

**CITY OF UNALASKA
UNALASKA, ALASKA
TUESDAY, MAY 10, 2016, 6:00 PM
UNALASKA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MINUTES**

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

The Board of Equalization hearing was called to order at 6:00 pm, Tuesday, May 10, 2016, in the Unalaska City Hall council chambers. Roll was taken:

PRESENT:

Shirley Marquardt, Chair
Frank Kelly
Roger Rowland
Zoya Johnson (Telephonic)
Alejandro Tungul
David Gregory
Yudelka Leclere

ABSENT:

None

Madame Chair reviewed the guidelines and rules of the Board of Equalization hearing for the parties.

BUSINESS ITEM:

1. APPEALS: 2016 REAL AND BUSINESS PERSONAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENTS

Appeal 2016-02 - Parcel ID # 06-04-280, Coe Whittern, Owner is called forward.

Madame Chair reviews the Findings of Procedural Compliance for the record:

City Clerk Hazen affirms:

1. At least 4 members of the Board of Equalization are present.
2. The Appellant is the person whose name appears on the Assessment Roll as the owner of record.
3. Written notice of the appeal was filed in the allowed time period.
4. The appeal is complete, filed on the prescribed form and is notarized.
5. The Assessor furnished to the Board of Equalization a copy of the Appellant's appeal and a summary of the assessment data relating to the appeal.

Appeal 2016-02

Parcel ID # 06-04-280

Appellant Coe Whittern is called forward.

Testimony:

Coe Whittern, Appellant

(Mr. Whittern states his objection to the lack of notification regarding some of the procedural guidelines as outlined by the Chairman at the beginning of the hearing).

I do not have anything on my appeal that is not relating to my appeal. I am appealing on a very narrow basis: Unequal Assessments. There are a lot of arguments I could make but everything I am saying is based on Unequal Assessments. And you need to fix the unequal. On my appeal I have (4) lots that I said were comparable properties.

Appeal Argument

I.

In 2014 Parcel 06-04-280 in 2014 was assessed at \$59,400.
In 2015 it (06-04-280) went up to \$478,900 and remains there this year.
I appealed it last year (2015) but I was caught off guard when I presumed that the change in the assessment related to dumping fill material on the land.
In the proceedings last year (Adam) the assessor said no and that the basis of raising the assessment was because they were way behind on raising that kind of property and they were catching up.
So I was not prepared to deal with that kind of variables.

This year we are looking at comparable (properties). It is pretty clear.
In my property we went up by a multiple of 9 in 2015 and remain there in 2016.
The first comparable is one of my own properties on Whittern Lane. I have photographs but I won't bother you with that because it is outside of your new rules.

If you in vision with me, if you go down Whittern Lane across from the City Shop, all the open land on the (L) side of the road, that is Track 06-05-450 also called Track 2, Whittern Subdivision.
This is a comparable piece of property. It is essentially flat. It is not a flood plain or wetlands.
It is not improved and there is a road frontage in front of it.
It is almost 10 acres where the other one (06-04-280) is 11 acres.
It (06-05-450) was assessed at quite a bit more than 06-04-280 in 2014. It (06-05-450) was assessed at \$80,000 as opposed to \$59,400.

If we argue that the value of my property that I am appealing (06-04-280) went up 9X because that type of property was lagging. Why is this one (06-05-450) which is a similar property, similar part of town, and similar circumstances; why did it stay exactly the same for the next (2) years.
It (06-05-450) is now behind the one that it used to be ahead of (06-04-280).
It used to be ahead by a huge multiple.
This is not equal.

The value per acre is not equal, the property is comparable.
My property (value) got raised as single family/duplex (zoning).
The comparable is high Density/Residential which is historically by practice more valuable than Single Residence/Duplex.
High Density/Residential sells higher.
That is another distortion.

II.

The second comparable is Parcel 06-05-600.
This is Tract A1 B. This is the Mormon property, Steward Road.

For all (3) years, that property (06-05-600) has had stayed the same assessment of \$97,500.
That (06-05-600) is a 6.09 acre piece.

About half of it is readily developable. Some of it is steep hillside.

