

  
**Haines Borough**  
**2010 Board of Equalization**  
**May 17, 2010**  
**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 Janice Hill.
2. **ROLL CALL:** **Present:** Mayor Janice **HILL** and Assembly Members, Scott **ROSSMAN**, Jerry **LAPP**, Scott **ROSSMAN**, Daymond **HOFFMAN**, Steve **VICK**, Norm **SMITH** and Joanne **WATERMAN**.

**Staff Present:** Mark **EARNEST**/Borough Manager, Julie **COZZI**/Borough Clerk, John **WURST**/Contract Assessor, and Dean **OLSEN**/Assessor-Appraiser Trainee.

**Appellants Present:** Thomas **HANLEY**, John **SCHNABEL**, Matthew **BORON**, James **TURNBULL**, Lawrence **WILKINS**, Ellen **LARSON** (via teleconference).

**Visitors Present:** Cappi **GEORGE** and Alex **GEORGE**.

3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**LAPP** suggested hearing appeals from those present in the order they appear on the agenda and then going back to all others in order. Mayor **HILL** asked if anyone settled since the packet was delivered, and **WURST** responded that the Kelly Jessup appeal had.

**Motion:** **LAPP** moved to approve the agenda and it was amended to hear appeals from those present in the order they appear on the agenda followed by all others in order and to removed the Jessup appeal because it was settled prior to this BOE. The motion carried unanimously.

4. **SWEARING IN OF BOARD MEMBERS:** **COZZI** 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:** **COZZI** administered the oath to **WURST** and the present 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 2010 Board of Equalization and provided a very brief overview of the Board's rights and responsibilities.

7. **PROPERTY APPEALS**

- A. **Appeal # 2010-17**

Subject property: C-HGL-05-0500

Appellant: **James Turnbull**

2010 Assessed Value: Site-\$36,950; Building-\$148,100 Total: \$185,050

Owner's Estimated Value: Site-\$24,500; Building-\$134,500 Total: \$159,000

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed value.

**TURNBULL** appealed his assessment citing the poor condition of the streets and the unsightly buildings that are reducing his property value, and he believes the borough needs to fix them. **WURST** recommended the Board sustain the assessed value.

**Motion:** **LAPP** moved to "sustain the assessed values for C-HGL-05-0500."

During discussion, **SMITH** disagreed with the assessed value because of the problems. He believes the 2009 values should be used and the manager directed to fix the road problems and the burned out buildings. **HOFFMAN** said it seems like the assembly is micro-managing. **ROSSMAN** agreed the roads need to be fixed, but believes the BOE is not where the matter should be discussed.

The motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**B. Appeal #2010-19, 20, 21, 22, 23**

Subject properties: 3-HHY-31-0900, 3-WRS-00-0200, 3-WRS-00-0300,  
3-WRS-00-0400, 3-WRS-00-0500

Appellant: **Hanley Living Trust**

2010 Assessed Value: Site (0900)- \$20,310; Building-\$62,520 Total: \$82,830  
Site (0200)- \$14,130; Building-\$0 Total: \$14,130  
Site (0300)- \$14,130; Building-\$0 Total: \$14,130  
Site (0400)- \$14,130; Building-\$0 Total: \$14,130  
Site (0500)- \$16,490; Building-\$0 Total: \$16,490

Owner's Estimated Value: Site (0900)- \$\$17,080; Building-\$29,000 Total: \$46,080  
Site (0200)- \$9,470; Building-\$0 Total: \$9,470  
Site (0300)- \$9,470; Building-\$0 Total: \$9,470  
Site (0400)- \$9,470; Building-\$0 Total: \$9,470  
Site (0500)- \$11,050; Building-\$0 Total: \$11,050

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed values.

**HANLEY** believes his property has been grossly over-assessed and talked about the many problems with his property and the shortcomings of his cabin that justify a lower valuation. **WURST** believes the land assessment is more than fair, and the cabin is good and strong and typical of a "backcountry cabin."

**Motion: WATERMAN** moved to sustain the assessed values for 3-HHY-31-0900, 3-WRS-00-0200, 3-WRS-00-0300, 3-WRS-00-0400, 3-WRS-00-0500, and it was amended to adjust the values for the 3-HHY-31-0900 parcel as follows: land to the 2009 value and improvements value to \$50,000.

