A Total: $6,690
Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed value.

MOORE outlined points she provided with the appeal paperwork to include:

- Assessments of adjacent lots
- Full & True Market value statements from HBC and SOA
- Assessment in 2006
- Landscaping and drainage estimates
- Historic Ice Pond

VICK asked the assessor what the landscape of the surrounding land looked like. **WURST** pointed out that the lot in question lies above the lot that the Moore's home lies on and that there is a culvert with a plug in it that could drain the lot. He also explained that he went through the roll and adjusted every buildable lot assessed at less than $20,000 up to $20,000 and explained that in his opinion every buildable site in Haines is worth at least $20,000.

Motion by **ROSSMAN**: Use the adjacent lot value of 94 cents per square foot to value the property at $11,458.60. It was seconded by **LAPP**.

WURST asked that the value be in even $100 increments for the calculations.

Motion to Amend by **ROSSMAN**: Adjusting the value up to $11,500 for a round number. It was seconded by **LAPP**.

LAPHAM asked what the value would be if the lot were a registered historic lot. **WURST** said that historic lots are exempt from property tax. **LAPHAM** then asked if the Moore's had considered going through the steps to register the lot as historic. **MOORE** answered that they had considered it, but had not reached a firm decision yet as it would encumber the property. **OLERUD** pointed out that the figure used to come up with the motions was the assessed value in1985. And that the value used on the adjacent properties in 2008 was $1.67 which when calculated times the square footage of the lot would make the value be $20,357.

The amendment motion failed 1-5 with **ROSSMAN** in favor.

The main motion failed 1-5 with **ROSSMAN** in favor.

Motion by **OLERUD:** To sustain the assessment. It was seconded by **LAPP**.

VICK pointed out that the lot needed work to be buildable yet was valued the same as adjacent lots and asked if the cost of the work was taken into consideration when valuing the property. **WURST** said yes.

The motion passed unanimously

G. Appeal 2009-12

Subject property: 1-HHY-07-0300
Appellant: **Patrick Philpott**
2009 Assessed Value: Site-$30,320; Building-$56,970 Total: $87,290
Owner's Estimated Value: Site-$25,000; Building-$29,000 Total: $54,000
Assessor's Recommendation: No change to assessment

PHILPOT said he was astounded at the increase in his two room unfinished homestead cabin. He has about $13,000 into it and it was built in the late 1990's. **WURST** said the last assessor assessed a 400 square foot structure in 2002 and it was assessed at $15,600 at that time. **VICK** pointed out that since then a greenhouse, porch and bedrooms had been added. **LAPP** asked if labor was included in the appellant's cost estimate. **PHILPOT** said labor wasn't included as he did the work himself. **WURST** explained how he assessed the structures. **VICK** asked if there was running water and a septic system. **PHILPOT** said yes. **VICK** asked about loss of land from Right-of-Ways. **WURST** said there are 2.68 acres left from 4.99 in 1998. **VICK** verified that the assessments since 1998 have been on the 2.68 acres. **WURST** said yes. **VICK** asked about the difference in the square footage values between another appeal and this appeal. **WURST** explained how he uses a spectrum range of excellent, average and poor to value properties. **SMITH** said that the bank wouldn't lend the assessed value of the property to a prospective purchaser. **BOLEN** pointed out that even though banks won't lend on certain structures based on their own set of criteria, doesn't mean it isn't the true and fair value.

Motion by **LAPP**: Sustain the assessment. It was seconded by **LAPHAM**. The motion carried 4-2 with **SMITH** and **ROSSMAN** opposed.

C. Appeal 2009-03
Subject property: 2-EVS-01-0100
Appellant: **James Wilson**
2009 Assessed Value: Site-$112,640; Building-$94,900 Total: $207,540
Owner's Estimated Value: Not Provided.
Assessor's Recommendation: Site - $112,650; Building - $59,020 Total: $171,670.

WURST said the assessed value was for a house because Mr. Wilson wouldn't allow an up close assessment. After the assessment notices were sent out, Mr. Wilson asked the assessor to come out and reassess the property at which point it was discovered the building was a cabin. He is recommending the assessment for the structure be reduced due to his findings during his thorough inspection.