Even if you argue that only half of this (06-05-600) is developable that makes it about \$32,000 per acre for property that is already excavated; already filled. It was a parking lot for a theater and theater building.
This (06-05-600) is not raw land. It is hard packed gravel, had a building on it, and has sewer and water and everything to the front of the property and this property is assessed lower than my Single Residence/Duplex property (06-04-280).
The property is classified as quasi-Public because the Mormon's hope to build a church there someday.
If you want to take on the "Best Use" argument that I have heard from (the assessor) before, then the best use would be High Density/Residential.
That would be higher per foot than my property as Single Family/Duplex.

III.

The next comparable property is Dustin Dickerson's property at the corner of East Broadway and Overland.
I think his property is assessed fairly but mine (06-04-280) is not.

He has 3.57 acres and all of it is developable. If you had the pictures that I am not able to give you, you would see that you could come off Overland Drive and come onto the plateau and it would not take any major earth work to be able to develop totally develop the entire piece.
This property is assessed at \$63,500 and if you run it out per acre that is around \$17,800 per acre more or less which is quite a bit.
It (the comparable property) is way below what my Single Family/Duplex is worth.
Also, this is not undeveloped property.

A good portion is actually developed and has occupied structures on it.
This is not undeveloped property and it is still significantly less than half per acre than my property per acre.

IV.

The next comparable is the wedge of land between the tennis courts and the softball field in the valley.
This property extends across the road to include the school bus operation and the house trailer that is up on the hill.
It is a 25 acre track.

Approximately half of it would be readily developable.
About 8.6 acres (of this track) is extremely developable or already developed and very valuable.
(Mr. Whitem refers to a handout) You can see at the bottom the last line on your sheet, I said for 8 acres, the value per acre for that piece of land if we took the whole value, and there are 25 acres plus, and attribute the value to only the 8.6 acres that are already developed or readily developable, it is only \$2689 per acre.
That is not equal.

I wish you could see my pictures.
That wedge of land is gorgeous property.
It is filled to a higher degree than to my property.

It is classified as commercial property on both sides of the road.
Commercial property is supposed to be well above (Single Family/Duplex property).

(Mr. Whitem reviews the hierarchy of property values by classification)

We are several steps up here and each step should represent on the norm a higher value per square foot. And each step should represent a higher norm per square foot.
These guys are several steps up from me and what should be the norm per square foot, their value per acre if we attribute all to the 8.6 acres and ignore the other 16 acres, is only \$2689 and mine is \$43,715.

Closing Comments by Coe Whitem, Appellant

I hope that you have some questions. From my perspective, if this thing were to work right, this guy is my adversary he is not a helper.
It is an unfair playing field.
I get to say what I say.
He gets to say what he says and I do not get to rebut.
If you are trying to decide who is right, you should (allow) a little exchange back and forth.
He gets to hear what I say and react to it.
I do not get to hear what he says.

Start of Questions/Comments from Board of Equalization for Coe Whitem, Appellant

BOE Member Rowland:

Comment:

I did not participate in the training the other night.
I did go through the Power Point.
It is frustrating for me.
I wanted to look at some pictures and do some research.
I was reminded today that we are not supposed to do that.
I did not do the research I wanted to do and that was in the Power Point.
I forgot we are not supposed to go outside of what is presented here.
That is very frustrating.

Procedural Question to Madame Chair:

Is there a way for us to ask Mr. Whitem back after Adam Verrier (City Assessor)?

Madame Chair:

We have the information. It was emailed to us so we could look at this in advance. This is what the assessor used in his (analysis).

BOE Member Rowland:

Yes, but we are supposed to base our decision on what is presented here and we have just been presented information which I had in my email and I went to get pictures from those (4) tax lots (tax lots used by Coe Whitem, Appellant as comparable) to see where those tax lots were.
But as (stated) "no you can't do that because you can only work on what you have been given in the packet".
That is frustrating to me.
I am trying to do due diligence.
I have been given good information.
I am prepared to continue.