Discussion included comments about the cabin being assessed using the regular house formula as opposed to the cabin-specific one and the difference between a meandering glacial riverfront property and one on a regular river that doesn't cause serious erosion issues.

The motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

[NOTE: this motion was subsequently reconsidered; see minutes following Item F]

**C. Appeal #2010-28**

Subject property: B-MCP-00-0100

Appellant: **John Schnabel**

2010 Assessed Value: Site-\$107,910; Building-\$153,600 Total: \$261,510

Owner's Estimated Value: Unspecified

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed land value; reduce the improvements to \$126,200 for a total of \$166,840.

**SCHNABEL** contested both the land and improvements assessments explaining that the land is very steep and lacks privacy. He has restricted use of his own land and very little

usable property. His house is unfinished, and the other buildings consist of small cabins that have never been used.

**WURST** responded that the appellant agreed to \$500/acre as being a fair value. The buildings were reviewed and reappraised, and Because they are rural, he took 70% of the valuation. He does recommend that the land value be reduced to \$67,500, and sustain the improvement values.

**Motion: LAPP** moved to "accept the assessor's recommendation to reduce the land value to \$67,500 and sustain the improvements value for property B-MCP-00-0100." The motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

The mayor called a recess at 7:20pm.

**D. Appeal # 2010-30**

Subject property: C-ANY-02-WEST

Appellant: **Matthew & Lillian Boron**

2010 Assessed Value: Site-\$78,000; Building-\$0 Total: \$78,000

Owner's Estimated Value: Site-\$60,000; Building-\$0 Total: \$60,000

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed value.

**BORON** said he has a 2-1/2 undeveloped acre of property. It significantly increased in value this year and he does not understand why since hasn't done anything to the parcel.

**WURST** responded that the land in that area was reassessed last year. The property owner paid a low price for the land in 2007, and the deed says he was conveyed title subject to conditions. It is not a clear title but the law says the land is to be valued as though there are no title encumbrances. A reasonable and prudent buyer would not pay full market value until it is clear, so he believes that is the reason for the low purchase price.

**Motion: WATERMAN** moved to "sustain the assessed values for C-ANY-02-WEST," and the motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**E. Appeal # 2010-40**

Subject property: C-WIL-00-26B0

Appellant: **Lawrence Wilkins**

2010 Assessed Value: Site-\$51,730; Building-\$185,850 Total: \$237,580

Owner's Estimated Value: Site-\$46,550; Building-\$167,350 Total: \$214,080

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed value.

**WILKINS** said his assessment has gone up \$10K in spite of a lot of problems including undrinkable well water, a troublesome septic system, a 1970s era house with dry rot and a leaky basement. He believes that he can't sell this at a marketable value with this assessment. He doesn't mind paying his fair share but believes the assessments have gotten out of hand.

**WURST** recommended the assessed value be sustained. All property was increased by a trend of 4%, and there was no increase between the 2008 and 2009 tax years. As for the age of the house, it has been updated since it was built, but he took into account a depreciated amount of 23%.

**Motion:** WATERMAN moved to sustain the assessed values for C-WIL-00-26B0, and it was amended to sustain only the land assessment and return the improvements back to the 2009 values. The motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**F. Appeal # 2010-01, 02, 03**

Subject properties: C-HHY-02-0610, C-HHY-02-0620, C-HHY-01-0900

Appellant: **Robert Loomis**

2010 Assessed Value: Site (0610)- \$270,090; Building-\$28,750 Total: \$298,840  
Site (0620)- \$48,570; Building-\$41,280 Total: \$89,850  
Site (0900)- \$32,880; Building-\$19,400 Total: \$52,280

Owner's Estimated Value: Site (0610)- \$151,140; Building-\$28,750 Total: \$298,840  
Site (0620)- \$29,000; Building-\$21,280 Total: \$50,280  
Site (0900)- \$0; Building-\$13,400 Total: \$13,400

Assessor's Recommendation: Site (0610)- \$175,680; Building-\$28,140 Total: \$203,820  
Site (0620)- Sustain assessed value  
Site (0900)- Sustain assessed value

**LOOMIS** said his 51-acre parcel is in the process of being sold, and he believes all of his parcels have been over-assessed. The road frontage is so steep that he has to access his property through a neighbor's property and there are no utilities. He believes parcel C-HHY-01-0900 is now worthless because of the EPA's contention that it is wetland.