Motion by **OLERUD**: Accept the assessor's recommendation. It was seconded by **LAPP**. The motion carried unanimously.

Short break7:50pm

D. Appeal 2009-04, 05, 06, 07, 08
Subject properties: 3-HHY-31-0900, 3-WRS-00-0200, 3-WRS-00-0300, 3-WRS-00-0400, 3-WRS-00-0500
Appellant: **Thomas Hanley**

2009 Assessed Value:	Site (0900)-$19,530; Building-$69,900 Total: $89,430
	Site (0200)-$13,590; Building-N/A Total: $13,590
	Site (0300)-$13,590; Building-N/A Total: $13,590
	Site (0400)-$13,590; Building-N/A Total: $13,590
	Site (0500)-$15,860; Building-N/A Total: $15,860
Owner's Estimated Value:	Site (0900)-$16,530; Building-$28,000 Total: $44,530
	Site (0200)-$9,120; Building-$N/A Total: $9,120
	Site (0300)-$9,120; Building-$N/A Total: $9,120
	Site (0400)-$9,120; Building-$N/A Total: $9,120
	Site (0500)-$10,640; Building-$N/A Total: $10,640
Assessor's Recommendation:	Site (0900)-$19,530; Building-$60,120 Total: $79,650
	Site (0200)-$13,590; Building-N/A Total: $13,590
	Site (0300)-$13,590; Building-N/A Total: $13,590
	Site (0400)-$13,590; Building-N/A Total: $13,590
	Site (0500)-$15,860; Building-$60,120 Total: $15,860

WURST said a neighboring 5 acre lot sold for $250,000. **ROSSMAN** asked if the lots go to the meander line. **WURST** said it depends on how the deed is written and looking at the plat he would predict that the lots follow the meander line.

Motion by **LAPP**: Accept the assessor's recommendations for property 3-HHY-31-0900. It was seconded by **VICK**. The motion carried unanimously.

Motion by **LAPHAM**: Sustain the assessor's recommendations for 3-WRS-00-0200, 3-WRS-00-0300, 3-WRS-00-0400 & 3-WRS-00-0500. It was seconded by **LAPP**. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Appeal 2009-09
Subject property: 3-BBC-E0-0800
Appellant: **Edgar & Norey LeBlanc**
2009 Assessed Value: Site-$22,770; Building-$100,100 Total: $122,870
Owner's Estimated Value: Site-$22,700; Building-$20,000 Total: $42,700
Assessor's Recommendation: Site-$22,770; Building-$74,300 Total: $97,070

Motion by **OLERUD**: Accept the assessor's recommendation. It was seconded by **LAPHAM**. **VICK** asked how the building was assessed. **WURST** said a badly worn house. **VICK** said due to no foundation and plumbing. **SMITH** asked about 9.13 acres being assessed at $22,770. **WURST** said he will be appraising the land in the near future.

The motion carried 5-1 with **VICK** opposed.

F. Appeal 2009-10
Subject property: 2-LTI-02-0100
Appellant: **Steve & Sarah Virg-In**
2009 Assessed Value: Site-$68,810; Building-$240,900 Total: $309,710
Owner's Estimated Value: Not Provided.
Assessor's Recommendation: No change to assessment

WURST stated the appellants position that the tideland property was not included in his lot and feels like there should be a differential for those lots. **OLERUD** asked if the professional's appraisal was provided as requested on the form. **WURST** said it wasn't. **SMITH** asked what had been done since the last appraisal. **WURST** explained that the more square footage you have the price per square footage drops because you have more open floor space.

Motion by **ROSSMAN**: Sustain the assessment. It was seconded by **LAPP**. The motion carried unanimously.

H. Appeal 2009-13
Subject property: 4-MBR-07-0400
Appellant: **Evan & Marjorie Haynes**
2009 Assessed Value: Site-$161,090; Building-$252,700 Total: $413,790
Owner's Estimated Value: Site-$161,090; Building-$201,900 Total: $362,990
Assessor's Recommendation: No change to assessment.

WURST said the appellant withdrew via e-mail but since there was no signature to that end, he is asking the BOE to sustain his assessment to finalize this appeal.