Madame Chair:

Comment:

In terms of if you all want to go back and forth (regarding testimony and rebuttal) then I suppose you can do that.
But that is not your role.
Your role is to have the appellant come forward and present why they believe the assessor is in correct in their assessment of the property with their facts and an allegation that something was done in error and was done incorrect; you question the appellant to make sure you understand the argument; the appeal; then it is the assessor's turn to come forward and give his information; what he used in order to come up with the numbers; then you as a body weigh the facts.
If you start the back and forth discussion, then it becomes "this is what I believe, this is what I think" and that is what is difficult about the Board of Equalization.
It is very straight forward.
Unless I hear otherwise, I will stay with the ground rules I set forth at the beginning of the meeting.
I asked everybody at the beginning of the meeting if everyone was comfortable with the ground rules, and everyone said yes.

BOE Member Kelty:

Comment:

I would assume if it would have been substantial, the assessment would have been much higher this year.

Question for Coe Whittern, Appellant:

Has any further earth been put on your property in question that was different from 2015?

Coe Whittern:

I am not the guy who has been placing the dirt.
It has been Northern Mechanical.
It is a freebie for them so they could get rid of stuff.
So I am not totally sure but no substantial amount of earth has been added.
Well actually, well maybe, I don't know.
My gut feel is that no substantial amount of earth has been added.
But quite a bit has been pushed.
They have an obligation to push it back.
It probably had more than it had but essential the same as it had last year.

BOE Member Kelty:

Question for Coe Whittern, Appellant:

There are still no structures, right?

Coe Whittern:

No structures.

BOE Member Leclerc:

Comment:

I wanted to see his (Coe Whittern's) lot up there (overhead screen) so I can have a clearer understanding because I was under the impression his lot was empty and everything that was compared it too has an actual structure on it. During the training one of the things that was mentioned was we were supposed to find of equal or similar so having a property (structure) on it would not make it equal or similar.

Question for Adam Verrier, Assessor:

(How can we compare) equal or similar (properties) when everything that was compared to it (06-04-480) has a structure on it?

Madame Chair:

Comment:

We need to remember we are talking about the value of the property, the value of the saleable property; it does not have anything to do with the houses on the property.

We are not talking about buildings.

We are not talking about improvements.

We are only talking about comparable saleable pieces of property.

Are there any other items you wish to have clarified by Mr. Whittern?

BOE Member Tunqui:

Question for Coe Whittern, Appellant:

Is the assessment of \$59,400 for 2015; is that the last assessment you got?

Coe Whittern:

Yes that is the assessment for 2015; the assessment for that year.
The most comparable property is that wedge between the tennis court and the softball field and on up.
Before they raised it (value) it was already higher than that superior property.
I want equal.

Madame Chair:

Question for Coe Whittern, Appellant:

(Madame Chair addresses Coe Whittern, Appellant)

For clarification, in your appeal, are you saying you the actual value of the property (06-04-280) should be put back at its value at 2014 value; what it had been for many years at 59,400 for 10 acres?

Coe Whittern:

That is what I am requesting although it is arguable that it is still not equal to my comparables in several locations in particular the last case (the wedge of land between the tennis courts and the softball field in the valley).

Question for Coe Whittern, Appellant:

If somebody wanted to buy this 10 acre property (06-04-280) in one piece from you they could come and offer you the assessed value of \$59,400?

Coe Whittern:

My argument is strictly on equal. Equal has nothing to do with values.
You cannot take values into this.
I am arguing on equal and no other criteria.
If you are not giving me equal on these comparables then you are screwing me.

End of Questions/Comments from Board of Equalization to Coe Whittern, Appellant

Appeal 2016-02

Parcel ID # 06-04-280

Adam Verrier is called forward.

Testimony:

Adam Verrier, Review Appraiser for Appraisal Company of Alaska

Appraisal Company of Alaska is the contracted assessor for the City of Unalaska.

I am here working with AJ Higginbotham.

I had analyzed the property (06-04-280) and it is the same analysis I did last year for this appeal last year and I added a small addendum to it and you received it earlier today.

My co-worker and I looked at about 10 properties.

They were the 4 that Coe Whittern brought up plus an additional 6 that were referenced in a records request by Mr. Whittern.

When we took a look at them we felt they were pretty supportive.
Some of them were valued a maybe a little higher comparatively than Mr. Whittern's property and some were valued a little lower.
We thought it was equitably assessed and generally within the range.
(Assessor references the analysis that was emailed to the board)
So what you see here is the analysis that had done for last year.
I read through it and I thought was still relevant for this year.