**Motion:** ROSSMAN moved to "accept the assessor's recommendation for property C-HHY-02-0610." The motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**Motion:** WATERMAN moved to "sustain the assessed values for C-HHY-02-0620." The motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**Motion:** SMITH moved to "sustain the assessed values for C-HHY-01-0900."

**WURST** said he recognizes that there are EPA issues with this parcel, but he still has to put a value on it. He has valued it at \$1,300/acre. He cannot give the appellant an exemption because of the issues. **LOOMIS** said this particular parcel was accretion land owned by the State. The State gave it to him in 1998, but he didn't get assessed taxes until 2007.

The motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**Motion:** VICK moved to reconsider the following Item B motion:

"Sustain the assessed values for 3-HHY-31-0900, 3-WRS-00-0200, 3-WRS-00-0300, 3-WRS-00-0400, 3-WRS-00-0500, and it was amended to adjust the values for the 3-HHY-31-0900 parcel as follows: land to the 2009 value and improvements value to \$50,000."

The motion to reconsider carried 5-1 with **LAPP** opposed.

**VICK** said he is a bit confused about the cabin rate, but it seems that the \$83/square feet that was used to figure the value was too high.

**Motion:** VICK to revalue the improvement assessment on parcel 3-HHY-31-0900 to \$68/square feet for \$40,400. The motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**G. Appeal # 2010-18**

Subject property: C-NUK-00-0400

Appellant: **Larry & Ellen Larson**

2010 Assessed Value: Site-\$41,600; Building-\$0 Total: \$41,600

Owner's Estimated Value: Site-\$20,000; Building-\$0 Total: \$20,000

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed value.

**LARSON** said from the time they bought the property and through 2009, this parcel had access. It was resurveyed, and that survey revealed that the lot is actually smaller and no longer has access. She believes a parcel with no access has lower value. She added that the assessor has been very helpful and very clear through this process.

**WURST** explained that the Nukdik Point Subdivision lots are selling for \$110-125,000, and he did discount this parcel to \$40,000. He reminded the Board that the borough is trying to bring parcels up to current market values. Since the property owner also owns the adjoining lot, the parcel in question does have access.

**Motion:** **WATERMAN** moved to "sustain the assessed values for C-NUK-00-0400," and the motion carried 5-1 in a roll call vote with **VICK** opposed.

**H. Appeal # 2010-06**

Subject property: 3-BBC-E0-0800

Appellant: **Robert LeBlanc**

2010 Assessed Value: Site-\$23,680; Building-\$77,270 Total: \$100,950

Owner's Estimated Value: Site-\$23,680; Building-\$20,000 Total: \$43,680

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed value.

**Motion:** **ROSSMAN** moved to "sustain the assessed values for 3-BBC-E0-0800."

**LAPP** does not believe the land value is high enough, and he believes it should be reassessed. **WURST** agreed reminding the Board that the borough's land values have not been reassessed in most areas.

The motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**I. Appeal # 2010-13**

Subject property: C-SKY-0A-0500

Appellant: **Edward Beitner**

2010 Assessed Value: Site-\$40,640; Building-\$163,580 Total: \$204,220

Owner's Estimated Value: Site-\$37,000; Building-\$115,000 Total: \$152,000

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed land value; reduce the improvements to \$126,200 for a total of \$166,840.

**WURST** explained that the appellant did not originally allow him to enter his property, but subsequent to the appeal entry was allowed and he determined that a lower improvement value is warranted.

**Motion:** **LAPP** moved to "sustain the land value and accept the assessor's recommendation to reduce the improvements value for property C-SKY-0A-0500." The motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**J. Appeal # 2010-25**

Subject property: B-CKL-01-11A0

Appellant: **Marjorie Ward**

2010 Assessed Value: Site-\$26,240; Building-\$0 Total: \$26,240

Owner's Estimated Value: Site-\$15,000; Building-\$0 Total: \$15,00

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed value.