Motion by **LAPP**: Sustain the assessment. It was seconded by **LAPHAM**. The motion carried unanimously.

I. Appeal 2009-16
Subject property: C-LTR-01-0500
Appellant: **Gregory Wartes**
2009 Assessed Value: Site-$40,270; Building-$63,300 Total: $103,570
Owner's Estimated Value: Site-$40,270; Building-$54,660 Total: $94,930
Assessor's Recommendation: No change to assessment.

Motion by **LAPP**: Sustain the assessment. It was seconded by **LAPHAM**. **LAPHAM** pointed out that the assessed value was less than what was originally paid for the property.

The motion carried unanimously.

J. Appeal 2009-18
Subject property: C-HEM-23-0100
Appellant: **Clint & Jacqueline Acquistapace**
2009 Assessed Value: Site-$39,680; Building-$185,100 Total: $224,780
Owner's Estimated Value: Site-$40,000; Building-$55,000 Total: $95,000
Assessor's Recommendation: No change to assessment.

This appeal was resolved prior to the BOE and was removed from the agenda at approval of the agenda.

K. Appeal 2009-19
Subject property: B-CKL-00-0850
Appellant: **Thomas & Shawna Hogan**
2009 Assessed Value: Site-$25,000; Building-$5,000 Total: $30,000
Owner's Estimated Value: Site-$17,500; Building-$3,000 Total: $20,800
Assessor's Recommendation: No change to assessment.

Motion by **LAPP**: Sustain the assessment. It was seconded by **LAPHAM**. The motion carried unanimously.

L. Appeal 2009-20
Subject property: 3-FWD-00-0900
Appellant: **Mark & Carol Ann Lickers**
2009 Assessed Value: Site-$23,900; Building-$27,260 Total: $51,160
Owner's Estimated Value: Site-$23,900; Building-$17,600 Total: $41,500
Assessor's Recommendation: No change to assessment.

WURST said this property hadn't been on the tax rolls until this year.

Motion by **LAPP**: Sustain the assessment. It was seconded by **ROSSMAN**. The motion carried unanimously.

M. <u>Appeal 2009-21, 22, 23</u>

Subject properties: C-GGT-00-0100, C-GGT-00-0300, C-GGT-00-0400
Appellant: **Ward Gray**

2009 Assessed Value:	Site(0100)-$32,690; Building-N/A Total: $32,690
	Site(0300)-$53,360; Building-$35,950 Total: $89,310
	Site(0400)-$43,530; Building-N/A Total: $43,530
Owner's Estimated Value:	Site(0100)-$20,000; Building-N/A Total: $20,000
	Site(0300)-$30,000; Building-$30,000 Total: $60,000
	Site(0400)-$25,000; Building-N/A Total: $25,000
Assessor's Recommendation:	(0100) No change to assessment.
	(0300) Site-$45,000; Building-$39,100 Total: $84,100
	(0400) No change to assessment.

WURST said the appellant's contention is that the lots are not accessible. He added that he drove the borough vehicle to the cabin and spoke with the tenants. They informed him that they are paying $550 per month rent.

<u>Motion</u> by **LAPP**: Sustain the assessment for the property C-GGT-00-0100. It was seconded by **VICK**. The motion carried unanimously.

<u>Motion</u> by **LAPHAM**: Accept the recommendation of the assessor for the property C-GGT-00-0300. It was seconded by **VICK**. **LAPP** asked the reasoning for the change. **WURST** said he didn't feel the land was equitably assessed. The motion carried unanimously.

<u>Motion</u> by **LAPP**: Sustain the assessment of C-GGT-00-0400. It was seconded by **VICK**. The motion carried unanimously.

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

9. ANNOUNCEMENTS/ASSEMBLY COMMENTS – LAPP thanked Wurst for getting the packets out early. **ROSSMAN** requested next year comparables be available to the BOE. **LAPHAM** asked for booklets to peruse that direct how to handle the duties of a BOE member as it is hard to not get personally involved.

10. ADJOURNMENT – 8:40pm

Janice Hill, Mayor

ATTEST:

Julie Cozzi, Borough Clerk

HAINES BOROUGH INCORPORATED SEAL OCTOBER 17 2002 STATE OF ALASKA