Start of Questions/Comments from Board of Equalization for Adam Verrier, Review Appraiser

BOE Member Rowland:

Comment:

Maybe this is my fault, but not everything opened (the attachments in the emailed of analysis by Adam Verrier, Review Appraiser) so I was not able to see those other 6 properties and it was given to us late today at the last minute so I was not able to see the other 6 properties.
It would be extremely helpful if I could have that information.

Adam Verrier:

My answer is I do not believe Coe (Mr. Whittern) put those (properties) in what he was submitting to you.
We knew he had requested the 10 properties to look at.
I assumed he was considering those for the basis of his appeal.
But I believe he referenced 4 of those properties and did not reference 6 of them.
So we looked at a list of things on the other side because we wanted to be ready for anything at this meeting.
We looked and thought these (properties) would be a little higher than Coe's (Mr. Whittern) and those would be a little lower.
There was a range of value.
We tend to have some properties that are slightly over valued and some that are undervalued.

BOE Member Gregory:

Question for Adam Verrier, Review Appraiser:

When you are doing your assessment, how big of a role does access and the proximity of utilities have to do with the assessment?

Adam Verrier:

They have a big party to do with it.
In Fee Appraisal and it is the same with Assessments, although the process for doing a Mass Assessment is a little bit different from doing a Fee Appraisal.
A Fee Appraisal is what you get if you ask the appraiser to do an appraisal of your place whether it is land or improved property.
Typically, we are trying to analyze anything that would influence a typical buyer.
And Market Value is described as the most likely purchase price we would see with a reasonable marketing time anytime buyer and seller are acting in their own best interest.
We are looking at anything such as utilities, access, view, topography, which are very important in this environment.
We know that for example that on Haystack Hill it requires a lot of dirt work.
You have a big parcel and you are carving out a building site might cost \$40,000, \$50,000 or \$60,000, so anything that would influence a typical buyer.

BOE Member Kelty:

Comment:

It would be helpful to me to see other properties that had similar jumps in 2014 and 2015 if there are any.
These pictures did not help me at all.
I don't even know why they are in here compared to Coe's (Mr. Whittern) lots.
That is one thing that bothers me.

Then there was the statement that Coe (Mr. Whittern) made.
It wasn't because of the dirt but just to catch up (increase in assessment).
This was going to be one of my questions, to catch up; I do not remember that being the answer last year.
I remember the dirt work being added was the main theme.
But if we undervalued lots, his lot particularly, then to have a jump this large from 2014 to what it was last year I would like to see some other evidence other lots that had similar increase.
That to me would be comparable.
That somebody is being treated equal.
Because that is a huge increase.

Adam Verrier:

What had happened last year is just about all of our appeals were filed by people with vacant raw land.
And that is because raw land values went up considerably last year.
The majority of our appeals were from Ounalashka Corporation.
We met them and described how we came up with those values and they withdrew all those appeals.
So if we had heard all of those appeals, I think it might have been 20 (appeals) and they were all on raw land because we raised raw land values considerably.
As far as the process of raising that (values) Mike Renfro and Arne Erickson were handling initial assessment work and I always come in as the reviewer for the BOE.
I cannot speak to what the process was when they raised them.
Certainly from \$59,400 to \$478,000 is a big jump but most of the appellants, just about all of the appellants from last year were appealing the jump, although we argued successfully that we look at market value as of today.

Madame Chair:

Question for Adam Verrier, Review Appraiser:

Could you explain how you value a piece of property in that way?

Adam Verrier:

All land is valued on a sales comparison approach.
What the assessor does in determining whether land values are appropriate; if the land is valued too high or too low we look at all the known sales that we have and compare them to the assessed values for the properties that sold.
So if we have a sample size with 10 parcels we would say if they look like they were all valued at only 30% of market value and the State says that we have to be at full and true value which we take to mean 100% of market value approximately then we would say we need to raise values a lot or lower values because sometimes it goes the other way.