**Motion:** **VICK** moved to "sustain the assessed values for B-CKL-01-11A0," and the motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**K. Appeal # 2010-27**

Subject property: C-STR-02-15NE

Appellant: **Dorothy Lemmer**

2010 Assessed Value: Site-\$20,800; Building-\$0 Total: \$20,800

Owner's Estimated Value: Site-\$20,000; Building-\$0 Total: \$20,000

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed value.

**Motion:** **WATERMAN** moved to "sustain the assessed values for C-STR-02-15NE," and the motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**L. Appeal # 2010-35**

Subject property: C-USS-03-1701

Appellant: **J. Gale Moody**

2010 Assessed Value: Site-\$20,800; Building-\$0 Total: \$20,800

Owner's Estimated Value: Unspecified

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed value.

**WURST** said Moody believes the lot has no access and should have a lower value because of it. Moody owns the adjoining lot so he has access through his own property.

**Motion:** **WATERMAN** moved to "sustain the assessed values for C-USS-03-1701," and the motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**M. Appeal # 2010-41**

Subject property: 1-HHY-07-0300

Appellant: **Patrick Philpott**

2010 Assessed Value: Site-\$31,530; Building-\$64,817 Total: \$96,347

Owner's Estimated Value: Unspecified

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed value.

**Motion:** **WATERMAN** moved to "sustain the assessed values for 1-HHY-07-0300," and the motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**N. Appeal # 2010-44, 45, 46**

Subject properties: C-735-01-0100, C-SKY-0B-1500, C-SKY-0B-1600

Appellant: **Bigfoot Auto Services, Inc.**

2010 Assessed Value: Site (0100)- \$53,460; Building-\$291,950 Total: \$345,410

Site (1500)- \$74,530; Building-\$0 Total: \$74,530

Site (1600)- \$92,140; Building-\$0 Total: \$92,140

Owner's Estimated Value: Site (0100)- \$51,400; Building-\$280,720 Total: \$332,120

Site (1500)- \$71,660; Building-\$0 Total: \$71,660

Site (1600)- \$74,800; Building-\$0 Total: \$74,800

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed values.

**Motion:** **WATERMAN** moved to "sustain the assessed values for C-735-01-0100" and the motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**Motion:** WATERMAN sustain C-SKY-OB-1500, C-SKY-OB-1600," and the motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**O. Appeal # 2010-47, 48**

Subject properties: 3-HHY-33-0700, C-SKY-OB-1700

Appellant: **Paul Nelson**

2010 Assessed Value: Site (0700)- \$122,060; Building-\$8,030 Total: \$139,090  
Site (1700)- \$81,300; Building-\$0 Total: \$81,300

Owner's Estimated Value: Site (0700)- \$117,370; Building-\$7,720 Total: \$125,090  
Site (1700)- \$78,170; Building-\$0 Total: \$78,170

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed values.

**Motion:** WATERMAN moved to "sustain the assessed values for C-SKY-OB-1700," and the motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**Motion:** WATERMAN moved to "sustain 3-HHY-33-0700," and the motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**P. Appeal # 2010-49**

Subject property: C-735-01-0400

Appellant: **Acme Transfer Co., Inc.**

2010 Assessed Value: Site-\$33,500; Building-\$129,310 Total: \$162,810

Owner's Estimated Value: Site-\$32,210; Building-\$124,340 Total: \$156,550

Assessor's Recommendation: Sustain assessed value.

**Motion:** WATERMAN moved to "sustain the assessed values for C-735-01-0400," and the motion carried unanimously in a roll call vote.

**8. PUBLIC COMMENTS** - None

**9. ANNOUNCEMENTS/ASSEMBLY COMMENTS** - None

**10. ADJOURNMENT – 9:46pm**

**Motion:** VICK moved to "adjourn."

\_\_\_\_\_  
Janice Hill, Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Julie Cozzi, Borough Clerk