In the assessment work the assessor takes a look at the sample size and in a market.
For many of the sales we don't the sales prices.
But when we do find out the purchase prices, we tend to have small sample sizes; each year we find out about only a few sales.
What tends to happen is if the market values are going up for example 10% or 15% annually and there are only 1 or 2 sales then you say it is pretty tough to raise values based on 1 or 2 sales but when you have enough sales then you say we are definitely behind and we need to raise them.
And at that point you tend to see large jumps.
And when the assessor is doing that work we tend to see a lot of appeals because this is the year we raised everybody.
Last year we had all those annual appeals.

Mike (Mike Renfro) told me prior to the BOE that we should expect to see a lot of land value appeals because we had found we needed to raise land values quite a bit.

I was not involved in that part of the analysis; I just came in as the review appraiser for last year and was asking the question last year rhetorically, was is this property (06-04-280) worth \$478,000.
As Coe (Mr. Whittern) said it is not the basis of his appeal but it is equitability.

Question for Adam Verrier, Review Appraiser:

In terms of equitability, what do you look for when looking at comparables; how do you define comparable when some are high and some are low (values)?

Adam Verrier:

For the assessor doing his initial assessment it is a little bit different from my job as a reviewer.
I am looking to check his (initial assessor) work to see if it seems reasonable.
I see my task here is to look at the data and see if this seems reasonable or is this unreasonable.
We looked at all the properties; some of the properties Coe (Mr. Whittern) mentioned and took photos of all these lots for ourselves and discussed them. These properties had topography issues that the subject does not have and some of them are valued lower too.
We looked at some of these and asked ourselves, "What can you build on this big site".
The LDS site the upper half is pretty much cliff and the lower half is very steep.
I don't think you build a subdivision on that (kind) of property; it would take a lot of dirt work and be very difficult.

The subject parcel though is an 11 acre parcel which in my analysis would be a pretty attractive property to own.
6,000 square foot lots; we know how much those are selling for.
So I do not feel that they are equal (subject parcel and LDS parcel) and those properties that were referenced were inferior.

We also saw some other properties that Coe (Mr. Whittern) did not reference tonight.
We looked at a property on the Dutch Harbor side which is zoned High Density/Residential.
When I look at the chronic undersupply of vacant Single Family/Duplex housing lots in this market as compared with the supply and demand situation for High Density/Residential properties we have a real demand for Single Family/ Low Density and Duplex essential properties.
There is not a lot of land available for that purpose.

As Coe (Mr. Whittern) said the least valuable land is the Single Family/Duplex Residential, Multi-Family properties are worth more and Industrial properties and as a general principle that is often the case but that is not always the case and Unalaska is a unique market.
Single Family/ Duplex properties are hard to come by.
I have spoken with other people who have developed properties on a small scale and they are subdividing properties and selling them.
There is a variety of techniques that some people are using here in town to do it.
But there is an under supply of housing here (Unalaska) and that influences market values.

BOE Member Kelty:

Question for Adam Verrier, Review Appraiser:

(BOE Member Kelty did not turn on his microphone)
(The question was in regard to the assessment timeframe for the re-assessment of Commercial/Business properties in Unalaska).

Madame Chair:

The Council had not asked the assessors to assess our Commercial/Business property up until that time.
It had not been done for many years and then Council decided that we should probably go ahead and do that and that is when last year many (properties) came in (higher).
I want you to know it was because they were never asked to do it (re-assess Commercial/Business properties).

BOE Member Kelty:

Comment:

(BOE Member Kelty did not turn on his microphone).
(The comment was in regard to housing).

Madame Chair:

That is correct and that is what the jump (increase in property value) showed.

BOE Member Gregory:

Question for Adam Verrier, Review Appraiser:

Parcel 06-05-450, Track 2, Whittern Subdivision, across from the City Shop, is a pretty flat piece of property; it does not have the access, it does not have the utilities close by; is that why there would be a difference in those appraisals?

Adam Verrier:

I did not do the initial analysis, but in speaking with the assessor before coming here; he was doing an analysis and left it for me for me to do my own analysis and he felt that that property (06-05-450) was a little more difficult to access, it did not have the utilities all the way to it and he felt that it was wet.
We (co-worker) went out and walked around it to see how wet it was.
There were areas that were wet and some areas that were not that wet and there were a variety of those factors present.

There will also be some variation across properties in that some properties may be undervalued and some overvalued.
Mr. Renfro felt that it (06-05-450) was a lesser desirable property because it had some drainage issues.

End of Questions/Comments from Board of Equalization to Adam Verrier, Review Assessor

Madame Chair:

As we go through deliberations, if you think of a specific question for either Mr. Whittern or Mr. Verrier, it will need to be very specific and not philosophical.

(Board in agreement)

Start of Board of Equalization Discussion

BOE Member Rowland:

Comment:

We are working off of this training (BOE training) and we have probably been a little relaxed in the past.
We are supposed to operate from the information presented at this meeting and in my mind Mr. Whittern has presented some very germane information.
I asked specifically about the other 6 properties and I was not given that information.
I asked Mr. Verrier and it was referenced but no actual numbers.

So based on what was presented, the numbers that were presented were these four (comparable properties) and I see a quite large inequality which is one of our criteria and again we are not arguing about the value.
I read the assessor's memo that was very good in methodology and conclusion and acceptable.
But in the hard data we were given tonight, I don't see equality.

As some of those others (comparable properties) were presented there were no numbers just that "They were higher". Well, was it higher per acre, was it higher total value? In other words, I am going on the information I was just presented which is what we were told to do and I see inequality.

There were references made to topography and I think Mr. Whittern tried to take topography into account. (BOE Member Rowland made reference his notes taken during Mr. Whittern's testimony).

I do see an inequality and I plan to support the appeal.

Madame Chair:

Question to Adam Verrier, Review Assessor:

Can we go through and show the properties that were used in the assessment?
We got this email and the information and there are the 3-4 comparables that were used correct?

Adam Verrier:

Mr. Whittern had referenced 4 properties but this (referring to the properties shown on the overhead screens) was in an appraisal of a hypothetical 10,000 square foot lot that would be carved out of the subject property.
That methodology was explained in that report.
So the parcels that are used here were used in the appraisal of a hypothetical 10,000 square foot lot.
But Mr. Whittern is referencing properties he compared to his subject property to show inequality.

Madame Chair:

Question to City Clerk Hazen:

Do we have the photos of the properties; 3; do you have the email that was sent out that was sent out to Council?

City Clerk:

We have the photographs that were used as part of the appeal for the subject property.
Then we have the photos of the residential lots that were used by Mr. Verrier in the comparison analysis that was used to come up with the value of a typical residential lot.

Madame Chair:

Comment:

Based on a subdivision of the larger acreage of property for 6000 square foot, is that correct?

Adam Verrier:

Yes, on 10,000 square feet.
This was for last year's Board of Equalization using a hypothetical 10,000 square foot per lot subdivision.

BOE Member Leclerc:

Comment:

I am struggling with it and I agree with BOE Member Rowland.
We do not have numbers and this particular email was late; I personally wish we had gotten it earlier so we can focus more attention to it and not have to gather through it the last hour before coming here.
I feel that there is an inequality.
It was a high jump.
From what I am seeing there is not a true comparable; (BOE Member Leclerc reads from AS statute).
I would have like to have seen a comparison with a lot that is in equal to Mr. Whittern's.
Based on the 4 that we were given and not having an appraisal on this it makes it difficult for me to deny his appeal.
And not having the numbers for the other properties for the comparison makes it a little difficult.

BOE Member Gregory:

Comment:

I appreciate the 4 properties Mr. Whittern gave us information on.
And that is what drove my question on access and utilities.
These 4 lots are not the same as the subject lot that is pretty clear.
Whether or not there is a substantiated jump from 2014 to 2015 that is something that still needs to get straight in my mind.

The properties that Mr. Verrier showed in his assessment were pretty high.
The cost per square foot was pretty close to what Mr. Whittern was being assessed.
So it is two different point of contention to try to rectify.

BOE Member Kelly:

Comment:

I would have liked to have seen more information on comparable lots.
I appreciate the information that Mr. Whittern brought.
I would have liked to have had more information on similar lots that experienced increases similar to Coe's (Mr. Whittern) lots.
That would have been very helpful to see if there was inequality in the community.
Without that information I am leaning in support of the appeal.

Madame Chair:

Question to Adam Verrier, Review Assessor:

Mr. Verrier, can you speak to the OC properties, were they anywhere near this this valuation or not?

Adam Verrier:

I have not looked into the OC appeals since last year.
We are here to figure out whether or not this property (06-04-280) is equitably assessed and whether the property is overvalued or not.
I have not looked to see how big a jump we made across the board in 2014.
That is not relevant to what we are discussing.

We need to discuss the value of the property; whether it is overvalued; whether it is inequitably valued.
Because you were instructed not to bring up additional information I can talk about some of the other properties that we analyzed.
I referenced it by saying we looked at 10 properties and we said to ourselves it looks to be in the range.
With the analysis that I had done, I was looking at hypothetical analysis per parcel.
I was not comparing any of those properties to the subjects 10.99 acre parcel.

I was saying how a typical buyer would look at this property.
A typical buyer would not look at this property and say, "Here is a 10.99 piece of property I can put a house on".
They would say, "Here is a property I can develop and sell lots and I can make some money."

If I invest this amount of money I should expect to get this amount of money over the next 10 years or next 15 years, 20 years whatever the time it takes to sell those lots.

I believe a typical person would look at this site as an investment opportunity.

As far as the valuation of the property, I look at \$478,000 say and people would easily line up to pay \$478,000 to have this investment property.

At 6,000 square feet per parcel I think you would gross 2.7 million in proceeds.

At 10,000 square feet you get 2.3 million dollars or less in gross proceeds at \$75,000 per parcel which is well supported in the market.

And I even looked at it with 20,000 square foot parcels.

BOE Member Johnson:

(Telephone difficulties, unable to hear; BOE Member Johnson disconnected from the conference line)

End of Board of Equalization Discussion

Madame Chair reviewed the options available to the Board of Equalization

Madame Chair:

Options:

1. Support Appeal 2016-02 Parcel ID # 06-04-280 - Appellant Coe Whittern
Parcel ID # 06-14-280 – \$59,400
2. Remand this issue back to the Assessor
Have the Assessor provide the specific analysis
Set a new Board of Equalization date

BOE Member Rowland:

Comment:

I am not prepared to remand it back (to the assessor)

I am going to support the appeal.

I am guessing the assessor understands all of the issues and will provide that to us next year.

BOE Member Gregory:

Comment:

I will support of remanding this back to the assessor.

Gregory made a motion to remand Appeal 2016-02; Parcel ID # 06-04-480, Coe Whittern, Owner with more information on any lots that would be considered comparable: the information, photos, descriptions, values, and a look back a properties when Council asked for all of our commercial properties to be reassessed; how many changes were made, types of changes that were made, similar jumps in valuation to other large pieces of acreage; Tungul seconded.

BOE Member Kelly:

Comment:

I will support the motion.

I would like to see more information around the period of jump; 2014 and 2015.

If we could focus on that time frame (2014-2015) that is what I would like to see.

Next Board of Equalization Meeting

Adam Verrier, Review Assessor:

Comment:

I am a Review Appraiser and I think you need the assessor, Mike Renfro to come out here.

He is currently out of the country.

The questions you are asking are systemic.

He (Mr. Renfro) handled the increase.

I know the land values increased but I was not involved in that work so I think you need to speak with Mike Renfro who did that work and is responsible for that work.

I come in as a reviewer; a fresh set of eyes because I do work here so frequently, and I take a look at what is in front of me and I give my analysis.

Madame Chair:

Possible end of June meeting.

(The Chair conferred with Mr. Whittern about the next BOE hearing date)

Coe Whittern, Appellant:

Comments:

(Stated his objection to the BOE process for the record)

Madame Chair:

Comment:

Comment:

We have a motion before us to remand; the Board believes there is insufficient evidence to make a decision.

We do not have a next Board of Equalization date set and time although it sounds like a June date might be workable for both Mr. Renfro and Mr. Whittern.

We will work under that assumption.

Madame Chair:

Restates the Motion for the record:

Motion to remand Appeal 2016-02 back to the assessor for reconsideration.

Roll Call Vote: Kelty – yes; Rowland – no; Tungul – yes; Gregory – yes; Leclere – yes.

Motion passed, 4-1.

Adjournment: The Board of Equalization adjourned at 7:10 pm.



Cat Hazen
City Clerk